ENERGY TRANSITION / UNDERWRITING DISCIPLINE

The Underwriting Carries Over

The discipline oil & gas M&A demands · reserve risk, off-take risk, cycle risk · is the same discipline the energy transition needs, just applied to new asset classes.

By Diego Molina - Mediavertical

The energy transition doesn't need a new underwriting discipline. It needs the one oil & gas M&A has spent decades refining, pointed at a different set of assets.

Reserve risk underwriting maps directly onto renewable resource risk.

Stress-testing a reserve report · separating proved from probable, questioning the assumptions behind a decline curve · is the same exercise as stress-testing a P50/P90 wind or solar yield assessment. Both are underwriting the gap between an engineer's estimate and what the asset actually produces over its life. The instinct to ask "what does this look like at P90, not P50" doesn't need to be relearned for renewables; it needs to be reapplied.

Off-take and counterparty risk analysis is structurally identical across oil & gas and renewables.

A power purchase agreement functions like an oil off-take contract in every way that matters for underwriting: the counterparty's credit quality, the curtailment and force majeure provisions, the price escalation mechanics, and what happens when the buyer's own demand shifts. An advisor who has spent years underwriting off-take risk in one commodity doesn't have to start over when the commodity is electrons instead of barrels · the contract structure and the failure modes rhyme closely enough that the analysis transfers directly.

Commodity price cycle underwriting builds the instinct for pricing any structurally variable revenue stream.

Oil & gas forces a cycle-aware mindset because flat-lining a price assumption gets punished fast and visibly. That same instinct is exactly what digital infrastructure and transportation assets need · data center and telecom assets have utilization cycles, transportation assets have toll and tariff elasticity · and both get mispriced by underwriters who default to a smooth DCF growth line instead of asking what the asset looks like at the bottom of its own cycle.

Regulatory and permitting risk transfers almost one-for-one.

Oil & gas underwriting builds a hard-won discipline around pricing permitting delay and regulatory reversal into deal timelines and structure · because the sector has lived through enough of both to know they're not tail risks, they're base case considerations. Renewable, PPP, and digital infrastructure deals are navigating their own evolving regulatory environments right now, and that same discipline · treat permitting and regulatory risk as structural, not incidental · applies directly, regardless of which vertical the electrons or the bandwidth are moving through.

None of this is a claim to specialist expertise in renewable power, digital infrastructure, or PPPs individually. It's the opposite: the value is in the underwriting range that transfers across all of them · reserve/resource risk, off-take risk, cycle risk, and regulatory risk are the same four questions in every energy and infrastructure vertical, whether the asset is a gas field, a solar farm, a data center, or a toll road.

For anyone evaluating deals across energy and infrastructure verticals: which of these four risk categories do you find gets underpriced most often in your sector?

Diego Molina | Mediavertical | MIT Sloan MBA | McKinsey · Microsoft · Google Mexico