Forest Industry: Application Review of IAS 41, Agriculture: The Fair Value of Standing Timber
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Executive summary
The application of fair value to standing timber requires a considerable degree of judgment, and the presentation of this type of valuation is of interest, not only amongst preparers and investors with knowledge about the industry, but also on behalf of new investors, such as investments funds. Amongst preparers and investors there are major questions as to how the standard is being applied to forest assets.

In 2009, we published a first of its kind study on how fair value was being applied by forest owning companies applying IFRS. In our follow up study 2011 we reviewed the manner in which fair value were being applied by the companies included in the 2009 study and a few additional companies who were early adopters based in regions migrating to IFRS.

In this 2017 study, based on financial statements published during 2015 and 2016, we have followed up on current development. A few companies have been dropped as they no longer publish IFRS financial statements.

We have not included any timberland investment management organisations (TIMO) in the study. Although their financial statements are usually not publicly available we expect to be able to include TIMOs in a coming update study.

This study aims to provide a follow up on the insights published in our prior studies to highlight certain observations on the difficulties, as well as any similarities and differences. What it doesn’t seek to do is pass judgment on how IAS 41 is being applied, although, that being said, it does aim to provide pointers as to what might be considered to comprise current best practice in fair valuing forest assets and in providing disclosures on these valuations.

The 2017 study has shown that companies preparing IAS 41 disclosures still have different levels of transparency in their financial reports. We have summarized them in three different categories (established in our 2011 study). In the first category, the companies present the complexity of various parameters but there is limited information regarding the effect on the valuation. The next level is to present more information on the effects of variations in key factors. The highest level of transparency is reached by companies who also discuss their assumptions on future prices and costs, as well as disclosing a sensitivity analysis with multiple parameters.

Based on our findings we encourage preparers to include a discussion on the fundamentals of the standing timber as an asset class and the starting point of any valuation exercise: the forest and harvest plans and the complexity of the structure of the asset, such as mix of species, age classes, pulp wood and saw timber and residuals. We encourage preparers to discuss expected future prices and costs development in order for the reader to understand the basis of the valuation and to include a discussion on when and how the values and cash flows are expected to be realised.

Last but not least, we strongly encourage preparers to increase the level of transparency and hence overall confidence in the balance sheet values ascribed to standing timber assets by including in the disclosures, a sensitivity analysis comprising each significant assumption used in the valuation that could have a significant influence on the value in case of a reasonable change, i.e. discount rate, prices, costs and growth. This is of importance especially in times of significant price fluctuations on the market and because changes in valuation assumptions can have a significant and variable impact on reported profits.

Max Blocker
Global FP&P Leader

Bo Lagerström
FP&P Leader PwC Sweden
**Introduction**

Forest owning companies applying international financial reporting standards (IFRS) all share the task of estimating and recognising changes in the fair value of their standing timber and of disclosing information on significant assumptions. IAS 41, Agriculture, is very specific, and the standing timber valuation process includes several significant assumptions requiring considerable judgement. The presentation of the valuation, itself, tends to require careful consideration due to its inherent complexities and its sensitivity to relatively small changes in the applied assumptions.

In early 2009, PwC published the first of its kind study on the application of IAS 41. This 2009 study was mainly based on 2007 financial statements and focused on how forest owning companies presented and discussed their fair value accounting of standing timber. By studying the methods and assumptions applied by companies in the forest industry, the aim was to provide insight into the key judgments made by preparers from around the world. The study highlighted difficulties, as well as similarities and differences, in the application of IAS 41. The overall conclusion was that there was room for further improvement with regards to the level of transparency of critical valuation assumptions.

In our 2011 study we performed an in-depth follow up study and update of the 2009 study. We reported that we did not gain any new ground breaking knowledge on how the preparers are assessing fair values or how they present their considerations and disclosures in their financial statements. In many ways this 2017 update confirms the findings from our two prior studies.

Although the valuation of standing timber for financial reporting purposes may be considered to be a somewhat isolated issue, only affecting listed forest owning companies, it is apparent that other actors in the market have an increasing appetite for forest land and, consequently, an increasing need to understand and master the valuation of standing timber. Application of IAS 41 to standing timber should be understood together with IAS 1, Presentation of financial statements, and IFRS 13 Fair value measurement. The standards represent the reporting framework which places tough requirements on transparency and disclosures on critical assumptions in financial statements.
What is the importance of this study at this time?

The application of IAS 1 and IAS 41 and IFRS 13 on standing timber, including both valuation and presentation of e.g. significant assumptions, is of increasing importance to preparers and investors throughout the world:

Preparers and investors have expressed interest in the manner in which IAS 41 is applied in different geographies.

The continuous implementation of IFRS in various regions with major commercial forestry activities, such as the United States, Canada, Chile and Brazil, also calls for this follow up study.

Institutional investors are becoming increasingly attracted to forestland as an asset class, seeing such assets as offering the possibility of an alternative and sustainable long-term investment strategy.

Forestry is attracting new strategic investor interest as wood-based biomass is seen as a vital renewable energy resource.

An increased number of institutional investors, who are not familiar with the financial reporting framework related to standing timber, accentuate the need for relevant information in the financial statements of forest owning companies.

The fair value of standing timber could be very sensitive to small changes in key factors which, in turn, imply possibilities for significant effects to the financial statements. In Europe we have been through a decade of significant turbulence in the industry, that, in many ways, still goes on in terms of a migration away from newsprint towards packaging, hygiene and other type of cellulose based products. We have also seen significant movements in both pulp and saw timber prices.

Given this constant growing interest, and the results of our prior studies, this 2017 study attempts to shed light on development over the last five years since 2011 by reviewing the disclosures in IFRS-based financial reports of forest owners around the globe. The study also revisits conclusions reached in our two prior studies.
What did we do?

Our procedure has been to study the level of disclosed information in IFRS financial statements by performing a qualitative review of both the note on critical assumptions and estimates and the note on the valuation of biological assets. We have used the same approach as in our two prior studies. We have included 23 (25 in 2011 and 19 in 2009) forest owning IFRS preparers based in Asia, Australia, Europe, South Africa and South America. Currently there is no forest owning IFRS preparer based in the US or Canada.

We have included comments on standing timber provided in the MD&A and like, and our procedure has also included the summary of significant accounting principles. Based on this qualitative analysis we have compared the level of transparency and have discussed significant observations related to current best practice.

We have tried to keep the list of companies from our prior studies intact. For 2017 we have added one company to our list. However, we have dropped a few companies because they have withdrawn their IFRS financial statements from the web.
Conclusions reached in our prior studies
The 2009 and 2011 studies – briefly described
Our 2009 study highlighted many similarities as regards the manner in which the fair value provisions of IAS 41 were applied to standing timber, both within regions of broadly similar forestry regimes – managed natural and plantation – and also across regions. The study highlighted certain differences. Both the 2009 and 2011 study showed that a number of judgments are necessary to arrive at the fair value and that, often, further disclosure would be beneficial to users in understanding some of those key judgments. The 2011 study evidenced some companies making extensive disclosures, which supports transparency in the financial statements.

In brief, both our prior studies evidenced: Reliable market-based prices for standing timber are rare. Of course, even where there are active markets, prices must be imputed from transaction prices which would normally also include the value of bare land. A common approach was, therefore, to use a standing volume method to value mature, or near mature, timber volumes at (imputed) current market prices. There is, however, limited disclosure as to how active markets have been assessed, including for example, limited information to provide an understanding of the degree of liquidity and the price ranges found in relevant/comparable market transactions.

A key conclusion from both studies was that few of the companies applied market-based prices for standing timber. This suggested that markets in timberland assets are limited, at least in the geographic regions in which these companies hold their assets or in commercially-sized timber plots. Consequently, net present value arrived at by DCF-modelling was, by far, the most common method of determining fair value.

Finally both studies further showed that the most important assumptions applied in the DCF-modelling included harvesting plans, timber prices, forestry costs, growth rates, and the discount rate.

Preparers used different approaches to determine these key assumptions. There were obvious differences, such as those due to geographic location, silvicultural practices, rotation periods and species, which drove different modelling assumptions; however, there were less obvious differences too, notably the use of current market price as compared to using imputed market price in estimating future timber prices.

However, as noted in both prior studies, often there were no discussion on the reasons behind a given, adopted fair valuation approach, implying that users may not appreciate the judgments and related uncertainties inherent in the valuation of forest assets. The 2011 study could not identify a noticeable improvement in the overall quality of the disclosures and management’s discussions on standing timber.

It was clear, from both prior studies that the majority of preparers have concluded that active and transparent markets in timberlands are the exception, rather than the rule. Hence, the use of net present value/DCF methods was the prevailing method of determining fair value.

One area that stood out in our 2011 study compared to the 2009 study was that some preparers already in 2010 made reference to how climate change is affecting timber growth rates and, hence, valuation. It was concluded that climate change were already driving changes in commercial forestry, for example, the increasing role of woody biomass as a renewable energy source.
The 2017 update study – briefly described

In our 2017 follow up we focused on three key objectives in focus, on which to gain insight:

- Has there been any change in the application of the valuation methods or factors used in the cash flow model since our 2011 study?
- Are there significant differences in the value of standing timber among the companies?
- Is there a noticeable difference (i.e. positive or negative development) in the quality of the information disclosed on the value of standing timber?

The study is based on an analysis of the published financial statements (2015 or 2016) of companies applying IFRS in the reporting of their forests assets. The study covers 23 companies: ten from the Nordic region, five from the rest of Europe, three from Chile, four from South Africa, and one from Malaysia\(^1\). The results are briefly summarised below. For a more in-depth analysis, please see the appendix.

Methods used to determine the fair value of forest assets

A key conclusion from our update study is that few of the companies studied have used market-based prices for standing timber. This suggests that available markets in timberland assets still are limited, at least in the geographic regions in which these companies hold their assets or in commercially-sized timber plots. Consequently, net present value arrived at by DCF-modelling is, by far, the most common method of determining fair value. A few companies continue to apply multiple methods due to the nature of their various standings.

**Discounted cash flow:** 19 of the 23 companies (21 of the 25 in 2011 and 18 of 19 in 2009) apply this method, both for managed natural forests and plantations. The main reason stated for using discounted cash flow methods is the lack of active markets for large plots of forest land, implying a lack of reliable quoted market prices for standing timber.

**Market value:** Two companies (three in 2011 and four in 2009) from South Africa and Europe (with standing timber in South Africa and Central and South America), explicitly state that they apply reliable, market-based prices for plantations of certain species and qualities of standing timber. Our updated study shows that these are plantations with relatively short rotation periods, typically between 5-20 years. These plantations are classified as mature when they reach a certain stage in their rotation. The preparers have stated that this type of standing timber could be sold at reliable market prices.

**Historical cost:** Six (seven in both 2011 and 2009) companies have stated that newly planted trees are carried at cost, which is deemed to be an indicator of their fair value. Additionally, cost is applied where there are no known reliable parameters, e.g. lack of known prices, growth rates or physical volumes.

In the 2011 and 2009 study one company, with natural tropical rain forest, concluded that cost represents the only option for certain areas with diverse indigenous species, where there are less well-known growth patterns and where there are no track records of reliable, quoted prices. However, in the 2017 study the company has moved to DCF methods but certain forests in Brazil are valued at the lower cost or market (based on only incremental growth will be harvested and the forest will be preserved).

\(^1\) The Australian companies included in our prior studies have been dropped since they no longer publish IFRS financial statements.
Assumptions in applying fair value via DCF methods

The update study has confirmed the conclusion from our 2011 and 2009 study that the most important assumptions used in the DCF-modelling include harvesting plans, timber prices, forestry costs, growth rates, and the discount rate. Preparers continue to use different approaches to determine these key assumptions. There are obvious differences such as differences due to geographic location, silvicultural practices, rotation periods and species which drive different modelling assumptions; however there are less obvious differences too, notably the basis of timber prices.

Timber price assumptions are fundamental in estimating fair value. The update study shows that some companies continue to base their assumptions on current non-adjusted market prices for timber, while others continue to use adjusted current market prices. Further, nine of the companies do not present timber price assumptions in their disclosures. It is notable that companies in the Nordic region use, in the main, imputed/adjusted price assumptions. To our understanding, this likely refers to the fact that trees in the Nordic regions have considerably longer growth cycles compared to the plantation trees in the southern hemisphere and that it is perceived as necessary to use the adjustment to smooth out short-term volatility in the market prices for logs.

For plantations in regions with faster rotation species, there appears to be less of a need for adjusted price assumptions, as current timber prices are considered sufficiently reliable for modelling fair values. However, an example to the contrary is the Chilean companies who are using imputed/adjusted price assumptions.

This said, the length of rotation period (and species diversification) does not entirely explain why some companies adjust current market prices for timber and others do not, as companies handle the price variable in differing manners within similar timber growing regions.

In 2010, one company stated that it revised the methodology for all immatu- re and mature timber to be harvested in more than 12 months from the balance sheet date. Instead of using current market prices, the company applied a 12 quarter rolling historical average price to this type of standing timber. The company is using this method also in its 2016 financial statements.

Concluding observations from the update study

Our update study has, in many ways, confirmed the findings from the 2011 and 2009 study. The companies included in the study are using differing approaches to the application of the fair value requirements of IAS 41 to standing timber. There are also differing approaches related to the disclosure practices. Some companies make extensive disclosures, which supports transparency in the financial statements.

However, as noted in our prior studies, often there is no discussion on the reasons behind a given, adopted fair valuation approach, implying that users may not appreciate the judgments and related uncertainties inherent in the valuation of forest assets. The update study has not identified a significant improvement in the overall quality of the disclosures and management’s discussions on standing timber compared to the 2011 study.

It is clear, both from the update study and our prior studies that the majority of preparers have concluded that active and transparent markets in timberlands are the exception, rather than the rule. Hence, the use of net present value/DCF methods is the prevailing method of determining fair value.

Our overall conclusion is that there is still room for further improvement with regard to the level of the transparency of critical valuation assumptions. This is especially true given that standing timber valuations are site specific. Generally, we encourage an enhanced discussion on the price assumptions used in DCF calculations with a sensitivity analysis of the most significant assumptions driving that value.

Another conclusion is that few preparers have discussed alternative uses or changed mixes of use of their standing timber and the consequences this would have on the valuations. Considering the continuous growing interest in carbon neutral energy production in many regions and a continuous drive for innovation and alternative use of cellulose fibre and cellulose residues we had expected further evidence of energy wood and other applications/use of residues impacting the valuations.

By comparing the 2015 or 2016 fiscal year-end estimated value of the standing timber per hectare of productive forest land, we have attempted to show how the value fluctuates among the companies. However, with few exceptions, the underlying fundamentals, such as geographical location, variations in species and annual yield, are not discussed in the financial statements. This implies that the low level of transparency makes any comparison between the companies in the study much more complicated.

Finally, with forests fundamental battling climate change, some preparers already back in 2010 made reference to how climate change is affecting timber growth rates and, hence, valuation. Climate change is already driving changes in commercial forestry, for example, the increasing role of woody biomass as a renewable energy source. These developments, and more, will impact upon forest valuation and, consequent- ly, financial reporting. We would expect more disclosures on these developments in financial reports.

Where markets do exist, often they are restricted to smaller plantation plots, which are not on a scale that is of interest to strategic or financial investors and, hence, the community of IFRS preparers. A further condition of an active market is that items traded within the market are homogeneous. This concept does not square readily with forest, as no two forest plots are the same. This said, the degree of similarity between same species short rotation plantation plots within a local region is far greater than in a managed natural forest. Hence, considerable judgement is required in determining what constitutes an active and transparent market.
Appendix
Introduction

Standing timber and recognition and measurement for financial reporting purposes is, in many cases, a difficult and time consuming exercise requiring various types of expertise on the assets, themselves, valuation techniques, and accounting standards. There are a few International Financial Reporting Standards covering issues related to standing timber. The most important standards are IAS 1, Presentation of Financial Statements, IAS 41, Agriculture and IFRS 13 Fair value measurement.

IAS 41 prescribes the treatment for standing timber during its growth period, degeneration, production, and procreation and as regards the initial measurement as agricultural produce, i.e. harvested timber. There is a presumption that the fair value of standing timber can be reliably measured. For standing timber with no market-determined prices or values, and for which no alternative estimates are available, historical cost can be used, that is, until the fair value becomes measurable. Fair value is stated net of point-of-sale costs. During the period of growth, any change in the fair value should be recognised through comprehensive income and should be included in the profit and loss of the period in which it arises. IAS 41 does not prescribe a valuation method; each preparer must determine the valuation approach which is most representative for its standing timber applying IFRS 13.

If market-determined prices or values are available, it may be reasonable to expect preparers to apply these to estimate the value of their own standing volume. However, almost all preparers claim that in most circumstances no such active markets are available to provide prices or values for standing timber. Without access to reliable market prices, a preparer is required to apply valuation techniques, typically discounted cash flows to achieve a net present value, requiring that management make judgments about, amongst other things, selling prices, costs and discount rates.

Valuation techniques, per se, and standing timber, in particular, require the preparer to make several critical assumptions and estimates. This circumstance could, in certain cases, require a discussion on estimation uncertainty and disclosures if there is a significant risk of material adjustment to the carrying value.

The 2011 study included 19 out of 23 (in 2009 18 of 19) companies and evidenced that the single most used valuation method was the DCF-model. This type of model requires critical estimates and assumptions regarding among other things:

- future selling prices and harvestable volumes,
- forestry-related factors, such as silviculture costs and growth rates and effects of infestations and fires,
- harvesting costs and
- discount rates

This type of assumption and estimate is of key importance in determining the fair value of the standing timber at any given balance sheet date. A small adjustment in any assumption could lead to significant change in the estimated value of the standing timber.

Our 2017 study includes 23 forest owning IFRS preparers in the forest, paper and packaging industry. Our main purpose has been to provide a summary of how standing timber is valued and how that value is actually derived and to make a comparison with our two prior studies. The main questions we have sought to address are:

- Are there any changes in the application of valuation method and parameters used in the cash flow model since our previous report?
- Are there significant differences in the forest value among the companies?
- Are preparers disclosing sufficient information with an adequate level of transparency to help the reader develop an understanding as to how the valuation has been derived and as regards the assumptions the company has made.
The following forest owning companies have been included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home country</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Forest land in ‘000 Ha</th>
<th>Location of main forests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portucel Soporcel</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Altri</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Precious Woods</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>Brazil, Gabon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Bergvik</td>
<td>2 408</td>
<td>Sweden, Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Holmen</td>
<td>1 042</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sveaskog</td>
<td>3 120</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Södra</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sweden, the Baltics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Metsäläitto Group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Stora Enso</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Brazil, Finland, Sweden, Uruguay, China, Laos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>UPM-Kymmene</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>Finland, Uruguay, USA, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Tornator</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>Estonia, Finland, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Smurfit Kappa</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Colombia, Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Lecta</td>
<td>Not published</td>
<td>France, Italy, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Mondl</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Russia, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Safcol</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Sappi</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>CMPC</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>Argentina, Brazil, Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Arauco</td>
<td>1 700</td>
<td>Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Masisa</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Samling Global</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Malaysia, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Green Resources</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gabon, Brazil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details from our study
In the following sections, we highlight significant observations related to the valuation methods and assumptions applied. The appendix is structured into two main sections:

- The discounted cash flow model and disclosed parameters
- Perspectives on cash flow parameters

Our analyses focus on the level of transparency in the disclosed information and if this information is sufficient to enable a reader to develop an understanding of how the valuation is performed and of the assumptions and estimates the company has made.

The Discounted cash flow model and disclosed parameters

Discounted cash flow

The companies in our three studies are applying IAS 41 using three different methods for valuation of the standing timber; discounted cash-flow (of expected or current log prices), historical cost (of newly planted trees), and market value (of trees approaching harvest age at current market prices). Certain companies are using multiple methods depending on their forest configurations.

In this update study, 19 out of 23 companies (21 out of 25 in 2011 and 18 out of 19 in 2009) use the discounted cash flow method, making it the far most common method applied. Consequently, this report will focus on the implications of the cash flow method, and for further information regarding cost- and market value methods, we refer to the previous report. The update study has confirmed that a few companies apply multiple methods (DCF and historical cost) due to the nature of their standings.

Even though the DCF-model is used instead of the market value, which is preferred by IAS 41 and IFRS 13, it is clear that not all companies disclose their reasons for using the DCF method. The most common reason described for applying the net present value of standing timber is the lack of active markets with available and reliable market prices for large plots of standing timber. Many companies have concluded that the only realistic option is to use DCF-methods applied to log prices. As the company SCA\(^2\) puts it “Since a market price or other comparable value does not exist for assets of the scope owned by SCA, biological assets are measured at the present value of anticipated future cash flows.”

The effect of chosen assumptions

Any valuation of standing timber is based on a number of assumptions and estimates; some are more difficult than others to prepare. Not all assumptions are mandatory to disclose for financial reporting purposes, but it is recommended to keep in mind the complexity of a valuation when reading the significantly condensed detail in an annual report. A valuation based on discounted cash flow includes several difficult assessments due to the basic characteristics of growing trees. The foundations of a standing timber DCF-valuation is based on management’s knowledge of the physical structure of the asset class and on management’s intentions as evidenced by the harvest plan.

- The structure of the standings refers to basic facts and circumstances vital to the calculation of the value, such as information concerning the mix of species and related growth patterns, age classes or structures, and yield due to soil conditions for different geographical locations.
- The harvest plan, which is the key to the valuation, covers one cycle or rotation period for each species. The plan is the instrument in which management summarises its ideas on what, where, when and which volume of timber will be subject to thinning and final felling in the immediate future. The plan also includes management’s best estimate on growth and harvesting activities following the initial plan period as regards the entire population of standing timber, during one complete rotation period.
The reader is reminded that one rotation period varies with geographical location, specie and the intention with the standing timber and could cover anything between seven years for certain species of eucalyptus located in the southern hemisphere, to well above one hundred years for slow growing pine and spruce located in boreal forests.

Other significant assumptions in a DCF-valuation, which are based on management’s best estimates, are the current and future selling prices of different species and qualities for differing purposes, i.e. pulpwood or saw timber, and residuals for energy production. It is a difficult task to assess future prices for a given rotation period with a realistic level of reliability. However, it appears to be a common practice to use current log prices and build estimates of future prices for the immediate future and, then, extrapolate the price assumption for the entire rotation period based on an assumption of long-term inflation. The selling price assumption is of absolute key importance to the valuation.

Harvest or logging costs are also of key importance to the valuation. It appears as if preparers treat logging costs very much in the same manner as selling price, i.e. to use current logging cost and build an estimate for the immediate future and, then, extrapolate for the entire rotation period based on an estimate of the long-term inflation.

Other assumptions, which are equally difficult to estimate in terms of volume and growth, selling price and logging costs, refer to basic forestry management, such as silvicultural activities (land preparation, nursing seedlings, planting, thinning, fertilizing, protecting from animals and insects, etc.). These assumptions do not appear to be equally important as the previously referred to assumptions, i.e. small changes in any of these assumptions do not tend to have profound effects on the value of the standing timber.

In the 2011 study, it was concluded that several assumptions had to be taken into consideration when applying the DCF valuation model, e.g. growth rate, discount rate, prices and costs. It was also concluded that the level of transparency and disclosure on the most critical assumptions, and also a deeper discussion on the fundamentals behind the valuation process, could, generally, be very significantly improved. The update study has not revealed any change as regards assumptions used to prepare estimates or general level of transparency.

By comparing the 2015 and 2016 fiscal year-end estimated value of the standing timber per hectare of productive forest land it is possible to obtain an indication on how the value fluctuates amongst the companies. The table below has been prepared based on the carrying value in Euro of standing timber divided by the number of hectares of productive forest land for each company who publishes its acreage.

It should be remembered that the illustrated values are taken from the 2015 and 2016 annual financial statements (IFRS) and that these values are based on several critical assumptions and estimates that are not clearly visible to the reader. It should also be noted that, with few exceptions, the underlying fundamentals, such as geographical location, variations in species and annual yield are not discussed in the financial statements. The low level of transparency makes any comparison between the companies in the study much more complicated.

From the table it is clear that the European companies have presented rather similar values on their standing timber. This is probably attributable to the fact that the majority of the standing timber is located in the Nordic region which implies similarities in terms of the standard of the standings and forestry practice, climate and variations in species, etc.

However, looking at Africa, it is clear that reported values vary considerably between the companies. There are no conclusive evidence of these variations from the financial statements. The fact that there are limited possibilities for a reader to understand the underlying reasons indicates that critical assumptions and significant basic preconditions, such as the capability of the forest land, chosen species, and forestry practice to generate biological transformation (growth in fibre volume), should be discussed more broadly and in greater depth as a compliment to the basic disclosure requirements in any accounting standards.

Another observation is that very little information is included in the financial statements as to when these values and the cash flows assuming to apply to the asset class will be, or are, expected to be realised, and in what manner. Such
information would increase the reader’s possibility of understanding the valuation presented.

But what is good information and what is considered to be a reasonable level of transparency for interested readers? These issues are addressed in the following sections.

**Perspectives on Cash Flow Parameters**

Application of DCF-models requires management to make several important assumptions for use in their calculation of the fair value of forest assets. The basic systems, such as software support related to the control and monitoring of the standing timber volume at various locations as at balance sheet date and regarding harvested volumes for different age classes and species during the period, are, indeed, of vital importance to management in establishing a reliable estimate of fair value. The integrity of the DCF-model is, itself, also of fundamental importance and, based on our experience, the use of spreadsheet software is widespread. The models applied vary and the companies using DCF employ differing assumptions for similar variables. Similarities and differences in the following key variables are described below: Formula, Harvest plans, Growth, Selling prices, Costs and Discount rate.

**Formula**

All companies in our update study applying DCF-modelling (19 of 23) have based their assessments on four significant types of variables. These variables do not change compared to the variables observed in our 2011 or 2009 study. However, the assumptions and conditions underlying certain of these variables differ and are discussed below.

- Expected income at harvest: volume * growth rate * price/unit of volume
- Expected costs during growth: silvicultural, maintenance and thinning, etc.
- Expected point-of-sale cost: harvesting, transport to market, etc.
- Discount rate: cost of capital for standing timber as an asset class

**Disclosed information**

Five companies do not disclose critical assumptions and estimates separately in the financial statements. These companies have recognised carrying values relating to biological assets ranging from EUR 0.3 million to EUR 3 500 million. This implies that standing timber has significant values in the balance sheet for at least some of the companies.

Of the 18 (19 in 2011) companies presenting disclosures, including critical assumptions and estimates, 16 (15 in 2011) state that the valuation of the standing timber asset is an important item. These companies have recognised significant carrying values in the balance sheet associated with their standing timber assets.

The most commonly presented assumptions are discount rates, selling prices and costs. However, harvesting plans and estimated growth rates vital to the valuation are not as commonly presented. These observations are the same as those made in our 2011 and 2009 study.

It is also noted that nine (eight) companies do not disclose any information on their price assumptions, which is one of the most critical assumptions in a standing timber DCF-valuation. Therefore, it may be considered worthy of note that nearly half (one of three) of the companies has failed to comply with the basic disclosure requirements in IAS 1 and IAS 41 and IFRS 13.

**Harvest plans**

Harvest plans can be perceived as the heart of the modelling. The harvest plan includes planned volumes to be harvested (both thinning and clear felling).
over a foreseeable future and extrapolations of the remaining volumes expected to be harvested. The plan typically includes one complete cycle from seedlings to harvested trees, although for short rotation plantations, the plan may cover more than one rotation when trees are left to regenerate naturally after the first felling. The companies’ rotation periods vary from 10 to 100 years, where the Nordic and European countries tend to have longer cycles due to the species of forest. The harvest plan is, in turn, based on assumptions about growth rates and the expected yield due to soil conditions etc. Companies in the Nordic region often refer to the harvesting or felling plan as the basis of assessing the volumes that can be harvested each year during the forecast period.

Surprisingly, even though the key to determining the harvesting plan is the rotation period, eight out of 23 (11 out of 25 in 2011) companies do not present any information regarding the production cycle. The companies who present this information are mainly companies located in the Nordic region, with a few exceptions. A longer time horizon implies that it is reasonable to assume an increasing level of difficulty in assessing the reasonableness of the harvest plan. A shorter time horizon implies, instead, that it could be more reasonable to expect such a harvest plan proves to be true for the forecast period in question. Regardless of the length of the period, the importance of the harvest plan calls for better information about the plan and its implications in terms of the DCF valuation.

**Growth**

Growth, i.e. the increase in volume through biological transformation during a given period of time, is essential to the fair value calculation. For any species of tree, growth is dependent upon general climate conditions, soil, silvicultural practice, and quality of genetic material. However, management must perform a series of qualified judgments, assessments and field studies. Sometimes external specialists are engaged to establish growth rates during one cycle for various species, taking into consideration local conditions. Without growth rates, it is not possible to apply DCF-modelling based on future growth until harvest. Assumptions of growth, the need for reforestation, and related thinning are estimated in the harvesting plan.

A common means of describing the implications of growth assumptions is to disclose that it is difficult to determine growth, but not difficult to determine the actual assumptions undertaken. This is, of course, not particularly helpful to the reader who wants to understand the underlying facts and circumstances.

A different example from our 2011 study was Wilmott® (no longer an IFRS preparer) who in its 2009 financial statements presented assumptions with a high level of transparency regarding growth and harvestable volumes. “Through consultation with industry experts, the Parent Entity has estimated that each hectare of forest plantation will generate over its 25 year life cycle an average of 539 m3 of timber. This yield results from appropriate silvicultural techniques and assumption that thinning of the plantation will occur at years 13, 18 and clear fell at year 25”.

Another example on transparency is SCA® that describes growth assumptions as: “Growth amounts to approximately 9.5 million m3fo per year on the productive land. Net growth, i.e. gross growth less felling and losses due to natural causes is expected to be 3.0 million m3fo per year. Felling in 2016 amounted to approximately 4.1 million m3sub”.

A limited number of companies in the update study present a sensitivity analysis including growth. This might depend on the fact that growth can be historically derived with a greater degree of accuracy than, for example, future prices. In any case, a sensitivity analysis is a good instrument to describe and discuss implications of significant uncertainty.

The 2009 study addressed the manner in which companies estimate and calibrate their growth assumptions. The 2017 update study and our 2011 study has not revealed any new information on this issue. The reader interested in this particular subject is recommended to look at the discussion in the 2009 study.

**Timber Prices**

Timber i.e. log, prices, are key and can be difficult to determine sometimes. The update study confirms the observation made in the 2011 and 2009 study that companies, rather than using current market prices for logs, often apply averaged prices based on price trend data that is periodically updated. Hence, the actual prices used in models may be higher or lower than the prevailing log prices. Inflation is considered in some cases, but not in all. The update study includes 15 (15 in 2011) companies applying DCF-modelling based on expected future log prices and four companies applying current market prices. In the 2009 study, nine applied expected future prices and eight applied current prices. The observation in our update study could be seen as an identification of a trend towards applying expected prices for the companies recently adapting IFRS.

The update study confirms another observation made in the 2011 and 2009 study, at that time labelled as a general rule: the longer the growth cycle, the greater the tendency to use modelled log prices to smooth out short-term price movements over typically longer forecast periods.

Regardless of whether or not current log prices are modelled, they would seem to be referenced into the assessment process on price assumptions in all cases. Log pricing is, therefore, a key area of management judgment, supplemented occasionally with the help of independent forestry experts.

The difficulty in determining future timber prices is mainly related to the general fluctuations of log prices in the market (covering different geographies) for various species and quality of the timber. In the update study many companies disclose that they use professional valuation companies and that they make a “careful judgment” or that timber prices are “updated periodically” when determining future prices included in the model. Hence, there is limited information regarding the actual assumptions made and, as noted above, nine companies do not include any information on their price assumptions. There may be several reasons explaining the lack of transparency
on this critical assumption. A rather obvious reason may be the complexity in presentation. Several species and age classes, harvested for varying purposes, could lead to a quite lengthy discussion on price without helping the reader with the task of understanding how management have formed their judgments.

The update study has concluded that there are only a few companies who stand out in their presentation of assumptions regarding timber prices.

Given the nature of the log price assumption effect on the valuation, we highlight some of the disclosures made by Nordic-based companies. These companies present their views about the future development of prices in a manner that could serve as a good example for other preparers with ambitions to develop their presentations.

Holmen has included a graphic illustrating the adjusted price curve and trend price, as well as the estimated cash-flow effects for the expected price-inflated, ten-year period. At the end of 2016 Holmen has made the assumption that “prices will decrease in 2011 and thereafter increase 1% per year until 2035 and thereafter by 2%”. In a sense, the subsequent drop in saw log, followed by pulpwood, prices may be seen to vindicate this smoothing approach.

Green Resources as noted “With the vast majority of Green Resources’ sales occurring domestically, the local markets in the immediate term have a much greater impact on the price forecasts than global pricing indices. Wherever possible, the valuation has used current local pricing evidence (e.g. published prices or prices realised in recent wood sales by Green Resources) as the basis for its stumpage

The Nominal price series shows the average selling price for Holmen. The Real series shows nominal prices recalculated at 2016 monetary value using historical Swedish CPI.
revenue calculations. Where local pricing is not available, or is not relevant to the end-markets which Green Resources is targeting, then a wood-paying capability (WPC) has been calculated for the proposed end-markets."

York as noted 71" The price per cubic metre per log class is based on current and future expected market prices per log class. It was assumed that prices will increase at 6.5% pa over the next year, 6% over the following year and at 6% pa over the long term (2015: 6.5% over the next two years and at 6% pa over the long term). The actual increase in the average selling price per cubic metre in 2016 was 10%, compared to the increase of 6.5% estimated in 2015."

For regions with much shorter growth cycles, there is, perhaps, seen to be less of a need to adjust current log prices, as these are deemed to be sufficiently reliable for financial reporting purposes. However, one company, based in South Africa, revised its pricing methodology during 2010 for immature and mature timber to be harvested in more than 12 months from balance sheet date. Instead of using current market prices, the company now applies a 12 quarter rolling historical average price to this type of standing timber. The revised model is still in use. Our update study shows that disclosures about assumptions on future prices are relatively unusual. This observation confirms the 2011 and 2009 study. However, several companies include timber prices as a parameter in their sensitivity analysis of the value of their standing timber. As it is difficult to determine future prices, it is reasonable to expect preparers to include a thorough discussion on the subject. Unfortunately this is not the case in current practice.

We would expect readers to ask for better information and, at least, demand a sensitivity analysis on the price assumption, together with a discussion on management’s thoughts on the robustness of the price assumption applied. We would also expect readers to require better information on actual outcomes and any necessary subsequent adjustments to the price modelling used.

Forestry costs
The update study confirms the observations made in our 2011 and 2009 study regarding forestry costs. Expenses related to various inputs in the forest management activities, are an important factor in the presented valuation models. Throughout the forest cycle, including land preparation, nursing seedlings, planting, thinning, fertilizing, protecting from animals and insects, harvest and so on, various activities are required to be performed, and the resultant costs can vary considerably between species, geographies, and over time. Not surprisingly, the costs included in DCF-models are similar to those discussed in the 2011 study:

• Felling costs.
• Silvicultural costs (including fertilizing).
• Point-of-sale costs, including all costs that would be necessary to incur in order to sell the harvested timber; certain companies include, and others exclude, costs necessary to transport the assets to market.
• Costs incurred to protect from natural hazards, such as fires and hurricanes as included in the calculations by the companies included in our study.
• Statutory replanting (Nordic region but also others).

The majority of companies disclose the type of costs included in the model. However, only 16 out of 23 companies (15 out of 25 in 2011) disclose the basis of the cost calculation. The update study shows that companies presenting transparent information about prices also tend to be transparent on their costs. 13 out of 15 companies (ten out of 15 in 2011), mainly based in the Nordic region, use current cost levels and assume cost increases during the forecast period to determine the cost parameter through the rotation period.

A couple of companies assume similar future increases in both timber prices and costs. For example, Holmen6 states "The valuation is based on a long-term trend price that is adjusted upwards annually by 2 per cent inflation. The trend price for 2017 is 424 kr/m3 sub, which is in line with applicable market prices. The cost forecast is based on present-day levels and is adjusted upwardly by just over 2 per cent per year10. It could be reasonable to assume similar future trends in both costs and prices if the production cycle is longer. However, this assumption should be subject to historical validation and subsequent calibration. Facts and circumstances tend to shift over time, and local preconditions can change very quickly due to e.g. migration or urbanization, shifts in available techniques or increased mechanization, changed trade patterns or changed rules and regulations on import and export.

The update study shows that it still is uncommon for the companies to include the most important costs driving the valuation in the sensitivity analysis. We regret this lack of information considering the fact that it can provide valuable insights into the valuation of standing timber, which is a truly complex asset class.

**Discount Rate**

The companies in this update study are based, or have forest assets, in Africa, Australia, Asia, Europe, Latin and South America. Some of these companies are forestland owners only, others are agricultural companies, and others, again, are integrated forest product companies. Hence, it is reasonable to expect varying discount rates throughout this diverse group of companies.

The update study confirms that the discount rate is the most commonly presented parameter in the disclosures associated with the valuation of standing timber. The discount rate is one of the single most significant factors, and even a small change in the applied rate can have significant effects on the valuation. Surprisingly, four companies (eleven in 2011 and nine in 2009) applying the DCF-method do not present information regarding the level of the discount rate. This failure to comply with basic disclosure requirements makes it unnecessarily difficult to analyse the effect of alternative risk assessments, etc. and, thereby, to understand the fairness of the valuation. For the 16 (14 in 2011) companies disclosing the discount rates applied, the variations between regions can be seen as follows:

An observation, comparing the update study with the 2011 study, is that the variations noted in the 2011 and 2009 study between regions still apply and that after-tax rates are used only in the Nordic region.

One way of presenting the effect of the chosen discount rate is to provide the reader with a sensitivity analysis. Of the 16 (14 in 2011) companies presenting the discount rate as a significant assumption, 14 companies present a sensitivity analysis. We can only encourage the remaining companies included in our update study to do the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forests in region</th>
<th>Pre-tax rate</th>
<th>After-tax rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nordic Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 company</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.0 - 7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 company</td>
<td>9.78 - 18.14%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 company</td>
<td>11.7 - 12.6% nominal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 companies</td>
<td>7.25 - 10.2% nominal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 companies</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25 - 7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9 - 12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fair value of plantations has been calculated using real pre-tax discount rate of 9.95%. The group currently values approximately 29 million tons of timber using selling prices and delivery costs that are benchmarked against industry norms. The average annual growth is measured at approximately 17 tons of timber per hectare while immature timber comprises approximately 150,000 hectares of plantations. As changes to estimated prices, the discount rate, costs to sell, and volume and growth assumptions are not discussed. Consequently, we have to conclude, once again, that there is room for improvement.

Another improvement we would like to encourage preparers to consider refers to the current lack of information on when the values assumed to belong to the asset class will be, or are expected to be, realised and in what manner. We believe such information will increase the reader’s possibility to understand management’s view on the standing timber and also to better understand what it will take the company to realise the values and related cash flows.

The easiest way for any preparer to provide its readers with transparent information on the critical assumptions used, and possible effects related to, a reasonable change in the assumptions applied is to undertake a sensitivity analysis. Five companies in our update study have disclosed a sensitivity analysis based on variations in several important parameters. Three illustrative examples are disclosed below; SCA, Precious Woods and Sappi.

Both the update study and the 2011 study have shown that current practice generally implies that IFRS financial statements do not include a discussion on either the forest plan or the harvest plan and that several critical assumptions and estimates are not discussed.

Concluding remarks on assumptions and cash flow valuations

Valuation of standing timber is a truly complex exercise requiring management’s deep knowledge of the structure of the asset class, and that it makes several assumptions on how the standing timber will transform in the future during one rotation period (forest plan). Management is also required to develop a detailed plan based on several assumptions, covering one rotation period, as to when the standing timber will be harvested and for what purpose (harvest plan), i.e. what portions of the expected volumes to be harvested will be used as saw timber, pulp wood or as bio mass.

Finally, management must make assumptions which are subject to disclosure requirements, such as selling price, logging costs, silvicultural costs etc. for one rotation period, and must relate these assumptions to the activities in the forest and harvest plan, assumptions that are difficult to assess and which appear to be sensitive to disclose and discuss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity analysis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEKm</td>
<td>Change in assumption</td>
<td>Change in value, before tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACC</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>2.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood price</td>
<td>0.50% the first 10 years</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>2.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felling cost</td>
<td>0.50% the first 10 years</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>150,000 m³ sub the first 10 years</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sensitivity analysis

The IAS standard requires that a sensitivity analysis of the most important parameters be carried out. The most critical assumptions in the Biological Asset Valuations are wood prices, costs and discount rates. The following charts illustrate these sensitivities.

The easiest way for any preparer to provide its readers with transparent information on the critical assumptions used, and possible effects related to, a reasonable change in the assumptions applied is to undertake a sensitivity analysis. Five companies in our update study have disclosed a sensitivity analysis based on variations in several important parameters. Three illustrative examples are disclosed below; SCA, Precious Woods and Sappi.

The fair value of plantations has been calculated using real pre-tax discount rate of 9.95%. The group currently values approximately 29 million tons of timber using selling prices and delivery costs that are benchmarked against industry norms. The average annual growth is measured at approximately 17 tons of timber per hectare while immature timber comprises approximately 150,000 hectares of plantations. As changes to estimated prices, the discount rate, costs to sell, and volume and growth assumptions are not discussed. Consequently, we have to conclude, once again, that there is room for improvement.

Another improvement we would like to encourage preparers to consider refers to the current lack of information on when the values assumed to belong to the asset class will be, or are expected to be, realised and in what manner. We believe such information will increase the reader’s possibility to understand management’s view on the standing timber and also to better understand what it will take the company to realise the values and related cash flows.

The easiest way for any preparer to provide its readers with transparent information on the critical assumptions used, and possible effects related to, a reasonable change in the assumptions applied is to undertake a sensitivity analysis. Five companies in our update study have disclosed a sensitivity analysis based on variations in several important parameters. Three illustrative examples are disclosed below; SCA, Precious Woods and Sappi.

Concluding remarks on assumptions and cash flow valuations

Valuation of standing timber is a truly complex exercise requiring management’s deep knowledge of the structure of the asset class, and that it makes several assumptions on how the standing timber will transform in the future during one rotation period (forest plan). Management is also required to develop a detailed plan based on several assumptions, covering one rotation period, as to when the standing timber will be harvested and for what purpose (harvest plan), i.e. what portions of the expected volumes to be harvested will be used as saw timber, pulp wood or as bio mass.

Finally, management must make assumptions which are subject to disclosure requirements, such as selling price, logging costs, silvicultural costs etc. for one rotation period, and must relate these assumptions to the activities in the forest and harvest plan, assumptions that are difficult to assess and which appear to be sensitive to disclose and discuss.

Both the update study and the 2011 study have shown that current practice generally implies that IFRS financial statements do not include a discussion on either the forest plan or the harvest plan and that several critical assumptions and estimates are not discussed. Consequently, we have to conclude, once again, that there is room for improvement.

A preparer wishing to communicate to its readers on the dynamics and sensitivity inherent in its DCF valuation of standing timber should try to discuss the asset based on a more holistic perspective. Such a perspective has the potential to greatly increase any reader’s possibility to form an opinion on the fairness of the valuation.

The easiest way for any preparer to provide its readers with transparent information on the critical assumptions used, and possible effects related to, a reasonable change in the assumptions applied is to undertake a sensitivity analysis. Five companies in our update study have disclosed a sensitivity analysis based on variations in several important parameters. Three illustrative examples are disclosed below; SCA, Precious Woods and Sappi.
Summary

Our 2017 update study, based on the 2015 and 2016 annual financial statements, shows that there is no significant noticeable change compared to our 2011 study in the application of IAS 41 at a global level. The additional companies included in the 2017 update study appear to apply the DCF valuation methodology in a similar manner as the other companies and have also used the same type of parameters. The new IAS 41 appliers have also used the same type of arguments to support the use of DFC modelling. Therefore, the main conclusions reached in our 2017 update study are very similar to the conclusions reached in the 2011 and 2009 study.

- Active markets, to the extent they exist and are relevant to valuing standing timber for IFRS purposes, appear limited to faster rotation plantation stands, where one would expect a high degree of species homogeneity and hence comparability with other stands. This questions whether the active market criteria can ever have any relevance other than for shorter rotation plantation stands. It could also be questioned if IAS 41 is really relevant in this respect and if it is not time to ask for guidance on how the price factor should be established in this type of situation.

- The overwhelming majority of valuations must be site specific and for which a net present value of discounted cash flows is deemed the best measure of fair value. Significant management judgment is needed in applying this method requiring significant disclosures regarding the many valuation critical factors.

- Although other assumptions are important, the most critical to the DCF-based valuation generally seem to be growth rates, log prices, harvest costs and discount rates. There would appear to be some variations, also, in the type of costs that are included, but the significance of these variations is difficult to judge.

- Surprisingly, many companies lack information regarding the rotation period, even though this information is key to determining the harvesting plan.

- Growth factors are critical. Broadly, the sensitivity of the valuation to changes in growth factors increases as the growth cycle for standing timber reduces. However, disclosures of growth assumptions and the variables that have caused, or might cause, them to change are often limited.

- Log price assumptions have a major impact on valuation. The broad conclusion is that the trend is moving towards using modelled prices, in which we see a need for additional disclosure on the assumptions the companies undertake concerning the future development of the prices. This applies particularly when taking current price fluctuations into consideration.

- The base for costs in the model varies between the companies; both current and historical costs are used, as well as assuming the same increase as for modelled prices.

- Discount rates. Valuation is highly sensitive to this assumption and considerations as to the choice of discount rate are not unique to fair valuing standing timber. What is noteworthy is that the discount rate is often not disclosed. However, in those cases where the interest rate is disclosed, it is not uncommon to provide a sensitivity analysis applying different interest rates.

- None of the companies included in the update study has discussed its valuation in the light of alternative uses of the standing timber, and not one single company has included differing perspectives, such as forest values and carbon sinking.

- By comparing the 2015 or 2016 fiscal year-end estimated value of the standing timber per hectare of productive forest land, we have tried to show how the value fluctuates among the companies. However, with few exceptions, the underlying fundamentals, such as geographical location, variations in species and annual yield, are not discussed in the financial statements. This means that the low level of transparency makes any comparison between the companies in the study much more complicated.

The study has shown that the companies have different levels of transparency in their disclosures in the financial reports. This can be summarized in three different categories. In the first category, the companies present the complexity of various parameters but there is limited information regarding the effect on the valuation. The next level is to present more information on the effects of variations in, for example, prices and interests and, in some cases, discloses a sensitivity analysis. The highest level of transparency is reached by the companies also discussing their assumptions about future development in prices and costs, as well as disclosing a sensitivity analysis with multiple parameters.

In order to achieve a high level of transparency, we suggest that the preparer include a discussion on the fundamentals of the standing timber as an asset class and the starting point of any valuation exercise: the forest and harvest plans and the complexity of the structure of the asset, such as mix of species, age classes, pulp wood and saw timber and residuals. We suggest that the preparer disclose the assumptions used and estimates made in the valuation and provide explanations as to why it is difficult to make those assumptions. We also encourage the preparer to elaborate on its reflections concerning expected future prices and costs developments in order for the reader to understand the assumptions and the basis of the valuation. This is of importance especially in times of significant price fluctuations on the market. We encourage preparers to consider including a discussion on when and how the values and related cash flows are expected to be realised. Last but not least, we strongly encourage the preparer to increase the level of transparency and overall trustworthiness of the valuation by including, among the disclosures, a sensitivity analysis comprising each significant assumption used in the valuation that could have a significant influence on the value in case of a reasonable change, i.e. discount rate, prices, costs and growth.
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<td><a href="mailto:rajan.wadhawan@in.pwc.com">rajan.wadhawan@in.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+91 124 3306014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Eddy Rintis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eddy.rintis@id.pwc.com">eddy.rintis@id.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+62 21 52891040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Enda McDonagh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:enda.mcdonagh@ie.pwc.com">enda.mcdonagh@ie.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+353 (1) 79 260000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Paolo Vesentini</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paolo.vesentini@it.pwc.com">paolo.vesentini@it.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+ 30 210 6674 733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Jeong-Hung</td>
<td>jeong-hun gp5 <a href="mailto:lee@kr.pwc.com">lee@kr.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+82 2 709 0644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Adriana Rodriguez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adriana.rodriguez@mx.pwc.com">adriana.rodriguez@mx.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+52 (55) 5263 6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Michiel Povel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michiel.povel@nl.pwc.com">michiel.povel@nl.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+31 8 87923848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Matt White</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matt.p.white@nz.pwc.com">matt.p.white@nz.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+64 (7) 838 7436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Fredrik Melle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fredrik.melle@pwc.com">fredrik.melle@pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+4795260013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Antonio Correia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antonio.correia@pt.pwc.com">antonio.correia@pt.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+351 225433127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Mihai Anita</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mihai.anita@ro.pwc.com">mihai.anita@ro.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+40212253906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Alexei Ivanov</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexei.ivanov@ru.pwc.com">alexei.ivanov@ru.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+7495 967 6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Eben Gerryts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eben.gerryts@za.pwc.com">eben.gerryts@za.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+ 27 12 429 0409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Jeong-Hun Lee</td>
<td>jeong-hun gp5 <a href="mailto:lee@kr.pwc.com">lee@kr.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+82 0 -2-709-0644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Mar Gallardo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mar.gallardo@es.pwc.com">mar.gallardo@es.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+ 34 915 684 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Bo Lagerström</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bo.lagerstroem@pwc.com">bo.lagerstroem@pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+ 46 10 213 30 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Daniel Garcia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garcia.daniel@uy.pwc.com">garcia.daniel@uy.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+598 (2) 916 0463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>Max Blocker</td>
<td><a href="mailto:max.blocker@pwc.com">max.blocker@pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+ 678 419 4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Victor Nietoh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:victor.h.nieto@ve.pwc.com">victor.h.nieto@ve.pwc.com</a></td>
<td>+ 58 281 418 7935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>