

REIT Financial Modeling

– Certification Quiz Questions

Module 1 – REIT Overview and Short Case Studies/Modeling Tests

- 1. You are comparing Equity REITs (Real Estate Investment Trusts) to real estate private equity (REPE) funds. Which of the following statements correctly describe(s) the similarities and differences between these entities?**
- a. REPE funds buy, sell, and develop properties constantly, while REITs focus on operating existing properties rather than buying, selling, and developing.
 - b. REITs are required to distribute a high percentage of their Net Income in the form of Dividends; REPE funds face no such requirement.
 - c. For REITs, high percentages of Revenue and Assets must be real estate-related; REPE funds face no such requirements.
 - d. Both REITs and REPE funds tend to pay no corporate taxes or minimal corporate taxes – because REPE funds are structured as limited partnerships, and REITs get special tax treatment if they comply with their Dividend, Revenue, Asset, and other requirements.
 - e. Both REITs and REPE funds tend to raise Debt and Equity constantly to fund their business operations.
 - f. REITs record large Depreciation charges on their financial statements but no Fair Value Gains or Losses, while REPE funds do the opposite.
 - g. All the statements above are correct.
 - h. Only statements A, B, C, and D are correct.
 - i. Only statements B, C, and D are correct.
 - j. Only statements B, C, D, and E are correct.

k. Only statements B, C, and E are correct.

l. Only statements A, B, C, E, and F are correct.

2. You are reviewing a 3-statement projection model for a U.S.-based Equity REIT in the hotel sector. The REIT's Cash Flow Statement Drivers, including its FFO, Dividends, and Debt and Equity issuances are shown below:

| Cash Flow Statement Drivers: | Units: | Historical: | | | Projected: | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | FY14 | FY15 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| Recurring Maintenance CapEx % Revenue: | % | 6.8% | 8.4% | 8.3% | 8.4% | 8.5% | 8.6% | 8.7% | 8.8% |
| (+) Net Income Attributable to Parent: | \$ M | \$ 176 | \$ 292 | \$ 132 | \$ 279 | \$ 280 | \$ 293 | \$ 295 | \$ 299 |
| (+) Depreciation & Amortization: | \$ M | 248 | 287 | 300 | 316 | 331 | 353 | 377 | 401 |
| (+) Impairment Loss: | \$ M | - | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - |
| (-) Gain / (+) Loss on Sale of Assets, Net: | \$ M | - | (143) | - | 30 | 29 | 27 | 26 | 24 |
| (+/-) Other Adjustments: | \$ M | - | 18 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| Funds from Operations (FFO): | \$ M | \$ 424 | \$ 454 | \$ 482 | \$ 659 | \$ 675 | \$ 708 | \$ 733 | \$ 758 |
| Dividends % FFO: | % | | | | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% | 65.0% |
| Planned Dividends: | \$ M | | | | 429 | 439 | 460 | 476 | 493 |
| Scheduled Debt Maturities: | \$ M | | | | 55 | - | - | 12 | 750 |
| Minimum Cash Balance: | \$ M | | | | 119 | 124 | 130 | 137 | 144 |
| Cash Balance Before Debt/Equity Financing: | \$ M | | | | 296 | 87 | (140) | (194) | (959) |
| Debt/Equity Funding Required: | \$ M | | | | - | 37 | 270 | 331 | 1,104 |
| Debt Issued: | \$ M | | | | - | 18 | 135 | 166 | 552 |
| Equity Issued: | \$ M | | | | - | 18 | 135 | 166 | 552 |
| Share Count: | # Millions | | | 197.605 | 197.605 | 198.263 | 203.122 | 209.083 | 228.959 |

| Key Metrics and Ratios: | Units: | Historical: | | | Projected: | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|--------|--------|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | FY14 | FY15 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | FY21 |
| EBITDA: | \$ M | \$ 688 | \$ 730 | \$ 733 | \$ 750 | \$ 763 | \$ 793 | \$ 823 | \$ 851 |
| EBITDA Growth: | % | N/A | 6.1% | 0.4% | 2.3% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 3.8% | 3.4% |
| EBITDA Margin: | % | 27.4% | 27.2% | 26.9% | 26.6% | 26.3% | 26.1% | 25.8% | 25.5% |
| Net Operating Income (NOI): | \$ M | 755 | 826 | 818 | 838 | 853 | 888 | 923 | 955 |
| NOI Growth: | % | N/A | 9.4% | (1.0%) | 2.4% | 1.9% | 4.1% | 3.9% | 3.5% |
| Forward Cap Rate Based on Gross RE Assets: | % | 9.9% | 7.9% | 8.0% | 8.1% | 8.2% | 8.1% | 8.1% | |
| Dividends per Share: | \$ as Stated | | | | \$ 2.17 | \$ 2.21 | \$ 2.26 | \$ 2.28 | \$ 2.15 |
| Dividend Yield: | % | | | | 7.8% | 8.0% | 8.2% | 8.2% | 7.8% |
| Debt / EBITDA: | x | 6.18 x | 5.63 x | 4.40 x | 4.22 x | 4.18 x | 4.19 x | 4.22 x | 3.85 x |
| Net Debt / EBITDA: | x | 6.12 x | 5.53 x | 4.00 x | 3.83 x | 4.01 x | 4.02 x | 4.05 x | 3.68 x |
| EBITDA / Interest: | x | 3.72 x | 3.95 x | 4.09 x | 6.29 x | 6.51 x | 6.92 x | 6.89 x | 7.00 x |
| Total Debt / Total Equity: | % | 164.0% | 146.9% | 84.3% | 86.1% | 89.9% | 94.4% | 99.1% | 84.7% |
| Total Debt / Total Assets: | % | 43.8% | 42.0% | 32.8% | 32.8% | 33.4% | 34.5% | 35.6% | 33.1% |
| EV / EBITDA: | x | | | 11.4 x | 11.2 x | 11.0 x | 10.5 x | 10.2 x | 9.8 x |
| P / FFO: | x | | | 11.4 x | 8.3 x | 8.1 x | 7.8 x | 7.5 x | 7.2 x |

Based on this screenshot, which of the following statements represents VALID criticism of this model?

- It seems that the model assumes 50/50 Debt/Equity funding, even for scheduled Debt maturities, which means the REIT may be raising higher-cost funding and straying from its targeted capital structure.
- The projected Gains and Losses shown here are almost certainly too low, which may be distorting the REIT's FFO and Dividends.
- The REIT's EBITDA Margins decline over time, even though NOI appears to be growing in-line with GDP or the inflation rate.
- The REIT's Share Count increases each year, even though there is no way to project the REIT's future share price – it would be better to hold the Share Count constant.
- All of the above.

3. You have built a Net Asset Value (NAV) Model for the same company to value this REIT based on its forward NOI and a range of Cap Rates. The basic model is shown below:

| ASSETS: | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|
| Forward Property Net Operating Income (NOI): | \$ M | \$ 838 |
| (±) Assumed Cap Rate: | % | 7.5% |
| Market Value of Gross Real Estate Operating Assets: | \$ M | \$ 11,168 |
| Construction-in-Progress: | \$ M | 79 |
| (x) Market Value Adjustment: | % | 80.0% |
| Market Value of Construction-in-Progress: | \$ M | 63 |
| Cash & Cash-Equivalents: | \$ M | 293 |
| Accounts Receivable: | \$ M | 130 |
| Goodwill & Other Intangibles: | \$ M | 648 |
| (x) Market Value Adjustment: | % | 10.0% |
| Market Value of Goodwill & Other Intangibles: | \$ M | 65 |
| Other Assets: | \$ M | 222 |
| Total Market Value of Assets: | \$ M | \$ 11,941 |
| LIABILITIES & EQUITY: | | |
| Debt & Other Borrowings: | \$ M | (3,222) |
| (x) Market Value Adjustment: | % | 100.0% |
| Market Value of Debt & Other Borrowings: | \$ M | (3,222) |
| Accounts Payable: | \$ M | (167) |
| Other Liabilities: | \$ M | (2,622) |
| Noncontrolling Interests (NCI): | \$ M | 49 |
| Net Asset Value (NAV): | \$ M | \$ 5,979 |
| NAV per Share: | \$ as Stated | \$ 30.26 |
| Current Share Price: | \$ as Stated | \$ 27.77 |
| NAV per Share Premium / (Discount) to Current: | % | 9.0% |
| Cap Rate Implied by Current Share Price: | % | 7.8% |

Based on this screenshot, which of the following statements represents something INCORRECT or a potential problem with this model?

- It's unusual to adjust the market value of Construction-in-Progress *down* from its book value; usually, the construction is expected to be worth more upon completion.
- Goodwill & Other Intangibles should be worth \$0, not some positive number, because they have no fair market value.
- Ideally, the model should use a *range* of Cap Rates or NOI by segment to determine a plausible valuation range for the company (these can also be in separate sensitivity table).
- It's unusual *not* to adjust the fair market value of the Debt – if interest rates have changed since the Debt was originally issued, its FMV is likely different now.
- All of the above.

4. You are valuing a European REIT. You get the following results from a set of Public Comps, which are based on European Office, Industrial, and Retail REITs with Fair Value of Investment Properties Between €3 and €15 Billion:

| Valuation Statistics: Company Name | Capitalisation | | | Fair Value of Investment Properties | Leverage (Debt to Total Assets) | Enterprise Value / | | | P / BV FY16 |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Equity Value | Enterprise Value | Total Assets | | | FY16 | EBITDA FY17 | FY18 | |
| intu properties plc | € 4,286 | € 9,963 | € 12,128 | € 10,800 | 48.6% | 23.0 x | 21.7 x | 21.7 x | 0.7 x |
| British Land Company Plc | 7,065 | 11,555 | 15,751 | 10,722 | 27.5% | 19.9 x | 20.2 x | 20.5 x | 0.7 x |
| Derwent London Plc | 3,226 | 4,543 | 5,912 | 5,666 | 21.3% | 32.1 x | 28.7 x | 28.6 x | 0.7 x |
| Société Foncière Lyonnaise | 2,236 | 4,596 | 5,764 | 5,632 | 34.9% | 27.0 x | 26.0 x | 25.6 x | 0.7 x |
| Hammerson plc | 5,088 | 9,229 | 11,452 | 5,622 | 36.1% | 23.5 x | 24.4 x | 24.3 x | 0.8 x |
| SEGRO Plc | 4,512 | 6,384 | 7,145 | 5,514 | 26.9% | 32.1 x | 23.6 x | 22.3 x | 0.9 x |
| Altea Cogedim | 2,554 | 6,358 | 7,081 | 4,256 | 44.6% | 29.7 x | 19.8 x | 17.0 x | 1.6 x |
| Beni Stabili SpA SIIQ | 1,202 | 3,467 | 4,240 | 3,995 | 54.1% | 25.1 x | 24.6 x | 24.8 x | 0.6 x |
| Wereldhave N.V. | 1,604 | 3,312 | 3,948 | 3,804 | 39.7% | 18.5 x | 18.2 x | 17.9 x | 0.8 x |
| Shaftesbury PLC | 2,860 | 3,856 | 3,983 | 3,764 | 25.5% | 46.8 x | 43.5 x | 37.4 x | 1.0 x |
| Eurocommercial Properties N.V. | 1,658 | 3,219 | 3,619 | 3,461 | 43.9% | 21.4 x | 20.8 x | 20.5 x | 0.9 x |
| alstria office REIT-AG | 1,748 | 2,987 | 3,383 | 3,006 | 43.9% | 19.3 x | 19.7 x | 19.0 x | 1.0 x |
| Maximum | € 7,065 | € 11,555 | € 15,751 | € 10,800 | 54.1% | 46.8 x | 43.5 x | 37.4 x | 1.6 x |
| 75th Percentile | 4,343 | 7,096 | 8,222 | 5,640 | 44.1% | 30.3 x | 24.9 x | 25.0 x | 0.9 x |
| Median | € 2,707 | € 4,569 | € 5,838 | € 4,885 | 37.9% | 24.3 x | 22.6 x | 22.0 x | 0.8 x |
| 25th Percentile | 1,726 | 3,428 | 3,974 | 3,794 | 27.3% | 21.0 x | 20.1 x | 20.1 x | 0.7 x |
| Minimum | 1,202 | 2,987 | 3,383 | 3,006 | 21.3% | 18.5 x | 18.2 x | 17.0 x | 0.6 x |
| Inmobiliaria Colonial SOCIMI, S.A. | € 2,256 | € 7,553 | € 8,228 | € 7,770 | 44.9% | 35.0 x | 32.6 x | 31.2 x | 1.0 x |

The company you are valuing (“Colonial”) is growing its EBITDA at 4-5% vs. a median of 1-2% for the comparable companies. It is also a bit larger than the average comparable in terms of Enterprise Value, Total Assets, Fair Value of Investment Properties, and EBITDA, and it is slightly more leveraged (45% vs. 38%). What can you conclude, based on this information and the screenshot above?

- The P / BV multiple is meaningless because REITs have high Accumulated Depreciation balances, which depress their Book Values.
- Most likely, Colonial is appropriately valued right now since its multiples are higher than the median multiples of the set, but its growth rates and financial metrics are also higher.
- You cannot say much because EV / EBITDA and EBITDA are not appropriate metrics for IFRS-based REITs due to the recognition of Fair Value Gains and Losses on the Income Statement.

- d. Colonial is likely to be overvalued currently because its growth rate is over 2x the median growth rate of the set, but its multiples are only 25-50% higher.
- e. You cannot say much because this set of Public Comps is too broad – you should select only one sector, such as Office or Retail, and you should limit the set to 1-2 European countries rather than the entire continent.