



Quarterly Brief

**Renewable energy valuation in
the global energy transition**

17th Edition of our
International Valuation Newsletter
Q1 2022

February 2022

home.kpmg/be



Dear Reader

Over the past years, a systematic shift has occurred in the world's stance on renewable energy. The need for a global energy transition, coupled with both increased governmental support and key technological advances, are hailing in renewable energy as the next frontier and are fueling the embracement of and the optimistic investment in a sustainable future.

In the midst of the global energy crisis – with some of the highest energy costs in decades – this edition of the Quarterly Brief introduces renewable energy, discusses the factors contributing to the recent wave of activity in renewables as well as how to approach renewable energy valuation.

In this newsletter, we explore questions such as:

- What are the major renewable energy sources and what is their current position in the global energy mix?
- What has contributed to the recent wave in renewable energy activity and investment?
- What are the key factors to consider when performing valuations of renewable energy projects?

In addition, we share with you our summary of key capital market data such as index performance, sector multiples, risk-free rates, country risk premiums and growth rates for selected markets. This can all be found in the final sections of this Quarterly Brief.

We look forward to discussing your questions regarding renewable energy valuation. As always, stay safe and healthy.

Yours faithfully



Jorn De Neve
Partner, Deal Advisory



Steven Goossens
Director, Deal Advisory

The global energy transition

The significance of the global energy transition from fossil fuels to renewable sources is widely acknowledged. The imperative of the transition from a fossil fuel-reliant society to a sustainable one is generally appreciated as being not only a global warming concern but also caused by the nature of fossil fuels as, by definition, being finite resources, which will eventually become prohibitively expensive as they deplete.

As a society, we depend systemically on fossil fuel sources to maintain our way of life and difficult changes must be made so our most beloved and common activities can continue without fossil fuels. For society to survive, we must continue to drive technological advances in order to surmount the formidable economic and societal obstacles in the way of a sustainable future.

Understanding renewable energy sources


Renewable energy flows come from three sources but manifest themselves in many forms. The three renewable energy flows are solar radiation, decay of radioactive

materials in the Earth's crust (i.e., geo-thermal energy) and the gravitational interplay between the earth and moon (i.e., tidal energy). In this Quarterly Brief, we will focus on the first, solar radiation. While the other two renewable energy flows are important, much of the renewable energy sources in use today and most promising for the future arise from the solar radiation energy flow. From solar radiation, we derive the following key renewable energy sources (Smil 2016):



Wind power,

which converts solar radiation into electricity indirectly, is generated due to pressure differences resulting from temperature differentials on the Earth's surfaces



Hydro power,

which also converts solar radiation into electricity indirectly, but does so through the kinetic energy of streams, created by the sun-driven water cycle of evaporation, precipitation, and runoff



Solar power,

which directly converts solar energy into electricity through the use of solar photovoltaic ("PV") cells, also known as solar panels, as well as concentrated solar power ("CSP") which uses mirrors or lenses to concentrate solar energy to a single point for conversion



Biomass,

another form of renewable energy from solar radiation (via photosynthesis), is a form of combustible renewable energy and contributes a relatively minor portion to the global energy mix

As shown in **Figure 1**, these energy sources make up the bulk of electricity converted from renewable energy sources with hydro power, wind power and solar power making up 51%, 31% and 17%, respectively, of total electricity production from renewable sources on average in 2021 for OECD countries.

As part of the total energy mix from all sources, though, we observe that electricity generated from renewable sources continues to make up a minority of the total output when compared to fossil fuel sources, as shown in **Figure 2**. Despite this, we observe renewable sources contributing a significant portion at an accelerating pace.

Figure 1

Electricity production by renewable energy source – OECD countries




Figure 2

Electricity production by energy source (all) – OECD countries





Figure 2 (cont.)

Average electricity production by energy source (all) – OECD countries



Based on data provided by: International Energy Agency

Recently, there has been an incredible wave of investment and activity spurring the energy transition, which is observed in the growing share of hydro, wind, solar and geothermal sources in global electricity production. As shown in **Figure 2**, these renewables made up 28% of the 2021 total electricity production on average throughout the year, up from an average contribution of 23% in 2016, and 16% in 2010. This adds up to an impressive 76% increase between 2010 and 2021. The transition is driven by a variety of factors including technological improvements and declining governmental barriers that have for so long hindered the global energy transition. In the following sections we explore in more detail the factors which have spurred this recent activity.

Technological innovation

One of the most significant hurdles hindering the transition to renewable energy has been the economics that fossil fuels, such as coal and natural gas, have been the cheapest way to generate electricity. As shown in **Figure 2**, the

sources of electricity with the highest share are natural gas and coal with a combined 2021 average of 50% of all electricity produced in OECD countries. The reason for this is simply the economic competitiveness of these fossil fuels, measured by the much higher amount of energy yield from their respective input resources. Using power density as an example, a measure of energy produced from the amount of land required to source the inputs and produce the energy, natural gas has an estimated power density of 3,000 w/m² and coal an estimated 1,000 w/m² on average (Smil 2016). Comparing this power density to even the hypothetical maximum for the “average” spot on earth, for solar energy of 188 w/m²¹, the picture becomes clear as to why fossil fuels have reigned as the leading source for electricity production in the past.

So, what is changing? Why has the portion of electricity production from renewable sources increased in recent years as shown in **Figure 2**? Improvements in the

¹ Calculated as the solar constant divided by 4 adjusted for atmospheric absorptions and reflections (1,367 w/m² ÷ 4) * (1-65%) = 188 w/m² (Smil 2016)

underlying technology as well as economies of scale leading to lower costs to purchase solar PV cells and wind turbines as well as construct solar PV and wind farms appear to be a key factor. In addition, according to a recent report by the International Renewable Energy Agency (“IRENA”), renewable energy has become the world’s cheapest source of electricity in 2020 with an estimated 89% reduction in the price of electricity from new solar PV power plants and a 70% reduction in the price of electricity from new wind farms in the past 10 years driven by improving technology and economies of scale, among other factors. By contrast, coal only saw a 2% reduction in electricity price during this 10-year period (IRENA, 2021). This shift in underlying economics has given renewable energy a significant tailwind in the energy transition.

term increase in global temperature to below 2 degrees Celsius, with efforts towards 1.5 degrees, compared to pre-industrial levels. Other important aspects of the Paris Climate Agreement include various frameworks to support countries in their efforts to meet their own goals as well as those of the Paris Climate Agreement. In addition, the agreement puts into place various reporting requirements to track progress. These expanded efforts to fight climate change are evidence of the shift in the global awareness and interest in how we satisfy our energy needs. The agreements reached with the Paris Climate Agreement have been further reinforced and extended with the recent COP26 summit that took place in Glasgow in November 2021, in light of the seriousness of recent natural disasters driven by climate change.

Governmental forces

In recent years governments around the globe have expanded their efforts towards decarbonization and the energy transition. This is evident in the clear targets set by countries across the world to reduce their carbon footprints and fight against global warming. For example, the Paris Climate Agreement, which entered into force in November 2016, is a legally binding international treaty signed by 192 countries plus the EU and sets long-term goals to respond to climate change. Such targets include a limit on the long-

Increased investment in renewable energy

These forces are driving forward a nascent wave of investment and activity in the renewable energy sector. As shown in **Figure 3**, this is evident in the 45% increase in net capacity additions of renewable energy sources globally between 2019 and 2020, further highlighting the 23% increase in average contribution to total electricity production from 2016 to 2021 from renewable sources as mentioned before and shown in **Figure 2**, which may indicate this increase will continue into the future.


Figure 3

Net renewable energy capacity addition growth 2012 to 2020 – Global



Based on data provided by: International Energy Agency

Renewable energy valuation



Valuation of renewable energy assets are required at different points in time throughout the investment lifecycle. Oftentimes, a valuation is required prior to investment, be it a greenfield investment, an M&A transaction, or a repowering investment. In these circumstances, the valuation model will yield a net present value, which can be used as a starting point in the negotiation process, or an internal rate of return can be derived assuming a certain initial investment. Valuation of renewable energy assets may be required also after the initial investment, for financial reporting or tax purposes as well as for post-acquisition assessments.

Valuation methodologies overview

Valuation analysts rely on three generally accepted valuation approaches to estimate the value of an asset: the Income Approach, the Market Approach and the Cost Approach.

The **Income Approach**, which determines value based on projected future economic benefits to the asset's owner(s), is commonly used when the valuation practitioner is able to reasonably project the asset's performance over time, making assumptions regarding growth, margins and further investments to support the planned growth, among others. It is often the preferred valuation approach when quality data is available due to its greater transparency.

The **Market Approach**, which determines value based on the observed purchases of similar assets, most often in the form of quoted prices of similar publicly traded companies or transactions of private companies, is strongest when there is a reasonable number of recent, comparable transactions available upon which the value of the asset or business can be implied.

The **Cost Approach**, which determines value based on estimates of the cost to reproduce or replace an asset or business, is strongest when such costs can be reasonably estimated, and when the performance of an asset or business is not expected to increase over time, such as increased future profitability. If the performance of the asset or business fluctuates over time, it is likely the Income Approach would be a better alternative to the Cost Approach.

As will be discussed later in this newsletter, renewable energy assets are subject to various market forces which impact performance and limit usefulness of certain traditional valuation approaches. For example, the usefulness of the Market Approach may be limited by the dissimilarity in the risk profiles unique to each asset or

renewable energy project, which may be difficult to reflect under this approach. For this reason, the Market Approach is generally not relied upon by valuation analysts when valuing renewable energy assets. The Cost Approach tends to be omitted in the valuation of income-producing assets such as renewable energy assets.

Income approach: The discounted cash flow method in renewable energy valuation

As the benefits to the owner(s) can generally be reliably estimated, the most often used method to estimate the value of a renewable energy project is the discounted cash flow ("DCF") method, a widely used method under the Income Approach. Through the DCF method, complexities such as reflecting Power Purchase Agreements ("PPA"), Feed-in-Tariffs ("FiT") and merchant price exposure, can be reflected in detail throughout the life of the project. This allows for sharpened consideration of both the risks and rewards relevant for investors and owners of the asset.

Key factors in projecting revenue: Volume and price

For renewable assets, the top line is the product of volume, i.e., the quantity of electricity produced (expressed in megawatt hours (MWh) in a given year by the asset, and price, i.e., the price at which the electricity can be sold (EUR/MWh).

Volume

The volume of electricity produced is a function of the following input:

- **Capacity:** Generally expressed in megawatts (MW), capacity is a measure of power which depends on the quantity of modules in a solar PV farm or the quantity of wind turbines in a wind farm, for example. While the exact capacity of a single solar PV module depends on many factors, with current technology you would generally expect between 3,000 and 5,000 solar modules to have a capacity of 1 MW
- **Specific yield:** Generally expressed in MWh/MW, the specific yield is a measure of the yield of a given asset to generate power (MWh) out of its installed capacity (MW). It is generally based on historical statistical models which consider meteorologic aspects in the specific geographic area (irradiance, wind hours) as well as technical aspects (degradation of modules)

Price

Likely one of the most difficult areas of renewable energy valuation, estimation of the future prices at which the electricity produced by the renewable energy asset is likely

to be sold is one of the most decisive inputs to determine the revenue projections over the life of the asset. Thanks to various mechanisms which exist in the energy market, investors in renewable energy assets can minimize this challenge by taking measures to stabilize revenue projections via PPAs and reflecting any available FiTs in their valuations.

Feed-in-Tariffs

As discussed previously in this Quarterly Brief, over the past decades the cost of producing electricity from renewable sources has been much higher than today, leaving renewable energy at a relative economic disadvantage compared to fossil fuel sources. Acknowledging this, various governments around the globe implemented FiT mechanisms to incentivize investment into renewable energies and temporarily eliminate this relative economic disadvantage. For example, in Germany – the global leader in harnessing solar radiation for electricity – most solar PV cells are not in large-scale solar farms but rather installed by homeowners and businesses on their rooftops. Many took this step in response to Germany’s Renewable Energy Act of 2000, which introduced guarantees in electricity prices for 20 years (Smil 2016).

The introduction of these incentive mechanisms, coupled with improvement of the underlying technologies for renewable energy, created a self-reinforcing cycle of demand, which in turn further lowered the costs related to

renewable energy. As mentioned previously, over the past decades the costs to construct renewable assets have decreased significantly and today solar and wind are the cheapest forms of electricity production as evidenced by the 89% and 70% decline in the price of electricity from new solar PV farms and wind farms, respectively (IRENA, 2021).

Power Purchase Agreements


Another key mechanism available to investors to stabilize cash flows and, thus, reduce risk in the fluctuation of price of electricity are Power Purchase Agreements. PPAs are simply unsubsidized contracts between energy producers and private buyers, such as companies that need electricity for their operations. Buyers, also called “offtakers” in this context, commit to buying energy at a fixed price from the energy producers over a certain period, often between five and 15 years, regardless of the prevailing market price. Generally, a certain volume is agreed upon to be supplied/purchased which may or may not be 100% of the energy producer’s output. This plays a critical role in the project’s risk profile and impacts the investment decision-making process as well as the level of leverage which may be obtainable for the project.

Merchant price exposure

As shown in **Figure 4**, upon expiration of the PPAs as well as any applicable FiTs, the project enters a period of merchant price exposure, i.e., direct exposure to the

Figure 4

Stages of risk for renewable projects



Source: KPMG

fluctuations of the prevailing market price of electricity in the electricity spot market. At this point in the lifecycle, the project is in its highest level of uncertainty regarding future risk and return, which presents difficult valuation challenges. In practice, the estimation of the future prices during this period of elevated uncertainty is typically accomplished by referring to studies from specialized third-party data providers who publish what are known as “power curves”. These power curves express their predictions on future energy prices and are developed using proprietary methodologies and complex econometric models. Additionally, power curves may also be developed in-house by major players in the energy sector who have experience in estimating and understanding the determinants of energy prices such as supply and demand factors or inflation, among many other influences which are outside of the scope of the newsletter. In addition, investors and valuation practitioners may consider a bundle of such power curves from a variety of third-party sources to create a consensus regarding the direction of merchant prices, especially considering such curves may be prepared on a region-specific basis.

Discount rates


A discount rate must be estimated that reflects the risk in achieving the cash flow projections. As renewable energy projects have some quite unique characteristics, care must be taken in the estimation of a risk-equivalent discount rate for those projects.

One of these unique characteristics is the lack of a terminal period as renewable energy projects are finite lived i.e., they will eventually be decommissioned. The cash flows are projected out until the end of the remaining useful life of the project, generally in line with the technological life, often 20 to 30 years. The finite lived nature of renewable energy projects determines the investment time horizon, which in turn impacts inputs such as the risk-free rate.


Business risk of renewable assets differs significantly over the different phases of the renewable asset lifecycle as shown in **Figure 5**.

Figure 5


Cash flow



Cumulative Cash flow



Risk profile



- Phases
- Cash inflow
- Cash outflow

During phase 1, business risk is relatively low since all the preparation work such as feasibility studies, government and regulatory approval, land lease, negotiating PPAs, etc. does not result in material cash outflows. Projects during this phase are generally referred to as “Pipeline Projects.”

Once preparation work is concluded, construction kicks off phase 2. The project experiences its highest risk in this phase due to the relatively high cash outflows paired with the uncertainty with respect to delays and unexpected additional construction costs. During this phase, business risk is comparable to any infrastructure construction project. Projects in this phase are generally referred to as “Assets Under Construction”.

Upon completion, the Commercial Operation Date (“COD”) marks the beginning of phase 3. The project is put into operation, electricity is produced and sold at electricity prices often contractually secured via FiTs, PPAs or both. During this period of limited or no merchant price exposure, cash flows have a relatively low volatility and high predictability, thus the business risk is very low. The risk in this phase is often comparable to utility companies or network operators due to the similar subsidized and/or regulated nature of their returns.

Finally, during phase 4, the electricity is sold at prevailing spot prices at full merchant price exposure unless new PPAs can be contracted. Projects in phases 3 and 4 are generally referred to as “Operational Assets”.

At the beginning of a renewable energy project, as is the case for investments in other infrastructure assets, project finance plays a key role, with an initial high leverage of up to 80% debt of total funding. Once the asset is selling electricity, the operating cash flows are utilized to pay down the debt, leading towards a shifting capital structure from majority debt financing at the beginning to majority equity financing in the latter years. The evolution in capital structure is often engineered to take place at the end of phase 3, aligning the merchant price exposure with lower or zero levels of leverage.


Due to the changing nature of the risk profile of renewable energy assets over their lifecycles, and the materially changing financing structure, valuation practitioners often apply period-specific discount rates. This approach is more sophisticated from a technical perspective but leads to more transparent and realistic valuation conclusions.

An expert view on the complexity of renewable energy valuation

KPMG Valuation Services regularly assists companies of all sizes with complex issues related to renewable energy valuation. Our valuation specialists will be happy to discuss your situation and share our views and expertise to help you navigate valuation issues in these transformative times.



Capital market data

The background of the image is a server room. The server racks are illuminated with a mix of blue and orange lights, creating a bokeh effect. The text 'Capital market data' is overlaid on the left side of the image in a white, sans-serif font.



In this section, we provide a selection of key financial market data covering:


- Comparison of major stock market performance for the 12 months ending 31 December 2021
- S&P Eurozone BMI Index sector multiples
- Risk-free rates for major currencies
- Country risk premiums and inflation forecasts for the BRIC countries

Major stock market performance: Continued strong year-over-year performance of most main indices

Returns of above 20% for five out of eleven indices underline the trends of solid market performance. No longer accounting for the extreme volatility caused by the COVID-19 pandemic on a 12-month look back period, the markets continue to show mostly stable and positive return figures.

Performance of leading indices

31 December 2020 - 31 December 2021



Source: Capital IQ, KPMG analysis

With positive quarter-over-quarter performance measures for eight of the eleven observed indices, the long-term upward trend seems to continue, at least for now. The upward trend over the last quarter is particularly pronounced for the SMI and S&P, with each increasing by 10.6%.


S&P Eurozone: Decreasing multiples for two consecutive quarters

Over the last two quarters, eight out of ten EV/EBITDA sector multiples decreased. While the decrease was relatively modest for most of the retrograding sectors, the impact for Financials, and Materials was substantial (-2.1x and -2.8x, respectively).




Despite having slightly declined over the last quarter, the Communication Services EV/EBITDA multiple has almost returned to its pre-COVID-19 long-term average level. A similar trend can be observed for the Consumer Staples sector, which is also slowly returning to its long-term average. The Information Technology sector, on the other hand, sustains its long-term growth trajectory, having doubled its EV/EBITDA multiple since March 2020. The sustainability of this ongoing trend remains questionable.


Communication Services




Consumer Discretionary




Consumer Staples




Energy




Financials




Health Care




Industrials




Information Technology




Materials



Real Estate



Utilities








Source: Capital IQ, KPMG analysis

Notes: Multiples are analyzed based on the latest information available as of the assessment date for the respective edition of the Quarterly Brief. Changes of index composition, revised financial information, and newly available information as of the respective assessment date may cause multiples to change. Financial services companies differ from many other companies in how they operate. Debt acts more as "raw material" than operational capital for financial services companies. A common valuation metric used by analysts evaluating such firms is the price-to-book (P/B) ratio.

Risk-free rates: Negative interest rates in Switzerland

The risk-free rates have not materially changed over the last six months. As of 31 December 2021, four risk-free rates analyzed were positive, and one was negative. Switzerland is back in negative territory at -0.1%. The risk-free rates of all

Euro countries and Germany specifically have continued to decrease over the last two observation periods but stay slightly positive. For the US and the UK, risk-free rates also slightly declined but continue to remain on a comparably higher level.

Risk-free rates										
		EUR		EUR		GBP		CHF		USD
30.09.2016		0.53%		0.47%		1.61%		(0.06)%		2.48%
31.12.2016		0.97%		0.95%		2.03%		0.35%		3.06%
31.03.2017		1.25%		1.24%		1.88%		0.32%		3.27%
30.06.2017		1.39%		1.33%		2.02%		0.39%		3.04%
30.09.2017		1.40%		1.38%		2.05%		0.45%		3.04%
31.12.2017		1.34%		1.34%		1.89%		0.36%		2.89%
31.03.2018		1.25%		1.24%		1.79%		0.56%		3.08%
30.06.2018		1.09%		1.12%		1.83%		0.51%		3.00%
30.09.2018		1.13%		1.15%		1.87%		0.61%		3.10%
31.12.2018		0.90%		0.94%		1.91%		0.37%		3.17%
31.03.2019		0.67%		0.65%		1.65%		0.17%		2.96%
30.06.2019		0.35%		0.33%		1.56%		0.02%		2.71%
30.09.2019		(0.03)%		(0.03)%		0.88%		(0.36)%		2.25%
31.12.2019		0.37%		0.34%		1.25%		(0.16)%		2.46%
31.03.2020		0.06%		0.01%		0.68%		(0.20)%		1.54%
30.06.2020		0.01%		(0.02)%		0.56%		(0.29)%		1.60%
30.09.2020		(0.08)%		(0.11)%		0.72%		(0.32)%		1.61%
31.12.2020		(0.13)%		(0.14)%		0.70%		(0.36)%		1.78%
31.03.2021		0.26%		0.32%		1.29%		(0.01)%		2.55%
30.06.2021		0.29%		0.31%		1.17%		0.05%		2.20%
30.09.2021		0.26%		0.25%		1.29%		0.00%		2.21%
31.12.2021		0.14%		0.12%		0.95%		(0.10)%		2.05%

Source: KPMG analysis





Approach: Approach: determination of a present value-equivalent uniform interest rate based on the yield curve of the specific central bank



Country risk premium: Stability in CRPs

After a slight decrease of the country risk premium ("CRP") of Russia a year ago, it appears to have flattened over recent quarters. While the premiums for China and

India stayed constant in the last quarter as well as in the year-over-year perspective, the CRP for Brazil has dropped by 50 basis points since September 2020 and stayed constant at that relatively low level for the last quarter.

Country risk premium						
	30 Sep 20	31 Dec 20	31 Mar 21	30 Jun 21	30 Sep 21	31 Dec 21
	3.1%	3.1%	3.0%	2.9%	2.5%	2.6%
	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.8%	1.6%	1.6%
	2.0%	2.0%	1.9%	1.8%	1.9%	1.9%
	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%


Based on two-year analysis. Source: KPMG CRP study

Growth rates: Growth expectations remain

Growth rates are a major component of the terminal value calculation for the discounted cash flow method. Inflation forecasts are one of the typical indicators that can be used to assess the long-term growth rate. The inflation rates for Brazil, Russia, India and China are based on the Economist Intelligence Unit's ("EIU") inflation forecast for the years 2022 to 2026. The expected inflation can be measured through several parameters. For our presentation, we consider the Consumer Price Index ("CPI") and the GDP deflator. The CPI is a measure that examines the weighted average of prices of a basket of consumer goods and services, while the GDP deflator, calculated as the difference between nominal and real GDP, measures the

change in prices for all of the goods and services produced in an economy.

Measured based on both the GDP deflator and the CPI as presented by EIU, the inflation forecast observed for Russia continues to be the highest of all countries analyzed. While the GDP deflator for India is expected to remain at a level of 3.9% in 2026, the CPI measure outranks by 42 basis points for the same forecast year. In comparison, the growth expectations inherently measured by the GDP deflator are expected to equal 3.9% for India and 2.8% for Brazil. With a CPI of 1.9% and GDP deflator of 1.3%, China remains lowest in the ranking of investigated countries.

Inflation forecast						
Country		2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
	CPI	7.7%	4.4%	3.4%	3.3%	3.2%
	GDP Deflator	6.7%	3.5%	2.8%	3.0%	2.8%
	CPI	4.9%	4.1%	4.3%	4.4%	4.5%
	GDP Deflator	5.2%	3.8%	4.0%	4.3%	5.3%
	CPI	4.6%	4.6%	4.4%	4.0%	4.2%
	GDP Deflator	3.8%	3.9%	3.2%	3.6%	3.9%
	CPI	2.3%	2.6%	2.3%	2.1%	1.9%
	GDP Deflator	2.5%	1.9%	1.5%	1.4%	1.3%

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit

References

1. IRENA. 2021. Majority of New Renewables Undercut Cheapest Fossil Fuels on Cost. <https://www.irena.org/newsroom/pressreleases/2021/Jun/Majority-of-New-Renewables-Undercut-Cheapest-Fossil-Fuel-on-Cost>
2. Smil 2016. *Power Density: A key to understanding energy sources and uses*

Your contacts

KPMG Belgium

Luchthaven Brussel Nationaal
1K B-1930 Zaventem

Jorn De Neve

Partner, Deal Advisory
+32 497 590 605
jdeneve@kpmg.com

Steven Goossens

Director, Deal Advisory
+32 477 993 475
stevengoossens@kpmg.com

home.kpmg/be

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received, or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation. The scope of any potential collaboration with audit clients is defined by regulatory requirements governing auditor independence. If you would like to know more about how KPMG AG processes personal data, please read our Privacy Policy, which you can find on our homepage at home.kpmg/be.

© 2022 KPMG Advisory, a Belgian BV/SRL and a member firm of the KPMG global organization of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved.