



CapitaLand Investment FY 2025 Financial Results Webcast

Transcript of the Question & Answer Session

11 February 2026, Capital Tower, Singapore

- LCK** Lee Chee Koon, Group CEO
AL Andrew Lim, Group COO & CEO, Private Equity Real Estate
PT Paul Tham, Group CFO
KM Kishore Moorjani, CEO, Alternatives, Private Funds & Chairman, India
KG Kevin Goh, CEO, Lodging & CEO, Ascott
EY Ervin Yeo, Group Chief Strategy Officer and CEO, Commercial Management
PTS Puah Tze Shyang, CEO, China
-

Question & Answer Session

Mervin Song, JP Morgan: Congrats on the core operating PATMI performance. I thought it was quite good, given the challenges. Maybe we can go to slide 14 – can you run through the potential FUM for this year based on the funds you are planning to launch. Second question is on China. Share price is down quite heavily, presumably due to the write-downs, which are non-cash. Are we past the worst or will there be further write-downs from China? And for the S\$3 billion of on-balance sheet assets (China), what's the implied NPI yield based on valuation?

AL: I'll take the part of the first question on FUM, and turn to Kishore to talk about Alternatives. So you saw, Mervin, that we have a couple of regional flagship products in the pipeline. First of all, this reflects where we are as a GP, as a house. We wouldn't be in a position to talk about a regional living fund, a regional logistics fund, and definitely not anything on credit, 12-18 months ago. So, the first point I want to make is, we are on a multi-year journey, and we're confident and quite pleased with where we are. So, when talking about regional flagship products, you are looking at minimum third party raises of roughly S\$500 million – that's a number we target. You double that because you add leverage to it, so your FUM, if you will, should be at S\$1 billion or thereabouts. These are the two flagship products that we are comfortable talking about now, because we are confident, and we think we can get these out this year. This is the launch, not necessarily the raise and the close - that's also a multi-year journey.

We also have Extra Space Asia, which I talked about, and we're confident that self-storage as an investable asset class in Asia is getting increasing traction, because of the reverse, inbound inquiries that we have helped to generate with the success of Extra Space Asia. People are starting to understand why this is an interesting asset class for core and core-plus strategies - it has a sticky and resilient customer base. And if you know what you're doing on the operations side, you can be confident about growing the platform. So those are the two I'm comfortable talking about now. Kishore can talk about Alternatives.

KM: On credit, similarly, for the ACP II fund, I would say very high visibility. We're engaged with investors, and we're in the process of effectively closing that out, I'd say, certainly within Q1, although some of investors may slip into early Q2. ACP III, on the back of that, will come out in the second half of this year. So, the pipeline, the originations for that, we are seeing very strong momentum. So, ACP II will close, and for ACP III, I'd like to see us have a first close before the end of this year. So ACP has very high visibility.

Wingate continues to grow. The senior debt fund is picking up momentum. Given the world we're going into, I anticipate we'll see stronger flows into the Wingate senior debt fund. We've invested a lot of time in products that will bear fruit in the second half of this year, I would put both our SGD product, which we expect to launch, and our data centre product, in that camp. As I said, those are not new initiatives. That's not a zero-to-one, those are in places where we're already operating, and we're already investing. We're now bringing those out in a slightly differentiated, but more focused product for investors. So, on both those fronts, very good momentum, high visibility to hopefully beat the fundraising numbers that we had last year.

LCK: Just to add on, I'm very actively involved in conversations with LPs and family offices. There's a lot of demand for some of the products that we are creating, and some are asking us to co-create products for them. That's why I am actually quite optimistic. This time last year, I wasn't quite sure of the fundraising momentum. We had big plans, but we were not sure in terms of where things could be headed. We went on the road and spent a lot of time with investors; and the feedback and the products that we are creating and also the conversations with our LPs, I'm actually a lot more confident about what our private funds team will be able to achieve. Early conversations, from the start of this year, have been very encouraging.

PT: I'll take the other two questions on the China revaluations component. This year, the China revaluations, on average from a portfolio viewpoint, were down about 5%, but that was quite a range depending on the asset class. China office and business parks were the hardest hit, but less so in some of the other sectors. We took a bigger write down, partly because of the vacancy in some of those buildings, which ties to your second question. Because the

vacancies in those buildings have come down as we've had some tenants in the offices and business parks move out, it has brought down the NPI numbers for those buildings. So, most of the NPI for the assets are in a range of 3-5%. As we can fill that occupancy, that should drive the NPI up to a stronger 4-6% or 4-7% range.

We hope the worst is behind us. But when we look at China for the last several years, we've taken write downs over the last four years, and this year was a bigger write down than most years. It's a little bit hard for us to predict whether there will or will not be further write downs. Certainly, the team would like to think or hope that the worst is past us. But as we continue to expect negative reversions and as occupancy is still weak for some of the asset classes, we think there could be some movement, up or down, over the next 12 months.

AL: I just want to add that it's not all doom and gloom on China. As Paul correctly characterised, there's a lot happening exogenously that we are having to deal with. There's little we can influence in terms of geopolitics, consumer sentiment, and so on. Tze Shyang is well versed in this. But as a senior team and as a Group, we need to make do with the cards that we are dealt with.

So what are we doing? As you all know, one of the Northstar destinations is China-for-China. Last year, we launched our first C-REIT, and it is trading really well. It has been well received. As Paul mentioned, we've registered for a second C-REIT this year, taking advantage of what the Chinese regulators have acknowledged as something they need to focus on. They need to be able to provide retail investors, savers in China, with a proven asset class with stable and visible distribution yields, rather than speculative real estate in China, which we know they are completely allergic to right now. That plays to the C-REIT market, and that plays to our ability to provide assets for them. They are great assets and we run them well. We just need to find the right price point where the market says 'this is great for me. I can get that distribution yield, get that savings in place'. So with the ability to demonstrate to the market that we've launched one C-REIT that's doing well, here is another one that is larger in size, more sophisticated, with an integrated development. You start to see our ability to accelerate our China-for-China strategy, even in the midst of what is a very difficult political, macro environment for China.

China has a huge savings base, in part driven by the fact that sentiment is down. People are not spending because they're worried about the future. When they're not spending, they want to save. They need something to save in, and I can think of nothing better in the equity side than a REIT. As we all know from our own savings here in Singapore, so much of our wealth is tied up in the S-REIT market. This plays to our strength, and if we execute well, we can turn what is an uncertain environment into something that is positive and part of that growth story for the Group, which is the China-for-China strategy. I know you have been

waiting for the inflection point and for us to tell you that there's no more bad news. We can't tell you that because events are happening very regularly, and they can come out of left field very often. What we can do as a team is just to respond as quickly as we can and stay focused on what it is we're trying to pivot towards.

LCK: Just to add on, we created a (RMB) master fund last year, and then the C-REIT. You will see us continue to do that because of our long history in China, our ability to operate and manage, as well as our reputation. We have received a lot of inquiries from capital partners who want to give us more capital to grow the asset management business in China. As a lot of competitors in the market today in China have exited in one way or another, it positions us quite nicely to grow the China business, using a lot of domestic capital, in a very capital-light manner to grow the business.

Yes, we do have balance sheet exposure to China from the original CapitaLand days when we used the developer's mindset to put a very heavy balance sheet to grow, which is not the case anymore. I don't want to keep revisiting and saying that these are all the things that have worked well for CapitaLand, but it is what it is. The important thing is what you do now. You want to be able to recycle the capital and invest it to grow the fee business, the asset management part of our business, being very capital efficient, and raising third party capital so that the fees that we are earning will be like coupon clipper for investors who invest with CLI. Perpetual capital that's safe, and the fees are there. You don't have to worry about the volatility of the real estate market. And that's what we are transforming the business model into. We've done that in other parts of the world. In China, we are now doing the same, where we are raising a lot more third-party capital. The potential for us to build a big FUM business in China using third party capital is there. We don't need to use so much of our own money in China. So that's the guidance: the strategy is to use less of our own money, to grow the business in China and make it a fee business.

Mervin: On the private credit side of things, a billion or two this year? That's realistic, I presume. You hired a big gun here to deliver.

KM: I'd like to see us get ahead of that billion, so watch this space.

Xuan Tan, Goldman Sachs: First question is on cost savings. The S\$5 million seems a bit low versus the previous S\$50 million target. Can you walk us through the initiatives? And secondly, on strategic M&A, if you do one with significant overlap in capabilities, how confident are you in realising core synergies, and what will you be doing differently? Second question on lodging: if this business is valued on a multiple, then EBITDA is actually more important than keys and revenue. So, if I look at your revenue target, EBITDA

should grow more than that, given operating leverage. My question is really on timeline: when can we expect it to come true.

PT: Overall, the Group target is still S\$50 million in cost savings. I think we are tracking fairly well. We've made some progress this year in terms of increased efficiency, streamlining some of our operations. We're still moving into that this year as we start outsourcing some parts of our work, and using more AI and digital initiatives. I think we'll be able to update a little more by mid-year in terms of progress, as we can see, sort of full-year savings. The goal is still to get to S\$30-S\$50 million savings, on a run rate basis by 2027.

On the cost savings for M&A, we've done two M&As in the last year. SC Capital was only a 40% (stake), so it's being largely run independently. For Wingate, which was 100%, we have started integrating those operations, and we are starting to see capability sharing. So, Kishore has now got a lot of Australian sourcing capability, not just for the Wingate funds, but also for ACP II, and ACP III in the future. We're starting to see some synergies there. Given that that has only been operational for about eight months, we have yet to be able to actually count the value of how much savings there are. But when we look at it, I think it's easy for us to estimate that 10-20% is a reasonable savings level for us in this particular aspect.

I think if we were to do a broader M&A, it would depend on how much overlap there is. If we look at our corporate costs, which, based on the slide there (slide 5), you can see we're still about that -S\$55 million, which is not true corporate cost, but has a mixture of factors. We would think of that as getting the most savings from (eliminating) overlap. So that's what we're driving to. We have not done any estimates on overlaps. But we do think that reasonable cost savings, when you look at overlapping operations, like in the case of something like Wingate, 10-20% is quite reasonable. Certainly, we hope to save more if there is more overlap.

LCK: I have done a number of M&As in my career in CapitaLand. From my Ascott days, buying Quest, and buying hotel platforms, and then subsequently the merger with Ascendas-Singbridge. I would say that so far, for all the M&As that we have done, we have been able to grow top line, and we have been able to create synergies. Those will be the principles that we take for whichever M&A we do. It has to make sense; there is no need for duplication of resources. Of course, we want to make sure that we do things properly.

When we did the merger with Ascendas-Singbridge, it was on the basis of 'best person for the job'. Some of you may recall that when we announced the transaction, we very quickly talked about the organisational structure because we wanted to make sure that things could be executed. And for some of you who may remember, after we completed the Ascendas-Singbridge transaction, the next day we talked about how we should put together the

Ascendas Hospitality Trust and the Ascott Residence Trust. It is a question of discipline. I mean, we need to make sure that, if you are committed to do a deal, you work out your entire plan, you put the people in place, create the synergies, and do things that make sense. I think we have enough of a track record to demonstrate that we always maintain discipline when doing transactions.

KG: On the last part, we are absolutely laser-focused in delivering EBITDA. If you look at our total key count, it's 176,000 currently. Just over 100,000 is operational and we have another 60,000-plus in the pipeline. So, the ratio of pipeline to operations is actually quite high, and that suggests that we have a lot of opportunity to gain operating leverage.

If you look at the construction schedules of the projects we have signed, we do expect a lot more properties to open in 2027. And you if give them a year to ramp up, we should be able to get a healthy boost in fee income in 2028. We do expect that by 2028, maybe 2029, we are operating at a more stabilised level of about 30% to 30+%.

Derek Tan, DBS: I'll just ask two questions. So if I could go back to China, could you give us a sense of how much have you written China down since the start? Are you at 10-12% down? And maybe to ask the question another way, if you put an asset in the market now, do you think you can transact at book, rather than going through the C-REIT route? Second question is on the ACP fund II. Could you give us a bit more colour in terms of returns? I always thought that for private credit, you'd be playing in a field where you are either junior debt, a bit more risky, or you're lending to corporates that could not get traditional funding? So, when Kishore mentioned looking at very senior debt investments, which are very safe, I was wondering whether it's your landscape or credit landscape, or the financial institutions, and how do you stand apart?

PT: On the China valuations, over the last five years, we've written down about S\$1.6 billion. It works out, on average, to about a 12% drop in valuations. But that is really an average. For some assets, they have gone down 20-30%. Some have actually barely moved because they're very strong performing assets.

In terms of whether we would be able to sell at current values, I think it's very asset specific. Certainly, there are some assets that would go out at current value. Some may, if we're fortunate, even get a slight gain. Depending on how the market outlook goes over the next three to six months, it will give us a better sense of whether there is an additional discount we need to take. Last year, we took an average 10-20% discount. We're actually quite willing to take some of these discounts if it gives us an ability to recycle it into a RMB fund. If you ask us to take an adjustment to the valuation, and it generates long-term, recurring income, then that's certainly something we would look at and consider. I think for us as we go forward,

we know we have some weak spots in parts of the portfolio, but we are very much focused on making sure that operating profit and fee-income stream grows.

KM: On credit, we're not doing anything on corporate. It's always real estate, always asset backed. Why does the opportunity exist? There are many cases where, for regulatory reasons, a bank struggles to do a certain type of lend. In construction and transition financing, we understand the underlying assets much better, so our ability to provide financing is greater and faster than financial institutions. We're clearly not cheaper.

The end returns we're looking at in our credit products is going to be – net to investors – between 6-10%. We hope we can outperform some of that 10%. But this is not a 15%-20% IRR business. It's generally transition, so it's shorter duration, 1, 2, 3 years. We're not doing 5 or 10-year loans because it's not sustainable for anybody who's taking that cost of capital for a long period of time.

Let me bring that to life through an example. We did a transaction late last year. We're about to do our second one in Australia, specifically in a prime Sydney residential neighbourhood, by financing a developer against completed stock. They got very expensive construction financing, which is the business we understand because of Wingate. They held on to some stock which they're now slowly selling out that stock on a completed basis. They're quite happy to take our capital at probably 7-8%. This is just to give direction where we are at. We will lend that on a 60-70% loan-to-value, so it's not very high LTV, firstly.

Second, we may selectively use some leverage on that, probably 50% back leverage, but we control the entire loan stack. Our end participation may be junior, but we control the entire stack. We're not sitting at a syndication table with six lenders if something goes wrong. If something goes wrong, the senior is actually looking to us, saying, you guys go resolve it and work through it. So something like that, on an unlevered basis, we're doing 7% or 8%. On a levered basis, we get to 10%- 11%. Net of fees, we're comfortably at 8-9%. On ACP, 10% or just over 10% net is what we're looking at. On the evergreen in SGD, that'll be safer, more like a 6% return.

Rachel Tan, Macquarie: A few questions from me. Firstly, you spoke about interest cost savings. Could you give us some guidance for interest costs in FY 2026. Second, on divestments, you've done S\$1 billion. Any outlook on the divestments for 2026? Last, on the commercial side – do you see any risks in your retail portfolio? And there are some office assets up for sale which are very sizable. Any thoughts on whether you will acquire them?

EY: I think we've always been consistent in terms of our retail portfolio, especially in Singapore. It's supported by fairly controlled supply, and we've been conscious of the trade mix. So reversions are consistent over time. Last year, it was about 7% or just under 7%, and this is consistent. We measure the business by occupancy costs, and we look at this across different trade categories. We think that the business this year will continue to be fairly resilient. The RTS is going to be opening at the end of the year. Our malls are not in the northern part of Singapore, but we are getting a presence there via the management contracts we signed in Johor. So I think the retail business should remain fairly consistent.

Our office performance has also been strong, supported by relatively managed supply. This is in contrast to China, where there is massive oversupply. Any opportunities that are on the table, we have various vehicles that will assess them. We'll be the first port of call, and if it makes sense, it makes sense.

PT: On interest cost savings, in terms of absolute interest costs, this may move up or down, depending on how divestments and investments go. I'm sure plenty of our bankers here hope that we end up borrowing more as we have more investments to do. So, the absolute cost may go up. But in terms of basis points, we're at 3.9%. The year before, we were at 4.4%. I think we can see it coming down maybe 10-15 basis points on average.

In terms of divestment target, certainly this coming year, we would like to do more than we did last year, particularly for China. There will be an effort to accelerate that and we hope over the next six to 12 months, we will be able to beat that S\$1 billion target quite comfortably.

Joy Wang, HSBC: Two questions. First, you held back share buybacks last year in view of acquisition pipelines. How long do we expect that process to take as you evaluate large-scale acquisitions. On the same token, what does that mean for your bolt-on strategies, and smaller platform acquisitions? Does that go through as BAU or will that be on hold as well? Second question is on operating platforms. Andrew talked about exploring operating platforms. Can I assume that the end game is eventually to exit or IPO these platforms? And if so, where are you on the various operating platforms, and when can we expect potential exits?

PT: We were quite active with share buybacks in 2024, 2025 and I think it holds the same for 2026, we believe that there are a number of organic and inorganic opportunities for us to invest in. Sponsoring new funds organically or sponsoring our REITs as they grow is still priority number one for our capital allocation.

Priority number two is growth via inorganic opportunities. I think we look at a range of them. As Chee Koon mentioned, we've been associated with quite a number of deals in the market,

and we continue to look at them. Since there are opportunities in the market, we are preserving capital to a certain degree for them. In terms of timeline, that's hard for us to pin down. We believe that the opportunities are readily available in the market in different segments, including bolt-ons. So I think from that viewpoint, we are still working on the basis that there will be more organic and inorganic opportunities for us to use our capital.

LCK: We are positioning the company for growth. We're seeing quite interesting opportunities, whether organic or inorganic. These could be smaller or bigger as long as they position us very well, allowing us to grow fee income on a more sustainable basis. That's why we are conserving some of this capital to give us that optionality.

We need to prioritise deals that makes sense, and what will give us the best bang for the buck. The heads of the different verticals are also looking at optionalities as well because we are actually seeing interesting things happening in the market.

AL: Chee Koon talked about optionality. I think that's the beauty of platforms. If you have platforms that are strategic in nature and are sought after, you can do a lot of things with them. You can keep them to generate more fee income vehicles as you produce vintage two, vintage three, vintage four, vintage five; or you could put it together with a fee vehicle and create opportunities with that. The option spectrum exists with all of our platforms - the ones that we have minority investments in, the ones which are strategic, including commercial management and lodging management, which are so intrinsic to our business today.

Obviously, the consideration set is different. But to your question of whether we can use them as part of a securitisation package or monetisation package, the answer is absolutely yes. But we need to take a view of what is the best outcome for us as a group. If something is so intrinsic to our business, with a much longer horizon and the ability to generate more fee income vehicles downstream, then it's something that we may decide to keep a little longer, and not release it. The reverse is also true.

LCK: We are today very much an investment house. If we grow the platforms, whether it's the Ascott platform or some of our platforms in India, and there's an opportunity to consider a strategic option, to list it independently, or give it a lease of life and get better valuation listing in certain markets. One way or another, we will consider it and use it as a chance to unlock capital, and properly capitalise it, so that it can compete in various markets on the verticals. So, all these are optionalities that we are looking at. At the end of the day, we need to grow the platforms properly by asking: How do we unlock value? How do we create the most value for our shareholders?

AL: Relevant to Xuan's point, it's all EBITDA. We want to generate multiple on earnings. If the platform is an intrinsic part of that ability to generate the maximum earnings multiple, then it becomes a key consideration. If it is not quite ready yet, but it's a key part of the thought leadership and the ability to think about how to design products, then I think it's better held within the Group, because we won't realise maximum value for that.

Wong Yew Kiang, CLSA: Two questions. First, how much are you willing to push gearing up to fund M&A going forward? And what kind of IRR or return targets do you have in mind? And also are you ok with near-term dilution on such M&A. Second question is on China. If you take in all your China assets and you divested, assuming you carve out today at book value, how much will this lower your current gearing?

PT: China assets for us are about S\$7.5 billion right now. If we were to carve them out, that would bring us down into a net equity position, our net cash position. We actually only have debt of about S\$5-6 billion on the books. That assumes that it is all sold. To be fair, I don't think it is a likely scenario for us, partly because we look at a lot of these assets as our sponsor stakes in a number of funds.

For your first question though, in terms of how much debt headroom we're comfortable with, I think we are comfortable spending an additional S\$6-odd billion, which gets us up to a 0.9x-type gearing. We are quite comfortable in that range, particularly now as we are divesting assets, and as Tze Shyang and the team make efforts to lower our China exposure, we will actually get additional capital back in the longer run. We're quite happy at this point, where 0.4x, 0.5x is probably about right for us. But we can afford a spike up if there is a deal worth doing. And obviously, with that type of headroom, it is very unlikely that we would need to raise equity. And then we would expect it will come down as we divest our stakes of the balance sheet assets. We are putting more money behind private equity, but because of our efficiency ratio, and as we enhance efficiency, the truth is we don't really need much more than the S\$5 billion that we already have in private funds. Because of the legacy assets and the legacy funds, our holdings are more than 30% on average. In the new funds, we hold 10-15%. So actually, we could double our private funds and not require more capital there. And then, similarly with the REITs, over time that stake will come down. So I would say that, from a debt headroom viewpoint, we're very comfortable, doing anything in the S\$6-8 billion range.

AL: You can remember, you were around when we did Ascendas-Singbridge, we took DE up to 0.83x, 0.86x with a commitment to bring it back down again, and we delivered on that without issuing new equity. So I think we understand the playbook, and we know what is important to shareholders.

Brandon Lee, Citi: The first one is, if you look at your fourth quarter event fees from private funds, right, there was a very nice S\$30 million number there. Can you guide us on what that is, and is that what we could see if more private funds have an exit over the next couple of years?

PT: Can you direct me to where you're seeing that figure? I don't think we had any event fees for the private funds in the fourth quarter. On our private funds activity, we do have fees, but it's very small in terms of event-driven. We're not expecting carry from any of our funds in the near term. The strength of the figures that we have for the funds business has been largely from recurring income, from both the listed and private sides, and that will continue at the same growth rate we would expect going forward. But we wouldn't expect very much in terms of event-driven from the private funds.

Brandon, Citi: The follow up is more on your dividends of 12 cents. So would you guide the market using your core operating PATMI on a dividend payout standpoint, or would it be more useful to use the operating cash flow? Because if you were to look at this S\$40 million, and you can assume that you can go at 6%, the payout is actually close to 100%.

PT: Our payout ratio is high, and it actually ties to the question of share buybacks. There are different ways we can return capital to investors. When we look at our operating cash flow, which is the metric we track more closely in terms of making sure that we have funds, it is more than S\$900 million, because we have a very strong fee business that consistently generates income. And also the REIT dividends that come in. We look at the operating cash flow as the more critical measure for our own internal capital management. We also look at the operating profits as a guide to what we think is about the right level to return to shareholders.

We could have used the money, to some degree, for buybacks. We have chosen to keep our dividends stable at this level. We think it is a level that we can comfortably maintain, given the trajectory we are on. Certainly at some point we hope that we grow faster and we're able to increase the dividend. But at the current payout ratio, we're sure we feel comfortable.

Vijay Natarajan, RHB: Firstly, on M&A, you have two targets: S\$200 billion as well as asset allocation to different geographies. Suppose a big M&A comes that fits your S\$200 billion target but doesn't fit your geography target in terms of exposure to China or US markets, how would you react? Second, on private funds, do you mark to market your private funds on an annual basis? If so, was there a gain, or loss? Was this the reason for your reduction in balance sheet exposure towards private funds from S\$5.3 to S\$5.2 billion?

PT: On the private funds reduction, some of the funds are starting to come back. For instance, as Kishore mentioned, ACP I, our first credit fund, actually returned capital, so some of that has come down, and it generated a 15% return, which also helped our earnings. So we have some funds that are returning funds. We also had a little bit of markdown from the China funds component, which also lowered the value there. So, there was a fair bit more movement down, but we also invested in new funds as well. That's how we came up with the balance. Most importantly, capital efficiency has improved. We're investing less into the new funds than we were previously.

LCK: If we are looking at an asset management platform, we look at the quality of the teams, whether it adds a strategic difference to us to be able to raise funds, and on an ongoing basis, whether we can create new products (out of that). So, if you ask me, I am less sensitive to where the FUM is from. Even if it is a certain entity that has some allocation to China that can help strengthen our China FUM on a fee basis, without us increasing a lot more capital allocation to China, we will look at that.

Let's say there's a fee business that we can buy in the US. The question that we need to ask ourselves is, if you buy a team in the US today, can the team, together with us, actually help turbocharge the growth in the FUM. So I think the issues are complex, but I just want to highlight that we are looking at platforms that help to generate and drive our fee business. So we are not looking to buy, for instance, a developer, an asset-heavy business. That's not our business model. We should have less stakes in the GPs, and over time, as what Paul mentioned, we want to also, in an organised fashion, reduce our stake in the REITs without affecting the share price of the various REITs that we have strong holdings for. So I hope that gives you clarity in terms of how we look at M&A.

Terence Lee, UBS: Two big picture questions. First, APAC real estate is an under-allocated space, and given that 2025 performance for many asset classes has been positive, especially public equities. APAC PERE is even more under allocated now, such that the rebalancing itself should see LPs knocking at your door. So, is it fair for us to expect that organic fundraising for private funds should be better on a year-on-year basis for 2026, i.e. more than S\$5 billion? Second, the US is making all assets accessible to people's 401(k)s. Platforms like Endowus and StashAway have access to dormant SRS funds and are distributing products from the likes of Blackstone, Hamilton Lane, etc. Do you see Singapore's retail wealth channel as a blue ocean market? And Andrew, you said we are already investing quite a bit of our money into S-REITs.

AL: Yes, we want to build on this momentum. The anecdotal evidence for 2026 is that allocations to real estate and real assets in general in Asia have gone up 15-20% for the reasons you mentioned. If we're going to continue to punch at or above our weight in capital

raising, yes, it stands to reason that if we raised S\$4.9 billion last year, that number has to go up by at least some percentage amount. It's going to be incumbent on the strategies, and the strategies need to make sense, which is where the product design, the folks on the ground who are telling us what investors are looking for, what is interesting in terms of real estate, having the underlying platforms to sync all that together. All very intrinsic to being able to successfully do so, that's question one.

Question two is around the wealth channels. You hit a very good point. Last year, we made very good strides in insurance, and we've also identified high net worth as a key component of a rounded distribution platform. Institutional, we started off with a decent base. On insurance, we've made some very strategic hires in the capital raising side to be able to speak the very specific language that insurance companies use when they talk about deployment and their specific requirements. We've done a very significant insurance mandate that we hope to share with you in the not-too-distant future; this then leaves us with high net worth, which is a relatively young channel for us. We took a big step forward last year with Wingate, which is essentially a high net worth shop. With Kishore's help, we can learn from how Wingate has developed that very high touch channel. It's a very different way of servicing your clients, but it can be very sticky capital, and your fee structures are very different in nature. It's a specific language, a specific skill set.

We've got Yvonne (Siew, MD & Head, Product Development & Wealth Markets, Private Capital Markets) here, who comes from that part of the world, both as a customer as well as a proponent. She knows how to target and design products that make sense to them, including potentially reaching out to US high net worth, although I will say that that's probably a bridge to be crossed at some point in time, in the future.

I think the lowest hanging fruit for us, and Kishore can add to that, is that there's enough wealth in Asia and even here in Singapore, for us to use. The strength of the CapitaLand name, the brand, the comfort it provides, the assurance of integrity and governance that investors look for when they make such investments. There's enough for us to do here without thinking further afield at this point in time.

KM: On the wealth side, it's a really good question. With Yvonne in the team, I think that gives us the ability to understand and create the right kind of products.

Given our REITs, the familiarity with the wealth channel of our brand is very high. While every global alternative or private capital firm is trying to move from institutional investor raises to wealth markets, that path is a lot easier for us, because the REITs have done a great job of attracting wealth capital. Secondly, in our home market here, this is a big wealth hub. If you look at the numbers from 2018 to 2030, the wealth channel grows from S\$800 billion of

assets to S\$1.5 trillion of assets in Singapore. With the SGD strength, to be able to offer products in that is very important, and something that we're very focused on.

The second thing is, when we do that, we do that with platforms, where, unlike a private equity firm, we are not investing in these platforms and then putting them up for sale in three or five years. We're an aligned investor. Even in our REITs, we own 15 or 20% (stakes). We might bring that down, but we own a big cornerstone stake for a long period of time. That, in the wealth channel as well as in the insurance channel, gives investors clear alignment, which is very different from a traditional GP putting up just 1%.

Goola Warden, The Edge Singapore: I've got two questions. First, on the next China C-REIT, is it the Raffles City portfolio? And if it is, what is the occupancy of the office building. Second, you don't have a real data centre operating platform in the way Keppel has. Would you be interested in one and would that help? And you talked about your operating platforms that help you design new products. Will that help you be more focused in your data centre strategies?

PTS: We are planning to launch a second C-REIT this year, probably late second quarter or early third quarter. We had one infrastructure C-REIT launched with two assets, and we are looking to launch another one. One of the assets that we have filed in our prospectus is Raffles City Shenzhen. It comprises a mall, serviced residences (Ascott), and an office component. Specifically for the office, in terms of occupancy, I think it's a high 80 coming to 90%, so it's stabilised.

AL: Going back to C-REITs and why this is good for us in China: the initial class of C-REIT approvals was restricted to certain asset classes, which excluded office. For this batch of C-REITs, the Chinese regulators (CSRC) have now relaxed that requirement to allow for commercial assets. If you think about our portfolio, our legacy funds, and this China-for-China pivot, it opens up the aperture for us to accelerate that pace of pivoting from our legacy USD products to China-for-China, including public-private vehicles, public vehicles, and private vehicles.

I don't want to put the cart before the horse and get overly excited, but the pieces are in place to pivot in China and get the momentum going. This is a very sizable and meaningful development that the regulator has done, which allows us the opportunity to do so.

Goola: What's the valuation versus book?

PTS: For the first C-REIT, we had an IPO price of RMB5.70 per unit and it's now trading at RMB6.90. Price above NAV is 1.21. For the first quarterly results, we were 3% above underwriting, so it's doing well.

To add to Andrew's point, the regulators are aware that liquidity is available in the market, and through a recognised and trusted REIT product, a lot of liquidity can flow back into real estate. In the last few years, there has been a departure of foreign buyers from the market that has affected transactions. Transactions are much lower than before. But in the last three years, as the infrastructure C-REIT has become more established in the market, CSRC's ability to introduce a commercial C-REIT, which opens up the mandate to include office, hospitality and retail, and by definition, integrated assets, (which means) our entire portfolio is now able to be 'C-REITed'. Given that the DPU yields are also tight or even tighter than the private market, it really represents a huge opportunity for us.

EY: What underpins all these assets are operations. Everyone knows the office market in China is challenging. I don't think you can find many office assets in China that are REIT-able. Why Raffles City Shenzhen is able to go in is that firstly, it's a mixed development. Secondly, Shenzhen is a good location. It has a benefit for Hong Kong tourists. And thirdly, because we are Singapore brand name. We are able to host the HQs of Chinese tech companies and American tech companies, and they're happy to be with us. At Raffles City Shenzhen, a leading Dutch semiconductor company is there, they exited an SOE (state-owned enterprise) building to come to us. Previously, after a Chinese tech company's HQ left, a leading American tech company came in, so it is fairly resilient among office assets.

KM: On your data centre question I would say, in the few months I've been here, I think data centres is a great example of somewhere that CapitalLand focuses on execution more than promotion. So, we have 800 MW in existing operating or under construction assets. We understand customer needs and demand really well.

We are now looking across that universe, as data centres have evolved from a niche real estate asset class to a deep operating capability asset class. We're looking at that with customers and with investors. You'll see us forming an operating construct in the next few months and focusing on very specific markets.

If I take India as an example, we are delivering nearly 240 MW of capacity. That puts us in the top five in the market in India. We're also delivering the first ever liquid cooling, direct-to-chip cooling asset in the country. If you're going to put an NVIDIA GB300 you can't have air cooling. You need to have direct-to-chip cooling. We're going very specific in that,

because the scale with these customers is massive and we'll pick our spots through an operating platform. Rather than trying to be all things to all people in data centres, we'll pick specific markets where we have strength and go very significant, very large there.

PTS: Just to add a couple of points for the commercial C-REIT. There're a couple of things that are going well for the commercial C-REIT side. Number one, it took us two years to prepare for the first IPO. The second one is likely to take six months. The regulators are picking up the pace and allowing a more expedited process. Number two, in the first infrastructure REIT, it was only retail (assets). As I explained, the mandate has (now) opened up which is really good for us. Thirdly, the regulators are addressing the pain points from the first three years. For the commercial C-REIT, one of the key breakthroughs is that there are no more reinvestment obligations. The commercial C-REIT does not require sponsors who inject assets to reinvest back into China. So that's really a big break.

LCK: The important thing is that we were very focused on making sure that the first C-REIT product would be well received and trades well, so the second one will also be well received. You want the vehicle to trade well and be of significant size. Then it can really be a vehicle to take on many of the assets we have in China at attractive pricing. Some of these things require us to invest time, energy, and resources to build up these platforms and optionality. And you know, after that you can execute. If you don't lay this foundation, then you're always held at ransom by the market.

Derek Chang, Morgan Stanley (Online): Thank you for sharing some guidance on core PATMI growth (mid-single digit). Will you formalise such guidance in the form of forward-looking disclosures, in view of what MAS or SGX is seeking, and today's share price reaction?

PT: We do have on the summary slide, the guidance and the expectation that we think this run rate for us is fairly sustainable from two aspects.

One, we would expect fund management revenue growth to continue to be double-digit, similar to this year. But we are still investing for the future. For us, that means recruitment and, in the case of our lodging platform, more marketing and advertising costs. Because of that, even though the revenue growth may be stronger, particularly for the funds, we think mid-single-digit growth for the core operating PATMI is a reasonable way forward, barring any catalyst events, whether it is extremely good fundraising from the team, or M&A, or other transactions that may skew that number. But otherwise, at least in the near term, that's a realistic growth number.

Going forward, we hope to accelerate that. The goal, as most of you know, has always been to get to a higher double-digit growth rate and a double-digit ROE target. But at least for the near term, we think our current run rate is about right.

###