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Executive summary

Deloitte Global Treasury Advisory is pleased to share its first Global Foreign Exchange survey

The survey was crafted in response to the recent high profile and impact of Foreign Exchange (FX) on businesses. In 2015 alone, the surge in the US dollar wiped billions off earnings of US organizations; material currency shifts surprised financial markets (ranging from the Swiss Franc in one direction to emerging market currencies in the other); and the decision to include the Chinese Renminbi in the SDR bucket from October onwards also reflects further progression in the currency markets. Furthermore, FX rates impact corporate transactions with the strengthening of the US dollar having fueled increased cross-border M&A activity for the US corporate sector (Deloitte M&A Index, 2016: Opportunities amidst divergence).

Similar levels of uncertainties are anticipated in 2016, with different expectations around interest rate policies, quantitative easing removals, potential depegging of some currencies, and other actions by global economies all driving FX volatility. Increased currency risk can have a direct impact on reported profits and on cash through the taxation of unrealized FX, even on intra-group transactions. More generally, the forthcoming changes to global tax rules under the OECD’s Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative could impact the financial implications of centralized FX hedging activities.

The ability of corporations to manage currency risk effectively will therefore continue to be tested. Boards and CFOs need to be comfortable that currency-related value erosion is avoided and, where necessary, challenge their treasury teams to address some of the identified hurdles.

The survey provides insight into the challenges corporations encounter when managing currency risk and possible causes (and solutions) for these challenges, as well as FX risk management structures, strategies, and processes adopted by companies across the globe. Key findings are summarized below.

Treasury challenges
Lack of visibility into FX exposures and reliable forecasts and the manual nature of exposure quantification is a challenge for nearly 60 percent of respondents. This challenge is pervasive throughout the survey, from the many sources of FX exposures in organizations, to the existence of largely manual forecasts and exposure collation processes, and the under-utilization of treasury systems in the FX management processes.

Without accurate measurement, risks cannot be managed effectively. Hence, value erosion from negative currency rate movements cannot be minimized. Organizations should prioritize appropriate investment to improve and automate exposure capture and analysis processes.

The board agenda
The survey suggests that boards do not always receive sufficient information in relation to FX risk. Executive management could challenge its treasurers more in order to better understand the impact of FX risk hedging strategies on profit margins and EPS; why only 11 percent of respondents manage year-on-year performance and predictability; and why opportunities to minimize exposures through the use of netting and natural hedging techniques are only explored by around half of the respondents.

Treasury structures
FX risk is predominantly managed via a central structure with 93 percent of respondents using a centralized treasury or in-house bank model, sometimes complemented by regional treasury centers. Organizations with centralized models report a higher number of benefits and fewer challenges than those with a decentralized model, although the benefits and challenges reported are similar, suggesting both can work.
Hedging strategies
Hedging strategy objectives are mainly focused on protecting cash and minimizing volatility in income statements. As a result, hedging strategies are primarily centered around monetary balance sheet FX items and FX cash flows, and much less on P&L translation or net asset hedging.

Use of technology
Technology is recognized as an important enabler to achieve efficient and effective processes, yet it appears to be a hindrance for many organizations that still deal with a multitude of source information systems with limited interconnectivity. More than 60 percent of respondents rely on manual forecasting processes.

A big thank you
Thank you to the companies around the world that responded to our survey online or by interview. Please contact your Deloitte Advisory contact for more information about how your company responded or compared to your peer group.

Deloitte’s Global Treasury Advisory Services team has emerged as the largest global professional services treasury practice. We offer services across all areas of treasury, covering FX hedging strategies, M&A, strategy, operating model and process transformation, treasury technology strategy, selection, and implementation. If this survey resonates with the issues that your company faces, please contact us. International contact information is provided on page 18.

Sincerely,

Melissa Cameron  
Principal | Deloitte Advisory  
Global Treasury Leader  
Global Treasury Advisory Services  
Deloitte & Touche LLP

Karlien Porré  
UK Treasury Partner  
Global Treasury Advisory Services  
Deloitte LLP
Levels of uncertainties in 2016 are anticipated to be similar to what was seen in 2015, with different expectations around interest rate policies, quantitative easing removals, potential depegging of some currencies, and other actions by global economies all driving FX volatility.
Survey demographics

We surveyed 133 corporations around the globe, representing a wide array of size, geographies, and industries.

In which region are you based?

- **Americas**: 23%
- **EMEA**: 62%
- **APAC**: 15%

What industry are you in?

- **Consumer & Industrial Products**: 41%
- **Energy & Resources**: 11%
- **Financial Services (non-bank)**: 4%
- **Life Sciences & Health Care**: 6%
- **Technology, Media & Telecommunications**: 15%
- **Other**: 23%

Annual revenue

- **01-10 Billion USD**: 64%
- **10-50 Billion USD**: 28%
- **50+ Billion USD**: 8%

Number of people managing FX risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front office</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle office</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back office</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This analysis excludes people supporting FX management in the operating entities.
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Lack of visibility related to FX exposures and reliable forecasts is a challenge for nearly 60 percent of respondents. Without accurate measurement, risks cannot be managed effectively and, arguably, value erosion from negative currency rate movements cannot be prevented. Hedging ineffectiveness disproportionately increases with inaccurate exposure information; hence, organizations with successful FX hedging strategies are those that have invested in the right exposure identification processes and technologies.
Lack of visibility driven by complexity and inadequate investment in automation

The lack of visibility reflects the complexity of the topic, with 31 percent of corporations relying on three or more sources to identify exposures. Companies therefore need to focus on achieving real-time integration of different systems, and data quality and consistency from the various sources, to drive visibility and reduce inaccuracy.

Complexity increases as companies become more global. Fifty percent of respondents operate in more than 20 countries. Treasurers need to impress this complexity on senior management and global teams.

Lack of automation is a contributing factor to the challenges of identifying FX exposures, emphasized by 62 percent of participants using manual forecasts and 36 percent having fully or largely manual processes. Manual information and processes cause late and unreliable forecasts, and one could challenge whether the operating entities fully understand what they need to gather. Unsurprisingly, the survey findings show a direct correlation between levels of automation and confidence in forecasts, demonstrating that investment in tools and technology helps to address the visibility challenge.

Inaccurate forecasts, poor communication on changes in forecasts, and non-transparent exposures constitute the top three sources of ineffectiveness in managing FX risk. FX risk cannot be managed effectively if it cannot be quantified in the first place. Treasurers need to be core members of corporate projects on IT and cash-flow forecasting to ensure their requirements are fully factored in.
Board visibility of FX exposures

Are FX exposures and FX risk management performance quantified and reported in a clear manner to senior management and the board of directors?

Yes 63%  
No 37%

Natural risk reduction

46% Natural management or netting of exposures across entities  
58% Natural management through matching costs and revenue in the same currency in the same entity

Measurement of commercial effectiveness of FX risk management activities

Extent of FX gains and losses in the income statement 48%  
Impact on gross margin or other profitability measures (e.g., EPS impact) 41%  
Level of volatility in the income statement 24%  
Not measured 21%  
Impact on consolidated earnings statement with such measures as constant currency reporting 18%  
Portfolio VaR or other statistical measure to test the level of actual risk that was run 16%  
Number of spot transactions required as a measure of how much of exposures were not hedged in line with the policy (i.e., unhedged exposures) 14%

Board visibility is impaired with 37 percent of respondents reporting that the board does not receive sufficient information in relation to FX exposure and risk management. This limits the board’s ability to challenge and guide. Treasurers should review their reports and communicate key FX risk metrics aligned to wider financial and strategic measures.

Boards should challenge their treasury teams over the limited use of natural hedging and netting within their organizations. Currently, only 58 percent of corporations minimize exposures and hedging cost through natural hedging and an even lower 46 percent through netting.

The question of course arises as to whether boards have the visibility to challenge this and ask key questions, such as why gross rather than net exposures are hedged with derivatives. Or why commercial teams do not maximize opportunities to match currencies of revenue and costs, and whether FX hedging costs are higher than they should be as a result.

Boards should also challenge their teams on improved measurement of the effectiveness of FX hedging activities. Crucial measures such as impact on profitability are tracked by less than half of the respondents and 21 percent do not measure performance at all.
Opportunity to improve reporting to the board

Key risk management dashboard reports used for the board of directors, risk committee, and/or senior management

- FX exposure summary: 72%
- FX gains/losses: 61%
- Hedged position and hedge coverage ratios: 60%
- Exposure forecast variances (actual to forecast comparison): 26%
- Limit and compliance reports: 25%
- FX accounting analysis and results: 24%
- FX activity summary (new trades, closed trades, settlements): 23%
- VaR or other "at risk" measures: 17%
- Stress test/scenario analysis: 15%
- Benchmarks and key performance indicators (i.e., impacts to EPS, gross margins, other income): 14%
- No dashboard reporting undertaken: 8%

When reporting to senior management, more than 70 percent of respondents report only fairly basic metrics such as quantum of foreign exchange exposures, hedged positions, and foreign exchange gains/losses.

Less than 25 percent generate more sophisticated information such as performance against key benchmarks, variance analysis, VaR or other at-risk measures, stress tests, or scenario analysis.

Treasurers have an opportunity to improve the reporting provided to boards and senior management by incorporating the more complex underused analysis, as well as improved staple reporting.
Both centralized and decentralized models work

What is your current operating model for managing FX risks?

- Central function with regional centers hedging on behalf of other subsidiaries: 11%
- Central model as part of an in-house bank: 82%
- Decentralized management by individual units/divisions: 7%

Perceived benefits of operating model

Both centralized and decentralized models appear to deliver increased oversight of FX exposures and clear responsibility as a key benefit of their structure.

Centralized models achieve more benefits overall, but it is noticeable that decentralized models outperform in fostering improved risk management decisions and responsiveness to FX management actions. We expect this results from the increased responsibility placed on operating units, thus generating greater awareness.

Neither model is deemed to be effective in maximizing the value delivered to the business, which less than 40 percent of respondents felt they had achieved. This is somewhat disappointing given the finding in our 2015 Global Corporate Treasury Survey that delivering value to the business was one of the top mandates treasurers felt they were given by their CFOs. Treasurers therefore continue to try to find the right structure and approach to value creation and optimization. They need to balance the trade-off between having efficiency from centralized operations versus having deep local market knowledge and driving value for the business.
Hedging objectives focus on reducing income statement volatility

Primary hedging objectives

- Reduce income statement volatility and protect subsidiary/local currency income statement/earnings: 49%
- Protect cash flows in Group reporting currency: 47%
- Protect consolidated reported earnings in your Group reporting currency: 38%
- Minimize FX gains and losses due to the remeasurement of FX-denominated assets and liabilities each period: 35%
- Protect subsidiary’s local currency cash flows: 28%
- Protecting shareholder value: 26%
- Protect/achieve annual budget FX rates: 25%
- Maintain marketplace competitive advantage: 16%
- Manage year on year financial performance (e.g., to achieve smoothing): 11%
- Mitigating subsidiary’s net equity or capital balance sheet translation impacts (net investment) on parent’s financial statement: 6%

Protecting the income statement (either in subsidiary local currency or Group reporting currency) and consolidated cash flows are key hedging objectives. Low on treasurers’ objectives list appears to be protecting balance sheet or net equity translation impacts.

Most hedging objectives focus on protecting discrete periods. Only 11 percent manage year-on-year financial performance, which seems to contradict the fact that the majority of companies use rolling hedging programs. Hedging objectives should arguably focus not just on covering the nearest accounting period, but also on providing resilience to FX risk in the longer term and thus protecting business growth.

Less than a third of respondents claim to focus on protecting shareholder value and maintaining marketplace competitive advantage. However, we know that many organizations are aligning hedging with their commercial strategies. Hence, we expect that these low scores reflect the fact that while this is not a primary hedging objective, it nevertheless is one factor to consider when developing hedging strategies.
Primary hedging strategies vary by industry

Fifty-nine percent of corporations primarily use a rolling hedging strategy, with roughly half incorporating some form of layering (28 percent) and the balance (31 percent) using a flat hedge ratio. This majority approach is not a surprise given the benefits provided by a rolling approach, including reduced volatility between periods and continued, rolling visibility of future FX rate achieved.

Thirty-three percent follow an ad hoc or situational approach to hedging. The ad hoc approach is largely driven by the Energy and Resources industry and the Automotive and Process and Industrial Products sector (within Consumer and Industrial Products) where respectively 65 percent and 32 percent adopt an ad-hoc hedging strategy. Different approaches clearly reflect the different nature of the business and, hence, profile of exposures.

Primary derivative hedging strategy

Static/annual hedging – Most hedges placed annually; typically coinciding with the budget FX rate setting process

Rolling hedge – Hedging on a frequency basis (every month, quarter, etc.) with a flat hedging target ratio for the full period hedged

Rolling but layering hedge – Hedging an increasing amount of the exposure over time to achieve an “average” rate for the item or buckets hedged

Ad hoc/situational hedging
Missed opportunities in natural hedges

Surprisingly, only around half of respondents use natural risk management techniques such as cash-flow netting and exposure matching. As nearly 90 percent of respondents use derivatives, opportunities seem to exist to increase usage of natural hedging to reduce derivatives-related costs.

Of those using derivatives, the vast majority use FX forwards and FX swaps. Products such as options and collars are used by only a third of respondents. This is low, perhaps driven by the reluctance to pay premiums or due to the perceived lack of benefits and in-house skills to manage these instruments.
The majority of derivatives hedge transaction exposures

**Derivative hedging programs currently employed**

- **Forecasted transactions hedging** – Transactional (cash-flow) exposures based on forecasts: 68%
- **Committed transactions hedging** – Committed transactional (cash-flow) exposures: 54%
- **Balance sheet hedging** – Exposures arising from monetary balances held in foreign currency on the entities’ own balance sheet: 44%
- **Hedging translational (net investment) exposures arising from balance sheet consolidation (i.e., net assets in entities with different functional currencies): 11%**
- **Hedging translational (net investment) exposures arising from profit and loss consolidation (i.e., income statement entities with different functional currencies): 8%**

As expected, corporations surveyed focus largely on hedging cash flows, both committed and forecast, and monetary balance sheet exposures.

There is limited hedging of translation exposures (income statement and balance sheet). This is likely to reflect the complexities of hedging pure translation exposures with derivatives, but also that most corporations are comfortable that shareholders are aware and are managing those risks themselves.

There are some noticeable geographical differences. In EMEA, there is a greater difference in the proportion of companies hedging forecasted exposures (72 percent), versus hedging balance sheet exposures (41 percent); in the US, there is a more even split (60 percent versus 50 percent). In addition, net investment hedging is approximately three or four times more common in APAC than the rest of the world.

**Derivative hedging programs currently employed – by geography**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hedging Program</th>
<th>APAC</th>
<th>EMEA</th>
<th>Americas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forecasted transactions hedging – Transactional (cash-flow) exposures based on forecasts</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed transactions hedging – Committed transactional (cash-flow) exposures</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance sheet hedging – Exposures arising from monetary balances held in foreign currency on the entities’ own balance sheet</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedging translational (net investment) exposures arising from balance sheet consolidation (i.e., net assets in entities with different functional currencies)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedging translational (net investment) exposures arising from profit and loss consolidation (i.e., income statement entities with different functional currencies)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hedging transaction exposures

As expected, transactional hedging percentages decline as the tenor increased. Exposures in the first three months are hedged on average for 68 percent in 83 percent of corporations, with the hedge ratio declining to 18 percent on average for exposures beyond 24 months in organizations that hedge that long (only 29 percent of those surveyed).

For larger corporations the percentages are higher, perhaps driven by increased confidence in forecasts and visibility of exposures due to the higher percentage of decentralized treasuries.

Across industries the level of hedging is fairly consistent, with the exception of Financial Services (FS), where foreign exchange hedging practices focus primarily on balance sheet exposures rather than forecast transactions. This is expected, given the different nature of FX exposures in the FS sector versus commercial organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure type</th>
<th>Firms that hedge (%)</th>
<th>Avg. hedge ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transaction exposures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance sheet</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Months</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 Months</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 Months</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18 Months</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Months</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond 24 Months</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation consolidation exposures

|                             |                      |                  |
| Net Investment             | 11%                  | –                |
| Foreign Earnings           | 8%                   | –                |

Transactional hedging per period, size

Transactional hedging per period, industry
Use of technology to manage FX risks

Do you use a treasury management system and/or financial risk system today for FX risk management?

Yes 56%  
No 44%

To what extent is FX risk management automated within your Treasury Management System and/or financial risk system(s)?

Fourty-four percent of respondents do not use a treasury management system (TMS) for managing their FX exposures. For those who do, their main usage is process-driven, covering deal capture and operations. Other tasks such as exposure capture and analytics are often done outside the TMS environment.

We believe there is scope for treasurers to extend the usage of their TMS from its current form to support all tasks. With respect to exposure identification and capture, interfaces with other financial systems may be required to resolve the current key challenges of inaccurate forecasts and the visibility of exposures.
Accounting treatment influencing hedging strategies

Accounting policies do not routinely drive hedging policies (only for 20 percent of organizations), but they are equally not routinely ignored (only 17 percent of respondents quoted that they have no impact). The more common impact of the accounting treatment is that it is one of the several influencers and/or policies that is tweaked, where possible, to avoid undesired accounting results.

This demonstrates the need for treasurers to balance the economically optimal hedging strategy with managing wider stakeholders’ expectations.

Adoption of hedge accounting treatment for FX derivatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derivatives that do get hedge accounting treatment</th>
<th>Derivatives that do not get hedge accounting treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FX collars</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue foreign currency debt</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-currency swaps</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased FX options (and/or variations of forwards with embedded options)</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX swaps</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX forwards and non-deliverable forwards</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extent to which accounting treatments impact or drive hedging strategies

- 35% Not a driver but try to minimize undesired accounting implications (where possible) but without changing the economically preferred policy
- 28% Hedging strategy is influenced by the accounting treatment and some adjustments are made where needed to achieve the desired accounting treatment
- 20% Accounting treatment is a key driver (for example with a focus on minimizing accounting gains/losses)
- 17% No impact

Adoption of hedge accounting treatment for FX derivatives

- Derivatives that do get hedge accounting treatment
- Derivatives that do not get hedge accounting treatment

2016 Global Foreign Exchange survey
Contacts

Global & United States
Melissa Cameron
mcameron@deloitte.com
+1 415 706 8227

United Kingdom
Karlien Porré
kporre@deloitte.co.uk
+44 20 7303 5153

Australia
Steven Cunico
scunico@deloitte.com.au
+61 3967 1702

United States
Niklas Bergentoft
nbergentoft@deloitte.com
+1 203 905 2859

Denmark
Michael Vestergaard
mvestergaard@deloitte.dk
+45 2030 4990

Richard Brooks
rbrooks@deloitte.com
+1 312 486 4364

Ireland
Pieter Burger
piburger@deloitte.ie
+35 03 1417 2446

Canada
Paul Lech
plech@deloitte.ca
+1 416 643 8037

South East Asia
Benny Koh
bekoh@deloitte.com
+65 6800 2266

China
Floyd Min Qian
flqian@deloitte.com.cn
+86 21 2316 6585

United States
Dino Nicolaides
dinicolaides@deloitte.co.uk
+44 20 7007 8545

India
Muzammil Patel
muzammilpatel@deloitte.com
+91 22 6185 5490

US Tax
John McNally
jmcnally@deloitte.com
+1.312.486.3141

Middle East
Irshad Jooma
ijooma@deloitte.com
+971 4506 4928

South Africa
Monique De Waal
modewaal@deloitte.co.za
+27 11 304 5417

UK Tax
Stephen Weston
sgweston@deloitte.co.uk
+44 20 7007 4568

The Netherlands
Jeroen Jansen
jerojansen@deloitte.nl
+31 (0) 88 288 5928

Global & United States
Melissa Cameron
mcameron@deloitte.com
+1 415 706 8227

Australia
Steven Cunico
scunico@deloitte.com.au
+61 3967 1702

United States
Niklas Bergentoft
nbergentoft@deloitte.com
+1 203 905 2859

Denmark
Michael Vestergaard
mvestergaard@deloitte.dk
+45 2030 4990

Ireland
Pieter Burger
piburger@deloitte.ie
+35 03 1417 2446

South East Asia
Benny Koh
bekoh@deloitte.com
+65 6800 2266

United States
Dino Nicolaides
dinicolaides@deloitte.co.uk
+44 20 7007 8545

US Tax
John McNally
jmcnally@deloitte.com
+1.312.486.3141

UK Tax
Stephen Weston
sgweston@deloitte.co.uk
+44 20 7007 4568

www.deloitte.com/us/globalfx