

**WRITE-OFFS OF EXPLORATION AND  
EVALUATION ASSETS IN AUSTRALIAN MINING  
DEVELOPMENT STAGE ENTITIES:  
DETERMINANTS AND STOCK PRICE REACTIONS**

**PhD Thesis by**

**Pauline Lam**

**February 2018**

**Accounting Discipline Group**

**University of Technology Sydney**

**Supervisors**

**Professor Andrew Ferguson**

**Professor Martin Bugeja**

**Dr Peter Lam**

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY**

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

Signature of PhD Candidate

Pauline Lam

Date: February 2018

This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would first and foremost like to thank my principal supervisor, Professor Andrew Ferguson. Thank you for all your support, mentoring and encouragement during my thesis. Without your guidance, this thesis would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Professor Stephen Penman, who was the advisor during my scholar visit at Columbia University, for his invaluable empirical advice and research direction. Together you two have inspired me to do interesting and rigorous research which I will remember for years to come. I also appreciated the assistance of Dr. Peter Lam for his research advice.

I am also grateful to the following people for advice, assistance and encouragement: Alexey Feigin, Matt Grosse, Hayley Ma, Nelson Ma, Sam Sherry, Fernando Distadio, Gabriel Pündrich, Ross McClure, Ann Usarat Thirathon, Urooj Khan, Vyas Dushyantkumar, Silvia Gaia, Tumi Makgetla, Wei Yin and Katherine Weiss. I am also grateful to the following people for industry advice and assistance: Katherine Kinkela, David Roots, Robert Coeraads, Joe Schifano, Jane Marks and Michael Carty. Many thanks to all the assistance from the University of Technology Sydney and Columbia University staff members, students, visitors and participants at workshops.

I also acknowledge the financial support received from the Accounting Discipline and the Graduate Research School of the University of Technology Sydney. I am also thankful for the editorial advice from Roger Herz.

Last and most importantly, I dedicate this thesis to my parents and all my three brothers for their support and inspirations for some of the hypotheses. I am truly thankful for my nephew, Christopher Paul Lam who provided generous assistance on the hand collection of data. Thank you for my mom's inspiration and unwavering belief

in education giving me the determination to complete this thesis. I would like to thank Peter Bender for his companionship, support and patience during my thesis journey.

## **ABSTRACT**

This thesis explores write-offs in exploration and evaluation (EE) assets reported by the pre-production Australian Mining Development Stage Entities (MDSEs). The financial reporting of MDSEs is subject to a specific principles-based accounting standard AASB 6, *Exploration for and Evaluation of Mineral Resources* which allows for multiple accounting choices to record EE assets. This reporting flexibility gives rise to managerial discretion in recording assets and can have a potential impact on asset quality. This study primarily evaluates different accounting choices in reporting EE costs at the firm level. This disclosure of information ultimately has a bearing over the impairment of the EE assets and the valuation of the firms.

To begin with, this thesis is the first comprehensive analysis on accounting choices under AASB6 since the Lourens and Henderson (1972) survey. It provides evidence of current accounting choices made by MDSEs to capitalise or to expense EE costs. This study further examines the determinants and market reactions of write-offs amongst MDSEs in the Australian mining sector. The latter signals a demarcation when uncertainty is resolved.

It is observed that capitalisation remains the dominating accounting choice for MDSEs. This descriptive finding holds in both the pre- and post-IFRS adoption periods. Based on descriptive statistics, firms choosing capitalization method, tend to have weaker financials with low cash balances, lower profitability and lower levels of equity funding. The expensing method tends to be used by firms with stronger financials with high cash balances, larger asset base, higher profitability and more equity funding.

In terms of the propensity to impair EE assets, impairment is more likely to occur amongst firms with a high proportion of non-exploration spending relative to

exploration-related spending, high cash burn rates, before obtaining project debt financing, during the mining boom. However, firms holding large EE assets with high book to market ratios, using non-Big 4 specialist auditors are associated with higher write-offs reported.

In assessing the impact of write-offs on equity valuation, on the announcement date, negative short windows (event date and 3 to 5-day abnormal buy-and-hold returns) are observed following price sensitive announcements, when information is derived from 'preliminary final' reports<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary final report must be lodged with Australian Stock Exchange as required by the listing rules while mining and oil and gas exploration companies are not mandatory. The preliminary final report contains statement of comprehensive income, financial position and cash flows and can be audited and unaudited.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY .....	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	II
ABSTRACT .....	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES .....	X
LIST OF TABLES .....	X
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Overview.....	1
1.2 Motivation .....	2
1.3 Summary.....	10
1.4 Thesis structure .....	12
CHAPTER 2 - THE DUAL ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK: FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE REPORTING IN THE AUSTRALIAN MINING INDUSTRY .....	14
2.1 Background.....	14
2.2 Conceptual framework for asset definition and recognition .....	16
2.3 Development of accounting standards .....	17
2.4 Applications of IRFS 6 by Australian MDSE's.....	20
2.5 Recognition of EE assets (AASB6) vs. intangible assets (AASB 138).....	24
2.6 Choice of valuation approach: cost versus revaluation models.....	27
2.7 International comparisons.....	28
2.8 History of the mineral reporting standard (The JORC Code).....	31
2.9 Theoretical framework.....	36
CHAPTER 3 - ACCOUNTING CHOICE.....	42
3.1 Introduction.....	42

3.2	Prior accounting choice research and related findings .....	42
3.3	Sample construction .....	43
3.4	Accounting treatment summary statistics .....	48
3.5	Summary.....	52
3.6	Prior Accounting Choice Research and Related Findings.....	52
CHAPTER 4 – DETERMINANTS OF THE PROPENSITY TO UNDERTAKE WRITE-OFFS...		61
4.1	Background.....	61
4.2	Literature review and hypothesis development .....	73
4.2.1	Financial reporting determinants of write-off decisions .....	73
4.2.2	Monitoring mechanism determinants of write-off decisions.....	79
4.2.3	Hypotheses development.....	81
4.3	Research Design.....	86
4.3.1	Characteristics of write-off firm model.....	86
4.3.2	Data collection .....	90
4.4	Results.....	90
4.4.1	Firm descriptive statistics .....	90
4.4.2	Correlation Matrix.....	92
4.4.3	Characteristics of write-off firms.....	93
4.4.4	Robustness testing.....	101
4.5	Conclusions.....	102
CHAPTER 5 - MARKET REACTIONS AND WRITE-OFFS .....		104
5.1	Introduction.....	104
5.2	Literature review and hypothesis development .....	105
5.3	Research design .....	109
5.3.1	Multivariate analysis on cross sectional variations in abnormal returns.....	109
5.3.2	Market reaction determinants.....	110



5.3.3 Confounding effects .....	112
5.4 Results.....	113
5.4.1 Market reaction to preliminary final reports.....	113
5.4.2 Determinants of reported write-off market reaction .....	113
5.4.3 Robustness test .....	116
5.5 Conclusion.....	120
CHAPTER 6 - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	122
6.1 Summary.....	122
6.2 Contributions and implications .....	124
6.3 Potential limitations.....	124
6.4 Suggestions for future research.....	125
6.5 Conclusion.....	126
REFERENCES.....	127
APPENDIX 1 .....	132
APPENDIX 2 .....	135
APPENDIX 3 .....	136
APPENDIX 4 .....	137
APPENDIX 5 .....	138
APPENDIX 6 ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS BY FIRM YEAR .....	139
APPENDIX 7 ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS BY NUMBER OF FIRMS.....	141
APPENDIX 8 AVERAGE DURATION OF ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS USED BY EACH FIRM .....	143
APPENDIX 9 FINANCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FIRMS ADOPTING ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS .....	145
APPENDIX 10 AUDITORS IN THE MDSE UNIVERSE FROM 1995 - 2015 .....	150

APPENDIX 11 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR FIRMS WITH WRITE-OFFS REPORTED .....	153
APPENDIX 12 REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON DETERMINANTS OF WRITE-OFFS YEAR-ON- YEAR.....	155

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 3.1 DISTRIBUTION OF LISTED AND DELISTED FIRMS IN MDSE SECTOR FROM 1995 - 2015.....	48
FIGURE 3.2 DISTRIBUTION OF ACCOUNTING CHOICES BY FIRM YEAR FROM 1995 - 2015 .....	49

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1 ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS OF EE ASSETS BY JURISDICTION .....	31
TABLE 3.1 ATTRITION TABLE FOR THE MDSE SAMPLE BY FIRM YEAR.....	44
TABLE 3.2 BREAKOUT OF FIRM YEARS BY ACCOUNTING TREATMENT & LISTING STATUS.....	49
TABLE 4.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS RELATED TO WRITE-OFF DECISIONS .....	90
TABLE 4.2 CORRELATION MATRIX OF VARIABLES OF WRITE-OFF DETERMINANTS.....	92
TABLE 4.3 REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON DETERMINANTS OF WRITE-OFF DECISIONS.....	93
TABLE 4.4 REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON DETERMINANTS OF WRITE-OFF DECISIONS - FIXED EFFECTS...	98
TABLE 4.5 REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON DETERMINANTS OF WRITE-OFF DECISIONS - WINSORISED HIGHEST AND LOWEST AT 5% .....	99
TABLE 4.6 ROBUSTNESS TESTS: REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON WRITE-OFF DETERMINANTS .....	101
TABLE 5.1 ABNORMAL RETURNS.....	113
TABLE 5.2 REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON ABNORMAL RETURNS (STATUTORY ANNUAL REPORTS) .....	114
TABLE 5.3 REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON ABNORMAL RETURNS (PRELIMINARY ANNUAL REPORT).....	115
TABLE 5.4 ROBUSTNESS TESTS: REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON ABNORMAL RETURNS - IFRS ADOPTION	117
TABLE 5.5 ROBUSTNESS TESTS: REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON ABNORMAL RETURNS - MINING BOOM PARTITIONING.....	118
TABLE 5.6 ROBUSTNESS TESTS: REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON ABNORMAL RETURNS - MINING BOOM PARTITIONING DURING POST IFRS ADOPTION PERIOD .....	119
TABLE 5.7 ROBUSTNESS TESTS: REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON ABNORMAL RETURNS - ACCOUNTING METHOD .....	120