



INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY

The Emerging Cost of Capital Divide

Institutional Timberland & Natural Capital

Perspective Note | June 2026

KEY TAKEAWAY

The institutional timberland market increasingly appears to be bifurcating between platforms competing primarily on commodity timber exposure and differentiated operating platforms capable of attracting more durable and strategically aligned capital relationships. Over time, cost of capital may become one of the defining competitive variables across institutional timberland and natural capital markets.

THE MARKET IS EVOLVING

Historically, institutional timberland was financed around relatively standardized assumptions: timber as an inflation hedge, biological growth, land appreciation, low correlation, and downside resilience. That framework helped institutionalize timberland as a core real asset allocation.

But as institutional capital evolves, the market increasingly appears to be bifurcating between platforms competing primarily on commodity timber exposure and differentiated operating platforms capable of attracting more durable and strategically aligned capital relationships.

WHY COST OF CAPITAL MATTERS

Traditional institutional timber capital benefits from mature underwriting frameworks, decades of historical performance data, consultant familiarity, established allocation buckets, and relatively well-understood return expectations.

As a result, core timberland strategies often benefit from lower institutional friction and lower implied costs of capital.

Importantly, lower cost of capital is not simply a financing advantage — it is a strategic advantage

Platforms operating with lower-cost and more durable capital are often positioned to:

- maintain greater operational flexibility through market cycles
- compete more aggressively for acquisitions
- withstand commodity volatility more effectively
- and allocate capital toward long-duration strategic initiatives that may not fit traditional quarterly return frameworks

By contrast, higher-cost or shorter-duration capital often increases pressure toward near-term monetization, narrower underwriting parameters, and shorter investment horizon. As institutional timberland markets evolve, differences in cost of capital may increasingly influence not only investment returns, but also:

- strategic flexibility
- acquisition competitiveness
- portfolio construction
- operational decision making
- and ultimately long-term platform durability

In this context, cost of capital becomes increasingly intertwined with institutional alignment, investor confidence, and long-duration trust in the operating platform itself.

THE NATURAL CAPITAL FRONTIER

Emerging natural capital and strategic real asset themes — including carbon, conservation, ecosystem services, biodiversity, recreation, and specialty land monetization — may offer compelling long-term optionality, but they also introduce new underwriting variables, evolving policy considerations, liquidity uncertainty, and less standardized institutional frameworks.

“The strongest platforms may ultimately be those capable of preserving operational discipline while selectively layering strategic optionality around a differentiated core business.”

THE EMERGING WINNERS

The strongest institutional platforms may progressively combine both: a stable, operationally credible core timber strategy paired with selective strategic optionality around natural capital and differentiated real asset themes. Increasingly, cost of capital may serve as more than simply a financing variable within institutional timberland markets. It may also function as a real-time signal for how institutional investors perceive platform quality, operational credibility, stewardship discipline, governance alignment, and long-duration strategic relevance.

Historically, many timberland platforms competed within relatively standardized institutional underwriting frameworks. As a result, cost of capital was often driven primarily by asset-level fundamentals, portfolio construction, and broader market conditions. Going forward, however, differentiated operating platforms may experience materially different capital formation outcomes based not only on the underlying timberland itself, but on the institutional trust embedded within the platform. In that framework, lower-cost and more durable capital may increasingly accrue to operators capable of demonstrating:

- long-term stewardship credibility
- operational consistency
- disciplined execution
- strategic alignment with institutional objectives
- and differentiated real asset positioning

Over time, relative cost of capital advantages may increasingly become a quantifiable proxy for institutional trust itself.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION

Which operating platforms are positioned to attract long-duration capital partners aligned not only with the asset class — but with the platform itself?

Historically, institutional timberland capital has been allocated primarily through the lens of asset quality, biological growth, geography, and portfolio construction. Those fundamentals remain essential.

However, as investors increasingly evaluate governance, stewardship, operational capability, and the growing role of ecosystem revenue opportunities, the competitive landscape will evolve.

In that environment, differentiation may no longer be defined solely by ownership of high-quality timberland. It will be determined by a platform's ability to generate institutional trust, demonstrate consistent execution, and thoughtfully integrate emerging sources of value across carbon, conservation, biodiversity, recreation, and other ecosystem services without compromising core asset performance.

The defining question may no longer be which timberland assets attract capital.

It may be which operating platforms earn the trust required to attract the most durable forms of capital—and are best positioned to convert long-term stewardship into multiple, aligned revenue streams over time.

That may ultimately become one of the defining strategic questions in institutional timberland and natural capital markets over the next decade.

Josh Yearout

Founder & Managing Partner

Verdant Natural Capital Partners

DISCLAIMER

This material has been prepared by Verdant Natural Capital Partners LLC ("Verdant") for informational and discussion purposes only and does not constitute investment advice, an offer to sell, or a solicitation of an offer to purchase any security, investment product, or advisory service. The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the author as of the date of publication and are subject to change without notice. Certain statements may contain forward-looking views, expectations, or assumptions which are inherently uncertain and subject to risks, market developments, and other factors beyond Verdant's control. This material should not be relied upon as legal, tax, accounting, regulatory, or investment advice. Readers should consult their own professional advisors regarding any investment, legal, or business decisions. While information contained herein has been obtained from sources believed to be reliable, Verdant makes no representation or warranty as to the accuracy, completeness, or reliability of the information presented.

© 2026 Verdant Natural Capital Partners LLC. All rights reserved. Verdant Natural Capital Partners™ and associated branding are proprietary marks of Verdant Natural Capital Partners LLC. Unauthorized reproduction, distribution, or use of this material without written permission is prohibited.