



**TDM BERHAD**  
**(“TDM” or “the Company”)**  
[Registration No: 196501000477 (6265-P)]

**TDM FIFTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING**  
**(“TDM 57th AGM”)**

**APPENDIX B - QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Note: The questions and answers have been edited for brevity and clarity**

## AGM LIVE QUESTIONS

### *Kalimantan subsidiaries*

No.	Shareholder/ Proxy	Question
1.	Encik Mohamad Azidi bin Mohd Anuar (Proxy)	Why did TDM decide to sell Kalimantan subsidiaries at a lower price than RM210.0 million in comparison to the earlier disposal attempt?
<b>Answer</b>		
<p>The earlier proposal on the disposal attempt was conducted when the condition in Kalimantan was in an excellent shape. Due to the following incident: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) Fire incident in 2019, covering over the plantation land; and</li><li>(b) the revocation of license for PT SRA IUP (announced at Bursa Malaysia on 18 June 2021); and</li></ul> <p>The Company took the above circumstances into the consideration, which also had an impact on the selling price making the previous disposal price amounting to RM210 million might no longer be achievable.</p> <p>As the Company additionally supplied the advances (supported in terms of tenants, renovations, salaries, and many other things) to the Kalimantan Subsidiaries, which are increasing year by year, the Kalimantan Subsidiaries were never profitable from the date of incorporation and were never exhibiting any profits.</p> <p>The Company looked at this matter practically on the price and recognised the qualified factors associated to the risks related to the assets and additional investment to be incur by the buyer. Hence, come to the amount of RM115.0 million on the disposal of the Kalimantan Subsidiaries.</p> <p>The Company had discussed with the respective parties on the book value of the Kalimantan subsidiaries, and the Company would still earn a profit from the latest deal.</p>		

No.	Shareholder/ Proxy	Question
2	Encik Mohd Helmi bin Marzuki (Proxy)	PT. Rafi Kamajaya Abadi is facing a civil and criminal suit by the Indonesian authorities in relation to the fire incident in 2019. What is our assessment of both cases?
<b>Answer</b>		
<p>The Company had made several announcements to Bursa Malaysia on the status of civil and criminal suit by the Indonesian authorities in relation to the fire incident in 2019.</p> <p>The Company has appointed a very good Indonesian counsel for both cases and they are confident that the Company have strong grounds to defend both cases.</p> <p>In summary, the Company was accused of being careless and causing the burning on the new land, whilst, based on the records, the burning occurred on the Company's owned land. Moreover, the authority is not able to determine/prove the person who started the fire because of the nature of the Company's plantation land is surrounded by the villagers. The peat land also makes the area is vulnerable to fire.</p> <p>The latest updates on the proceedings as announced at Bursa Malaysia are the court had called the expert witnesses to testify in front of the judges. The Company had appointed expert witnesses who are very familiar with the case to testify on behalf of the Company.</p> <p>Additionally, as per recent announcement, the Court of Sintang had on 13 June 2022 fixed 27 June 2022 for field visit at the location affected by the fire incident in 2019.</p>		