Answers

1 Consolidated statement of financial position of Alpha at 31 December 20X8
[all numbers in '000]

	$'000
Assets	
Non-current assets	
Property, plant and equipment (W7)	732,500
Goodwill (W2)	33,900
Intangible asset (W1)	21,000
	787,400
Current assets	
Inventories (125,000 + 90,000 – 5,000 (W5))	210,000
Trade receivables (100,000 + 80,000)	180,000
Cash and cash equivalents (40,000 + 30,000)	70,000
	460,000
Total assets	1,247,400
Equity and liabilities	
Equity attributable to equity holders of the parent	
Share capital ($1 shares)	200,000
Retained earnings (W5)	291,700
Other components of equity (W6)	65,500
	560,200
Non-controlling interest (W4)	65,100
Total equity	622,300
Non-current liabilities	
Long-term borrowings (150,000 + 60,000)	210,000
Deferred tax (W8)	145,100
Total non-current liabilities	355,100
Current liabilities	
Trade and other payables (90,000 + 80,000)	170,000
Current tax payable (60,000 + 40,000)	100,000
Total current liabilities	270,000
Total liabilities	625,100
Total equity and liabilities	1,247,400

Workings (all numbers in $'000)

Working 1 – Net assets table for Beta

	1 January 20X6 $'000	31 December 20X8 $'000
Per financial statements of Beta		
Share capital	120,000	120,000
Retained earnings:	35,000	85,000
Fair value adjustments:		
Property, plant and equipment (post-acquisition additional depreciation = 18,000 x 1/4 x 3 = 13,500)	18,000	4,500
Brand (post-acquisition amortisation = 30,000 x 1/10 x 3 = 9,000)	30,000	21,000
Deferred tax on fair value adjustments (20%)	(9,600)	(5,100)
Other components of equity	25,000	35,000
Net assets for the consolidation	218,400	260,400

Increase in net assets (260,400 – 218,400) = 42,000. 10,000 of this relates to other components of equity and the balance of 32,000 (42,000 – 10,000) to retained earnings.

Note: Marks for the split awarded in W5 and W6.

Working 2 – Goodwill on acquisition of Beta

	$'000
Cost of investment	207,900
Non-controlling interest at date of acquisition (218,400 (W1) x 25%)	54,600
Net assets at date of acquisition (W1)	(218,400)
	44,100
Impairment at 31 December 20X8 (W3)	(10,200)
Goodwill at 31 December 20X8	33,900

Working 3 – Impairment of Beta Goodwill

	$'000 Total
Net assets of Beta at 31 December 20X8	260,400
Grossed up goodwill (44,100 x 100/75)	58,800
	319,200
Recoverable amount (**higher** of VIU and FVLCOD)	305,600
So gross impairment equals	13,600
Group share only recognised	10,200

Working 4 – Non-controlling interest in Beta

	$'000
At date of acquisition (W2)	54,600
25% of post-acquisition increase in net assets (25% x 42,000 (W1))	10,500
	65,100

Working 5 – Retained earnings

	$'000
Alpha – per draft SOFP	295,000
75% of post-acquisition share of Beta (75% x 32,000 (W1))	24,000
Unrealised profit on sales to Beta (20,000 x 1/4)	(5,000)
Acquisition costs of Beta	(2,100)
Impairment of Beta goodwill (W4)	(10,200)
Reversal of profit on de-recognition of derivative	(10,000)
	291,700

Working 6 – Other components of equity

	$'000
Alpha – per draft SOFP	80,000
75% of post-acquisition share of Beta (75% x 10,000 (W1))	7,500
20X7 derivative gain set against the cost of hedged PPE	(22,000)
	65,500

Working 7 – Property, plant and equipment

	$'000
Alpha + Beta (per own financial statements – 500,000 + 260,000)	760,000
Fair value adjustment (W1)	4,500
Gain on hedging derivative set against cost	(32,000)
	732,500

Working 8 – Deferred tax

	$'000
Alpha + Beta (per own financial statements – 100,000 + 40,000)	140,000
Deferred tax on fair value adjustments (W1)	5,100
	145,100

2 (a) Attachment 1 to the email

The relevant standard is **IFRS 2** – *Share-based Payment*. Under the principles of IFRS 2, the arrangement is an **equity settled share-based payment** since it potentially involves the issue of equity instruments.

IFRS 2 states that where equity settled share-based awards are made to employees, then they are effectively **employee remuneration**. The cost of the awards should be recognised in **profit or loss as an operating expense**.

Where the award is dependent on the future actions of the employee (in this case whether or not they remain in employment over the three-year period ending on 31 December 20X9), then the award is subject to a **vesting condition**.

IFRS 2 states that the cost of the award should be recognised in profit or loss over the vesting period based on the number of awards which are expected to vest in the employees at the end of the vesting period.

During 20X7 and 20X8, a total of 18 employees (10 + 8) left employment and forfeited their rights to the options.

A further nine employees are expected to leave employment in 20X9, so the total number of employees who are expected to ultimately become entitled to exercise the options measured at 31 December 20X8 is 773 (800 – 18 – 9).

The appropriate fair value measure to use to measure the value of the award is the fair value of the option at the **grant** date. Therefore the total expected cost of the award is **$1,855,200** (773 x $2·40 x 1,000).

IFRS 2 states that the cost of the award should be recognised over the vesting period. This means that the cumulative cost which should have been recognised in profit or loss up to 31 December 20X8 is **$1,236,800** ($1,855,200 x 2/3).

The credit entry which is required when the cost is debited to profit or loss is to equity. IFRS 2 does not specify a designation for this component of equity, in practice it is often described as a 'share option reserve'.

The financial statements for the year ended 31 December 20X7 should have included appropriate amounts relating to this option award. They therefore contained an error which had a material impact on those statements.

Reporting of errors of this nature is governed by **IAS 8** – *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors*.

IAS 8 states that the impact of material errors in the financial statements of previous periods should be recognised **retrospectively** in the financial statements of the current period. In practice, this involves **computing the impact of the error and recognising it by making an appropriate adjustment to opening equity**.

When the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 20X7 were prepared, the directors should have estimated that 25 employees (10 + 15) would leave over the three-year vesting period and **775** (800 – 25) would become entitled to the awards.

The cost which should have been debited to profit or loss and credited to equity in the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 20X7 should have been $620,000 (775 x $2·40 x 1,000 x 1/3).

Therefore, in the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 20X8, an adjustment to opening equity should have been made, debiting retained earnings with $620,000 and crediting a share option reserve or similar component with $620,000.

The statement of profit or loss for the year ended 31 December 20X8 should include an employee remuneration expense of **$616,800** ($1,236,800 – $620,000).

The closing balance on the share option reserve (or similar) will be $1,236,800.

Spreadsheet working for share-based payment amounts

Date	Expected options vesting on 31 December 20X9	Total expected cost (FV at grant date $2·40)	Cost to date	Movement
		$	$	$
31 December 20X7	775,000 [775 (800 – 10 – 15) x 1,000]	1,860,000	620,000	620,000
31 December 20X8	773,000 [773 (800 – 18 – 9) x 1,000]	1,855,200	1,236,800	616,800

(b) Attachment 2 to the email

The relevant standard is **IFRS 16** – *Leases*. In the scenario described here, Delta is the lessee.

The general requirements of IFRS 16 are that, at the commencement of a lease, the lessee should recognise a lease liability equal to the present value of the lease payments not paid at the date.

As far as the lease of the business premises is concerned, this liability should be $2,670,000 ($250,000 x 10·68).

IFRS 16 also requires recognition of a right-of-use (ROU) asset, equal to the present value of the lease payments (the initial measurement of the lease liability) plus any initial direct costs incurred by the lessee. These initial direct costs do not form part of the opening lease liability.

As far as the lease of the business premises is concerned, this ROU asset should be $2,800,000 ($2,670,000 + $130,000). The prepayment will therefore be derecognised and the $130,000 transferred to the ROU asset.

The lease liability will attract a **finance cost**. For the year ended 31 December 20X8, this cost will be **$106,800** ($2,670,000 x 8% x 6/12).

The closing lease liability will be **$2,776,800** ($2,670,000 + $106,800).

$2,633,600 (W1) of this liability will be non-current and the balance of **$143,200** ($2,776,800 – $2,633,600) will be current.

The right of use asset will be **depreciated over the 25-year lease term**, so the depreciation for the year ended 31 December 20X8 will be $56,000 ($2,800,000 x 1/25 x 6/12).

The closing balance of the right of use asset will be **$2,744,000** ($2,800,000 – $56,000). This will be shown as a non-current asset.

W1 – Spreadsheet workings: non-current lease liability at 31 December 20X8

	$
Liability at 1 January 20X9	2,776,800
Finance cost to 30 June 20X9	106,800
Rental payment on 30 June 20X9	(250,000)
Liability at 30 June 20X9	2,633,600

Tutorial note: *As an alternative to computing the non-current element of the lease liability and inserting the current element as the balancing figure, candidates could have focused on the computation of the current element and the insertion of the non-current element as the balancing figure. This would be done as follows:*

	$
Rental payment due on 30 June 20X9	*250,000*
Deduct: finance cost from 1 January 20X9 to 30 June 20X9 (not part of closing liability at 1 January 20X9)	*(106,800)*
So current liability at 31 December 20X8 equals	*143,200*

Candidates who adopt this approach will receive full credit.

(c) Ethical issue – Email from director

You are in danger of breaching the fundamental ethical principle of integrity. The director has suggested that you collude in the reporting of an inflated profit figure and, as a result, share in a profit-related bonus (*candidates who refer to a self-interest threat here will receive appropriate credit*).

You face a danger of breaching the principle of objectivity because of the way the director has linked your complying with these instructions to your upcoming staff appraisal (*candidates who refer to an intimidation threat here will receive appropriate credit*).

You also may be breaching the fundamental ethical principle of professional competence and due care. The treatments suggested by the director are clearly inappropriate and not in compliance with IFRS Accounting Standards. Were you to implement them, you would be in breach of your professional duty to conduct yourself in a competent manner.

Your decision to discuss these issues with your friend, who is not employed by Delta, means that you are in danger of breaching the fundamental ethical principle of confidentiality.

3 Exhibit 1 – Memorandum

To: Trainee accountant
From: Financial controller

(i) ***Is there a specific IFRS Accounting Standard which deals with the issue of 'potential liabilities' and if so, how does it distinguish 'potential liabilities' from liabilities like trade payables and loans?***

There is an IFRS Accounting Standard which deals with the measurement and disclosure of potential liabilities and assets. The standard is IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*.

IAS 37 defines a liability as a present obligation arising from past events the settlement of which is expected to result in an outflow of resources embodying economic benefits and defines a provision as a **liability of uncertain timing or amount**. This distinguishes provisions (potential liabilities) from trade payables and loans where there is no uncertainty.

(ii) ***What are the conditions which must be in place before a potential liability is recognised in the financial statements and how is it measured?***

IAS 37 states that, in order for a provision to be recognised, the reporting entity needs to have a **present obligation** (legal or constructive) arising out of a **past event** which is expected to lead to an **outflow of resources embodying economic benefits to settle the obligation and a reliable estimate** can be made of the obligation.

(iii) ***How should a potential liability be measured at initial recognition and would timing of settlement of the liability affect this measurement?***

IAS 37 further states that, when a provision is recognised, it is measured at the amount the entity would pay to settle the obligation at the end of the reporting period.

Where the obligation is not expected to be settled until a significant time period has elapsed (usually more than 12 months), then the **time value of money** should be taken into account and the provision should be measured at the **present value** of the expected future outflow of economic benefits.

As the date for settlement of the liability draws closer, the present value of the expected future outflow increases and so does the measurement of the liability. This increase in the measurement is shown as a finance cost in the statement of profit or loss.

(iv) ***When a potential liability is recognised, the credit always goes to liabilities and the debit normally goes to profit or loss. Are there any circumstances where the debit is dealt with in some other way?***

Where a provision is recognised, the debit entry is **not** always to profit or loss. **For example**, when a new mine or oil rig is opened with an associated obligation for future environmental clean-up, then the associated provision is shown as part of the **cost of the relevant asset** (debited to PPE).

(v) ***If a potential liability is not recognised, is there an alternative treatment for the financial statements which will inform users of its existence and possible impact?***

A potential liability which is not recognised, either because the potential obligation is possible, but not probable, or because the potential outflow of economic benefits is possible, but not probable, is known as a contingent liability.

Details of contingent liabilities are **disclosed in the notes** to the financial statements. This would not apply if the possibility of an outflow of economic benefits was **remote**, in which case no disclosure is required.

The disclosure note for a contingent liability should, where practicable, estimate the financial effect, indicate the uncertainties relating to the amount or timing and the possibility of any reimbursement.

(vi) ***What are the rules for recognising potential assets? Are they the mirror image of the rules for recognising potential liabilities?***

The treatment of potential assets is **not** the mirror image of the treatment of potential liabilities. Potential assets are only recognised in the financial statements of they are **virtually certain** to be realised.

IAS 37 defines a contingent asset as a possible asset which arises from past events, and whose existence will be confirmed only by the occurrence or non-occurrence of one or more uncertain future events not wholly within the control of the entity.

The existence of contingent assets should be disclosed where an inflow of economic benefits is probable.

Exhibit 2 – Transactions

Transaction (a)

The purchase of the land for $20 million, and the cost of constructing the mine of $12 million, would be classified as property, plant and equipment (PPE) in the financial statements of Epsilon, in accordance with **IAS 16** – *Property, Plant and Equipment*. Therefore **$32** million would be included in PPE.

On 1 October 20X5, Epsilon **would need to recognise a provision** for the cost of restoring the site in 20 years' time. The provision recognised would be the **present value** of the future amount expected to be paid. In this case, the amount recognised would be **$3·12 million** ($10 million x 0·312).

This amount would be added to the carrying amount of the PPE to give a total carrying amount of **$35·12** million at 1 October 20X5.

The PPE would be **depreciated** over its expected useful life of 20 years. The land element would **not** be depreciated **because** its useful life is expected to be indefinite (it can be sold on for development purposes at the end of the 20-year period). Therefore the depreciation charged to profit or loss in the year ended 30 September 20X6 would be **$756,000** [($35·12 million – $20 million) x 1/20].

The closing carrying amount of the PPE would be **$34·364** million ($35·12 million – $756,000). This would be shown as a **non-current asset** in the statement of financial position at 30 September 20X6.

The licence to extract minerals would be regarded as an intangible asset in accordance with the provisions of **IAS 38** *Intangible Assets*. The cost can be recognised in the financial statements since it is a **separately purchased** intangible asset.

IAS 38 requires that intangible assets with finite useful lives are **amortised** over their expected lives. The amortisation would begin from the date the licence began to generate economic benefits for Epsilon – 1 **October** 20X5. In this case, the amortisation of the licence for the year ended 30 September 20X6 would be $200,000 ($4 million x 1/20). **$200,000** would be charged to **profit or loss** for the year ended 30 September 20X6.

The balance of the intangible asset at 30 September 20X6 would be **$3·8 million** ($4 million – $200,000). This would be shown as a **non-current asset** in the statement of financial position at 30 September 20X6.

As the date for settlement of the restoration liability draws closer, the measurement of the provision changes as the discount **unwinds**. The unwinding of the discount for the year ended 30 September 20X6 would be **$187,200** ($3·12 million x 6%). This will be shown as a **finance cost in the statement of profit or loss**.

The closing balance of the provision will be $3,307,200 ($3·12 million + $187,200). This will be shown as a **non-current liability** in the statement of financial position at 30 September 20X6.

Spreadsheet workings for Transaction (a)

Working 1. Property, plant and equipment (PPE)

	$m
Land cost	20
Construction cost	12
Environmental provision (W3)	3·12
Total PPE cost	35·12
Depreciation [(35·12 – 20) x 1/20]	(0·756)
Carrying amount at 30 September 20X6	**34·364**

Working 2. Intangible asset

	$m
Cost of licence	4
Amortisation (1/20)	(0·2)
Carrying amount at 30 September 20X6	**3·8**

Working 3. Provision

	$'000
Opening provision	3,120
Unwinding of discount (finance cost) at 6%	187·2
Closing provision	**3,307·2**

Transaction (b)

The information received about the legal claim was received **after the year end but before the financial statements are due to be authorised for issue**. Therefore the provisions of **IAS 10** *Events after the Reporting Period* are relevant to this issue.

Since the legal claim relates to the alleged supply of faulty goods on 30 June 20X6, it refers to a condition **existing at the reporting date** and would be regarded as an **adjusting event** under the provisions of IAS 10. Therefore, if the conditions of IAS 37 are satisfied, a liability should be recognised.

Based on the information in the question, there is a 70% probability the claim will succeed, so a provision for the likely cost of the claim, plus the associated legal costs, will be appropriate.

Where there is uncertainty regarding the exact amount of the outflow of economic benefits and there are a finite number of discrete possibilities, IAS 37 requires that the individual most likely outcome be recognised as a provision.

Therefore in this case, a provision of **$6 million** ($5 million + $1 million) should be recognised as a **current liability** in the statement of financial position at 30 September 20X6 and an expense in the statement of profit or loss.

Under the provisions of IAS 37, the potential recovery from the insurers is a contingent asset because the outcome of the negotiations with the insurance company is uncertain.

This means that **no asset** should be recognised in respect of this potential asset but **disclosure** of its existence is appropriate because the directors are **confident** it will be paid.

4 Exhibit 1 – Segment disclosures

The accounting standard which is relevant here is **IFRS 8** – *Operating Segments*. IFRS 8 requires entities to which it applies to provide segmental disclosures based on its **operating segments**.

IFRS 8 is only compulsory for **listed entities**. Unlisted entities may choose to provide segmental disclosures but if they do so, these disclosures must be made in accordance with the requirements of IFRS 8. This **probably explains** why Iota provides segmental disclosures but Kappa does not.

IFRS 8 defines an operating segment as a business component for which discrete financial information is available and whose operating results are regularly reviewed by the chief operating decision maker.

The chief operating decision maker is the person (or persons) who assesses performance and allocates resources.

It would appear that Omega assesses performance and allocates resources on a geographical basis whereas Iota does this on a 'product type' basis (*mark for coming to a logical conclusion*).

Notwithstanding the above, IFRS 8 normally requires all entities to give details of revenues by geographical area and by product type and non-current assets by geographical area.

However, the geographical area disclosure is not required if the information could only be made available at an **excessive cost**. This fact, however, must be disclosed.

This would appear to explain the discrepancy between our segmental disclosures and those of Iota.

Exhibit 2 – Financial assets

(i) ***What do we mean by the term 'financial asset'?***

A financial asset in defined in **IAS 32** – *Financial Instruments: Presentation*. IAS 32 defines a financial asset as:

- **Cash**.
- An **equity instrument** of another entity.
- A **contractual right** to receive cash.
- A contractual right to **exchange financial assets or liabilities under potentially favourable conditions**.

(ii) ***Is 'fair value' the same as resale value?***

The accounting standard which is relevant to the measurement of fair values is IFRS 13 *Fair Value Measurement*. IFRS 13 states that the fair value of an asset is the **amount which could be expected to be received to sell an asset** in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date.

(iii) ***What is meant by the term 'amortised cost'?***

Amortised cost is defined in **IFRS 9** – *Financial Instruments*. IFRS 9 defines amortised cost as **the amount at which the financial asset is measured at initial recognition plus or minus the cumulative amortisation using the effective interest method of any difference between that initial amount and the maturity amount** and, for financial assets, adjusted for any loss allowance.

Any difference is interest income. This income is recognised at a rate which exactly discounts the estimated future cash receipts to the initially recognised amount of the financial asset.

(iv) ***Is there a choice of using either fair value or amortised cost to measure financial assets and how do entities decide which measurement basis to use?***

Under IFRS 9, the method of measuring financial assets depends on how they are **classified**. IFRS 9 refers to three classifications:

Fair value through profit or loss
Fair value through other comprehensive income
Amortised cost

IFRS 9 states that a financial asset should be classified at amortised cost if **two** conditions are met:

(i) The reason (**business model**) for holding the financial asset is to collect the contractual cash flows expected to arise from the asset.

(ii) The **contractual terms** of the financial asset give rise on specified dates to cash flows which are solely receipts of principal and interest on the amounts outstanding.

If the business model has as an objective to **both** collect the contractual cash flows and to sell the financial asset **and** the contractual terms of the financial asset give rise on specified dates to cash flows which are solely receipts of principal and interest on the amounts outstanding, then the financial asset should be measured at **fair value through other comprehensive income**.

(v) ***If fair value is used, how do entities decide whether changes in fair value are recognised in profit or loss or in other comprehensive income?***

Where the financial asset is an **equity instrument** which is **not held for trading**, then it is possible to make an **irrevocable election** at the date of initial recognition to use **fair value through other comprehensive income** as the measurement basis.

Any **other** financial assets which are an equity instrument should be measured at **fair value through profit or loss**.

Notwithstanding the above, IFRS 9 allows entities **to irrevocably designate at the date of initial recognition any financial asset at fair value through profit or loss to reduce a measurement inconsistency**.

Exhibit 3 – Contracts

(i) ***When should revenue be recognised for a construction contract – should Omega wait until the construction is complete before recognising any revenue?***

The recognition of revenue and costs relating to construction contracts is regulated by the provisions of **IFRS 15** *Revenue from Contracts with Customers*. IFRS 15 states that contracts with customers create **performance obligations**. IFRS 15 states that, as a general principle, revenue should be recognised **as performance obligations are satisfied**.

IFRS 15 recognises that performance obligations are either recognised at a particular point in time or over a period of time. In the case of construction contracts, performance obligations are recognised over a period of time. Therefore revenue should be recognised over a period of time as the performance obligation is satisfied.

(ii) ***Should the timing of recognition of costs of the contract follow the same pattern as the recognition of the revenue or should we simply debit the costs incurred to date to cost of sales?***

IFRS 15 does not specify a precise method of measurement of the extent of completion of a performance obligation which is satisfied over time. However, IFRS 15 **does** provide guidance regarding methods which may be suitable. Suitable methods are broadly categorised as either **output** methods (proportion of the total value of the contract completed) or **input** methods (proportion of the total expected costs of the contract incurred). Once a suitable method is decided upon, it should be applied **consistently** to contracts of a similar type.

IFRS 15 states if the criteria are met, then the direct costs of fulfilling the performance obligations relating to a construction contract should initially be recognised as an asset but then amortised (taken to cost of sales) in a manner which is consistent with the recognition of revenue on the contract.

(iii) ***What do we do if we assess a contract is likely to be loss making?***

If, for a particular contract, the future anticipated revenue to be recognised is less than the future expected costs (loss making), then an impairment loss equal to that difference should be recognised in profit or loss immediately.

In the above circumstances, the contract would be regarded as an onerous contract in accordance with the principles of IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*. IAS 37 would require recognition of the future net cost of fulfilling the contract.

(iv) ***Does Omega need to wait until we know the precise amount to be received before recognising any revenue?***

IFRS 15 recognises that, for some contracts, the amount receivable will contain a **fixed** and a **variable** element and therefore the precise amount may not be known when the contract is agreed.

IFRS 15 does **not** specify a single method of measurement of variable consideration. IFRS 15 states that either the **expected value method** (using probabilities) or the **single most likely method** should be used. Once a suitable method is decided upon, it should be applied **consistently** throughout the contract.

		Marks
1	Consolidated statement of financial position	
	Non-current assets	
	– PPE	2
	– Goodwill	8
	– Intangible asset	0·5
	Current assets	2
	Equity	
	– Share capital and other components of equity	2·5
	– Retained earnings	6·5
	– Non-controlling interest	1
	Non-current liabilities	
	– Long-term borrowings	0·5
	– Deferred tax	1
	Current liabilities	1
		25
2	**(a)** – Explanations per IFRS 2	4
	– Calculations	4
	– Explanations per IAS 8	2
	– Calculations	2
		12
	(b) – Explanations per IFRS 16	4
	– Calculations	5
		9
	(c) Ethics	4
		25
3	Exhibit 1	
	– Reply to memorandum per IAS 37	**9**
	Exhibit 2	
	Transaction (a)	
	– Explanations IAS 16	2
	– Calculations	2
	– Explanation per IAS 37	1
	– Calculations	2
	– Explanation per IAS 38	3
	– Calculations	1
	–	11
	Transaction (b)	
	– Explanations IAS 10	1·5
	– Explanations IAS 37	3
	– Calculations	0·5
		5
		25

		Marks
4	**Exhibit 1**	
	Explanations per IFRS 8	7
	Exhibit 2	
	Explanations per IAS 32	1
	Explanations per IFRS 13	1
	Explanations per IFRS 9	8
		10
	Exhibit 3	
	Explanations per IFRS 15	6·5
	Explanations IAS 37	1·5
		8
		25