

CHAPTER 5

PROVISIONS, CONTINGENT LIABILITIES AND CONTINGENT ASSETS (IND AS 37)

QUESTIONS FROM ICAI STUDY MATERIAL

Q1: ABC Limited is an automobile component manufacturer. The automobile manufacturer has specified a delivery schedule, non-adherence to which will entail a penalty. As on 31st March, 20X1, the reporting date, the manufacturer has a delivery scheduled for June 20X2. However, the manufacturer is aware that he will not be able to meet the delivery schedule in June 20X2.

Determine whether the entity has a present obligation as at 31st March, 20X1, requiring recognition of provision.

Ans: In this case, there is no present obligation arising out of a past event as the goods are scheduled for delivery in June 20X2 and there is no delay as at 31st March, 20X1. Hence, there is no present obligation to pay the penalty in the current year. Therefore, there is no present obligation to recognise the provision.

Q2: X Shipping Ltd. is required by law to overhaul its shipping fleet once in every 3 years. The company's finance team was of the view that recognising the costs only when paid would prevent matching of revenue earned all the time with certain costs of large amounts which are incurred occasional. Thereby, it has formulated an accounting policy of providing in its books of account for the future cost of maintenance (overhauls, annual inspection etc.) by calculating a rate per hours sailed on sea and accumulating a provision over time. The provision is adjusted when the expenditure is actually incurred. Is the accounting policy of X Shipping Ltd. correct?

Ans: A provision is made for a present obligation arising out of a past event. Overhauling does not arise out of past event. Even a legal requirement to overhaul does not make the cost of overhaul a liability, because no obligation exists to overhaul the ships independently of the company's future actions - the company could avoid the future expenditure by its future actions for example by selling the ships. So there is no present obligation.

As per the standard, financial statements deal with the financial position of an entity at the end of its reporting period and not its possible position in the future. Therefore, no provision is recognised for costs that need to be incurred to operate in the future. The only liabilities recognised in an entity's balance sheet are those that exist at the end of the reporting period.

Therefore, the accounting policy of X Shipping Ltd. is not correct. The company should adopt the component approach in Ind AS 16, Property, Plant and Equipment, for accounting for the refurbishment cost.

Q3: X Chemical Ltd. is operating in the vicinity of a river since 20 years. A community living near X Chemical Ltd. claims that its operations has caused contamination of drinking water. X Chemical

Ltd. has received notice from the governmental environmental agency that official investigations will be made into claims of pollution caused by the entity. If it is found that X Chemical Ltd. has caused contamination, then penalties and fine would be levied on it.

X Chemical Ltd. believes that it has implemented all environmental safety measures to an extent that it is unlikely to cause pollution. Management is not sure whether it has all the information about the entire 20 years. Therefore, neither management nor external experts are able to assess X Chemical Ltd.'s responsibility until the investigation has completed.

In such situation, how should management of X Chemical Ltd. account for a liability?

Ans: As per the standard, in the present case, the available evidence does not support a conclusion that a present obligation exists. However, there is a possible obligation which exists and will be confirmed upon completion of investigations. Therefore, management should disclose the contingent liability for potential penalties and fines that may be imposed if contamination is proved.

Q4: X Ltd. has entered into an agreement with its selling agent Y, in accordance with which X Ltd. has to pay a base percentage of commission on export sales and an additional commission is to be paid if the export incentives are received. As per the accounting policy of X Ltd., it recognises export incentives when actually realised, on account of the uncertainty in realising such incentives. Export incentives have not been received for the year 20X1-20X2, however X Ltd. is hopeful of receiving the export incentives in the year 20X2-20X3. In the financial statements for 20X1-20X2, should X Ltd. provide for both base commission and additional commission?

Ans: So far as the base percentage of sales commission is concerned, it is a present obligation arising out of past events. The obligating event takes place when the sales are made and also since commission is based on percentage of sale, reliable estimation can also be made. Therefore, the base percentage of sales commission should be provided.

However, in respect of additional commission, it is to be paid when the export incentives are recognised and export incentives are recognised only when it is received. Therefore, the obligating event will arise only when export incentives are received. Hence, no provision for additional commission is to be made in financial year 20X1-20X2. The expectation of X Ltd. to receive the export incentives in next year would not make any difference as on 31 March 20X2.

Q5: An entity sells goods with a warranty under which customers are covered for the cost of repairs of any manufacturing defects that become apparent within the first six months after purchase. If minor defects were detected in all products sold, repair costs of 1 million would result. If major defects were detected in all products sold, repair costs of 4 million would result. The entity's past experience and future expectations indicate that, for the coming year, 75% of the goods sold will have no defects, 20% of the goods sold will have minor defects and 5% of the goods sold will have major defects.

Assess the probability of an outflow for the warranty obligations as a whole.

Ans: The expected value of the cost of repairs is:

$$(75\% \text{ of nil}) + (20\% \text{ of } 1\text{m}) + (5\% \text{ of } 4\text{m}) = 4,00,000$$

Q6: X Solar Power Ltd., a power company, has a present obligation to dismantle its plant after 35 years of useful life. X Solar Power Ltd. cannot cancel this obligation or transfer to third party. X Solar Power Ltd. has estimated the total cost of dismantling at ₹ 50,00,000, the present value of which is ₹ 30,00,000. Based on the facts and circumstances, X Solar Power Ltd. considers the risk factor of 5% i.e., the risk that the actual outflows would be more from the expected present value. How should X Solar Power Ltd. account for the obligation? **[MTP May 25]**

Ans: The obligation should be measured at the present value of outflows i.e., ₹ 30,00,000. Further a risk adjustment of 5% i.e., ₹ 1,50,000 (₹ 30,00,000 x 5%) would be made.

So, the liability will be recognised at = ₹ 30,00,000 + ₹1,50,000 = ₹ 31,50,000.

Q7: ABC Ltd. has an obligation to restore the seabed for the damage it has caused in the past. It has to pay ₹ 10,00,000 cash on 31st March 20X3 relating to this liability. ABC Ltd.'s management considers that 5% is an appropriate discount rate. The time value of money is considered to be material.

Calculate the amount to be provided for at 31st March 20X1 for the costs of restoring the seabed.

Ans: Discounting factor of 5% for 2nd year as on 31st March 20X1 = $(1/1.05)^2 = 0.907$ The present value of the provision as on 31st March 20X1 is = ₹ 10,00,000 x 0.907 = ₹ 9,07,000

The amount of increase in the provision resulting from unwinding of discounting to reflect the passage of time should be included as an element of borrowing cost in determining the profit or loss for the year.

The provision should be initially recognised at ₹ 9,07,000 which is the present value of ₹ 10,00,000 discounted at 5% for two years. At the end of year 1 i.e. 31st March 20X2, the provision increases to ₹ 9,52,350, and the difference of ₹ 45,350 is recognised as borrowing cost. Similarly, for the year ending 31st March 20X3, the provision will increase to 10,00,000 and the increase being recognised as borrowing cost. Consequently, at the end of year 2 the amount of provision will be equal to the amount due, i.e., ₹ 10,00,000.

Note: There may be some difference in amount due to approximation (limiting discounting factor to 3 place decimal), which can be overcome either by full scale calculation or adjustment at the end.

Q8: X Chemicals Ltd. engaged in the chemical industry causes environmental damage by dumping waste in the river near its factory. It does not clean up because there is no environmental legislation requiring cleaning up and X Chemicals Ltd. is causing damage for last 40 years. As at March 31, 20X2, the State Legislature has passed a path breaking legislation requiring all polluting factories to clean-up the river water already contaminated. The formal Gazette notification of the law is pending. How should X Chemicals Ltd. deal with this situation?

Ans: The obligating event is the contamination of water and because of the virtually certainty of legislation requiring cleaning up, an outflow of resources is certain. It is possible to arrive at best estimated cost for the cleanup activity. So, a provision should be recognised in the books of X Chemicals Ltd. for 20X1-20X2.

Q9: X Beauty Solutions Ltd. is selling cosmetic products under its brand name 'B', but it is getting its product manufactured from Y Ltd. It has an understanding with Y Ltd. that if the company becomes liable for any damage claims, due to any injury or harm to the customer of the cosmetic products, 30% will be reimbursed to it by Y Ltd. During the financial year 20X1-20X2, a claim of ₹ 30,00,000 demanded by customers from X Beauty Solutions Ltd. How should X Beauty Solutions Ltd. account for the claim that becomes payable?

Ans: Since the understanding results in an enforceable agreement, the reimbursement of ₹ 9,00,000 (₹ 30,00,000 x 30%) shall be recognised as a reimbursement right and provision will be recognised for ₹ 30,00,000. The reimbursement right shall be treated as a separate asset and shall not be offset with the provision. In the statement of profit and loss, the expense may be presented as ₹ 21,00,000 after offsetting the reimbursement right.

Q10: X Telecom Ltd. has income tax litigation pending before appellate authorities. Legal advisor's opinion is that X Telecom Ltd. will lose the case and estimated that liability of ₹ 1,00,00,000 may arise in two years. The liability is recognised on a discounted basis. The discount rate at which the liability has been discounted is 10% and it is assumed that discount rate does not change over the period of 2 years. How should X Telecom Ltd. calculate the amount of borrowing cost?

Ans: The discount factor of 10% for 2 years is 0.827. X Telecom Ltd. will initially recognise provision for ₹ 82,60,000 (₹ 1,00,00,000 x 0.826).

The discount factor of 10% at the end of year 1 is 0.909. At the end of year 1, provision amount would be ₹ 90,90,000 (₹ 1,00,00,000 x 0.909).

As per the standard, the difference between the two present values i.e., ₹ 8,30,000 is recognised as a borrowing cost in year 1.

At the end of the Year 2, the liability would be ₹ 1,00,00,000.

The difference between the two present values i.e., ₹ 9,10,000 (₹ 1,00,00,000 - ₹ 90,90,000) is recognised as borrowing cost in year 2.

Q11: X Packaging Ltd. has two segments, packaging division and paper division. In March 20X1, the board of directors approved and announced a formal plan to sell the paper division in June 20X1. Operating losses of the paper division are estimated to be approximately ₹ 50,00,000 during the period from April 1, 20X1 to the expected date of disposal. Management of X Packaging Ltd. wants to include the future operating loss of ₹ 50,00,000 in a provision for restructuring in the financial statements for the period ended March 31, 20X1. Can X Packaging Ltd. include these operating losses in a provision for restructuring?

Ans: Standard states that provision should not be made for future operating losses. Since Ind AS 37 prohibits the recognition of future operating losses, so X Packaging Ltd. should not include these future operating losses in a provision for restructuring even though these losses relate to the disposal group.

Q12: X Metals Ltd. had entered into a non-cancellable contract with Y Ltd. to purchase 10,000 units of raw material at ₹ 50 per unit at a contract price of ₹ 5,00,000. As per the terms of contract, X Metals Ltd. would have to pay ₹ 60,000 to exit the said contract. X Metals Ltd. has discontinued

manufacturing the product that would use the said raw material. For that X Metals Ltd. has identified a third party to whom it can sell the said raw material at ₹ 45 per unit.

How should X Metals Ltd. account for this transaction in its books of account in respect of the above contract?

Ans: These circumstances do indicate an onerous contract. The only benefit to be derived from the purchase contract costing ₹ 5,00,000 are the proceeds from the sale contract, which are ₹ 4,50,000. Therefore, a provision should be made for the onerous element of ₹ 50,000, being the lower of cost of fulfilling the contract and the penal cost of cancellation of ₹ 60,000.

Q13: X Cements Ltd. has three manufacturing units situated in three different states of India. The board of directors of X Cements Ltd., in their meeting held on January 10, 20X1, decided to close down its operations in one particular state on account of environmental reasons. A detailed formal plan for shutting down the above unit was also formalised and agreed by the board of directors in that meeting, which specifies the approximate number of employees who will be compensated and expenditure expected to be incurred. Date of implementation of plan has also been mentioned. Meetings were also held with customers, suppliers, and workers to communicate the features of the formal plan to close down the operations in the said state, and representatives of all interested parties were present in those meetings. Do the actions of the board of directors create a constructive obligation that needs a provision for restructuring?

Ans: As per Ind AS 37, the conditions prescribed are:

- (a) there should be detailed formal plan of restructuring;
- (b) which should have raised valid expectations in the minds of those affected that the entity would carry out the restructuring by announcing the main features of its plans to restructure.

The board of directors did discuss and formalise a formal plan of winding up the operation in the above said state. This plan was communicated to the parties affected and created a valid expectation in their minds that X Cements Ltd. would go ahead with its plans to close down operations in that state. Thus, there is a constructive obligation that needs to be provided at year-end.

Q14: A manufacturer gives warranties at the time of sale to purchasers of its three product lines. Under the terms of the warranty, the manufacturer undertakes to repair or replace items that fail to perform satisfactorily for two years from the date of sale. At the end of the reporting period, a provision of 60,000 has been recognised for the sale made during the year. The provision has not been discounted as the effect of discounting is not material.

Draft the Note.

Ans: A provision of 60,000 has been recognised for expected warranty claims on products sold during the current financial year. It is assumed that the majority of this expenditure will be incurred in the next financial year, and all will be incurred within two years from the reporting period

Q15: X Ltd. is operating in the telecom industry. During the Financial Year 20X1-20X2, the Income Tax authorities sent a scrutiny assessment notice under Section 143(2) of the Income-tax Act, 1961, in respect to return filed under Section 139 of this Act for Previous Year 20X0-20X1 (Assessment

Year 20X1-20X2) and initiated assessment proceedings on account of a deduction claimed by the company which in the view of the authorities was inadmissible.

During the financial year 20X1-20X2 itself, the assessment proceedings were completed and the assessing officer did not allow the deduction and raised a demand of ₹ 1,00,00,000 against the company. The company contested such levy and filed an appeal with the Appellate authority. At the end of the financial year 20X1-20X2, the appeal had not been heard. The company is not confident whether that the company would win the appeal. However, the company was advised by its legal counsel that on a similar matter, two appellate authorities of different jurisdictions had given conflicting judgements, one in favour of the assessee and one against the assessee. The legal counsel further stated it had more than 50% chance of winning the appeal. Please advise how the company should account for these transactions in the financial year 20X1-20X2.

Ans: Ind AS 37 provides that in rare cases it not clear whether there is a present obligation, for example, in a lawsuit, it may be disputed either whether certain events have occurred or whether those events result in a present obligation. In such a case, an entity should determine whether a present obligation exists at the end of the reporting period by taking account of all available evidence, for example, the opinion of experts.

In the present case, the company is not confident that whether it would win the appeal. By taking into account the opinion of the legal counsel, it is not sure that whether the company would win the appeal. On the basis of such evidence, it is more likely than not that a present obligation exists at the end of the reporting period. Therefore, the entity should recognise a provision. The company should provide for a liability of ₹ 1,00,00,000.

Q16: An entity is a telecom operator. Laying of cables across the world is a requirement to enable the entity to run its business. Cables are also laid under the sea and contracts are entered into for the same. By virtue of laws of the countries through which the cable passes, the entity is required to restore the sea bed at the end of the contract period. What is the nature of obligation that the entity has in such a case? **[Exam May 2023 (4 Marks)]**

Ans: Paragraph 14 of Ind AS 37 states “A provision shall be recognised when:

- (a) an entity has a present obligation (legal or constructive) as a result of a past event;
- (b) it is probable that an outflow of resources embodying economic benefits will be required to settle the obligation; and
- (c) a reliable estimate can be made of the amount of the obligation. If these conditions are not met, no provision shall be recognised.”

Further, with regard to past event paragraph 17 of Ind AS 37 states “A past event that leads to a present obligation is called an obligating event. For an event to be an obligating event, it is necessary that the entity has no realistic alternative to settling the obligation created by the event. This is the case only:

- (a) where the settlement of the obligation can be enforced by law; or
- (b) in the case of a constructive obligation, where the event (which may be an action of the entity) creates valid expectations in other parties that the entity will discharge the obligation.”

On the basis of the above, provision should be recognised as soon as the obligating event takes place because the entity is under legal obligation to restore the sea bed, provided the other recognition criteria stated in paragraph 14 reproduced above are met. Moreover, the amount of the provision would depend on the extent of the obligation arising from the obligating event. In the instant case, an obligating event is the laying of cables under the sea. To the extent the cables have been laid down under the sea, a legal obligation has arisen and to that extent provision for restoration of sea bed should be recognised.

Q17: ✓
Chp Nov 26

U Ltd. is a large conglomerate with a number of subsidiaries. It is preparing consolidated financial statements as on 31st March 2018 as per the notified Ind AS. The financial statements are due to be authorised for issue on 15th May 2018. It is seeking your assistance for some transactions that have taken place in some of its subsidiaries during the year.

G Ltd. is a wholly owned subsidiary of U Ltd. engaged in management consultancy services. On 31st January 2018, the board of directors of U Ltd. decided to discontinue the business of G Ltd. from 30th April 2018. They made a public announcement of their decision on 15th February 2018.

G Ltd. does not have many assets or liabilities and it is estimated that the outstanding trade receivables and payables would be settled by 31st May 2018. U Ltd. would collect any amounts still owed by G Ltd's customers after 31st May 2018. They have offered the employees of G Ltd. termination payments or alternative employment opportunities.

Following are some of the details relating to G Ltd.

- a) On the date of public announcement, it is estimated by G Ltd. that it would have to pay 540 lakhs as termination payments to employees and the costs for relocation of employees who would remain with the Group would be ₹ 60 lakhs. The actual termination payments totalling to ₹ 520 lakhs were made in full on 15th May 2018. As per latest estimates made on 15th May 2018, the total relocation cost is ₹ 63 lakhs.
- b) G Ltd. had taken a property on operating lease, which was expiring on 31st March 2022. The present value of the future lease rentals (using an appropriate discount rate) is ₹ 430 lakhs. On 15th May 2018, G Ltd. made a payment to the lessor of ₹ 410 lakhs in return for early termination of the lease.

The loss after tax of G Ltd. for the year ended 31st March 2018 was ₹ 400 lakhs. G Ltd. made further operating losses totalling ₹ 60 lakhs till 30th April 2018.

How should U Ltd. present the decision to discontinue the business of G Ltd. in its consolidated statement of comprehensive income as per Ind AS? What are the provisions that the Company is required to make as per Ind AS 37? [MTP Nov 2023]

Ans: A discontinued operation is one that is discontinued in the period or classified as held for sale at the year end. The operations of G Ltd were discontinued on 30th April 2018 and therefore, would be treated as discontinued operation for the year ending 31st March 2019. It does not meet the criteria for held for sale since the company is terminating its business and does not hold these for sale.

Accordingly, the results of G Ltd will be included on a line-by-line basis in the consolidated statement of comprehensive income as part of the profit from continuing operations of U Ltd for the year ending 31st March 2018.

As per para 72 of Ind AS 37 'Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets', restructuring includes sale or termination of a line of business. A constructive obligation to restructure arises when:

- (a) an entity has a detailed formal plan for the restructuring
- (b) has raised a valid expectation in those affected that it will carry out the restructuring by starting to implement that plan or announcing its main features to those affected by it.

The Board of directors of U Ltd have decided to terminate the operations of G Ltd. from 30th April 2018. They have made a formal announcement on 15th February 2018, thus creating a valid expectation that the termination will be implemented. This creates a constructive obligation on the company and requires provisions for restructuring.

A restructuring provision includes only the direct expenditures arising from the restructuring that are necessarily entailed by the restructuring and are not associated with the ongoing activities of the entity.

The termination payments fulfil the above condition. As per Ind AS 10 'Events after Reporting Date', events that provide additional evidence of conditions existing at the reporting date should be reflected in the financial statements. Therefore, the company should make a provision for ₹ 520 lakhs in this respect.

The relocation costs relate to the future conduct of the business and are not liabilities for restructuring at the end of the reporting period. Hence, these would be recognised on the same basis as if they arose independently of a restructuring.

The operating lease would be regarded as an onerous contract. A provision would be made at the lower of the cost of fulfilling it and any compensation or penalties arising from failure to fulfil it. Hence, a provision shall be made for ₹ 410 lakhs.

Further operating losses relate to future events and do not form a part of the closure provision.

Therefore, the total provision required = ₹ 520 lakhs + ₹ 410 lakhs = ₹ 930 lakhs

Q18: A company manufacturing and supplying process control equipment is entitled to duty draw back if it exceeds its turnover above a specified limit. To claim duty drawback, the company needs to file application within 15 days of meeting the specified turnover. If application is not filed within stipulated time, the Department has discretionary power of giving duty draw back credit. For the year 20X1-20X2 the company has exceeded the specified limit of turnover by the end of the reporting period. However, duty drawback can be claimed on filing of application within the stipulated time or on discretion of the Department if filing of application is late. The application for duty drawback is filed on April 20, 20X2, which is after the stipulated time of 15 days of meeting the turnover condition. Duty drawback has been credited by the Department on June 28, 20X2 and financial statements have been approved by the Board of Directors of the company on July 26, 20X2. What would be the treatment of duty drawback credit as per the given information?

Ans: In the instant case, the condition of exceeding the specified turnover was met at the end of the reporting period and the company was entitled for the duty drawback. However, the application for the same has been filed after the stipulated time. Therefore, credit of duty drawback was

discretionary in the hands of the Department. Since the claim was to be accrued only after filing of application, its accrual will be considered in the year 20X2-20X3 only.

Accordingly, the duty drawback credit is a contingent asset as at the end of the reporting period 20X1-20X2, which will be realised when the Department credits the same.

As per para 35 of Ind AS 37, Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets, contingent assets are assessed continually to ensure that developments are appropriately reflected in the financial statements. If it has become virtually certain that an inflow of economic benefits will arise, the asset and the related income are recognised in the financial statements of the period in which the change occurs. If an inflow of economic benefits has become probable, an entity discloses the contingent asset.

In accordance with the above, the duty drawback credit which was contingent asset for the F.Y. 20X1-20X2 should be recognised as asset and related income should be recognized in the reporting period in which the change occurs. i.e., in the period in which realisation becomes virtually certain, i.e., F.Y. 20X2-20X3.

Q19: Entity XYZ entered into a contract to supply 1000 television sets for ₹ 2 million. An increase in the cost of inputs has resulted into an increase in the cost of sales to ₹ 2.5 million. The penalty for non- performance of the contract is expected to be ₹ 0.25 million. Is the contract onerous and how much provision in this regard is required? **[MTP May 2023; SEP 2025]**

Ans: Ind AS 37 “Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets” defines an onerous contract as a contract in which the unavoidable costs of meeting the obligations under the contract exceed the economic benefits expected to be received under it.

Paragraph 68 of Ind AS 37 states that the unavoidable costs under a contract reflect the least net cost of exiting from the contract, which is the lower of the cost of fulfilling it and any compensation or penalties arising from failure to fulfill it.

In the instant case, cost of fulfilling the contract is ₹ 0.5 million (₹ 2.5 million – ₹ 2 million) and cost of exiting from the contract by paying penalty is ₹ 0.25 million.

In accordance with the above reproduced paragraph, it is an onerous contract as cost of meeting the contract exceeds the economic benefits.

Therefore, the provision should be recognised at the best estimate of the unavoidable cost, which is lower of the cost of fulfilling it and any compensation or penalties arising from failure to fulfill it, i.e., at ₹ 0.25 million (lower of ₹ 0.25 million and ₹ 0.5 million).

Q20: Marico has an obligation to restore environmental damage in the area surrounding its factory. Expert advice indicates that the restoration will be carried out in two distinct phases; the first phase requiring expenditure of ₹ 2 million to remove the contaminated soil from the area and the second phase, commencing three years later from the end of first phase, to replant the area with suitable trees and vegetation. The estimated cost of replanting is ₹ 3.5 million. Marico uses a cost of capital (before taxation) of 10% and the expenditure, when incurred, will attract tax relief at the company’s marginal tax rate of 30%. Marico has not recognised any provision for such costs in the past and today’s date is 31 March 20X2. The first phase of the clean up will commence in a few months time and will be completed on 31 March 20X3 when the first payment

of ₹ 2 million will be made. Phase 2 costs will be paid three years later from the end of first phase. Calculate the amount to be provided at 31 March 20X2 for the restoration costs.

Ans:

Year	Cash Flow	10% Discount factor	Present Value
20X2-20X3	20,00,000	0.909	18,18,000
20X5-20X6	35,00,000	0.683	<u>23,90,500</u>
Provision required at 31 March 20X2			<u>42,08,500</u>

The provision is calculated using the pre-tax costs and a pre-tax cost of capital. The fact that the eventual payment will attract tax relief will be reflected in the recognition of a deferred tax asset for the deductible temporary difference (assuming that the recognition criteria for deferred tax assets are met.)

QUESTIONS FROM OTHER SOURCE

Q21: At the end of the financial year ending on 31st December, 2007, a company finds that there are twenty law suits outstanding which have not been settled till the date of approval of accounts by the Board of Directors. The possible outcome as estimated by the Board is as follows:

	Probability	Loss (₹)
In respect of five cases		
- Win	100%	---
Next ten cases		
- Win	60%	---
- Lose (Low damages)	30%	1,20,000
- Lose (High damages)	10%	2,00,000
Remaining five cases		
- Win	50%	---
- Lose (Low damages)	30%	1,00,000
- Lose (High damages)	20%	2,10,000

Outcome of each case is to be taken as a separate entity. Ascertain the amount of contingent loss and the accounting treatment in respect thereof.

Ans: In this case, the probability of winning of first five cases is 100% and hence, question of providing for contingent loss does not arise. The probability of winning of next ten cases is 60% and for remaining five cases is 50%. As per IND AS 37, we make a provision if the loss is probable. As the loss does not appear to be probable and the possibility of an outflow of resources embodying economic benefits is not remote rather there is reasonable possibility of loss, therefore disclosure by way of note should be made. For the purpose of the disclosure of contingent liability by way of note, amount may be calculated as under:

Expected loss in next ten cases = 30% of ₹ 1,20,000 + 10% of ₹ 2,00,000

= ₹ 36,000 + ₹ 20,000 = ₹ 56,000

Expected loss in remaining five cases = 30% of ₹ 1,00,000 + 20% of ₹ 2,10,000

= ₹ 30,000 + ₹ 42,000 = ₹ 72,000

To disclose contingent liability on the basis of maximum loss will be highly unrealistic.

Therefore, the better approach will be to disclose the overall expected loss of ₹ 9,20,000 (₹ 56,000 X 10 + ₹ 72,000 X 5) as contingent liability.

Q22: An engineering goods company provides after sales warranty for 2 years to its customers. Based on past experience, the company has been following policy for making provision for warranties on the invoice amount, on the remaining balance warranty period:

Less than 1 year : 2% provision

More than 1 year : 3% provision

The company has raised invoices as under:

Invoice Date	Amount ₹
19th January, 2011	40,000
29th January, 2012	25,000
15th October, 2012	90,000

Calculate the provision to be made for warranty under Accounting Standard 29 as at 31st March, 2012 and 31st March, 2013. Also compute amount to be debited to Profit and Loss Account for the year ended 31st March, 2013.

Ans: Provision to be made for warranty under IND AS 37 'Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets'

As at 31st March, 2012 = ₹ 40,000 x .02 + ₹ 25,000 x .03 = ₹ 800 + ₹ 750 =	₹ 1,550
As at 31st March, 2013 = ₹ 25,000 x .02 + ₹ 90,000 x .03 = ₹ 500 + ₹ 2,700 =	₹ 3,200
Amount debited to Profit and Loss Account for year ended 31st March, 2013	₹
Balance of provision required as on 31.03.2013	3,200
Less: Opening Balance as on 1.4.2012	(1,550)
Amount debited to profit and loss account	1,650

QUESTIONS FROM RTP/MTP/EXAMS

Q23: During the year, QA Ltd. delivered manufactured products to customer K. The products were faulty and on 1st October, 2016 customer K commenced legal action against the Company claiming damages in respect of losses due to the supply of faulty product. Upon investigating the matter, QA Ltd. discovered that the products were faulty due to defective raw material procured from supplier F. Therefore, on 1st December, 2016, the Company commenced legal action against F claiming damages in respect of the supply of defective raw materials.

to change its method of production. The new method will not require the machine ordered which is to be scrapped after delivery. The expected scrap value is nil. Given that the asset is yet to be delivered, should any liability be recognized for the potential loss? If so, give reasons for the same, the amount of liability as well as the accounting entry. **[Nov 2018 Exam (4 Marks)]**

Ans: As per Ind AS 37, Executory contracts are contracts under which

- neither party has performed any of its obligations; or
- both parties have partially performed their obligations to an equal extent.

The contract entered by Sun Ltd. is an executory contract, since the delivery has not yet taken place.

Ind AS 37 is applied to executory contracts only if they are onerous.

Ind AS 37 defines an onerous contract as a contract in which the unavoidable costs of meeting the obligations under the contract exceed the economic benefits expected to be received under it.

As per the facts given in the question, Sun Ltd. will not require the machine ordered. However, since it is a binding agreement, the entity cannot exit / cancel the agreement. Further, Sun Ltd. has to scrap the machine after delivery at nil scrap value.

These circumstances do indicate that the agreement/contract is an onerous contract. Therefore, a provision should be made for the onerous element of ₹ 4,00,000 ie the full cost of the machine.

Onerous Contract Provision Expense A/c	Dr.	4,00,000	
To Provision for Onerous Contract Liability A/c			4,00,000

(Being asset to be received due to binding agreement recognized)

Profit and Loss Account (Loss due to onerous contract)	Dr.	4,00,000	
To Onerous Contract Provision Expense A/c			4,00,000

(Being loss due to onerous contract recognized and asset derecognised)

Q25: A manufacturer gives warranties at the time of sale to purchasers of its product. Under the terms of the contract for sale, the manufacturer undertakes to remedy, by repair or replacement, manufacturing defects that become apparent within three years from the date of sale. As this is the first year that the warranty has been available, there is no data from the firm to indicate whether there will be claim under the warranties. However, industry research suggests that it is likely that such claims will be forthcoming.

Should the manufacturer recognize a provision in accordance with the requirements of Ind AS 37. Why or why not? **[Nov 2019]**

Ans: For a provision to be recognized, Para 14 of Ind AS 37 requires that:

- an entity has a present obligation (legal or constructive) as a result of a past event;
- it is probable that an outflow of resources embodying economic benefits will be required to settle the obligation, and

c) a reliable estimate can be made of the amount of the obligation.

Here, the manufacturer has a present legal obligation. The obligation event is the sale of the product with a warranty.

Ind AS 37 outlines that the future sacrifice of economic benefits is probable when it is more likely than less likely that the future sacrifice of economic benefits will be required. The probability that settlement will be required will be determined by considering the class of obligation (warranties) as a whole. In accordance with para 24 of Ind AS 37, it is more likely than less likely that a future sacrifice of economic benefits will be required to settle the class of obligations as a whole.

If a reliable estimate can be made the provision can be measured reliably. Past data can provide reliable measures, even if the data is not firm specific but rather industry based. Ind AS 37 notes that only in extremely rare cases, a reliable measure of a provision cannot be obtained. Difficulty in estimating the amount of a provision under conditions of significant uncertainty does not justify non-recognition of the provision.

Here, the manufacturer should recognize a provision based on the best estimate of the consideration required to settle the present obligation as at the reporting date.

Q26: Assume that the firm has not been operating its warranty for five years, and reliable data exists to suggest the following:

- If minor defects occur in all products sold, repair costs of ₹ 20,00,000 would result.
- If major defects are detected in all products, costs of ₹ 50,00,000 would result.
- The manufacturer's past experience and future expectations indicate that each year 80% of the goods sold will have no defects. 15% of the goods sold will have minor defects, and 5% of the goods sold will have major defects.

Calculate the expected value of the cost of repairs in accordance with the requirements of Ind AS 37, if any. Ignore both income tax and the effect of discounting. **[Exam Nov 2019]**

Ans: The expected value of cost of repairs in accordance with Ind AS 37 is:

$$(80\% \times \text{nil}) + (15\% \times ₹ 20,00,000) + (5\% \times ₹ 50,00,000) = 3,00,000 + 2,50,000 = 5,50,000$$

Q27: Entity XYZ entered into a contract to supply 1000 television sets for ₹ 2 million. An increase in the cost of inputs has resulted into an increase in the cost of sales to ₹ 2.5 million. The penalty for non-performance of the contract is expected to be ₹ 0.25 million. Is the contract onerous and how much provision in this regard is required? **[RTP May 2020]**

Ans: Ind AS 37 "Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets" defines an onerous contract as "a contract in which the unavoidable costs of meeting the obligations under the contract exceed the economic benefits expected to be received under it".

Paragraph 68 of Ind AS 37 states that "the unavoidable costs under a contract reflect the least net cost of exiting from the contract, which is the lower of the cost of fulfilling it and any compensation or penalties arising from failure to fulfill it".

In the instant case, cost of fulfilling the contract is ₹ 0.5 million (₹ 2.5 million – ₹ 2 million) and cost of exiting from the contract by paying penalty is ₹ 0.25 million.

In accordance with the above reproduced paragraph, it is an onerous contract as cost of meeting the contract exceeds the economic benefits.

Therefore, the provision should be recognised at the best estimate of the unavoidable cost, which is lower of the cost of fulfilling it and any compensation or penalties arising from failure to fulfill it, i.e., at ₹ 0.25 million (lower of ₹ 0.25 million and ₹ 0.5 million).

Q28: An entity engaged in automobile sector has assessed the impact of COVID-19 outbreak on its future viability of business model. Senior Management has identified the need for restructuring some of its business activities and retrenching its employees in many areas. Senior Management is drawing up a plan for the consideration of the Board of Directors in their meeting scheduled in May 2020, which is subsequent to the reporting date of the current financial year i.e. 31 March 2020. Can the entity recognise provisions for restructuring costs in the financial statements of the current year i.e. 2019-2020? **[MTP Nov 2020]**

Ans: In accordance with paragraph 72 of Ind AS 37, 'Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets', a constructive obligation to restructure arises only when an entity has detailed formal plan for restructuring identifying the business or part of business concerned; the principal locations affected; the location, function, and approximate number of employees who will be compensated for terminating their services; the expenditures that will be undertaken; and when the plan will be implemented; and has raised a valid expectation in those affected that it will carry out the restructuring by starting to implement that plan or announcing its main features to those affected by it.

Further, paragraph 75 of Ind AS 37 provides that a management or board decision to restructure taken before the end of the reporting period does not give rise to a constructive obligation at the end of the reporting period unless the entity has, before the end of the reporting period

- a) started to implement the restructuring plan; or
- b) announced the main features of the restructuring plan to those affected by it in a sufficiently specific manner to raise a valid expectation in them that the entity will carry out the restructuring.

In the given case, since COVID-19 pandemic impact started during March 2020, it is likely that the senior management started drawing up the plan for restructuring some of its business activities after the end of the reporting period, i.e., 2019-2020. If that be so, as per Ind AS 37, the management decisions subsequent to reporting date do not give rise to constructive obligation as of reporting date and no provision is required for restructuring costs as at 31 March 2020.

In this regard, paragraph 75 of Ind AS 37 provides that if an entity starts to implement a restructuring plan, or announces its main features to those affected, only after the reporting period, disclosure is required under Ind AS 10, Events after the Reporting Period, if the restructuring is material and non-disclosure could influence the economic decisions that users make on the basis of the financial statements.

Q29: Mr. Goel also mentioned that during the year ended 31st March 2017, ABC Ltd. provided consultancy services to a customer regarding the installation of a new production system. The system has caused the customer considerable problems, so the customer has taken legal action against ABC Ltd. for the loss that has arisen as a result of the problems with the system installation. The legal department of the group felt that there is 25% chance to successfully defend the claim. However, at the same time it also felt that 75% chance is that ABC Ltd. may require to pay damages of ₹1.6 million. Mr. Goel believes that ABC Ltd. should not suffer any overall loss because the legal department informed that the company is covered by insurance against such types of losses. Mr. Goel feels that ABC Ltd. will make a claim immediately if the outcome of the case is against the company. According to him no provision shall be made for it because ABC Ltd. is covered by insurance. However, disclosure by way of a note shall be given for it.

Do you agree with the views of Mr. Goel on the legal action taken by the customer and the treatment suggested by him? State your answer with reasons **[GFRS]**

Ans: It is necessary to consider the two parts of the issue separately.

The claim made by the customer needs to be recognised as a liability in the financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2017.

IND AS 37 – Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets – states that a provision should be made when, at the reporting date:

- An entity has a present obligation arising out of a past event.
- There is a probable outflow of economic benefits.
- A reliable estimate can be made of the outflow.

All three of those conditions are satisfied here, and so a provision is appropriate.

The provision should be measured at the amount the entity would rationally pay to settle the obligation at the reporting date.

Where there is a range of possible outcomes, the individual most likely outcome is often the most appropriate measure to use.

In this case a provision of ₹1.6 million seems appropriate, with a corresponding charge to profit or loss.

The insurance claim against our customer (to whom consultancy is provided) is a contingent asset.

IND AS 37 states that contingent assets should not be recognised until their realisation is virtually certain, but should be disclosed where their realisation is probable.

Accordingly, the contingent asset would be disclosed in 2016 -2017 financial statements. Any credit to profit or loss arises when the claim is settled.

Q30: XYZ Ltd. offers a six-month warranty on its small to medium sized equipment, which can be put to use by the customer with no installation support. The warranty comes with the equipment and the customer cannot purchase it separately. This equipment is typically sold at a gross margin

of 40%. XYZ Ltd. has made a provision of ₹ 30,000 during the year ended 31st March, 20X2, which is approximately 1% of its gross margin on the sale of these equipment. Based on past experience, it is expected that 1% of equipment sold have been returned as faulty within the warranty period. Faulty equipment returned to XYZ Ltd. during the warranty period are scrapped and the sale value is fully refunded to the customer.

Assuming that sales occurred evenly during the year, how should XYZ Ltd. evaluate whether any additional warranty provision is required on equipment sold in the past as at 31st March, 20X2? Had the warranty period been 2 years instead of six months, what additional criteria would XYZ Ltd. need to consider?

[RTP May 2022]

Ans: Calculation of additional warranty provisions:

Warranty claim covers 1% of gross margin, whereas customers are refunded the full selling price. As the goods are scrapped it is assumed XYZ Ltd has no potential for re-imburement from its supplier regarding the faulty goods.

A calculation of warranty provision is set out below:

1% of annual gross margin is ₹ 30,000 therefore 100% of annual gross margin must be ₹ 30,00,000. Since gross margin is 40%, sales should be ₹ 75,00,000. As provide in the question that the sales are evenly spread during the year and given the six month warranty, half of the sales occurred in the second half of the year is still covered within the warranty period as follows.

	% age	Annual sales	Product under warranty at 31st March, 20X2	Percentage expected to be returned	Warranty provision
		₹	₹	₹	₹
Gross margin	40%	30,00,000			
Selling price	100%	75,00,000	37,50,000	1%	37,500

The warranty provision should therefore be increased by ₹ 7,500 (₹ 37,500 – ₹ 30,000). As the provision is expected to be used in the next 6 months no discounting is required.

If the warranty period is 2 years:

Since the outstanding period of warranties is 6 months (i.e. less than a year), no discounting is required. However, if a longer warranty period is to be given, the entity will have to take into account the effect of the time value of money. The amount of provision shall be the present value of the expenditures expected to be required to settle the warranty obligation. (Refer Para 45 of Ind AS 37)

The discount rate shall be a pre-tax rate that reflects current market assessments of the time value of money and the risks specific to the liability. The discount rate shall not reflect risks for which future cash flow estimates have been adjusted. (Refer Para 47 of Ind AS 37)

	% age	Annual sales	Product under warranty at 31st March, 20X2	Percentage expected to be returned	Warranty provision
		₹	₹	₹	₹

Gross margin	40%	30,00,000			
Selling price	100%	75,00,000	75,00,000	1%	75,000

The warranty provision should therefore be increased by ₹ 45,000 (₹ 75,000 – ₹ 30,000). Further discounting of provision would be required.

Q31: HVCL manufactures heavy equipment for construction industry. An order for supply of 90 equipment was received from ABIL. The unit price of the equipment was agreed at ₹ 190 lakhs each. 64 equipment was supplied during the year 20X1-20X2 and balance quantity remaining to be supplied as on 31.3.20X2. HVCL has 5 equipment in its inventory as on 31.3.20X2. HVCL considered that the contract was an onerous contract and therefore, the net realisable value of inventory has been taken as value of inventory as on 31.3.20X2.

The management of HVCL contends that costs incurred towards administrative overheads, finance charges, R & D expenses, sales overhead, head quarter expenditure etc., are considered as period cost and hence not considered for creation of provision. Hence, the same have not been included in the computation of unavoidable cost.

The management of HVCL has submitted the details of costs that have been considered for creation of provision towards onerous contract:

- o **Material cost** - includes cost of material procured, cost of freight & insurance incurred for material procurement and handling, loading and unloading charges incurred.
- o **Labour cost/ Factory Overheads** - includes salaries and other expenses of direct production department, and also expenses allocated from indirect departments to direct department.
- o **Material Overheads** - Includes salaries and other expenses (including expenses allocated from other departments) booked under departments linked with materials like purchases, stores and quality control.

Accordingly, provision has been made considering the above costs only. The value of provision created for 21 remaining equipment to be produced is as per the working shown below:

Particulars	Value (₹ in lakh)
(i) Cost of production (which includes material cost, labour cost/factory overhead and material overhead)	199.00
(ii) Selling price	(190.00)
(iii) Differential cost per equipment	9.00
(iv) Differential cost of ₹ 9 Lakh per equipment for 21 equipment	189.00

Whether the company's accounting treatment of cost for creation of provision towards onerous contracts is in line with the provisions of Ind AS 37? [RTP Nov 2022]

Ans: As per para 68 of Ind AS 37, onerous contract is a contract in which the unavoidable costs of meeting the obligations under the contract exceed the economic benefits expected to be received under it. The unavoidable cost under a contract reflects the least net cost of exiting from the contract, which is the lower of the cost of fulfilling it and any compensation for penalties arising from failure to fulfilling it.

Ind AS 37 provides that the amount recognised shall be the best estimate of the expenditure required to settle the present obligation, which is the amount that an entity would rationally pay to settle the obligation at the end of the reporting period or to transfer it to a third party at that time. In case of onerous contracts, an amount that an entity would rationally pay to settle the obligation would be the lower of the compensation or penalties arising from failure to fulfil the contacts and excess of unavoidable cost of meeting the obligations under the contract from the economic benefits expected to be received under it.

As per para 68 of Ind AS 37, the cost of fulfilling a contract comprises the costs that relate directly to the contract. Costs that relate directly to a contract consist of both -

- (a) the incremental costs of fulfilling that contract—for example, direct labour and materials; and
- (b) an allocation of other costs that relate directly to fulfilling contracts— for example, an allocation of the depreciation charge for an item of property, plant and equipment used in fulfilling that contract among others.

The unavoidable costs of meeting the obligations under the contract are only costs that:

- "are directly variable with the contract and therefore incremental to the performance of the contract;"
- do not include allocated or shared costs that will be incurred regardless of whether the entity fulfils the contract or not; and
- cannot be avoided by the entity's future actions.

Accordingly, HVCL has correctly measured the cost for creation of provision for onerous contracts by considering material cost, labour cost (to the extent it relates directly to production) and material overheads (to the extent it relates directly to production).

Further, HVCL is correct that the period cost will not be considered for measurement of cost for the purpose of creation of provision on onerous contracts as they do not relate directly to fulfilling the contracts.

Chp Nov 26

Q32. On 1st January, 20X2, the directors of Johansen Ltd. decided to terminate production at one of the company's divisions. This decision was publicly announced on 31st January, 20X2. The activities of the division were gradually reduced from 1st April, 20X2 and closure is expected to be complete by 30th September, 20X2.

At 31st January, 20X2, the directors prepared the following estimates of the financial implications of the closure:

- (i) Redundancy costs were initially estimated at ₹ 2 million. Further expenditure of ₹ 8,00,000 will be necessary to retrain employees who will be affected by the closure but remained with Johansen Ltd. in different divisions. This retraining will begin in early July 20X2. Latest estimates are that redundancy costs will be ₹ 1.9 million, with retraining costs of ₹ 8,50,000.
- (ii) Plant and equipment having an expected carrying value at 31st March, 20X2 of ₹ 8 million will have a recoverable amount ₹ 1.5 million. These estimates remain valid.
- (iii) The division is under contract to supply goods to a customer for the next three years at a pre-determined price. It will be necessary to pay compensation of ₹ 6,00,000 to this customer. The compensation actually paid, on 31st May, 20X2, was ₹ 5,50,000.
- (iv) The division will make operating losses of ₹ 3,00,000 per month in the first three months of 20X2-20X3 and ₹ 2,00,000 per month in the next three months of 20X2-20X3. This estimate proved accurate for April, 20X2 and May, 20X2.
- (v) The division operates from a leasehold premise. The lease is a non-cancellable operating lease with an unexpired term of five years from 31 st March, 20X2. The annual lease rentals (payable on 31st March in arrears) are ₹ 1.5 million. The landlord is not prepared to discuss an early termination payment.

Following the closure of the division it is estimated that Johansen Ltd. would be able to sub-let the property from 1st October, 20X2.

Johansen Ltd. could expect to receive a rental of ₹ 3,00,000 for the six-month period from 1st October, 20X2 to 31st March, 20X3 and then annual rentals of ₹ 5,00,000 for each period ending 31st March, 20X4 to 31st March, 20X7. All rentals will be received in arrears.

Any discounting calculations should be performed using a discount rate of 5% per annum. You are given the following data for discounting at 5% per annum:

Present value of ₹ 1 received at the end of year 1	=	₹ 0.95
Present value of ₹ 1 received at the end of year 1–2 inclusive	=	₹ 1.86
Present value of ₹ 1 received at the end of year 1–3 inclusive	=	₹ 2.72
Present value of ₹ 1 received at the end of year 1–4 inclusive	=	₹ 3.54
Present value of ₹ 1 received at the end of year 1–5 inclusive	=	₹ 4.32

Compute the amounts that will be included in the Statement of Profit and Loss for the year ended 31st March, 20X2 in respect of the decision to close the division of Johansen Ltd.

[RTP Nov 2023; MTP SEP 2025]

Ans. As per Ind AS 37 'Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets', closure of a division is a restructuring exercise. Ind AS 37 states that a constructive obligation to proceed with the restructuring arises when at the reporting date the entity has:

- Commenced activities connected with the restructuring; or
- Made a public announcement of the main features of the restructuring to those affected by it. In this case a public announcement has been made and so a provision will be necessary at 31st March, 20X2.

This will result in the following charges to the Statement of Profit and Loss:

- (i) Estimate of redundancy costs of ₹ 1.9 million is the best estimate of the expenditure at the date the financial statements are authorized for issue. Changes in estimates after the reporting date are taken into account for this purpose as an adjusting event after the reporting date. No charge is necessary for the retraining costs as these are not incurred in 20X1 -20X2 and cannot form part of a restructuring provision as they are related to the ongoing activities of the entity.
- (ii) Impairment of plant and equipment of ₹ 6.5 million is although not strictly part of the restructuring provision the decision to restructure before the year-end means that related assets need to be reviewed for impairment. In this case the recoverable amount of the plant and equipment is only ₹ 1.5 million. As per Ind AS 36 'Impairment of Assets', property, plant and equipment should be written down to this amount, resulting in a charge of ₹ 6.5 million to the income statement.
- (iii) For compensation for breach of contract of ₹ 0.55 million, same principle applies here as applied to the redundancy costs.
- (iv) No charge is recognized in 20X1-20X2 with respect to future operating losses of 20X2-20X3. Future operating losses relate to future events and provisions are made only for the consequences of past events.
- (v) Ind AS 37 states that an onerous contract is one for which the expected cost of fulfilling the contract exceeds the benefits expected from the contract. Provision is made for the lower of the expected net cost of fulfilling the contract and the cost of early termination (not available in this case).

The net cost of fulfilling the contract is ₹ 4.51 million [$₹ 1.5 \text{ million} \times 4.32 - ₹ 0.3 \text{ million} \times 0.95 - ₹ 0.5 \text{ million} \times (4.32 - 0.95)$].

Q33: An entity has a contract to purchase one million units of gas at 23p per unit, giving a contract price of ₹ 2,30,000. The current market price for a similar contract is 16p per unit, giving a price of ₹ 1,60,000. All of the gas purchased by the entity is used to generate electricity using dedicated assets.

Determine in the following situations whether the contract is onerous and provision is to be made when:

- (a) The electricity is sold at a profit. The electricity is sold to a wide range of customers.
- (b) The electricity is sold at a loss, and the entity makes an overall operating loss. The electricity is sold to a wide range of customers.

- (c) The entity sells the gas under contract, which it no longer needs, to a third party for 18p per unit (5p below cost). The entity determines that it would have to pay ₹ 55,000 to exit the purchase contract. **[MTP May 2024]**

- Ans:** (i) The gas will be used to generate electricity, which will be sold at a profit. The economic benefits from the contract include the benefits to the entity of using the gas in its business and, because the electricity will be sold at a profit, the contract is not onerous.
- (ii) The electricity is sold to a wide range of customers. The entity first considers whether the assets used to generate electricity are impaired. To the extent that there is still a loss after the assets have been written down, a provision for an onerous contract should be recorded.
- (iii) The only economic benefit from the purchase contract costing ₹ 2,30,000 are the proceeds from the sales contract, which are ₹ 1,80,000. Therefore, a provision should be made for the onerous element of ₹ 50,000, being the lower of the cost of fulfilling the contract and the penalty cost of cancellation (₹ 55,000).

Q34: Under new legislation, an entity is required to fit smoke filters to its factories by 30th September, 20X1. The entity has not fitted the smoke filters. It is assumed that a reliable estimate can be made of any outflows expected.

Determine whether any provision is required to be made by the entity on

- a) At 31st March, 20X1, the end of the reporting period
b) At 31st March, 20X2, the end of the reporting period **[MTP Nov 2024]**

Ans: (a) At 31st March, 20X1, the end of the reporting period

Present obligation as a result of a past obligating event – There is no obligation because there is no obligating event either for the costs of fitting smoke filters or for fines under the legislation.

Conclusion – No provision is recognised for the cost of fitting the smoke filters.

(b) At 31st March, 20X2, the end of the reporting period

Present obligation as a result of a past obligating event – There is still no obligation for the costs of fitting smoke filters because no obligating event has occurred (the fitting of the filters). However, an obligation might arise to pay fines or penalties under the legislation because the obligating event has occurred (the non-compliant operation of the factory).

An outflow of resources embodying economic benefits in settlement – Assessment of probability of incurring fines and penalties by non-compliant operation depends on the details of the legislation and the stringency of the enforcement regime.

Conclusion – No provision is recognised for the costs of fitting smoke filters. However, a provision is recognised for the best estimate of any fines and penalties that are more likely than not to be imposed.