Re: FAA Reg re: 15/16 accounting practices

From: "Provis, Ian (TBS)" <ian.provis@ontario.ca>
To: "Petsche, Nadine (TBS)" <nadine.petsche@ontario.ca>, "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <cindy.veinot@ontario.ca>
Date: Sat, 17 Sep 2016 13:16:26 -0400

I would think an asset only on a multiyear holiday. If it is just a one year holiday there would be an expense savings and there is no future expected benefit to reduce the valuation allowance (but it would theoretically slow the asset growth)

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2016 12:57
To: Provis, Ian (TBS); Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Subject: RE: FAA Reg re: 15/16 accounting practices

---

w.r.t. contributions…what about the case of a contribution holiday? I guess we'd be able to recognize that portion of the asset then.

From: Provis, Ian (TBS)
Sent: September-17-16 12:54 PM
To: Kaufman, Paul (TBS); Killoch, Alex (MOF)
Cc: Petsche, Nadine (TBS); Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Hatzis, Len (TBS)
Subject: Re: FAA Reg re: 15/16 accounting practices

Looks really good. I wonder where **or to which the Province makes contributions** came from. I will check with Alex on what this might capture.

At first I was a little concerned about the talk on 14-15. But reading it carefully it seems ok using change 14-15 and with the clarification of not restating the original.

With nadines suggestion on asset we might as well include revenue as well to be fully inclusive

Thanks Ian

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Kaufman, Paul (TBS)
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2016 11:22
To: Provis, Ian (TBS)
Cc: Petsche, Nadine (TBS); Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Hatzis, Len (TBS)
Subject: FAA Reg re: 15/16 accounting practices

Hi Ian - we're trying to keep moving the reg forward - sorry for bothering you over the weekend but your views on this today would be appreciated. A revised version of the reg text is attached (and set out below in case you are on black berry) - this reflects your most recent input and some thoughts Nick had as well. Leg counsel might fiddle with some wording and we are going to seek input from MOF legal on the pension terminology, but can you let me know if this accurately reflects the accounting treatment, as that is obviously the key issue?

Change in accounting policies and practices for the 2015/2016 fiscal year

3. (1) The consolidated financial statements of the Province set out in the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2016, including comparative financial results for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2015, shall be prepared on a basis that:

(a) in respect of any jointly sponsored pension plan under which the Province is a participating employer or to which the Province makes contributions, deems a carrying value of zero in instances where the Province would have otherwise recorded an asset before any valuation allowance; and

(b) reflects the change required under clause (a) in all related liability, expense and accumulated deficit balances as if it had been implemented effective April 1, 2014.

(2) For greater certainty, any change to the comparative financial results for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2015 required under subsection (1) does not constitute a restatement of the consolidated financial statements of the Province for that fiscal year.

(3) In this section,

"jointly sponsored pension plan" has the same meaning as in the Pension Benefits Act. ("French");

Commencement

2. This Regulation comes into force on the day it is filed.