The Adoption of IPSASs: A Study in Indonesia

Ibrahim Fatwa Wijaya[1], Putri Nugrahaningsih[1], Nasyiah Hasanah[1]

[1]Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia
Jalan Ir. Sutami 36 A Surakarta Indonesia
+62271 647481
ibrahimfatwa@staff.uns.ac.id

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to investigate the conformity of the contents of Indonesian Government Accounting Standards with IPSASs. Material harmonisation study was conducted by comparing IPSASB's minimum recommendations on financial report with Indonesian Government Accounting Standards promulgated in Government Regulation “PP” 71/2010. The current study found Indonesian Government Accounting Standards has already presented five elements of financial reports recommended by IPSASB namely, balance sheet, cash flow statement, operating statement, statement of changes in net assets/equity, and accounting practices and financial statement notes. In addition, along with 76 items on each element recommended by IPSASB, Indonesia has already presented 71.05% of the items.

Keywords: government accounting standards, IPSASs, accrual accounting.

Introduction

The past twenty years have seen increasingly rapid advances in the field of Indonesian government accounting standards. Prior the government accounting reform was discharged in the late 1998, Indonesian government only report cash and its change on its financial report (PSASP, 2003). Therefore, there was no information on asset, liability, and equity. Robinson and Harun (2004) believe that this cash basis system was not appropriate for planning and decision making tools.

Seemingly, it is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore the role of International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSASs) in shaping government's accounting reform in Indonesia. One important attempt had been made in the late 2002 was the release exposure draft on public sector accounting standard by Public Sector Commission-Indonesia Chartered Accountant (PSASP, 2003). It was claimed that the exposure draft was the translation of the 6 topics covered in IPSASs (PSASP, 2003). This adoption was in accordance with Chan (2006) suggestion. There are some reasons for developing countries that adopt IPSASs, such as majority of the developing countries do not have government's accounting standards that are similar or better than IPSASs and IPSASs could offer some advantages for assisting government's accounting reforms (Chan, 2006).

However, government's accounting reforms in developing countries are more difficult to be executed as compared to developed countries. Cost for applying the reforms is one of the problems (Chan, 2006). International Public Sector Accounting Standard Board (IPSASB) has captured this difficulty. Developing countries could discharge government reforms at a lower cost by avoiding “re-inventing the wheel”, that is IPSASs adoption (Sutcliffe, 2003). According to Sutcliffe (2006), there are many benefits of the IPSASs, such as it could be used for increasing transparency, quality, consistency, and usefulness of the government's financial reports.

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the study of IPSASs' implementation around the world. However, there are only a few published articles that contain the study about IPSASs, especially in developing countries. As Chan (2006, p.35) stated that "Thus it is puzzling why developing countries did not receive emphasis early, despite the sponsors' institutional responsibilities and apparent interest". This could rise because the harmonisation and standardisation of government accounting is considered less important and relevant as compared to business accounting and to the area that does not belong to supranational union or international organisation (Benito et al., 2007). In addition, the standard itself is mainly developed from International Accounting Standards (IAS), which are mostly adopted by Anglo-Saxon countries (IFAC, 2011; Christiaens et al., 2010). Moreover, the strategy and approach on developing accounting standards for public sector within accrual accounting context is the adoption of International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) as a basis of IPSASs (IFAC, 2011; Sutcliffe, 2003).

A growing body of literature, in recent years, has attempted to explain public sector accounting in Indonesia (Djamhuri, 2009; Marwata & Alam, 2006; Robinson and Harun, 2004; Harun, et al, 2013; McLeod and Harun, 2014; Wijaya, et al, 2016). The phenomenon of the release of Indonesian Government Accounting Standard promulgated by government's regulation (PP) 71/2010, becomes the base of this study.

The present paper aims at studying the conformity of the contents of Indonesian Government Accounting Standards with IPSASs based on documentary analysis. A comparison between Indonesian Government Accounting Standards and IPSASs would be conducted to gain an understanding of the conformity. Further study in developing countries, especially in Indonesia, needs to be conducted because it has some special characteristics different from other countries.

However, it should be noticed that this study has limitations of scope. The triangulate multiple sources of data from interview or questionnaire (primary data) could not be conducted since it is mainly based on documentary analysis. Therefore, the result could not be generalised in broader perspectives.

Accrual Accounting Needs

IPSASB supports every country to adopt the accrual basis and also facilitates the transition from cash basis to accrual basis that provides more advantages for describing government's performance (IFAC, 2011; Chan, 2006; Pina and Torres, 2003). Chan (2006) even proposes that government in developing countries have greater needs for accrual accounting since it could reduce liquidity and solvency risk problems. In addition, Hepworth (2003) points out that World Bank and IMF also encourage government to adopt accrual accounting.

The rise of the new public management (NPM) promotes the replication of the private sector style inside the public sector (Lapsley, et al, 2009; Hood, 1995). However, it need to be noticed that the fundamental difference between public sector and private sector, which is profit vs. non-profit oriented, should be deemed the adoption of IASs (Sutcliffe, 2003). In addition, Lapsley et al. (2009), raises a deep question that why there were no limitations discussed in the accrual accounting application for public sector area on the IFAC report. Numerous studies have attempted to explain the accrual accounting in public sectors for example: Khan & Mayes, 2009; Christiaens & Rommel, 2008; Hepworth, 2003; and Guthrie, 1998, Craner & Jones, 1990. These studies describe the benefits, limitiations, and the application of accrual accounting in public sectors.

However, the implementation of accrual accounting in some countries is not without problems. The problems that hinder the implementation are knowledge and skill of government's officer (Azmi and Mohamed, 2014), unstable political situation (Tickell, 2010), low level of human capacity and resource (Adhikari and Mellemvik, 2011) and lack of accounting system and difficulty in recording assets (Van Wyk, 2007). While in Indonesia, there are two problems in accrual accounting issue, first, lack of government's officers who expert in accrual accounting and second, lack of detail and comprehensive regulation in the accrual accounting implementation (Wijaya et al., 2016).

The benefits and limitation of IPSASs

Arguably, the main reason of development of IPSASs is to ensure the transparency and quality of the government's financial reports. Sutcliffe (2003) lists advantages of the development and promotion of IPSASs, such as to provide benchmark of financial reporting, to maintain consistency, to harmonize financial report between countries, internal user could increase the quality of its government's financial report, to provide greater efficiency and effectiveness of audit and financial statement analysis, and the developing countries could access financial reporting expertise and other resources at a lower cost. In addition, Benito et al. (2007) argues that the public sector reform could be implemented easier with the availability of IPSASs. Benito et al. (2007) concludes that IPSASs could be used in the development of new standards, the revision of standards, or in the countries or entities that has no standards yet.

Two main characteristics of IPSASs are the adoption of business standards and the strong influence of the Anglo-Saxon countries (Benito et al., 2007). Arguably, the adoption of private sector accounting style into government accounting is not without critiques. International Accounting Standards (IAS) is a set of standards that is written for business. Arguably, public sector has more aspects that should be covered. In addition, the IAS is created in order to help companies prepare financial report for investors and creditors. Hence, IPSASs only focuses on government's financial report and neglect the wider part in accounting, such as management accounting, auditing, and finance (Jones, 2004).

Many developed countries in Europe have decided not to adopt IPSASs. The main reason for not adopting IPSASs is the accounting legislation, which is already based on local business accounting rules (Christiaens et al., 2010). Seemingly, IPSASs cannot play a main role in the government's accounting reform in developed countries, particularly in Europe. Most of the countries have already applied non-IPSASs accrual accounting, including leading countries, such as UK, France, and Germany (Ernst & Young, 2010).

Mautz (1989) also concludes that public sector is different to private sector. Therefore, it needs different financial reporting. Mautz (1989) questions the classification of building, libraries, museum, highways, or parks in public sector as assets. These service facilities do not produce probable future cash inflow for the government. Moreover, Mautz (1989) also suggests that depreciation is not appropriate for service facilities. It is better expensed rather than capitalized.

Carolini (2010) highlights the problem in the diversity of IPSASB and development standards process. To date, IPSASB members have represented from different regions and different level of income. However, Carolini (2010) concludes that mostly the comment of the "Exposure Draft" is derived from the English speaking countries and high-level income countries. These barriers could result in the development of standards that do not reflect the needs and "best practice" from low-level income countries (Carolini, 2010).

Despite the advantages IPSASs could offer, it should be noticed that there are some limitations of IPSASs. Another point is, if IPSASs encourage countries to adopt accrual, it should notice the capacity constraint of the countries before it moves to accrual based accounting systems. Chan (2006) suggests that IPSASs implementation in developing countries should be accompanied by a robust internal control. Lack of reliability in the transactions' recording, fraud and corruption in government finance, and lack of financial integrity often occurs in developing countries. The government's financial statement is not guaranteed to be free from fraud and misconduct despite the government adopts IPASs.

Uniformity and Harmonization

IPSASB, in its main objective, mentions public sector accounting standards could enhance the uniformity of financial report between countries. In addition, the IPSASs have a role in increasing harmonisation of financial reports between countries (Benito et al., 2007; Sutcliffe, 2003). Fuertes (2008) concludes that the main difference in standardisation and harmonisation is in the term of strictness. According to Benito, et al (2007) harmonisation still allows for alternative case while standardisation does not.

Fuertes (2008) finds that IPSASs’ content consists of two items which are disclosure requirements where an item is recognised and what aspects are to be disclosed, and how. The other item is measurement, which deals with how much the item is recognised. The disclosure items have dominated IPSASs by around 77.31% while 22.69% deals with measurement items (Fuertes, 2008).

However, as regards the implementation practices, the “uniformity” objective as stated by IPSASB is not without barriers. Different conditions in every country including culture, historical background, legal system, political, users of financial report, and structural elements cause the diversity and difficulty in the government accounting reform (Pina and Torres, 2003). Benito et al. (2007) also points out that the implementation of IPSASs in the continental countries would be more difficult as compared to Anglo-Saxon countries. Potential barriers would be lower in Anglo-Saxon countries because IPSASs is mainly influenced by Anglo-Saxon accounting traditions (Fuertes, 2008).

Another barrier occurs in promoting IPSASs implementation, which is derived from the power to enforce. IPSASB has no power to force every country to adopt IPSAS in order to achieve fully uniformity of financial report (Christiaens et al., 2010; Carolini, 2010). Arguably, the natural way of the process of adoption is cooperation. As IFAC (2011, p6) stated:

> “The IPSASB cooperates with national standard-setters in preparing and issuing Standards to the extent possible, with a view to sharing resources, minimizing duplication of effort and reaching consensus and convergence in standards at an early stage in their development”.

IPSASs Adoption in Practices

Christiaens et al. (2010), in the research, produces information about the variation of financial information systems in 17 European countries regarding the use of basis accounting system, the reason of the countries to link or not to link its accrual accounting to IPSASs, and also the reason of the countries to adopt or not to adopt accrual accounting. Surprisingly, most of the countries being studied choose not to adopt IPSASs. The IPSASs is applied weakly in European countries because the IPSASs are relatively unknown and not suitable with local accounting rules (Christiaens et al., 2010).

Benito et al. (2007) in their study divided three groups according to their level of conformity index of IPSASs. Benito et al. (2007) found that New Zealand, Sweden, Australia, US, Mexico, Holland, and UK are countries with high level of conformity index. Benito et al. (2007) argues that these countries mainly comprise of Anglo-Saxon countries. The medium level of conformity countries consists of Portugal, Finland, Spain, Belgium, and Italy. Their conformity level ranges from 49% to 70%. The last group consists of Argentina, Canada, Switzerland, Austria, Chile, and Norway. Their conformity level is below 50%.

The wave of public sector accounting reforms also happened in Central and Latin America countries. Perez & Hernandez (2007) compare financial statement produced by Latin-America countries with the IPSASs recommendations. Perez and Hernandez (2007) analyse the level of compliance IPSASs is based on. They are five elements of financial statement that should be provided by the countries (IPSAS 1) and 76 aspects that should be provided in five elements. Perez and Hernandez (2007) found that only Argentina, Colombia, Panama, and Peru obtained around 50% of information that should be provided in the financial statement as recommended by IPSASB. The low level of compliance was caused by different policy regarding transparency and disclosure in every country (Perez & Hernandez, 2007).

Leandro et al. (2011) also conducts a comparative study adoption of IPSASs in Costa Rica, El-Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. Some actions, in order to adopt IPSASs, have been implemented by the countries, such as action plan covering the design, implementation and evaluation and training, promulgation of legislation, and also hiring international consultant to support the decision of IPSASs adoption (Leandro et al., 2011).

Leandro et al. (2011) find that some problems arise regarding the implementation practices that are highly centralised trend setters and makes academician, professional college, or external audit firms participate in low degree of the IPSASs implementation, cost, and lack of IT. Finally, Leandro et al. (2011) concludes that the level of convergence between financial statements and IPSASs recommendation is not so high and needs to be improved.

Indonesian Government's Accounting Standards

Indonesian Government's Accounting Standards or "PSAP" is promulgated by government regulation 71/2010. Prior to this, Law 17/2003 was launched and required all government institutions to apply accrual accounting for their financial report. It is stated that the government agencies should apply accrual accounting maximum 5 years after the Law launched. However, this Law had no great practical effect until 2008 and even eleven years later or in 2014, the Law still had no great practical effect since majority of the local governments still using cash towards accrual basis. This could be occurred since government regulation 71/2010 allows entities to choose either full accrual based or cash toward accrual based. Therefore, it provides two attachments of accounting standards, full accrual and cash towards accrual. It could be concluded that the movement to use full accrual basis in Indonesia in a very slow.

Halim and Kusufi (2012) mentions that under government regulation 71/2010 government agencies should produce 3 main reports, such as budgeting report (cash basis), financial report (accrual basis), and notes to the financial statements. Therefore in a transaction, there will be two opportunity of recording (journals), first, transaction will be recorded in both journal based on budgeting and financial or second, the transaction will be recorded only in financial journal (accrual based). This could be happening since the budgeting report only mention the revenue, the expense, and the financing activities. Table 1 shows the Government accounting standards.

Table 1. Indonesian Government Accounting Standards based on PP 71/2010

SAP 01	Presentation of Financial Statements
SAP 02	Budget Realisation Report Based on Cash
SAP 03	Cash Flow Statement
SAP 04	Notes of Financial Statement
SAP 05	Accounting for Inventories
SAP 06	Accounting for Investment
SAP 07	Accounting for Fixed Assets
SAP 08	Accounting for Construction on Contracts
SAP 09	Accounting for Liabilities
SAP 10	Accounting for Changes in Accounting Policy, Errors, and Extraordinary Events
SAP 11	Consolidated Financial Statement
SAP 12	Operating Statement

Source: Government Regulation PP 71/2010

The Degree of Consistency of Indonesian Government Accounting Standards with IPSASs

In order to answer the degree of consistency between PSAP and IPSASs, material harmonisation study is conducted. The research methodology from Perez & Hernandez (2007) will be used to measure the degree of conformity.

The study will compare the minimum requirements of financial statement recommended by IPSASB with items that have already been provided by PSAP. The comparison will be indexed in two levels:

Level One: Five elements of financial statement as stated in IPSASs 1 will be compared with the elements that are provided in PSAP irrespective of their contents. Those five elements are: balance sheet, cash flow statement, operating statement, statement of changes in net assets/equity, and accounting practices and financial statement notes.

Level Two: Compares the minimum contents that are recommended by IPSASB in each five elements of financial statement with the contents provided on PSAP. Total 76 items were selected.

In order to score level one, score 1 will be given if PSAP provide elements of financial statement and score 0 will be applied if PSAP does not provide the element required by IPSASB. The total score is obtained by dividing the total number with 5. All items have same weight.

In order to score the items in level two, 76 items were weighed in the same degree. Score 1 is applied if PSAP provides the item, or score 0 will be applied if PSAP does not provide the item. The items will be divided into 5 groups. The formula is as follows:

$$TC = \frac{TRIPSAS}{m} x\,100$$

TC = Second Level of consistency

TRIPSAS= Total minimum IPSAS requirements fulfilled by the country

M = Number of items

Partial indexes for each financial statement are: TCb for balance sheet, TCp for operating statement, TCc for cash flow statement, TCn for the statement of changes in net assets, and TCs for the notes of financial statements.

In the first level degree of consistency with IPSASs, PSAP score 100%. 5 out of 5 of the elements of financial statement recommended by IPSASs no 1 provided by PSAP. Table 2 shows first level conformity with IPSASs.

Table 2. First Level Degree of Consistency with IPSASs

Items	Score
Balance sheet	1
Statement of financial/operating statement	1
Statement of changes in net assets/Equity	1
Statement of cash flow	1
Accounting practices and financial statement notes	1
First level degree of consistency 5 out of 5	100%

In the second level, consistency with balance sheet, PSAP scores 88.24%. PSAP provided 15 out of 17 items to be presented in balance sheet. Two items that do not conform are, *firstly*, the short and long term receivables in PSAP (not disclosed separately); *secondly,* the current portion of borrowing is not disclosed separately. The current portion of borrowing is included in other current liabilities items. Appendices 1 to 5 show second level consistency of PSAP.

Interestingly, PSAP provides 100% items on the Operating Statement and Cash Flow Statement. However, PSAP only shows three out of six items (50%) recommended by IPSASB on the statement of changes in net asset/equity. Finally, PSAP provides 20 out of 37 (54.05%) items recommended by IPSASB in the notes of financial statement. The total degree of consistency in level two is 71.05%. The score shows that at least IPSASs is well applied in Indonesia. Indonesia, clearly, still needs to work more to produce better statement of changes in net asset/equity and notes of financial statement. It could be said that Indonesia has moved along IPSASB direction by applying 100% recommendation on IPSAS 1 and 71.05% by applying items that has been recommended by IPSASB for each financial statement elements.

Conclusion

It needs to be noticed that the Indonesian Government Accounting standards, which are already applied in IPSASs recommendations, do not reflect a good implementation in practice since many government agencies have not been applied full accrual basis yet. Indeed, several barriers need to be overcome by the government supported by academician and accountancy profession. Arguably, one of the main problems is human resource. Harun, et al (2013) argues that accrual accounting implementation needs to be supported by government agencies who capable producing accrual accounting. The recommendation of using either full accrual or cash toward accrual in PP 71/2010 could be seen as a "compromise" strategy discharged by Indonesian Government to adjust the problem.

The adoption of accrual based IPSASs in Indonesia, is a part of the government's accounting reforms in Indonesia. Two interesting points argued by Sutcliffe (2003) and Benito et al. (2007), are the increase in the quality of government's financial report and cost of IPSASs' implementation. Arguably, these advantages would be suitable with the condition of Indonesia. Indonesia, prior the promulgation of the first government's accounting standards (Financial Ministry Decree 337/2002), only produced budget realisation report for all government entities based on cash basis. It would also be very costly and time consuming for Indonesia to develop its new government accounting standards. Marwata & Alam (2006) find that among main player actors of public sector accounting reforms in Indonesia, there is a lack of goal congruence and coordination. Therefore, IPSASs could become the solution for the effective and efficient government accounting reforms in Indonesia. Despite IPSASs provide better quality of government's financial reporting than the Dutch accounting system, several preconditions need to be envisaged cautiously. It could be concluded that Indonesia has moved along IPSASB direction. Indonesia has already implemented what IPSASB recommended at relatively high level. However, a further research needs to be conducted in the context of implementation on Indonesian Government Accounting Standards.

REFERENCES

Adhikari, P. and Mellemvik, F., 2011. The rise and fall of accruals: a case of Nepalese central government. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, *1*(2), pp.123-143.

Azmi, A.H. and Mohamed, N., 2014. Readiness of Malaysian public sector employees in moving towards accrual accounting for improve accountability: The case of ministry of education (MOE). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *164*, pp.106-111.

Benito, B., Brusca, I., and Montesinos, V. (2007). The harmonization of government financial information systems: the role of the IPSASs. *International Review of Administrative Science*. Vol. 73, No. 2, pp 293-317.

Carolini, G., Y., (2010). The Tools of Whose Trade? How International Accounting Guidelines are Failing Governments in the Global South. *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 469-483.

Chan, J. (2006). IPSAS and government accounting reform in developing countries in Lande, E. and Scheid, J-C. (eds) Accounting reform in the public sector: mimicry, fad or necessity, Paris: Experts Comptables Media, pp 31-41.

Chan, J., L. (2003). Government Accounting: An Assessment of Theory, Purposes, and Standards, *Public Money & Development* 23(1): 13-21.

Christiaens, J., Reyniers, B., and Rolle, C. (2010). Impact of IPSAS on Reforming Governmental Financial Information Systems: A Comparative Study. *International Review of Administrative Science*. Vol. 76, No. 3, pp 537-554.

Christiaens, J., and Rommel, J. (2008) Accrual Accounting Reforms: Only for businesslike (parts of) governments. *Financial Accountability & Management*, Vol 24, No 1, pp 59-75.

Craner, J., & Jones, R. (1990). Accrual Accounting for National Governments: The Case of Developing Countries. *Research in Third World Accounting*. Vol. 1, pp. 103-113.

Djamhuri, A. (2009). A Case Study of Governmental Accounting and Budgeting Reform at Local Authority in Indonesia: An Institutionalist Perspective. University Sains Malaysia. Viewed 27 June2011. http://eprints.usm.my/15225/1/A_CASE_STUDY_OF_GOVERNMENTAL_ACCOUNTING.pdf

Ernst & Young (2010). Towards Transparency: A Comparative Study of Governmental Accounting in Europe. Viewed 20 July 2011. http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/toward_transparency/$FILE/toward_transparency.pdf

Fuertez, I (2008). Towards harmonization or standardization in Governmental Accounting? The International Public Sector Accounting Standards Boards Experience. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*. Vol 10, No 4, pp 327-345.

Guthrie, J. (1998). Application of Accrual Accounting in the Australian Public Sector – Rhetoric or Reality? *Financial Accountability & Management*. Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.1-19.

Halim, A., and Kusufi, M., S. (2012) *Akuntansi Sektor Publik: Akuntansi Keuangan Daerah.* Penerbit Salemba Empat. Jakarta

Harun, H., An, Y., and Kahar, A. (2013). Implementation and Challenges of introducing NPM and accrual accounting in Indonesian Local Government. Public Money and Management. Vol. 33, No.5 pp.383-388

Hepworth, N. (2003). Preconditions for Successful Implementation of Accrual Accounting in Central Government. *Public Money and Management*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.37-44.

Hood, C. (1995). The "New Public Management" in The 1980s: Variations on A Theme. *Accounting, Organizations, and Society*, Vol. 20, No. 2/3, pp 93-109.

IFAC (2011). *Handbook of International Public Sector Accounting Pronouncement: Volume I*. IFAC: New York.

IFAC (2011). *Handbook of International Public Sector Accounting Pronouncement: Volume II*. IFAC: New York.

Indonesia, The Republic of. (2010*) Government Regulation No. 71 Year 2010 about Government Accounting Standards (Translated from: Peraturan Pemerintah No. 71 Tahun 2010 tentang Standar Akuntansi Pemerintahan)*. President of the Republic of Indonesia. Jakarta.

Jones, R. (2004). A Critique of International Public Sector Accounting Standards. *The ICFAI Journal of Accounting Research*. Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 49-57.

Khan, A., & Mayes, S. (2009). Transition to Accrual Accounting. Fiscal Affairs Department, International Monetary Fund. Viewed 10 May 2011. http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/tnm/2009/tnm0902.pdf.

Lapsley, I., Mussari, R., & Paulsson, G. (2009). On the Adoption of Accrual Accounting in the Public Sector: A Self Evident and Problematic Reform. *European Accounting Review*. Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 719-723.

Leandro, C., E., A., Perez, C., C., & Hernandez, A., M., L. (2011). Convergence of The Central American Integration System Member Countries to IPSAS of the IFAC. Paper presented on 13th Binneal CIGAR Conference (9-10 June) Ghent, Belgium.

Marwata & Alam, M. (2006). The Interaction Amongst Reform Drivers in Governmental Accounting Changes. *Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change*. Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 144-163.

Mautz, R., K. (1989). Not-for-Profit Financial Reporting: Another View. *Journal of Accountancy*. Vol. 168, No. 2., pp. 60-66.

McLeod, R., H., and Harub, H. (2014). Public Sector Accounting Reform at Local Government Level in Indonesia. *Financial Accountability and Management*. Vol. 30, No. 2 pp. 238-258.

Perez, C., C., & Hernandez, A., L.(2007) Latin-American Public Financial Reporting: Recent and Future Development. *Public Administration and Development*. Vol. 27, pp. 139-157.

Pina, V., and Torres, L. (2003). Reshaping Public Sector Accounting: An International Comparative View. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*. Vol. 20, No. 4, pp 334-350.

PSASP-Pusat Studi Akuntansi Sektor Publik (2003). *Two Years IPSAS Implementation in Indonesia (Translated from: 2 Tahun Perjalanan IPSAS di Indonesia)*. PSASP: Yogyakarta.

Robinson, P., and Harun (2004). Reforming the Indonesian Public Sector: The Introduction of Accrual Accounting. Paper presented in the Fourth Asia Pacific Interdisciplinary Research in Accounting Conference, Singapore.

Sutcliffe, P. (2006). *International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSASs) 1996-2006 Progress and Status*. IFAC: New York.

Sutcliffe, P. (2003). The Standards Programme of IFAC's Public Sector Committe. *Public Money and Management*. Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 29-36.

Tickell, G., 2010. Cash to accrual accounting: One nation's dilemma. *The International Business & Economics Research Journal*, *9*(11), p.71.

Van Wyk, H.A., 2007. Is the transformation of public sector financial reporting in South Africa's provincial governments on track?. *Meditari: Research Journal of the School of Accounting Sciences*, *15*(2), pp.65-75.

Wijaya, I.F., Dahlan, B., Anni Aryani, Y., Payamta, P. and Ramadhan, A.F., 2016. The Challenges in the Transition to Accrual Accounting: Evidence from the Local Governments in Indonesia. *Advanced Science Letters*, *22*(5-6), pp.1625-1630.

Appendices

1. The second level of consistency of the balance sheet

1	Items to be presented on the face of the balance sheet			
	1.1	Non-financial fixed assets	1	
	1.2	Tangible assets	1	
	1.3	Intangible assets	1	in other assets item
	1.4	Investments	1	
	1.5	Short and long-term financial assets disclosed separately	1	
	1.6	Receivables	1	
	1.7	Short and long-term receivables disclosed separately	0	
	1.8	Cash and cash equivalents	1	
	1.9	Prepayments	1	
	1.10	Payables	1	
	1.11	Short and long-term payables disclosed separately	1	
	1.12	Borrowing	1	
	1.13	Short and long-term borrowings disclosed separately	1	
	1.14	Current portion of borrowing disclosed separately	0	include in other current liabilities item
	1.15	Provision	1	
	1.16	Net asset/equity	1	
	1.17	Current and non-current asset and current and non-current liabilities as separate classification or in order of their liquidity	1	
		Total minimum IPSAS requirements for the balance sheet fulfilled by the country (TRIPSASb)	15	
		SECOND LEVEL OF CONSISTENCY OF THE BALANCE SHEET (mb=17) TCb = (TRIPSASb/mb) X 100	88.24 %	

2. The second level of consistency of the operating statement

2	Items to be presented on the face of operating statement		
	2.1	Revenue from operating activities	1
	2.2	Surplus or deficit from operating activities	1
	2.3	Finance cost	1
	2.4	Surplus or deficit from ordinary activities	1
	2.5	Extraordinary items	1
	2.6	Net surplus or deficit for the period	1
	2.7	Expenses are aggregated according their nature, programme, or purpose for which they were made	1
		Total minimum IPSAS requirements for the operating statement fulfilled by the country (TRIPSASp)	7
		SECOND LEVEL OF CONSISTENCY OF THE OPERATING STATEMENT (mp=7) TCp=(TRIPSASp/mp) X 100	100%

3. The Second level of consistency of the cash flow statement

3	Items to be presented on the face of the cash flow statement			
	3.1	Net use of cash payments arising from operating activities disclosed separately	1	
	3.2	Major classes of gross cash receipts and gross from operating activities disclosed separately	1	
	3.3	Use of net cash payments arising from investing activities disclosed separately	1	
	3.4	Major classes of gross cash receipts and gross from investing activities disclosed separately	1	
	3.5	Net use of cash payments arising from financing activities disclosed separately	1	
	3.6	Major classes of gross cash receipts and gross from financing activities disclosed separately	1	
	3.7	Cash flows associated with extraordinary items disclosed separately	1	included in operating activities
	3.8	Cash flows associated with interest received and paid as either operating, investing, or financing activities disclosed separately	1	
	3.9	Reconciliation of the amounts in the cash flow statement with the equivalent items reported in the statement of financial position disclosed	1	
		Total minimum IPSAS requirements for cash flow fulfilled by the country (TRIPSASc)	9	
		SECOND LEVEL OF CONSISTENCY OF THE CASH FLOW STATEMENT (mc=9) TCc=(TRIPSASc/mc) X 100	100%	

4. The Second level of consistency of the statement of the changes in net assets/equity

4	Items to be presented on the face of the changes in net assets/equity		
	4.1	Net surplus or deficit for the period	1
	4.2	Each item or revenue and expense, which is recognised directly in net asset/equity and total of these items	0
	4.3	Contributions by owners and distribution by owners, in their capacity as owners	0
	4.4	Cumulative effect of changes in accounting policy and the correction of fundamental errors	1
	4.5	The balance of accumulated surpluses or deficits at the beginning of the period and at the reporting date and movements for the period	1
	4.6	A reconciliation between the earning amount of each component of net asset/equity at the beginning and end of the period	0
		Total minimum IPSAS requirements for statement of changes in net assets fulfilled by the country (TRIPSASn)	3
		SECOND LEVEL OF CONSISTENCY OF THE ASSET/EQUITY (mn=6) TCn=(TRIPSASn/mn) X 100	50%

5. The Second level of consistency of notes to the financial statements

5	Information presented in the main section or in the notes to the financial statements				
5A	Supporting information for the items included in the balance sheet (further sub-classifications of line items included)				
	5.1	Tangible assets show separately			
		5.1.1	Land and buildings	1	
		5.1.2	Plant and equipment	1	
		5.1.3	Infrastructure asset	1	
		5.1.4	Accumulated depreciation	1	
	5.2	Net assets/equity shown separately			
		5.2.1	Reserves	0	
		5.2.2	Accumulated surpluses/deficits	0	
		5.2.3	Capital contributed by other government entities	0	
	5.3	Intangible asset		1	
	5.4	Investments		1	
	5.5	Receivables		1	
	5.6	Cash and cash equivalents		1	
	5.7	Prepayments		1	
	5.8	Payables		1	
	5.9	Provision shown separately			
		5.9.1	Employee benefits	0	
		5.9.2	Other provisions	0	
	5.10	Borrowing		1	
	Total section A			11	
5B	Supporting information for the items included in the operating statement				
	5.11	A sub-classification of total revenue		0	
	5.12	An analysis of expenses using a classification based on either the nature of expenses or their function within entity		0	
	Total section B			0	
5C	Supporting information to the financial statement in general:				
	5.13	Cross references to any related information in the notes		0	
	5.14	Measurement basis used		1	
	5.15	Specific accounting policy on:			

		5.15.1	Revenue recognition	1	
		5.15.2	Consolidation principles		
		5.15.3	Investments	1	equity method
		5.15.4	Recognition and depreciation/amortisation of tangible and intangible assets	1	
		5.15.5	Capitalisation of borrowing costs and other expenditure	1	
		5.15.6	Construction contracts	1	
		5.15.7	Investments properties	0	
		5.15.8	Financial instruments and investments	0	
		5.15.9	Employee benefit cost	1	
		5.15.10	Research and development cost	1	
		5.15.11	Provisions	0	
		5.15.12	Foreign currency translation and hedging	1	
		5.15.13	Inflation accounting	0	
	5.16	The cash not available for use by the economic entity		0	
	5.17	Contingencies not included in the balance sheet		0	
	5.18	Commitments not included in the balance sheet		0	
	5.19	Non-financial information not included in the balance sheet		0	
	Total section C			9	
		Total minimum IPSAS requirements for the notes to financial statement fulfilled by the country (TRIPSASs)		20	
		SECOND LEVEL OF CONSISTENCY OF THE NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (ms=37) TCs=(TRIPSASs/ms) X 100		54.05	
		TOTAL CONSISTENCY LEVEL (m=76) TC=(TRIPSAS/m) X 100		71.05	