INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT
TO THE UNITHOLDERS OF THE FAR PROPERTY COMPANY LIMITED

Our opinion
In our opinion, the consolidated and separate financial statements give a true and fair view of the consolidated and separate financial position of The FaR Property Company Limited (the “Company”) and its subsidiaries (together the “Group”) as at 30 June 2019, and of its consolidated and separate financial performance and its consolidated and separate cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (“IFRS”).

What we have audited
The FaR Property Company Limited’s consolidated and separate financial statements set out on pages 10 to 60 comprise:

- the consolidated and separate statements of financial position as at 30 June 2019;
- the consolidated and separate statements of comprehensive income for the year then ended;
- the consolidated and separate statements of changes in equity for the year then ended;
- the consolidated and separate statements of cash flows for the year then ended; and
- the notes to the consolidated and separate financial statements, which include a summary of significant accounting policies.

Basis for opinion
We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (“ISAs”). Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the Auditor’s responsibilities for the audit of the consolidated and separate financial statements section of our report.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.

Independence
We are independent of the Group in accordance with the International Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (including International Independence Standards) (“IESBA Code”) issued by the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants and other independence requirements applicable to performing audits of financial statements in Botswana. We have fulfilled our other ethical responsibilities in accordance with the IESBA Code and other ethical requirements applicable to performing audits of financial statements in Botswana.
**Our audit approach**

**Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall group materiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Overall group materiality: P 6,398,000, which represents 0.75% of consolidated net assets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group audit scope**

Group audit scope has been determined based on indicators such as the contribution to the consolidated net assets by each component. The Group consists of four components, which includes the Company and three wholly owned subsidiaries. We performed a full scope audit on the holding company, which we considered to be the single financially significant component. On the South African subsidiary, Qtique 79 (Proprietary) Limited, we performed audit procedures on certain account balances and transactions based on materiality and the risk associated with these account balances and transactions. Analytical review procedures were performed on the two insignificant components.

**Key Audit Matters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Audit Matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Valuation of Investment Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of designing our audit, we determined materiality and assessed the risks of material misstatement in the consolidated and separate financial statements. In particular, we considered where the directors made subjective judgements; for example, in respect of significant accounting estimates that involved making assumptions and considering future events that are inherently uncertain. As in all of our audits, we also addressed the risk of management override of internal controls, including among other matters, consideration of whether there was evidence of bias that represented a risk of material misstatement due to fraud.

**Materiality**

The scope of our audit was influenced by our application of materiality. An audit is designed to obtain reasonable assurance whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement. Misstatements may arise due to fraud or error. They are considered material if individually or in aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the consolidated financial statements.

Based on our professional judgement, we determined certain quantitative thresholds for materiality, including the overall group materiality for the consolidated financial statements as a whole as set out in the table below. These, together with qualitative considerations, helped us to determine the scope of our audit and the nature, timing and extent of our audit procedures and to evaluate the effect of misstatements, both individually and in aggregate on the financial statements as a whole.
Overall group materiality  P 6,398,000

How we determined it  0.75% of the consolidated net assets

Rationale for the materiality benchmark applied
We chose consolidated net assets as the benchmark because, in our view, the net assets value and the distribution yield, which is distribution divided by the consolidated net assets, are the key criteria against which the performance of the Group is most commonly measured by users. We chose 0.75%, which is lower than the normal quantitative materiality thresholds used for similar companies in this sector, because the Group has significant exposure to third party liabilities, with related debt covenant requirements.

How we tailored our group audit scope
We tailored the scope of our audit in order to perform sufficient work to enable us to provide an opinion on the consolidated financial statements as a whole, taking into account the structure of the Group, the accounting processes and controls, and the industry in which the Group operates.

The Group consists of the Company and three wholly owned subsidiaries, all of which we considered to be individual components for purposes of our group audit. Our scoping assessment included consideration of the financial significance of each component as well as taking into consideration the sufficiency of work planned to be performed over material line items in the consolidated financial statements. We identified the Company to be the only financially significant component in the Group based on its contribution to the consolidated net assets. We also included the South African subsidiary, Qtique 79 (Proprietary) Limited, in the scope of our group audit based on indicators such as the subsidiary’s contribution to consolidated net assets. The remainder of the components were considered to be insignificant to the Group individually and in aggregate.

For the financially significant component, which is the holding company, we performed a full scope audit and for the other in-scope component, we performed audit procedures on certain account balances and transactions based on materiality and the risk associated with these account balances and transactions. Analytical review procedures were performed on insignificant components. All audit work was performed by the Group engagement team and did not require involvement of component auditors. This, together with additional procedures performed at the Group level, including testing of consolidation journals and intercompany eliminations, provided us the audit evidence we needed for our opinion on the consolidated financial statements as a whole.

Key audit matters
Key audit matters are those matters that, in our professional judgment, were of most significance in our audit of the financial statements of the current period. These matters were addressed in the context of our audit of the consolidated and separate financial statements as a whole, and in forming our opinion thereon, and we do not provide a separate opinion on these matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key audit matter</th>
<th>How our audit addressed the key audit matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Investment Property</td>
<td>We assessed the competence and capabilities of the independent valuers by verifying their qualifications and past experience. We also determined whether there are any matters that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The carrying values of investment properties for the Group and Company at 30 June 2019 were BWP1,481,019,203 and BWP1,142,728,622, respectively (refer Note 3 - Investment Property). The fair value adjustment recorded in net profit before tax in respect of investment properties for the Group and Company amounted to a P6,917,117 gain and a P10,643,564 loss, respectively.

At 30 June 2019, the Group’s valuation of the portfolio of properties was based on valuations carried out by independent valuers, using valuation techniques such as the sales comparison, depreciated replacement cost and income capitalisation methods. These valuation techniques incorporate unobservable inputs such as future rental cash inflows, capitalisation rates, direct comparable sales, rent escalation rates, build rates and discount rates as set out in Note 3 – Investment Property.

Significant judgement is required to determine the fair value of investment properties, especially with respect to the determination of unobservable inputs to be utilised. We therefore considered the valuation of Investment Property to be a matter of most significance to the current year audit due to the magnitude of the balances, combined with the significant assumptions associated with determining the fair values.

This key audit matter relates to the consolidated and separate financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key audit matter</th>
<th>How our audit addressed the key audit matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The carrying values of investment properties for the Group and Company at 30 June 2019 were BWP1,481,019,203 and BWP1,142,728,622, respectively (refer Note 3 - Investment Property). The fair value adjustment recorded in net profit before tax in respect of investment properties for the Group and Company amounted to a P6,917,117 gain and a P10,643,564 loss, respectively.</td>
<td>might have affected their objectivity or may have imposed scope limitations upon the work performed by them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 30 June 2019, the Group’s valuation of the portfolio of properties was based on valuations carried out by independent valuers, using valuation techniques such as the sales comparison, depreciated replacement cost and income capitalisation methods. These valuation techniques incorporate unobservable inputs such as future rental cash inflows, capitalisation rates, direct comparable sales, rent escalation rates, build rates and discount rates as set out in Note 3 – Investment Property.</td>
<td>In doing so, we obtained written confirmation from the valuers that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant judgement is required to determine the fair value of investment properties, especially with respect to the determination of unobservable inputs to be utilised. We therefore considered the valuation of Investment Property to be a matter of most significance to the current year audit due to the magnitude of the balances, combined with the significant assumptions associated with determining the fair values.</td>
<td>• all professional staff involved in the valuation process are in good standing with relevant professional bodies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We compared the valuation techniques used by the independent valuers against IFRS guidance and industry norms to confirm that the methodologies were appropriate under the circumstances. The valuation methods were comparable to those typically used in the market.</td>
<td>• they are free from any direct or indirect shareholding or financial interest in the Group;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We tested a sample of data inputs used in the independent valuations. For example, we agreed future rental cash inflows and rent escalation rates to appropriate supporting documentation (such as rental agreements, business plans and historical performance) to assess the accuracy and completeness thereof. We also compared a sample of direct comparable sales values, rent escalation rates and build rates utilised in the valuation to those generally used in the market for similar properties and rates used in historical valuations. The data inputs used in the independent valuations were found to be reasonable and were applied consistently in comparison to the prior year.</td>
<td>• the Group did not place any restrictions on the valuation process; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We compared the capitalisation rates utilised in the valuation to those generally used in the market for similar properties, rates used in historical valuations, general market factors (such as comparable long-bond yield rates) and</td>
<td>• they are not aware of any information relevant to the valuation which had been withheld by the Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We found no evidence to suggest that valuers are not appropriately qualified or experienced or that their objectivity in performance of the valuation was compromised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We compared the valuation techniques used by the independent valuers against IFRS guidance and industry norms to confirm that the methodologies were appropriate under the circumstances. The valuation methods were comparable to those typically used in the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We tested a sample of data inputs used in the independent valuations. For example, we agreed future rental cash inflows and rent escalation rates to appropriate supporting documentation (such as rental agreements, business plans and historical performance) to assess the accuracy and completeness thereof. We also compared a sample of direct comparable sales values, rent escalation rates and build rates utilised in the valuation to those generally used in the market for similar properties and rates used in historical valuations. The data inputs used in the independent valuations were found to be reasonable and were applied consistently in comparison to the prior year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We compared the capitalisation rates utilised in the valuation to those generally used in the market for similar properties, rates used in historical valuations, general market factors (such as comparable long-bond yield rates) and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key audit matter | How our audit addressed the key audit matter
--- | ---
 | property specific risk factors. These inputs were found to be within a reasonable range.

**Other information**
The directors are responsible for the other information. The other information comprises the information included in the document titled “The FaR Property Company Limited Consolidated and Separate Annual Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2019”, which we obtained prior to the date of this auditor’s report, and the other sections of the document titled “FaR Property Integrated Annual Report 2019”, which is expected to be made available to us after that date. The other information does not include the consolidated and separate financial statements and our auditor’s report thereon.

Our opinion on the consolidated and separate financial statements does not cover the other information and we do not and will not express an audit opinion or any form of assurance conclusion thereon.

In connection with our audit of the consolidated and separate financial statements, our responsibility is to read the other information identified above and, in doing so, consider whether the other information is materially inconsistent with the consolidated and separate financial statements or our knowledge obtained in the audit, or otherwise appears to be materially misstated.

If, based on the work we have performed on the other information that we obtained prior to the date of this auditor’s report, we conclude that there is a material misstatement of this other information, we are required to report that fact. We have nothing to report in this regard.

**Responsibilities of the directors for the consolidated and separate financial statements**
The directors are responsible for the preparation of the consolidated and separate financial statements that give a true and fair view in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards and for such internal control as the directors determine is necessary to enable the preparation of consolidated and separate financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

In preparing the consolidated and separate financial statements, the directors are responsible for assessing the Group and the Company’s ability to continue as a going concern, disclosing, as applicable, matters related to going concern and using the going concern basis of accounting unless the directors either intend to liquidate the Group and/or the Company or to cease operations, or have no realistic alternative but to do so.

**Auditor’s responsibilities for the audit of the consolidated and separate financial statements**
Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the consolidated and separate financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor’s report that includes our opinion. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance, but is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with ISAs will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. Misstatements can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of these consolidated and separate financial statements.

As part of an audit in accordance with ISAs, we exercise professional judgement and maintain professional scepticism throughout the audit. We also:
- Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the consolidated and separate financial statements, whether due to fraud or error, design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks, and obtain audit evidence that is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control.
- Obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Group’s and the Company’s internal control.
- Evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates and related disclosures made by the directors.
- Conclude on the appropriateness of the directors’ use of the going concern basis of accounting and, based on the audit evidence obtained, whether a material uncertainty exists related to events or conditions that may cast significant doubt on the Group’s and the Company’s ability to continue as a going concern. If we conclude that a material uncertainty exists, we are required to draw attention in our auditor’s report to the related disclosures in the consolidated and separate financial statements or, if such disclosures are inadequate, to modify our opinion. Our conclusions are based on the audit evidence obtained up to the date of our auditor’s report. However, future events or conditions may cause the Group and/or Company to cease to continue as a going concern.
- Evaluate the overall presentation, structure and content of the consolidated and separate financial statements, including the disclosures, and whether the consolidated and separate financial statements represent the underlying transactions and events in a manner that achieves fair presentation.
- Obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the financial information of the entities or business activities within the Group to express an opinion on the consolidated financial statements. We are responsible for the direction, supervision and performance of the group audit. We remain solely responsible for our audit opinion.

We communicate with the directors regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit and significant audit findings, including any significant deficiencies in internal control that we identify during our audit.

We also provide the directors with a statement that we have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence, and to communicate with them all relationships and other matters that may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence, and where applicable, related safeguards.

From the matters communicated with the directors, we determine those matters that were of most significance in the audit of the consolidated and separate financial statements of the current period and are therefore the key audit matters. We describe these matters in our auditor’s report unless law or regulation precludes public disclosure about the matter or when, in extremely rare circumstances, we determine that a matter should not be communicated in our report because the adverse consequences of doing so would reasonably be expected to outweigh the public interest benefits of such communication.
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