

**INTERPRETATION ISSUES IN PROGRESS
 (13 October 2010)**

Part A: IFRS Interpretations Committee Topics

No	Project	History and Current Status	Next Steps	Timing
1	<p>Classification of Vesting Conditions</p> <p><i>IFRS 2 Share-based Payment</i></p>	<p>In May 2009, the IFRIC received a request to clarify the basis on which vesting conditions, especially performance conditions, can be distinguished from non-vesting conditions. The request arose because constituents are interpreting differently the principle set out in IFRS 2 that the vesting conditions should be those that determine whether the entity receives the required services from the counterparty.</p> <p>The IFRIC decided that further research and analysis were needed to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ whether the issues identified in the submission fundamentally relate to the interaction of other conditions with the service conditions; and ▪ whether these types of transactions are widespread and the extent of diversity in practice. <p>The IFRIC will resume its discussion of whether this project should be added to its agenda at a future meeting (July 2009).</p> <p>The IFRIC received a status update (Nov 2009).</p> <p>The IFRIC considered two application issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ does there need to be a direct link between a performance target and an individual employee’s service in order for that target to be a performance condition?; and ▪ when determining whether the target qualifies as a performance condition, does it matter whether the specified service period is shorter or longer than the period over which the performance target should be met? <p>The IFRIC noted that the revised guidance issued in January 2008 (IG24) lacked clarity and therefore divergent practices may result when distinguishing between vesting conditions and non-vesting conditions.</p> <p>The IFRIC concluded that consistency could be improved by clarifying the distinction between service, performance and non-vesting conditions and therefore decided to add the issue to its agenda (Jan 2010).</p> <p>The IFRIC received a status update from the staff and also began preliminary deliberations on the scope of the project. Staff were asked to consider whether convergence with US GAAP on this matter would be helpful (March 2010).</p> <p>The IFRS Interpretations Committee discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ clarifying the definition of a vesting condition and a vesting period; ▪ incorporating into IFRSs definitions of non-vesting, service, performance and other vesting conditions, and definitions of attribution period; 	<p>Committee to ask the IASB for its recommendations on how to proceed.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

No	Project	History and Current Status	Next Steps	Timing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ removing from IFRSs the definition of a market condition; ▪ returning to an employee perspective when assessing vesting conditions; ▪ providing further guidance on contingent features and the interaction of multiple vesting conditions; and ▪ including guidance on determining the period over which to recognise compensation cost (the ‘attribution period’) when an arrangement includes multiple vesting conditions. <p>No decisions were made.</p> <p>Staff have been requested to determine the impact of the proposed changes to IFRS 2 on current practice and to clarify some of the proposed definitions (May 2010).</p> <p>At the July 2010 meeting the Committee discussed an analysis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the attributes of a performance condition; ▪ the current and proposed accounting for nine examples of specific share-based payment transactions; and ▪ drafting suggestions for consideration by the staff. <p>The Committee tentatively decided that a performance condition should be defined by reference to the operation or activities of the entity but without reference to the proposed attributes and that an IPO and a change of control conditions should be deemed to constitute a performance condition. It was decided that there should be no change to the accounting for SAYE plans (July 2010).</p> <p>At the September 2010 meeting, the Committee tentatively decided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a non-compete provision should be presumed to be a contingent feature; and ▪ a performance target should fully coincide with an explicit or implicit service requirement for the entire period between grant date and the performance target date in order to constitute a performance condition. <p>The Committee also discussed different options, including interpretation, annual improvement and separate amendment, for proceeding with the agenda project (Sep 2010).</p>		
2	<p>Accounting for production stripping costs</p> <p><i>IAS 16 Property, Plant and Equipment</i></p>	<p>In June 2009 the IFRIC received a request for guidance in respect of the accounting treatment of stripping costs during the production stage of a mine. The topic was discussed in two separate sessions of the IFRIC meeting. The first session gave a brief discussion on the nature of stripping costs and current accounting practices and Niall Weatherstone from Rio Tinto gave a presentation which provided additional background on the mechanics of and economic considerations within the mining industry.</p> <p>In the second session the IFRIC discussed four methods of accounting for stripping costs under various frameworks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ expense production stripping costs as incurred; ▪ capitalise stripping costs as a cost of inventory, as variable production costs; 	Committee to consider comments received by constituents on DI/2010/1.	Nov 2010

No	Project	History and Current Status	Next Steps	Timing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ capitalise stripping costs and attribute to reserves benefited in a systematic and rational manner; and ▪ capitalise stripping costs using a strip ratio. <p>The IFRIC noted that in general, mine development costs qualify for capitalisation and that where production stripping activities create a future benefit for the entity, the related costs would qualify for recognition as an asset, or as part of an asset.</p> <p>The IFRIC agreed that there is diversity in practice and this exists because the issue is not addressed in IFRSs and there is differing guidance in other frameworks e.g. US and Canadian GAAP. Further, as the issue is not going to be addressed in the IASB’s <i>Extractive Activities</i> project and the issue is sufficiently narrow in nature, the IFRIC decided to add it to its agenda (Nov 2009).</p> <p>The IFRIC reviewed and accepted a project plan which proposes the issuance of an interpretation in June 2010. The scope of the proposed interpretation was discussed and the following wording was decided on:</p> <p><i>“Accounting for the costs of removal of waste material in a surface mining activity during the production phase”</i> (January 2010).</p> <p>IFRIC Staff presented two papers for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a paper discussing the accounting for the costs of waste removal and the associated benefit; and ▪ a paper discussing the attribution of the stripping cost asset. <p>In respect of the costs of waste removal and the associated benefit, the IFRIC tentatively agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the benefit to the entity is that of improved access to the ore; ▪ the principle in IAS 16 <i>Property, Plant and Equipment</i> should apply, however whether the asset meets the definition of PPE or of an intangible asset will be decided at a future meeting; and ▪ the benefit should be allocated to current and future periods using the specific identification approach. <p>The IFRIC also tentatively agreed that the unit of account is the stripping campaign, and that the asset created should be attributed over the specific ore reserves that benefited from the stripping campaign (March 2010).</p> <p>The Committee considered a draft Interpretation and tentatively agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ where costs incurred as a result of a stripping campaign do not meet the definition of an asset, they shall be accounted for as inventory costs in the current period; ▪ when a stripping campaign creates a benefit of improved access, and this benefit meets the definition of an asset (the ‘stripping campaign component’), it is accounted for as an addition to, or enhancement of, an existing tangible 		

No	Project	History and Current Status	Next Steps	Timing
		<p>or intangible asset; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the stripping campaign component shall be specifically identified with the ore directly benefiting from the stripping campaign. This will also form the basis of its subsequent amortisation or depreciation. <p>Staff are to revise the draft Interpretation to reflect the Committee’s discussion and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ describing the concept of the ‘stripping campaign’, with the possible inclusion of an explanatory diagram; ▪ explaining the difference between ‘suspension’ of and ‘termination’ of a stripping campaign, for the purposes of determining how to account for any remaining carrying amount of the stripping campaign component in these circumstances; ▪ clarifying the transition guidance, especially when an entity is currently applying the strip ratio approach; and ▪ reflecting the results of additional outreach to determine the nature and extent of any disclosure requirements (May 2010). <p>Staff presented a revised draft Interpretation and a paper analysing various transition considerations for entities. The Committee tentatively agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a ‘stripping campaign’ should be defined as a systematic process undertaken to gain access to a specific section of the ore base, that is a more aggressive process than routine waste clearing activities. The stripping campaign is planned in advance and forms part of the mine plan. It will have a defined start date and it will end when the entity has completed the waste removal activity necessary to access the ore to which the campaign is associated; ▪ the Application Guidance should include a diagram illustrating the concepts of routine stripping and stripping undertaken as part of a stripping campaign; ▪ an entity should apply the draft Interpretation prospectively to costs incurred from the effective date; and ▪ the scope of the draft Interpretation should continue to include all production stripping costs, not limited to those incurred under a stripping campaign (July 2010). <p>In August 2010 the IASB published a Draft Interpretation <i>DI/2010/1 Stripping Costs in the Production Stage of a Surface Mine</i>. Comments are due to the IFRS Interpretations Committee by 30 November 2010.</p> <p>DI/2010/1 proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ capitalising production stripping costs that are part of a ‘stripping campaign’, as a component of the larger asset (i.e. the specific section of an ore body that becomes directly accessible as a result of the stripping campaign); ▪ depreciating/amortising the stripping campaign component over the expected useful life of the section of ore that becomes directly accessible as a result of the ‘stripping campaign’ (i.e. specific identification approach), based on the units of production method unless another method is 		

No	Project	History and Current Status	Next Steps	Timing
		<p>more appropriate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ accounting for routine stripping costs that are not incurred as part of a stripping campaign as a production cost in accordance with IAS 2 <i>Inventories</i>; and ▪ on transition, any existing stripping campaign component asset that cannot be directly associated with an identifiable section of the ore body and any existing stripping cost liability balances would be recognised in profit or loss at the beginning of the earliest period presented. 		
3	<p>Put options written over non-controlling interests</p> <p>IAS 27 <i>Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements</i></p>	<p>The Committee received a request to provide guidance on how an entity should account for changes in the carrying amount of a financial liability of a put option, written over shares held by a non-controlling interest shareholder, in the consolidated financial statements of a parent entity.</p> <p>The issue arises because of a potential conflict that the 2008 amendments to IFRS 3 <i>Business Combinations</i>, IAS 27 <i>Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements</i> and IAS 39 <i>Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement</i>, has created in the financial instrument guidance in IAS 32 <i>Financial Instruments: Presentation</i>, IAS 39 and the guidance in IAS 27.</p> <p>Some constituents believe, consistent with the guidance in IAS 32 and IAS 39 that because a financial liability is initially recognised for the NCI put, subsequent changes in its carrying amount should be recognised in profit and loss. However, other constituents believe changes in the carrying amount of the NCI put should be recognised in equity which is consistent with the guidance in IAS 27.</p> <p>The Committee decided to add the issue to the agenda and directed staff to develop a paper that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ includes illustrative examples of the issues discussed; and ▪ assesses the proposed scope of the project (May 2010). <p>The Committee discussed which components of the accounting for NCI puts should be included within the scope of the draft Interpretation and tentatively decided to include guidance for the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ initial recognition of NCI puts proposing that a financial liability should be recognised and initially measured at fair value (the present value of the redemption amount) of the NCI put; and ▪ subsequent measurement of NCI puts, proposing that changes in the carrying amount of a financial liability for a NCI put should be recognised in profit or loss in accordance with the guidance in IAS 39 (July 2010). 	<p>Staff to develop issues paper providing analysis of approach to initial recognition of NCI put. This analysis should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ consideration of the alternatives for the initial recognition of an NCI put; ▪ the implications of the NCI put being written as part of a business combination; and ▪ the interaction between changes in the carrying amount of the financial liability and changes in the amount, if any, that is recognised for NCI. 	Uncertain

Part B: Domestic Topics

No	Project	History and Current Status	Next Step	Timing
1	<i>Related Party Disclosures – Managed Investment Schemes (MIS)</i>	<p>AASB decided to refer the issue of whether an entity can be a key management person to the IFRIC (December 2007).</p> <p>AASB Chairman sent a letter to the IASB requesting the IASB to address this issue when considering the amendments to IAS 24 in relation to state-controlled entities and the definition of a related party.</p> <p>The IASB discussed <i>State-controlled Entities and the Definition of a Related Party</i> and decided not to consider in this project whether an entity can be a member of key management personnel (September 2008).</p> <p>It has recently emerged that the issue may also be a concern in New Zealand.</p> <p>A joint letter from the AASB and FRSB has been sent to the IASB requesting that the issue be reconsidered (July 2009).</p> <p>Received a letter from the IASB (see September 2009 Agenda paper 9.2.1) explaining that the issue was not going to be considered by the IASB in its current IAS 24 project as it was beyond the limited scope of the existing project. The letter suggests that the AASB/FRSB consider submitting the issue to the IFRIC (Aug 2009).</p> <p>The Board agreed that the issue should be circulated to National Standard Setters to determine if any other jurisdictions are experiencing the same issue (Sept 2009).</p> <p>The issue was discussed by NSS in April 2010 and the general view that emerged was that the definition of KMP related only to people, but that it would be impracticable in many cases to identify the compensation paid to KMP employed by another entity. Furthermore, the view was noted that a possible principle underlying the disclosure framework was that the information disclosed should be about the entity reporting, not information about other entities, and in certain circumstances it would be best to require disclosure of the fees paid to another entity as compensation. Accordingly the NSS agreed there is a sound basis for seeking to have the IASB amend IAS 24 to remove issues of impracticability and potentially inappropriate disclosures (April 2010).</p> <p>A joint letter from the AASB and FRSB (Agenda paper 17.3 of the AASB's June 2010 meeting) has been sent to the IASB requesting that the issue be addressed as an Annual Improvement (June 2010).</p> <p>The Committee recommended that the IASB amend, within Annual Improvements, the definition of a 'related party' in IAS 24 to clarify that a management entity that provides KMP services to a reporting entity is deemed to be identified as the relevant related party in respect of those KMP services. Consequently, the service fees paid by the reporting entity to the management entity would be disclosed (Sep 2010)</p>	None	Uncertain

2	<i>Non-Reporting Entities – Applicability of Standards</i>	The AASB considered a proposed agenda rejection statement, related issue proposal and submissions received. The AASB reconsidered a draft agenda decision from May 2007 and decided to defer any further action until the project on differential reporting is completed (June 2008).	Await outcome of differential reporting project.	Timing uncertain
---	---	--	--	------------------