

**International Financial Reporting Standard**

# **Improvements to IFRSs**

**May 2010**

**BASES FOR CONCLUSIONS – AMENDMENTS**

**[IFRS 1 & 7 and IAS 1 & 34 and IFRIC 13]**

**[Related to AASB 2010-4]**

International Financial Reporting Standards together with their accompanying documents are issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB).

**COPYRIGHT**

Copyright © 2010 International Accounting Standards Committee Foundation (IASCF).

Reproduction of this extract within Australia in unaltered form (retaining this notice) is permitted for non-commercial use subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgment of the IASCF's copyright.

All other rights reserved. Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and rights for commercial purposes within Australia or for any purpose outside Australia should be addressed to the International Accounting Standards Committee Foundation at [www.iasb.org](http://www.iasb.org).

## **Amendments to Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 1 *First-time Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards***

Paragraphs BC46A, BC46B and BC47F–BC47K, a heading after paragraph BC96 and paragraph BC97 are added.
---

### **Opening IFRS balance sheet**

---

#### **Exemptions from other IFRSs**

##### **Deemed cost**

- BC46A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board extended the scope of paragraph D8 for the use of the deemed cost exemption for an event-driven fair value. In some jurisdictions, local law requires an entity to revalue its assets and liabilities to fair value for a privatisation or initial public offering (IPO) and to treat the revalued amounts as deemed cost for the entity's previous GAAP. Before the amendment made in May 2010, if that revaluation occurred after the entity's date of transition to IFRSs, the entity could not have used that revaluation as deemed cost for IFRSs. Therefore, the entity would have had to prepare two sets of measurements for its assets and liabilities—one to comply with IFRSs, and one to comply with local law. The Board considered this unduly onerous. Therefore, the Board amended paragraph D8 to allow an entity to recognise an event-driven fair value measurement as deemed cost when the event occurs, provided that this is during the periods covered by its first IFRS financial statements. In addition, the Board concluded that the same relief should apply to an entity that adopted IFRSs in periods before the effective date of IFRS 1 or applied IFRS 1 in a previous period, provided the measurement date is within the period covered by its first IFRS financial statements.
- BC46B The Board also decided to require the entity to present historical costs or other amounts already permitted by IFRS 1 for the periods before that date. In this regard, the Board considered an approach where an entity could 'work back' to the deemed cost on the date of transition, using the revaluation amounts obtained on the measurement date, adjusted to exclude any depreciation, amortisation or impairment between the two dates. Although some believed that this presentation would have provided greater comparability throughout the first IFRS reporting

period, the Board rejected it because making such adjustments would require hindsight and the computed carrying amounts on the date of transition to IFRSs would be neither the historical costs of the revalued assets nor their fair values on that date.

- BC47F In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board extended the use of the deemed cost exemption to entities with operations subject to rate regulation. An entity might have items of property, plant and equipment or intangible assets that it holds for use in operations subject to rate regulation, or that it once used for this purpose and now holds for other purposes. Under previous GAAP, an entity might have capitalised, as part of the carrying amount of items of property, plant and equipment or intangible assets held for use in operations subject to rate regulation, amounts that do not qualify for capitalisation under IFRSs. For example, when setting rates regulators often permit entities to capitalise, as part of the cost of property, plant and equipment or intangible assets acquired, constructed or produced over time, an allowance for the cost of financing the asset's acquisition, construction or production. This allowance typically includes an imputed cost of equity. IFRSs do not permit an entity to capitalise an imputed cost of equity.
- BC47G Before this amendment, an entity with such items whose carrying amounts include amounts that do not qualify for capitalisation under IFRSs would have had either to restate those items retrospectively to remove the non-qualifying amounts, or to use the exemption in paragraph D5 (fair value as deemed cost). Both of those alternatives pose significant practical challenges, the cost of which can often outweigh the benefit.
- BC47H Typically, once amounts are included in the total cost of an item of property, plant and equipment, they are no longer tracked separately. The restatement of property, plant and equipment to remove amounts not in compliance with IFRSs would require historical information that, given the typical age of some of the assets involved, is probably no longer available and would be difficult to estimate. Obtaining the fair value information necessary to use the exemption in paragraph D5 may not be a practical alternative, given the lack of readily available fair value information for those assets.
- BC47I The Board decided it would permit entities with operations subject to rate regulation to use as deemed cost at the date of transition to IFRSs the carrying amount of the items of property, plant and equipment or intangible assets determined under the entity's previous GAAP. The Board views this exemption as consistent with the exemptions already

included in IFRS 1 in that it avoids excessive costs while meeting the objectives of the IFRS.

- BC47J The Board understands that most first-time adopters with operations subject to rate regulation have previously accounted for property, plant and equipment largely in accordance with a historical cost model consistent with IAS 16. The Board concluded that the cost and effort required to achieve total compliance in this area for the purposes of preparing an entity's first IFRS financial statements is not warranted to meet the objective of providing a suitable starting point for accounting under IFRSs. IFRS 1 requires that each item for which the exemption is used is tested for impairment, either individually or at the cash-generating unit to which the item belongs in accordance with IAS 36, at the date of transition. This requirement provides further assurance that this objective is met.
- BC47K Consistent with the Board's rationale for the use of fair value as deemed cost in paragraphs BC43 and BC44, this exemption means that an entity will report the same cost data as if it had acquired an asset with the same remaining service potential for that amount at the date of transition to IFRSs. An entity's use of this exemption results in a new cost basis for the item and previous GAAP depreciation methods and capitalisation policies are not relevant. Thus, if an entity uses this exemption for items of property, plant and equipment or intangible assets, it does not also apply the exemption for borrowing costs provided in paragraph D23.

## **Presentation and disclosure**

---

### **Interim financial reports**

#### **Accounting policy changes in the year of adoption**

- BC97 In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board clarified unclear wording concerning how changes in accounting policies should be addressed by a first-time adopter when those changes occur after the publication of the entity's first interim financial report. The Board decided that a first-time adopter is exempt from all the requirements of IAS 8 for the interim financial report it presents in accordance with IAS 34 for part of the period covered by its first IFRS financial statements and for its first IFRS financial statements. The Board concluded that to comply with IFRS 1's requirement to explain its transition to IFRSs, an entity should be required to explain any changes in its accounting policies or the IFRS 1

exemptions it applied between its first IFRS interim financial report and its first IFRS financial statements. The Board decided that the most useful information it could require was updated reconciliations between previous GAAP and IFRSs.

## **Amendments to Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures***

After paragraph BC42, a heading and paragraph BC42A are added. Paragraphs BC47A and BC49A are added. After paragraph BC54, a heading and paragraph BC54A are added. Paragraphs BC55A and BC56A are added.

### **Interaction between qualitative and quantitative disclosures (paragraph 32A)**

- BC42A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board addressed a perceived lack of clarity in the intended interaction between the qualitative and quantitative disclosures of the nature and extent of risks arising from financial instruments. The Board emphasised the interaction between qualitative and quantitative disclosures about the nature and extent of risks arising from financial instruments. This enables users to link related disclosures and hence form an overall picture of the nature and extent of risks arising from financial instruments. The Board concluded that an explicit emphasis on the interaction between qualitative and quantitative disclosures will contribute to disclosure of information in a way that better enables users to evaluate an entity's exposure.
- BC47A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board removed the reference to materiality from paragraph 34(b) of IFRS 7. The Board noted that the reference could imply that disclosures in IFRS 7 are required even if those disclosures are not material, which was not the Board's intention.
- BC49A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board enhanced consistency within IFRS 7 by clarifying that the disclosure requirement in paragraph 36(a) applies only to financial assets whose carrying amounts do not show the reporting entity's maximum exposure to credit risk. Such an approach is consistent with the approach taken in paragraph 29(a), which states that disclosure of fair value is not required when the carrying amount is a reasonable approximation of fair value. Moreover, the Board concluded that the requirement might be duplicative for assets that are presented in the statement of financial position because the carrying amount of these assets often represents the maximum exposure to credit risk. In the Board's view, the disclosure requirement should focus on the entity's exposure to credit risk that is not already reflected in the statement of financial position.

### **Financial assets with renegotiated terms (paragraph 36(d))**

- BC54A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board addressed a practical concern relating to the disclosure requirements for renegotiated financial assets. The Board deleted the requirement in paragraph 36(d) to disclose the carrying amount of financial assets that would otherwise be past due or impaired whose terms have been renegotiated. The Board considered the difficulty in identifying financial assets whose terms have been renegotiated to avoid becoming past due or impaired (rather than for other commercial reasons). The Board noted that the original requirement was unclear about whether the requirement applies only to financial assets that were renegotiated in the current reporting period or whether past negotiations of those assets should be considered. Moreover, the Board was informed that commercial terms of loans are often renegotiated regularly for reasons that are not related to impairment. In practice it is difficult, especially for a large portfolio of loans, to ascertain which loans were renegotiated to avoid becoming past due or impaired.
- BC55A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board addressed a concern that the disclosure of the fair value of collateral was potentially misleading. Within a class of assets some might be over-collateralised while others might be under-collateralised. Hence, aggregate disclosure of the fair value might be misleading. Therefore, the Board removed from paragraph 37(c) the requirement to disclose the fair value of collateral and other credit enhancements. However, the Board believes that information on the financial effect of such assets is useful to users. Hence, the Board included in paragraph 36(b) a requirement to disclose a description of collateral held as security and of other credit enhancements and to disclose their financial effect.
- BC56A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board enhanced consistency within IFRS 7 by clarifying that paragraph 38 requires entities to disclose the amount of foreclosed collateral held at the reporting date. This is consistent with the objective in IFRS 7 to disclose information that enables users to evaluate the nature and extent of risks arising from financial instruments to which the entity is exposed at the end of the reporting period.

## **Amendment to Basis for Conclusions on IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements***

After paragraph BC74 a heading and paragraph BC74A are added.
---

### **Statement of changes in equity**

---

#### **Reconciliation for each component of other comprehensive income (paragraphs 106(d)(ii) and 106A)**

BC74A Paragraph 106(d) requires an entity to provide a reconciliation of changes in each component of equity. In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board clarified that entities may present the required reconciliations for each component of other comprehensive income either in the statement of changes in equity or in the notes to the financial statements.



## **Addition of Basis for Conclusions on IAS 34 *Interim Financial Reporting***

A Basis for Conclusions on IAS 34 containing paragraphs BC1–BC4 is added.
---

### **Basis for Conclusions on IAS 34 *Interim Financial Reporting***

*This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, IAS 34.*

- BC1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises the International Accounting Standards Board's considerations in amending paragraphs 15–18 of IAS 34 *Interim Financial Reporting* as part of *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010. Those changes aim to emphasise the disclosures principles in IAS 34 and to add further guidance to illustrate how to apply these principles.
- BC2 IAS 34 was developed by the International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) in 1998 and did not include a Basis for Conclusions.

### **Significant events and transactions**

---

- BC3 In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board addressed requests for clarification of the disclosures required by IAS 34 when considered against changes in the disclosure requirements of other IFRSs. IAS 34 was issued by the Board's predecessor body, IASC, in 1998. In the light of recent improvements to disclosure requirements, many users of financial statements asked the Board to consider whether particular disclosures required by IFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures* for annual financial statements should also be required in interim financial statements. IAS 34 sets out disclosure principles to determine what information should be disclosed in an interim financial report. The Board concluded that amending IAS 34 to place greater emphasis on those principles and the inclusion of additional examples relating to more recent disclosure requirements, ie fair value measurements, would improve interim financial reporting.
- BC4 As part of *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board deleted paragraph 18 of IAS 34 because it repeats paragraph 10 of IAS 34 and because the Board's intention is to emphasise those disclosures that are required rather than those that are not required.

## **Amendment to Basis for Conclusions on IFRIC 13 *Customer Loyalty Programmes***

A heading is added after paragraph BC14 and paragraph BC14A is added.
---

### **Measuring the fair value of award credits**

BC14A In *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2010, the Board addressed unclear wording that could lead to divergent interpretations of the term ‘fair value’ in the application guidance for IFRIC 13. The Board was made aware that paragraph AG2 could be interpreted to mean that the fair value of award credits is equal to the fair value of redemption awards because the term ‘fair value’ is used to refer to both the value of the award credits and the value of the awards for which the credits could be redeemed. To address this, the Board amended paragraph AG2 and Example 1 in the illustrative examples. The amendment clarifies that when the fair value of award credits is measured on the basis of the value of the awards for which they could be redeemed, the fair value of the award credits should take account of expected forfeitures as well as the discounts or incentives that would otherwise be offered to customers who have not earned award credits from an initial sale.