

International Financial Reporting Standard

Disclosures – Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities

December 2011

BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS – AMENDMENTS

[IFRS 7]

[Related to AASB 2012-2]

International Financial Reporting Standards together with their accompanying documents are issued by the IFRS Foundation.

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2011 IFRS Foundation.

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 IFRS Foundation'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 IFRS Foundation at www.ifrs.org.

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

After paragraph BC5A, paragraph BC5B is added.

BC5B In January 2011 the IASB and the US national standard-setter, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), published the exposure draft *Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities*. This was in response to requests from users of financial statements and recommendations from the Financial Stability Board to achieve convergence of the boards' requirements for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities. The different requirements result in a significant difference between amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with IFRSs and amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with US GAAP, particularly for entities that have large amounts of derivative activities. The proposals in the exposure draft would have replaced the requirements for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities and would have established a common approach with the FASB. After considering the responses to the exposure draft, the boards decided to maintain their respective offsetting models. However, to meet the needs of users of financial statements, the boards agreed jointly on additional disclosures to enable users of financial statements to evaluate the effect or potential effect of netting arrangements, including rights of set-off associated with an entity's recognised financial assets and recognised financial liabilities, on the entity's financial position. *Disclosures—Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities* (Amendments to IFRS 7) was issued in December 2011 and is effective for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2013 and interim periods within those annual periods.

After paragraph BC24, headings and paragraphs BC24A–BC24AL are added.

Offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities

Background

BC24A Following requests from users of financial statements and recommendations from the Financial Stability Board, in June 2010 the IASB and the FASB added a project to their respective agendas to improve and potentially achieve convergence of the requirements for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities. The different requirements result in a significant difference between amounts presented in

statements of financial position prepared in accordance with IFRSs and amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with US GAAP, particularly for entities that have large amounts of derivative activities.

- BC24B Consequently, in January 2011 the IASB and the FASB published the exposure draft *Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities*. The exposure draft proposed common offsetting requirements for IFRSs and US GAAP and proposed disclosures about financial assets and financial liabilities that are subject to rights of set-off and related arrangements.
- BC24C Most respondents to the exposure draft supported the boards' efforts towards achieving convergence, but their responses to the proposals varied. Many IFRS preparers agreed with the proposals, stating that the underlying principle and proposed criteria were similar to those in IAS 32 and reflect an entity's credit and liquidity exposure to such instruments. Some US GAAP preparers indicated that offsetting in the statement of financial position in accordance with the proposed criteria provided more relevant information than the current model, except for derivatives and repurchase or reverse repurchase agreements.
- BC24D There was no consensus among users of financial statements regarding if, or when, to present gross or net information in the statement of financial position. However, there was consensus that both gross and net information are useful and necessary for analysing financial statements. Users of financial statements supported achieving convergence of the IFRS and US GAAP requirements, and also supported improving disclosures so that financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRSs and US GAAP would be more comparable. Comparable information is important to investors for calculating their ratios and performing their analyses.
- BC24E As a result of the feedback received on the exposure draft, the IASB and the FASB decided to maintain their respective offsetting models. However, the boards noted that requiring common disclosures of gross and net amounts of recognised financial instruments that are (a) set off in the statement of financial position and (b) subject to enforceable master netting arrangements and similar agreements, even if not set off in the statement of financial position, would be helpful for users of financial statements. Accordingly, the boards agreed on common disclosure requirements by amending and finalising the disclosures initially proposed in the exposure draft.

Scope (paragraph 13A)

- BC24F The disclosures in the exposure draft would have applied to all recognised financial assets and recognised financial liabilities subject to a right of set-off, and/or for which an entity had either received or pledged cash or other financial instruments as collateral.
- BC24G Respondents to the exposure draft noted that paragraphs 14, 15 and 36(b) of IFRS 7 already require disclosures of financial instrument collateral received and pledged and other credit enhancements. US GAAP has similar disclosure requirements. Consequently, if an entity has no financial assets or financial liabilities subject to a right of set-off (other than collateral agreements or credit enhancements), the boards concluded that there would be no incremental value in providing additional disclosure information for such instruments.
- BC24H For example, some respondents were concerned that providing disclosure of conditional rights to set off loans and customer deposits at the same financial institution would be a significant operational burden. Such rights are often a result of statute, and entities do not typically manage their credit risk related to such amounts based on these rights of set-off. In addition, entities that have contractual rights to set off customer deposits with loans only in situations such as events of default see these rights as a credit enhancement and not as the primary source of credit mitigation. Respondents argued that the cost of including these amounts in the amended disclosures would outweigh the benefit because users of financial statements did not request information related to these instruments when discussing the offsetting disclosure requirements.
- BC24I The boards agreed and decided to limit the scope of the disclosures to all financial instruments that meet the boards' respective offsetting models and recognised financial assets and recognised financial liabilities that are subject to an enforceable master netting arrangement or a similar agreement. The boards specifically excluded loans and customer deposits with the same financial institution from the scope of these requirements (except in the limited cases when the respective offsetting model is satisfied). This reduced scope still responds to the needs of users of financial statements for information about amounts that have been set off in accordance with IFRSs and amounts that have been set off in accordance with US GAAP. The types of instruments that fall within the scope of these disclosures include the instruments that cause significant differences between amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with IFRSs and amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with US GAAP.

- BC24J If there is an associated collateral agreement for such instruments, an entity would disclose amounts subject to such agreements in order to provide full information about its exposure in the normal course of business, as well as in the events of default and insolvency or bankruptcy.
- BC24K Other respondents requested that the scope of the proposed disclosures be further amended to exclude financial instruments for which the lender has the right to set off the related non-financial collateral in the event of default. Although non-financial collateral agreements may exist for some financial instruments, those preparers do not necessarily manage the credit risk related to such financial instruments on the basis of the non-financial collateral held.
- BC24L The disclosures focus on the effects of recognised financial instruments and financial instrument set-off agreements on an entity's financial position. The boards also noted that a comprehensive reconsideration of credit risk disclosures was not within the scope of this project. They therefore restricted the scope of the disclosures to exclude financial instruments with rights of set-off only for non-financial collateral.
- BC24M A few respondents were concerned that the proposals seem to be designed for financial institutions and would impose requirements on non-financial institutions. They questioned the benefit that such disclosures would provide to investors in non-financial entities.
- BC24N Although the boards acknowledged that financial institutions would be among those most affected, they did not agree that the disclosures are only relevant for financial institutions. Other industries have similar financial instrument activities and use enforceable master netting arrangements and similar agreements to mitigate exposure to credit risks. Consequently, the boards concluded that the required disclosures provide useful information about an entity's arrangements, irrespective of the nature of the entity's business.

Disclosure of quantitative information for recognised financial assets and recognised financial liabilities within the scope of paragraph 13A (paragraph 13C)

- BC24O The boards understood that recognised financial instruments included in the disclosure requirements in paragraph 13C of IFRS 7 may be subject to different measurement requirements. For example, a payable related to a repurchase agreement may be measured at amortised cost, while a derivative asset or derivative liability subject to the same disclosure requirements (for example, in paragraph 13C(a) of IFRS 7) will be

measured at fair value. In addition, the fair value amount of any financial instrument collateral received or pledged and subject to paragraph 13C(d)(ii) of IFRS 7 should be included in the disclosures to provide users of financial statements with the best information about an entity's exposure. Consequently, a financial asset or financial liability disclosure table may include financial instruments measured at different amounts. To provide users of financial statements with the information they need to evaluate the amounts disclosed in accordance with paragraph 13C of IFRS 7, the boards decided that an entity should describe any resulting measurement differences in the related disclosures.

Disclosure of the net amounts presented in the statement of financial position (paragraph 13C(c))

- BC24P When providing feedback on the proposals in the exposure draft, users of financial statements emphasised that information in the notes should be clearly reconciled back to the amounts in the statement of financial position. The boards therefore decided that if an entity determines that the aggregation or disaggregation of individual financial statement line item amounts provides more relevant information when disclosing amounts in accordance with paragraph 13C of IFRS 7, the entity must still reconcile the amounts disclosed in paragraph 13C(c) of IFRS 7 back to the individual line item amounts in the statement of financial position.

Disclosure of the amounts subject to an enforceable master netting arrangement or similar agreement that are not otherwise included in paragraph 13C(b) (paragraph 13C(d))

- BC24Q Paragraph 13C(d)(i) of IFRS 7 requires disclosure of amounts related to recognised financial instruments that do not meet some or all of the offsetting criteria in paragraph 42 of IAS 32. This may include current rights of set-off that do not meet the criterion in paragraph 42(b) of IAS 32, or conditional rights of set-off that are enforceable and exercisable only in the event of default, or only in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of any of the counterparties. Although such rights do not qualify for set-off in accordance with IAS 32, users of financial statements are interested in arrangements that an entity has entered into that mitigate the entity's exposure to such financial instruments in the normal course of business and/or in the events of default and insolvency or bankruptcy.

- BC24R Paragraph 13C(d)(ii) of IFRS 7 requires disclosure of amounts of cash and financial instrument collateral (whether recognised or unrecognised) that do not meet the criteria for offsetting in the statement of financial position but that relate to financial instruments within the scope of these disclosure requirements. Depending on the terms of the collateral arrangement, collateral will often reduce an entity's exposure in the events of default and insolvency or bankruptcy of a counterparty to the contract. Collateral received or pledged against financial assets and financial liabilities may often be liquidated immediately upon an event of default. Consequently, the boards concluded that the amounts of collateral that are not set off in the statement of financial position but that are associated with other netting arrangements should be included in the amounts disclosed as required by paragraph 13C(d)(ii) of IFRS 7.

*Limits on the amounts disclosed in paragraph 13C(d)
(paragraph 13D)*

- BC24S The boards concluded that an aggregate disclosure of the amount of cash collateral and/or the fair value of collateral in the form of other financial instruments would be misleading when some financial assets and financial liabilities are over-collateralised and others have insufficient collateral. To prevent an entity from inappropriately obscuring under-collateralised financial instruments with others that are over-collateralised, paragraph 13D of IFRS 7 restricts the amounts of cash and/or financial instrument collateral to be disclosed in respect of a recognised financial instrument to more accurately reflect an entity's exposure. However, if rights to collateral can be enforced across financial instruments, such rights can be included in the disclosure provided in accordance with paragraph 13D of IFRS 7. At no point in time should under-collateralisation be obscured.

Disclosure by type of financial instrument or by counterparty

- BC24T The exposure draft proposed disclosures by class of financial instrument. An entity would have been required to group financial assets and financial liabilities separately into classes that were appropriate to the nature of the information disclosed, taking into account the characteristics of those financial instruments and the applicable rights of set-off. Many preparers were concerned that the cost of disclosing amounts related to rights of set-off in the events of default and

insolvency or bankruptcy by class of financial instrument would outweigh the benefit. They also indicated that they often manage credit exposure by counterparty and not necessarily by class of financial instrument.

- BC24U Many users of financial statements indicated that disclosure of recognised amounts subject to enforceable master netting arrangements and similar agreements (including financial collateral) that were not set off in the statement of financial position would be useful irrespective of whether the amounts are disclosed by counterparty or by type or by class of financial instrument, as long as they can reconcile these amounts back to the statement of financial position. In evaluating whether the disclosures should be provided by type or by class of financial instrument or by counterparty, the boards noted that the objective of these disclosures (paragraph 13B of IFRS 7) is that an entity should disclose information to enable users of its financial statements to evaluate the effect or potential effect of netting arrangements on the entity's financial position.
- BC24V The boards decided to reduce the burden on preparers by requiring disclosure by type of financial instrument rather than by class. Disclosure by type of financial instrument may (or may not) differ from the class of financial instrument used for other disclosures in IFRS 7, but is appropriate in circumstances where a difference would better achieve the objective of the disclosures required by these amendments. The boards also decided to provide flexibility as to whether the information required by paragraph 13C(c)–(e) of IFRS 7 is presented by type of financial instrument or by counterparty. This would allow preparers to present the disclosures in the same way that they manage their credit exposure.
- BC24W The Board also noted that paragraph 31 of IFRS 7 requires an entity to disclose information that enables users of its financial statements 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. In addition, paragraph 34 of IFRS 7 requires the disclosure of concentrations of risk for each type of risk. Consequently, the Board noted that, irrespective of whether the disclosures were required to be provided by type or by class of financial instrument or by counterparty, entities are already required to disclose information about risks and how they are managed, including information about concentrations of credit risk.

*Other considerations***Reconciliation between IFRSs and US GAAP**

- BC24X Some users of financial statements asked for information to help them reconcile between the amounts set off in accordance with IFRSs and the amounts set off in accordance with US GAAP. The boards recognised that the amounts disclosed in accordance with paragraph 13C(b), (c) and (d) of IFRS 7 will probably be different for financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRSs and those prepared in accordance with US GAAP. However, the amounts disclosed in accordance with paragraph 13C(a) and (e) of IFRS 7 are generally not affected by the offsetting criteria applied in the statement of financial position. These amounts are important for users of financial statements to understand the effects of netting arrangements on an entity's financial position in the normal course of business and in the events of default and insolvency or bankruptcy.
- BC24Y Consequently, while the amended disclosure requirements do not directly reconcile the IFRS and US GAAP amounts, they provide both gross and net information on a comparable basis. The boards considered that requiring a full reconciliation between IFRSs and US GAAP was unnecessary, particularly given the relative costs and benefits. Such reconciliation would have required preparers to apply two sets of accounting requirements and to track any changes to the related accounting standards and to contracts in the related jurisdictions.

Tabular information

- BC24Z The disclosures require amounts to be presented in a tabular format (ie a table) unless another format is more appropriate. The boards believe that a tabular format best conveys an overall understanding of the effect of any rights of set-off and other related arrangements on an entity's financial position and improves the transparency of such information.

Transition and effective date

- BC24AA The boards identified two transition approaches in the exposure draft—prospective and retrospective.
- BC24AB Prospective transition is generally appropriate only in situations where it is not practicable to apply a standard to all prior periods. The boards did not believe that this was the case with the proposed disclosure requirements. Retrospective transition would require an entity to apply the new requirements to all periods presented. This would maximise

consistency of financial information between periods. Retrospective transition would enable analysis and understanding of comparative accounting information among entities. In addition, the scope of the disclosures was reduced and the disclosures amended to require less detailed information than originally proposed, which would make them less burdensome for preparers to apply retrospectively.

BC24AC The exposure draft did not propose an effective date, but instead asked respondents for information about the time and effort that would be involved in implementing the proposed requirements. The boards indicated that they would use such feedback, as well as the responses in their *Request for Views on Effective Dates and Transition Methods*, and the timing of other planned accounting and reporting standards, to determine an appropriate effective date for the proposals in the exposure draft.

BC24AD Some respondents suggested that the offsetting proposals should have the same effective date as the other components of the IASB's project to replace IAS 39 with IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments*. If an earlier date was required, it was suggested that application should be restricted only to the accounting period being presented, rather than providing comparative information, because of the potential burden of applying the proposed disclosure requirements.

BC24AE At the time the amended disclosure requirements were issued (December 2011), IFRS 9 was not yet mandatorily effective. However, the Board did not believe that the IFRS 9 project would change the offsetting disclosures. Aligning the effective date of these amendments with the effective date of the financial instruments project could result in postponing the effective date of the common disclosure requirements, which would mean a delay in providing users of financial statements the information that they need. For users of financial statements to benefit from the increased comparability, and because the offsetting and IFRS 9 projects are independent of one another, the boards decided that common disclosures should be effective as early as possible.

BC24AF In addition, the boards did not think that a long transition period was needed, because the amended disclosures had a reduced scope and less detailed information than originally proposed in the exposure draft and were related to the presentation of instruments that entities have already recognised and measured. The boards therefore decided that the effective date for the amended disclosures should be for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2013, and interim periods within those annual periods.

- BC24AG As described in greater detail in other sections of this Basis for Conclusions, the disclosures required by paragraphs 13B–13E of IFRS 7 are a result of requests from users of financial statements for information to enable them to compare statements of financial position prepared in accordance with IFRSs with statements of financial position prepared in accordance with US GAAP, particularly for entities that have large amounts of derivative activities.
- BC24AH The information required in paragraphs 13B–13E of IFRS 7 will enable users of financial statements to evaluate the effect or potential effect of netting arrangements, including rights of set-off associated with an entity's recognised financial assets and recognised financial liabilities, on the entity's financial position for financial statements presented in accordance with IFRSs and those presented in accordance with US GAAP.
- BC24AI The Board noted that paragraph 10(f) of IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements* requires an entity to provide a statement of financial position as at the beginning of the earliest comparative period when an entity applies an accounting policy retrospectively or makes a retrospective restatement of items in its financial statements, or when it reclassifies items in its financial statements. In the case of *Disclosures—Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities* (Amendments to IFRS 7), because the change relates only to disclosures and there is no associated change in accounting policy, or a resulting restatement or reclassification, it was noted that paragraph 10(f) of IAS 1 does not apply for these amendments to IFRS 7.

Cost-benefit considerations

- BC24AJ Before issuing an IFRS or an amendment to an IFRS, the Board seeks to ensure that it will meet a significant need and that the overall benefits of the resulting information justify the costs of providing it. As described in greater detail in other sections of this Basis for Conclusions on *Disclosures—Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities* (Amendments to IFRS 7), the Board considered that there is significant benefit to market participants in providing these disclosures. The disclosures address a significant difference between the amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with IFRSs and amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with US GAAP, particularly for entities that have large amounts of derivative activities. The disclosures therefore make the amounts presented in accordance with both sets of standards more comparable.

BC24AK During redeliberations, the Board considered feedback related to the costs of providing the disclosures proposed in the exposure draft. As described in greater detail in other sections of this Basis for Conclusions, the Board decided to limit the scope of the disclosures because these changes would reduce the cost to preparers while still providing the information that users of financial statements had requested.

BC24AL On the basis of the considerations described in the Basis for Conclusions on these amendments, and summarised in paragraphs BC24AJ and BC24AK, the Board concluded that the benefits of *Disclosures—Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities* (Amendments to IFRS 7) outweigh the costs to preparers of applying these amendments.