

## **International Accounting Standard IAS 17**

# **Leases**

**January 2012**

*(incorporating amendments from IFRSs issued up to 31 December 2011, including those with an effective date after 1 January 2012)*

### **BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS**

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

#### **COPYRIGHT**

Copyright © 2012 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](http://www.ifrs.org).

## Basis for Conclusions on IAS 17 Leases

*This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, IAS 17.*

### Introduction

---

- BC1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises the International Accounting Standards Board's considerations in reaching its conclusions on revising IAS 17 *Leases* in 2003. Individual Board members gave greater weight to some factors than to others.
- BC2 In July 2001 the Board announced that, as part of its initial agenda of technical projects, it would undertake a project to improve a number of Standards, including IAS 17. The project was undertaken in the light of queries and criticisms raised in relation to the Standards by securities regulators, professional accountants and other interested parties. The objectives of the Improvements project were to reduce or eliminate alternatives, redundancies and conflicts within existing Standards, to deal with some convergence issues and to make other improvements. In May 2002 the Board published its proposals in an Exposure Draft of *Improvements to International Accounting Standards*, with a comment deadline of 16 September 2002. The Board received over 160 comment letters on the Exposure Draft.
- BC3 Because the Board's intention was not to reconsider the fundamental approach to the accounting for leases established by IAS 17, this Basis for Conclusions does not discuss requirements in IAS 17 that the Board has not reconsidered.

### Classification of leases—leases of land and buildings (2003 amendment)

---

- BC4 Paragraph 14 of the Standard requires a lease of land with an indefinite economic life to be normally classified as an operating lease, unless title is expected to pass to the lessee by the end of the lease term. The previous version of IAS 17 (as amended in 2000) was not explicit about how to classify a lease of land and buildings.
- BC5 This is a matter of concern in countries where property rights are obtained under long-term leases and the substance of those leases differs little from buying a property. Therefore, the Board decided to deal with this matter in its Improvements project in 2001 and not to defer its resolution until the more fundamental project on leases was completed.
- BC6 The Board noted that two approaches are applied in practice. The first is to treat such a lease as a single unit and to classify it as an operating lease in its entirety. The second is to split the lease into two elements—a lease of land and a lease of buildings. The Board decided that the first approach does not adequately reflect

the assets controlled by the entity or their usage and financing. It is also inconsistent with the classification and the measurement of other leases. Therefore, the Board rejected the first approach of classifying a lease of land and buildings as an operating lease in its entirety.

- BC7 The Board agreed on the second approach of splitting the lease into two elements—a lease of land and a lease of buildings. The land element would normally be classified as an operating lease in accordance with paragraph 14 of the revised Standard and the buildings element classified as an operating or finance lease by applying the conditions in paragraphs 7–13. The Board noted that generally accepted accounting principles in Australia, Canada and the United States all explicitly require a lease of land and buildings to be split into two elements.
- BC8 The Board also discussed a third approach, namely whether to delete the requirement (in paragraph 14 of the Standard) normally to classify a lease of land as an operating lease when title does not pass at the end of the lease and to require such a lease to be classified as a finance lease when all other conditions for finance lease classification in the Standard are met. The Board noted that such an accounting treatment would conflict with the criteria for lease classification in the Standard, which are based on the extent to which the risks and rewards incidental to ownership of a leased asset lie with the lessor or the lessee. Indeed, land normally has an indefinite economic life and hence there are significant risks and rewards associated with the land at the end of the lease term, which do not pass to the lessee. Therefore, the Board rejected this approach when issuing the amendments to IAS 17 in December 2003.

### **Land element in long-term leases (2009 amendment)<sup>1</sup>**

- BC8A As part of its annual improvements project in 2007, the Board reconsidered the decisions it made in 2003, specifically the perceived inconsistency between the general lease classification guidance in paragraphs 7–13 and the specific lease classification guidance in paragraphs 14 and 15 related to long-term leases of land and buildings. The Board concluded that the guidance in paragraphs 14 and 15 might lead to a conclusion on the classification of land leases that does not reflect the substance of the transaction.
- BC8B For example, consider a 999-year lease of land and buildings. In this situation, significant risks and rewards associated with the land during the lease term would have been transferred to the lessee despite there being no transfer of title.
- BC8C The Board noted that the lessee in leases of this type will typically be in a position economically similar to an entity that purchased the land and buildings. The present value of the residual value of the property in a lease with a term of several decades would be negligible. The Board concluded that the accounting for the land element as a finance lease in such circumstances would be consistent with the economic position of the lessee.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraphs BC8A–BC8F were added as a consequence of amendments to IAS 17 made by *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in April 2009.

- BC8D The Board noted that this amendment reversed the decision it made in amending IAS 17 in December 2003. The Board also noted that the amendment differed from the International Financial Reporting Interpretations Committee's agenda decision in March 2006 based on the IAS 17 guidance that such long-term leases of land would be classified as an operating lease unless title or significant risks and rewards of ownership passed to the lessee, irrespective of the term of the lease. However, the Board believed that this change improves the accounting for leases by removing a rule and an exception to the general principles applicable to the classification of leases.
- BC8E Some respondents to the exposure draft proposing this amendment agreed with the direction of this proposal but suggested that it should be incorporated into the Board's project on leases. The Board acknowledged that the project on leases is expected to produce a standard in 2011. However, the Board decided to issue the amendment now because of the improvement in accounting for leases that would result and the significance of this issue in countries in which property rights are obtained under long-term leases. Therefore, the Board decided to remove this potential inconsistency by deleting the guidance in paragraphs 14 and 15.
- BC8F Some respondents raised concerns about the proposed requirement to apply the amendment retrospectively. The land and buildings elements of a long-term finance lease may have different amortisation bases. Accordingly, entities must obtain relative fair values even when both elements are classified as finance leases. The Board noted that this information should already be available because entities would have had to obtain it to adopt the 2003 amendment to IAS 17 that required the split between land and buildings elements for the purposes of lease classification. However, the Board acknowledged that the fair values at the inception of the leases might not be available in some situations. The Board noted that determining the fair value of the land element at the inception of long-term leases in these instances would require the use of hindsight and might not achieve comparability. Accordingly, the Board decided not to require retrospective application when the necessary information is not available. The Board also rejected prospective application of the amendment because the land element in existing long-term leases would be accounted for inconsistently. Therefore, the Board decided to adopt the modified retrospective transition requirement in paragraph 68A of IAS 17.

### **Allocation of minimum lease payments between land and buildings**

- BC9 The Exposure Draft proposed that the allocation of the minimum lease payments between land and buildings should be made in proportion to their relative fair values at the inception of the lease. Respondents to the Exposure Draft questioned whether the allocation basis referred to the land and buildings components of the fair value of the property or the fair value of those components to the extent they were the subject of the lease.
- BC10 The Board noted that an allocation of the minimum lease payments by reference to the relative fair values of the land and buildings would not reflect the fact that land often has an indefinite economic life, and therefore would be expected to maintain its value beyond the lease term. In contrast, the future economic

benefits of a building are likely to be used up, at the least to some extent, over the lease term. Therefore, it would be reasonable to expect that the lease payments relating to the building would be set at a level that enabled the lessor not only to make a return on initial investment, but also to recoup the value of the building used up over the term of the lease. In the case of land, the lessor would not normally need compensation for using up the land.

- BC11 Therefore, the Board decided to clarify in the Standard that the allocation of the minimum lease payments is weighted to reflect their role in compensating the lessor, and not by reference to the relative fair values of the land and buildings. In other words, the weighting should reflect the lessee's leasehold interest in the land and the buildings. In the extreme case that a building is fully depreciated over the lease term, the minimum lease payments would need to be weighted to provide a return plus the full depreciation of the building's value at the inception of the lease. The leasehold interest in the land would, assuming a residual value that equals its value at the inception of the lease, have a weighting that reflects only a return on the initial investment.

### **Impracticability of split between land and buildings**

- BC12 A question that arises is how to treat leases for which it is not possible to measure the two elements reliably (eg because similar land and buildings are not sold or leased separately). One possibility would be to classify the entire lease as a finance lease. This would prevent a lessee from avoiding finance lease treatment for the buildings by asserting that it cannot separately measure the two elements. However, it may be apparent from the circumstances that classifying the entire lease as a finance lease is not representationally faithful. In view of this, the Board decided that when it is not possible to measure the two elements reliably, the entire lease should be classified as a finance lease unless it is clear that both elements should be classified as an operating lease.

### **Exception to the requirement to separate the land and buildings elements**

- BC13 The Board discussed whether to allow or require an exception from the requirement to separate the land and buildings elements in cases in which the present value of the land element at the inception of the lease is small in relation to the value of the entire lease. In such cases the benefits of separating the lease into two elements and accounting for each separately may not outweigh the costs. The Board noted that generally accepted accounting principles in Australia, Canada and the United States allow or require such leases to be classified and accounted for as a single unit, with finance lease treatment being used when the relevant criteria are met. The Board decided to allow land and buildings to be treated as a single unit when the land element is immaterial.
- BC14 Some respondents to the Exposure Draft requested guidance on how small the relative value of the land element needs to be in relation to the total value of the lease. The Board decided not to introduce a bright line such as a specific percentage threshold. The Board decided that the normal provisions on materiality should apply.

## **Transitional provisions**

---

- BC15 The Board decided that the requirement to separate the land and buildings elements in a lease of land and buildings should be applied retrospectively. It noted that there will be cases when it will be impracticable to reassess the treatment of these leases retrospectively, because doing so requires estimating what the fair value of the two elements was at the inception of the lease, which may have been many years before. The Board also noted that IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors* contains guidance on when it is impracticable to apply retrospectively a change in accounting policy and therefore decided not to provide specific transitional provisions for the implementation of this revision to IAS 17.

## **Inception of the lease and commencement of the lease term**

---

- BC16 The previous version of IAS 17 did not define the commencement of the lease term. It implicitly assumed that commencement (when the lease begins) and inception (when the agreement is entered into) are simultaneous. Some respondents questioned what should happen if there is a time lag between the two dates, particularly if the amounts change—for example, because the asset is under construction and the final cost is not known at inception. The Standard now specifies that recognition takes place at commencement, based on values measured at inception. However, if the lease is adjusted for changes in the lessor's costs between the inception of the lease and the commencement of the lease term, the effect of any such changes is deemed to have taken place at inception. These revisions are consistent with generally accepted accounting principles in Australia, Canada and the United States, and are consistent with the present accounting treatment of most ordinary purchases and sales.
- BC17 In agreeing on this treatment, the Board noted that measurement at commencement would have been more satisfactory in principle. However, this cannot be done properly within the framework of IAS 17 because the Standard generally requires a finance lease receivable or payable to be recognised at an amount based on the fair value of the asset, which is inappropriate at any date after inception.

## **Leases in the financial statements of lessors other than manufacturers and dealers**

---

- BC18 Lessors may incur direct costs in negotiating a lease, such as commissions, brokers' fees and legal fees. The previous version of IAS 17 contained a choice on how to account for such costs—they might be either charged as an expense as incurred or allocated over the lease term. The choice of treatment applied to operating and finance leases. In the case of a finance lease, paragraph 33 of the previous version of IAS 17 stated that allocation over the lease term might be achieved by recognising the cost as an expense and, in the same period, recognising an equal amount of unearned finance income.

## IAS 17 BC

- BC19 The Board decided that this treatment was not in accordance with the *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*.<sup>2</sup> Its effect was to recognise some future finance income as income and an asset at the commencement of the lease term. However, at that date, the *Framework's* definitions of income and assets are not met. Therefore, the Board decided that if direct costs incurred by lessors are to be allocated over the lease term, this should be achieved by including them in the carrying amount of the lease asset.
- BC20 The Board noted that standard-setters in Australia, Canada, France, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States either permit or require initial direct costs to be allocated over the lease term. The Board also noted that other Standards permit or require the recognition of a range of similar costs in the carrying amount of assets, generally subject to those costs being directly attributable to the acquisition of the asset in question. Hence, for reasons of convergence and comparability with other Standards, the Board decided to require initial direct costs to be included in the carrying amount of the lease asset.
- BC21 For consistency with other Standards, in particular IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*,<sup>3</sup> the Board decided that recognition in the carrying amount of assets should be restricted to costs that are incremental and directly attributable to negotiating and arranging a lease.

---

<sup>2</sup> IASC's *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements* was adopted by the IASB in 2001. In September 2010 the IASB replaced the *Framework* with the *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting*.

<sup>3</sup> In November 2009 and October 2010 the IASB amended some of the requirements of IAS 39 and relocated them to IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments*. IFRS 9 applies to all items within the scope of IAS 39. This paragraph refers to matters relevant when IAS 17 was issued.

## Dissenting opinion

### **Dissent of James J Leisenring from the amendment issued in April 2009**

- DO1 Mr Leisenring dissents from the amendment to IAS 17 *Leases* made by *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in April 2009.
- DO2 Mr Leisenring believes that the amendment inappropriately permits an accounting that does not reflect the economic position of the lessee. In his view, land normally has an indefinite economic life, unlike other properties with finite useful lives. Therefore, it is not the lessee's land at the end of the lease even if the lease term is 999 years. He does not believe that a lessee is in a position economically similar to the purchaser of the land. Any appreciation in the land value does not accrue to the lessee at the termination of the lease. Furthermore, it is unclear how long the lease term must be for the Board to conclude that a lessee and a purchaser are in the same economic position.
- DO3 This amendment also reverses the decision the Board made in amending IAS 17 in December 2003 and creates a divergence from US generally accepted accounting principles. Mr Leisenring agrees with some respondents that it is best to incorporate this amendment into the Board's broader project on lease accounting.