



DRSC e. V. • Zimmerstr. 30 • 10969 Berlin

Mr Hans Hoogervorst  
Chairman of the  
International Accounting Standards Board  
30 Cannon Street  
London EC4M 6XH  
United Kingdom

Telefon +49 (0)30 206412-12  
Telefax +49 (0)30 206412-15  
E-Mail info@drsc.de

Berlin, XX XXX 2012

06. Sitzung HGB-FA vom 02.11.2012  
06\_05a\_HGB-FA\_RFI-IFRS\_for\_SME\_DCL

Dear Hans

**IASB Request for Information RFI/2012/06 *Comprehensive Review of the IFRS for SMEs***

On behalf of the Accounting Standards Committee of Germany (ASCG), I am writing to comment on the Request for Information RFI/2012/06 *Comprehensive Review of the IFRS for SMEs* (herein referred to as 'RFI'). Our comments on the RFI are limited to the aspects that, different from full IFRSs adopted by the European Union (EU), there is no statutory regulation or incorporation of the *IFRS for SMEs* in the German Commercial Code or other national regulation in Germany and consequently no experience from German SMEs in the application of the standard. Nevertheless, we believe the *IFRS for SMEs* will have increasing influence on the future development of financial reporting standards for SMEs on a global level, including jurisdictions currently not using the *IFRS for SMEs*. In this context we appreciate the opportunity to contribute our view on the RFI and future development of the *IFRS for SMEs*.

We would like to specifically address the following issues:

**Assumptions of users and preparers of the *IFRS for SMEs***

- We encourage the IASB as a standard setter to depict more clearly the underlying assumption for developing and maintaining the SME standard in context of the users and preparers of SME financial statements, but not restricting the application of the *IFRS for SMEs* to specific entities. Setting the scope of entities that have to prepare and publish financial reports in accordance with a specific set of standards is a sovereign task of national authorities and regulators with the sovereign right to endorse and enforce those standards and national GAAP.
- In our view the departures from full IFRSs recognition and measurement concepts in the *IFRS for SMEs* are justified by the IASB on the basis of cost-benefit constraints and corresponding complexity concerns for SMEs. The scope criterion of non-public accountability as currently defined in the *IFRS for SMEs* does not appropriately reflect this



thinking in developing requirements in the *IFRS for SMEs*. If the IASB continue to define a scope criterion for entities, the criterion should better portrait the underlying assumption and justification of developing the SME standard and any guidance.

### **Review process and criteria to justify changes in the *IFRS for SMEs***

- We also think there are clarification needs on the timing of the review and due process activities for the *IFRS for SMEs*. Currently many unanswered questions arise in context of the comprehensive review process and the structure of the future omnibus reviews. Therefore we recommend the development of review criteria and a more formal structure of review activities.
- The review criteria should reflect the assumption that the *IFRS for SMEs* is considered as a self-contained document and any changes in full IFRS do not automatically trigger consequential changes in the SME standard. Changes in full IFRS are not justified in the *IFRS for SMEs* if the impact of those changes would be limited compared to existing requirements and guidance in the *IFRS for SMEs*. Furthermore, the criteria need to highlight and emphasize the high need of a stable platform and the inability of most SMEs to implement frequent changes of the requirements.
- In context of any final decision to change the full IFRSs we recommend that the IASB start timely discussion and conclude tentative views if and to what extent those changes in full IFRSs should also be reflected in the *IFRS for SMEs*. The tentative views should be collected and bundled over three years and published together as an omnibus exposure draft. This process would be similar to the current process of annual improvements, except replacing the annual cycle with a three year cycle.

Please find our detailed recommendations and comments on the questions raised in the RFI in the appendix to this letter.

If you would like to discuss our comments and recommendations further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

*Liesel Knorr*

President



## Appendix – Answers to the questions of the RFI

### **S1: Use by publicly traded entities (Section 1)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* currently prohibits an entity whose debt or equity instruments are traded in a public market from using the *IFRS for SMEs* (paragraph 1.3(a)). The IASB concluded that all entities that choose to enter a public securities market become publicly accountable and, therefore, should use full IFRSs.

Some interested parties believe that governments and regulatory authorities in each individual jurisdiction should decide whether some publicly traded entities should be eligible to use the *IFRS for SMEs* on the basis of their assessment of the public interest, the needs of investors in their jurisdiction and the capabilities of those publicly traded companies to implement full IFRSs.

#### **Are the scope requirements of the *IFRS for SMEs* currently too restrictive for publicly traded entities?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to prohibit an entity whose debt or equity instruments trade in a public market from using the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (b) Yes—revise the scope of the *IFRS for SMEs* to permit each jurisdiction to decide whether entities whose debt or equity instruments are traded in a public market should be permitted or required to use the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice (a), (b) or (c).

### **ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

In our view a similar question was part of a very detailed debate on the scope and the title of the standard before the IASB finalised the *IFRS for SMEs* in 2009. The IASB should provide more information whether those requests from interested parties to extend the scope of the *IFRS for SMEs* are different compared to previous debates.



In the past the IFRS Foundation, and the IASB as the technical body, emphasized its own role of being a private standard setter and not a regulator or enforcer of the standards. This included the position of the IASB not defining or limiting the scope of entities, the countries, and jurisdiction eligible to use the IFRSs. It seems that the IASB consider to depart from the role of developing financial reporting standard if it limits the compliance statement for standards to specific entities. Setting the scope of entities that have to prepare and publish financial reports in accordance with a specific set of standards is a sovereign task of national authorities and regulators with the sovereign right to endorse and enforce those standards and GAAP.

We encourage the IASB as a standard setter to depict clearly the underlying assumption for developing the SME standard in context of the users and preparers of SME financial statements but not limiting or restricting the application of the standard to specific entities. This should also include emphases of any differences of those assumptions compared to full IFRSs, especially on the differences of the user's needs and how the IASB justifies departure of recognition, measurement and presentation requirements in full IFRSs. We think national authorities and regulators are in a better position to determine the scope of entities in reflection of the national framework for capital markets and such description of user needs and cost-benefit constraints in the *IFRS for SMEs*.

According to the *IFRS for SMEs* (section 2.2) the objective of financial statements of a small or medium-sized entity is to provide information about the financial position, performance and cash flows of the entity that is useful for economic decision-making by a broad range of **users who are not in a position to demand reports tailored** [emphasis added] to meet their particular information needs. In our view this description of users and corresponding needs for information in the *IFRS for SMEs* is very similar to those user needs described in the full IFRSs. It is not obvious why capital providers who have no access to tailored information of the SME would have different needs compared to users acting as capital providers in public markets. Hence, the major difference between the *IFRS for SMEs* and full IFRSs seems to be cost-benefit constraints, especially the limited resources of the SMEs to prepare financial statements. In our view the IASB also focused on the cost-benefit and complexity issue during the development of the *IFRS for SMEs* and any justification to depart from recognition and measurement concepts developed in the full IFRSs. If these cost-benefit constraints would remain the major driver of any difference between full IFRS and the *IFRS for SMEs*, we doubt that public accountability as currently defined in the *IFRS for SMEs* is an appropriate criterion to reflect this difference.



## **S2: Use by financial institutions (Section 1)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* currently prohibits financial institutions and other entities that hold assets for a broad group of outsiders as one of their primary businesses from using the *IFRS for SMEs* (paragraph 1.3(b)). The IASB concluded that standing ready to take and hold funds from a broad group of outsiders makes those entities publicly accountable and, therefore, they should use full IFRSs. In every jurisdiction financial institutions are subject to regulation.

In some jurisdictions, financial institutions such as credit unions and micro banks are very small. Some believe that governments and regulatory authorities in each individual jurisdiction should decide whether some financial institutions should be eligible to use the *IFRS for SMEs* on the basis of their assessment of the public interest, the needs of investors in their jurisdiction and the capabilities of those financial institutions to implement full IFRSs.

### **Are the scope requirements of the *IFRS for SMEs* currently too restrictive for financial institutions and similar entities?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to prohibit all financial institutions and other entities that hold assets for a broad group of outsiders as one of their primary businesses from using the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (b) Yes—revise the scope of the *IFRS for SMEs* to permit each jurisdiction to decide whether any financial institutions and other entities that hold assets for a broad group of outsiders as one of their primary businesses should be permitted or required to use the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (c) Other—please explain.

### **ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

We think this question is similar to question S1 and refer to our response above.



### **S3: Clarification of use by not-for-profit entities (Section 1)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* is silent on whether not-for-profit (NFP) entities (eg charities) are eligible to use the *IFRS for SMEs*. Some interested parties have asked whether soliciting and accepting contributions would automatically make an NFP entity publicly accountable. The *IFRS for SMEs* specifically identifies only two types of entities that have public accountability and, therefore, are not eligible to use the *IFRS for SMEs*:

- those that have issued debt or equity securities in public capital markets; and
- those that hold assets for a broad group of outsiders as one of their primary businesses.

#### **Should the *IFRS for SMEs* be revised to clarify whether an NFP entity is eligible to use it?**

- (a) Yes—clarify that soliciting and accepting contributions does not automatically make an NFP entity publicly accountable. An NFP entity can use the *IFRS for SMEs* if it otherwise qualifies under Section 1.
- (b) Yes—clarify that soliciting and accepting contributions will automatically make an NFP entity publicly accountable. As a consequence, an NFP entity cannot use the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (c) No—do not revise the *IFRS for SMEs* for this issue.
- (d) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b), (c) or (d).

#### **ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

Generally we do not think there is a need for clarification whether not-for-profit entities are eligible to use the *IFRS for SMEs*. Furthermore, the Basis for Conclusions in paragraph BC57 (b) already indicates that soliciting and accepting contributions does not automatically make an NFP entity publicly accountable. However, if the IASB receives on a frequent basis clarification requests on this issue, we recommend changing the *IFRS for SMEs* for clarification purpose only. The IASB should consider whether clarification in the Basis for Conclusions would be sufficient in order to limit the number of changes to the *IFRS for SMEs* overall. Furthermore, we refer to our response to question S1.

*IFRS for SMEs* BC57 (b) states: “The exposure draft had proposed that any entity that holds assets in a fiduciary capacity for a broad group of outsiders should not be eligible to use the *IFRS for SMEs*. Respondents noted that entities often hold assets in a fiduciary capacity for



*reasons incidental to their primary business (as, for example, may be the case for travel or real estate agents, schools, charitable organisations, co-operative enterprises and utility companies). The IFRS for SMEs clarifies that those circumstances do not result in an entity having public accountability.”*

#### **S4: Consideration of recent changes to the consolidation guidance in full IFRSs (Section 9)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* establishes control as the basis for determining which entities are consolidated in the consolidated financial statements. This is consistent with the current approach in full IFRSs.

Recently, full IFRSs on this topic have been updated by IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements*, which replaced IAS 27 *Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements* (2008). IFRS 10 includes additional guidance on applying the control principle in a number of situations, with the intention of avoiding divergence in practice. The guidance will generally affect borderline cases where it is difficult to establish if an entity has control (ie, most straightforward parent-subsidary relationships will not be affected). Additional guidance is provided in IFRS 10 for:

- agency relationships, where one entity legally appoints another to act on its behalf. This guidance is particularly relevant to investment managers that make decisions on behalf of investors. Fund managers and entities that hold assets for a broad group of outsiders as a primary business are generally outside the scope of the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- control with less than a majority of the voting rights, sometimes called ‘de facto control’ (this principle is already addressed in paragraph 9.5 of the *IFRS for SMEs* but in less detail than in IFRS 10).
- assessing control where potential voting rights exist, such as options, rights or conversion features that, if exercised, give the holder additional voting rights (this principle is already addressed in paragraph 9.6 of the *IFRS for SMEs* but in less detail than in IFRS 10).

The changes above will generally mean that more judgement needs to be applied in borderline cases and where more complex relationships exist.

#### **Should the changes outlined above be considered, but modified as appropriate to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and cost-benefit considerations?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to use the current definition of control and the guidance on its application in Section 9. They are appropriate for SMEs, and SMEs have been able to implement the definition and guidance without





problems.

- (b) Yes—revise the *IFRS for SMEs* to reflect the main changes from IFRS 10 outlined above (modified as appropriate for SMEs).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* should be a self-contained document and high priority should be dedicated to the stable platform notion. Frequent changes in the SME standard would be burdensome for preparers as well as users. For preparers cost do not only occur from potential modification of the information system to be capable to compile information, cost for preparers also arise from communication and education of those changes and the impact for SME financial statements to users.

There should be no automatic amendment process for the *IFRS for SMEs* arising from changes in recognition, measurement and presentation requirements in full IFRSs. Nevertheless, the conceptual spread between full IFRSs and the *IFRS for SMEs* should be limited and only extend to a level that can be justified in difference of user needs and cost-benefit constraints between both standards. In this context, we recommend developing review criteria for a better understanding when changes in full IFRSs should also be considered in the *IFRS for SMEs*. These criteria should reflect the assumption that changes to the *IFRS for SMEs* are only necessary if a demonstrated need for improvement of SMEs financial statements exists. The review criteria would also enhance transparency of the review process (see further comments and suggestions for the timing and structure of the review process in our response to question G5).

**S5: Use of recognition and measurement provisions in full IFRSs for financial instruments (Section 11)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* currently permits entities to choose to apply either (paragraph 11.2):

- the provisions of both Sections 11 and 12 in full; or
- the recognition and measurement provisions of IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* and the disclosure requirements of Sections 11 and 12.

In paragraph BC106 of the Basis for Conclusions issued with the *IFRS for SMEs*, the IASB





lists its reasons for providing SMEs with the option to use IAS 39. This is the only time that the *IFRS for SMEs* specifically permits the use of full IFRSs. One of the main reasons for this option is that the IASB concluded that SMEs should be permitted to have the same accounting policy options as in IAS 39, pending completion of its comprehensive financial instruments project to replace IAS 39. That decision is explained in more detail in paragraph BC106.

IAS 39 will be replaced by IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments*. Any amendments to the *IFRS for SMEs* from this comprehensive review would most probably be effective at a similar time to the effective date of IFRS 9. The *IFRS for SMEs* refers specifically to IAS 39. SMEs are not permitted to apply IFRS 9.

**How should the current option to use IAS 39 in the *IFRS for SMEs* be updated once IFRS 9 has become effective?**

- (a) There should be no option to use the recognition and measurement provisions in either IAS 39 or IFRS 9. All SMEs must follow the financial instrument requirements in Sections 11 and 12 in full.
- (b) Allow entities the option of following the recognition and measurement provisions of IFRS 9 (with the disclosure requirements of Sections 11 and 12).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**Note:** the purpose of this question is to assess your overall view on whether the fallback to full IFRSs in Sections 11 and 12 should be removed completely, should continue to refer to an IFRS that has been superseded, or should be updated to refer to a current IFRS. It does not ask respondents to consider whether any of the recognition and measurement principles of IFRS 9 should result in amendments of the *IFRS for SMEs* at this stage, because the IASB has several current agenda projects that are expected to result in changes to IFRS 9 (see paragraph 13 of the Introduction to this Request for Information).

**ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

Similar to our response to question S4 we think the *IFRS for SMEs* should be a self-contained document, and a linkage to full IFRSs for recognition, measurement and presentation is undesirable. If there is a clear need for improvement in Sections 11 and 12 that is or will be addressed in IFRS 9 and IAS 39 related projects, the IASB should incorporate those improvements into the *IFRS for SMEs* as appropriate to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and cost-benefit constraints.



**S6: Guidance on fair value measurement for financial and non-financial items (Section 11 and other sections)**

Paragraphs 11.27–11.32 of the *IFRS for SMEs* contain guidance on fair value measurement. Those paragraphs are written within the context of financial instruments. However, several other sections of the *IFRS for SMEs* make reference to them, for example, fair value model for associates and jointly controlled entities (Sections 14 and 15), investment property (Section 16) and fair value of pension plan assets (Section 28). In addition, several other sections refer to fair value although they do not specifically refer to the guidance in Section 11. There is some other guidance about fair value elsewhere in the *IFRS for SMEs*, for example, guidance on fair value less costs to sell in paragraph 27.14.

Recently the guidance on fair value in full IFRSs has been consolidated and comprehensively updated by IFRS 13 *Fair Value Measurement*. Some of the main changes are:

- an emphasis that fair value is a market-based measurement (not an entity-specific measurement);
- an amendment to the definition of fair value to focus on an exit price (fair value is defined in IFRS 13 as “the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date”); and
- more specific guidance on determining fair value, including assessing the highest and best use of non-financial assets and identifying the principal market.

The guidance on fair value in Section 11 is based on the guidance on fair value in IAS 39. The IAS 39 guidance on fair value has been replaced by IFRS 13.

In straightforward cases, applying the IFRS 13 guidance on fair value would have no impact on the way fair value measurements are made under the *IFRS for SMEs*. However, if the new guidance was to be incorporated into the *IFRS for SMEs*, SMEs would need to re-evaluate their methods for determining fair value amounts to confirm that this is the case (particularly for non-financial assets) and use greater judgement in assessing what data market participants would use when pricing an asset or liability.

**Should the fair value guidance in Section 11 be expanded to reflect the principles in IFRS 13, modified as appropriate to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and the specific circumstances of SMEs (for example, it would take into account their often more limited access to markets, valuation expertise, and other cost-benefit considerations)?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. The guidance for fair value measurement



in paragraphs 11.27–11.32 is sufficient for financial and non-financial items.

- (b) Yes—the guidance for fair value measurement in Section 11 is not sufficient. Revise the *IFRS for SMEs* to incorporate those aspects of the fair value guidance in IFRS 13 that are important for SMEs, modified as appropriate for SMEs (including the appropriate disclosures).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**Note:** an alternative is to create a separate section in the *IFRS for SMEs* to deal with guidance on fair value that would be applicable to the entire *IFRS for SMEs*, rather than leaving such guidance in Section 11. This is covered in the following question (question S7).

### **ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

We think the terminology of the *IFRS for SMEs* and full IFRSs should be aligned. Differences in definition and understanding of fundamental concepts and terms increase complexity. Furthermore, the differences are not helpful if the standard does not specifically address a transaction, event or condition, and the entity's management shall use its judgement in developing and applying an accounting policy.

The IASB should evaluate the effect of incorporating the fair value definition and guidance of IFRS 13 (including disclosures) in the *IFRS for SMEs* and provide relief as appropriate to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and cost-benefit constraints.



**S7: Positioning of fair value guidance in the Standard (Section 11)**

As noted in question S6, several sections of the *IFRS for SMEs* (covering both financial and non-financial items) make reference to the fair value guidance in Section 11.

**Should the guidance be moved into a separate section? The benefit would be to make clear that the guidance is applicable to all references to fair value in the *IFRS for SMEs*, not just to financial instruments.**

- (a) No—do not move the guidance. It is sufficient to have the fair value measurement guidance in Section 11.
- (b) Yes—move the guidance from Section 11 into a separate section on fair value measurement.
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**Note:** please answer this question regardless of your answer to question S6.

**ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

We have no strong view whether measurement guidance should be moved into a separate section. Any clarification that the guidance would be applicable to all references to fair value in the *IFRS for SMEs* could also be incorporated in Section 11. Nevertheless, the *IFRS for SMEs* already dedicated a separate section of guidance for recognising and measuring the impairment of assets. Hence, a separate fair value section would be reasonable. We recommend that the IASB should choose a method to structure the requirements and guidance to ensure consistency across the sections and minimize the amount of consequential amendments.

**S8: Consideration of recent changes to accounting for joint ventures in full IFRSs (Section 15)**

Recently, the requirements for joint ventures in full IFRSs have been updated by the issue of IFRS 11 *Joint Arrangements*, which replaced IAS 31 *Interests in Joint Ventures*. A key change resulting from IFRS 11 is to classify and account for a joint arrangement on the basis of the parties' rights and obligations under the arrangement. Previously under IAS 31, the structure of the arrangement was the main determinant of the accounting (ie establishment of a corporation, partnership or other entity was required to account for the arrangement as a jointly-controlled entity). In line with this, IFRS 11 changes the definitions and terminology and classifies arrangements as either joint operations or joint ventures.



Section 15 is based on IAS 31 except that Section 15 (like IFRS 11) does not permit proportionate consolidation for joint ventures, which had been permitted by IAS 31. Like IAS 31, Section 15 classifies arrangements as jointly controlled operations, jointly controlled assets or jointly controlled entities. If the changes under IFRS 11 described above were adopted in Section 15, in most cases, jointly controlled assets and jointly controlled operations would become joint operations, and jointly controlled entities would become joint ventures. Consequently, there would be no change to the way they are accounted for under Section 15. However, it is possible that, as a result of the changes, an investment that previously met the definition of a jointly controlled entity would become a joint operation. This is because the existence of a separate legal vehicle is no longer the main factor in classification.

**Should the changes above to joint venture accounting in full IFRSs be reflected in the *IFRS for SMEs*, modified as appropriate to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and cost-benefit considerations?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to classify arrangements as jointly controlled assets, jointly controlled operations and jointly controlled entities (this terminology and classification is based on IAS 31 *Interests in Joint Ventures*). The existing Section 15 is appropriate for SMEs, and SMEs have been able to implement it without problems.
- (b) Yes—revise the *IFRS for SMEs* so that arrangements are classified as joint ventures or joint operations on the basis of the parties' rights and obligations under the arrangement (terminology and classification based on IFRS 11 *Joint Arrangements*, modified as appropriate for SMEs).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**Note:** this would not change the accounting options available for jointly-controlled entities meeting the criteria to be joint ventures (ie cost model, equity method and fair value model).

#### **ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

We refer to our response to question S4. The terminology should be aligned as much as possible between full IFRS and the *IFRS for SMEs* (as described in our response to question S6).

#### **S9: Revaluation of property, plant and equipment (Section 17)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* currently prohibits the revaluation of property, plant and equipment (PPE).



Instead, all items of PPE must be measured at cost less any accumulated depreciation and any accumulated impairment losses (cost-depreciation-impairment model—paragraph 17.15). Revaluation of PPE was one of the complex accounting policy options in full IFRSs that the IASB eliminated in the interest of comparability and simplification of the *IFRS for SMEs*. In full IFRSs, IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment* allows entities to choose a revaluation model, rather than the cost-depreciation-impairment model, for entire classes of PPE. In accordance with the revaluation model in IAS 16, after recognition as an asset, an item of PPE whose fair value can be measured reliably is carried at a revalued amount—its fair value at the date of the revaluation less any subsequent accumulated depreciation and subsequent accumulated impairment losses. Revaluation increases are recognised in other comprehensive income and are accumulated in equity under the heading of ‘revaluation surplus’ (unless an increase reverses a previous revaluation decrease recognised in profit or loss for the same asset). Revaluation decreases that are in excess of prior increases are recognised in profit or loss. Revaluations must be made with sufficient regularity to ensure that the carrying amount does not differ materially from that which would be determined using fair value at the end of the reporting period.

**Should an option to use the revaluation model for PPE be added to the *IFRS for SMEs*?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to require the cost-depreciation-impairment model with no option to revalue items of PPE.
- (b) Yes—revise the *IFRS for SMEs* to permit an entity to choose, for each major class of PPE, whether to apply the cost-depreciation-impairment model or the revaluation model (the approach in IAS 16).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

We noticed the lengthy debate of the IASB on the issue whether all accounting policy options in full IFRSs should be allowed in the *IFRS for SMEs*. The outcome of this debate and the decision are also addressed in the Basis for Conclusions on the *IFRS for SMEs* in paragraphs BC84-BC94, including the revaluation option for PPE.

From the RFI document and the description of question S9 it is unclear, whether the IASB gained new insights on this issue to raise again this separate question or whether the answers should provide a reconfirmation of the decision to exclude the revaluation option. We noticed



that some jurisdictions have been arguing in favour of the revaluation method. In addition, it is often argued that excluding options in full IFRSs from the *IFRS for SMEs* may be costly for some SMEs if the entity has to prepare a second set of financial statements as a subsidiary for consolidation purpose using those options in full IFRSs. However, the Basis for Conclusions on the *IFRS for SMEs* indicates that the IASB was already aware of these arguments in the redeliberation of the Exposure Draft and in finalising the SME standard in 2009.

We think accounting options are generally undesirable and weaken comparability of financial statements. We would not be in favour of a (re)introduction of the option in the *IFRS for SMEs* to allow revaluation of PPE. Furthermore, the revaluation method is also an option for the subsequent measurement of intangible assets<sup>1</sup> in full IFRSs and it is not clear to us why the RFI only focuses on the revaluation of PPE in IAS 16.

#### **S10: Capitalisation of development costs (Section 18)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* currently requires that all research and development costs be charged to expense when incurred unless they form part of the cost of another asset that meets the recognition criteria in the *IFRS for SMEs* (paragraph 18.14). The IASB reached that decision because many preparers and auditors of SME financial statements said that SMEs do not have the resources to assess whether a project is commercially viable on an ongoing basis. Bank lending officers told the IASB that information about capitalised development costs is of little benefit to them, and that they disregard those costs in making lending decisions.

In full IFRSs, IAS 38 *Intangible Assets* requires that all research and some development costs must be charged to expense, but development costs incurred after the entity is able to demonstrate that the development has produced an asset with future economic benefits should be capitalised. IAS 38.57 lists certain criteria that must be met for this to be the case.

IAS 38.57 states “An intangible asset arising from development (or from the development phase of an internal project) shall be recognised if, and only if, an entity can demonstrate all of the following:

- the technical feasibility of completing the intangible asset so that it will be available for use or sale.
- its intention to complete the intangible asset and use or sell it.
- its ability to use or sell the intangible asset.
- how the intangible asset will generate probable future economic benefits. Among other

<sup>1</sup> Unless there is no active market for those intangible assets.





things, the entity can demonstrate the existence of a market for the output of the intangible asset or the intangible asset itself or, if it is to be used internally, the usefulness of the intangible asset.

- the availability of adequate technical, financial and other resources to complete the development and to use or sell the intangible asset.
- its ability to measure reliably the expenditure attributable to the intangible asset during its development.”

**Should the *IFRS for SMEs* be changed to require capitalisation of development costs meeting criteria for capitalisation (on the basis of on the criteria in IAS 38)?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to charge all development costs to expense.
- (b) Yes—revise the *IFRS for SMEs* to require capitalisation of development costs meeting the criteria for capitalisation (the approach in IAS 38).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

Similar to question S9 it is unclear why this issue was identified for a separate question in the RFI. There should be more explanation whether the IASB gained new insights to form the basis for reevaluation of the current requirements and previous decisions.

**S11: Amortisation period for goodwill and other intangible assets (Section 18)**

Paragraph 18.21 requires an entity to amortise an intangible asset on a systematic basis over its useful life. This requirement applies to goodwill as well as to other intangible assets (see paragraph 19.23(a)). Paragraph 18.20 states “If an entity is unable to make a reliable estimate of the useful life of an intangible asset, the life shall be presumed to be ten years.” Some interested parties have said that, in some cases, although the management of the entity is unable to estimate the useful life reliably, management’s judgement is that the useful life is considerably shorter than ten years.

**Should paragraph 18.20 be modified to state: “If an entity is unable to make a reliable estimate of the useful life of an intangible asset, the life shall be presumed to be ten years unless a shorter period can be justified”?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Retain the presumption of ten years if an



entity is unable to make a reliable estimate of the useful life of an intangible asset (including goodwill).

- (b) Yes—modify paragraph 18.20 to establish a presumption of ten years that can be overridden if a shorter period can be justified.
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

### **ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

The IASB should provide more explanation and examples of the referred cases and scenarios addressed by those interested parties. Generally, it seems to be counterintuitive that the entity would be capable to be in a position to justify shorter or longer periods than 10 years if the entity is unable to make a reliable estimate of the useful life.

### **S12: Consideration of changes to accounting for business combinations in full IFRSs (Section 19)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* accounts for all business combinations by applying the purchase method. This is similar to the ‘acquisition method’ approach currently applied in full IFRSs.

Section 19 of the *IFRS for SMEs* is generally based on the 2004 version of IFRS 3 *Business Combinations*. IFRS 3 was revised in 2008, which was near the time of the release of the *IFRS for SMEs*. IFRS 3 (2008) addressed deficiencies in the previous version of IFRS 3 without changing the basic accounting; it also promoted international convergence of accounting standards.

The main changes introduced by IFRS 3 (2008) that could be considered for incorporation in the *IFRS for SMEs* are:

- A focus on what is given as consideration to the seller, rather than what is spent in order to acquire the entity. As a consequence, acquisition-related costs are recognised as an expense rather than treated as part of the business combination (for example, advisory, valuation and other professional and administrative fees).
- Contingent consideration is recognised at fair value (without regard to probability) and then subsequently accounted for as a financial instrument instead of as an adjustment to the cost of the business combination.
- Determining goodwill requires remeasurement to fair value of any existing interest in the acquired company and measurement of any non-controlling interest in the acquired



company.

**Should Section 19 be amended to incorporate the above changes, modified as appropriate to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and cost-benefit considerations?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. The current approach in Section 19 (based on IFRS 3 (2004)) is suitable for SMEs, and SMEs have been able to implement it without problems.
- (b) Yes—revise the *IFRS for SMEs* to incorporate the main changes introduced by IFRS 3 (2008), as outlined above and modified as appropriate for SMEs.
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

We refer to our response to question S4.

**S13: Presentation of share subscriptions receivable (Section 22)**

Paragraph 22.7(a) requires that subscriptions receivable, and similar receivables that arise when equity instruments are issued before the entity receives the cash for those instruments, must be offset against equity in the statement of financial position, not presented as an asset. Some interested parties have told the IASB that their national laws regard the equity as having been issued and require the presentation of the related receivable as an asset.

**Should paragraph 22.7(a) be amended either to permit or require the presentation of the receivable as an asset?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to present the subscription receivable as an offset to equity.
- (b) Yes—change paragraph 22.7(a) to require that the subscription receivable is presented as an asset.
- (c) Yes—add an additional option to paragraph 22.7(a) to permit the subscription receivable to be presented as an asset, ie the entity would have a choice whether to present it as an asset or as an offset to equity.
- (d) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b), (c) or (d).



**ASCG response: Alternative (d)**

We think a change in the presentation would not be costly for SMEs. In absence of a linked presentation concept in the *IFRS for SMEs* for the statement of financial position, we think the IASB should apply the concepts in Section 2 *Concepts and Pervasive Principles* relating to the definition and recognition of assets in the statement of financial position consistently.



**S14: Capitalisation of borrowing costs on qualifying assets (Section 25)**

The *IFRS for SMEs* currently requires all borrowing costs to be recognised as an expense when incurred (paragraph 25.2). The IASB decided not to require capitalisation of any borrowing costs for cost-benefit reasons, particularly because of the complexity of identifying qualifying assets and calculating the amount of borrowing costs eligible for capitalisation.

IAS 23 *Borrowing Costs* requires that borrowing costs that are directly attributable to the acquisition, construction or production of a qualifying asset (ie an asset that necessarily takes a substantial period of time to get ready for use or sale) must be capitalised as part of the cost of that asset, and all other borrowing costs must be recognised as an expense when incurred.

**Should Section 25 of the *IFRS for SMEs* be changed so that SMEs are required to capitalise borrowing costs that are directly attributable to the acquisition, construction or production of a qualifying asset, with all other borrowing costs recognised as an expense when incurred?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to require all borrowing costs to be recognised as an expense when incurred.
- (b) Yes—revise the *IFRS for SMEs* to require capitalisation of borrowing costs that are directly attributable to the acquisition, construction or production of a qualifying asset (the approach in IAS 23).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

We refer to our response to questions S9 and S10.

**S15 Presentation of actuarial gains or losses (Section 28)**

In accordance with the *IFRS for SMEs*, an entity is required to recognise all actuarial gains and losses in the period in which they occur, either in profit or loss or in other comprehensive income as an accounting policy election (paragraph 28.24).

Recently, the requirements in full IFRSs have been updated by the issue of IAS 19 *Employee Benefits* (revised 2011). A key change as a result of the 2011 revisions to IAS 19 is that all actuarial gains and losses must be recognised in other comprehensive income in the period in which they arise. Previously, under full IFRSs, actuarial gains and losses could be recognised either in other comprehensive income or in profit or loss as an accounting policy election (and



under the latter option there were a number of permitted methods for the timing of the recognition in profit or loss).

Section 28 is based on IAS 19 before the 2011 revisions, modified as appropriate to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and cost-benefit considerations. Removing the option for SMEs to recognise actuarial gains and losses in profit or loss would improve comparability between SMEs without adding any complexity.

**Should the option to recognise actuarial gains and losses in profit or loss be removed from paragraph 28.24?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Continue to allow an entity to recognise actuarial gains and losses either in profit or loss or in other comprehensive income as an accounting policy election.
- (b) Yes—revise the *IFRS for SMEs* so that an entity is required to recognise all actuarial gains and losses in other comprehensive income (ie removal of profit or loss option in paragraph 28.24).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**Note:** IAS 19 (revised 2011) made a number of other changes to full IFRSs. However, because Section 28 was simplified from the previous version of IAS 19 to reflect the needs of users of SME financial statements and cost-benefit considerations, the changes made to full IFRSs do not directly relate to the requirements in Section 28.

**ASCG response: (b)**

We think the removal of the accounting policy option will improve comparability across financial statements.

**S16: Approach for accounting for deferred income taxes (Section 29)**

Section 29 of the *IFRS for SMEs* currently requires that deferred income taxes must be recognised using the temporary difference method. This is also the fundamental approach required by full IFRSs (IAS 12 *Income Taxes*).

Some hold the view that SMEs should recognise deferred income taxes and that the temporary difference method is appropriate. Others hold the view that while SMEs should recognise deferred income taxes, the temporary difference method (which bases deferred



taxes on differences between the tax basis of an asset or liability and its carrying amount) is too complex for SMEs. They propose replacing the temporary difference method with the timing difference method (which bases deferred taxes on differences between when an item of income or expense is recognised for tax purposes and when it is recognised in profit or loss). Others hold the view that SMEs should recognise deferred taxes only for timing differences that are expected to reverse in the near future (sometimes called the 'liability method'). And still others hold the view that SMEs should not recognise any deferred taxes at all (sometimes called the 'taxes payable method').

**Should SMEs recognise deferred income taxes and, if so, how should they be recognised?**

- (a) Yes—SMEs should recognise deferred income taxes using the temporary difference method (the approach currently used in both the *IFRS for SMEs* and full IFRSs).
- (b) Yes—SMEs should recognise deferred income taxes using the timing difference method.
- (c) Yes—SMEs should recognise deferred income taxes using the liability method.
- (d) No—SMEs should not recognise deferred income taxes at all (ie they should use the taxes payable method), although some related disclosures should be required.
- (e) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e).

**ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

We refer to our response to questions S9 and S10.

**S17: Consideration of IAS 12 exemptions from recognising deferred taxes and other differences under IAS 12 (Section 29)**

In answering this question, please assume that SMEs will continue to recognise deferred income taxes using the temporary difference method (see discussion in question S16).

Section 29 is based on the IASB's March 2009 exposure draft *Income Tax*. At the time the *IFRS for SMEs* was issued, that exposure draft was expected to amend IAS 12 *Income Taxes* by eliminating some exemptions from recognising deferred taxes and simplifying the accounting in other areas. The IASB eliminated the exemptions when developing Section 29 and made the other changes in the interest of simplifying the *IFRS for SMEs*.

Some interested parties who are familiar with IAS 12 say that Section 29 does not noticeably





simplify IAS 12 and that the removal of the IAS 12 exemptions results in more deferred tax calculations being required. Because the March 2009 exposure draft was not finalised, some question whether the differences between Section 29 and IAS 12 are now justified.

**Should Section 29 be revised to conform it to IAS 12, modified as appropriate to reflect the needs of the users of SME financial statements?**

- (a) No—do not change the overall approach in Section 29.
- (b) Yes—revise Section 29 to conform it to the current IAS 12 (modified as appropriate for SMEs).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**ASCG response: Alternative (c)**

Based on the fact that the *IFRS for SMEs* is currently not used in Germany, we have no empirical evidence whether or not the current requirements in the *IFRS for SMEs* result in noticeably more deferred tax calculation. The IASB should revise Section 29 if there is strong evidence for potential cost-benefit improvements.

**S18: Rebuttable presumption that investment property at fair value is recovered through sale (Section 29)**

In answering this question, please also assume that SMEs will continue to recognise deferred income taxes using the temporary difference method (see discussion in question S16).

In December 2010, the IASB amended IAS 12 to introduce a rebuttable presumption that the carrying amount of investment property measured at fair value will be recovered entirely through sale.

The amendment to IAS 12 was issued because, without specific plans for the disposal of the investment property, it can be difficult and subjective to estimate how much of the carrying amount of the investment property will be recovered through cash flows from rental income and how much of it will be recovered through cash flows from selling the asset.

Paragraph 29.20 currently states:

“The measurement of deferred tax liabilities and deferred tax assets shall reflect the tax consequences that would follow from the manner in which the entity expects, at the reporting date, to recover or settle the carrying amount of the related assets and liabilities.”

**Should Section 29 be revised to incorporate a similar exemption from paragraph 29.20**



**for investment property at fair value?**

- (a) No—do not change the current requirements. Do not add an exemption in paragraph 29.20 for investment property measured at fair value.
- (b) Yes—revise Section 29 to incorporate the exemption for investment property at fair value (the approach in IAS 12).
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

**Note:** please answer this question regardless of your answer to questions S16 and S17 above.

**ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

We refer to our response to question S4.



**S19: Inclusion of additional topics in the *IFRS for SMEs***

The IASB intended that the 35 sections in the *IFRS for SMEs* would cover the kinds of transactions, events and conditions that are typically encountered by most SMEs. The IASB also provided guidance on how an entity's management should exercise judgement in developing an accounting policy in cases where the *IFRS for SMEs* does not specifically address a topic (see paragraphs 10.4–10.6).

**Are there any topics that are not specifically addressed in the *IFRS for SMEs* that you think should be covered (ie where the general guidance in paragraphs 10.4–10.6 is not sufficient)?**

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes (please state the topic and reasoning for your response).

**Note:** this question is asking about topics that are not currently addressed by the *IFRS for SMEs*. It is not asking which areas of the *IFRS for SMEs* require additional guidance. If you think more guidance should be added for a topic already covered by the *IFRS for SMEs*, please provide your comments in response to question S20.

**ASCG response: Alternative (a)**

**S20: Opportunity to add your own specific issues**

Are there any additional issues that you would like to bring to the IASB's attention on specific requirements in the sections of the *IFRS for SMEs*?

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes (please state your issues, identify the section(s) to which they relate, provide references to paragraphs in the *IFRS for SMEs* where applicable and provide separate reasoning for each issue given).

**ASCG response: Alternative (b)**

In our response to the specific questions above we highlight the necessity of developing review criteria and guidance when changes for the *IFRS for SMEs* should be considered by the IASB to improve the SME standard (see also our response to question G5). Currently it is not understandable on which basis the specific questions were justified and added as individual issues to the RFI while other issues reflecting the work of the IASB since 2009 were omitted from specific questions, for example:



- The IASB modified the qualitative characteristic in the conceptual framework. Should these changes be reflected in Section 2 *Concepts and Pervasive Principles* of the *IFRS for SMEs*? Or is there the intention to have different qualitative characteristics in the *IFRS for SMEs* and the full IFRSs?
- The IASB amended the presentation requirements in IAS 1 and introduced new terminology. Is this considered as a minor change in full IFRSs and therefore not subject to the specific questions in the RFI? Is the focus of the RFI only on potential changes in recognition and measurement of entities transactions?

The IASB and SMEIG need to improve the review process and the corresponding documentation, especially for any consideration in context of changes in full IFRSs. It may be necessary to review all changes in full IFRSs with a corresponding documentation of review considerations for the *IFRS for SMEs*. Otherwise there would be too much room for undesirable speculation of constituents why only some issues were addressed in the review activities of the IASB.



## RFI – General questions

### **G1: Consideration of minor improvements to full IFRSs**

The *IFRS for SMEs* was developed from full IFRSs but tailored for SMEs. As a result, the *IFRS for SMEs* uses identical wording to full IFRSs in many places.

The IASB makes ongoing changes to full IFRSs as part of its Annual Improvements project as well as during other projects. Such amendments may clarify guidance and wording, modify definitions or make other relatively minor amendments to full IFRSs to address unintended consequences, conflicts or oversights. For more information, the IASB web pages on its Annual Improvements project can be accessed on the following link: <http://go.ifrs.org/AI>

Some believe that because those changes are intended to improve requirements, they should naturally be incorporated in the *IFRS for SMEs* where they are relevant. Others note that each small change to the *IFRS for SMEs* would unnecessarily increase the reporting burden for SMEs because SMEs would have to assess whether each individual change will affect its current accounting policies. Those who hold that view concluded that, although the *IFRS for SMEs* was based on full IFRSs, it is now a separate Standard and does not need to reflect relatively minor changes in full IFRSs.

#### **How should the IASB deal with such minor improvements, where the *IFRS for SMEs* is based on old wording from full IFRSs?**

- (a) Where changes are intended to improve requirements in full IFRSs and there are similar wordings and requirements in the *IFRS for SMEs*, they should be incorporated in the (three-yearly) omnibus exposure draft of changes to the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (b) Changes should only be made where there is a known problem for SMEs, ie there should be a rebuttable presumption that changes should not be incorporated in the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (c) The IASB should develop criteria for assessing how any such improvements should be incorporated (please give your suggestions for the criteria to be used).
- (d) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b), (c) or (d).

### **ASCG response: Alternative (d)**

From the description of question G1 it is not entirely clear to us whether minor improvements include only the changes arising from the annual improvement process or also comprise changes from other projects on full IFRSs. Generally, we refer to our response to question G5.



Any change in full IFRS should not automatically trigger consequential changes for the *IFRS for SMEs*.

## **G2: Further need for Q&As**

One of the key responsibilities of the SMEIG has been to consider implementation questions raised by users of the *IFRS for SMEs* and to develop proposed non-mandatory guidance in the form of questions and answers (Q&As). These Q&As are intended to help those who use the *IFRS for SMEs* to think about specific accounting questions.

The SMEIG Q&A programme has been limited. Only seven final Q&As have been published. Three of those seven deal with eligibility to use the *IFRS for SMEs*. No additional Q&As are currently under development by the SMEIG.

Some people are of the view that, while the Q&A programme was useful when the *IFRS for SMEs* was first issued so that implementation questions arising in the early years of application around the world could be dealt with, it is no longer needed. Any new issues that arise in the future can be addressed in other ways, for example through education material or by future three-yearly updates to the *IFRS for SMEs*. Many who hold this view think that an ongoing programme of issuing Q&As is inconsistent with the principle-based approach in the *IFRS for SMEs*, is burdensome because Q&As are perceived to add another set of rules on top of the *IFRS for SMEs*, and has the potential to create unnecessary conflict with full IFRSs if issues overlap with issues in full IFRSs.

Others, however, believe that the volume of Q&As issued so far is not excessive and that the non-mandatory guidance is helpful, and not a burden, especially to smaller organisations and in smaller jurisdictions that have limited resources to assist their constituents in implementing the *IFRS for SMEs*. Furthermore, in general, the Q&As released so far provide guidance on considerations when applying judgement, rather than creating rules.

### **Do you believe that the current, limited programme for developing Q&As should continue after this comprehensive review is completed?**

- (a) Yes—the current Q&A programme should be continued.
- (b) No—the current Q&A programme has served its purpose and should not be continued.
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

## **ASCG response: (c)**

We refer to our response to G3.



### **G3: Treatment of existing Q&As**

As noted in question G2, there are seven final Q&As for the *IFRS for SMEs*. This comprehensive review provides an opportunity for the guidance in those Q&As to be incorporated into the *IFRS for SMEs* and for the Q&As to be deleted.

Non-mandatory guidance from the Q&As will become mandatory if it is included as requirements in the *IFRS for SMEs*. In addition, any guidance may need to be incorporated in the *IFRS for SMEs* in a reduced format or may even be omitted altogether (if the IASB deems that the guidance is no longer applicable after the Standard is updated or that the guidance is better suited for inclusion in training material). The IASB would also have to decide whether any parts of the guidance that are not incorporated into the *IFRS for SMEs* should be retained in some fashion, for example, as an addition to the Basis for Conclusions accompanying the *IFRS for SMEs* or as part of the training material on the *IFRS for SMEs*.

An alternative approach would be to continue to retain the Q&As separately where they remain relevant to the updated *IFRS for SMEs*. Under this approach there would be no need to reduce the guidance in the Q&As, but the guidance may need to be updated because of changes to the *IFRS for SMEs* resulting from the comprehensive review.

#### **Should the Q&As be incorporated into the *IFRS for SMEs*?**

- (a) Yes—the seven final Q&As should be incorporated as explained above, and deleted.
- (b) No—the seven final Q&As should be retained as guidance separate from the *IFRS for SMEs*.
- (c) Other—please explain.

Please provide reasoning to support your choice of (a), (b) or (c).

#### **ASCG response: (c)**

The IASB should be the only source for any authoritative guidance. If the non-mandatory Q&A guidance will be incorporated into the *IFRS for SMEs* as application guidance, new publications of Q&As may be considered by constituents as de-facto authoritative literature (at least until the next IASB review project of the *IFRS for SMEs*). Therefore we encourage the IASB to rethink the institutional process for clarification request from constituents, especially in case of urgency or certain level of importance.

### **G4: Training material**

The IFRS Foundation has developed comprehensive free-to-download self-study training





material to support the implementation of the *IFRS for SMEs*. These are available on our website: <http://go.ifrs.org/smetraining>. In addition to your views on the questions we have raised about the *IFRS for SMEs*, we welcome any comments you may have about the training material, including any suggestions you may have on how we can improve it.

**Do you have any comments on the IFRS Foundation's *IFRS for SMEs* training material available on the link above?**

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes (please provide your comments).

**ASCG response: n/a**

**G5: Opportunity to add any further general issues**

Are there any additional issues you would like to bring to the IASB's attention relating to the *IFRS for SMEs*?

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes (please state your issues and provide separate reasoning for each issue given).

**ASCG response: Alternative (b)**

We think there is the necessity for the IASB:

- To develop review criteria as basis and guide on any decision whether changes in full IFRSs arising from new or amended IFRSs (including those changes from annual improvements) should result in amendments to the *IFRS for SMEs*;
- To develop and describe the timing of the review and corresponding due process, including consideration on effective date and early application; and
- To develop a formal process on clarification request from constituents addressed only for the *IFRS for SMEs*.

The review criteria should reflect the assumption that the *IFRS for SMEs* is considered as a self-contained document and any changes in full IFRSs do not automatically trigger consequential changes in the SME standard. Changes are not justified in the *IFRS for SMEs* if the impact of those changes would be very limited compared to existing requirements and guidance in the *IFRS for SMEs*. Furthermore, the criteria need to highlight and emphasize a high need of a stable platform and inability of most SMEs to implement frequent changes in the requirements.



We also think there are clarification needs on the timing of the review and due process activities for the *IFRS for SMEs*. Currently many questions arise in context of the comprehensive review process and the structure of future omnibus reviews. The IASB should take into consideration:

- Implementation and transition period changes in the *IFRS for SMEs* should be at least the same as for full IFRSs. Usually SMEs would require a longer period to implement the changes compared to full IFRSs.
- SMEs usually do not have the capacity of writing comment letters on a frequent basis and to follow standard setting process closely.
- Decision by the IASB to change full IFRSs should trigger immediately discussion whether those changes should also result in changes in the *IFRS for SMEs*.

In light of these considerations we recommend that the IASB implement a review and due process similar to the timing and decision structure of the annual improvement process for full IFRSs, except replacing the annual cycle of this process with a three year cycle. In consequence of such a process any decision to change full IFRSs (including annual improvements) should trigger immediately discussion and timely tentative views by the IASB whether those changes should also result in changes in the SME standard. The IASB should collect these tentative views and publish every three years a comprehensive omnibus exposure draft. Furthermore, the IASB may only include issues for potential changes in the omnibus exposure draft already discussed by the IASB twelve months before publication of the omnibus exposure draft or limit the number of issues. Such a process may delay the effective dates and early application compared to full IFRSs. However, we think this process would be consistent with the need of stable platform and cost-benefit constraints for preparers. Such a process provides sufficient time for constituents to prepare feedback on a comprehensive package of proposals. We would not encourage the IASB to establish a process starting discussion only every three years whether changes for the SME standard need to be incorporated.



### **G6: Use of *IFRS for SMEs* in your jurisdiction**

This question contains four sub-questions. The purpose of the questions is to give us some information about the use of the *IFRS for SMEs* in the jurisdictions of those responding to this Request for Information.

**1 What is your country/jurisdiction?**

**2 Is the *IFRS for SMEs* currently used in your country/jurisdiction?**

- (a) Yes, widely used by a majority of our SMEs.
- (b) Yes, used by some but not a majority of our SMEs.
- (c) No, not widely used by our SMEs.
- (d) Other (please explain).

**3 If the *IFRS for SMEs* is used in your country/jurisdiction, in your judgement what have been the principal benefits of the *IFRS for SMEs*?**

(Please give details of any benefits.)

**4 If the *IFRS for SMEs* is used in your country/jurisdiction, in your judgement what have been the principal practical problems in implementing the *IFRS for SMEs*?**

(Please give details of any problems.)

**Response: 1 Germany**

**2 Alternative (d)**

**3 n/a**

**4 n/a**

Different from full IFRSs adopted by the European Union (EU) there is no statutory regulation or incorporation of the *IFRS for SMEs* in the German Commercial Code or other national regulation in Germany. Any interim or annual report prepared and published in accordance with the *IFRS for SMEs* does not exempt a SME from the duty to prepare and publish statutory reports in accordance with the German Commercial Code and national GAAP.