



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

EFRAG
Françoise Flores
35 Square Meeûs

B-1000 Brussels

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

Berlin, 7 September 2012

Dear Françoise,

IASB Exposure Draft ED/2012/1 Annual Improvements to IFRSs 2010-2012 Cycle

On behalf of the Accounting Standards Committee of Germany (ASCG), I am writing to comment on EFRAG's draft comment letter on the IASB's ED/2012/1 Annual Improvements to IFRSs 2010-2012 Cycle (version 6 September 2012). We appreciate the opportunity to comment on EFRAG's draft comment letter.

For our arguments and further details, please see our draft comment letter to the IASB as attached to this letter, specifically our comments on the proposed amendments to IFRS 3 *Business Combinations*.

If you would like to discuss any aspects of this draft comment letter in detail, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Liesel Knorr
President



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

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, 07 September 2012

Dear Hans,

Exposure Draft ED/2012/1 Annual Improvements to IFRSs 2010-2012 Cycle

On behalf of the Accounting Standards Committee of Germany (ASCG) I am writing to comment on the IASB Exposure Draft ED/2012/1 'Annual Improvements to IFRSs 2010-2012 Cycle'. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Exposure Draft under the fifth cycle of the Annual Improvements project.

In general, we agree with the majority of the proposals as drafted in the Exposure Draft. In some cases we provide additional comments that could lead to further improvements to the proposed amendments. Notwithstanding the above, we would like to raise the following issues for further consideration by the Board:

IFRS 3 *Business Combinations*: Accounting for contingent consideration in a business combination

In general, we agree with the Board's proposal. However, in order to ensure consistent application as soon as possible, we believe that the IASB should make the consequential amendments not only to IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* but also to IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* and make the amendments to IFRS 3, IFRS 9 and IAS 39 applicable as of 1 January 2014 already.

Zimmerstr. 30 · 10969 Berlin · Telefon +49 (0)30 206412-0 · Telefax +49 (0)30 206412-15 · E-Mail: info@drsc.de
Bankverbindung: Deutsche Bank Berlin, Konto-Nr. 0 700 781 00, BLZ 100 700 00
IBAN-Nr. DE26 1007 0000 0070 0781 00, BIC (Swift-Code) DEUTDE33HAN
Vereinsregister: Amtsgericht Berlin-Charlottenburg, VR 18526 Nz

Präsidium:

Dr. h.c. Liesel Knorr (Präsidentin), Dr. Rolf Ulrich (Vizepräsident)

Further, we suggest amending the wording of paragraph 40 of IFRS 3 to clarify that the obligation to pay contingent consideration may be classified as a non-financial liability. In addition, the proposed paragraph 4.2.1(e) of IFRS 9 seems to be inconsistent with the accounting requirements of paragraph 5.7.1 in conjunction with paragraph 4.2.1(a) in cases, where liabilities for contingent considerations in a business combination meet the definition of derivatives.

Finally, we would strongly encourage the IASB to reconsider the entire concept of contingent consideration within the intended post implementation review of IFRS 3.

IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements*: Current/non-current classification of liabilities

We partly agree with the Board's proposed amendment. Whilst we fully support the proposed amendment to paragraph 73, which clarifies that an existing obligation should be classified as non-current when it is refinanced or rolled over with the same lender, we have several concerns with respect to the proposed term 'same or similar terms'. We would encourage the IASB to reconsider the term 'same or similar terms' and to ensure consistency with the corresponding terms used in IFRS 9 and IAS 39. In addition, we suggest explaining the term 'same or similar' in the standard itself rather than in the Basis for Conclusions on IAS 1. Furthermore, we recommend improving the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 73 since it appears to be unclear.

IAS 12 *Income Taxes*: Recognition of deferred tax assets for unrealised losses

We do not fully agree with the Board's conclusions. We appreciate that the Board strives for a timely harmonisation of the current diversity in practice with respect to several issues that have been raised by its constituents regarding the recognition of deferred tax assets for unrealised losses.

However, we are concerned not only about the proposed amendment, but about the approach the Board has taken in improving this standard. We disagree with a piecemeal rectification of shortcomings of IAS 12 and instead strongly favour a fundamental revision of this standard.



Notwithstanding our general concerns, if the IASB were to proceed with the proposed amendments, we would agree with the first two.

With regard to the third proposal, adding the new para. 30A, we have concerns that the IASB excludes specific actions from being a tax planning opportunity. To deny a reporting entity considering the strategy of simply holding debt securities to qualify as a tax planning opportunity, might result in a not meaningful presentation of the respective economic situation. The exception introduced by the new para. 30A is questionable. Any exceptions which result in a deviation from general principles should be assessed in a broader context instead of an Annual Improvements project.

Our detailed comments on the eleven proposed amendments are set out in the appendix to this letter.

If you would like to discuss any aspects of this comment letter in detail, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Liesel Knorr
President



Appendix

General questions – to be answered individually for each proposed amendment:

Question 1:

Do you agree with the Board's proposal to amend the IFRS as described in the exposure draft? If not, why and what alternative do you propose?

Question 2:

Do you agree with the proposed transitional provisions and effective date for the issue as described in the exposure draft? If not, why and what alternative do you propose?

IFRS 2 *Share-based Payment*

Definition of 'vesting condition'

Question 1: We support the Board's intention to clarify the definition of 'vesting conditions' relating to share-based payments. We acknowledge that there is a lack of clarity in the current definitions of 'performance conditions' and 'service conditions' that are incorporated in the definition of 'vesting conditions' in IFRS 2. Within the proposed revision the Board addresses certain specific concerns that have been raised about these definitions. However, we think that addressing several specific cases within a standard seems to be inconsistent with a principle-based approach. Disadvantages of a case-by-case approach are an increased complexity and a still incomprehensive definition that might require further contentious case-specific changes to IFRS 2.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.

IFRS 3 *Business Combinations*

Accounting for contingent consideration in a business combination

Question 1: In general, we agree with the Board's proposal to clarify the accounting for contingent consideration arising from business combinations. The IASB's ra-



tionale for this amendment, as given in the Basis for Conclusions, is convincing. Specifically, we support removing from IFRS 3 all the references to other IFRSs and instead creating a provision within IFRS 3 which clarifies the classification and the subsequent measurement of all contingent considerations in a business combination.

However, in order to ensure consistent application as soon as possible, we believe that the IASB should make the consequential amendments not only to IFRS 9 but also to IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* and make them applicable as of 1 January 2014 already (see our answer to Question 2).

Furthermore, the wording of paragraph 40 as proposed is not clear as to whether the obligation to pay contingent consideration may be classified as a non-financial liability. Therefore, we recommend adding a reference to this within the IFRS 3. Furthermore, we suggest amending the first sentence of paragraph 40 of IFRS 3 as follows: “The acquirer shall classify an obligation to ~~pay~~ fulfill contingent consideration that meets the definition of a financial instrument as a financial liability or as equity on the basis of the definitions of an equity instrument and a financial liability in paragraph 11 of IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Presentation*”.

In addition, we question whether the proposed paragraph 4.2.1(e) of IFRS 9 is consistent with the accounting requirements of paragraph 5.7.1 in conjunction with paragraph 4.2.1(a) in cases, where liabilities for contingent consideration in a business combination meet the definition of derivatives. The proposed paragraph 4.2.1(e) requires changes in the fair value of contingent consideration in a business combination to be presented in accordance with paragraphs 5.7.7-5.7.8 of IFRS 9. According to paragraph 5.7.7(a), those changes in the fair value that are attributable to changes in the credit risk of a financial liability shall be recognised in other comprehensive income. At the same time, these changes in the fair value shall be presented in profit or loss, if a relevant contingent consideration meets the definition of a derivative (paragraph 5.7.1 in conjunction with paragraph 4.2.1(a)). That this can be the case follows from paragraph BC354 on IFRS 3, according to which many obligations for contingent consideration classified as liabilities meet the definition of derivatives.

On a more general note we would like to point out that the whole concept of accounting for contingent consideration in a business combination as prescribed in IFRS 3 is



criticized by our constituents, who would point to the requirements for contingent considerations outside of business combinations. Therefore, we would strongly encourage the IASB to reconsider the entire concept within the intended post implementation review of IFRS 3. We concur with the IASB's intention to rectify perceived inconsistencies with respect to the accounting for contingent consideration in a business combination through the Annual Improvements project because it adds clarity on the issue on a timely basis. However, we believe that any future amendments to IFRS 3 would best be considered in connection with the IASB's post implementation review of this standard rather than in the Annual Improvements project.

Question 2: We disagree with the Board's proposal.

As a consequence of our suggestion regarding the consequential amendments to IAS 39 as described in our response to question 1 above, we suggest the following amendments to the proposed effective date:

- bringing forward the effective date of the proposed amendments to 1 January 2014,
- deleting the last part of the sentence of the proposed IFRS 3.64G "[...] ~~and at the same time apply IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* (as amended by *Annual Improvements to IFRSs 201-2012 Cycle*)~~",
- deleting the last part of the sentence of the proposed IFRS 9.7.1.4 "[...] ~~and at the same time apply IFRS 3 *Business Combinations* (as amended by *Annual Improvements to IFRSs 201-2012 Cycle*)~~",
- deleting the last sentence of paragraph BC7 on IFRS 3 "~~In addition, the Board thinks that the proposed amendment should not be applied before IFRS 9 (2010) because of the proposed consequential amendment to that IFRS~~",
- proposing an effective date in IAS 39.



IFRS 8 *Operating Segments*

Aggregation of operating segments

Question 1: We partially agree with the proposal to require entities to state the basis for the aggregation of entity's operating segments. We acknowledge the IASB's rationale for this amendment being to provide users with the understanding of how operating segments have been aggregated.

Nevertheless, we believe that the additional disclosure requirement should only include a brief description of the operating segments that have been aggregated and an explanation of how the aggregation criteria of IFRS 8.12 have been met. In our view, it should be within the management's discretion to specify which qualitative or quantitative characteristics are appropriate to be disclosed in order to inform the users about the factors considered in aggregating the operating segments. Examples for specific economic characteristics provided in the proposed paragraph 22(aa) in brackets ("profit margin spreads, sales growth rates etc") indicate only quantitative information to be disclosed. Accordingly, we suggest either deleting the text in brackets or adding examples for non-quantitative criteria.

Finally, we believe that any future amendments to IFRS 8 are to be considered in connection with the IASB's post implementation review of this standard rather than in the Annual Improvements project.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.

IFRS 8 *Operating Segments*

Reconciliation of the total of the reportable segments' assets to the entity's assets

Question 1: We agree with the Board's proposal.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.

IFRS 13 *Fair Value Measurement*

Short-term receivables and payables

Question 1: The Board proposes amending the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 13 without amending the standard correspondingly. We believe that an amendment to the Basis for Conclusions without a corresponding change in the core text of the standard is appropriate only, if the Basis for Conclusions itself was found to be misleading or containing an error that is to be rectified.

With respect to the proposed amendment, however, we do not see the need for a clarification in the Basis for Conclusions that the deletion of B5.4.12 of IFRS 9 and AG79 of IAS 39 did not intend to change the practical expedient to measure short-term receivables and payables with no stated interest rate at invoice amounts without discounting, when the effect of not discounting is immaterial. IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors* addresses materiality in applying accounting policies and, thus, already contains such a practical expedient. There is no need for case-by-case provisions regarding the consideration of materiality. Conversely, the explicit guidance on the accounting treatment of issues that are not material within the several standards or the accompanying documents might falsely imply that the materiality principle should not be applied, if not explicitly referred to in the related standard.

Furthermore, we question whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the practical expedient as proposed in paragraph 60 of the IASB's ED/2011/6 *Revenue from Contracts with Customers*. The measurement of short-term receivables and payables with no stated interest rate without discounting is only allowed, if the effect of not discounting is immaterial. However, the practical expedient of paragraph 60 of ED/2011/6 is not limited to cases where the time value of money is immaterial. This might result in different accounting treatments for economically similar issues.

Question 2: Not applicable, since the proposed amendment regards the Basis for Conclusions.



IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements*

Current/non-current classification of liabilities

Question 1: We partially agree with the Board's proposed amendment. We acknowledge that there is currently diversity in practice as regards the classification of liabilities when different terms apply. Furthermore, there is a perceived inconsistency between the current/non-current classification of liabilities in IAS 1 and derecognition guidance for financial liabilities given in IFRS 9.

Therefore, we fully agree with the proposed amendment to paragraph 73 of IAS 1 related to the classification of a liability as non-current, if it is refinanced or rolled over under the existing loan facility with the same lender. However, with respect to the proposed term 'same or similar terms', we have the following concerns.

The term 'same or similar terms' is ambiguous. For example, it might not be clear how to classify a loan in case the interest rate agreed by the parties involved depends on the entity's rating

- On the one hand, the deterioration of the entity's rating at the time of a loan rollover leads to increased interest payments, which would indicate that the terms are not the same.
- On the other hand, since the connection of the interest rate to the entity's rating is part of the loan conditions agreed already at the inception of this loan, it could be concluded that the same terms apply when rolling over this loan.

It might also not be clear whether the terms of a fixed-interest loan can be assessed as being similar when, in case of a refinancing under the existing loan facilities, the interest rate of this loan will be adjusted to market.

In this context, the purpose of the classification of liabilities as current or non-current in IAS 1 should be considered, which is to provide information about the entity's long-term liquidity situation independent of its creditworthiness or about the same or similar credit conditions.

In addition, we do not support introducing new terminology in IAS 1. As noted in the proposed Basis for Conclusions on IAS 1, one of the Board's intentions for the proposed amendment is to remove inconsistencies between IAS 1 and IFRS 9 regarding the classification / derecognition of financial liabilities when different loan terms apply. To achieve this, we think it would be favourable to either use the same wording in both standards or to explain whether different terms in both standards ('same or similar terms', 'no substantial change to the rights and obligations', 'substantial modification' and 'substantially different terms') are used with the same meaning. Further, we question whether the '10 per cent extinguishment test' as described in B 3.3.6 of IFRS 9 and AG 62 of IAS 39 can be used when assessing the similarity of the loan terms.

Therefore, we would encourage the IASB to reconsider the term 'same or similar terms' and to ensure consistency with the terms used in IFRS 9 and IAS 39. Furthermore, we suggest explaining this term in the standard itself rather than in the Basis for Conclusions on IAS 1.

Furthermore, we believe that the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 73 of IAS 1 should be improved. Firstly, it might not be clear whether the terms should be assessed as similar when only a part of an existing obligation is expected to be refinanced or rolled over. Secondly, the word 'discretion' implies a judgment factor which may not be an intention of the requirement of this paragraph. Accordingly, we would suggest amending the wording of the proposed first sentence of paragraph 73 of IAS 1 as follows:

"If an entity expects, and has ~~the discretion~~ the right and the ability at the reporting date to refinance or roll over an obligation fully or partially for at least twelve months after the reporting period under an existing loan facility with the same lender, on the same or similar terms, it classifies the obligation as non-current, even if it would otherwise be due within a shorter period."

Finally, the reference in BC1 and in the footnote to BC1 to paragraph 3.2.2 of IFRS 9 in the proposed amendment is not correct. It should be 3.3.2.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.



IAS 7 *Statement of Cash Flows*

Interest paid that is capitalised

Question 1: We agree with the Board's proposal.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.

IAS 12 *Income Taxes*

Recognition of deferred tax assets for unrealised losses

Question 1: We do not fully agree with the Board's conclusions. The Board proposes to clarify several issues that have been raised by its constituents regarding the recognition of deferred tax assets for unrealised losses. We appreciate that the Board strives for a timely harmonisation of the current diversity in practice with respect to these issues.

However, we would like to express some generic concerns with respect to IAS 12. This standard has often been criticised by constituents as being difficult to apply and partly being inconsistent. Despite several amendments to IAS 12, the decision usefulness of the information that is provided in accordance with this standard is questionable.

We are concerned not only about the proposed amendment, but about the approach the Board has taken in improving this standard. We disagree with a piece-meal rectification of shortcomings of IAS 12 and instead strongly favour a fundamental revision of this standard. Within the proposed amendment the Board addresses certain issues related to recognition of deferred tax assets for unrealised losses. The recognition of deferred tax assets is, however, only one issue amongst others that require improvements.

Notwithstanding our general concerns, if the IASB were to proceed with the proposed amendments, we would agree with the first two.

With regard to the third proposal, adding the new para. 30A, we have concerns that the IASB excludes specific actions from being a tax planning opportunity, in particular



an action that results only in the reversal of existing deductible temporary differences from holding debt securities to maturity. Taking into account that different business models exist in different industries, we believe that generally all kind of techniques available to a reporting entity that do not create or increase taxable income but rather avoids taxes that would otherwise be payable in essence could represent effective tax planning strategies and, therefore, should usually equally qualify as tax planning opportunities. Temporary taxable differences from debt securities – except for default risks – will never impact taxable income if a reporting entity has the intention and ability to hold debt securities currently in a loss position until maturity or at least until unrealized losses are recovered. Thus, to deny a reporting entity considering the strategy of simply holding debt securities to qualify as a tax planning opportunity, might result in a not meaningful presentation of the respective economic situation. In particular, entities with a specific investment strategy (i.e. companies that try to match the holding period of their investment assets to the duration of their liabilities) will face disadvantages if their primary business model is to hold debt securities until maturity, because under the new para. 30A they will no longer be able to recognize deferred tax assets for unrealized losses under specific circumstances. In consequence, the exception introduced by the new para. 30A is questionable. Any exceptions which result in a deviation from general principles should be assessed in a broader context instead of an Annual Improvements project.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.

IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment* and IAS 38 *Intangible Assets*

Revaluation method—proportionate restatement of accumulated depreciation

Question 1: We agree with the Board's proposal.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.



IAS 24 *Related Party Disclosures*

Key management personnel

Question 1: We agree with the Board's proposal.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.

IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets*

Harmonisation of disclosures for value in use and fair value less costs of disposal

Question 1: We agree with the Board's proposal.

Question 2: We agree with the Board's proposal.