

Deutsches Rechnungslegungs Standards Committee e.V.

Accounting Standards Committee of Germany



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

Mr Hans Hoogervorst
Chairman of the
International Accounting Standards Board
Columbus Building
7 Westferry Circus / Canary Wharf
London E14 4HD

IFRS Technical Committee

Phone: +49 (0)30 206412-12

E-Mail: info@drsc.de

Berlin, XX June 2019

Dear Hans,

IASB Exposure Draft ED/2019/1 *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Proposed amendments to IFRS 9 and IAS 39*

On behalf of the Accounting Standards Committee of Germany (ASCG) I am writing to comment on the Exposure Draft ED/2019/1 *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Proposed amendments to IFRS 9 and IAS 39* issued by the IASB on 3 May 2019 (herein referred to as 'ED'). We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the ED.

The IASB proposes to amend IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* and IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* to provide relief from particular hedge accounting requirements in the run-up to the IBOR reform. We welcome IASB's efforts to address these pre-replacement issues in a timely manner and support the proposed amendments.

As the specific conditions and details of the replacement of existing interest rate benchmarks with alternatives have yet to be finalised, the ED cannot and does not address replacement issues. The IASB intends to assess these issues separately in a second project phase, which in our view is the appropriate approach. That said, we encourage the IASB to consider issues that might affect financial reporting when interest rate benchmarks are replaced with alternative interest rates as soon as possible. Given the dynamic developments in individual jurisdictions relating to particular interest rate benchmarks, a timely deliberation of replacement issues seems warranted in order to provide clarity to constituents.

Our detailed comments in response to the ED questions are laid out in the appendix to this letter. If you would like to discuss our comments further, please do not hesitate to contact Kristina Schwedler (schwedler@drsc.de) or me.

Yours sincerely,

Andreas Barckow

President

Contact:
Zimmerstr. 30 D-10969 Berlin
(via Markgrafenstr.19a)
Phone: +49 (0)30 206412-0
Fax: +49 (0)30 206412-15
E-Mail: info@drsc.de

Bank Details:
Deutsche Bank Berlin
IBAN-Nr.
DE26 1007 0000 0070 0781 00
BIC (Swift-Code)
DEUTDE33XXX

Register of Associations:
District Court Berlin-Charlottenburg, VR 18526 Nz
President:
Prof. Dr. Andreas Barckow
Executive Director:
Prof. Dr. Sven Morich

Appendix – Answers to the questions in the DP

Question 1 [paragraphs 6.8.4–6.8.6 of IFRS 9 and paragraphs 102D–102F of IAS 39]

Highly probable requirement and prospective assessments

For hedges of interest rate risk that are affected by interest rate benchmark reform, the Board proposes amendments to IFRS 9 and IAS 39 as described below.

(a) For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC8–BC15, the Board proposes exceptions for determining whether a forecast transaction is highly probable or whether it is no longer expected to occur. Specifically, the Exposure Draft proposes that an entity would apply those requirements assuming that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based is not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform.

(b) For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC16–BC23, the Board proposes exceptions to the hedge accounting requirements in IFRS 9 and IAS 39 so that an entity would assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based, and/or the interest rate benchmark on which the cash flows of the hedging instrument are based, are not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform when the entity determines whether:

(i) there is an economic relationship between the hedged item and the hedging instrument applying IFRS 9; or

(ii) the hedge is expected to be highly effective in achieving offsetting applying IAS 39.

Do you agree with these proposals? Why or why not? If you agree with only parts of the proposals, please specify what you agree and disagree with. If you disagree with the proposals, please explain what you propose instead and why.

We welcome the IASB's intention to provide relief and exempt entities from specific hedge accounting requirements in IAS 39 and IFRS 9 as we observe significant market uncertainty regarding the compliance with those requirements in light of the upcoming IBOR reform. Without this relief, many constituents would be left in uncertainty as to whether they could continue their hedge accounting for hedging relationships that would otherwise meet the hedge accounting requirements. We agree with the IASB that the volatility resulting from the discontinuation of these hedging relationships would not provide decision-useful information.

Hence, we support the proposed exception from the highly probable requirement as this exemption appropriately presents the relief intended.

We also support the proposed exception from prospective assessments and agree with the reasoning in BC16-BC23. BC22 clarifies that the relief is not intended to change the measurement of hedge effectiveness or to change how hedges are reflected in the financial statements. We consider this clarification to be helpful and appropriate.

Kommentiert [PDAB1]: Im Protokoll zur Telefonkonferenz vom 21.5. ist vermerkt: „[...] regt [...] Klarstellung hinsichtlich der *Abgrenzung* [Hervorhebung durch Verf.] ‚künftiger Zahlungen‘ gegen ‚künftige Geschäftsvorfälle‘ an.“

Die Geschäftsstelle hat sich die Passage sowie die dazugehörigen Erläuterungen in der BC daraufhin noch einmal angesehen. Das Kriterium der hohen Wahrscheinlichkeit bezieht sich auf eine *forecast transaction* als Grundgeschäft, d.h. auf einen künftigen Geschäftsvorfall. Sofern variable Zinszahlungen aus bereits bilanzierten finanziellen Verbindlichkeiten/Vermögenswerten designiert wurden, sind auch diese als erwartete künftige Transaktionen anzusehen (vgl. hierzu insb. auch die beispielhaften Ausführungen in BC 13). Der IASB gewährt die Ausnahme damit also sowohl für variable Zahlungen von bereits bestehenden Geschäften als auch für Zahlungen künftig noch abzuschließender Geschäfte.

U.E. entfällt damit die Anregung einer Klarstellung der Abgrenzung, weil diese aufgrund der Erläuterungen in der Beschlussgrundlage gar nicht getroffen wird.

Wenn der Fachausschuss der Ansicht ist, DASS eine Unterscheidung getroffen werden sollte und nur eine Geschäftsart mit einer Ausnahmeregelung belegt werden sollte, dann wäre dies herauszuarbeiten und zu begründen. Da die Geschäftsstelle keine stichhaltige Begründung für eine Einengung sieht, haben wir die Antwort positiv formuliert und den Vorschlägen zugestimmt.

Question 2 [paragraph 6.8.7 of IFRS 9 and paragraph 102G of IAS 39]

Designating a component of an item as the hedged item

For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC24–BC27, the Board proposes amendments to the hedge accounting requirements in IFRS 9 and IAS 39 for hedges of the benchmark component of interest rate risk that is not contractually specified and that is affected by interest rate benchmark reform. Specifically, for such hedges, the Exposure Draft proposes that an entity applies the requirement—that the designated risk component or designated portion is separately identifiable—only at the inception of the hedging relationship.

Do you agree with this proposal? Why or why not? If you disagree with the proposal, please explain what you propose instead and why.

We agree with the proposal for the same reasons discussed in our answer to question 1. The proposed relief rightly allows continued designation and avoids unnecessary volatility in financial reporting.

Question 3 [paragraphs 6.8.8–6.8.10 of IFRS 9 and paragraphs 102H–102J of IAS 39]

Mandatory application and end of application

(a) For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC28–BC31, the Board proposes that the exceptions are mandatory. As a result, entities would be required to apply the proposed exceptions to all hedging relationships that are affected by interest rate benchmark reform.

(b) For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC32–BC42, the Board proposes that the exceptions would apply for a limited period. Specifically, an entity would prospectively cease applying the proposed amendments at the earlier of:

(i) when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows; and

(ii) when the hedging relationship is discontinued, or if paragraph 6.8.9 of IFRS 9 or paragraph 102I of IAS 39 applies, when the entire amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve with respect to that hedging relationship is reclassified to profit or loss.

(c) For the reasons set out in paragraph BC43, the Board is not proposing an end of application in relation to the separate identification requirement.

Do you agree with these proposals? Why or why not? If you agree with only parts of the proposals, please specify what you agree and disagree with. If you disagree with the proposals, please explain what you propose instead and why.



We agree with the proposed mandatory application of the exceptions to all hedging relationships that are affected by the interest rate benchmark reform as we share the view expressed in BC28-BC29. Voluntary application of the proposed amendments could give rise to earnings management, which should be avoided.

Further, we agree with the proposed provisions regarding the end of application which focus on the end of uncertainty arising from the interest rate benchmark reform.

In addition, we support not proposing an end of the application for the exemption from the separate identification requirement as we agree with the IASB's reasoning in BC43 that an end of application would contradict the objective of the relief.

Question 4 [paragraph 6.8.11 of IFRS 9 and paragraph 102K of IAS 39]

Disclosures

For the reasons set out in paragraph BC44, the Board proposes that entities provide specific disclosures about the extent to which their hedging relationships are affected by the proposed amendments.

Do you agree with these proposed disclosures? Why or why not? If not, what disclosures would you propose instead and why?

We support the general objective of the additional disclosure requirements. However, we question whether all of the proposed additions are indeed proportionate and significant to every entity and suggest making clear that these requirements follow the general proportionality approach of IFRS 7. Otherwise, we fear that the benefits could outweigh the costs for some entities.

In our view, the disclosure requirements should focus on the information as to what extent an entity is affected by the interest benchmark reform. As we believe that this will already be achieved by the requirements in paragraphs 24A(a) and 24B(a)(i) of IFRS 7, we fail to see why the other disclosure requirements (with reference to 24A(c)-(d), 24B(a)(ii), 24B(a)(iv) und 24(B)(b) of IFRS 7) would be necessary.

Additionally, we emphasise that – because of the suggested effective date – the disclosures will already be required for the comparative periods, i.e. the year 2019 or even 2018 should an entity wish to adopt the new provisions early.

Against this background, we suggest the Board reconsider the specific disclosures proposed against the objective of the disclosure requirements as a whole.

Kommentiert [PDAB2]: Die Diskussionsunterlage zur Telefonkonferenz und damit auch die FA-Diskussion am 21.5.2019 bezogen sich primär auf Snapshot und Fragenkatalog. Das im Protokoll hinterlegte Sitzungsergebnis „[...] hat aber Bedenken, dass die gewählte Formulierung weiterhin auslegungsbedürftig sei“ ist vor diesem Hintergrund zu sehen.

ED/2019/1 enthält zur Beendigung der vorgeschlagenen Ausnahmen differenzierte Bestimmungen (vgl. ED/2019/1 par. 6.8.8-6.8.10 für IFRS 9 und par. 102H -102J für IAS 39). In Bezug auf das highly-probable-Kriterium wird vorgeschlagen:

“An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 6.8.4. to a hedged item at the earlier of: (a) when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item; and [...]”.

Im Snapshot und im Fragenkatalog zu ED/2019/1 fehlt die Differenzierung bzw. die hervorgehobene Spezifizierung. Die Beschlussgrundlage enthält verschiedene Beispiele zum Ende der Ausnahmeregelungen, geht hierbei aber z.T. nur implizit auf die differenzierten Bestimmungen ein (vgl. BC35ff.)

Die Geschäftsstelle hält den Text im Änderungsentwurf des IASB nach nochmaligem Lesen für eindeutig und sieht die Auslegungsbedürftigkeit nicht mehr als gegeben an. Daher wurde der Antwortentwurf zustimmend formuliert.



Question 5 [paragraphs 7.1.9 and 7.2.26(d) of IFRS 9 and paragraph 108G of IAS 39]

Effective date and transition

For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC45–BC47, the Board proposes that the amendments would have an effective date of annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2020. Earlier application would be permitted. The Board proposes that the amendments would be applied retrospectively. No specific transition provisions are proposed.

Do you agree with these proposals? Why or why not? If you disagree with the proposals, please explain what you propose instead and why.

We agree with the proposed effective date and the permission of earlier application taking into account the demand for a fast solution of issues affecting financial reporting in the run-up to the IBOR-Reform. We also agree with the proposal to apply the amendments retrospectively. As regards the disclosure requirements, our agreement should be read in the context of our answer to question 4.