

**IASB documents published to accompany**

**IAS 32**

# Financial Instruments: Presentation

The text of the unaccompanied standard, IAS 32, is contained in Part A of this edition. Its effective date when issued was 1 January 2005. The text of the Accompanying Guidance on IAS 32 is contained in Part B of this edition. This part presents the following documents:

**BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS**

**DISSENTING OPINIONS**

## CONTENTS

*from paragraph*

<b>BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS ON IAS 32 FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS: PRESENTATION</b>	
<b>SCOPE</b>	<b>BC3B</b>
<b>DEFINITIONS (PARAGRAPHS 11–14 AND AG3–AG24)</b>	<b>BC4</b>
Financial asset, financial liability and equity instrument (paragraphs 11 and AG3–AG14)	BC4
Foreign currency denominated pro rata rights issues	BC4A
<b>PRESENTATION (PARAGRAPHS 15–50 AND AG25–AG39)</b>	<b>BC5</b>
Liabilities and equity (paragraphs 15–27 and AG25–AG29)	BC5
No contractual obligation to deliver cash or another financial asset (paragraphs 17–20, AG25 and AG26)	BC7
Compound financial instruments (paragraphs 28–32 and AG30–AG35)	BC22
Treasury shares (paragraphs 33–34 and AG36)	BC32
Interest, dividends, losses and gains (paragraphs 35–41 and AG37)	BC33
Income tax consequences of distributions to holders of an equity instrument and of transaction costs of an equity transaction	BC33A
<b>SUMMARY OF CHANGES FROM THE EXPOSURE DRAFT</b>	<b>BC49</b>
<b>AMENDMENTS FOR SOME PUTTABLE INSTRUMENTS AND SOME INSTRUMENTS THAT IMPOSE ON THE ENTITY AN OBLIGATION TO DELIVER TO ANOTHER PARTY A PRO RATA SHARE OF THE NET ASSETS OF THE ENTITY ONLY ON LIQUIDATION</b>	<b>BC50</b>
Amendment for puttable instruments	BC50
Amendment for obligations to deliver to another party a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation	BC64
Non-controlling interests	BC68
Analysis of costs and benefits	BC69
<b>AMENDMENTS TO THE APPLICATION GUIDANCE FOR OFFSETTING FINANCIAL ASSETS AND FINANCIAL LIABILITIES</b>	<b>BC75</b>
Background	BC75
Requirements for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities	BC79
Offsetting collateral amounts	BC102
Unit of account	BC105
Cost-benefit considerations	BC112
Transition and effective date	BC117
<b>DISSENTING OPINIONS</b>	

## Basis for Conclusions on IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Presentation*

*This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, IAS 32.*

- BC1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises the International Accounting Standards Board's considerations in reaching its conclusions on revising IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Disclosure and Presentation*<sup>1</sup> in 2003. Individual Board members gave greater weight to some factors than to others.
- BC2 In July 2001 the Board announced that, as part of its initial agenda of technical projects, it would undertake a project to improve a number of Standards, including IAS 32 and IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*.<sup>2</sup> The objectives of the Improvements project were to reduce the complexity in the Standards by clarifying and adding guidance, eliminating internal inconsistencies, and incorporating into the Standards elements of Standing Interpretations Committee (SIC) Interpretations and IAS 39 implementation guidance. In June 2002 the Board published its proposals in an Exposure Draft of proposed amendments to IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Disclosure and Presentation* and IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*, with a comment deadline of 14 October 2002. The Board received over 170 comment letters on the Exposure Draft.
- BC3 Because the Board did not reconsider the fundamental approach to the accounting for financial instruments established by IAS 32 and IAS 39, this Basis for Conclusions does not discuss requirements in IAS 32 that the Board has not reconsidered.
- BC3A In July 2006 the Board published an exposure draft of proposed amendments to IAS 32 relating to the classification of puttable instruments and instruments with obligations arising on liquidation. The Board subsequently confirmed the proposals and in 2008 issued an amendment that now forms part of IAS 32. A summary of the Board's considerations and reasons for its conclusions is in paragraphs BC50–BC74.

### Scope

- BC3B In November 2013 the Board amended the scope of IAS 32 so that it conformed to the scope of IAS 39 as amended in November 2013 regarding the accounting for some executory contracts (which was changed as a result of replacing the hedge accounting requirements in IAS 39).
- BC3C IFRS 9 replaced IAS 39 and consequentially in July 2014 the scope of IAS 39 was relocated to IFRS 9.

<sup>1</sup> In August 2005, the IASB relocated all disclosures relating to financial instruments to IFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures*. The paragraphs relating to disclosures that were originally published in this Basis for Conclusions were relocated, if still relevant, to the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 7.

<sup>2</sup> IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* replaced IAS 39. IFRS 9 applies to all items that were previously within the scope of IAS 39.

**Definitions (paragraphs 11–14 and AG3–AG24)**

---

**Financial asset, financial liability and equity instrument (paragraphs 11 and AG3–AG14)**

- BC4 The revised IAS 32 addresses the classification as financial assets, financial liabilities or equity instruments of financial instruments that are indexed to, or settled in, an entity's own equity instruments. As discussed further in paragraphs BC6–BC15, the Board decided to preclude equity classification for such contracts when they (a) involve an obligation to deliver cash or another financial asset or to exchange financial assets or financial liabilities under conditions that are potentially unfavourable to the entity, (b) in the case of a non-derivative, are not for the receipt or delivery of a fixed number of shares or (c) in the case of a derivative, are not for the exchange of a fixed number of shares for a fixed amount of cash or another financial asset. The Board also decided to preclude equity classification for contracts that are derivatives on derivatives on an entity's own equity. Consistently with this decision, the Board also decided to amend the definitions of financial asset, financial liability and equity instrument in IAS 32 to make them consistent with the guidance about contracts on an entity's own equity instruments. The Board did not reconsider other aspects of the definitions as part of this project to revise IAS 32, for example the other changes to the definitions proposed by the Joint Working Group in its Draft Standard *Financial Instruments and Similar Items* published by the Board's predecessor body, IASC, in 2000.

**Foreign currency denominated pro rata rights issues**

- BC4A In 2005 the International Financial Reporting Interpretations Committee (IFRIC) was asked whether the equity conversion option embedded in a convertible bond denominated in a foreign currency met IAS 32's requirements to be classified as an equity instrument. IAS 32 states that a derivative instrument relating to the purchase or issue of an entity's own equity instruments is classified as equity only if it results in the exchange of a fixed number of equity instruments for a fixed amount of cash or other assets. At that time, the IFRIC concluded that if the conversion option was denominated in a currency other than the issuing entity's functional currency, the amount of cash to be received in the functional currency would be variable. Consequently, the instrument was a derivative liability that should be measured at its fair value with changes in fair value included in profit or loss.
- BC4B However, the IFRIC also concluded that this outcome was not consistent with the Board's approach when it introduced the 'fixed for fixed' notion in IAS 32. Therefore, the IFRIC decided to recommend that the Board amend IAS 32 to permit a conversion or stand-alone option to be classified as equity if the exercise price was fixed in any currency. In September 2005 the Board decided not to proceed with the proposed amendment.

- BC4C In 2009 the Board was asked by the IFRIC to consider a similar issue. This issue was whether a right entitling the holder to receive a fixed number of the issuing entity's own equity instruments for a fixed amount of a currency other than the issuing entity's functional currency (foreign currency) should be accounted for as a derivative liability.
- BC4D These rights are commonly described as 'rights issues' and include rights, options and warrants. Laws or regulations in many jurisdictions throughout the world require the use of rights issues when raising capital. The entity issues one or more rights to acquire a fixed number of additional shares pro rata to all existing shareholders of a class of non-derivative equity instruments. The exercise price is normally below the current market price of the shares. Consequently, a shareholder must exercise its rights if it does not wish its proportionate interest in the entity to be diluted. Issues with those characteristics are discussed in IFRS 2 *Share-based Payment* and IAS 33 *Earnings per Share*.
- BC4E The Board was advised that rights with the characteristics discussed above were being issued frequently in the current economic environment. The Board was also advised that many issuing entities fixed the exercise price of the rights in currencies other than their functional currency because the entities were listed in more than one jurisdiction and might be required to do so by law or regulation. Therefore, the accounting conclusions affected a significant number of entities in many jurisdictions. In addition, because these are usually relatively large transactions, they can have a substantial effect on entities' financial statement amounts.
- BC4F The Board agreed with the IFRIC's 2005 conclusion that a contract with an exercise price denominated in a foreign currency would not result in the entity receiving a fixed amount of cash. However, the Board also agreed with the IFRIC that classifying rights as derivative liabilities was not consistent with the substance of the transaction. Rights issues are issued only to existing shareholders on the basis of the number of shares they already own. In this respect they partially resemble dividends paid in shares.
- BC4G The Board decided that a financial instrument that gives the holder the right to acquire a fixed number of the entity's own equity instruments for a fixed amount of any currency is an equity instrument if, and only if, the entity offers the financial instrument pro rata to all of its existing owners of the same class of its own non-derivative equity instruments.
- BC4H In excluding grants of rights with these features from the scope of IFRS 2, the Board explicitly recognised that the holder of the right receives it as a holder of equity instruments, ie as an owner. The Board noted that IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements* requires transactions with owners in their capacity as owners to be recognised in the statement of changes in equity rather than in the statement of comprehensive income.
- BC4I Consistently with its conclusion in IFRS 2, the Board decided that a pro rata issue of rights to all existing shareholders to acquire additional shares is a transaction with an entity's owners in their capacity as owners. Consequently, those transactions should be recognised in equity, not comprehensive income.

Because the Board concluded that the rights were equity instruments, it decided to amend the definition of a financial liability to exclude them.

BC4J Some respondents to the exposure draft expressed concerns that the wording of the amendment was too open-ended and could lead to structuring risks. The Board rejected this argument because of the extremely narrow amendment that requires the entity to treat all of its existing owners of the same class of its own non-derivative equity instruments equally. The Board also noted that a change in the capital structure of an entity to create a new class of non-derivative equity instruments would be transparent because of the presentation and disclosure requirements in IFRSs.

BC4K The Board decided not to extend this conclusion to other instruments that grant the holder the right to purchase the entity's own equity instruments such as the conversion feature in convertible bonds. The Board also noted that long-dated foreign currency rights issues are not primarily transactions with owners in their capacity as owners. The equal treatment of all owners of the same class of equity instruments was also the basis on which, in IFRIC 17 *Distributions of Non-cash Assets to Owners*, the IFRIC distinguished non-reciprocal distributions to owners from exchange transactions. The fact that the rights are distributed pro rata to existing shareholders is critical to the Board's conclusion to provide an exception to the 'fixed for fixed' concept in IAS 32 as this is a narrow targeted transaction with owners in their capacity as owners.

## **Presentation (paragraphs 15–50 and AG25–AG39)**

---

### **Liabilities and equity (paragraphs 15–27 and AG25–AG29)**

BC5 The revised IAS 32 addresses whether derivative and non-derivative contracts indexed to, or settled in, an entity's own equity instruments are financial assets, financial liabilities or equity instruments. The original IAS 32 dealt with aspects of this issue piecemeal and it was not clear how various transactions (eg net share settled contracts and contracts with settlement options) should be treated under the Standard. The Board concluded that it needed to clarify the accounting treatment for such transactions.

BC6 The approach agreed by the Board can be summarised as follows:

A contract on an entity's own equity is an equity instrument if, and only if:

- (a) it contains no contractual obligation to transfer cash or another financial asset, or to exchange financial assets or financial liabilities with another entity under conditions that are potentially unfavourable to the entity; and
- (b) if the instrument will or may be settled in the entity's own equity instruments, it is either (i) a non-derivative that includes no contractual obligation for the entity to deliver a variable number of its own equity instruments, or (ii) a derivative that will be settled by the entity exchanging a fixed amount of cash or another financial asset for a fixed number of its own equity instruments.

## **No contractual obligation to deliver cash or another financial asset (paragraphs 17–20, AG25 and AG26)**

### **Puttable instruments (paragraph 18(b))**

- BC7 The Board decided that a financial instrument that gives the holder the right to put the instrument back to the entity for cash or another financial asset is a financial liability of the entity. Such financial instruments are commonly issued by mutual funds, unit trusts, co-operative and similar entities, often with the redemption amount being equal to a proportionate share in the net assets of the entity. Although the legal form of such financial instruments often includes a right to the residual interest in the assets of an entity available to holders of such instruments, the inclusion of an option for the holder to put the instrument back to the entity for cash or another financial asset means that the instrument meets the definition of a financial liability. The classification as a financial liability is independent of considerations such as when the right is exercisable, how the amount payable or receivable upon exercise of the right is determined, and whether the puttable instrument has a fixed maturity.
- BC7A The Board reconsidered its conclusions with regards to some puttable instruments and amended IAS 32 in February 2008 (see paragraphs BC50–BC74).
- BC8 The Board noted that the classification of a puttable instrument as a financial liability does not preclude the use of descriptors such as ‘net assets attributable to unitholders’ and ‘change in net assets attributable to unitholders’ on the face of the financial statements of an entity that has no equity (such as some mutual funds and unit trusts) or whose share capital is a financial liability under IAS 32 (such as some co-operatives). The Board also agreed that it should provide examples of how such entities might present their income statement<sup>3</sup> and balance sheet<sup>4</sup> (see Illustrative Examples 7 and 8).

### **Implicit obligations (paragraph 20)**

- BC9 The Board did not debate whether an obligation can be established implicitly rather than explicitly because this is not within the scope of an improvements project. This question will be considered by the Board in its project on revenue, liabilities and equity. Consequently, the Board retained the existing notion that an instrument may establish an obligation indirectly through its terms and conditions (see paragraph 20). However, it decided that the example of a preference share with a contractually accelerating dividend which, within the foreseeable future, is scheduled to yield a dividend so high that the entity will be economically compelled to redeem the instrument, was insufficiently clear. The example was therefore removed and replaced with others that are clearer and deal with situations that have proved problematic in practice.

<sup>3</sup> IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements* (as revised in 2007) requires an entity to present all income and expense items in one statement of comprehensive income or in two statements (a separate income statement and a statement of comprehensive income).

<sup>4</sup> IAS 1 (revised 2007) replaced the term ‘balance sheet’ with ‘statement of financial position’.

**Settlement in the entity's own equity instruments  
(paragraphs 21–24 and AG27)**

- BC10 The approach taken in the revised IAS 32 includes two main conclusions:
- (a) When an entity has an obligation to purchase its own shares for cash (such as under a forward contract to purchase its own shares), there is a financial liability for the amount of cash that the entity has an obligation to pay.
  - (b) When an entity uses its own equity instruments 'as currency' in a contract to receive or deliver a variable number of shares whose value equals a fixed amount or an amount based on changes in an underlying variable (eg a commodity price), the contract is not an equity instrument, but is a financial asset or a financial liability. In other words, when a contract is settled in a variable number of the entity's own equity instruments, or by the entity exchanging a fixed number of its own equity instruments for a variable amount of cash or another financial asset, the contract is not an equity instrument but is a financial asset or a financial liability.

*When an entity has an obligation to purchase its own shares for cash, there is a financial liability for the amount of cash that the entity has an obligation to pay.*

- BC11 An entity's obligation to purchase its own shares establishes a maturity date for the shares that are subject to the contract. Therefore, to the extent of the obligation, those shares cease to be equity instruments when the entity assumes the obligation. This treatment under IAS 32 is consistent with the treatment of shares that provide for mandatory redemption by the entity. Without a requirement to recognise a financial liability for the present value of the share redemption amount, entities with identical obligations to deliver cash in exchange for their own equity instruments could report different information in their financial statements depending on whether the redemption clause is embedded in the equity instrument or is a free-standing derivative contract.

- BC12 Some respondents to the Exposure Draft suggested that when an entity writes an option that, if exercised, will result in the entity paying cash in return for receiving its own shares, it is incorrect to treat the full amount of the exercise price as a financial liability because the obligation is conditional upon the option being exercised. The Board rejected this argument because the entity has an obligation to pay the full redemption amount and cannot avoid settlement in cash or another financial asset for the full redemption amount unless the counterparty decides not to exercise its redemption right or specified future events or circumstances beyond the control of the entity occur or do not occur. The Board also noted that a change would require a reconsideration of other provisions in IAS 32 that require liability treatment for obligations that are conditional on events or choices that are beyond the entity's control. These include, for example, (a) the treatment of financial instruments with contingent settlement provisions as financial liabilities for the full amount of the conditional obligation, (b) the treatment of preference



shares that are redeemable at the option of the holder as financial liabilities for the full amount of the conditional obligation, and (c) the treatment of financial instruments (puttable instruments) that give the holder the right to put the instrument back to the issuer for cash or another financial asset, the amount of which is determined by reference to an index, and which therefore has the potential to increase and decrease, as financial liabilities for the full amount of the conditional obligation.

*When an entity uses its own equity instruments as currency in a contract to receive or deliver a variable number of shares, the contract is not an equity instrument, but is a financial asset or a financial liability.*

- BC13 The Board agreed that it would be inappropriate to account for a contract as an equity instrument when an entity's own equity instruments are used as currency in a contract to receive or deliver a variable number of shares whose value equals a fixed amount or an amount based on changes in an underlying variable (eg a net share-settled derivative contract on gold or an obligation to deliver as many shares as are equal in value to CU10,000). Such a contract represents a right or obligation of a specified amount rather than a specified equity interest. A contract to pay or receive a specified amount (rather than a specified equity interest) is not an equity instrument. For such a contract, the entity does not know, before the transaction is settled, how many of its own shares (or how much cash) it will receive or deliver and the entity may not even know whether it will receive or deliver its own shares.
- BC14 In addition, the Board noted that precluding equity treatment for such a contract limits incentives for structuring potentially favourable or unfavourable transactions to obtain equity treatment. For example, the Board believes that an entity should not be able to obtain equity treatment for a transaction simply by including a share settlement clause when the contract is for a specified value, rather than a specified equity interest.
- BC15 The Board rejected the argument that a contract that is settled in the entity's own shares must be an equity instrument because no change in assets or liabilities, and thus no gain or loss, arises on settlement of the contract. The Board noted that any gain or loss arises before settlement of the transaction, not when it is settled.

#### **Contingent settlement provisions (paragraphs 25 and AG28)**

- BC16 The revised Standard incorporates the conclusion previously in SIC-5 *Classification of Financial Instruments—Contingent Settlement Provisions* that a financial instrument for which the manner of settlement depends on the occurrence or non-occurrence of uncertain future events, or on the outcome of uncertain circumstances that are beyond the control of both the issuer and the holder (ie a 'contingent settlement provision'), is a financial liability.
- BC17 The amendments do not include the exception previously provided in paragraph 6 of SIC-5 for circumstances in which the possibility of the entity being required to settle in cash or another financial asset is remote at the time the financial instrument is issued. The Board concluded that it is not consistent with the definitions of financial liabilities and equity instruments

to classify an obligation to deliver cash or another financial asset as a financial liability only when settlement in cash is probable. There is a contractual obligation to transfer economic benefits as a result of past events because the entity is unable to avoid a settlement in cash or another financial asset unless an event occurs or does not occur in the future.

BC18 However, the Board also concluded that contingent settlement provisions that would apply only in the event of liquidation of an entity should not influence the classification of the instrument because to do so would be inconsistent with a going concern assumption. A contingent settlement provision that provides for payment in cash or another financial asset only on the liquidation of the entity is similar to an equity instrument that has priority in liquidation and therefore should be ignored in classifying the instrument.

BC19 Additionally, the Board decided that if the part of a contingent settlement provision that could require settlement in cash or a variable number of own shares is not genuine, it should be ignored for the purposes of classifying the instrument. The Board also agreed to provide guidance on the meaning of 'genuine' in this context (see paragraph AG28).

#### **Settlement options (paragraphs 26 and 27)**

BC20 The revised Standard requires that if one of the parties to a contract has one or more options as to how it is settled (eg net in cash or by exchanging shares for cash), the contract is a financial asset or a financial liability unless all of the settlement alternatives would result in equity classification. The Board concluded that entities should not be able to circumvent the accounting requirements for financial assets and financial liabilities simply by including an option to settle a contract through the exchange of a fixed number of shares for a fixed amount. The Board had proposed in the Exposure Draft that past practice and management intentions should be considered in determining the classification of such instruments. However, respondents to the Exposure Draft noted that such requirements can be difficult to apply because some entities do not have any history of similar transactions and the assessment of whether an established practice exists and of what is management's intention can be subjective. The Board agreed with these comments and accordingly concluded that past practice and management intentions should not be determining factors.

#### **Alternative approaches considered**

BC21 In finalising the revisions to IAS 32 the Board considered, but rejected, a number of alternative approaches:

- (a) To classify as an equity instrument any contract that will be settled in the entity's own shares. The Board rejected this approach because it does not deal adequately with transactions in which an entity is using its own shares as currency, eg when an entity has an obligation to pay a fixed or determinable amount that is settled in a variable number of its own shares.

- (b) To classify a contract as an equity instrument only if (i) the contract will be settled in the entity's own shares, and (ii) the changes in the fair value of the contract move in the same direction as the changes in the fair value of the shares from the perspective of the counterparty. Under this approach, contracts that will be settled in the entity's own shares would be financial assets or financial liabilities if, from the perspective of the counterparty, their value moves inversely with the price of the entity's own shares. An example is an entity's obligation to buy back its own shares. The Board rejected this approach because its adoption would represent a fundamental shift in the concept of equity. The Board also noted that it would result in a change to the classification of some transactions, compared with the existing *Framework*<sup>5</sup> and IAS 32, that had not been exposed for comment.
- (c) To classify as an equity instrument a contract that will be settled in the entity's own shares unless its value changes in response to something other than the price of the entity's own shares. The Board rejected this approach to avoid an exception to the principle that non-derivative contracts that are settled in a variable number of an entity's own shares should be treated as financial assets or financial liabilities.
- (d) To limit classification as equity instruments to outstanding ordinary shares, and classify as financial assets or financial liabilities all contracts that involve future receipt or delivery of the entity's own shares. The Board rejected this approach because its adoption would represent a fundamental shift in the concept of equity. The Board also noted that it would result in a change to the classification of some transactions compared with the existing IAS 32 that had not been exposed for comment.

### **Compound financial instruments (paragraphs 28–32 and AG30–AG35)**

- BC22 The Standard requires the separate presentation in an entity's balance sheet<sup>6</sup> of liability and equity components of a single financial instrument. It is more a matter of form than a matter of substance that both liabilities and equity interests are created by a single financial instrument rather than two or more separate instruments. The Board believes that an entity's financial position is more faithfully represented by separate presentation of liability and equity components contained in a single instrument.

<sup>5</sup> References to the *Framework* in this Basis for Conclusions are to the IASC's *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, adopted by the Board in 2001 and in effect when the Standard was revised and amended.

<sup>6</sup> IAS 1 (as revised in 2007) replaced the term 'balance sheet' with 'statement of financial position'.

*Allocation of the initial carrying amount to the liability and equity components (paragraphs 31, 32 and AG36–AG38 and Illustrative Examples 9–12)*

- BC23 The previous version of IAS 32 did not prescribe a particular method for assigning the initial carrying amount of a compound financial instrument to its separated liability and equity components. Rather, it suggested approaches that might be considered, such as:
- (a) assigning to the less easily measurable component (often the equity component) the residual amount after deducting from the instrument as a whole the amount separately determined for the component that is more easily determinable (a ‘with-and-without’ method); and
  - (b) measuring the liability and equity components separately and, to the extent necessary, adjusting these amounts pro rata so that the sum of the components equals the amount of the instrument as a whole (a ‘relative fair value’ method).
- BC24 This choice was originally justified on the grounds that IAS 32 did not deal with the measurement of financial assets, financial liabilities and equity instruments.
- BC25 However, since the issue of IAS 39,<sup>7</sup> IFRSs contain requirements for the measurement of financial assets and financial liabilities. Therefore, the view that IAS 32 should not prescribe a particular method for separating compound financial instruments because of the absence of measurement requirements for financial instruments is no longer valid. IAS 39, paragraph 43, requires a financial liability to be measured on initial recognition at its fair value. Therefore, a relative fair value method could result in an initial measurement of the liability component that is not in compliance with IAS 39.
- BC26 After initial recognition, a financial liability that is classified as at fair value through profit or loss is measured at fair value under IAS 39,<sup>8</sup> and other financial liabilities are measured at amortised cost. If the liability component of a compound financial instrument is classified as at fair value through profit or loss, an entity could recognise an immediate gain or loss after initial recognition if it applies a relative fair value method. This is contrary to IAS 32, paragraph 31, which states that no gain or loss arises from recognising the components of the instrument separately.
- BC27 Under the *Framework*, and IASs 32 and 39, an equity instrument is defined as any contract that evidences a residual interest in the assets of an entity after deducting all of its liabilities. Paragraph 67 of the *Framework* further states that the amount at which equity is recognised in the balance sheet is dependent on the measurement of assets and liabilities.

---

<sup>7</sup> IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* replaced IAS 39. The requirements of paragraph 43 of IAS 39 relating to the initial measurement of financial assets were relocated to paragraph 5.1.1 of IFRS 9.

<sup>8</sup> IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* replaced IAS 39. IFRS 9 applies to all items that were previously within the scope of IAS 39.

- BC28 The Board concluded that the alternatives in IAS 32 to measure on initial recognition the liability component of a compound financial instrument as a residual amount after separating the equity component or on the basis of a relative fair value method should be eliminated. Instead the liability component should be measured first (including the value of any embedded non-equity derivative features, such as an embedded call feature), and the residual amount assigned to the equity component.
- BC29 The objective of this amendment is to make the requirements about the entity's separation of the liability and equity components of a single compound financial instrument consistent with the requirements about the initial measurement of a financial liability in IAS 39 and the definitions in IAS 32 and the *Framework* of an equity instrument as a residual interest.
- BC30 This approach removes the need to estimate inputs to, and apply, complex option pricing models to measure the equity component of some compound financial instruments. The Board also noted that the absence of a prescribed approach led to a lack of comparability among entities applying IAS 32 and that it therefore was desirable to specify a single approach.
- BC31 The Board noted that a requirement to use the with-and-without method, under which the liability component is determined first, is consistent with the proposals of the Joint Working Group of Standard Setters in its Draft Standard and Basis for Conclusions in *Financial Instruments and Similar Items*, published by IASC in December 2000 (see Draft Standard, paragraphs 74 and 75 and Application Supplement, paragraph 318).

### **Treasury shares (paragraphs 33, 34 and AG36)**

- BC32 The revised Standard incorporates the guidance in SIC-16 *Share Capital—Reacquired Own Equity Instruments (Treasury Shares)*. The acquisition and subsequent resale by an entity of its own equity instruments represents a transfer between those holders of equity instruments who have given up their equity interest and those who continue to hold an equity instrument, rather than a gain or loss to the entity.
- BC32A *[This paragraph refers to amendments that are not yet effective, and is therefore not included in this edition.]*

### **Interest, dividends, losses and gains (paragraphs 35–41 and AG37)**

#### **Costs of an equity transaction (paragraphs 35 and 37–39)**

- BC33 The revised Standard incorporates the guidance in SIC-17 *Equity—Costs of an Equity Transaction*. Transaction costs incurred as a necessary part of completing an equity transaction are accounted for as part of the transaction to which they relate. Linking the equity transaction and costs of the transaction reflects in equity the total cost of the transaction.

**Income tax consequences of distributions to holders of an equity instrument and of transaction costs of an equity transaction**

- BC33A In *Annual Improvements 2009–2011 Cycle* (issued in May 2012) the Board addressed perceived inconsistencies between IAS 12 *Income Taxes* and IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Presentation* with regards to recognising the consequences of income tax relating to distributions to holders of an equity instrument and to transaction costs of an equity transaction. Paragraph 52B of IAS 12 requires the recognition of the income tax consequences of dividends in profit or loss except when the circumstances described in paragraph 58(a) and (b) of IAS 12 arise. However, paragraph 35 of IAS 32 required the recognition of income tax relating to distributions to holders of an equity instrument in equity (prior to the amendment).<sup>9</sup>
- BC33B The Board noted that the intention of IAS 32 was to follow the requirements in IAS 12 for accounting for income tax relating to distributions to holders of an equity instrument and to transaction costs of an equity transaction. Consequently, the Board decided to add paragraph 35A to IAS 32 to clarify this intention.
- BC33C The Board noted that this amendment is not intended to address the distinction between income tax consequences of dividends in accordance with paragraph 52B, and withholding tax for dividends in accordance with paragraph 65A, of IAS 12. In this respect, the Board observed that the income tax consequences of distributions to holders of an equity instrument are recognised in profit or loss in accordance with paragraph 52B of IAS 12. Consequently, to the extent that the distribution relates to income arising from a transaction that was originally recognised in profit or loss, the income tax on the distribution should be recognised in profit or loss. However, if the distribution relates to income or to a transaction that was originally recognised in other comprehensive income or equity, the entity should apply the exception in paragraph 58(a) of IAS 12, and recognise the income tax consequences of the distribution outside of profit or loss. The Board also observed that, in accordance with paragraph 65A, when an entity pays dividends to its shareholders the portion of the dividends paid or payable to taxation authorities as withholding tax is charged to equity as part of the dividends.<sup>10</sup>
- BC34–  
BC48 [Deleted]

---

<sup>9</sup> *Annual Improvements to IFRS Standards 2015–2017 Cycle*, issued in December 2017, deleted paragraph 52B of IAS 12. The requirements previously specified in that paragraph were moved to paragraph 57A of IAS 12.

<sup>10</sup> *Annual Improvements to IFRS Standards 2015–2017 Cycle*, issued in December 2017, deleted paragraph 52B of IAS 12. The requirements previously specified in that paragraph were moved to paragraph 57A of IAS 12.

## Summary of changes from the Exposure Draft

---

- BC49 The main changes from the Exposure Draft's proposals are as follows:
- (a) The Exposure Draft proposed to define a financial liability as a contractual obligation to deliver cash or another financial asset to another entity or to exchange financial instruments with another entity under conditions that are potentially unfavourable. The definition in the Standard has been expanded to include some contracts that will or may be settled in the entity's own equity instruments. The Standard's definition of a financial asset has been similarly expanded.
  - (b) The Exposure Draft proposed that a financial instrument that gives the holder the right to put it back to the entity for cash or another financial asset is a financial liability. The Standard retains this conclusion, but provides additional guidance and illustrative examples to assist entities that, as a result of this requirement, either have no equity as defined in IAS 32 or whose share capital is not equity as defined in IAS 32.
  - (c) The Standard retains and clarifies the proposal in the Exposure Draft that terms and conditions of a financial instrument may indirectly create an obligation.
  - (d) The Exposure Draft proposed to incorporate in IAS 32 the conclusion previously in SIC-5. This is that a financial instrument for which the manner of settlement depends on the occurrence or non-occurrence of uncertain future events or on the outcome of uncertain circumstances that are beyond the control of both the issuer and the holder is a financial liability. The Standard clarifies this conclusion by requiring contingent settlement provisions that apply only in the event of liquidation of an entity or are not genuine to be ignored.
  - (e) The Exposure Draft proposed that a derivative contract that contains an option as to how it is settled meets the definition of an equity instrument if the entity had all of the following: (i) an unconditional right and ability to settle the contract gross; (ii) an established practice of such settlement; and (iii) the intention to settle the contract gross. These conditions have not been carried forward into the Standard. Rather, a derivative with settlement options is classified as a financial asset or a financial liability unless all the settlement alternatives would result in equity classification.
  - (f) The Standard provides explicit guidance on accounting for the repurchase of a convertible instrument.
  - (g) The Standard provides explicit guidance on accounting for the amendment of the terms of a convertible instrument to induce early conversion.

- (h) The Exposure Draft proposed that a financial instrument that is an equity instrument of a subsidiary should be eliminated on consolidation when held by the parent, or presented in the consolidated balance sheet within equity when not held by the parent (as a minority interest<sup>11</sup> separate from the equity of the parent). The Standard requires all terms and conditions agreed between members of the group and the holders of the instrument to be considered when determining if the group as a whole has an obligation that would give rise to a financial liability. To the extent there is such an obligation, the instrument (or component of the instrument that is subject to the obligation) is a financial liability in consolidated financial statements.
- (i)–(j) [deleted]
- (k) In August 2005, the IASB issued IFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures*. As a result, disclosures relating to financial instruments, if still relevant, were relocated to IFRS 7.

### **Amendments for some puttable instruments and some instruments that impose on the entity an obligation to deliver to another party a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation**

---

#### **Amendment for puttable instruments**

BC50 As discussed in paragraphs BC7 and BC8, puttable instruments meet the definition of a financial liability and the Board concluded that all such instruments should be classified as liabilities. However, constituents raised the following concerns about classifying such instruments as financial liabilities if they represent the residual claim to the net assets of the entity:

- (a) On an ongoing basis, the liability is recognised at not less than the amount payable on demand. This can result in the entire market capitalisation of the entity being recognised as a liability depending on the basis for which the redemption value of the financial instrument is calculated.
- (b) Changes in the carrying value of the liability are recognised in profit or loss. This results in counter-intuitive accounting (if the redemption value is linked to the performance of the entity) because:
  - (i) when an entity performs well, the present value of the settlement amount of the liabilities increases, and a loss is recognised.

---

<sup>11</sup> In January 2008 the IASB issued an amended IAS 27 *Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements*, which amended 'minority interest' to 'non-controlling interests'. The consolidation requirements in IAS 27 were superseded by IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements* issued in May 2011. The term 'non-controlling interests' and the requirements for non-controlling interests were not changed.



- (ii) when the entity performs poorly, the present value of the settlement amount of the liability decreases, and a gain is recognised.
- (c) It is possible, again depending on the basis for which the redemption value is calculated, that the entity will report negative net assets because of unrecognised intangible assets and goodwill, and because the measurement of recognised assets and liabilities may not be at fair value.
- (d) The issuing entity's statement of financial position portrays the entity as wholly, or mostly, debt funded.
- (e) Distributions of profits to shareholders are recognised as expenses. Hence, it may appear that profit or loss is a function of the distribution policy, not performance.

Furthermore, constituents contended that additional disclosures and adapting the format of the statement of comprehensive income and statement of financial position did not resolve these concerns.

BC51 The Board agreed with constituents that many puttable instruments, despite meeting the definition of a financial liability, represent a residual interest in the net assets of the entity. The Board also agreed with constituents that additional disclosures and adapting the format of the entity's financial statements did not resolve the problem of the lack of relevance and understandability of that current accounting treatment. Therefore, the Board decided to amend IAS 32 to improve the financial reporting of these instruments.

BC52 The Board considered the following ways to improve the financial reporting of instruments that represent a residual interest in the net assets of the entity:

- (a) to continue to classify these instruments as financial liabilities, but amend their measurement so that changes in their fair value would not be recognised;
- (b) to amend IAS 32 to require separation of all puttable instruments into a put option and a host instrument; or
- (c) to amend IAS 32 to provide a limited scope exception so that financial instruments puttable at fair value would be classified as equity, if specified conditions were met.

*Amend the measurement of some puttable financial instruments so that changes in their fair value would not be recognised*

BC53 The Board decided against this approach because:

- (a) it is inconsistent with the principle in IAS 32 and IAS 39<sup>12</sup> that only equity instruments are not remeasured after their initial recognition;

<sup>12</sup> IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* replaced IAS 39. IFRS 9 applies to all items that were previously within the scope of IAS 39.

IAS 32 BC

- (b) it retains the disadvantage that entities whose instruments are all puttable would have no equity instruments; and
- (c) it introduces a new category of financial liabilities to IAS 39, and thus increases complexity.

*Separate all puttable instruments into a put option and a host instrument*

BC54 The Board concluded that conducting further research into an approach that splits a puttable share into an equity component and a written put option component (financial liability) would duplicate efforts of the Board's longer-term project on liabilities and equity. Consequently, the Board decided not to proceed with a project at this stage to determine whether a puttable share should be split into an equity component and a written put option component.

*Classify as equity instruments puttable instruments that represent a residual interest in the entity*

BC55 The Board decided to proceed with proposals to amend IAS 32 to require puttable financial instruments that represent a residual interest in the net assets of the entity to be classified as equity provided that specified conditions are met. The proposals represented a limited scope exception to the definition of a financial liability and a short-term solution, pending the outcome of the longer-term project on liabilities and equity. In June 2006 the Board published an exposure draft proposing that financial instruments puttable at fair value that meet specific criteria should be classified as equity.

BC56 In response to comments received from respondents to that exposure draft, the Board amended the criteria for identifying puttable instruments that represent a residual interest in the entity, to those included in paragraphs 16A and 16B. The Board decided on those conditions for the following reasons:

- (a) to ensure that the puttable instruments, as a class, represent the residual interest in the net assets of the entity;
- (b) to ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with a limited scope exception to the definition of a financial liability; and
- (c) to reduce structuring opportunities that might arise as a result of the amendments.

BC57 The Board decided that the instrument must entitle the holder to a pro rata share of the net assets on liquidation because the net assets on liquidation represent the ultimate residual interest of the entity.

BC58 The Board decided that the instrument must be in the class of instruments that is subordinate to all other classes of instruments on liquidation in order to represent the residual interest in the entity.

BC59 The Board decided that all instruments in the class that is subordinate to all other classes of instruments must have identical contractual terms and conditions. In order to ensure that the class of instruments as a whole is the residual class, the Board decided that no instrument holder in that class can have preferential terms or conditions in its position as an owner of the entity.

- BC60 The Board decided that the puttable instruments should contain no contractual obligation to deliver a financial asset to another entity other than the put. That is because the amendments represent a limited scope exception to the definition of a financial liability and extending that exception to instruments that also contain other contractual obligations is not appropriate. Moreover, the Board concluded that if the puttable instrument contains another contractual obligation, that instrument may not represent the residual interest because the holder of the puttable instrument may have a claim to some of the net assets of the entity in preference to other instruments.
- BC61 As well as requiring a direct link between the puttable instrument and the performance of the entity, the Board also decided that there should be no financial instrument or contract with a return that is more residual. The Board decided to require that there must be no other financial instrument or contract that has total cash flows based substantially on the performance of the entity and has the effect of significantly restricting or fixing the return to the puttable instrument holders. This criterion was included to ensure that the holders of the puttable instruments represent the residual interest in the net assets of the entity.
- BC62 An instrument holder may enter into transactions with the issuing entity in a role other than that of an owner. The Board concluded that it is inappropriate to consider cash flows and contractual features related to the instrument holder in a non-owner role when evaluating whether a financial instrument has the features set out in paragraph 16A or paragraph 16C. That is because those cash flows and contractual features are separate and distinct from the cash flows and contractual features of the puttable financial instrument.
- BC63 The Board also decided that contracts (such as warrants and other derivatives) to be settled by the issue of puttable financial instruments should be precluded from equity classification. That is because the Board noted that the amendments represent a limited scope exception to the definition of a financial liability and extending that exception to such contracts is not appropriate.

### **Amendment for obligations to deliver to another party a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation**

- BC64 Issues similar to those raised by constituents relating to classification of puttable financial instruments apply to some financial instruments that create an obligation only on liquidation of the entity.
- BC65 In the exposure draft published in June 2006, the Board proposed to exclude from the definition of a financial liability a contractual obligation that entitles the holder to a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation of the entity. The liquidation of the entity may be:
- (a) certain to occur and outside the control of the entity (limited life entities); or

## IAS 32 BC

- (b) uncertain to occur but at the option of the holder (for example, some partnership interests).

BC66 Respondents to that exposure draft were generally supportive of the proposed amendment.

BC67 The Board decided that an exception to the definition of a financial liability should be made for instruments that entitle the holder to a pro rata share of the net assets of an entity only on liquidation if particular requirements are met. Many of those requirements, and the reasons for them, are similar to those for puttable financial instruments. The differences between the requirements are as follows:

- (a) there is no requirement that there be no other contractual obligations;
- (b) there is no requirement to consider the expected total cash flows throughout the life of the instrument;
- (c) the only feature that must be identical among the instruments in the class is the obligation for the issuing entity to deliver to the holder a pro rata share of its net assets on liquidation.

The reason for the differences is the timing of settlement of the obligation. The life of the financial instrument is the same as the life of the issuing entity; the extinguishment of the obligation can occur only at liquidation. Therefore, the Board concluded that it was appropriate to focus only on the obligations that exist at liquidation. The instrument must be subordinate to all other classes of instruments and represent the residual interests only at that point in time. However, if the instrument contains other contractual obligations, those obligations may need to be accounted for separately in accordance with the requirements of IAS 32.

### **Non-controlling interests**

BC68 The Board decided that puttable financial instruments or instruments that impose on the entity an obligation to deliver to another party a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation should be classified as equity in the separate financial statements of the issuer if they represent the residual class of instruments (and all the relevant requirements are met). The Board decided that such instruments were not the residual interest in the consolidated financial statements and therefore that non-controlling interests that contain an obligation to transfer a financial asset to another entity should be classified as a financial liability in the consolidated financial statements.

### **Analysis of costs and benefits**

BC69 The Board acknowledged that the amendments made in February 2008 are not consistent with the definition of a liability in the *Framework*, or with the underlying principle of IAS 32, which is based on that definition. Consequently, those amendments added complexity to IAS 32 and introduced the need for detailed rules. However, the Board also noted that IAS 32 contains other exceptions to its principle (and the definition of a liability in the *Framework*) that require instruments to be classified as liabilities that

otherwise would be treated as equity. Those exceptions highlight the need for a comprehensive reconsideration of the distinctions between liabilities and equity, which the Board is undertaking in its long-term project.

- BC70 In the interim, the Board concluded that classifying as equity the instruments that have all the features and meet the conditions in paragraphs 16A and 16B or paragraphs 16C and 16D would improve the comparability of information provided to the users of financial statements. That is because financial instruments that are largely equivalent to ordinary shares would be consistently classified across different entity structures (eg some partnerships, limited life entities and co-operatives). The specified instruments differ from ordinary shares in one respect; that difference is the obligation to deliver cash (or another financial asset). However, the Board concluded that the other characteristics of the specified instruments are sufficiently similar to ordinary shares for the instruments to be classified as equity. Consequently, the Board concluded that the amendments will result in financial reporting that is more understandable and relevant to the users of financial statements.
- BC71 Furthermore, in developing the amendments, the Board considered the costs to entities of obtaining information necessary to determine the required classification. The Board believes that the costs of obtaining any new information would be slight because all of the necessary information should be readily available.
- BC72 The Board also acknowledged that one of the costs and risks of introducing exceptions to the definition of a financial liability is the structuring opportunities that may result. The Board concluded that financial structuring opportunities are minimised by the detailed criteria required for equity classification and the related disclosures.
- BC73 Consequently, the Board believed that the benefits of the amendments outweigh the costs.
- BC74 The Board took the view that, in most cases, entities should be able to apply the amendments retrospectively. The Board noted that IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors* provides relief when it is impracticable to apply a change in accounting policy retrospectively as a result of a new requirement. Furthermore, the Board took the view that the costs outweighed the benefits of separating a compound financial instrument with an obligation to deliver a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation when the liability component is no longer outstanding on the date of initial application. Hence, there is no requirement on transition to separate such compound instruments.

## Amendments to the application guidance for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities

---

### Background

- BC75 Following requests from users of financial statements and recommendations from the Financial Stability Board, in June 2010 the IASB and the US national standard-setter, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), added a project to their respective agendas to improve, and potentially achieve convergence of, the requirements for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities. The boards made this decision because the differences in their requirements for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities cause significant differences between amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with IFRSs and amounts presented in statements of financial position prepared in accordance with US GAAP. This is particularly so for entities that have large amounts of derivative activities.
- BC76 Consequently, in January 2011 the Board published the exposure draft *Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities*. The proposals in the exposure draft would have established a common approach with the FASB. The exposure draft also proposed disclosures about financial assets and financial liabilities that are subject to set-off rights and related arrangements (such as collateral agreements), and the effect of those rights and arrangements on an entity's financial position.
- BC77 As a result of the feedback received on the exposure draft, the IASB and the FASB decided to maintain their current offsetting models. However, the boards noted that requiring common disclosures of gross and net information would be helpful for users of financial statements. Accordingly, the boards agreed on common disclosure requirements by amending and finalising the disclosures that were initially proposed in the exposure draft. The amendments *Disclosures—Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities* (Amendments to IFRS 7) were issued in December 2011.
- BC78 In addition, the IASB decided to add application guidance to IAS 32 to address inconsistencies identified in applying some of the offsetting criteria. This included clarifying the meaning of 'currently has a legally enforceable right of set-off' and that some gross settlement systems may be considered equivalent to net settlement.

### Requirements for offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities

#### **Criterion that an entity 'currently has a legally enforceable right to set off the recognised amounts' (paragraph 42(a))**

- BC79 To meet the criterion in paragraph 42(a) of IAS 32, an entity must currently have a legally enforceable right to set off the recognised amounts. However, IAS 32 did not previously provide guidance on what was meant by 'currently has a legally enforceable right to set off'. Feedback from the exposure draft revealed inconsistencies in the application of this criterion by IFRS preparers.

Consequently, the Board decided to include application guidance in IAS 32 (paragraphs AG38A–AG38D) to clarify the meaning of this criterion.

- BC80 The Board believes that the net amounts of financial assets and financial liabilities presented in the statement of financial position should represent an entity's exposure in the normal course of business and its exposure if one of the parties will not or cannot perform under the terms of the contract. The Board therefore clarified in paragraph AG38B that to meet the criterion in paragraph 42(a) of IAS 32 a right of set-off is required to be legally enforceable in the normal course of business, the event of default and the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of the entity and all of the counterparties. The right must exist for all counterparties so that if an event occurs for one of the counterparties, including the entity, the other counterparty or parties will be able to enforce the right of set-off against the party that has defaulted or gone insolvent or bankrupt.
- BC81 If a right of set-off cannot be enforced in the event of default and in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy, then offsetting would not reflect the economic substance of the entity's rights and obligations and would therefore not meet the objective of offsetting in paragraph 43 of IAS 32. The Board uses the term 'in the event of default and in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy' to describe scenarios where an entity will not or cannot perform under the contract.
- BC82 The use of the word 'currently' in paragraph 42(a) of IAS 32 means that the right of set-off cannot be contingent on a future event. If a right of set-off were contingent or conditional on a future event an entity would not currently have a (legally enforceable) right of set-off. The right of set-off would not exist until the contingency occurred, if at all.
- BC83 In addition, the Board believes that the passage of time or uncertainties in amounts to be paid do not preclude an entity from currently having a (legally enforceable) right of set-off. The fact that the payments subject to a right of set-off will only arise at a future date is not in itself a condition or a form of contingency that prevents offsetting in accordance with paragraph 42(a) of IAS 32.
- BC84 However, if the right of set-off is not exercisable during a period when amounts are due and payable, then the entity does not meet the offsetting criterion as it has no right to set off those payments. Similarly, a right of set-off that could disappear or that would no longer be enforceable after a future event that could take place in the normal course of business or in the event of default, or in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy, such as a ratings downgrade, would not meet the currently (legally enforceable) criterion in paragraph 42(a) of IAS 32.
- BC85 The application of the word 'currently' in paragraph 42(a) of IAS 32 was not a source of inconsistency in practice but rather a question that arose as a result of the wording in the exposure draft. Consequently, the Board decided that further application guidance was only required for the legal enforceability part of the criterion.

## IAS 32 BC

BC86 In developing the proposals in the exposure draft, the Board concluded that the net amount represents the entity's right or obligation if (a) the entity has the ability to insist on net settlement or to enforce net settlement in all situations (ie the exercise of that right is not contingent on a future event), (b) that ability is assured, and (c) the entity intends to receive or pay a single net amount, or to realise the asset and settle the liability simultaneously.

BC87 Some respondents were concerned that the terms 'in all situations' and 'the ability is assured' as referred to in paragraph BC86 create a higher hurdle than IAS 32 today. The Board however believes that the conclusions in the exposure draft are consistent with the offsetting criteria and principle in IAS 32, specifically paragraphs 42, 43, 46 and 47. In addition, the application guidance in paragraph AG38B of IAS 32 addresses respondents' concerns by clarifying the circumstances in which an entity should be able to net (ie what 'in all situations' means), and by requiring legal enforceability in such circumstances, a term commonly used in applying IAS 32 today.

### *Applicability to all counterparties*

BC88 The proposals in the exposure draft required that the right of set-off be legally enforceable in the event of default and in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of 'one of the counterparties' (including the entity itself). There were differing views as to whether the requirement that the right of set-off must be enforceable in the event of the entity's default and/or insolvency or bankruptcy changed the criteria in IAS 32 today.

BC89 Some respondents disagreed that the right of set-off must be enforceable in the events of default and insolvency or bankruptcy of the entity. Although consideration is given to enforceability today to achieve offsetting in accordance with IAS 32, some have only focused on the effects of the insolvency or bankruptcy of the counterparty. These respondents questioned whether legal opinions as to enforceability in the event of their own insolvency or bankruptcy could be obtained and considered this to be a change in practice from IAS 32 that could increase costs and the burden for preparers. They also believed that such a requirement would be inconsistent with the going concern basis of preparation for financial statements.

BC90 Other respondents, however, agreed that, to represent the entity's net exposure at all times, the right of set-off must be enforceable in the insolvency or bankruptcy of all of the counterparties to the contract.

BC91 The Board believes that limiting the enforcement of the right of set-off to the event of default and the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of the counterparty (and not the entity itself) is not consistent with the principle and objective of offsetting in IAS 32.

BC92 If a right of set-off cannot also be enforced in the event of default and in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of the entity, then offsetting would not reflect the economic substance of the entity's rights and obligations or the financial position of the entity (ie offsetting would not reflect an entity's expected future cash flows from settling two or more separate financial



instruments in accordance with paragraph 43 of IAS 32) and would therefore not meet the objective of offsetting in IAS 32.

- BC93 Consequently, the Board decided to clarify that, to meet the offsetting criterion in paragraph 42(a) of IAS 32, a right of set-off must be enforceable in the event of default and in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of both the entity and its counterparties (paragraphs AG38A and AG38B of IAS 32).

**Criterion that an entity 'intends either to settle on a net basis, or to realise the asset and settle the liability simultaneously' (paragraph 42(b))**

- BC94 In the exposure draft the boards noted that offsetting financial assets and financial liabilities is appropriate and reflects the financial position of an entity only if the entity has, in effect, a right to, or an obligation for, only the net amount (ie the entity has, in effect, a single net financial asset or net financial liability). The amount resulting from offsetting must also reflect the entity's expected future cash flows from settling two or more separate financial instruments. This is consistent with the principle in paragraph 43 of IAS 32.
- BC95 When developing that principle the boards understood that entities may currently have a legally enforceable right and desire to settle net, but may not have the operational capabilities to effect net settlement. The gross positions would be settled at the same moment such that the outcome would not be distinguishable from net settlement. As a result the boards included simultaneous settlement as a practical exception to net settlement. Simultaneous settlement was intended to capture payments that are essentially equivalent to actual net settlement. The proposals in the exposure draft also defined simultaneous settlement as settlement 'at the same moment'.
- BC96 Simultaneous settlement as 'at the same moment' is already a concept in paragraph 48 of IAS 32 that enables an entity to meet the criterion in paragraph 42(b) of IAS 32. However, feedback received during outreach indicated that there was diversity in practice related to the interpretation of 'simultaneous settlement' in IAS 32. Many preparers and accounting firms have interpreted paragraph 48 of IAS 32 to mean that settlement through a clearing house always meets the simultaneous settlement criterion even if not occurring at the same moment.
- BC97 Respondents also noted that settlement of two positions by exchange of gross cash flows at exactly the same moment (simultaneously) rarely occurs in practice today. They argued that 'simultaneous' is not operational and ignores settlement systems that are established to achieve what is economically considered to be net exposure.
- BC98 Some preparers also indicated that settlement through some gross settlement mechanisms, though not simultaneous, effectively results in the same exposure as in net settlement or settlement at the same moment and are currently considered to meet the requirements in IAS 32, without actually taking place 'at the same moment'. For particular settlement mechanisms,

## IAS 32 BC

once the settlement process commences, the entity is not exposed to credit or liquidity risk over and above the net amount and therefore the process is equivalent to net settlement.

- BC99 Paragraph 48 of IAS 32 states that simultaneous settlement results in 'no exposure to credit or liquidity risk'. In its redeliberations the Board considered gross settlement mechanisms with features that both (i) eliminate credit and liquidity risk; and (ii) process receivables and payables in a single settlement process. The Board agreed that gross settlement systems with such features are effectively equivalent to net settlement.
- BC100 To clarify the application of the IAS 32 offsetting criteria and to reduce diversity in practice, the Board therefore clarified the principle behind net settlement and included an example of a gross settlement system with characteristics that would satisfy the IAS 32 criterion for net settlement in paragraph AG38F of IAS 32.
- BC101 However, the Board decided not to refer specifically to clearing houses or central counterparties when describing systems that may be treated as equivalent to net settlement for the purposes of the set-off criterion. Systems that meet the principle in paragraph AG38F of IAS 32 may be referred to by different names in different jurisdictions. Referring to specific types of settlement systems may exclude other systems that are also considered equivalent to net settlement. In addition, the Board did not want to imply that settlement through specific systems would always meet the net settlement criterion. Entities must determine whether a system meets the principle in paragraph AG38F of IAS 32 by determining whether or not the system eliminates or results in insignificant credit and liquidity risk and processes receivables and payables in the same settlement process or cycle.

### **Offsetting collateral amounts**

- BC102 The proposals in the exposure draft specifically prohibited offsetting assets pledged as collateral (or the right to reclaim the collateral pledged) or the obligation to return collateral sold with the associated financial assets and financial liabilities. A number of respondents disagreed with the proposed treatment of collateral and noted that the proposed prohibition was more restrictive than the offsetting criteria in paragraph 42 of IAS 32.
- BC103 The offsetting criteria in IAS 32 do not give special consideration to items referred to as 'collateral'. The Board confirmed that a recognised financial instrument referred to as collateral should be set off against the related financial asset or financial liability in the statement of financial position if, and only if, it meets the offsetting criteria in paragraph 42 of IAS 32. The Board also noted that if an entity can be required to return or receive back collateral, the entity would not currently have a legally enforceable right of set-off in all of the following circumstances: in the normal course of business, the event of default and the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of one of the counterparties.

- BC104 Because no particular practice concerns or inconsistencies were brought to the Board's attention related to the treatment of collateral in accordance with the offsetting criteria in IAS 32, and as the concerns that arose originated from the proposals in the exposure draft, the Board did not consider it necessary to add application guidance for the treatment of collateral.

### **Unit of account**

- BC105 Neither IAS 32 nor the exposure draft specifies the unit of account to which the offsetting requirements should be applied. During the outreach performed on the exposure draft, it became apparent that there was diversity in practice regarding the unit of account that was used for offsetting in accordance with IAS 32.
- BC106 Entities in some industries (for example, energy producers and traders) apply the offsetting criteria to identifiable cash flows. Other entities apply the offsetting criteria to entire financial assets and financial liabilities. For those entities (for example, financial institutions), applying the offsetting criteria to individual identifiable cash flows (portions of financial assets and financial liabilities) within contracts would be impractical and burdensome, even though requiring application of the offsetting criteria to entire financial instruments results in less offsetting in the statement of financial position.
- BC107 The Board acknowledged that the focus of the offsetting model is the entity's net exposure and expected future cash flows from settling the related financial instruments.
- BC108 The Board also noted that some of the entities for whom the offsetting requirements are most relevant are those that would have the most significant operational challenges with applying the model to individual cash flows (such as financial institutions with large derivative activities). This is important to consider because IAS 32 requires offsetting if the offsetting criteria are met.
- BC109 On the other hand, if the application of the offsetting criteria to individual cash flows was prohibited, entities in some industries (for example, energy producers and traders) that apply the criteria in IAS 32 to individual cash flows of financial instruments, and achieve set-off on that basis today, would no longer be permitted to do so.
- BC110 The Board considered clarifying the application guidance in IAS 32 to indicate that offsetting should apply to individual cash flows of financial instruments. However, if it made such clarification, the Board felt that it would be necessary to consider an exemption from this requirement on the basis of operational complexity. This would result in the offsetting requirements still being applied differently between entities.
- BC111 Although different interpretations of the unit of account are applied today, the Board concluded that this does not result in inappropriate application of the offsetting criteria. The benefits of amending IAS 32 would not outweigh the costs for preparers and therefore the Board decided not to amend the application guidance to IAS 32 on this subject.

### **Cost-benefit considerations**

- BC112 Before issuing an IFRS or an amendment to an IFRS, the Board seeks to ensure that it will meet a significant need and that the overall benefits of the resulting information will justify the costs of providing it. The Board issued *Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities (Amendments to IAS 32)* to eliminate inconsistencies in the application of the offsetting criteria in paragraph 42 of IAS 32 by clarifying the meaning of ‘currently has a legally enforceable right of set-off’ and that some gross settlement systems may be considered equivalent to net settlement.
- BC113 Some respondents were concerned that requiring a right of set-off to be enforceable in the event of default and in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of the entity would increase the cost of applying the offsetting criteria in IAS 32, if, for example, they needed to obtain additional legal opinions on enforceability. However, the Board noted that without this clarification the offsetting criteria would continue to be applied inconsistently, and the resulting offsetting would be inconsistent with the offsetting objective in IAS 32. This would also reduce comparability for users of financial statements. Consequently, the Board concluded that the benefit of clarifying this criterion outweighed the cost to preparers of applying these amendments.
- BC114 During redeliberations the Board also considered feedback received on the proposals in the exposure draft related to the treatment of collateral and unit of account. However, as described in greater detail in other sections of this Basis for Conclusions, the Board did not consider it necessary to add application guidance for the treatment of these items.
- BC115 The amendments to the IAS 32 application guidance (paragraphs AG38A–AG38F of IAS 32) are intended to clarify the Board’s objective for the offsetting criteria and therefore eliminate inconsistencies noted in applying paragraph 42 of IAS 32.
- BC116 Based on the considerations described in the Basis for Conclusions of these amendments, and summarised in paragraphs BC112–BC115, the Board concluded that the benefits of *Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities (Amendments to IAS 32)* outweigh the costs to preparers of applying those amendments.

### **Transition and effective date**

- BC117 During redeliberations, the Board originally decided to require retrospective application of the application guidance in paragraphs AG38A–AG38F of IAS 32 for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2013. The Board did not expect significant changes in practice as a result of the clarifications made to the application guidance and hence aligned the effective date and transition of these amendments with that of *Disclosures—Offsetting Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities (Amendments to IFRS 7)*, issued in December 2011.

- BC118 However, the Board received additional feedback from some preparers that the clarifications to the application guidance could change their practice. These preparers indicated that they needed more time to evaluate the effects of the amendments. They indicated that it would be difficult for them to make this assessment in time to allow application of the amendments to the application guidance for the first comparative reporting period.
- BC119 Preparers therefore requested that the Board consider aligning the effective date of the amendments with the then revised effective date of IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* (1 January 2015),<sup>13</sup> with earlier application permitted. This would give them sufficient time to determine if there would be any changes to their financial statements.
- BC120 The Board believed that the amendments to the IAS 32 application guidance should be effective as soon as possible to ensure comparability of financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRSs. In addition, the Board did not consider that the effective date needed to be aligned with that of IFRS 9. However, the Board also understood the concerns of preparers. The Board therefore decided to require the amendments to the IAS 32 application guidance to be effective for periods beginning 1 January 2014 with earlier application permitted. This would provide a balance between the time needed to implement the amendments with the need for consistent application of the IAS 32 offsetting requirements.

---

<sup>13</sup> In the completed version of IFRS 9, issued in July 2014, the Board specified that entities must adopt the completed version of IFRS 9 for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018.

## Dissenting opinions

### Dissent of James J Leisenring from the issue of IAS 32 in December 2003

- DO1 Mr Leisenring dissents from IAS 32 because, in his view, the conclusions about the accounting for forward purchase contracts and written put options on an issuer's equity instruments that require physical settlement in exchange for cash are inappropriate. IAS 32 requires a forward purchase contract to be recognised as though the future transaction had already occurred. Similarly it requires a written put option to be accounted for as though the option had already been exercised. Both of these contracts result in combining the separate forward contract and the written put option with outstanding shares to create a synthetic liability.
- DO2 Recording a liability for the present value of the fixed forward price as a result of a forward contract is inconsistent with the accounting for other forward contracts. Recording a liability for the present value of the strike price of an option results in recording a liability that is inconsistent with the *Framework*<sup>14</sup> as there is no present obligation for the strike price. In both instances the shares considered to be subject to the contracts are outstanding, have the same rights as any other shares and should be accounted for as outstanding. The forward and option contracts meet the definition of a derivative and should be accounted for as derivatives rather than create an exception to the accounting required by IAS 39.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, if the redemption feature is embedded in the equity instrument (for example, a redeemable preference share) rather than being a free-standing derivative contract, the redemption feature should be accounted for as a derivative.
- DO3 Mr Leisenring also objects to the conclusion that a purchased put or call option on a fixed number of an issuer's equity instruments is not an asset. The rights created by these contracts meet the definition of an asset and should be accounted for as assets and not as a reduction in equity. These contracts also meet the definition of derivatives that should be accounted for as such consistently with IAS 39.

---

<sup>14</sup> The reference to the *Framework* is to the IASC's *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, adopted by the Board in 2001 and in effect when the Standard was revised.

<sup>15</sup> IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* replaced IAS 39. IFRS 9 applies to all items that were previously within the scope of IAS 39.

**Dissent of Mary E Barth and Robert P Garnett from the issue of *Puttable Financial Instruments and Obligations Arising on Liquidation* (Amendments to IAS 32 and IAS 1) in February 2008**

- DO1 Professor Barth and Mr Garnett voted against the publication of *Puttable Financial Instruments and Obligations Arising on Liquidation* (Amendments to IAS 32 and IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements*). The reasons for their dissent are set out below.
- DO2 These Board members believe that the decision to permit entities to classify as equity some puttable financial instruments and some financial instruments that entitle the holder to a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation is inconsistent with the *Framework*.<sup>16</sup> The contractual provisions attached to those instruments give the holders the right to put the instruments to the entity and demand cash. The *Framework*'s definition of a liability is that it is a present obligation of the entity arising from a past event, the settlement of which is expected to result in an outflow of resources of the entity. Thus, financial instruments within the scope of the amendments clearly meet the definition of a liability in the *Framework*.
- DO3 These Board members do not agree with the Board that an exception to the *Framework* is justified in this situation. First, the Board has an active project on the *Framework*, which will revisit the definition of a liability. Although these Board members agree that standards projects can precede decisions in the *Framework* project, the discussions to date in the *Framework* project do not make it clear that the Board will modify the existing elements definitions in such a way that these instruments would be equity. Second, the amendments would require disclosure of the expected cash outflow on redemption or repurchase of puttable instruments classified as equity. These disclosures are similar to those for financial liabilities; existing standards do not require similar disclosure for equity instruments. The Board's decision to require these disclosures reveals its implicit view these instruments are, in fact, liabilities. Yet, the *Framework* is clear that disclosure is not a substitute for recognition. Third, these Board members see no cost-benefit or practical reasons for making this exception. The amendments require the same or similar information to be obtained and disclosed as would be the case if these obligations were classified as liabilities. Existing standards offer presentation alternatives for entities that have no equity under the *Framework*'s definitions.
- DO4 These Board members also do not agree with the Board that there are benefits to issuing these amendments. First, paragraph BC70 in the Basis for Conclusions states that the amendments will result in more relevant and understandable financial reporting. However, as noted above, these Board members do not believe that presenting as equity items that meet the *Framework*'s definition of a liability results in relevant information. Also as

---

<sup>16</sup> References to the *Framework* in this Dissent are to the IASC's *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, adopted by the Board in 2001 and in effect when the Standard was amended.

noted above, existing standards offer presentation alternatives that result in understandable financial reporting.

- DO5      Second, paragraph BC70 states that the amendments would increase comparability by requiring more consistent classification of financial instruments that are largely equivalent to ordinary shares. These Board members believe that the amendments decrease comparability. These instruments are not comparable to ordinary shares because these instruments oblige the entity to transfer its economic resources; ordinary shares do not. Also, puttable instruments and instruments that entitle the holder to a pro rata share of the net assets of the entity only on liquidation will be classified as equity by some entities and as liabilities by other entities, depending on whether the other criteria specified in the amendments are met. Thus, these amendments account similarly for economically different instruments, which decreases comparability.
- DO6      Finally, these Board members do not believe that the amendments are based on a clear principle. Rather, they comprise several paragraphs of detailed rules crafted to achieve a desired accounting result. Although the Board attempted to craft these rules to minimise structuring opportunities, the lack of a clear principle leaves open the possibility that economically similar situations will be accounted for differently and economically different situations will be accounted for similarly. Both of these outcomes also result in lack of comparability.



**Dissent of James J Leisenring and John T Smith from the issue of *Classification of Rights Issues* in October 2009**

- DO1 Messrs Leisenring and Smith dissent from the amendment *Classification of Rights Issues* for the reasons set out below.
- DO2 Mr Smith agrees with the concept of accounting for a rights issue as equity in specified circumstances and supports both the IFRIC recommendation and staff recommendation in July 2009 that the Board make 'an extremely narrow amendment' to IAS 32 to deal with this issue. However, he dissents because he believes the change is not extremely narrow and will provide a means for an entity to use its equity instruments as a way to engage in speculative foreign currency transactions and structure them as equity transactions, a concern identified by the Board in the Basis for Conclusions on IAS 32.
- DO3 In their comment letters on the exposure draft, some respondents expressed concerns that the wording of the amendment was too open-ended and could lead to structuring risks. Mr Smith believes that these concerns are well-founded because there is no limitation on what qualifies as a class of equity. Without some limitation, an entity could, for example, establish a foreign currency trading subsidiary, issue shares to a non-controlling interest and deem the shares to be a class of equity in the consolidated group.
- DO4 The staff acknowledged the concerns expressed in comment letters that a new class of equity could be created for the purpose of obtaining a desired accounting treatment. However, the Board decided not to attempt to limit such structuring opportunities. The Board was concerned that a requirement that a pro rata offer of rights must be made to all existing owners (rather than only all existing owners of a particular class) of equity instruments would mean that the amendment would not be applicable to most of the transactions to which the Board intended the amendment to apply.
- DO5 Instead of trying to narrow the amendment, the Board simply acknowledged that under the amendment, 'You could set up a new class of shares today and one minute later issue shares to that class and ... speculate in foreign currency without it going through the income statement.' Mr Smith believes the Board should have explored other alternatives. Mr Smith believes that the Board should have sought solutions that could in fact provide a means of narrowing the amendment to limit structuring while accommodating appropriate transactions.
- DO6 Mr Smith believes that structuring opportunities could be curtailed significantly if some limitations were placed on the type of class of equity instruments that qualify for the exemption. There are a number of factors or indicators that could have been incorporated into the amendment that would limit the exception. For example, the amendment could have specified that non-controlling interests do not constitute a class. The amendment could have further required that qualification for the exemption is limited to those classes of equity instruments in which (a) ownership in the class is diverse or (b) the class is registered on an exchange and shares are exchanged in the marketplace or (c) shares in that class when issued were offered to the public at large and sold in more than one jurisdiction and there was no agreement to

subsequently offer rights to shares of the entity; and the amount of capital provided by the class is substantial relative to the other classes of equity. Clearly, some combination of these and other alternatives could have been used to limit structuring opportunities. Mr Smith believes that a better solution could have been found and without introducing some limits around the type of class of equity instruments that qualify, the Board did not produce an extremely narrow amendment.

- D07 Mr Leisenring agrees that when an entity issues rights to acquire its own equity instruments those rights should be classified as equity. However, he does not accept that the issue must be pro rata to all existing shareholders of a class of non-derivative equity instruments. He does not accept that whether or not the offer is pro rata is relevant to determining if the transaction meets the definition of a liability.
- D08 Paragraph BC4J suggests that the Board limited its conclusion to those transactions issued on a pro rata basis because of concerns about structuring risks. If that is of concern the suggestions contained in Mr Smith's dissent would be much more effective and desirable than introducing a precedent that transactions such as this rights offering must simply be pro rata to be considered a transaction with owners as owners.
- D09 Mr Leisenring would have preferred to conclude that a right granted for a fixed amount of a currency was a 'fixed for fixed' exchange rather than create additional conditions to the determination of a liability.