

This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of EFRAG TEG. The paper forms part of an early stage of the development of a potential EFRAG position. Consequently, the paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG Board or EFRAG TEG. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG Board, are published as comment letters, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.

## **Equity Instruments: research on measurement Issues Paper**

### **Objective**

- 1 The objective of this agenda paper is to inform EFRAG TEG on the structure and key elements of the proposed EFRAG advice to the European Commission (the 'EC') request.

### **Introduction**

- 2 EFRAG's reply to the EC will include a comparative assessment of alternative accounting treatments to fair value measurement for long-term investment portfolios of equity and equity-type instruments and appendices related to EFRAG work on the topic (e.g. EFRAG feedback statement).

### **Structure and key elements of EFRAG's reply to the European Commission**

- 3 EFRAG's reply to the EC is expected to have 8 Chapters that address different topics.

Section	Description
<b>Executive Summary</b>	
<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction</b>	<p>This chapter summarises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the accounting treatment requirements for equity instruments in IFRS Standards;</li> <li>EFRAG's endorsement advice on IFRS 9 <i>Financial Instruments</i>;</li> <li>the request from the EC in 2017 and EFRAG's reply to the EC in 2018;</li> <li>the request from the EC in 2018;</li> <li>the objective of EFRAG's advice.</li> </ul>
<b>Chapter 2 – Summary of survey's results</b>	This chapter includes the executive summary of EFRAG's feedback Statement that is going to be published separately (agenda paper 10.02).

<p><b>Chapter 3</b> – Base Case: IFRS 9 <i>Financial Instruments</i></p>	<p>This chapter discusses the approach followed in IFRS 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the use of fair value in the statement of financial position;</li> <li>• the recognition of fair value changes in the statement of financial performance, including the pros and cons of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the FVPL approach;</li> <li>○ the FVOCI approach (without recycling) and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• a comparison of IFRS with US GAAP</li> </ul>
<p><b>Chapter 4</b> – Possible Alternatives</p>	<p>This chapter considers some alternative models to fair value. These include models that have been applied in practice and theoretical models. Alternative accounting treatments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Historical cost less impairment;</b></li> <li>• <b>Dual measurement model:</b> FVOCI with recycling;</li> <li>• <b>Fair value moving average:</b> the use of a moving average of fair value to reduce market volatility;</li> <li>• <b>Fair value excluding average industry volatility:</b> account for the changes of the yield industry average in OCI and the remaining in PL;</li> <li>• <b>Value in Use:</b> Entity specific discounted cash flow model;</li> <li>• <b>Modified historical cost:</b> a model similar to the equity method or a model where historical cost is adjusted for observable market conditions; and</li> <li>• <b>Revaluation model:</b> all declines in fair value below the acquisition cost would be recognised PL and changes in fair value above the acquisition cost would be recognised in OCI (recycled on disposal).</li> </ul> <p>In addition, this chapter considers alternative impairment approaches including those based on IFRS 9, IAS 39 and IAS 36.</p>
<p><b>Chapter 5</b> – Alternatives suggested by survey respondents</p>	<p>As referred to in summary in chapter 2, respondents were also given the opportunity to suggest new alternatives apart from the ones mentioned in the survey. This chapter considers such alternatives.</p>
<p><b>Chapter 6</b> – Equity-Type Instruments</p>	<p>If an alternative accounting treatment was also to be applied to ‘equity-type’ instruments, then ‘equity-type’ would need to be defined. This chapter considers possible definitions of ‘equity-type’ and whether the models identified in the report could be applied to such instruments.</p>
<p><b>Chapter 8</b> - Conclusion</p>	<p>This chapter includes a summary of the key characteristics of the different approaches identified in the report. The alternative accounting treatments are compared against</p>

	some factors and criteria such as relevance, reliability and operability.
<b>Appendix 1 – Summary of Previous Research</b>	This appendix provides a detailed summary of EFRAG's previous research on the classification of equity instruments.
<b>Appendix 2 – Feedback Statement on EFRAG's public Consultation</b>	This chapter will include EFRAG's feedback Statement that is going to be published separately.

**Questions for EFRAG TEG**

- 4 Do EFRAG TEG members have comments on the structure and key elements of EFRAG reply to the European Commission request?