

## **Prepayment Features with Negative Compensation (Proposed amendments to IFRS 9) Comment Letter**

International Accounting Standards Board  
30 Cannon Street  
London EC4M 6XH  
United Kingdom

31 May 2017

Dear Mr Hoogervorst,

### **Re: IASB ED/2017/3 *Prepayment Features with Negative Compensation* (Proposed amendments to IFRS 9)**

On behalf of the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG), I am writing to comment on the Exposure Draft ED/2017/3 *Prepayment Features with Negative Compensation (Proposed amendments to IFRS 9)*, issued by the IASB on 21 April 2017 (the 'Amendments').

This letter is intended to contribute to the IASB's due process and does not necessarily indicate the conclusions that would be reached by EFRAG in its capacity as advisor to the European Commission on endorsement of definitive IFRS in the European Union and European Economic Area.

EFRAG considers that financial instruments containing prepayment features with negative compensation could be eligible for measurement at amortised cost or at fair value through other comprehensive income ('FVOCI'). EFRAG is of the view that the negative sign of the reasonable compensation for early termination should not be the sole reason for preventing measurement of a financial asset at amortised cost or FVOCI.

EFRAG considers that prepayment features with negative compensation should be subject to the same eligibility conditions as prepayment features with positive compensation. As a result, EFRAG agrees with the first eligibility criterion proposed in the Amendments but not with the second one. This second criterion states that the fair value of the prepayment feature should be insignificant at initial recognition. EFRAG notes that this criterion does not apply to prepayment features with positive compensation. Moreover, given that the Amendments are being developed on a fast track timetable, EFRAG questions whether the IASB has or will be able to obtain sufficient evidence of the types of instruments that would be excluded by the second criterion and whether those outcomes are appropriate.

EFRAG notes that modifying IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* a few months before its effective date will inevitably affect the implementation efforts already undertaken by many preparers (including early adopters) and by users. In order to minimise any disruption, EFRAG requests the IASB to do its utmost to finalise the Amendments as soon as possible and to ensure they are limited to what is strictly necessary to address the issue submitted to the IFRS Interpretations Committee. Consequently, EFRAG is strongly of the view that the final amendments to IFRS 9 should not be accompanied by references that interpret existing IFRS 9, including the meaning of 'reasonable compensation'. Any such

*IASB ED/2017/3 Prepayment Features with Negative Compensation (Proposed Amendments to IFRS 9) Comment Letter*

references might affect the accounting treatment of other financial instruments, which is beyond the scope of the proposed Amendments.

Further, EFRAG recommends that the IASB change the effective date to 1 January 2019, with early application permitted, rather than the date proposed in the Amendments. This addresses to the extent possible, the potential issue of European entities that are SEC-filers having to publish two sets of financial statements if the final Amendments cannot be endorsed in time to be applied when such entities file on the basis of IFRS 9 for the first time. EFRAG additionally notes that, in jurisdictions with an endorsement process that cannot be completed by a due date of 1 January 2018, entities would have to classify and measure financial assets in accordance with the existing version of IFRS 9 from that date. Subsequently, they will apply the revised version of IFRS 9 and will therefore need to reassess the classification and measurement of financial assets to which the final Amendments apply. EFRAG acknowledges such a situation is far from ideal and may require additional communication efforts from preparers, including the disclosures in IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors* relating to standards that have been issued but are not yet effective.

EFRAG sees no negative impact for European entities from changing the effective date of the Amendments to 1 January 2019 with early application permitted. If the Amendments can be endorsed before the end of the first quarter of 2018, European entities will be in a position to apply them when they first apply IFRS 9.

Irrespective of whether the effective date is the same as IFRS 9 or later, we support retrospective application of the Amendments. We see no need for additional transition requirements beyond those proposed in the Amendments if the effective date is deferred to 1 January 2019 with early application permitted.

EFRAG's detailed comments and responses to the questions in the proposed Amendments are set out in the Appendix.

If you would like to discuss our comments, please do not hesitate to contact Didier Andries, Joachim Jacobs, Ioanna Chatzieffraimidou or me.

Yours sincerely,



Jean-Paul Gauzès  
**President of the EFRAG Board**

## Appendix - EFRAG's responses to the questions in the Amendments

### Question 1 – Addressing the concerns raised

Paragraphs BC3 – BC6 describe the concerns raised about the classification of financial assets with particular prepayment features applying IFRS 9. The proposals in this Exposure Draft are designed to address these concerns.

Do you agree that the IASB should seek to address these concerns? Why or why not?

#### *EFRAG's response*

**EFRAG welcomes the IASB addressing the concerns related to prepayment features with negative compensation as it will clarify the accounting for financial instruments that incorporate prepayment features with negative compensation.**

- 1 EFRAG appreciates the IASB's initiative to address concerns raised during the implementation of IFRS 9 as, based on initial outreach, prepayment features with negative compensation exist in different types of loans in various jurisdictions across Europe. Our initial outreach also revealed that prepayment features with negative compensation do not necessarily arise from a legal or regulatory requirement. Further, prepayment features with negative compensation are generally not contingent on the occurrence of any specific 'trigger' event; although in some contracts they can only be exercised at specified dates.
- 2 EFRAG acknowledges that amending IFRS 9 so close to its effective date may create difficulties, in particular for jurisdictions with translation requirements and/or endorsement processes such as the European Union ('EU'). On balance, however, EFRAG is of the view that addressing the concerns related to prepayment features with negative compensation is worthwhile as it will clarify the accounting for financial instruments that incorporate prepayment features with negative compensation.
- 3 In order to minimise any disruption, EFRAG requests the IASB to do its utmost to finalise the Amendments as soon as possible and to ensure they are limited to what is strictly necessary to address the issue submitted to the IFRS Interpretations Committee.

### Question 2 – The proposed exception

The Exposure Draft proposes a narrow exception to IFRS 9 for particular financial assets that would otherwise have contractual cash flows that are solely payments of principal and interest but do not meet that condition only as a result of a prepayment feature. Specifically, the Amendments propose that such a financial asset would be eligible to be measured at amortised cost or at fair value through other comprehensive income, subject to the assessment of the business model in which it is held, if the following two conditions are met:

- The prepayment amount is inconsistent with paragraph B4.1.11(b) of IFRS 9 only because the party that chooses to terminate the contract early (or otherwise causes the early termination to occur) may **receive** reasonable additional compensation for doing so; and
- When the entity initially recognises the financial asset, the fair value of the prepayment feature is insignificant.

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

*EFRAG's response*

**EFRAG supports the proposal that financial instruments containing prepayment features with negative compensation could be eligible for measurement at amortised cost or at FVOCI. EFRAG considers that the existence of either a positive or a negative compensation element in the prepayment amount should not in isolation prevent the instrument qualifying as SPPI, provided that the compensation element is reasonable.**

**EFRAG therefore agrees with the first eligibility criterion.**

**However, EFRAG disagrees with the second eligibility criterion. EFRAG is of the view that the eligibility criteria for prepayment features with negative compensation should be aligned with those for prepayment features with positive compensation.**

**In addition, EFRAG considers that the proposals should not be accompanied by references that interpret existing guidance in IFRS 9, including the meaning of 'reasonable compensation'. Any such reference might affect the accounting treatment of other financial instruments, which is beyond the scope of the proposals in the Amendments.**

- 4 EFRAG considers that amortised cost measurement provides relevant information for financial assets that are held within a 'hold to collect' business model and that are consistent with a basic lending arrangement (i.e. with contractual cash flows that are SPPI). The SPPI test excludes instruments with contractual features giving rise to exposure to risks or fluctuations unrelated to a basic lending arrangement, such as leverage or changes in equity prices or commodity prices.

*Assessing the first eligibility criterion*

- 5 EFRAG understands that the proposed Amendments address those prepayment features that would meet the requirements in paragraph B4.1.11(b) of IFRS 9, except for the fact that they could result in compensation for the early termination of the contract that is negative. EFRAG understands that this condition would require the negative compensation to be 'reasonable', consistent with the requirement for positive compensation.
- 6 EFRAG considers the main issue to be the selection of the measurement basis that provides the most useful information to users of financial statements. EFRAG agrees that measurement at amortised cost can provide relevant information for financial instruments that contain prepayment features with negative compensation, even in case changes in expected cash flows occur because of the possibility to address these changes in expected cash flows through a catch-up adjustment.
- 7 EFRAG notes that paragraph BC18 of the Basis for Conclusions on the proposed Amendments asserts that financial assets that are prepayable at fair value do not qualify for an amortised cost measurement. The IASB asserts here that such a prepayment amount is inconsistent with paragraph B4.1.11(b) of IFRS 9 because the amount exposes the holder to changes in the fair value of the instrument, and contractual cash flows resulting from such exposure are not SPPI. In other words, the IASB concludes that a fair value amount is not a reasonable compensation for the early termination of the contract.

*IASB ED/2017/3 Prepayment Features with Negative Compensation (Proposed Amendments to IFRS 9) Comment Letter*

- 8 Moreover, in paragraph BC18 of the proposed Amendments, the IASB concludes that amortised cost does not provide useful information for a financial asset that is prepayable at an amount that includes the fair value cost to terminate an associated hedging instrument *if* that prepayment amount is inconsistent with paragraph B4.1.11(b) of IFRS 9, because the instrument exposes the holder to factors that could result in contractual cash flows that are not SPPI.
- 9 EFRAG is very concerned that these references in the Basis for Conclusions go beyond the scope of the issue that was submitted to the IFRS Interpretations Committee and that the Amendments are intended to address. These references seem to interpret existing guidance in IFRS 9, including the meaning of ‘reasonable compensation’ in the context of prepayment options with positive compensation features. EFRAG considers that interpreting ‘reasonable compensation’ so close to the effective date risks causing unnecessary disruption at this late stage in preparers’ implementation efforts. We therefore recommend removing this guidance from the final Basis for Conclusions.

*Assessing the second eligibility criterion*

- 10 The stated aim of the second eligibility criterion is to limit the scope of the proposed exception to instruments for which prepayment (and consequently negative compensation) is unlikely to occur. To achieve this, the prepayment feature will be eligible only if its fair value is insignificant at initial recognition.
- 11 EFRAG notes that, in accordance with paragraph B4.1.11(b) of IFRS 9, prepayment options for which the prepayment amount includes a compensation element are considered to result in contractual cash flows that are SPPI provided that compensation element is ‘reasonable’. Further, EFRAG recalls the guidance from IFRS 9 that all contingent features must be assessed in the same way. Consequently, we question why a prepayment feature with negative compensation is to be treated differently than one that provides reasonable additional (positive) compensation as permitted by paragraph B4.1.11(b) of IFRS 9.
- 12 EFRAG is concerned that this second criterion will overly restrict the eligibility of instruments with negative compensation features for measurement at amortised cost or FVOCI. Moreover, given that the Amendments are being developed on a fast track timetable, EFRAG questions whether the IASB has or will be able to obtain sufficient evidence of the types of instrument that would be excluded by second criterion and whether those outcomes are appropriate.
- 13 EFRAG acknowledges that prepayable financial assets with positive compensation features that were acquired or originated at a premium or discount to the contractual par amount are subject an ‘insignificant fair value at initial recognition’ criterion (paragraph B4.1.12 of IFRS 9). However, this criterion has been justified as an exception to the general guidance based on the particular circumstances of this sub-category of prepayable financial assets. EFRAG considers that it is more appropriate that eligibility criteria for prepayable financial assets with negative compensation are aligned with the main guidance on prepayable assets in paragraph B4.1.11 (b) of IFRS 9 than with sub-category addressed by paragraph B4.1.12 of IFRS 9.
- 14 For these reasons, EFRAG disagrees with the second eligibility criterion.

*Overall assessment*

- 15 EFRAG expects that preparers have already analysed which of their financial instruments pass the SPPI test as the implementation date of IFRS 9 is very close. EFRAG assesses that the proposals in the Amendments should not be accompanied by references that could interpret existing guidance in IFRS 9, including the meaning of ‘reasonable compensation’. Any such reference might

affect the accounting treatment of other instruments, which is beyond the scope of the Amendments.

- 16 EFRAG agrees with the first eligibility criterion, but not with the second one. EFRAG is of the view that the treatment of prepayment features with negative compensation should be aligned with the treatment of prepayment features with positive compensation. If the IASB were to agree with this, EFRAG suggests the objective of the Amendments can be achieved more simply, by clarifying in paragraph B4.1.11(b) that the reasonable compensation for the early termination of the contract can both be positive or negative.
- 17 Finally, EFRAG is concerned about potential spill-over effects of statements in the Basis for Conclusions on the Amendments that appear to interpret existing guidance in IFRS 9 (in particular, the meaning of 'reasonable additional compensation').

### **Question 3 – Effective date**

For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC25-BC26, the Exposure Draft proposes that the effective date of the exception would be the same as the effective date of IFRS 9; that is, annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018 with early application permitted.

Do you agree with this proposal? Why or why not? If you do not agree with the proposed effective date, what date would you propose instead and why? In particular, do you think a later effective date is more appropriate (with early application permitted) and, if so, why?

### *EFRAG's response*

**EFRAG supports a later effective date of 1 January 2019, with early application permitted. This will allow jurisdictions with translation and/or endorsement processes to finalise such processes before the mandatory effective date, while the possibility to early apply the Amendments provides preparers with the ability to implement soon after finalisation of any translation or endorsement process.**

- 18 EFRAG is concerned about the short time period between the expected date of finalisation of Amendments and the proposed effective date of 1 January 2018. It is highly uncertain that the European endorsement process can be completed by 1 January 2018. An effective date that allows insufficient time for the endorsement process presents difficulties for Europe and possibly for other jurisdictions with similar processes. If endorsement cannot be completed by 1 January 2018, European entities would have to classify and measure financial assets in accordance with the existing version of IFRS 9 from that date and then reassess the classification and measurement of financial assets to which the final Amendments apply at a later date. Such a reassessment within a short time-frame will raise questions from users of financial statements, and may require specific communication efforts from preparers.
- 19 In addition, EFRAG notes that European entities that are SEC-filers have to publish financial statements in accordance with IFRS as issued by the IASB as well as with IFRS as endorsed in the EU. A mandatory effective date of 1 January 2018 may require European entities that are SEC-filers to prepare two sets of financial statements if the endorsement process cannot be completed in time for their first filing in which IFRS 9 is applied.
- 20 Therefore, EFRAG recommends that the IASB changes the effective date to 1 January 2019, with early application permitted. This is in order to provide more

time for Europe's and other jurisdictions' translation and/or endorsement processes and to address the concerns of SEC-filers described above.

- 21 EFRAG acknowledges that changing the effective date to 2019 with early application is only a partial solution: if endorsement is not completed by 1 January 2018 (or by the first filing in which IFRS 9 is applied), European entities would still need to apply the revised version of IFRS 9 soon after transitioning to the existing version. However, EFRAG sees no negative impact for European entities from changing the effective date as recommended. If the Amendments are endorsed in time, European entities will be in a position to apply them at the same time they transition to IFRS 9 and EFRAG expects that they would do so.
- 22 EFRAG also acknowledges that applying the Amendments later than the effective date of IFRS 9 may give rise to communication as well as implementation issues (if entities decide not to apply them or if the timing of endorsement prevents this). EFRAG also notes that entities are required to disclose certain information for IFRS Standards that were issued but are not yet effective which the entity has not yet applied. This information required by paragraphs 30-31 of IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors* requires an entity to disclose the known or reasonably estimable information relevant to assessing the possible impact that the application of a new IFRS Standard will have on the entity's financial statements in the period of initial application. This disclosure should somewhat mitigate the potential communication issues.
- 23 We address our comments on transition in question 4 below.

#### Question 4 - Transition

For the reasons set out in paragraphs BC27-BC28, the Exposure Draft proposes that the exception would be applied retrospectively, subject to a specific transition provision if doing so is impracticable.

- Do you agree with this proposal? Why or why not? If not, what would you propose instead and why?

As described in paragraphs BC30-31, the Exposure Draft does not propose any specific transition provisions for entities that apply IFRS 9 before they apply the exception.

- Do you think there are additional transition considerations that need to be specifically addressed for entities that apply IFRS 9 before they apply the amendments set out in the ED? If so, what are those considerations?

#### EFRAG's response

**EFRAG agrees that the Amendments should be applied using the transition provisions provided in IFRS 9 if applied at the same time as IFRS 9.**

**EFRAG sees no need for additional transition requirements in the case that the effective date would be 1 January 2019 with early application permitted.**

- 24 Regarding transition, EFRAG supports retrospective application of new, or amendments to existing, Standards and Interpretations. EFRAG also considers that the normal transition requirements of IFRS 9 will cater for entities applying the final Amendments at the same time as first applying IFRS 9.
- 25 We support retrospective application of the Amendments irrespective of the IASB's final decision about the effective date. We see no need for additional transition requirements beyond those proposed in the Amendments if the effective date is deferred to 1 January 2019 with early application permitted.