

### Invitation to comment

**ITC 1** The ASB invites comments on any aspect of the FRED, whether it be the proposed standard itself or the ASB's proposals for implementing it in the UK, by 7 March 2003 - the same date as the IASB has set for comments on its proposed IFRS.

**ITC 2** The ASB would particularly welcome comments on the following issues:

#### ASB Question 1

The ASB is proposing to require the adoption in the UK of a standard based on the proposed IFRS from the effective date in the IFRS (which is expected to be accounting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2004). Do you agree with this approach?

*Pearson: Yes – subject to the concerns expressed in our cover letter.*

#### ASB Question 2

The IASB has concluded that its standard should apply to all entities. The ASB does not believe there are any conceptual or practical reasons why that conclusion should not apply equally in the UK. It is therefore proposing that *all* UK entities, other than those that are applying the FRSSSE, should be required to prepare their financial statements in accordance with the proposed standard. Do you agree with this proposal?

*Pearson: We see no practical benefit in applying this standard in unlisted companies and in unconsolidated accounts.*

#### ASB Question 3

The IASB has concluded that its standard should apply to all types of share-based payment transactions, including SAYE-type share purchase plans. The ASB does not believe there are any additional UK considerations that would justify a different conclusion being reached in the context of UK accounting. Therefore, like the IASB the ASB is proposing that the standard should apply to *all* types of share-based payment transaction. Do you agree with this proposal?

*Pearson: Yes*

#### ASB Question 4

The IASB is proposing that its standard should apply equally to all individual entity financial statements and consolidated financial statements, regardless of whether for example the reporting entity is a wholly-owned subsidiary of a group that prepares consolidated financial statements or a parent company that also prepares consolidated financial statements. The ASB does not believe there are any additional UK considerations that would justify a different conclusion being reached in the context of UK accounting and is therefore proposing to adopt the same approach as the IASB. Do you agree with this proposal?

*Pearson: No see above (Q2)*

#### ASB Question 5

The ASB is proposing that, when the share-based payments standard is implemented in the UK, the ASB should withdraw UITF Abstract 10 'Disclosure of directors' share options' (if it has not already been withdrawn by then), UITF Abstract 13 'Accounting for ESOP Trusts', and UITF Abstract 17 'Employee share schemes'. It also acknowledges that consequential amendments may need to be made to UITF Abstract 32 'Employee benefit trusts and other intermediate payment arrangements'.

- (a) Will these amendments to existing UK requirements be sufficient to enable entities to adopt the proposed standard without being in breach of an existing requirement?

(b) Are any of the amendments unnecessary for this purpose?

*Pearson: No comment*

### **ASB Question 6**

The FRED proposes that entities should be required to apply the requirements of the standard to equity-settled share-based payment transactions that were granted after the publication date of the FRED but had not vested at the effective date of the standard. Full retrospective application would not be permitted (unless it can be achieved through early adoption) and nor would prospective application. Do you agree with this proposal?

*Pearson: Yes*

(IASB Question 22 also focuses on the transitional requirements set out in the proposed standard.)

**ITC 3** The ASB would also welcome comments on the questions that the IASB has asked in its exposure draft, which are as follows:\*

---

\* It is worth noting that the IASB prefaced its invitation to comment by noting that "comments are most helpful if they indicate the specific paragraph or group of paragraphs to which they relate, contain a clear rationale and, where applicable, provide a suggestion for alternative wording."

---

### **IASB Question 1**

Paragraphs 1-3 of the draft IFRS set out the proposed scope of the IFRS. There are no proposed exemptions, apart from for transactions within the scope of another IFRS.

Is the proposed scope appropriate? If not, which transactions should be excluded and why?

*Pearson: No. See Q2*

### **IASB Question 2**

Paragraphs 4-6 of the draft IFRS propose requirements for the recognition of share-based payment transactions, including the recognition of an expense when the goods or services received or acquired are consumed.

Are these recognition requirements appropriate? If not, why not, or in which circumstances are the recognition requirements inappropriate?

*Pearson: Yes*

### **IASB Question 3**

For an equity-settled share-based payment transaction, the draft IFRS proposes that, in principle, the entity should measure the goods or services received, and the corresponding increase in equity, either directly, at the fair value of the goods or services received, or indirectly, by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted, whichever fair value is more readily determinable (paragraph 7). There are no exemptions to the requirement to measure share-based payment transactions at fair value. For example, there are no exemptions for unlisted entities.

Is this measurement principle appropriate? If not, why not, or in which circumstances is it not appropriate?

*Pearson: We agree the principle is appropriate but more guidance is needed on valuing specific schemes. We would also like more guidance on the treatment of hedged shares. In addition, there is currently too much leeway in applying the models to assess fair value which will lead to little consistency between companies.*

### **IASB Question 4**

If the fair value of the goods or services received in an equity-settled share-based payment transaction is measured directly, the draft IFRS proposes that fair value should be measured at the date when the entity obtains the goods or receives the services (paragraph 8).

Do you agree that this is the appropriate date at which to measure the fair value of the goods or services received? If not, at which date should the fair value of the goods or services received be measured? Why?

*Pearson: We agree assuming it is grant date in the case where services are received over a specific period from grant date*

### **IASB Question 5**

If the fair value of the goods or services received in an equity-settled share-based payment transaction is measured by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted, the draft IFRS proposes that the fair value of the equity instruments granted should be measured at grant date (paragraph 8).

Do you agree that this is the appropriate date at which to measure the fair value of the equity instruments granted? If not, at which date should the fair value of the equity instruments granted be measured? Why?

*Pearson: Yes. In our view, grant date is the most appropriate and should equate more fairly with the value of the goods or service – see response to Q4 above.*

**IASB Question 6**

For equity-settled transactions with parties other than employees, the draft IFRS proposes a rebuttable presumption that the fair value of the goods or services received is more readily determinable than the fair value of the equity instruments granted (paragraphs 9 and 10).

Do you agree that the fair value of the goods or services received is usually more readily determinable than the fair value of the equity instruments granted? In what circumstances is this not so?

*Pearson: Agreed.*

**IASB Question 7**

For equity-settled transactions with employees, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the fair value of the employee services received by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted, because the latter fair value is more readily determinable (paragraphs 11 and 12).

Do you agree that the fair value of the equity instruments granted is more readily determinable than the fair value of the employee services received? Are there any circumstances in which this is not so?

*Pearson: Agreed.*

**IASB Question 8**

Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the draft IFRS propose requirements for determining when the counterparty renders service for the equity instruments granted, based on whether the counterparty is required to complete a specified period of service before the equity instruments vest.

Do you agree that it is reasonable to presume that the services rendered by the counterparty as consideration for the equity instruments are received during the vesting period? If not, when are the services received, in your view?

*Pearson: Agreed.*

**IASB Question 9**

If the services received are measured by using the fair value of the equity instruments granted as a surrogate measure, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should determine the amount to attribute to each unit of service received, by dividing the fair value of the equity instruments granted by the number of units of service expected to be received during the vesting period (paragraph 15).

Do you agree that if the fair value of the equity instruments granted is used as a surrogate measure of the fair value of the services received, it is necessary to determine the amount to attribute to each unit of service received? If not, what alternative approach do you propose? If an entity is required to determine the amount to attribute to each unit of service received, do you agree that this should be calculated by dividing the fair value of the equity instruments granted by the number of units of services expected to be received during the vesting period? If not, what alternative method do you propose?

*Pearson: Agreed.*

### **IASB Question 10**

In an equity-settled share-based payment transaction, the draft IFRS proposes that having recognised the services received, and a corresponding increase in equity, the entity should make no subsequent adjustment to total equity, even if the equity instruments granted do not vest or, in the case of options, the options are not exercised (paragraph 16). However, this requirement does not preclude the entity from recognising a transfer within equity, ie a transfer from one component of equity to another.

Do you agree with this proposed requirement? If not, in what circumstances should an adjustment be made to total equity and why?

*Pearson: For shares which do not vest, from a practical point of view it makes sense not to adjust as it would be difficult to administer and monitor given that some options run for 10 years.*

*However, if they do not vest because performance conditions are not met, this implies that the services have not been received so it would make more sense to adjust. Moreover, these services which have not been received have also not been paid for, so it does not make sense to show any charge in respect of these. We believe therefore any charge should be backed out in the year these conditions are not met.*

### **IASB Question 11**

The draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the fair value of equity instruments granted, based on market prices if available, taking into account the terms and conditions of the grant (paragraph 17). In the absence of a market price, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should estimate the fair value of options granted, by applying an option pricing model that takes into account various factors, namely the exercise price of the option, the life of the option, the current price of the underlying shares, the expected volatility of the share price, the dividends expected on the shares (where appropriate) and the risk-free interest rate for the life of the option (paragraph 20). Paragraph 23 of the proposed IFRS explains when it is appropriate to take into account expected dividends.

Do you agree that an option pricing model should be applied to estimate the fair value of options granted? If not, by what other means should the fair value of the options be estimated? Are there circumstances in which it would be inappropriate or impracticable to take into account any of the factors listed above in applying an option pricing model?

*Pearson: We agree that this type of model is really the only way of measuring the fair value, but too much leeway on assumptions, such as expected life, forfeitures, will lead to inconsistencies between companies. More specific guidance on the type of model and inputs would help.*

### **IASB Question 12**

If an option is non-transferable, the draft IFRS proposes that the expected life of an option rather than its contracted life should be used in applying an option pricing model (paragraph 21). The draft IFRS also proposes requirements for options that are subject to vesting conditions and therefore cannot be exercised during the vesting period (paragraph 22).

Do you agree that replacing an option's contracted life with its expected life when applying an option pricing model is an appropriate means of adjusting the option's fair value for the effects of non-transferability? If not, do you have an alternative suggestion? Is the proposed requirement for taking into account the inability to exercise an option during the vesting period appropriate?

*Pearson: Yes. Although this is a judgement call which could be manipulated.*

### **IASB Question 13**

If a grant of shares or options is conditional upon satisfying specified vesting conditions, the draft IFRS proposes that these conditions should be taken into account when an entity measures the fair value of the shares or options granted. In the case of options, vesting conditions should be taken into account either by

incorporating them into the application of an option pricing model or by making an appropriate adjustment to the value produced by such a model (paragraph 24).

Do you agree that vesting conditions should be taken into account when estimating the fair value of options or shares granted? If not, why not? Do you have any suggestions for how vesting conditions should be taken into account when estimating the fair value of shares or options granted?

*Pearson: Agreed.*

#### **IASB Question 14**

For options with a reload feature, the draft IFRS proposes that the reload feature should be taken into account, where practicable, when an entity measures the fair value of the options granted. However, if the reload feature is not taken into account in the measurement of the fair value of the options granted, then the reload option granted should be accounted for as a new option grant (paragraph 25).

Is this proposed requirement appropriate? If not, why not? Do you have an alternative proposal for dealing with options with reload features?

*Pearson: Although this would not apply to Pearson in historical terms, in principal we agree, subject to any previous charges relating to the original option being reversed.*

#### **IASB Question 15**

The draft IFRS proposes requirements for taking into account various features common to employee share options, such as non-transferability, inability to exercise the option during the vesting period, and vesting conditions (paragraphs 21-25).

Are there other common features of employee share options for which the IFRS should specify requirements?

*Pearson: Performance criteria, hedged shares.*

#### **IASB Question 16**

The draft IFRS does not contain prescriptive guidance on the estimation of the fair value of options, consistently with the Board's objective of setting principles-based standards and to allow for future developments in valuation methodologies.

Do you agree with this approach? Are there specific aspects of valuing options for which such guidance should be given?

*Pearson: We do not agree with this approach principally because it makes estimation very inconsistent and open to abuse.*

### **IASB Question 17**

If an entity reprices a share option, or otherwise modifies the terms or conditions on which equity instruments were granted, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the incremental value granted upon repricing, and include that incremental value when measuring the services received. This means that the entity is required to recognise additional amounts for services received during the remainder of the vesting period, ie additional to the amounts recognised in respect of the original option grant.

Example 3 in Appendix B illustrates this requirement. As shown in that example, the incremental value granted on repricing is treated as a new option grant, in addition to the original option grant. An alternative approach is also illustrated, whereby the two grants are averaged and spread over the remainder of the vesting period.

Do you agree that the incremental value granted should be taken into account when measuring the services received, resulting in the recognition of additional amounts in the remainder of the vesting period? If not, how do you suggest repricing should be dealt with? Of the two methods illustrated in Example 3, which is more appropriate? Why?

*Pearson: Agreed.*

### **IASB Question 18**

If an entity cancels a share or option grant during the vesting period (other than a grant cancelled by forfeiture when the vesting conditions are not satisfied), the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should continue to recognise the services rendered by the counterparty in the remainder of the vesting period, as if that grant had not been cancelled. The draft IFRS also proposes requirements for dealing with any payment made on cancellation and/or a grant of replacement options, and for the repurchase of vested equity instruments.

Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please explain why not and provide details of your suggested alternative approach.

*Pearson: Does this mean that there are 2 charges where there are replacement options? Cancelling a share or option grant implies that no service has been received, nor has any payment been made, so why charge at all? We believe that any charge to the P&L in respect of cancelled awards should be backed out.*

### **IASB Question 19**

For cash-settled share-based payment transactions, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the goods or services acquired and the liability incurred at the fair value of the liability. Until the liability is settled, the entity should remeasure the fair value of the liability at each reporting date, with any changes in value recognised in the income statement.

Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please provide details of your suggested alternative approach.

*Pearson: Agreed.*

### **IASB Question 20**

For share-based payment transactions in which either the entity or the supplier of goods or services may choose whether the entity settles the transaction in cash or by issuing equity instruments, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should account for the transaction, or the components of that transaction, as a cash-settled share-based payment transaction if the entity has incurred a liability to settle in cash, or as an equity-settled share-based payment transaction if no such liability has been incurred. The draft IFRS proposes various requirements to apply this principle.

Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please provide details of your suggested alternative approach.

*Pearson: Agreed.*

### **IASB Question 21**

The draft IFRS proposes that an entity should disclose information to enable users of financial statements to understand:

- (a) the nature and extent of share-based payment arrangements that existed during the period,
- (b) how the fair value of the goods or services received, or the fair value of the equity instruments granted, during the period was determined, and
- (c) the effect of expenses arising from share-based payment transactions on the entity's profit or loss.

Are these disclosure requirements appropriate? If not, which disclosure requirements do you suggest should be added, deleted or amended (and how)?

*Pearson: Agreed that these are appropriate. In addition, however, we would like to see disclosures on the company's hedging policy.*

### **IASB Question 22**

The draft IFRS proposes that an entity should apply the requirements of the IFRS to grants of equity instruments that were granted after the publication date of this Exposure Draft and had not vested at the effective date of the IFRS. It also proposes that an entity should apply retrospectively the requirements of the IFRS to liabilities existing at the effective date of the IFRS, except that the entity is not required to measure vested share appreciation rights (and similar liabilities) at fair value, but instead should measure such liabilities at their settlement amount (ie the amount that would have been paid on settlement of the liability had the counterparty demanded settlement at the date the liability is measured).

Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please provide details of your suggestions for the IFRS's transitional provisions.

*Pearson: Agreed*

### **IASB Question 23**

The draft IFRS proposes a consequential amendment to IAS 12 (revised 2000) *Income Taxes* to add an example to that standard illustrating how to account for the tax effects of share-based payment transactions. As shown in that example, it is proposed that all tax effects of share-based payment transactions should be recognised in the income statement.



Are the proposed requirements appropriate?

*Pearson: Agreed*

#### **IASB Question 24**

In developing the Exposure Draft, the Board considered how various issues are dealt with under the US standard SFAS 123 *Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation*, as explained further in the Basis for Conclusions. Although the draft IFRS is similar to SFAS 123 in many respects, there are some differences. The main differences include the following:

- (a) Apart from transactions within the scope of another IFRS, the draft IFRS does not propose any exemptions, either from the requirement to apply the IFRS or from the requirement to measure share-based payment transactions at fair value. SFAS 123 contains the following exemptions, none of which are included in the draft IFRS:

- employee share purchase plans are excluded from SFAS 123, provided specified criteria are met, such as the discount given to employees is relatively small;
- SFAS 123 encourages, but does not require, entities to apply its fair value measurement method to recognise transactions with employees; entities are permitted to apply instead the intrinsic value measurement method in Accounting Principles Board Opinion No.25 *Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees* (paragraphs BC70-BC74 in the Basis for Conclusions give an explanation of intrinsic value); and
- unlisted (non-public) entities are permitted to apply the minimum value method when estimating the value of share options, which excludes from the valuation the effects of expected share price volatility (paragraphs BC75-BC78 in the Basis for Conclusions give an explanation of minimum value).

*Pearson – IFRS treatment agreed in general. Re unlisted companies, see earlier comments*

- (b) For transactions in which equity instruments are granted to employees, both SFAS 123 and the draft IFRS have a measurement method that is based on the fair value of those equity instruments at grant date. However:
- under SFAS 123, the estimate of the fair value of an equity instrument at grant date is not reduced for the possibility of forfeiture due to failure to satisfy the vesting conditions, whereas the draft IFRS proposes that the possibility of forfeiture should be taken into account in making such an estimate.
  - under SFAS 123, the transaction is measured at the fair value of the equity instruments issued. Because equity instruments are not regarded as issued until any specified vesting conditions have been satisfied, the transaction amount is ultimately measured at the number of vested equity instruments multiplied by the fair value of those equity instruments at grant date. Hence, any amounts recognised for employee services received during the vesting period will be subsequently reversed if the equity instruments granted are forfeited. Under the draft IFRS, the transaction is measured at the deemed fair value of the employee services received. The fair value of the equity instruments granted is used as a surrogate measure, to determine the deemed fair value of each unit of employee service received. The transaction amount is ultimately measured at the number of units of service received during the vesting period multiplied by the deemed fair value per unit of service. Hence, any amounts recognised for employee services received are not subsequently reversed, even if the equity instruments granted are forfeited.

*Pearson: We do not agree with IFRS treatment - see earlier comments. We believe the SFAS 123*

*approach is more appropriate*

- (c) If, during the vesting period, an entity settles in cash a grant of equity instruments, under SFAS 123 those equity instruments are regarded as having immediately vested, and therefore the amount of compensation expense measured at grant date but not yet recognised is recognised immediately at the date of settlement. The draft IFRS does not require immediate recognition of an expense but instead proposes that the entity should continue to recognise the services received (and hence the resulting expense) over the remainder of the vesting period, as if that grant of equity instruments had not been cancelled.

*Pearson: IFRS treatment agreed.*

- (d) SFAS 123 does not specify a measurement date for transactions with parties other than employees that are measured at the fair value of the equity instruments issued. Emerging Issues Task Force Issue 96-18 *Accounting for Equity Instruments That Are Issued to Other Than Employees for Acquiring, or in Conjunction with Selling, Goods or Services* requires the fair value of the equity instruments issued to be measured at the earlier of (i) the date a performance commitment is reached or (ii) the date performance is complete. This date might be later than grant date, for example, if there is no performance commitment at grant date. Under the draft IFRS, the fair value of the equity instruments granted is measured at grant date in all cases.

*Pearson: IFRS treatment agreed.*

- (e) SFAS 123 requires liabilities for cash-settled share appreciation rights (SARs) to be measured using an intrinsic value measurement method. The draft IFRS proposes that such liabilities should be measured using a fair value measurement method, which includes the time value of the SARs, in the same way that options have time value (refer to paragraphs BC70-BC81 of the Basis for Conclusions for a discussion of intrinsic value, time value and fair value).

*Pearson: IFRS treatment agreed.*

- (f) For a share-based payment transaction in which equity instruments are granted, SFAS 123 requires realised tax benefits to be credited direct to equity as additional paid-in capital, to the extent that those tax benefits exceed the tax benefits on the total amount of compensation expense recognised in respect of that grant of equity instruments. The draft IFRS, in a consequential amendment to IAS 12 (revised 2000) *Income Taxes*, proposes that all tax effects of share-based payment transactions should be recognised in profit or loss, as part of tax expense.

*Pearson: IFRS treatment agreed*

For each of the above differences, which treatment is the most appropriate? Why? If you regard neither treatment as appropriate, please provide details of your preferred treatment.\*

---

\* In the IASB's Invitation to Comment, it points out that "further details of the differences between the draft IFRS and SFAS 123 are given in the FASB's Invitation to Comment."

---

## **IASB Question 25**

Do you have any other comments on the Exposure Draft?

*If you proceed with the implementation of FRED 31 as currently drafted, as a matter of record we would like to state that we do not agree with the recommendations due to our following main concerns:*

- *The 'notional' nature of the FRED 31 charge*

- *Lack of distinction between companies that hedge and those that do not*
- *Inconsistent use of option pricing models and assumptions therein*
- *No reversal of charge where performance criteria are not met.*