APPENDIX

Question 1 – Disclosures relating to the significance of financial instruments to financial position and performance

The draft IFRS incorporates disclosures at present contained in IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Disclosure and Presentation* so that all disclosures about financial instruments are located in one Standard. It also proposes to add the following disclosure requirements:

a) financial assets and financial liabilities by classification (see paragraphs 10 and BC13).
b) information about any allowance account (see paragraphs 17 and BC14).
c) income statement amounts by classification (see paragraphs 21(a), BC15 and BC16).
d) fee income and expense (see paragraphs 21(d) and BC17).

Are these proposals appropriate? If not, why not? What alternative disclosures would you propose?

<u>Answer:</u>

(a) This presentation is logical and relevant
(b) This disclosure is justified. However, it involves a distortion of disclosure between entities which will choose to use an allowance account (with an aim of best follow-up) and those which will choose to write-off directly the carrying amount of the financial asset
(c) This disclosure is consistent with those required for the balance sheet.

Question 2 – Disclosure of the fair value of collateral and other credit enhancements

For an entity's exposure to credit risk, the draft IFRS proposes to require disclosure of the fair value of collateral pledged as security and other credit enhancements unless impracticable (see paragraphs 39, 40, BC27 and BC28).

Is this proposal appropriate? If not, why not? What, if any, alternative disclosures would you propose to meet the stated objective?

<u>Answer:</u>

As the Board emphasises it in the BC 28, in many circumstances, the information about the fair value of collateral pledged is not available. Qualitative information about credit policy and credit risk management seems to us sufficient in order to meet the objective.

For banks, the notion of the past due is not relevant because, in many cases, the first incident of payment is often due to a technical problem and is thus not representative of a credit risk. Consequently, this information would be misleading to the users of the financial statements.

Question 3 – Disclosure of a sensitivity analysis

For an entity that has an exposure to market risk arising from financial instruments, the draft IFRS proposes to require disclosure of a sensitivity analysis (see paragraphs 43, 44 and BC36-BC39).

Is the proposed disclosure of a sensitivity analysis practicable for all entities?
If not, why not and what, if any, alternative disclosures of market risk would you propose to meet the stated objective of enabling users to evaluate the nature and extent of market risk?

Answer:

The sensitivity analysis is relevant. The possibility of providing an analysis on one or more variables is satisfying.

In other respects, we consider it as an opportunity that disclosures about the effective rate on financial assets and liabilities be no longer required.

Question 4 – Capital disclosures

The draft IFRS proposes disclosure of information that enables users of an entity's financial statements to evaluate the nature and extent of its capital. This includes a proposed requirement to disclose qualitative information about the entity's objectives, policies and processes for managing capital; quantitative data about what the entity regards as capital; whether during the period it complied with any capital targets set by management and any externally imposed capital requirements; and if it has not complied, the consequences of such non-compliance (see paragraphs 46-48 and BC45-BC54).

Is this proposal appropriate? If not, why not? Should it be limited to only externally imposed capital requirements? What, if any, alternative disclosures would you propose?

Answer:

Some of the required information is strategic (capital management, internally targets) and shall not be located in the notes of the financial statements. Moreover, in the Pillar III of the New Capital Accord of Basel Committee, much information is already required. Consequently, some disclosures required by the Board are redundant.
Quantitative data about what is regarded as capital is generally already provided in the notes of the financial statements.
The banking industry is subject to externally imposed capital requirements, which are analysed by the supervisor. Consequently, disclosures about these requirements do not seem appropriate to us.

Question 5 – Effective date and transition

The proposed effective date is for periods beginning on or after 1 January 2007 with earlier adoption encouraged (see paragraphs 49 and BC62-BC67).
Entities adopting IFRSs and the draft IFRS for the first time before 1 January 2006 would be exempt from providing comparative disclosures for the draft IFRS in the first year of adoption (see Appendix B, paragraph B9).

Are the proposed effective date and transition requirements appropriate? If not, why not? What alternative would you propose?

<u>Answer:</u>

We agree with the proposed effective date and transition requirements.

Question 6 – Location of disclosures of risks arising from financial instruments

The disclosure of risks arising from financial instruments proposed by the draft IFRS would be part of the financial statements prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (see paragraph BC41). Some believe that disclosures about risks should not be part of financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRSs; rather they should be part of the information provided by management outside the financial statements.

Do you agree that the disclosures proposed by the draft IFRS should be part of the financial statements? If not, why not?

<u>Answer:</u>

We are opposed to locating disclosures of risks arising from financial instruments in the financial statements. They shall be located in the management report, because they are really management data and not accounting data. Moreover, the location of these disclosures in the financial statements would involve the use of very strict audit standards, which is not compatible with the proper nature of management information.

Question 7 – Consequential amendments to IFRS 4 (paragraph B10 of Appendix B)

Paragraph B10 of Appendix B proposes amendments to the risk disclosures in IFRS 4 *Insurance Contracts* to make them consistent with the requirements proposed in the draft IFRS. The requirements in IFRS 4 were based on disclosure requirements in IAS 32 that would be amended by the draft IFRS. The Board's reasons for proposing these amendments are set out in paragraphs BC57-BC61.

Do you agree that the risk disclosures in IFRS 4 should be amended to make them consistent with the requirements proposed in the draft IFRS? If not, why not and what amendments would you make pending the outcome of phase II of the Board's Insurance project?

<u>Answer:</u>

We agree with the necessity to amend the risk disclosures in IFRS 4 in order to make them more consistent with the requirements of the draft IFRS. However, we consider that it will be preferable to propose those amendments within the phase II of the Insurance Project.

Question 8 – Implementation Guidance

The draft Implementation Guidance accompanying the draft IFRS suggests possible ways to apply the risk disclosure requirements in paragraphs 32-45 (see paragraphs BC19, BC20 and BC42-BC44).

Is the Implementation Guidance sufficient? If not, what additional guidance would you propose?

Answer:

The Implementation Guidance is sufficient.

Question 9 – Differences from the Exposure Draft of Proposed Statement of Financial Accounting Standards *Fair Value Measurements* published by the US Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB).

The FASB's Proposed Statement of Financial Accounting Standards *Fair Value Measurements*, which is open for public comment at the same time as this Exposure Draft, proposes guidance on how to measure fair value that would apply broadly to financial and non-financial assets and liabilities that are measured at fair value in accordance with other FASB pronouncements. That Exposure Draft proposes disclosure of information about the use of fair value in measuring assets and liabilities as follows:

(a) For assets and liabilities that are remeasured at fair value on a recurring (or ongoing) basis during the period (for example, trading securities)

(i) the fair value amounts at the end of the period, in total and as a percentage of total assets and liabilities,

(ii) how those fair value amounts were determined (whether based on quoted prices in active markets or on the results of other valuation techniques, indicating the extent to which market inputs were used), and

(iii) the effect of the remeasurements on earnings for the period (unrealised gains or losses) relating to those assets and liabilities still held at the reporting date.

(b) For assets and liabilities that are remeasured at fair value on a non-recurring (or periodic) basis during the period (for example, impaired assets), a description of

(i) the reason for remeasurements,

(ii) the fair value amounts,

(iii) how those fair value amounts were determined (whether based on quoted prices in active markets or on the results of other valuation techniques, indicating the extent to which market inputs were used), and

(iv) the effect of the remeasurements on earnings for the period relating to those assets and liabilities still held at the reporting date.

Disclosures similar to (a)(ii) above are proposed in paragraph 31 of the draft IFRS (and are currently required by paragraph 92 of IAS 32) and disclosures similar to (a)(iii) are proposed in paragraph 21(a).

Do you agree that the requirements in the draft IFRS provide adequate disclosure of fair value compared with those proposed in the FASB's Exposure Draft? If not, why not, and what changes to the draft IFRS would you propose?

Answer:

We agree with the fact that fair value disclosures as proposed in ED7 are adequate compared to those in the FASB's exposure draft.

Question 10 – Other comments

Do you have any other comments on the draft IFRS, Implementation Guidance and Illustrative Examples?

<u>Answer:</u>

This ED requires too much information, which is susceptible of misunderstanding. The Board would have to determine only some general axles of information and not a checklist of disclosures.