



30 Cannon Street, London EC4M 6XH, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)20 7246 6410 Fax: +44 (0)20 7246 6411
E-mail: iasb@iasb.org Website: www.iasb.org

**International
Accounting Standards
Board**

This observer note is provided as a convenience to observers at IFRIC meetings, to assist them in following the IFRIC's discussion. Views expressed in this document are identified by the staff as a basis for the discussion at the IFRIC meeting. This document does not represent an official position of the IFRIC. Decisions of the IFRIC are determined only after extensive deliberation and due process. IFRIC positions are set out in Interpretations.

Note: The observer note is based on the staff paper prepared for the IFRIC. Paragraph numbers correspond to paragraph numbers used in the IFRIC paper. However, because the observer note is less detailed, some paragraph numbers are not used.

INFORMATION FOR OBSERVERS

IFRIC meeting: November 2008, London
Project: Classification of Puttable and Perpetual Instruments under revised IAS 32

INTRODUCTION

1. In September 2008, the IFRIC received a request to consider whether, under IAS 32 as revised in 2008 (IAS 32 R), an entity's puttable instruments that are subordinate to all other class of instruments can be classified as equity when the entity's perpetual instruments are already classified as equity (see Appendix A to this paper).
2. The request focuses on whether the puttable instruments meet the criterion in IAS 32.16A (c) that requires *identical features* for instruments within the class of instruments that is subordinate to all other classes of instruments. The submission sets out two different views. Some people consider that perpetual instruments classified as equity do not prohibit the entity from classifying puttable instruments as equity instruments, provided all criteria in IAS 32.16A and B are met. Others believe that only one class of instruments can represent the residual interest in an entity upon liquidation. Thus when perpetual instruments are already designated as equity instruments, instruments that do

not have the same features in that they are puttable cannot qualify for equity classification.

3. The request assumes that, though IAS 32 R is not yet effective, diversity in practice will arise.
4. This paper sets out the staff's analysis of whether this issue should be added to the IFRIC's agenda.

BACKGROUND

5. In February 2008 the IASB amended IAS 32 by requiring some financial instruments that otherwise meet the definition of a financial liability to be classified as equity. Entities should apply the amendments for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2009, earlier application being permitted.
6. The amendment addresses the classification of some:
 - a) puttable financial instruments, and
 - b) instruments, or components of 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.
7. The objective was a short-term, limited scope amendment to improve the financial reporting of particular types of financial instruments that meet the definition of a financial liability but represent the residual interest in the net assets of the entity (see Appendix C to this paper: paragraphs 16A and 16B of IAS 32 are reproduced there for ease of reference).

DIFFERING INTERPRETATIONS

8. The submission to the IFRIC contains two different views that are set out below. More extensive rationale in support of the two views is included in Appendix A.

View 1: perpetual instruments classified as equity do not prohibit the entity from classifying puttable instruments as equity provided all criteria in IAS 32.16A and B are met.

9. Paragraph 11 of IAS 32 defines liabilities and equity instruments, the latter being “any contract that evidences a residual interest in the assets of an entity after deducting all of its liabilities”. The proponents of view 1 emphasize that the definition refers to “a residual interest”, meaning that an entity can have more than one class of equity instruments. They also point out that this analysis is backed by the way disclosures relating to equity instruments are worded, for instance in paragraph 136A of IAS 1 – *Presentation of Financial Statements*.
10. The supporters of view 1 assert that the wording in IAS 32.16A (c) describing instruments in the class of instruments that is “subordinate to all other classes of instruments” refers to IAS 32.16A (b): “the most subordinate class upon liquidation”. Again, this implies that there can be more than one class of equity instruments and that only **those** instruments in the **most subordinate** class upon liquidation are subject to the ‘identical features’ - test. Consequently, if the perpetual instruments classified as equity instruments **are senior instruments** such as perpetual preferred shares (the puttable instruments’ claims upon liquidation are more subordinate than the claims of the perpetual instruments), the puttable instruments can be classified as equity. This is because the ‘identical features’ - test is limited to the most subordinate class of instruments and the perpetual instruments are not within that class.

View 2: perpetual instruments classified as equity prohibit puttable instruments from being classified as equity at the same time, since the criterion in IAS 32.16A (c) is not met.

11. Supporters of view 2 argue that IAS 32 R states that instruments that represent the residual interest in an entity are de facto subordinate to all others. Thus only one class of instruments subordinate to all others can exist.
12. They thus assert that if perpetual instruments exist, only they can be classified as equity instrument. Indeed, even if the puttable instruments represent a residual interest in the entity’s net assets upon liquidation, they do not have the same features as the perpetual instruments in that they are puttable, hence they do not meet the identical features criterion set out in revised IAS 32.16A (c).

STAFF ANALYSIS

Analysis of the instruments in the submission

13. The staff believes that classification of puttable instruments requires a two step approach:

a) Step 1:

Apply the general principles set out in IAS 32 to determine whether the instrument meets the requirements to be classified as equity or not. If the analysis concludes that they are equity, then no further analysis is required as a result of the amendment. In other words, IAS 32 R will not change this classification.

b) Step 2:

If the analysis carried out in step 1 concludes that the instrument is a liability and the instrument is puttable, then IAS 32.16A and IAS 32.16B apply. Further analysis is required to determine whether the puttable instrument meets the criteria in IAS 32.16A and whether instruments issued by the entity other than the puttable instrument may have the features described in IAS 32.16B(a) and (b). Indeed, IAS 32.16B relates to other financial instruments (for example, perpetual shares with priority in liquidation), which subject to conditions (a) and (b), might prevent puttable instruments that would otherwise meet the IAS 32.16A criteria from being classified as equity.

14. The staff believes that analysing the instruments' features, especially how the return is determined and the order they are paid out on liquidation, is critically important. The staff also notes that IAS 32 does not consider the existence of the put in determining the level of an instrument's subordination. In accordance with IAS 32.16A, subordination is assessed by reference to priority in liquidation.

15. As regards the request received in September 2008, the staff confirmed with the submitter that the entity's **perpetual instruments** referred to in the request met the definition of equity instruments in accordance with the general principles of

IAS 32. The staff was informed that the characteristics of the perpetual instruments support their classification as equity instruments as they represent a **residual interest** in the assets of the entity after deducting all of its liabilities and the issuer has no contractual obligation to repurchase or redeem those instruments for cash or other assets.

16. In the staff’s opinion, the **puttable instruments** referred to in the submission represent a **class of instruments subordinate to** the perpetual instruments (criterion set out in IAS 32.16A(b)). Indeed, given their characteristics, the puttable instruments may not receive any net assets upon liquidation whereas when the entity’s residual net assets are below a certain amount the perpetual instruments may. The staff also understands from the request that the puttable instruments also met the other criteria in IAS 32.16A and that no other instruments of the entity has a return that is more residual in accordance with IAS 32.16B. The **puttable instruments** then represent the residual interest in the net assets of the entity (see IAS 32.BC61).

Analysis of the views proposed by the constituents

17. The staff notes that in IAS 32 R Basis for Conclusions paragraph BC52, the intention of the Board is quite clear: “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”. Board members made it clear that they were willing to consider by exception instruments that both met the definition of a financial liability *and* represented the residual claim to the net assets of the entity. They did not attempt to reconsider the classification of instruments already classified as equity under the general principles in IAS 32.
18. The conclusion on classification reached for instruments within the scope of the amendment is independent of the analysis carried out for perpetual instruments with equity features. Hence because puttable and perpetual instruments are analysed based on different requirements both may be classified as equity instruments.
19. An entity may disclose more than one class of equity instruments: puttable instruments, which are subordinate to all other classes of instruments and higher priority perpetual instruments. The identical features test in revised

IAS 32.16A (c) applies only to **puttable instruments** that meet the definition of financial liabilities *and* represent the residual claim to the net assets of the entity, and only to that class of instruments.

Conclusion

20. Considering the analysis above, the staff agrees with view 1 in the submission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

21. The staff has assessed the issue raised in the submission against the IFRIC agenda criteria as follows:
- a) IAS 32 R is not effective until January, 1st 2009. Hence, no current practice has developed yet. However, the submission sets out two strongly held views and these constituents foresee diversity in practice. The staff is not aware of any other differing views on this issue.
 - b) If diversity were to emerge in practice, the staff agrees that financial reporting would be improved by eliminating it in such an important area.
 - c) The issue is sufficiently narrow in scope that the IFRIC could resolve it efficiently or recommend an amendment to IAS 39 through the Annual Improvements project.
 - d) Equity/liability classification is a difficult and contentious issue currently on the Board's active project agenda and widespread discussions are being held on IAS 32.
22. The staff analysis is that IAS 32 R is sufficiently clear that we do not expect diversity in practice to arise.
23. The staff has set out proposed wording for the tentative agenda decision in Appendix B.

QUESTIONS FOR THE IFRIC

24. Does the IFRIC agree with the staff recommendation?

25. Does the IFRIC have any comments on the drafting of the tentative agenda decision?

APPENDIX A: Submission

I. The issue

Amendments to IAS 32 Financial Instruments: Presentation and IAS 1 Presentation of Financial Statements Puttable Financial Instruments and Obligations Arising on Liquidation

(in the following referred to as “IAS 32 (amend)”)

Perpetual instruments classified as equity and puttable instruments

Suppose that an entity has correctly classified perpetual instruments, i.e. non-puttable instruments, as equity instruments under IAS 32’s principle, i.e. the perpetual instruments that do not impose a contractual settlement obligation during the entity’s lifetime. In light of the 2008 amendments to IAS 32 the question is whether the entity can, at the same time, also classify puttable instruments as equity instruments under IAS 32 (rev. 2008) if they meet the relevant criteria of the standard. In particular, the question is whether the puttable instruments can meet the criterion in IAS 32.16A(c) in this situation, as the perpetual instruments and the puttable instruments differ at least in the respect that not all the instruments are puttable. Thus, the ‘identical features’-condition in IAS 32.16A(c) might not be met.

View A: Perpetual instruments classified as equity do not prohibit the entity from (additionally) classifying puttable instruments as equity instruments, provided all criteria in IAS 32.16A and B are met. This includes the criterion in IAS 32.16A(c).

Proponents of view A give the following reasons:

(1)

Proponents of view A emphasise the principles laid down in the definitions in IAS 32.11. Herein liabilities are defined and if a financial instrument does not meet the definition of a liability it represents an equity instrument: “An equity instrument is any contract that evidences a residual interest in the assets of an entity after deducting all of its liabilities”.

In light of the discussions regarding IAS 32 (amend) it is important to note that IAS 32.11 does not contain any notion regarding “subordination” or “most subordinated” respectively. It does neither refer to “**the** residual interest” or even “**the** residual **instrument**” but to “**a** residual interest”. Accordingly, under IAS 32 it is obvious that different types of instruments can represent equity instruments and, using IAS 32 (amend) terminology, different equity classes can exist.

There is no indication in the standards that the above principles of IAS 32 are changed by IAS 32 (amend). In contrast para 16A outlines in the second sentence: “**As an exception to the definition of a financial liability, an instrument that includes such an obligation** is classified as an equity instrument if it has all of the following features: [...]”

As a result the amendments are directed to a special equity accounting treatment for puttables **in addition** to the general principles of IAS 32. The possibility of different equity classes is retained and the only difference is that under IAS 32 (amend) puttables can now qualify as equity if the related criteria are met in addition to those instruments classified as equity under the general principle.

The history of the development of IAS 32 (amend), in particular why the project was put on the Board’s agenda, supports this view.

(2)

Referring specifically to IAS 32 (amend) proponents of view A argue that the wording in IAS 32.16A (c) refers to instruments in the class of instruments that is “subordinate to all other classes of instruments that have identical features”; in other words and with reference to IAS 32.16A (b): “the most subordinated class upon liquidation”. Again, this implies that there can be more than one class of equity instruments and that only **those** instruments in the **most subordinated** class upon liquidation are subject to the ‘identical features’-test. Consequently, if the perpetual instruments classified as equity instruments **are less subordinated** (i.e. the puttable instruments’ claims upon liquidation were subordinated to the claims in relation to the perpetual instrument), the puttable instruments can be classified as equity, since the ‘identical features’-test is limited to the most subordinated class of instruments and the perpetual instruments are not within that class.

Accordingly, the criterion established via IAS 32.16A needs to be met **only** by the most subordinated class of puttables in reference to all puttables issued; different classes of equity (such as perpetuals) continue to fall under the unamended general principles of IAS 32, i.e. an “equity instrument” is any contract that evidences a residual interest in the assets of an entity after deducting all of its liabilities. In terms of terminology, both classes represent residual interests. No flaw can be seen that there are different classes of residual instruments because required note disclosures provide for the required transparency.

(3)

IAS 32 (amend) para. 136A (a) and (c) respectively also support the view that different equity classes of residual instruments can exist when referring to “ [...] for puttable financial instruments classified as equity instruments [...]: (a) summary quantitative data about the amount classified as equity” and “[...]”; c) the expected cash outflow on redemption or repurchase of that class of financial instruments; [...]”. If it were the intention of the IASB to allow for just one class of equity instruments why such a wording of “amount classified as equity” or “.that class of [...]”?

(4)

If the above views will not hold true, the proponents of View A argue that the scope of IAS 32 (amend) would be limited to those entities which do not have equity instruments other than puttables qualifying under IAS 32 (amend). This would mean that identical puttables would be treated differently subject to whether the entity has other equity instruments in line with IAS 32 or not. The underlying principle is not apparent.

(5)

In addition, the significant consequences are by no means appropriately clarified in IAS 32 (amend), neither in the standard, the Basis for Conclusions nor the Illustrative Examples. The BoC reference cited in this context by proponents of View B is not clear and, at least, does not remove the argument, that both puttables and other equity instruments can represent residual interests.

As a matter of principle, proponents of View A also do not believe that discussions during a Board meeting – as raised by proponents of View B – and which for example may have changed in subsequent meetings - replace understandable and clear standards. Constituents are not committed to follow Board meetings in order to understand IFRS. Referring more specifically to the cited Board discussion it is not clear whether the response to comments received considers a case, as mentioned above, where the non-puttable instruments are less subordinated to the puttables.

Based on the above, the Proponents of View A believe that the understanding outlined above is an appropriate answer to the issue under discussion. It results in a more appropriate presentation of equity for those entities with puttables irrespective whether there are other equity instruments or not.

View B: If an entity has classified perpetual instruments as equity instruments (= residual instruments), this prohibits puttable instruments to be classified as equity at the same time, since the criterion in IAS 32.16A (c) is violated. Since perpetual instruments and puttable instruments are both residual instruments, but differ at least in respect of being puttable / perpetual, the puttable instruments fail to qualify for equity treatment. Another way of saying this is that perpetual instruments are always more subordinated to puttable instrument because they are perpetual.

Proponents of view B give the following reasons:

(1)

Although IAS 32.16A (c) uses the term „most subordinated“, it is unclear if and how this differs from the term „residual“. They refer to parts of the Basis for Conclusions (such as IAS 32.BC51) that seem to use both terms interchangeably. Moreover, it is not totally clear what the difference between a “residual claim” and a “subordinated claim” upon liquidation is supposed to be: Both terms describe a claim that is settled after some other claims (i.e. liabilities) are settled. Any perpetual instrument classified as equity must, by definition, meet the definition of an equity instrument in IAS 32.11, meaning that it must be a residual instrument.

(2)

Proponents of view B acknowledge that different classes of equity instruments (potentially with different levels of subordination) can exist under the general principle of IAS 32. This is because any equity instruments under IAS 32's principle do not impose any obligations onto the entity during the entity's lifetime. Thus, under IAS 32's principle, a situation in which there are puttable and perpetual equity instruments at the same time can never occur. This situation would indeed give rise to the question of which equity instruments are more "subordinated" or "residual".

If, however, an entity has issued puttable residual instruments, the question becomes relevant. If an instrument is puttable by the holder during the entity's lifetime (and thus gives rise to an obligation of the entity during the lifetime) and, at the same time, the entity has perpetual residual instruments, only the latter class of instruments can truly be considered "residual" upon liquidation.

The only situation in which a puttable residual interest is deemed to have equity characteristics and may be classifiable as equity is when the residual class of instruments itself is puttable and there are no other residual instruments. This is the situation that the amendment addresses. In this situation, the criterion in IAS 32.16A (c) ensures that the class of residual instruments has identical features, i.e. the instruments are all puttable and it is ex ante unclear which of the instruments will be outstanding until liquidation and which will be put prior to liquidation.

(3)

With regard to arguments (1) and (2) put forward under view A, proponents of view B argue that it was the IASB's intention to address those situations in which **the** residual interests in an entity are not classified as equity instruments because they are puttable and thus, the entity appears as debt-funded (see IAS 32.BC50). In this situation, the amendment permits the entity to classify their residual interests as equity instruments, by way of an exception. They note that this intention of the criteria in IAS 32.16A, including (c), is evidenced by IAS 32.BC56:

"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; [...]"*

In particular with regard to argument (1), proponents of view B acknowledge that in the definition of an equity instrument as cited there, the IASB used the word "a residual". However, they point to the fact that, in par.56 Basis for Conclusions to IAS 32amend (see above), the word "**the** residual" was used. Thus, while under the general principle of IAS 32 different classes of equity instruments can exist, under the amended standard, in the case of puttable instruments classified as equity, the puttable instruments represent the residual interest.

Proponents of view B also refer to the discussion during the IASB board meeting in May 2008 (see Agenda Paper 9, par 44 ff.):

"Respondents have raised concerns over this criteria for a number of reasons, including: [...]"

c) Finally, there are a number of types of entity with a minimal number of non-puttable instruments whilst most of the financing will be contributed via puttable shares. [...]

This criteria also means that a partnership that issues perpetual instruments would immediately cause all the partnership interests (that must be puttable by law) to be classified as liabilities. Some consider some perpetual instruments to have fewer equity 'characteristics' than the partnership interests, but perpetuals are more subordinate because they are perpetual.

One possible approach to these concerns is to create an exception to the most residual principle."

Note that the IASB did not agree to an exception to the most residual principle.

(4)

Proponents of view B also point to the fact that view A implicitly assumes (at least) two classes of residual instruments, one of which is puttable and one is not. View A could potentially lead to a number of different classes of different residual instruments, one of which is puttable, the others not. They note that the criterion in IAS 32.16A (c) largely becomes superfluous if one can define different classes within the residual instruments that can be heterogeneous between classes, while only the puttable class must be homogenous (i.e. must have identical features).

(5)

With regard to the arguments put forward under (3) in relation to view A, proponents of view B note that the note disclosures are intended to compensate the fact that, under IAS 32's general principle, equity instruments do not embody an obligation. That piece of information is relevant regardless of whether other instruments are classifiable as equity (view A) or not (view B). Even under view B, an entity may present other amounts other than puttable financial instruments as equity, such as currency translation adjustments, cash flow hedging reserves, revaluation reserves. These amounts do not meet the definition of a contractual financial instrument. Thus, information on the class of puttable financial instruments classified as equity as a subgroup of total equity is relevant also under view B. Accordingly, proponents of view B do not see why the note disclosure supports view A.

II. Current practice: diversity in practice

Since IAS 32 (amend) is not yet effective, it needs to be stated that no current practice has yet developed.

However, since there is a widespread discussion in literature on IAS 32 (amend) amongst constituents, the IFRIC should address the issue as outlined above so that there is an official interpretation (either by an IFRIC or at least by an agenda decision) how to properly apply IAS 32.16A.

III. Reasons for the IFRIC to address the issue:

a) Is the issue widespread and practical?

As mentioned above, IAS 32 (amend) is not yet effective. However, based on the current discussion it is envisaged that the issue will be widespread.

b) Does the issue involve significantly divergent interpretations (either emerging or already existing in practice)?

As outlined above – there are currently the two views A and B, which would lead to fundamentally different treatments.

c) Would financial reporting be improved through elimination of the diversity?

Financial reporting would be improved greatly by clarifying this issue since the accounting for equity instruments based on an appropriate interpretation of the IFRIC would enhance comparability among companies' financial reporting.

d) Is the issue sufficiently narrow in scope to be capable of interpretation within the confines of IFRSs and *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, but not so narrow that it is inefficient to apply the interpretation process?

We are of the opinion that the issue is sufficiently narrow in order to be addressed by an interpretation of the IFRIC.

e) If the issue relates to current or planned IASB project, is there a pressing need for guidance sooner than would be expected from the IASB project? (The IFRIC will not add an item to its agenda if an IASB project is expected to resolve the issue in a shorter period than the IFRIC would require to complete its due process).

N.A.

[Appendix B omitted from observer note]

APPENDIX C

Puttable instruments

- 16A A puttable financial instrument includes a contractual obligation for the issuer to repurchase or redeem that instrument for cash or another [financial asset](#) on exercise of the put. As an exception to the definition of a [financial liability](#), an instrument that includes such an obligation is classified as an [equity instrument](#) if it has all the following features:
- (a) It entitles the holder to a pro rata share of the entity's net assets in the event of the entity's liquidation. The entity's net assets are those assets that remain after deducting all other claims on its assets. A pro rata share is determined by:
 - (i) dividing the entity's net assets on liquidation into units of equal amount; and
 - (ii) multiplying that amount by the number of the units held by the financial instrument holder.
 - (b) The instrument is in the class of instruments that is subordinate to all other classes of instruments. To be in such a class the instrument:
 - (i) has no priority over other claims to the assets of the entity on liquidation, and
 - (ii) does not need to be converted into another instrument before it is in the class of instruments that is subordinate to all other classes of instruments.
 - (c) All financial instruments in the class of instruments that is subordinate to all other classes of instruments have identical features. For example, they must all be puttable, and the formula or other method used to calculate the repurchase or redemption price is the same for all instruments in that class.
 - (d) Apart from the contractual obligation for the issuer to repurchase or redeem the instrument for cash or another financial asset, the instrument does not include any contractual obligation to deliver cash or another financial asset to another entity, or to exchange financial assets or financial liabilities with another entity under conditions that are potentially unfavourable to the entity, and it is not a contract that will or may be settled in the entity's own equity instruments as set out in subparagraph (b) of the [definition of a financial liability](#).
 - (e) The total expected cash flows attributable to the instrument over the life of the instrument are based substantially on the profit or loss, the change in the recognised net assets or the change in the fair value of the recognised and unrecognised net assets of the entity over the life of the instrument

(excluding any effects of the instrument).

16B For an instrument to be classified as an [equity instrument](#), in addition to the instrument having all the above features, the issuer must have no other [financial instrument](#) or contract that has:

- (a) total cash flows based substantially on the profit or loss, the change in the recognised net assets or the change in the [fair value](#) of the recognised and unrecognised net assets of the entity (excluding any effects of such instrument or contract) and
- (b) the effect of substantially restricting or fixing the residual return to the puttable instrument holders.

For the purposes of applying this condition, the entity shall not consider non-financial contracts with a holder of an instrument described in [paragraph 16A](#) that have contractual terms and conditions that are similar to the contractual terms and conditions of an equivalent contract that might occur between a non-instrument holder and the issuing entity. If the entity cannot determine that this condition is met, it shall not classify the puttable instrument as an equity instrument.