IFRS	IASB Meeting	Agenda reference	1B
	Staff Paper	Date	7 November 2011

Contact(s)	Katherine Cancro	kcancro@ifrs.org	+44-207-246-6928

Project	**Mandatory effective date of IFRS 9**
Topic	**Comparative restatement**

Purpose of this paper

1. IFRS 9 is required to be applied for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2013. Although not all phases of the project to replace IAS 39 have been completed, entities that have not yet applied IFRS 9 will be required to apply it from 1 January 2013, including presenting comparative statements for the annual period beginning 1 January 2012. Due to the need for entities to prepare comparative statements beginning at 1 January 2012, the staff believes that the amendments, if any, related to the mandatory effective date and the requirement to issue comparative statements should be issued expeditiously.

2. This paper presents a summary of the feedback received related to the requirement to restate comparative statements for entities that initially apply IFRS 9 for reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2012 . This feedback has been received on the *Request for Views on Effective Dates and Transition Methods* (the 'Request for Views') and the the exposure draft *Mandatory Effective Date of IFRS 9* (the 'mandatory effective date ED'). **Agenda Paper 1A** addresses the mandatory effective date of IFRS 9. **Agenda Paper 1** introduces the project history, overall items of note for both this paper and Agenda Paper 1A, and summary statistics of the comment letters received on the ED. Other feedback will be addressed at future meetings.

This paper has been prepared by the technical staff of the IFRS Foundation for discussion at a public meeting of the IASB.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the staff preparing the paper. They do not purport to represent the views of any individual members of the IASB.

Comments made in relation to the application of an IFRS do not purport to be acceptable or unacceptable application of that IFRS—only the IFRS Interpretations Committee or the IASB can make such a determination.

The tentative decisions made by the IASB at its public meetings are reported in IASB *Update*. Official pronouncements of the IASB, including Discussion Papers, Exposure Drafts, IFRSs and Interpretations are published only after it has completed its full due process, including appropriate public consultation and formal voting procedures.

3. This paper is divided into the following main sections:

   (a) **Section A:** a feedback summary on the classification and measurement ED, the Request for Views and the mandatory effective date ED;

   (b) **Section B:** more-detailed descriptions of specific implementation issues raised in the feedback that are related to whether comparative statements should be required to be presented; and

   (c) **Section C:** alternatives, staff analysis and recommendation for comparative information.

4. This paper contains one question for the Board.

A. Feedback summary

Comment letters and outreach - Classification and measurement ED

5. Whether comparative statements should be required for IFRS 9 was first discussed by the Board in its redeliberations between the issue of the exposure draft *Financial Instruments: Classification and Measurement* (the 'classification and measurement ED') and IFRS 9 (2009). At that time, the following comments were raised by those who did not believe that comparative statements should be required:

   (a) While theoretically full retrospective application renders the most useful information, many, including users of financial statements, were concerned that due to inevitable exceptions to full retrospective application any restated information is incomplete and may actually not help in informing users about performance in comparative periods and in undertaking trend analysis;

   (b) Many respondents pointed out that comparative relief had been granted for IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Presentation* and IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* upon first-time adoption of IFRSs for European reporting entities. These respondents noted that entities put significant effort into explaining the adjustments and their effect on opening retained earnings, and that as a result investors understood the changes well; and

(c) Although IFRS only requires one year of comparatives, many jurisdictions require more than that—five years in some cases and often those requirements are triggered when IFRS requires comparatives to be restated. The requirement to restate comparatives would make early adoption overly onerous or impossible such that these entities would not early adopt.

Comment letters - Request for Views and mandatory effective date ED

6. After the issue of IFRS 9, respondents to the Request for Views and the mandatory effective date ED raised specific implementation issues about IFRS 9 that were not raised before, that increase the cost of applying the classification and measurement requirements of IFRS 9 in periods prior to their date of initial application. These reasons are the interaction between the date of initial application and:

    (a) the fact that IFRS 9 must not be applied to items that have already been derecognised as of the date of initial application;

    (b) the initial business model determination; and

    (c) the fair value option and FVOCI elections at the date of initial application.

    These issues are discussed in further detail in the following section (Section B).[1]

7. There was no consensus between respondents to the mandatory effective date ED as to whether comparative statements should be required to be restated upon the initial application of IFRS 9.

8. Those who believe that comparative statements should be required to be presented noted the following arguments:

    (a) Presentation of comparative statements is consistent with IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors.*

[1] The Board's rationale for its decision in IFRS 9 and its proposal in the ED (ie to require the restatement of comparative statements by entities who initially apply the standard for periods beginning on or after 1 January 2012) is explained in more detail in paragraph 43 of this paper.

(b) A delay in the mandatory effective date of IFRS 9 will allow a sufficient timeframe for entities to prepare comparatives.

(c) IAS 39 and IFRS 9 are sufficiently different to each other that restatement will be necessary to provide meaningful information to users of financial statements.

9. In contrast, those who do not believe that comparative statements should be required noted the following which were:

    (a) They believe that time pressures similar to those existing when IFRS 9 (2009) and IFRS 9 (2010) were initially issued will nonetheless exist when the last phase of the project to replace IAS 39 is issued.

    (b) IFRS 9 will not be finished by 1 January 2012. Therefore with a mandatory effective date of 1 January 2015, if comparative statements were required to be presented they would need to be presented for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2014, which would be less than three years from the issue date of the last project phase which some believe is still challenging.

10. They also reiterated comments similar to those which had been raised in responses to the classification and measurement ED:

    (a) Comparative relief was granted for IAS 32 and IAS 39 upon first-time adoption of IFRS for European reporting entities.

    (b) Comparability is impaired by the transition requirements which are complex and inconsistent across various phases of the project, reducing the usefulness of the comparative information (eg classification and measurement requires retrospective application, whereas hedge accounting requires prospective application).

11. Some respondents believed that relief from providing comparative statements should still only be provided to early adopters. However, if the mandatory effective date of IFRS 9 is deferred this could be achieved by not requiring restated comparatives to be presented by entities that initially apply IFRS 9 for

reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2014 (ie one year before the mandatory effective date).

12. One commenter was concerned that those who applied IFRS 9 early should not have to go back and recast their comparative statements under IAS 39. The staff notes that the alternatives in this paper do not propose to prohibit entities from providing comparative statements under IFRS 9 (see paragraph 42 of this paper), only to require additional disclosures for those who initially apply IFRS 9 after the amendments, if any, are issued.

Outreach – Request for Views and Mandatory effective date ED

13. The staff noted that some of the key messages from the feedback received both from those who believe that comparative statements should be required, and those who do not, are consistent. That is, investors need comparable information and an understanding of the effects of the transition to IFRS 9, that comparative statements are burdensome to prepare and that based on the different transition requirements of the phases (eg retrospective for classification and measurement and prospective for hedge accounting[2]) partial restatement of comparatives creates either confusion or a misleading impression of period-to-period comparability. Based on these key messages, and to supplement the feedback received in the comment letters, staff have:

    (a) Evaluated some diclosures by European financial institutions when they transitioned from other GAAPs to IFRSs, and

    (b) Conducted outreach during the comment period:

        (i) with European financial institutions about their transition disclosures at transition from other GAAPs to IFRSs, and how these changes were communicated to and received by investors, as well as solicited feedback on disclosures they could provide about the transition to IFRS 9 other than through the provision of restated comparatives; and

[2] With limited exceptions. Refer to Agenda Paper 15 from the September 2011 Board meeting for additional discussion.

(ii) with investors to solicit feedback on transition disclosures at transition from other GAAPs to IFRSs, and what information would be useful to them for comparability and to understand the effect of transition to IFRS 9.

14. In providing feedback on their preferred transition approach for the project to replace IAS 39, investors consistently emphasised a need for comparable period-to-period information—that is, information that enables them to understand the effect of the transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9. Investors, irrespective of their preferred approach, noted that the mix of transition requirements between phases and the modifications to retrospective application in the classification and measurement phase diminish the usefulness of comparative statements.

15. Although they did not believe that the presentation of comparative statements was the only way to achieve comparability (ie most noted examples of transition disclosures that were useful in explaining the effect of transition from other GAAPs to IFRSs in 2005), some investor respondents favoured the presentation of comparative statements with full retrospective application of all project phases as the preferred way of achieving comparability.[3] Similar to previous comments in comment letters and previous outreach, one of these investors who favoured the presentation of comparative statements with full retrospective application questioned the cost-benefit of partial restatement, as well as the usefulness of the information it would provide, and noted that it could actually be misleading. This investor suggested that if the transition provisions were not revisited more holistically, that perhaps IFRS 9 could be permitted to be applied to derecognised items. In this case, this investor stated a preference for period-to-period comparability for the single entity, over entity-to-entity comparability of prior periods.

16. In addition to feedback on their preferred approach to transition for the project to replace IAS 39, investors also provided information on what they focus on when analysing financial instruments in financial statements. They noted that except

[3]We also received anecdotal evidence from a European financial institution that although they provided additional disclosure ontransition to IFRSs in 2005 which was well received by most investors, one investor nonetheless would have preferred the full restatement of comparative statements.

where it allows for a link with the statement of financial position (eg net interest income), the statement of profit or loss (and restatement of it in comparative periods) is less important to their analysis than the statement of financial position. Similarly, where restatement means primarily the presentation of historical fair value changes, they are generally less concerned with comparative information as extrapolation is not possible.

17. Investors also provided feedback on disclosures that would be useful at transition between IAS 39 and IFRS 9. They cited examples that they found useful at the transition from other GAAPs to IFRSs in Europe in 2005. One also noted that disclosures similar to those required by IFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures* for transfers of financial assets between classification categories would be useful—ie that entities should not avoid reclassification disclosures at the date of initial application simply because the reclassification results from applying a new accounting standard. This investor also stated a preference for quantitative disclosures of the effects of the transition to IFRS 9, with supporting narrative addressing the reasons for these effects (eg in addition to high-level differences between IAS 39 and IFRS 9).

B. Specific cost issues on transition

Assets derecognised at date of initial application

Background

18. Respondents have also raised the issue of items that have been derecognised as of the date of initial application. IFRS 9 must not be applied to items that have already been derecognised at the date of initial application. The classification and measurement ED did not contain this requirement. However, in their comments to the classification and measurement ED some constituents told the Board that applying the new requirements to derecognised items would be a time-consuming and difficult (or perhaps impossible) process.

19. In response to those concerns, the Board decided during its redeliberations to provide what was intended to be transition relief and thus prohibited entities from

applying the requirements in IFRS 9 to derecognised items.[4] The Board considered whether it should allow (rather than prohibit) entities to choose to apply IFRS 9 to derecognised items but rejected that alternative because it would cause a lack of comparability between entities.

20. Since the issue of IFRS 9, some constituents have expressed concerns related to the requirement that prohibits entities from applying IFRS 9 to items that have already been derecognised at the date of initial application. Instead of providing relief, those constituents say that the requirement actually makes transition much more difficult. Because entities are not permitted to apply IFRS 9 to items that have already been derecognised at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements, they state that they are unable to compile restated comparative information until the date of initial application has passed. They note that it is not until that time that they know what items have been derecognised and thus which items will be classified and measured using IFRS 9 and which using IAS 39.

21. With respect to the derecognition issue, constituents made the following suggestions:

    (a) permit (rather than prohibit) entities to apply IFRS 9 to items that have already been derecognised at the date of initial application,

    (b) require (rather than prohibit) entities to apply IFRS 9 to items that have already been derecognised at the date of initial application, or

    (c) extend the relief from restating prior periods until IFRS 9's mandatory effective date.

Staff analysis

22. The proposal to permit (rather than prohibit) entities to apply IFRS 9 would provide more flexibility. However it would decrease comparability, which was the primary reason that the Board rejected this alternative when it issued IFRS 9 in 2009. The proposal to require (rather than prohibit) entities to apply IFRS 9 to

[4] Paragraph 7.2.1

items derecognised prior to the initial application of IFRS 9 would maintain the current level of comparability, but the requirement to continue to apply IAS 39 was introduced as a *concession* at the request of preparers. Therefore, the staff does not recommend that any changes should be made to the requirement for entities to apply IAS 39 rather than IFRS 9 to items derecognised at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement chapters of IFRS 9.

23. However, the staff notes that this concern would be substantially addressed if comparative statements were not required to be presented because IAS 39 would be applied to all financial instruments until the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements of IFRS 9. That is, the most significant issue of being able to prepare comparatives on a timely basis (ie prior to the passing of the date of initial application) would be addressed. Whether comparative statements should be required to be presented is further discussed in Section C of this paper.

Business model determination

Background

24. IFRS 9 states that for the purposes of transition, the date of initial application is the date when an entity first applies the requirements of IFRS 9.[5]

25. Respondents have noted that entities are required to initially apply IFRS 9 to classify their financial instruments on the basis of the business model at the date of initial application, and that the resulting classification is to be applied retrospectively irrespective of the business model in prior periods. They have noted that unless an entity applies IFRS 9 before 1 January 2012, it will be required to restate its comparatives. That restatement will be based on a business model that they assert cannot be assessed until after the end of the comparative period.

[5] Paragraphs 7.2.1–7.2.16

Staff analysis

26. The staff notes that in most cases entities should be able to determine their business model and to assess their anticipated elections prior to the actual date of initial application. Changes in business model are not anticipated to be common. However this will not always be the case, eg in particular in the current market environment in which many entities are re-evaluating and perhaps changing their business models, and would mean that some entities are unable to compile restated comparative information until their date of initial application has passed.

27. Like for items derecognised at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements, the staff notes that for those entities who were affected, this concern would be substantially addressed if comparative statements were not required to be presented, which is further discussed in Section C of this paper.

Fair value option and FVOCI elections

Background

28. Similar to the business model assessment, entities are required at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements to make one-time, irrevocable elections to designate an asset or liability under the fair value option, or to present subsequent changes in fair value of a non-trading equity investment in other comprehensive income.

29. For financial assets and financial liabilities designated under the fair value option, the entity's use of the fair value option is based on 'accounting mismatches' that exist at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements:

    (a) The entity may *choose* to revisit all of its elections under the fair value option. That is, it may:

        (i) initially elect the fair value option if there is an accounting mismatch at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements even

though it was not elected at initial recognition of the instrument as it normally would have to be under IAS 39 and IFRS 9,[6] and/or

(ii) elect to revoke previous fair value option elections even though there is still an accounting mismatch at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements (ie the entity has the ability to revisit all of its elections under the fair value option);[7] and

(b) The entity is ***required*** to revoke its previous fair value option elections if an accounting mismatch does not exist at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements.[8]

30. For financial liabilities designated under the fair value option (ie not financial assets), at the date of initial application of IFRS 9 (2010) the entity is ***required*** to determine whether presenting the effects of changes in 'own credit' in profit or loss would eliminate or significantly reduce an accounting mismatch. If so, the entity is required to present these 'own credit' changes in profit or loss, and if not the entity is required to present the 'own credit' changes in other comprehensive income.[9]

31. Similar to the business model determination, the entity must defer its fair value option evaluations in accordance with IFRS 9, which may further restrict the ability of entities to compile comparative information if the entity is unable to determine its financial asset and liability classifications until the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements has passed—eg if the entity has been re-evaluating and/or changing its business model as discussed in paragraph 26 of this paper.

32. Similar to the fair value option, the irrevocable election for fair value changes of an equity investment to be presented in other comprehensive income (the 'FVOCI election') would be available only if the investment is not held for trading as of

---

[6] Paragraphs 7.2.7 and 7.2.9
[7] Paragraph 7.2.8 and 7.2.9
[8] Paragraph 7.2.8 and 7.2.9
[9] Paragraphs 7.2.9, 5.7.7 and 5.7.8

the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements, rather than at initial recognition as would be available on an ongoing basis in accordance with IFRS 9.[10]

Staff analysis

33. The staff is not questioning the ability to make FVOCI and fair value options at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements of IFRS 9, because these elections are part of the new classification model. Like other elements of the classification model, these elections should be based on facts and circumstances as at the date of initial application of the classification and measurement requirements.

34. However, the staff notes that the requirement to revoke previous fair value option determinations if an accounting mismatch does not exist at the date of initial application (eg because assets or the liabilities were derecognised during the comparative period) would mean that the fair value option is not available to address prior-period accounting mismatches that have since gone away. The reverse is also true—the fair value option would be applied only to one side of a matched set of assets and liabilities in periods before the other side was initially recognised. This staff believes that this would diminish the usefulness of the comparative statements.

C. Alternatives for comparative information on transition

Alternative 1

35. Alternative 1 would require additional disclosures to provide information to enable users to understand the effect of the transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9. It would involve modifying the existing disclosures of IAS 8 and IFRS 7 to provide information about the transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9.

36. The staff notes that much of the information requested by investors is already required by IAS 8 and IFRS 7. For example, IAS 8 requires disclosure of the nature of the change in accounting policy, a description of the transitional provisions and the effect of the change on each financial statement line item

[10] Paragraph 7.2.7

affected. IFRS 7 requires disclosures for reclassifications of financial assets and the fair values of financial assets measured at amortised cost in the financial statements, as well as quantitative disclosures for the changes on transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9. See Appendix A for excerpts from the relevant standards with existing disclosure requirements relevant to investor needs on transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9.

37. In particular, because they should already be equipped to handle such disclosures on an ongoing basis, the staff believes that the provision of disclosures largely based on existing requirements should not create an undue incremental burden for preparers. However, in response to investor feedback specific to the transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9, the staff believes that some modifications to this information would make it more useful in this circumstance as described in the following paragraphs. Appendix B contains an illustration of disclosures that could be required to be presented in a tabular format based on Alternative 1.

38. The requirements of paragraph 28 of IAS 8 are required to be provided by financial statement line item, and the requirements of IFRS 7 are in some cases required to be provided by class of financial instrument, in a manner that enables them to be reconciled to financial statement line items. Similar to the ongoing requirements for the reclassification of financial assets, investors noted that information about transfers between measurement categories is also of key importance. However, the measurement categories may not correspond to financial statement line items and/or classes of financial instrument. Therefore, the staff believes that on transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9, in order for investors to see relationships between the disclosures and the financial statements, all disclosures provided should permit reconciliation between the financial statement line items and the measurement category under IAS 39 and IFRS 9 (and the classes of financial instrument where normally required).

39. The staff also believes that the reclassification disclosures in IFRS 7 (as amended by IFRS 9) should be required on transition. The staff notes that IFRS 9 amended the disclosures for financial assets reclassified from fair value to other categories. The rationale at the time was that under IAS 39 these disclosures existed until the derecognition of a financial asset, in order to respond to criticisms that entities

could 'cherry pick' their timing of removing items from being measured at fair value to another category. This was important because the reclassifications were elective (subject to the satisfaction of criteria). Under IFRS 9 reclassification is not optional but rather is required when an entity's business model has changed. As a result, this disclosure is only given in the reporting period of the reclassification because the objective of mandatory reclassifications under IFRS 9 is to provide better information on the amounts, timing and uncertainty of future cash flows of the related instruments and because there is discipline around reclassification. The staff continues to believe this is appropriate.

40. The staff notes that what is proposed, as illustrated in Appendix B, would require an additional level of detailed analysis of the carrying amounts and changes in them than what would otherwise be required by the disclosure requirements of IFRSs; however, the staff notes that investors have noted that this detail is useful on transition, and that, while not previously required to be disclosed, preparers would have the necessary data as part of transitioning to IFRS 9.

41. The staff considered whether any disclosure requirements related to profit or loss should be included in the period that includes the date of initial application. Although investors noted that they do not generally focus on the profit or loss accounts when analysing financial instruments, there are some items (eg net interest income) that are conducive to trend analysis because they are not based on fair value changes, and therefore can be useful in analyses. However, the staff notes that to attribute changes in net interest income to applying IFRS 9 for the first time would be to ignore the effects of other factors at play, such as interest and credit changes. It could be difficult to isolate the effects due to reclassification and could be misleading to investors as well. Therefore the staff did not include any disclosures related to the profit or loss accounts in Alternative 1.

42. The staff also considered whether the comparative transition disclosures under Alternative 1 should be required if the entity presents restated comparative statements or only if they are not provided. The staff believes that requiring all entities to present the comparative transition disclosures would further increase the usefulness to users by enhancing comparability between entities on transition.

As noted above, in the staff's view the burden of these comparative transition disclosures for prepares would not be unreasonable because it will be based largely on existing disclosure requirements. Therefore, the staff believes that these disclosures should be required even if restated comparative statements are provided.

Alternative 2

43. Under Alternative 2, comparative statements would be required to be restated. A variation on Alternative 2 would be to extend the comparative relief for early application, ie to 1 January 2014.

44. IFRS 9 provides relief from restating comparatives for those who apply it early.[11] The Board's view in the Basis for Conclusions[12] was that waiving the requirement to restate comparatives strikes a balance between the conceptually preferable method of full retrospective application (as stated in IAS 8) and the practicability of adopting the new classification model within a short time frame. However, the Board noted that these practicability considerations would be less applicable for entities that adopted outside a short time frame, and therefore in the deliberations leading up to the issue of the mandatory effective date ED, the Board noted that its rationale for its decision on comparative relief when issuing IFRS 9 was not affected by changes in circumstances (ie a short timeframe, unlike the mandatory effective date).

45. In providing feedback on their preferred transition approach for the project to replace IAS 39, investors consistently emphasised a need for comparable period-to-period information. Although restatement of comparative periods is generally done to achieve period-to-period comparability, investors, irrespective of whether they preferred comparative statements or disclosures, noted that the mix of transition requirements between phases and the modifications to retrospective application in the classification and measurement phase diminishes the usefulness of comparative statements. Most of these investors agreed with the views of

---

[11] Paragraph 7.2.12

[12] paragraph BC7.21

many preparers that the restatement of comparative statements with the mix of transition requirements could be misleading.

Staff recommendation

46. Based on the analysis presented in the preceding sections, the staff recommends Alternative 1. Because the transition to classification and measurement is retrospective, and the transition to hedge accounting is prospective due to the risk of hindsight in retrospective designation, the comparative statements will be a blend of retrospective and prospective application which diminishes their usefulness at best, and at the worst may actually make them misleading. The staff believes that comparative transition disclosures such as those provided in Alternative 1 will provide the information necessary for investors to understand the effect of the transition from IAS 39 to IFRS 9. The staff also believes that comparative transition disclosures, being based largely from disclosures that entities already need to present, will significantly reduce the burden on preparers compared to the restatement of comparative statements.

Question – Comparative information
Does the Board agree with the staff recommendation in paragraph 46—that the comparative transition disclosures in Alternative 1 should be required in lieu of the restatement of comparative statements? If not, what would the Board prefer, and why?

Appendix A: Excerpts from other IFRSs with relevant disclosure requirements for the transition to IFRS 9

IAS 8:

28 When initial application of an IFRS has an effect on the current period or any prior period, would have an effect except that it is impracticable to determine the amount of the adjustment, or might have an effect on future periods, an entity shall disclose:

(a) the title of the IFRS;

(b) when applicable that the change in accounting policy is made in accordance with its transition provisions;

(c) the nature of the change in accounting policy;

(d) when applicable, a description of the transitional provisions;

(e) when applicable, the transitional provisions that might have an effect on future periods;

(f) for the current period and each prior period presented, to the extent practicable, the amount of the adjustment:

(i) for each financial statement line item affected; and

(ii) if IAS 33 *Earnings per Share* applies to the entity, for basic and diluted earnings per share;

IFRS 7 (as amended by IFRS 9):

Classes of financial instruments and level of disclosure

6 When this IFRS requires disclosures by class of financial instrument, an entity shall group financial instruments into classes that are appropriate to the nature of the information disclosed and that take into account the characteristics of those financial instruments. An entity shall provide sufficient information to permit reconciliations to the line items presented in the statement of financial position.

…

Reclassification

12B An entity shall disclose if, in the current or previous reporting periods, it has reclassified any financial assets in accordance with paragraph 4.4.1 of IFRS 9. For each such event, an entity shall disclose:

(a) the date of reclassification.

(b) a detailed explanation of the change in business model and a qualitative description of its effect on the entity's financial statements.

(c) the amount reclassified into and out of each category.

12C For each reporting period following reclassification until derecognition, an entity shall disclose for assets reclassified so that they are measured at amortised cost in accordance with paragraph 4.4.1 of IFRS 9:

(a) the effective interest rate determined on the date of reclassification; and

(b) the interest income or expense recognised.

12D If an entity has reclassified financial assets so that they are measured at amortised cost since its last annual reporting date, it shall disclose:

(a) the fair value of the financial assets at the end of the reporting period; and

(b) the fair value gain or loss that would have been recognised in profit or loss during the reporting period if the financial assets had not been reclassified.

…

Fair value

25 Except as set out in paragraph 29, for each class of financial assets and financial liabilities (see paragraph 6), an entity shall disclose the fair value of that class of assets and liabilities in such a way that permits it to be compared with its carrying amount.

Effective date and transition

…

44I When an entity first applies IFRS 9, it shall disclose for each class of financial assets at the date of initial application:

(a) the original measurement category and carrying amount determined in accordance with IAS 39;

(b) the new measurement category and carrying amount determined in accordance with IFRS 9;

(c) the amount of any financial assets in the statement of financial position that were previously designated as measured at fair value through profit or loss but are no longer so designated, distinguishing between those that IFRS 9 requires an entity to reclassify and those that an entity elects to reclassify.

An entity shall present these quantitative disclosures in tabular format unless another format is more appropriate.