

Accounting Standards Advisory Forum meeting

Date	October 2026
Project	Amortised Cost Measurement
Topic	Contingent settlement provisions
Contacts	Karen Robson (karen.robson@ifrs.org) Iliriana Feka (ifeke@ifrs.org) Riana Wiesner (rwiesner@ifrs.org)

This paper has been prepared for discussion at a public meeting of the Accounting Standards Advisory Forum (ASAF). This paper does not represent the views of the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) or any individual IASB member. Any comments in the paper do not purport to set out what would be an acceptable or unacceptable application of IFRS® Accounting Standards. The IASB's technical decisions are made in public and are reported in the IASB® *Update*.
Copyright © 2026 IFRS Foundation. All rights reserved.

Purpose of this paper

The purpose of this paper is to seek ASAF members' feedback on a potential approach for measuring financial liabilities arising from contingent settlement provisions



Contents

from page

Introduction and questions

4


Previous IASB proposals and stakeholder feedback

7

A potential way forward

12

Introduction and questions



Introduction

- In April 2026, the IASB decided that stakeholder **feedback on measuring financial liabilities arising from contingent settlement provisions** might be better addressed in the Amortised Cost Measurement project rather than in the Financial Instruments with Characteristics of Equity (FICE) project (see pages 8–11).
- In July 2026, Financial Instrument Consultative Group (FICG) members provided feedback on potential ways forward for responding to stakeholder feedback about measuring financial liabilities arising from contingent settlement provisions. Specifically, most **FICG members** expressed **support** for measuring such a financial liability at its **transaction price** (see page 21).
- At this meeting, the IASB is **seeking ASAF members' feedback** on the potential approach for measuring financial liabilities arising from contingent settlement provisions (see page 6).

Questions for ASAF members


Question 1—Initial measurement at transaction price

Do you agree with the initial staff views on page [22](#)? Specifically, do you agree that initially measuring a financial liability arising from a contingent settlement at its transaction price addresses the challenges identified with the proposed FICE Exposure Draft amendment?

Question 2—Alternative approaches

Have you identified any alternatives that might better address those challenges? If so, how would that alternative address stakeholder concerns about faithful reflection of the obligation arising from a contingent settlement provision and provide useful information to users of financial statements?

Previous IASB proposals and stakeholder feedback



Proposals in the FICE Exposure Draft

Paragraph 25 of IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Presentation* requires a financial instrument that is settled in cash upon the occurrence of an uncertain future event, that is beyond the control of both the issuer and the holder of the instrument, to be classified as a financial liability.

Examples	Proposed amendment in <u>FICE Exposure Draft</u>
Example 1—Contingent convertible instrument: • issued at par with no maturity date • convertible into variable number of shares to the value of fixed par amount if CET 1 ratio breached • discretionary dividends Example 2—Contingent redeemable instrument: • redeemable in cash if a successful initial public offering does not occur within a specified period	• Financial instruments with contingent settlement provisions could be compound instruments • The financial liability portion is measured at the present value of the settlement amount, on initial recognition and subsequently • Settlement amount is discounted, assuming settlement will occur at the earliest possible settlement date specified in the contract • Any gains or losses on remeasurement are recognised in profit or loss • The probability and estimated timing of occurrence or non-occurrence of the contingent event have no effect on the initial or subsequent measurement

Overall stakeholder feedback

Overall, stakeholders had opposing views to the measurement proposals: some agreed with the proposals, while others strongly disagreed

- Those who agreed, viewed the proposal as an appropriate and pragmatic solution that:
 - provides a faithful reflection of liquidity risk;
 - is simpler to apply because it avoids the complexities and costs associated with the periodic remeasurement of financial liabilities in accordance with IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments*;
 - balances the interests of investors and preparers; and
 - aligns with the requirements in IAS 32 for measuring obligations to purchase own equity instruments at the present value of the redemption amount (paragraph 23 of IAS 32)
- However, these stakeholders asked for some clarification of the proposals (see page 11)

Agenda Paper [5B](#) for the April 2026 IASB meeting includes further details

Overall stakeholder feedback (cont.)


- Those who disagreed said that the proposed solution would not provide useful information because it did not consider market participants' perspective on the occurrence of the contingent event.
- In their view, the settlement amount does not reflect the economic substance of the instrument because it does not consider the probability and timing of the contingent event occurring. Therefore, they believe that:
 - liabilities might be overstated when the contingent event is remote; and
 - liabilities might be understated when later or higher settlements are more probable.
- These stakeholders said that the proposals introduce a new measurement basis for particular financial liabilities and would reduce comparability rather than improve it.
- They suggested that financial liabilities are measured applying the general principles in IFRS 9, which in their view would take into account expected cash flows (ie probability and timing of the contingent event occurring).

Request for further clarification

Questions stakeholders raised about the application of the proposed measurement requirements included:

- **Day one gains or losses**—how to account for differences between the settlement amount and transaction price on initial recognition.
- **Discount rate**—how to determine the discount rate for calculating the present value of the settlement amount on initial measurement, whether to adjust the discount rate subsequently and how to account for any differences arising from the adjustments.
- **Settlement amount**—how to determine the settlement amount on initial recognition, and subsequently, if there are multiple contingent settlement provisions, multiple settlement dates or if the settlement amount is based on future performance targets or performance metrics of the entity.
- **Embedded derivatives**—how the proposed measurement approach relates to the requirements in IFRS 9 for separating embedded derivatives from the host financial liability. Stakeholders noted that in practice, the requirements are applied differently, resulting in either recognition of a financial liability for the full amount without accounting for an embedded derivative or recognition of both a financial liability and an embedded derivative.

A potential way forward



Exploring potential ways forward

- Based on the feedback, the staff identified two possible approaches for the IASB to consider, namely, measuring the liability arising from a contingent settlement provision on initial recognition at:
 - the transaction price (**Approach 1**—see pages 14–16); and
 - the expected value (**Approach 2**—see pages 17–20).
- These views differ fundamentally, therefore; we do not think a compromise between them is possible.
- Furthermore, the terms and conditions of contracts with contingent settlement provisions vary significantly, including across different jurisdictions. Consequently, identifying an approach that might achieve broad stakeholder support across jurisdictions may not be feasible.
- However, the IASB is aware of diversity in practice. Stakeholders have repeatedly requested guidance and noted that this diversity reduces the usefulness of information provided to investors. Accordingly, the IASB still intends to explore potential solutions rather than maintaining the status quo.
- The staff think it would be beneficial to explore whether measuring financial liabilities in accordance with IFRS 9 requirements could address some of the concerns that stakeholders identified in relation to the approach proposed in the FICE Exposure Draft.

Approach 1: Transaction price

Initial measurement

- Paragraph 31 of IAS 32 requires the equity component of compound instrument to be assigned the residual amount after deducting from fair value of the instrument as a whole, the amount separately determined for the liability component.
- IFRS 9 requires financial instruments to be initially measured at fair value. Paragraph B5.1.1 of IFRS 9 states that **fair value is normally the transaction price**.
- The approach in IAS 32 and in the FICE Exposure Draft was based on measuring a financial liability at the amount an entity cannot avoid paying upon occurrence of the contingent event. This approach is consistent with the definition of a financial liability. For contingent settlement provisions, the occurrence of the event is outside the control of both the holder and issuer; therefore, the issuer cannot avoid paying at least the transaction price.
- As the contingent event is outside control of the issuer, it is assumed that contingent event can occur at any time, therefore the financial liability is not discounted for the time value of money.

Subsequent measurement

- If measured at amortised cost, the carrying amount is **increased via a catch-up adjustment** when an entity expects to settle the liability at an amount higher than the transaction price (paragraph B5.4.6 of IFRS 9).

Approach 1: Transaction price (cont.)

Other considerations

- Financial liabilities arising from contingent settlement provisions are different from other financial liabilities. For most financial liabilities there is an unconditional contractual obligation to pay an amount of cash. However, in the case of contingent settlement provisions, the obligation is conditional on the occurrence of a future event. Therefore, specific requirements for such liabilities would need to be included in IFRS 9.
- This approach would avoid any day 1 gains or losses arising and would meet the IASB's objective to have consistent measurement between initial and subsequent measurement (ie no day 2 gains would be recognised).

Approach 1 would be largely consistent with the proposals in the FICE Exposure Draft, but simplified and responsive to the requests for clarification summarised on page 11.

Advantages and disadvantages of Approach 1

Key advantages	Key disadvantages
• Initial measurement applying existing concepts. The financial liability arising from contingent settlement would initially be measured at transaction price, already discussed in IFRS 9 (eg see paragraph B5.1.1 of IFRS 9). • Objectively determined financial liability amount. Initial recognition of the financial liability at transaction price would be a factual and more objective measure, being the contractual amount agreed by the parties at issuance. • Reflective of how these instruments are priced and invested. Feedback on FICE project indicated that, although interest is discretionary, it is usually paid in favorable conditions. From an investor's perspective, the cash flows behave as debt, which explains why some entities hedge the associated interest rate and foreign exchange risks. • Balanced cost-benefit outcome. The potential investor benefits of reflecting expected probability and timing might not outweigh preparer costs, particularly because estimates for events such as non-viability may be unreliable. • Improves comparability. Measuring the liability without significant subjective judgements or arbitrary assumptions about timing or occurrence of contingent event occurring would improve comparability.	• Ignoring the probability of the contingent event may not reflect economic substance. Some stakeholders argue that a market participant would consider the probability of the contingent event occurring and allocate some, or most, of the instrument's initial fair value to the equity component. • Regulatory consequences. Measuring the financial liability at transaction price could result in the reclassification of amounts from equity to liabilities on transition in some jurisdictions. This may have a consequential effect on the regulatory capital metrics, including the Common Equity Tier 1 (CET1) ratio in those jurisdictions.

Approach 2: Expected value

Initial measurement

- When determining the fair value of the liability component applying paragraph B5.1.1 of IFRS 9, the issuer considers the probability and expected timing of the contingent event occurring.
- IFRS 13 *Fair Value Measurement* states that fair value measurement assumes that a financial liability remains outstanding and is transferred to a market participant and that the market participant would be required to fulfil the obligation.
- Supporters of this approach argue that, when applying a present value approach to measure the liability's fair value, the issuer would estimate future cash flows and consider possible variations in their amount and timing.

Subsequent measurement

- If measured at amortised cost, the carrying amount is adjusted (ie increased or decreased) for changes in the issuer's expectations about the amount and timing of the cash flows required to settle the liability (paragraph B5.4.6 of IFRS 9).

Approach 2: Expected value (cont.)

Other considerations

- Under this approach, the fair value of the liability component might be very low if an entity does not expect the contingent event to occur, resulting in the remaining amount being allocated to the equity component. As a result, the carrying amount of the liability will increase as the probability of the contingent event occurring increases. In practice, the effect might be that no liability is recognised until the contingent event is resolved (eg entity is deemed to be non-viable or redemption period lapses).
- However, some stakeholders said that, doing so would involve significant subjective judgements, for example requiring an entity to estimate the probability of events such as own non-viability to occur. That subjectivity may not improve financial reporting, as it might:
 - increase operational costs to develop a reliable estimate and frequently remeasure the liability; and
 - reduce the usefulness of information due to subjective judgements which reduce comparability.
- This approach is similar to the proposal in the 2018 FICE Discussion Paper on the ‘amount feature’, which would measure the liability based on the probability of the entity entering liquidation. Stakeholders strongly disagreed with that proposal because assessing whether, or when, an entity would enter liquidation is highly subjective and could produce counter-intuitive outcomes—that is, as an entity’s financial position worsens, the liability’s carrying amount would increase.

Approach 2: Expected value (cont.)

Other considerations (continued)

- Furthermore, as discussed at the IASB's [June 2025](#) meeting, preparers have reported that, for financial instruments with contingent terms affecting the contractual interest rate, estimating the probability and timing of a contingent event on initial recognition is often not feasible. Any resulting estimate would be unreliable because it would require significant judgement and would not be based on reasonable and supportable information available.
- The IASB was previously asked to provide application guidance on how to reflect the probability of contingent events in the expected cash flows for the purpose of determining the effective interest rate on initial recognition of a financial instrument with contingent terms.
- In [September 2025](#), the IASB concluded that prescribing a method may be arbitrary and may not appropriately reflect the substance of different types of contingent contractual cash flows. At the time, the IASB tentatively decided to take no further action on this matter.

Advantages and disadvantages of Approach 2

Key advantages	Key disadvantages
• Reflects the expected obligation. Taking into account the expected probability and timing would help avoid overstating liabilities when the contingent event is remote and understating them when higher or later settlement amounts are more likely. • Consistent with a market participant perspective. This approach better aligns with fair value—that is, the price paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. • Usefulness of information. Might be reflective of economic substance; therefore, resulting in decision useful information. However, the significant subjectivity involved may also undermine the usefulness of information.	• Relies on subjective estimates and probability-weighted outcomes. This would increase costs for preparers and reduce comparability of information for users of financial statements. • May produce counter-intuitive outcomes. The higher the probability of the contingent event, such as non-viability, the higher the liability amount and related losses recognised in profit or loss. • Lack of transparency. Because the liability is likely to have an immaterial carrying amount in favourable conditions, users may have limited visibility of the potential for a significant liability to be recognised in ‘bad’ times.

FICG feedback


At its **July 2026** meeting, FICG members provided feedback on the two approaches described on pages 13–20:

- Most FICG members (preparers and users) expressed strong support for measuring a financial liability arising from a contingent settlement provision at its transaction price. They said Approach 1 would:
 - be more objective, transparent and comparable, for reasons similar to those described in page 16.
 - be simpler to apply as it avoids the complexities, costs and audit challenges of estimating and continuously updating probabilities of contingent events; and
 - better reflect the risk management of the liability and enable an entity to achieve hedge accounting for eligible risks.
- In particular, the user members said that information resulting from Approach 2 might not be particularly useful because:
 - gains and losses would reflect changes in estimates of contingent events rather than changes in the underlying economics of the instrument; and
 - increases in the liability amount may occur only when the likelihood of the contingent event has already increased significantly, reducing the usefulness of the information in identifying emerging risks and potentially amplifying volatility during periods of financial stress.
- However, a few preparer members preferred Approach 2 because incorporating probabilities may better reflect economic substance in arrangements where settlement is considered highly unlikely.
- Some members suggested enhancing disclosures for liabilities arising from contingent settlement provisions.

Initial staff views

Based on the staff analysis on pages 13–20 and feedback from FICG members on page 21, we think Approach 1 would:

- address the challenges identified in applying the proposed amendment in the FICE Exposure Draft; and
- achieve a more appropriate balance between costs for preparers and benefits from the resulting information for users of financial statements.



Get involved

Learn more

- Access [IFRS Accounting Standards](#)
- Explore materials for the [consistent application](#) of Standards
- Respond to [consultations](#)

Track progress

- Watch [IASB meetings](#)
- Listen to [podcasts](#)
- Register for [news alerts](#)