



CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

Spotlight on IFRS

Q1 2021

kpmg.ca



Table of contents

03 Quarterly update

04 Major projects and new standards

- 04 Insurance contracts (IFRS 17)
- 05 Update on financial instruments projects
- 08 Update on rate-regulated activities project
- 09 General presentation and disclosures

11 Other developments

- 11 Classification of debt with covenants as current or non-current
- 11 Accounting policy or estimate?
- 11 Applying materiality when preparing financial statements
- 12 Business combinations under common control
- 12 Lease liability in a sale and leaseback
- 13 Sustainability reporting
- 13 IFRIC agenda decisions

14 Requirements effective in 2021

- 14 IBOR – Phase 2
(Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39 and IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16)
- 14 COVID-19-related rent concessions (Amendments to IFRS 16)

15 Appendix 1: Requirements effective in 2022 and beyond

16 Appendix 2: IASB work plan

Quarterly update

Each quarter, we provide a summary of newly effective and forthcoming standards as well as other significant accounting and financial reporting developments. This edition covers current developments in the quarter ended on March 31, 2021.

There are certain new requirements that are effective from January 1, 2021. Companies that have calendar year-ends and are preparing interim financial statements will need to consider the newly effective Interest Rate Benchmark Reform (IBOR) – Phase 2¹.

On March 31, 2021, the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) issued amendments to IFRS 16 *Leases*², which extends the practical expedient for rent concessions related to the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic by one year. Lessees that had applied practical expedient to account for rent concessions will need to consider these amendments to the extent they have rent concessions that extend beyond June 30, 2021 which meet the criteria for use of the practical expedient. The amendments are effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after April 1, 2021 with early application permitted.

Further information on these new requirements is provided in the section 'Requirements effective in 2021'.

Most companies are likely to continue to be impacted by the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic. Our [Covid-19 financial reporting resource centre](#) provides regularly updated information on potential accounting and disclosure implications for your company, focusing on the financial reporting impacts for 2021 period ends. Our latest [IFRS Today podcast](#) offers clear and concise points to consider on reflecting the impact of COVID-19 in year-end financial statements. In addition, our [COVID-19 supplement](#) to our [Illustrative disclosures](#) and [Illustrative disclosures for banks](#) illustrate disclosure examples related to accounting issues arising from the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic.

¹ *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Phase 2 (Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16)*

² *Covid-19-Related Rent Concessions beyond 30 June 2021 (Amendments to IFRS 16)*

Major projects and new standards

Insurance contracts (IFRS 17)

In May 2017, the IASB issued the new insurance contracts standard IFRS 17 *Insurance Contracts* which brings fundamental changes to insurance accounting.

IFRS 17 introduces a single:

- measurement model based on a current fulfillment value that incorporates available information in a way that is consistent with observable market information; and
- revenue recognition principle to reflect services provided.

Benefits of the new standard include increased transparency about the profitability of new and in-force business which will provide more insight into an insurer's financial health. Other effects may include greater volatility in financial results and equity due to the use of current discount rates and assumptions around future cash flows.

Other changes include:

- separate presentation of underwriting and finance results, providing information surrounding the sources of profit and quality of earnings;
- premium volumes will no longer drive the 'top line' as investment components and cash received are no longer considered to be revenue; and
- accounting for options and guarantees will be more consistent and transparent.

Implementation of IFRS 17 requires the coordination of several functions, including finance, actuarial, and IT as well as the introduction of new or upgraded systems, processes and controls. Read our [web article](#) about the published guidance by the Global Public Policy Committee (GPPC) which seek to help insurers' audit committees fulfil their responsibilities for IFRS 17 implementation.

To help support implementation and reduce the potential for diversity in practice, both the IASB and the Canadian Accounting Standards Board have set up

Transition Resource Groups (TRGs) - with the Canadian TRG focusing on Canadian-specific issues. Our online magazine [Insurance – Transition to IFRS 17](#) tracks the activities of IASB's TRG and contains our summary of and observations on the topics discussed.

To address concerns and implementation challenges the IASB, after several months of redeliberations, published amendments to IFRS 17 in June 2020.

The following are the key areas of amendments:

- Effective date: January 1, 2023 is the effective date for application of IFRS 17 and exemption from applying IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* for qualifying insurers;
- Scope for certain credit cards that provide insurance coverage and loans that meet the definition of an insurance contract;
- Measuring the contractual service margin
 - Accounting policy choice for interim reporting;
 - Insurance contract services now include both insurance and investment services;
 - Accounting for assets and liabilities before the related group of contracts is recognized;
- Transitioning to IFRS 17
 - Contracts acquired in their settlement period;
 - Assets for insurance acquisition cash flows;
 - Transition reliefs and minor amendments;
- Accounting for direct participating contracts
 - Risk mitigation option expanded to non-derivative assets at fair value through profit or loss and reinsurance contracts held and extended to provide relief prospectively from the transition date;
 - Applying the OCI option and risk mitigation option together;

- Accounting for reinsurance contracts held
 - Accounting for recovery of losses on initial recognition;
- Presentation and disclosure requirements
 - Presentation in the statement of financial position;
 - Treatment of income taxes chargeable to the policyholder.

For additional information about the amendments, refer to our [web article](#) and listen to our [podcast](#).

Our updated guide *Insurers - Illustrative disclosures* provides a comprehensive illustration for financial statements for an annual period beginning on January 1, 2023 when IFRS 17 and IFRS 9 are applied for the first time (including the impact of the amendments).

For additional information, refer to our webpage *IFRS - Insurance* and updated publication *Insurance Contracts – First Impressions*.

Update on financial instruments projects

Financial instruments with characteristics of equity

IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Presentation* sets out how an issuer distinguishes between a financial liability and equity and works well for many, simpler financial instruments. However, classifying more complex financial instruments under IAS 32 – e.g. those with characteristics of equity – can be more challenging, leading to diversity in practice. In response, in June 2018 the IASB has published a discussion paper *Financial Instruments with Characteristics of Equity* (FICE) that sought to improve IAS 32.

To learn more about the IASB's proposals in the discussion paper, read our [web article](#).

In September 2019 in the light of the feedback received on the discussion paper, the staff provided the IASB five alternatives for the direction of the FICE project. From the alternatives, the IASB tentatively decided on making clarifying amendments to IAS 32, which would focus on addressing practice issues by clarifying particular underlying principles in IAS 32.

In October 2019, the IASB discussed the project plan and outlined a preliminary list of practice issues that could be addressed in the scope of the project:

- (a) classification of financial instruments that will or may be settled in the issuer's own equity instruments – e.g. application of the fixed-for-fixed condition to particular derivatives on own equity and the classification of mandatorily convertible financial instruments;
- (b) accounting for obligations to redeem own equity instruments – e.g. accounting for written put options on non-controlling interests (NCI puts);
- (c) accounting for financial instruments that contain contingent settlement provisions – e.g. financial instruments with a non-viability clause;
- (d) the effect of laws and regulations on the classification of financial instruments;
- (e) reclassification between financial liability and equity instruments – e.g. when circumstances change, or contractual terms are modified; and
- (f) classification of particular financial instruments that contain obligations that arise only on liquidation of the entity – e.g. perpetual financial instruments.

In December 2019, the IASB commenced its discussions on the classification of financial instruments that will or may be settled in the issuer's own equity instruments. In April 2020, the IASB made the following tentative decisions:

- *With regards to the foundation principle for classifying derivatives on own equity:* for a derivative on own equity to meet the fixed-for-fixed condition in IAS 32, the number of functional currency units to be exchanged with each underlying equity instrument must be fixed or only vary with:
 - allowable preservation adjustments; or
 - allowable passage of time adjustments.
- *With regards to share-for-share exchange:* to classify as equity a contract that can be settled by exchanging a fixed number of non-derivative own equity instruments with a fixed number of another type of non-derivative own equity instruments.
- *With regards to preservation adjustments:* an entity would be required to classify derivatives on own equity as equity instruments if preservation adjustments require the entity to preserve the relative economic interests of future shareholders

to an equal or a lesser extent than those of the existing shareholders.

- *With regards to passage of time adjustments:* an entity would be required to classify derivatives on own equity as equity instruments if passage of time adjustments:
 - are pre-determined and vary only with the passage of time; and
 - fix the number of functional currency units per underlying equity instrument in terms of a present value.

In its December 2020 meeting, the IASB decided to move the FICE project from the research programme to the standard-setting programme.

Dynamic risk management

Although IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* and IFRS 9 provide models for macro hedge accounting, these contain restrictions that limit companies' ability to reflect some common dynamic risk management activities in their accounting (i.e. when the risk position being hedged changes frequently and is hedged by an open portfolio of changing assets and liabilities). Moreover, some of these models deal specifically with interest rate risk management rather than other types of risk. Without an accounting model that reflects the broader use of dynamic risk management activities, some have asserted that it can be difficult to faithfully represent these activities in financial statements.

In response to these issues, in April 2014 the IASB published the *Discussion Paper Accounting for Dynamic Risk Management – a Portfolio Revaluation Approach to Macro Hedging* as the first due process document for the project.

Based on the feedback received from respondents on the discussion paper, the IASB decided to prioritize the consideration of interest rate risk and consider other risks at a later stage in the project. It also decided that the project would remain as a research project, and that a second discussion paper would be published before issuing an exposure draft.

In November 2017, the IASB tentatively decided that the dynamic risk management accounting model should be developed based on cash flow hedge accounting mechanics.

Some of the key areas discussed by the IASB in past meetings were the following.

- the role of the asset profile within the Dynamic Risk Management Accounting model (the Model); in particular, the application of qualifying criteria to the asset profile, as well as designation of items within the asset profile and documentation requirements.
- the role of the target profile within the Model; in particular, what is a target profile, how it is determined, consistency of the asset profile and target profile and the time horizon of the target profile.
- the application of qualifying criteria to the target profile, as well as designation of items within the target profile, core demand deposits and the documentation requirements.
- derivative financial instruments, including designation and de-designation of derivatives.
- the information that should be provided in situations of imperfect alignment (i.e. when the asset profile, in conjunction with the designated derivatives, are not aligned with the target profile).
- misalignments that could result in an accounting outcome inconsistent with the purpose of the Model, economic relationship between the target profile and the combination of the asset profile and designated derivatives.
- how derivatives designated within the Model should be presented in financial statements.
- negative balances within the target profile.
- documentation of and changes in risk management strategy.

Stakeholder consultation on the core elements of the Model began in October 2020. In its October 2020 meeting, the IASB received an update on its stakeholder consultation on the core elements of the Model. The IASB will consider the feedback from the consultation during the first half of 2021.

IBOR reforms and accounting impacts

In many markets around the world benchmark rates are IBORs. However, there have been various issues related to these rates, especially in the UK.

Regulators, international bodies and organizations around the world recently started various initiatives and consultations related to replacing or supplementing such rates with alternative benchmarks that are more robust, reliable and closer to a risk free rate (RFR).

In March 2018, the Canadian Alternative Reference Rate Working Group (CARR) was established to identify and seek to develop a new term risk-free Canadian dollar interest rate benchmark. Such a risk-free rate would operate alongside the existing Canadian Dollar Offered Rate (CDOR). CARR also explored possible enhancements to the existing Canadian overnight risk-free rate, the Canadian Overnight Repo Rate Average (CORRA). In February 2019, the Bank of Canada published a consultation on proposed enhancements to CORRA. In July 2019, the Bank of Canada published the results from the CARR consultation and announced its intention to become the administrator of CORRA. On June 15, 2020 the Bank of Canada took over the responsibility for publishing the CORRA based on the new methodology, and meanwhile, the Montréal Exchange announced the launch of Three-Month CORRA Futures contracts. For more details refer to the Bank of Canada [website](#).

To consider the financial reporting implications of the reforms, in 2018, the IASB added the IBOR Reform and its Effects on Financial Reporting project to the IASB's standard-setting program and decided that the project will address the following two groups of accounting issues separately:

- pre-replacement issues — issues affecting financial reporting in the period before the replacement of an existing interest rate benchmark with an alternative RFR (Phase 1); and
- replacement issues — issues that might affect financial reporting when an existing interest rate benchmark is replaced with an alternative RFR (Phase 2).

After the completion of Phase 1 that were effective in 2020 and several months of redeliberations, the IASB published amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 16, IFRS 4 *Insurance Contracts* and IFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures* in August 2020 under Phase 2. The following summarizes the key amendments.

- As a practical expedient, a change in the benchmark interest rate required by IBOR reform is accounted for by updating the effective interest rate (EIR), without adjusting the relevant financial instrument's carrying amount (i.e. as per IFRS 9.B5.4.5), rather than recalculating the carrying amount using the original EIR (as per IFRS 9.5.4.3 or IFRS 9.B5.4.6). After applying the practical expedient to modifications that relate only to IBOR reform, the current IFRS 9 requirements are applied to assess any other modifications made to that financial instrument. A similar practical expedient to use an updated EIR applies to insurers applying IAS 39 and lessees when accounting for modifications of lease liabilities.
- The following exceptions to hedge accounting are applied when the Phase 1 exceptions cease to apply.
 - The formal designation of a hedging relationship is updated to reflect the changes that are required by the reform without having to cease hedge accounting for that hedging relationship.
 - The amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve is deemed to be based on the alternative benchmark rate on which the hedged future cash flows are determined.
 - For a discontinued cash flow hedging relationship, when the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged future cash flows had been based is changed as required by interest rate benchmark reform, in order to determine whether the hedged future cash flows are expected to occur, the amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve is deemed to be based on the alternative benchmark rate on which the hedged future cash flows will be based.
 - When a group of items was designated as a hedged item and an item in the group is amended to reflect the changes that are required by the reform, the hedged items are allocated to sub groups based on the benchmark rate being hedged. The benchmark rate for each sub-group is then designated as the hedged risk. Each sub-group is assessed separately to determine

whether the sub-group is eligible to be a hedged item.

- If it is reasonably expected that an alternative benchmark rate will be separately identifiable within a period of 24 months, the replacement rate is designated as a non-contractually specified risk component even if it is not separately identifiable at the designation date. All hedging relationships in which such benchmark rate was designated must discontinue if subsequently it is expected that the rate will not be separately identifiable within 24 months from the date it is first designated.
- When performing a retrospective hedge effectiveness assessment under IAS 39, the cumulative fair value changes of the hedged item and hedging instrument may be reset to zero on a hedge-by-hedge basis.
- Additional disclosures are required about:
 - the nature and extent of risks arising from IBOR reform to which the company is exposed, and how the company manages those risks; and
 - the company's progress in transitioning from IBORs to alternative benchmark rates, and how that transition is being managed.

The above Phase 2 amendments are effective for annual periods beginning on or after January 1, 2021, with early application permitted. The amendments are to be applied retrospectively. Hedging relationships previously discontinued solely because of changes resulting from the IBOR reform must be reinstated if certain conditions are met.

To learn more about the amendments, read our [web article](#) and listen to our [podcast](#). For additional information, refer to our webpage [IBOR reform and IFRS](#).

Update on rate-regulated activities project

Some companies are subject to regulations that say how much and when they can charge their customers. Although some national accounting bodies provide specific guidance on accounting for the effects of rate regulation, IFRS does not contain any equivalent comprehensive guidance. IFRS 14 *Regulatory Deferral Accounts* provides only temporary relief to first-time adopters of IFRS that are subject to rate regulation.

Companies use different accounting models to report the effects of this rate regulation. Some of these models reflect incomplete information about how rate regulation affects a company's underlying financial position, performance and cash flows.

In January 2021, the IASB published its exposure draft *Regulatory Assets and Regulatory Liabilities*. The exposure draft proposes a new accounting model under which a company subject to rate regulation that meets the scope criteria would recognize regulatory assets and liabilities. This accounting model would align the total income recognized in a period under IFRS Standards with the total allowed compensation the company is permitted to earn by the rate regulator, often reducing reported volatility in financial performance.

The key proposal in the exposure draft is that a company that is subject to rate regulation should report in its financial statements the total allowed compensation it is permitted to earn by the rate regulator for goods and services supplied in the period.

To achieve this, the exposure draft proposes an 'overlay' approach under which a company would, first, continue to apply the requirements of existing IFRS Standards – for example, to recognize and measure revenue from contracts with customers. Then, a company would recognize:

- a regulatory asset – when it has an enforceable present right to add an amount in determining the regulated rate to be charged to customers in future periods; and
- a regulatory liability – when it has an enforceable present obligation to deduct an amount in determining the regulated rate to be charged to customers in future periods.

Movements in regulatory assets and liabilities would give rise to regulatory income and expense. Broadly speaking, the total revenue recognized under existing IFRS Standards plus regulatory income minus regulatory expense under the proposed new IFRS Standard would align with the total allowed compensation determined by the rate regulator.

The company would present regulatory income minus regulatory expense separately in the statement of financial performance, immediately below revenue. Regulatory assets and liabilities would be presented

separately from other assets and liabilities.

It is possible that some companies in the utility sector would not meet the scope criteria, whereas some outside the utility sector would be captured. A company would fall within the scope of the proposals if it meets the following conditions:

- the company is a party to a regulatory agreement;
- the regulatory agreement determines the regulated rate that the company can charge for goods or services supplied to its customers; and
- the regulated rate is determined in a such a way that some or all the total allowed compensation for goods or services supplied in one period is charged to customers in a different period.

The proposed standard provides some guidance for these conditions. If a company meets these criteria, then it would be required to apply the accounting model in the exposure draft. Unlike the approach in IFRS 14, the new accounting model would not be optional.

Companies covered by the proposals who did not apply IFRS 14 would recognize new assets and liabilities, and new items of income and expense. The impact on financial performance will depend on the facts and circumstances of the company but common cases would include the following.

- If recognition of income under IFRS Standards previously lagged total allowed compensation permitted by the regulator, then a company would see an increase in net assets on transition to the new standard.
- If a company previously experienced material short-term timing differences between recognition of income under IFRS Standards and total allowed compensation permitted by the regulator, volatility in reported earnings would be reduced.

Companies that applied IFRS 14 would transition to the new requirements. There is no option to automatically carry forward existing IFRS 14 accounting.

The IASB has requested comments on the exposure draft by July 30, 2021.

Read our [web article](#) and [New on the Horizon](#) publication which contain detailed analysis and insights.

General presentation and disclosures

In December 2019, the IASB published the exposure draft *General Presentation and Disclosures* that aims to improve how information is communicated in the financial statements, with a focus on financial performance. The proposals would result in a new IFRS Standard, replacing IAS 1, and would amend some other IFRS Standards.

The proposals would introduce significant changes to the structure of a company's income statement, more discipline and transparency in presentation of management's own performance measures (commonly referred to as 'non-GAAP measures,') and less aggregation of items into large, single numbers.

Presentation choices in the cash flow statement would also be reduced, improving comparability.

The IASB proposes requiring:

- additional subtotals in the income statement, including 'operating profit';
- disaggregation to help a company to provide relevant information;
- disclosure of some management-defined performance measures – that is, performance measures not specified by IFRS Standards; and
- limited changes to the statement of cash flows to improve consistency in classification by removing options.

In its December 2020 and January 2021 meetings, the IASB discussed feedback on its exposure draft. In its March 2021 meeting, the IASB began to redeliberate proposals in its exposure draft relating to:

- subtotals and categories in the statement of profit or loss, by discussing the requirements for and the definition of 'operating profit';
- management performance measures, including the potential expansion of their scope beyond income and expense subtotals; and

- amendments to the statement of cash flows, including the scope of amendments and some of the specific proposals.

The IASB will continue to redeliberate the project proposals at a future meeting.

The exposure draft and other materials are available on the IASB's Primary Financial Statements [project page](#).

Read our [web article](#) and [New on the Horizon](#) publication which contains detailed analysis and insights.

Other developments

Classification of debt with covenants as current or non-current

In January 2020 the IASB issued amendments to IAS 1³ and clarified how to classify debt and other financial liabilities as current or non-current in particular circumstances. In its December 2020 tentative agenda decision, the IFRS Interpretations Committee (IFRIC) clarified that classifying debt with future conditions as current or non-current would be based on a *hypothetical test* at the reporting date – a test that the lender does not require until a later date. The tentative agenda decision illustrates how a company would apply the amendments using three different term loan examples.

The tentative agenda decision clarifies that when the right to defer settlement of a liability for at least 12 months after the reporting date is subject to future conditions related to financial position, a company (borrower) would need to perform a hypothetical test for compliance at the reporting date:

- if the loan agreement requires the test for compliance at a later date; and
- using its financial information as at the reporting date.

This means that a company would classify its debt as non-current only when it complies at the reporting date with *all* conditions – i.e. those conditions that exist at the reporting date and those that are due to be tested within 12 months after that date.

Comments on the tentative agenda decision received by February 15, 2021 will be deliberated by IFRIC at a future meeting. For more information about the

tentative agenda decision, as well as the examples discussed by IFRIC, refer to our [web article](#).

Accounting policy or estimate?

In February 2021, the IASB issued amendments to IAS 8⁴ and clarified how to distinguish changes in accounting policies from changes in estimates. Distinguishing between accounting policies and accounting estimates is important because changes in accounting policies are generally applied retrospectively, while changes in accounting estimates are applied prospectively.

The amendments introduce a new definition for accounting estimates, clarifying that they are monetary amounts in the financial statements that are subject to measurement uncertainty. The amendments also clarify the relationship between accounting policies and accounting estimates by specifying that a company develops an accounting estimate to achieve the objective set out by an accounting policy.

The amendments are effective for periods beginning on or after January 1, 2023, with earlier application permitted. For more information about the amendments refer to our [web article](#).

Applying materiality when preparing financial statements

In October 2018, the IASB refined its definition of material to make it easier to understand and apply. This definition is now aligned across IFRS Standards and the Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting. In addition, the refined definition of material complements the non-mandatory IFRS Practice Statement 2 *Making Materiality Judgements*, guidance the IASB issued in 2017, which outlines a four-step process that

³ *Classification of Liabilities as Current or Non-current (Amendments to IAS 1)*

⁴ *Definition of Accounting Estimates (Amendments to IAS 8)*

companies can use to help them make materiality judgements in preparing financial statements.

In February 2021, the IASB issued amendments to IAS 1 and IFRS Practice Statement 2⁵ to help companies provide useful accounting policy disclosures. The key amendments include:

- requiring companies to disclose their material accounting policies rather than their significant accounting policies;
- clarifying that accounting policies related to immaterial transactions, other events or conditions are themselves immaterial and as such need not be disclosed; and
- clarifying that not all accounting policies that relate to material transactions, other events or conditions are themselves material to a company's financial statements.

The amendments are effective from January 1, 2023, with earlier application permitted. For more information about the amendments refer to our [web article](#).

Business combinations under common control

Currently, there is no guidance in IFRS for business combinations under common control – i.e. transactions in which the combining businesses are ultimately controlled by the same party both before, and after the combination. In the absence of specific requirements, diversity in practice exists making it difficult for users of financial statements to understand how a business combination under common control affects a company and to compare companies that undertake similar transactions.

In November 2020, the IASB published the discussion paper *Business Combinations under Common Control*. The discussion paper sets out the IASB's preliminary views on possible reporting requirements that would help companies provide better information about business combinations under common control.

The IASB has proposed that transactions would be

measured using either the acquisition method – i.e. applying IFRS 3 *Business Combinations* – or a specific book-value method. The approach would depend on the type of transaction – e.g. if it affects non-controlling shareholders. The IASB proposes the following.

- The acquisition method would be used for transactions that affect non-controlling shareholders of the receiving company because those transactions are similar to business combinations in the scope of IFRS 3. However, the IASB is proposing certain exceptions to this rule – e.g. if the company's shares are not publicly traded, and the non-controlling shareholders are related parties of the company.
- The book-value method proposed would be used for all other transactions because such transactions only move economic resources within the group and are not like those covered by IFRS 3.
- Under the book-value method, the receiving company would measure the assets and liabilities received using the book values of the transferred company, not the controlling party's book values.
- Restating pre-combination information to include the financial information of the transferred company would be prohibited under both methods.

The IASB is seeking feedback on its preliminary views by September 1, 2021. For more information about the discussion paper refer to our [web article](#).

Lease liability in a sale and leaseback

Under IFRS 16, a lessee does not generally include variable lease payments in the measurement of a lease liability, unless they depend on an index or a rate. However, questions have arisen in practice about how to measure the right-of-use asset and lease liability in a sale-and-leaseback transaction with variable lease payments.

Initially, the IFRIC addressed the issue in its agenda decision and recommended that the IASB consider amending IFRS 16 to address subsequent accounting. In November 2020, the IASB published the exposure

⁵ *Disclosure of Accounting Policies (Amendments to IAS 1 and IFRS Practice Statement 2)*

draft *Lease Liability in a Sale and Leaseback*. The exposure draft specifies the method a seller-lessee uses in initially measuring the right-of-use asset and lease liability arising in a sale and leaseback transaction and how the seller-lessee subsequently measures that liability. The proposed method would require the seller-lessee to initially measure the lease liability at the present value of the expected lease payments, which by definition will include both fixed payments and variable payments at market rates.

The comment period on the exposure draft ended on March 29, 2021, and the IASB is now considering feedback before developing its final requirements. For more information about the exposure draft refer to our [web article](#).

Sustainability reporting

The demand for sustainability information (or environmental, social, and governance (ESG) information) continues to grow as business models are increasingly exposed to social and environmental issues, including climate-change related regulation. Although a variety of sustainability frameworks and standards already exist, investors are now calling for convergence and a single framework that will bring consistency and comparability.

In September 2020, the IFRS Foundation Trustees published the consultation paper *Consultation Paper on Sustainability Reporting* to seek input on the need for a global set of internationally recognized sustainability standards, and gauging support for their role in developing such standards. Following the strong support received on their consultation paper and endorsement from the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO), in March 2021, the IFRS Foundation Trustees have set out the strategic direction for a new board to develop global sustainability reporting standards. This could signal a new era in corporate reporting where the same rigour is demanded for sustainability reporting as for financial information.

The Trustees are focusing on four key strategic areas:

- investor focus for enterprise value;
- sustainability scope, prioritizing climate;

- build on existing frameworks; and
- building blocks approach.

The IFRS Foundation Trustees plan to publish a feedback statement on their consultation paper along with the proposed changes to the constitution necessary to formally establish a new board. This could lead to the announcement of a new board in advance of the November 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 26).

For more information about the development in this area, refer to our [web article](#) and webpage [Sustainability reporting](#).

IFRIC agenda decisions

In March 2021, the IFRIC reached its conclusions on the agenda decision *Configuration or Customization Costs in a Cloud Computing Arrangement (IAS 38)*. The IFRIC received a request about how a customer accounts for costs of configuring or customizing the supplier's application software in a Software as a Service arrangement. This agenda decision will be considered by the IASB at its April 2021 meeting. Subject to the IASB not objecting, the agenda decision will be published in April 2021 in an addendum to this [IFRIC Update](#).

Requirements effective in 2021

New requirements effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2021

IBOR – Phase 2 (Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16)

In August 2020, the IASB issued Phase 2 amendments, which amended the requirements in IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4, and IFRS 16, principally addressing the following areas:

- modification of a financial asset or a financial liability;
- modification of a lease;
- additional reliefs for hedging relationships;
- new disclosures; and
- effective date and transition.

For more information about the amendments refer to 'IBOR reforms and accounting impacts' in the section 'Major projects and new standards'.

COVID-19-related rent concessions (Amendments to IFRS 16)

In May 2020, the IASB issued COVID-19-Related Rent Concessions, which amended IFRS 16. The 2020 amendments introduced an optional practical expedient that simplifies how a lessee accounts for rent concessions that are a direct consequence of COVID-19, only if certain conditions are met. Under the practical expedient, a lessee is not required to assess whether eligible rent concessions are lease modifications, instead accounting for them in accordance with other applicable guidance.

The practical expedient introduced in the 2020 amendments only applies to rent concessions that

reduce lease payments originally due on or before June 30, 2021. Subsequently, in March 2021, the IASB extended the practical expedient by 12 months – i.e. permitting lessees to apply it to rent concessions that reduce lease payments originally due on or before June 30, 2022. This new amendment is effective for annual periods beginning on or after April 2021, with earlier application permitted.

The original version of the practical expedient under 2020 amendment was (and remains) optional. However, the new amendment is, in effect, not optional because a lessee that chose to apply the practical expedient introduced by the 2020 amendment needs to consistently apply the extension to similar rent concessions. This means that lessees may need to reverse previous lease modification accounting if a rent concession was ineligible for the original version of the practical expedient under the 2020 amendment (i.e. because the concession extended beyond June 30, 2021) but becomes eligible as a result of the new amendment.

The amendments require companies to disclose additional information about the application of practical expedient.

No practical expedient is provided for lessors. Lessors are required to continue to assess if the rent concessions are lease modifications and account for them accordingly.

For additional information, refer to KPMG's [web article 1](#), [web article 2](#), and webpage [IFRS 16 – An overview](#).

Appendix 1: Requirements effective in 2022 and beyond

A reminder of standards and amendments to published standards not yet effective, but available for early adoption are listed in this table.

Effective for periods beginning on or after	Standards and amendments	KPMG's guidance
January 1, 2023	IFRS 17 <i>Insurance Contracts</i> and Amendments to IFRS 17	<i>IFRS – Insurance</i>
January 1, 2023	Classification of liabilities as current or non-current (Amendments to IAS 1)	<i>Web article</i>
January 1, 2023	Definition of accounting estimates (Amendments to IAS 8 <i>Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors</i>)	<i>Web article</i>
January 1, 2023	Disclosure initiative – accounting policies (Amendments to IAS 1 and IFRS Practice Statement 2 <i>Making Materiality Judgements</i>)	<i>Web article</i>
January 1, 2022	Property, plant and equipment – proceeds before intended use (Amendments to IAS 16)	<i>Web article</i>
January 1, 2022	Onerous contracts – cost of fulfilling a contract (Amendments to IAS 37)	<i>Web article</i>
January 1, 2022	Reference to the Conceptual Framework (Amendments to IFRS 3)	
January 1, 2022	Annual improvements to IFRS Standards 2018–2020	<i>Web article</i>
April 1, 2021	COVID-19-related rent concessions (Amendments to IFRS 16)	<i>Web article</i>
NA*	Sale or contribution of assets between an investor and its associate or joint venture (Amendments to IFRS 10 and IAS 28)	<i>Web article</i>

* The IASB has decided to defer the effective date for these amendments indefinitely. Adoption is still permitted.

Appendix 2: IASB work plan

These tables are intended to act as an outlook of current IASB projects that may impact your financial statements in the future.

Matters under discussion by IFRIC are not included in these tables.

Standard-setting projects	Next milestone	Expected date	KPMG's guidance
Financial instruments with characteristics of equity	Exposure draft	TBD	<i>Web article</i>
Management commentary (IFRS practice statement)	Exposure draft	May 2021	
Primary financial statements	IFRS Standard	TBD	<i>Web article</i> <i>New on the Horizon</i>
Rate-regulated activities	Exposure draft feedback	H2 2021	<i>In the headlines, issue 2014/20</i> <i>Web article</i>
Disclosure initiative – subsidiaries that are SMEs	Exposure draft	Q3 2021	
Disclosure initiative – targeted standards-level review of disclosures	Exposure draft feedback	H1 2022	
Second comprehensive review of the IFRS for SMEs standard	Exposure draft	TBD	

Research projects	Next milestone	Expected date	KPMG's guidance
Business combinations under common control	Discussion paper feedback	Q3 2021	<i>Web article</i>
Dynamic risk management	Core model feedback	April 2021	<i>IFRS newsletter: financial instruments</i>
Equity method	Decide project direction	TBD	
Extractive activities	Decide project direction	May 2021	
Goodwill and impairment	Discussion paper feedback	April 2021	
Pension benefits that depend on asset returns	Review research	April 2021	

Research projects	Next milestone	Expected date	KPMG's guidance
Post-implementation review of IFRS 10, IFRS 11 and IFRS 12	Request for information feedback	Q3 2021	<i>IFRS newsletter: review of IFRS standards 10, 11 and 12</i>
Post-implementation review of IFRS 9 – classification and measurement	Request for information	Q3 2021	
Maintenance projects	Next milestone	Expected date	KPMG's guidance
Availability of a refund (amendments to IFRIC 14)	Decide project direction	TBD	
Deferred tax related to assets and liabilities arising from a single transaction (amendments to IAS 12)	IFRS amendment	May 2021	<i>Web article</i>
Lack of exchangeability (amendments to IAS 21)	Exposure draft	April 2021	
Lease liability in a sale and leaseback	Exposure draft feedback	May 2021	<i>Web article</i>
Provisions – targeted improvements	Decide project direction	TBD	
Other projects	Next milestone	Expected date	KPMG's guidance
Sustainability reporting	Consultation paper feedback	December 2020	<i>Web article</i> <i>Sustainability reporting</i>
Third agenda consultation	Request for information feedback	Q3 2021	
IFRS taxonomy update (amendments to IAS 1, IAS 8 and IFRS Practice Statement 2)	Proposed IFRS taxonomy update	April 2021	

Contact us

Allison McManus

Partner

416-777-3730

amcmanus@kpmg.ca

Mag Stewart

Partner

416-777-8177

magstewart@kpmg.ca

Dana Chaput

Partner

416-777-8695

dchaput@kpmg.ca

David Brownridge

Partner

647-777-5385

dbrownridge@kpmg.ca

Gale Kelly

Partner

416-777-3757

galekelly@kpmg.ca

Woojin Park

Senior manager

416-777-3030

wooinpark1@kpmg.ca

[kpmg.ca](https://www.kpmg.ca)



The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2021 KPMG LLP, an Ontario limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organization of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organization.