



## EFRA<sup>1</sup> DRAFT ENDORSEMENT ADVICE FOR INTEREST RATE BENCHMARK REFORM – PHASE 2 (AMENDMENTS TO IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 AND IFRS 16)

Issued 8 September 2020

ICAEW welcomes the opportunity to comment on EFRA<sup>1</sup>'s draft endorsement advice for Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Phase 2 (Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16), published by EFRA<sup>1</sup> in August 2020, a copy of which is available from this [link](#).

This response of 8 September 2020 has been prepared by the ICAEW Financial Reporting Faculty. Recognised internationally as a leading authority on financial reporting, the Faculty, through its Financial Reporting Committee, is responsible for formulating ICAEW policy on financial reporting issues and makes submissions to standard setters and other external bodies on behalf of ICAEW. The Faculty provides an extensive range of services to its members including providing practical assistance with common financial reporting problems.

ICAEW is a world-leading professional body established under a Royal Charter to serve the public interest. In pursuit of its vision of a world of strong economies, ICAEW works with governments, regulators and businesses and it leads, connects, supports and regulates more than 186,500 chartered accountant members and students around the world. ICAEW members work in all types of private and public organisations, including public practice firms, and are trained to provide clarity and rigour and apply the highest professional, technical and ethical standards.

© ICAEW 2020

All rights reserved.

This document may be reproduced without specific permission, in whole or part, free of charge and in any format or medium, subject to the conditions that:

- it is appropriately attributed, replicated accurately and is not used in a misleading context;
- the source of the extract or document is acknowledged and the title and ICAEW reference number are quoted.

Where third-party copyright material has been identified application for permission must be made to the copyright holder.

For more information, please contact: [frf@icaew.com](mailto:frf@icaew.com)

## KEY POINTS

1. ICAEW welcomes the opportunity to comment on EFRAG's draft endorsement advice for Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Phase 2 (Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16), published by EFRAG in August 2020, a copy of which is available from this [link](#). This response of 8 September 2020, reproduced in the appendix below, has been prepared on behalf of ICAEW by the Financial Reporting Faculty.
2. ICAEW supports the endorsement of the IASB's Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Phase 2 (Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16) for application in the EU.



## INVITATION TO COMMENT ON EFRAG'S ASSESSMENTS ON *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Phase 2 (Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16)*

Once filled in, this form should be submitted by 7 September 2020 using the 'Comment publication link' available at the bottom of the respective news item. All open consultations can be found on EFRAG's web site: [Open consultations: express your views.](#)

EFRAG has been asked by the European Commission to provide it with advice and supporting material on *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform – Phase 2 (Amendments to IFRS 9, IAS 39, IFRS 7, IFRS 4 and IFRS 16)* (the Amendments). In order to do so, EFRAG has been carrying out an assessment of the Amendments against the technical criteria for endorsement set out in Regulation (EC) No 1606/2002 and has also been assessing the costs and benefits that would arise from their implementation in the European Union (the EU) and European Economic Area.

A summary of the Amendments is set out in Appendix 1 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement of the Amendments.

Before finalising its assessment, EFRAG would welcome your views on the issues set out below. Please note that all responses received will be placed on the public record, unless the respondent requests confidentiality. In the interests of transparency, EFRAG will wish to discuss the responses it receives in a public meeting, so it is preferable that all responses can be published.

**EFRAG's initial assessments, summarised in this questionnaire, will be updated for comments received from constituents when EFRAG is in the process of finalising its *Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement of the Amendments.**

### YOUR DETAILS

1 Please provide the following details:

- (a) Your name or, if you are responding on behalf of an organisation or company, its name:

Institute of Chartered Accountants of England and Wales (ICAEW)

- (b) Are you a:

☐ Preparer ☐ User ☒ Other (please specify)

Professional body

- (c) Please provide a short description of your activity:

ICAEW is a world-leading professional body established under a Royal Charter to serve the public interest. In pursuit of its vision of a world of strong economies, ICAEW works with governments, regulators and businesses and it leads, connects,

supports and regulates more than 150,000 chartered accountant members in over 160 countries. ICAEW members work in all types of private and public organisations, including public practice firms, and are trained to provide clarity and rigour and apply the highest professional, technical and ethical standards.

- (d) Country where you are located:

United Kingdom

- (e) Contact details, including e-mail address:

Chartered Accountants' Hall, Moorgate Place, London, EC2R 6EA UK,  
T +44 (0)20 7920 8100  
sarah.dunn@icaew.com

## EFRAG'S INITIAL ASSESSMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE TECHNICAL CRITERIA FOR ENDORSEMENT

- 2 EFRAG's initial assessment of the Amendments is that they meet the technical criteria for endorsement. In other words, the Amendments are not contrary to the principle of true and fair view and meet the criteria of understandability, relevance, reliability, comparability and lead to prudent accounting. EFRAG's reasoning is set out in Appendix 2 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement of the Amendments.

- (a) Do you agree with this assessment? **Yes**

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and what you believe the implications of this could be for EFRAG's endorsement advice.

- (b) Are there any issues that are not mentioned in Appendix 2 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement of [the Document] that you believe EFRAG should take into account in its technical evaluation of the Amendments? If there are, what are those issues and why do you believe they are relevant to the evaluation?

**No**

## THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC GOOD

- 3 In its assessment of the impact of the Amendments on the European public good, EFRAG has considered a number of issues that are addressed in Appendix 3 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement of the Amendments.

### *Improvement in financial reporting*

- 4 EFRAG has identified that in assessing whether the endorsement of the Amendments is conducive to the European public good it should consider whether the Amendments are an improvement over current requirements across the areas which have been subject to

changes (see paragraphs 3 to 5 of Appendix 3 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission*). To summarise, EFRAG's initial assessment is that the Amendments are likely to improve the quality of financial reporting.

Do you agree with the assessment? **Yes**

If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

#### *Costs and benefits*

- 5 EFRAG is also assessing the costs that are likely to arise for preparers and for users on implementation of the Amendments in the EU, both in year one and in subsequent years. Some initial work has been carried out, and the responses to this invitation to comment will be used to complete the assessment.

The results of the initial assessment of costs are set out in paragraphs 11 to 13 of Appendix 3 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement of the Amendments. To summarise, EFRAG's initial assessment is that implementation of the Amendments will not result in increased costs to users; that is, it is likely to be cost neutral.

Do you agree with this assessment? **Yes**

If you do not, please explain why you do not and (if possible) explain broadly what you believe the costs involved will be?

- 6 In addition, EFRAG is assessing the benefits that are likely to be derived from the Amendments. The results of the initial assessment of benefits are set out in paragraph 14-16 of Appendix 3 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission* regarding endorsement of the Amendments. To summarise, EFRAG's initial assessment is that users will benefit from financial information reflecting the underlying economic substance. The Amendments are expected to significantly reduce the operational burden on preparers. In addition, preparers will benefit from the Amendments which will help with avoiding the undue disruption from discontinuing hedging relationships which would otherwise be caused by the IBOR reform.

Do you agree with this assessment? **Yes**

If you do not agree with this assessment, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

- 7 EFRAG's initial assessment is that the benefits to be derived from implementing the Amendments in the EU, as described in paragraph 6 above, are likely to outweigh the costs involved, as described in paragraph 5 above.

Do you agree with this assessment? **Yes**

If you do not agree with this assessment, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.

*Overall assessment with respect to the European public good*

- 8 EFRAG has initially concluded that endorsement of the Amendments would be conducive to the European public good (see paragraphs 23 to 27 of Appendix 3 of the accompanying *Draft Letter to the European Commission*).

Do you agree with this conclusion? **Yes**

If you do not agree, please explain your reasons.