DRSC e. V. • Zimmerstr. 30 • 10969 Berlin

Telefon +4
Telefax +4

+49 (0)30 206412-12 +49 (0)30 206412-15

E-Mail

info@drsc.de

Roger Marshall 35 Square de Meeûs B-1000 Brussels

Belgique

EFRAG

Berlin, 18 June 2015

Dear Roger,

DRAFT ENDORSEMENT ADVICE AND EFFECTS STUDY REPORT ON Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception (Amendments to IFRS 10, IFRS 12 and IAS 28)

On behalf of the Accounting Standards Committee of Germany (ASCG) I am writing to comment on EFRAG's Assessment of *Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception (Amendments to IFRS 10, IFRS 12 and IAS 28).*

Overall, we agree with the views set out in the assessment in respect to the technical criteria for endorsement as well as in respect to the conduciveness for the European public good.

However, as a national standard-setter we are not in a position to answer the questions regarding the costs that will arise for preparers and for users to implement these amendments.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely, Andreas Barckow President



Invitation to Comment on EFRAG's Assessments on Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception (Amendments to IFRS 10, IFRS 12 and IAS 28)

Comments should be sent to commentletters@efrag.org by 19 June 2015

EFRAG has been asked by the European Commission to provide it with advice and supporting material on *Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception (Amendments to IFRS 10, IFRS 12 and IAS 28)* ('the Amendments'). In order to do that, 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 its 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 EFRAG's Draft Letter to the European Commission.

Before finalising its assessments in Appendices 2 and 3, 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 interest of transparency EFRAG will wish to discuss the responses it receives in a public meeting, so we would prefer to be able to publish all the responses received.

Your details

barckow@drsc.de

Plea	ase provide the following details about yourself:				
(a)	Your name or, if you are responding on behalf of an organisation or company, its name:				
	Andreas Barckow, ASCG (Accounting Standards Committee of Germany)				
(b)	Are you a:				
	☐ Preparer ☐ User ☒ Other (please specify)				
	National Standard Setter				
(c)	Please provide a short description of your activity:				
	National Standard Setter				
(d)	Country where you are located:				
	Germany				
(e)	Contact details including e-mail address:				
	Prof. Dr. Andreas Barckow – c/o DRSC e.V.				
	Zimmerstr. 30; D-10969 Berlin				

Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception Invitation to Comment on EFRAG's Assessments

EFRAG's initial assessment of the Amendments is that they meet the technical

EFRAG's initial assessment with respect to the technical criteria for endorsement

2

	not out i	ria for endorsement. In other words, they lead to prudent accounting and are contrary to the principle of true and fair view and they meet the criteria of erstandability, relevance, reliability and comparability. EFRAG's reasoning is set n Appendix 2 of the accompanying EFRAG's Draft Letter to the European mission regarding endorsement of the Amendments.
	(a)	Do you agree with this initial assessment?
		⊠ Yes □ No
		If you do not, please explain why you do not agree and what you believe the implications of this should be for EFRAG's endorsement advice.
	(b)	Are there any issues that are not mentioned in Appendix 2 of the accompanying EFRAG's Draft Letter to the European Commission regarding endorsement of the Amendments 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?
		none
The I	Europ	pean public good
3	good of the	initial assessment of the impact of the Amendments on the European public I, EFRAG has considered a number of issues that are addressed in Appendix 3 e accompanying EFRAG's Draft Letter to the European Commission regarding presement of the Amendments.
Costs	s and	benefits
4	imple years	AG is assessing the costs that are likely to arise for preparers and for users on ementation of the Amendments in the EU, both in year one and in subsequent s. Some initial work has been carried out, and the responses to this Invitation to ment will be used to complete the assessment.
	Apper regardance asse off co	results of the initial assessment of costs are set out in paragraphs 9 to 24 of endix 3 of the accompanying EFRAG Draft Letter to the European Commission rding endorsement of the Amendments. To summarise, EFRAG's initial ssment is that the Amendments will result in only insignificant incremental one-osts of implementation and some ongoing costs for users that are unlikely to be ficant.
	Do y	ou agree with this initial assessment?
	Y	es
		u do not, please explain why you do not and (if possible) explain broadly what believe the costs involved will be?
	As a	national standard setter we are not in a position to comment on this issue.

Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception Invitation to Comment on EFRAG's Assessments

5	In addition, EFRAG's initial assessment is that benefits are likely to be derived from the Amendments. The results of the initial assessment of benefits are set out in paragraphs 25 to 28 of Appendix 3 of the accompanying EFRAG Draft Letter to the European Commission regarding endorsement of the Amendments. To summarise, EFRAG's initial assessment is that both preparers and users are likely to benefit from the Amendments.						
	Do yo	ou agree with this initial assessment?					
		es 🗌 No					
		do not agree with this initial assessment, please provide your arguments and the how this should affect EFRAG's endorsement advice?					
	As a ı	national standard setter we are not in a position to comment on this issue.					
6	Amer	AG's initial assessment is that the benefits to be derived from implementing the adments in the EU as described in paragraph 5 above are likely to outweigh osts involved as described in paragraph 4 above.					
	Do yo	ou agree with this initial assessment?					
		es 🗌 No					
		do not agree with this initial assessment, please provide your arguments and the how this should affect EFRAG's endorsement advice?					
	As a ı	national standard setter we are not in a position to comment on this issue.					
Other	facto	rs considered					
7	asses	AG has also identified a number of other factors that could be considered in sing whether the endorsement of the Amendments would be conducive to the bean public good (see Appendix 3, paragraphs 4 to 8).					
	(a)	Do you agree with the initial assessment of these factors?					
		⊠ Yes □ No					
		If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this could affect EFRAG's endorsement advice.					
	(b)	Do you agree that there are no other factors?					
	` '	⊠ Yes □ No					
		If you do not agree, please provide your arguments and indicate how this should affect EFRAG's endorsement advice?					

Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception Invitation to Comment on EFRAG's Assessments

Overall initial assessment with respect to the European public good

Do you	Do you agree with the initial assessment of these factors?					
⊠ Yes		☐ No				
If you d	If you do not agree, please explain your reasons.					