

This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of EFRAG TEG. The paper forms part of an early stage of the development of a potential EFRAG position. Consequently, the paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG Board or EFRAG TEG. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG Board, are published as comment letters, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.

International Accounting Standards Board
7 Westferry Circus, Canary Wharf
London E14 4HD
United Kingdom

XX October 2021

Dear Mr. Barckow,

Re: Initial application of IFRS 17 and IFRS 9 – Comparative Information

On behalf of the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG), I am writing to comment on the Exposure Draft *Initial Application of IFRS 17 and IFRS 9 – Comparative Information (Proposed amendment to IFRS 17)*, issued by the IASB on 28 July 2021 (the ‘ED’).

This letter is intended to contribute to the IASB’s due process and does not necessarily indicate the conclusions that would be reached by EFRAG in its capacity as advisor to the European Commission on endorsement of definitive IFRS Standards in the European Union and European Economic Area.

EFRAG would like to express its appreciation for the IASB’s swift response and delivery of the ED as this is an urgent issue. EFRAG welcomes and supports the IASB proposal as it will allow insurance entities to provide more useful information about their activities during the comparative period. The narrow-scope amendment addresses an important issue related to accounting mismatches between insurance contract liabilities and financial assets arising in the comparative information presented on initial application of IFRS 17 and IFRS 9. EFRAG commends the IASB for addressing most of the comments raised by European constituents in this area.

EFRAG agrees with the IASB proposals in the ED because this would:

- alleviate accounting mismatches between financial assets and insurance contract liabilities in the comparative period for those insurance entities who do not intend to provide IFRS 9 comparatives;
- address the impact of classification differences between financial assets derecognised in the comparative period (where IAS 39 will be applied) and other financial assets (where IFRS 9 will be applied); and
- ease the operational challenges for those insurance entities who want to restate the comparative information under IFRS 9.

EFRAG Draft Final Comment Letter

In addressing the above, the comparative information in the financial statements of insurance entities would be more comparable, thereby providing relevant information for users.

EFRAG notes that most insurance entities will first apply IFRS 17 together with IFRS 9 on 1 January 2023, and the IASB proposals will enable these insurance entities to improve the usefulness of the comparative information presented on initial application of IFRS 17 and IFRS 9.

However, there are some remaining sources of concern that we would like the IASB to address when finalising the amendment.

Based on feedback, the difference in scope between the classification overlay and the temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9 may lead to inconsistencies in the consolidated financial statements and unnecessary operational complexity. In finalising the proposals, EFRAG recommends the IASB to align the two scopes.

In order to avoid questions about the use of hindsight, EFRAG suggests the IASB to state explicitly that the classification overlay may be applied from a date pre-dating the publication of the ED or the final amendment.

EFRAG appreciates that the expected credit loss approach of IFRS 9 is not required to be applied when using the overlay approach. Nevertheless, we suggest clarifying the wording to make this clearer by stating that the expected credit loss requirements in IFRS 9 are permitted but not required to apply.

EFRAG's detailed comments and responses to the questions in the ED are set out in the Appendix.

If you would like to discuss our comments further, please do not hesitate to contact Didier Andries or me.

Yours sincerely,

Jean-Paul Gauzès
President of the EFRAG Board

**Appendix – EFRAG’s response to the ED Initial Application of IFRS 17 and IFRS 9
– Comparative Information**

Question 1

Do you agree with the proposed amendment in this Exposure Draft? Why or why not? If not, what alternative do you propose and why?

EFRAG’s response

EFRAG welcomes the rapid response by the IASB to an important and urgent issue identified by the insurance industry.

EFRAG welcomes and supports the IASB proposal as it will allow insurance entities to provide more useful information about their activities during the comparative period. EFRAG commends the IASB for addressing most of the comments raised by European constituents in this area. In particular, EFRAG notes that entities that apply the classification overlay can, but are not required to, apply the impairment requirements of IFRS 9. EFRAG also notes that the clarification not to apply the classification overlay to comparative information for reporting periods before the transition date of IFRS 17, is very helpful to address the uncertainties raised in this regard.

Based on feedback, the difference in scope between the classification overlay and the temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9 may lead to inconsistencies in the consolidated financial statements and unnecessary operational complexity (using two general ledgers relating to IAS 39 and IFRS 9). In finalising the proposals, EFRAG recommends the IASB to align the two scopes.

In order to avoid questions about the use of hindsight, EFRAG suggests the IASB to state explicitly that the classification overlay may be applied from a date pre-dating the publication of the ED or the final amendment.

- 1 EFRAG welcomes the IASB’s quick response to the issue as identified by the insurance industry. EFRAG notes that the proposals are intended to:
 - (a) reduce accounting mismatches for those insurance entities who do not intend to restate the comparative information under IFRS 9;
 - (b) reduce accounting mismatches relating to financial assets derecognised in the comparative period for those who do intend to restate comparative information under IFRS 9; and
 - (c) alleviate the burden with respect to restating comparatives under IFRS 9.
- 2 For these reasons, EFRAG supports the IASB proposal in the ED. EFRAG also compliments the IASB for addressing most of the issues raised by European constituents regarding this IASB proposal. In particular, the issues relating to the application of expected credit loss to derecognised assets and two-year comparatives (further details are provided below).

Use of IAS 39 for financial assets derecognised in comparative period

- 3 EFRAG notes that the requirement to use IAS 39 to account for items derecognised during the comparative period affects all aspects of the financial statements. EFRAG also understands that at least some insurance entities consider that they would need to provide extensive supplementary information to assist users of financial statements to understand the ‘actual’ comparative information.
- 4 Therefore, EFRAG supports the proposals and notes that the proposed amendments would improve comparability of the information provided both year on

year but also between the assets and the insurance liabilities they relate to. This would enable users to understand better the statement of financial position. Therefore, this proposed amendment would result in more relevant information and would reduce the need for supplementary information in this regard.

IFRS 9 transition rules being operationally burdensome

- 5 The European insurance industry associations have informed EFRAG that the existing IFRS 9 transition requirements are operationally burdensome and may constitute a significant part of the IFRS 9 implementation costs. EFRAG understands that the operational burden may become an obstacle to the voluntary presentation of comparative information under IFRS 9.
- 6 Furthermore, some indicated that the current transitional requirements in IFRS 9 necessitates entities to use data that come from two different accounting ledgers and pointed out that running two different ledgers in parallel is costly and technically challenging. This would disincentivise for example, companies from restating comparative information, with a negative impact on comparability.
- 7 EFRAG acknowledges the operational burden related to the current transition requirements and also notes the increase in usefulness of the information resulting from the proposed amendments. Hence, EFRAG welcomes the IASB's suggestion to address accounting mismatches and implementation challenges through a classification overlay.

Application of expected credit loss

- 8 The European insurance industry associations have informed EFRAG that the transitional requirements of IFRS 9 mean that the requirements regarding expected credit loss cannot be applied to the financial assets derecognised during the comparative period. This would not impact the net profit or loss but the split between the profit on disposal and the amounts recognised in profit or loss relating to provision for impairment. This may not be material, but the effort involved to prove that it is not material is of concern. Furthermore, the efforts involved with applying IAS 39 to these items would mean the same difficulties as previously indicated.
- 9 Therefore, EFRAG welcomes the proposal that in applying the classification overlay, entities can, but are not required to, apply the impairment requirements in Section 5.5. of IFRS 9. This will allow insurance entities that are sufficiently advanced in their implementation to apply the impairment requirements while those that are not sufficiently advanced are not obliged to do so but can still benefit from applying the classification overlay. EFRAG is unclear whether the application of the impairment requirements is an accounting policy which is to be applied consistently or is eligible on an instrument-by-instrument basis and would welcome a clarification on this.
- 10 However, we suggest clarifying the wording by stating that the impairment requirements in Section 5.5 of IFRS 9 "are permitted but not required to apply".

Scope of the classification overlay versus the temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9

- 11 Most insurance entities have noted the scope of the classification overlay is different to that of the temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9 currently in IFRS 4 paragraphs 20A and 20B.
- 12 EFRAG notes the scope of the classification overlay and the temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9 are as follows:

IASB Scope classification overlay	IASB scope temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9
Instrument by instrument basis	Reporting entity level All financial assets and financial liabilities, subject to an insurance entity's activities being predominantly

Financial assets that are held in respect of an activity that is not unconnected with contracts within the scope of IFRS 17	connected to insurance (> 80% and no significant activity unconnected to insurance)
---	---

- 13 EFRAG is of the view that the scope of the classification overlay and the temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9 should be aligned for the following reasons:
- (a) Cost-benefit reasons because the existing IFRS 9 transition requirements would be applied to assets that meet the IFRS 9 temporary exemption criteria but not the classification criteria. Also, it would require using two general ledgers relating to IAS 39 and IFRS 9.
 - (b) Also, the difference in scope leads to operational complexity and inconsistencies in presentation for those financial assets that relate to the insignificant banking or asset management activities of a predominant insurance entity (where IAS 39 is applied) compared to financial assets under the classification overlay (where IFRS 9 is applied). EFRAG questions the usefulness of this mixed presentation.
 - (c) In addition, EFRAG is of the view that it is important for users of financial statements to be able to have comparable information within the population of those predominant insurance entities.
- 14 On the basis of the reasons as described above, EFRAG recommends to the IASB in finalising the proposals, to align the scope of the classification overlay and the temporary exemption from applying IFRS 9, in order to avoid operational complexity. As a result, EFRAG also recommends the deletion of paragraph BC19 of the proposed amendment prohibition.
- 15 Therefore, EFRAG suggests that the IASB deletes paragraph C28E(a) to ensure that the overlay could be applied to all financial assets by entities applying the temporary exemption as implied by the words in C28A (“that first applies IFRS 17 and IFRS 9 at the same time is permitted to apply the classification overlay”).
- 16 For financial liabilities within the scope of IAS 39/IFRS 9 (i.e., not relating to insurance contracts), the issue is not expected to be practically significant as it would result in the same classification and measurement under either standard.

The use of hindsight

- 17 EFRAG notes that the ED only addresses the use of hindsight in the Basis for Conclusions (BC21 and BC26), even though entities may elect to show 2 years of comparatives (i.e., 2021 and 2022) and the amendment will not be finalised until late 2021. In the absence of guidance, there may be questions as to the applicability of the classification overlay when the ED was only published at the end of July. One way to limit the use of hindsight is to require contemporaneous documentation at the date of transition but this may prove difficult here.
- 18 Therefore, EFRAG considers that the final amendment should state explicitly whether the classification overlay may be applied from a date that pre-dates the publication of the ED or the final amendment.

Disclosures

- 19 EFRAG agrees with and welcomes the IASB proposal not to add detailed disclosures about applying the classification overlay approach. We support that disclosing the fact of using the classification overlay will also avoid operational burden for the entities.
- 20 However, we note that some of our constituents consider that it is not clear if IFRS 9 disclosures would be required at both the effective date of 1 January 2023 as well as at the transition date of 1 January 2022 for classification overlay approach. These constituents consider that providing IFRS 9 transitional disclosures as from 1

January 2022 would provide more useful and relevant information to users and providing IFRS 9 transition disclosures also at 1January 2023 would create additional burden given timing constraints, without providing useful information.

Question for EFRAG TEG

- 21 Do EFRAG TEG members have comments on the updated version of the comment letter?