

Draft

International Financial Reporting Interpretations Committee

Draft

IFRIC

Draft

Near-final draft

Draft

IFRIC INTERPRETATION X

Service Concession Arrangements

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

The International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), the International Accounting Standards Committee Foundation (IASCF), the authors and the publishers accept no responsibility for loss or damage caused to any party who acts or refrains from acting in reliance on the following materials, whether such loss is caused by negligence or otherwise.

The following materials are drafts and may be subject to revision or change before formal issue.

Copyright © 2006 IASCF®

International Financial Reporting Standards, International Accounting Standards, Interpretations, Exposure Drafts, and other IASB publications including drafts of those documents are copyright of the IASCF. The approved text of International Financial Reporting Standards, International Accounting Standards and Interpretations is that published by the IASB in the English language and copies may be obtained from the IASB. Please address publications and copyright matters to:

IASCF Publications Department,
30 Cannon Street,
London EC4M 6XH,
United Kingdom.

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7332 2730 Fax: +44 (0)20 7332 7249

Email: publications@iasb.org Web: www.iasb.org

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be translated, reprinted, reproduced, distributed or utilised in any form either in whole or in part or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage and retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the IASCF.

The IASB logo/‘Hexagon Device’, ‘eIFRS’, ‘IAS’, ‘IASB’, ‘IASC’, ‘IASCF’, ‘IASs’, ‘IFRIC’, ‘IFRS’, ‘IFRSs’, ‘International Accounting Standards’, ‘International Financial Reporting Standards’ and ‘SIC’ are Trade Marks of the IASCF.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

IFRIC *International Financial Reporting Interpretations Committee*

Draft

IFRIC INTERPRETATION X***Service Concession Arrangements***

IFRIC Interpretation X *Service Concession Arrangements* is set out in paragraphs 1-30 and Appendices A and B. IFRIC X is accompanied by Information Notes, Illustrative Examples and a Basis for Conclusions. The scope and authority of Interpretations are set out in paragraphs 1 and 8-10 of the IFRIC *Preface*.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft
CONTENTS

Draft

paragraphs

IFRIC INTERPRETATION X SERVICE CONCESSION ARRANGEMENTS

REFERENCES

BACKGROUND

SCOPE

ISSUES

CONSENSUS

EFFECTIVE DATE

TRANSITION

APPENDICES

A Application Guidance

B Amendments to IFRS 1 and to other Interpretations

INFORMATION NOTES

1 Accounting framework for public-to-private service arrangements

2 References to IFRSs that apply to typical types of arrangements

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS

1-3

4-9

10

11-27

28

29-30

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

IFRIC Interpretation X

Service Concession Arrangements

References

- *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*
- *IFRS 1 First-time Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards*
- *IFRS 7 Financial Instruments: Disclosures*
- *IAS 8 Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors*
- *IAS 11 Construction Contracts*
- *IAS 16 Property, Plant and Equipment*
- *IAS 17 Leases*
- *IAS 18 Revenue*
- *IAS 20 Government Grants*
- *IAS 23 Borrowing Costs*
- *IAS 32 Financial Instruments: Presentation*
- *IAS 36 Impairment of Assets*
- *IAS 37 Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*
- *IAS 38 Intangible Assets*
- *IAS 39 Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*
- *IFRIC 4 Determining whether an Arrangement contains a Lease*
- *SIC-29 Disclosure—Service Concession Arrangements*

Background

- 1 In many countries, infrastructure for public services—such as roads, bridges, tunnels, prisons, hospitals, airports, water distribution facilities, energy supply and telecommunication networks—has traditionally been constructed, operated and maintained by the public sector and financed through public budget appropriation.
- 2 In some countries, governments have introduced contractual service arrangements to attract private sector participation in the development, financing, operation and maintenance of such infrastructure. The infrastructure may already exist, or may be

Copyright © 2006 IASCF. All rights reserved. No permission granted to reproduce or distribute.

constructed during the period of the service arrangement. An arrangement within the scope of this Interpretation typically involves a private sector entity (an operator) constructing the infrastructure used to provide the public service or upgrading it (for example, by increasing its capacity) and operating and maintaining that infrastructure for a specified period of time. The operator is paid for its services over the period of the arrangement. The arrangement is governed by a contract that sets out performance standards, mechanisms for adjusting prices, and arrangements for arbitrating disputes. Such an arrangement is often described as a ‘build-operate-transfer’, a ‘rehabilitate-operate-transfer’ or a ‘public-to-private’ service concession arrangement.

3 A feature of these service arrangements is the public service nature of the obligation undertaken by the operator. Public policy is for the services related to the infrastructure to be provided to the public, irrespective of the identity of the party that operates the services. The service arrangement contractually obliges the operator to provide the services to the public on behalf of the public sector entity. Other common features are:

- (a) the party that grants the service arrangement (the grantor) is a public sector entity, including a governmental body, or a private sector entity to which the responsibility for the service has been devolved.
- (b) the operator is responsible for at least some of the management of the infrastructure and related services and does not merely act as an agent on behalf of the grantor.
- (c) the contract sets the initial prices to be levied by the operator and regulates price revisions over the period of the service arrangement.
- (d) the operator is obliged to hand over the infrastructure to the grantor in a specified condition at the end of the period of the arrangement, for little or no incremental consideration, irrespective of which party initially financed it.

Scope

4 This Interpretation gives guidance on the accounting by operators for public-to-private service concession arrangements.

5 This Interpretation applies to public-to-private service concession arrangements if:

- (a) the grantor controls or regulates what services the operator must provide with the infrastructure, to whom it must provide them, and at what price; and
- (b) the grantor controls—through ownership, beneficial entitlement or otherwise—any significant residual interest in the infrastructure at the end of the term of the arrangement.

6 Infrastructure used in a public-to-private service concession arrangement for its entire useful life (whole of life assets) is within the scope of this Interpretation if the conditions in paragraph 5(a) are met. Paragraphs AG1-AG8 provide guidance on

determining whether, and to what extent, public-to-private service concession arrangements are within the scope of this Interpretation.

- 7 This Interpretation applies to both:
- (a) infrastructure that the operator constructs or acquires from a third party for the purpose of the service arrangement; and
 - (b) existing infrastructure to which the grantor gives the operator access for the purpose of the service arrangement.
- 8 This Interpretation does not specify the accounting for infrastructure that was held and recognised as property, plant and equipment by the operator before entering the service arrangement. The derecognition requirements of IFRSs (set out in IAS 16) apply to such infrastructure.
- 9 This Interpretation does not specify the accounting by grantors.

Issue

- 10 This Interpretation sets out general principles on recognising and measuring the obligations and related rights in service concession arrangements. Requirements for disclosing information about service concession arrangements are in SIC-29 *Service Concession Arrangements: Disclosures*. The issues addressed in this Interpretation are:
- (a) treatment of the operator's rights over the infrastructure;
 - (b) recognition and measurement of arrangement consideration;
 - (c) construction or upgrade services;
 - (d) operation services;
 - (e) borrowing costs;
 - (f) subsequent accounting treatment of a financial asset and an intangible asset; and
 - (g) items provided to the operator by the grantor.

Consensus

Treatment of the operator's rights over the infrastructure

- 11 Infrastructure within the scope of this Interpretation shall not be recognised as property, plant and equipment of the operator because the contractual service arrangement does not convey the right to control the use of the public service infrastructure to the operator. The operator has access to operate the infrastructure to

provide the public service on behalf of the grantor in accordance with the terms specified in the contract.

Recognition and measurement of arrangement consideration

- 12 Under the terms of contractual arrangements within the scope of this Interpretation, the operator acts as a service provider. The operator constructs or upgrades infrastructure (construction or upgrade services) used to provide a public service and operates and maintains that infrastructure (operation services) for a specified period of time.
- 13 The operator shall recognise and measure revenue in accordance with IASs 11 and 18 for the services it performs. If the operator performs more than one service (ie construction or upgrade services and operation services) under a single contract or arrangement, consideration received or receivable shall be allocated by reference to the relative fair values of the services delivered, when the amounts are separately identifiable. The nature of the consideration determines its subsequent accounting treatment. The subsequent accounting for consideration received as a financial asset and as an intangible asset is detailed in paragraphs 23-26 below.

Construction or upgrade services

- 14 The operator shall account for revenue and costs relating to construction or upgrade services in accordance with IAS 11.

Consideration given by the grantor to the operator

- 15 If the operator provides construction or upgrade services the consideration received or receivable by the operator shall be recognised at its fair value. The consideration may be rights to:
- (a) a financial asset; or
 - (b) an intangible asset.
- 16 The operator shall recognise a financial asset to the extent that it has an unconditional contractual right to receive cash or other financial asset from the grantor for the construction services; the grantor has little, if any, discretion to avoid payment, usually because the agreement is enforceable by law. The operator has an unconditional right to receive cash for the construction services if the grantor contractually guarantees to pay the operator (a) specified or determinable amounts or (b) the shortfall, if any, between amounts received from users of the public service and specified or determinable amounts, even if payment is contingent on the operator ensuring that the infrastructure meets specified quality or efficiency requirements.
- 17 The operator shall recognise an intangible asset to the extent that it receives a right (a licence) to charge users of the public service. A right to charge users of the public service is not an unconditional right to receive cash because the amounts are contingent on the extent that public uses the service.

18 If the operator is paid for the construction services partly by a financial asset and partly by an intangible asset it is necessary to account separately for each component of the operator's consideration. The consideration received or receivable for both components shall be recognised initially at the fair value of the consideration received or receivable.

19 The nature of the consideration given by the grantor to the operator shall be determined by reference to the contract terms and when it exists, relevant contract law.

Operation services

20 The operator shall account for revenue and costs relating to operation services in accordance with IAS 18.

Contractual obligations to restore the infrastructure to a specified level of serviceability

21 The operator may have contractual obligations it must fulfil as a condition of its licence to (a) maintain the infrastructure to a specified level of serviceability or (b) restore the infrastructure to a specified condition before it is handed over to the grantor at the end of the service arrangement. These contractual obligations to maintain or restore infrastructure, except for any upgrade element (see paragraph 14) shall be recognised and measured in accordance with IAS 37, ie at the best estimate of the expenditure that would be required to settle the present obligation at the balance sheet date.

Borrowing costs incurred by the operator

22 In accordance with IAS 23, borrowing costs attributable to the arrangement shall be recognised as an expense in the period in which they are incurred unless the operator has a contractual right to receive an intangible asset (a right to charge users of the public service). In this case borrowing costs attributable to the arrangement may be capitalised during the construction phase of the arrangement in accordance with the allowed alternative treatment under that Standard.

Financial asset

23 IASs 32 and 39 and IFRS 7 apply to the financial asset recognised under paragraphs 16 and 18.

24 The amount due from or at the direction of the grantor is accounted for in accordance with IAS 39 as:

- (a) a loan or receivable;
- (b) an available-for-sale financial asset; or

(c) if so designated upon initial recognition, a financial asset at fair value through profit or loss, if the conditions for that classification are met.

- 25 If the amount due from the grantor is accounted for either as a loan or receivable or as an available-for-sale financial asset, IAS 39 requires interest calculated using the effective interest method to be recognised in profit or loss.

Intangible asset

- 26 IAS 38 applies to the intangible asset recognised in accordance with paragraphs 17 and 18. Paragraphs 45-47 of IAS 38 provide guidance on measuring intangible assets acquired in exchange for a non-monetary asset or assets or a combination of monetary and non-monetary assets.

Items provided to the operator by the grantor

- 27 In accordance with paragraph 11, infrastructure items to which the operator is given access by the grantor for the purposes of the service arrangement are not recognised as property, plant and equipment of the operator. The grantor may also provide other items to the operator that the operator can keep or deal with as it wishes. If such assets form part of the consideration payable by the grantor for the services, they are not government grants as defined in IAS 20. They are recognised as assets of the operator, measured at fair value on initial recognition. The operator shall recognise a liability in respect of unfulfilled obligations it has assumed in exchange for the assets.

Effective date

- 28 An entity shall apply this Interpretation for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2008. Earlier application is permitted. If an entity applies this Interpretation for a period beginning before 1 January 2008, it shall disclose that fact.

Transition

- 29 Subject to paragraph 30, changes in accounting policies are accounted for in accordance with IAS 8, ie retrospectively.

30 If, for any particular service arrangement, it is impracticable for an operator to apply this Interpretation retrospectively at the start of the earliest period presented, it shall:

- (a) recognise financial assets and intangible assets that existed at the start of the earliest period presented;
- (b) use the previous carrying amounts of those financial and intangible assets (however previously classified) as their carrying amounts as at that date; and
- (c) test financial and intangible assets recognised at that date for impairment, unless this is not practicable, in which case the amounts shall be tested for impairment as at the start of the current period.

Draft

Appendix A

Draft

Application Guidance

This appendix is an integral part of the Interpretation.

Scope (paragraph 5)

- AG1 Paragraph 5 of this Interpretation specifies that infrastructure is within the scope of the Interpretation when the following conditions apply:
- (a) the grantor controls or regulates what services the operator must provide with the infrastructure, to whom it must provide them, and at what price; and
 - (b) the grantor controls—through ownership, beneficial entitlement or otherwise any significant residual interest in the infrastructure at the end of the term of the arrangement.
- AG2 The control or regulation referred to in condition (a) could be by contract or otherwise (such as through a regulator), and includes circumstances in which the grantor buys all of the output as well as those in which some or all of the output is bought by other users. In applying this condition, the grantor and any related parties shall be considered together. If the grantor is a public sector entity, the public sector as a whole, together with any regulators acting in the public interest, shall be regarded as related to the grantor for the purposes of this Interpretation..
- AG3 For the purpose of condition (a), the grantor does not need to have complete control of the price: it is sufficient for the price to be regulated by the grantor, contract or regulator, for example by a capping mechanism. However, the condition shall be applied to the substance of the agreement. Non-substantive features, such as a cap that will apply only in remote circumstances, shall be ignored. Conversely, if for example, a contract purports to give the operator freedom to set prices, but any excess profit is returned to the grantor, the operator's return is capped and the price element of the control test is met.
- AG4 For the purpose of condition (b), the grantor's control over any significant residual interest should both restrict the operator's practical ability to sell or pledge the infrastructure and give the grantor a continuing right of use throughout the period of the arrangement. The residual interest in the infrastructure is the estimated current value of the infrastructure as if it were already of the age and in the condition expected at the end of the period of the arrangement.
- AG5 Control should be distinguished from management. If the grantor retains both the degree of control described in paragraph 5(a) and any significant residual interest in the infrastructure, the operator is only managing the infrastructure on the grantor's behalf—even though, in many cases, it may have wide managerial discretion.
- AG6 Conditions (a) and (b) together identify when the infrastructure, including any replacements required (see paragraph 21), is controlled by the grantor for the whole of its economic life. For example, if the operator has to replace part of an item of

infrastructure during the period of the arrangement (eg the top layer of a road or the roof of a building), the item of infrastructure shall be considered as a whole. Thus condition (b) is met for the whole of the infrastructure, including the part that is replaced, if the grantor controls any significant residual interest in the final replacement of that part.

AG7 Sometimes, the use of infrastructure is partly regulated in the manner described in condition (a) of paragraph 5 and partly unregulated. However, these arrangements take a variety of forms:

(a) any infrastructure that is physically separable and capable of being operated independently and meets the definition of a cash generating unit as defined in IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets* shall be analysed separately if it is used wholly for unregulated purposes. For example, this might apply to a private wing of a hospital, where the remainder of the hospital is used by the grantor to treat public patients.

(b) when purely ancillary activities (such as a hospital shop) are unregulated, the control tests shall be applied as if those services did not exist, because in cases in which the grantor controls the services in the manner described in paragraph 5, the existence of ancillary activities does not detract from the grantor's control of the infrastructure.

AG8 The operator may have a right to use the separable infrastructure in paragraph AG7(a), or the facilities used to provide ancillary unregulated services in paragraph AG7(b). In either case, there may in substance be a lease from the grantor to the operator; if so, it shall be accounted for in accordance with IAS 17.

Draft

Draft

Appendix B**Amendments to IFRS 1 and to other Interpretations**

The amendments in this appendix shall be applied for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2008. If an entity applies this Interpretation for an earlier period, these amendments shall be applied for that earlier period.

- B1 IFRS 1 *First-time Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards* is amended as described below. New text is underlined and deleted text struck through.

Paragraph 9 is amended as follows:

- 9 The transitional provisions in other IFRSs apply to changes in accounting policies made by an entity that already uses IFRSs; they do not apply to a *first-time adopter's* transition to IFRSs, except as specified in paragraphs 25D, 25H, 34A and 34B.

In paragraph 12(a), the reference to paragraphs 13-25G is changed to 13-25H.

In paragraph 13, subparagraphs (k) and (l) are amended, and subparagraph (m) is inserted, as follows:

- (k) leases (paragraph 25F); ~~and~~
- (l) fair value measurement of financial assets or financial liabilities at initial recognition (paragraph 25G); ~~and~~
- (m) a financial or an intangible asset accounted in accordance with IFRIC X Service Concession Arrangements (paragraph 25H)

After paragraph 25G, a new heading and paragraph 25H are inserted as follows:

IFRIC X Service Concession Arrangements

25H A first-time adopter may apply the transitional provisions in IFRIC X Service Concession Arrangements.

- B2 IFRIC 4 *Determining whether an Arrangement Contains a Lease* is amended as described below.

Paragraph 4 is amended as follows (new text is underlined):

- 4 This Interpretation does not apply to arrangements that:
- (a) are or contain, leases excluded from the scope of IAS 17; or
 - (b) are public-to-private service concession arrangements within the scope of IFRIC X Service Concession Arrangements.

In the Basis for Conclusions a new paragraph BC14A is inserted as follows:

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

BC14A The IFRIC considered whether the scope of the Interpretation might overlap with IFRIC X, which was developed from draft Interpretations D12-D14. In particular it noted the views expressed by some respondents to the proposals that the contractual terms of some public-to-private service concession arrangements would be regarded as leases under IFRIC 4 and would also be regarded as meeting the scope criterion of D12-D14. The IFRIC did not regard the choice between accounting treatments as appropriate because it could lead to different accounting treatments for contracts that have similar economic effects. The IFRIC therefore amended IFRIC 4 to specify that if a public-to-private service concession arrangement met the scope requirements of IFRIC X it would not be within the scope of IFRIC 4.

- B3 SIC-29 *Disclosure—Service Concession Arrangements* is amended as described below (new text is underlined).

Its title is amended to *Service Concession Arrangements: Disclosures*.

In paragraphs 1-6 references to ‘Concession Operator’ are changed to ‘operator’, and references to ‘Concession Provider’ are changed to ‘grantor’.

In paragraph 6, subparagraph (d) is amended, and subparagraph (e) is inserted, as follows:

(d) changes in the arrangement occurring during the period; and

(e) how the service arrangement has been classified.

A new paragraph 6A is inserted, as follows:

6A An operator shall disclose the amount of revenue and profits or losses recognised in the period on exchanging construction services for a financial asset or an intangible asset.

In the SIC’s Basis for Conclusions, the rubric above paragraph 8 should be read as follows:

[The original text has been marked up to reflect the revision of IAS 1 in 2003 and the issue of IFRIC X in 2006.]

and the last sentence of paragraph 9 should be changed as follows:

... delivering that asset to the ~~Concession Provider~~ grantor at the end of the concession period.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft


Draft

Information note 1

Accounting framework for public-to-private service arrangements

This note accompanies, but is not part of, IFRIC X.

The diagram below summarises the accounting for service arrangements established by IFRIC X.



Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Information note 2**References to IFRSs that apply to typical types of public-to-private arrangements**

This note accompanies, but is not part of, IFRIC X.

The table sets out the typical types of arrangements for private sector participation in the provision of public sector services and provides references to IFRSs that apply to those arrangements. The list of arrangements types is not exhaustive. The purpose of the table is to highlight the continuum of arrangements. It is not the IFRIC's intention to convey the impression that bright lines exist between the accounting requirements for public-to-private arrangements.

| Category | Lessee | Service provider | | | Owner | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Typical arrangement types | Lease (eg Operator leases asset from grantor) | Service and/or maintenance contract (specific tasks eg debt collection) | Rehabilitate-operate-transfer | Build-operate-transfer | Build-own-operate | 100% Divestment/Privatisation/Corporation |
| Asset ownership | Grantor | | | | Operator | |
| Capital investment | Grantor | | Operator | | | |
| Demand risk | Shared | Grantor | Operator and or Grantor | | Operator | |
| Typical duration | 8-20 years | 1-5 years | 25-30 years | | | Indefinite (or may be limited by licence) |
| Residual interest | Grantor | | | | Operator | |
| Relevant IFRSs | IAS 17 | IAS 18 | IFRIC X | | IAS 16 | |

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Illustrative examples

These examples accompany, but are not part of, IFRIC X.

Example 1: The grantor gives the operator a financial asset**Arrangement terms**

IE1 The terms of the arrangement require an operator to construct a road—completing construction within two years—and maintain and operate the road to a specified standard for eight years (ie years 3-10). The terms of the arrangement also require the operator to resurface the road at the end of year 8—the resurfacing activity is revenue generating. At the end of year 10, the arrangement will end. The operator estimates that the costs it will incur to fulfil its obligations will be:

Table 1 Contract costs

| | Year | CU* |
|-------------------------------|------|-----|
| Construction Services | 1 | 500 |
| | 2 | 500 |
| Operation Services (per year) | 3-10 | 10 |
| Road resurfacing | 8 | 100 |

* in this example, monetary amounts are denominated in 'currency units' (CU).

- IE2 The terms of the arrangement require the grantor to pay the operator 200 currency units (CU200) per year in years 3-10 for making the road available to the public.
- IE3 For the purpose of this illustration, it is assumed that all cash flows take place at the end of the year.

Contract revenue

IE4 The operator recognises contract revenue and costs in accordance with IAS 11 *Construction Contracts* and IAS 18 *Revenue*. The costs of each activity—construction, operation and resurfacing—are recognised as expenses by reference to the stage of completion of that activity. Contract revenue—the fair value of the amount due from the grantor for the activity undertaken—is recognised at the same time. Under the terms of the arrangement the operator is obliged to resurface the road at the end of year 8. In year 8 the operator will be reimbursed by the grantor for resurfacing the road. The obligation to resurface the road is measured at zero in the balance sheet and the revenue and expense are not recognised in the income statement until the resurfacing work is performed.

Draft

Draft

IE5 The total consideration (CU200 in each of years 3-8) reflects the fair values for each of the services, which are:

Table 2 Fair values of the consideration received or receivable

| Fair value | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Construction services | Forecast cost + 5% |
| Operation services | " " + 20% |
| Road resurfacing | " " + 10% |
| Effective interest rate | 6.18% per year |

IE6 In year 1, for example, construction costs of CU500, construction revenue of CU525 (cost plus 5 per cent), and hence construction profit of CU25 are recognised in the income statement.

Financial asset

IE7 The amounts due from the grantor meet the definition of a receivable in IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*. The receivable is measured initially at fair value. It is subsequently measured at amortised cost, ie the amount initially recognised plus the cumulative interest on that amount calculated using the effective interest method minus repayments.

IE8 If the cash flows and fair values remain the same as those forecast, the effective interest rate is 6.18 per cent and the receivable recognised at the end of years 1-3 will be:

Table 3 Measurement of receivable

| | CU |
|---|--------------|
| Amount due for construction in year 1 | <u>525</u> |
| Receivable at end of year 1* | 525 |
| Effective interest in year 2 on receivable at the end of year 1 (6.18% x CU525) | 32 |
| Amount due for construction in year 2 | <u>525</u> |
| Receivable at end of year 2 | 1,082 |
| Effective interest in year 3 on receivable at the end of year 2 (6.18% x CU1,082) | 67 |
| Amount due for operation in year 3 (CU10 x (1 + 20%)) | 12 |
| Cash receipts in year 3 | <u>(200)</u> |
| Receivable at end of year 3 | 961 |

* No effective interest arises in year 1 because the cash flows are assumed to take place at the end of the year.

Draft

Draft

Overview of cash flows, income statement and balance sheet

IE9 For the purpose of this illustration, it is assumed that the operator finances the arrangement wholly with debt and retained profits. It pays interest at 6.7 per cent per year on outstanding debt. If the cash flows and fair values remain the same as those forecast, the operator's cash flows, income statement and balance sheet over the duration of the arrangement will be:

Table 4 Cash flows (currency units)

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|---------|
| Receipts | - | - | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 1,600 |
| Contract costs* | (500) | (500) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (110) | (10) | (10) | (1,180) |
| Borrowing costs** | - | (34) | (69) | (61) | (53) | (43) | (33) | (23) | (19) | (7) | (342) |
| Net inflow/ (outflow) | (500) | (534) | 121 | 129 | 137 | 147 | 157 | 67 | 171 | 183 | 78 |

* Table 1

** Debt at start of year (table 6) x 6.7%

Table 5 Income statement (currency units)

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
|-------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|---------|
| Revenue | 525 | 525 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 122 | 12 | 12 | 1,256 |
| Operating costs | (500) | (500) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (110) | (10) | (10) | (1,180) |
| Finance income* | - | 32 | 67 | 59 | 51 | 43 | 34 | 25 | 22 | 11 | 344 |
| Borrowing costs** | - | (34) | (69) | (61) | (53) | (43) | (33) | (23) | (19) | (7) | (342) |
| Net profit | 25 | 23 | - | - | - | 2 | 3 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 78 |

* Amount due from grantor at start of year (table 6) x 6.18%

** Table 6 x 6.7%

Table 6 Balance sheet (currency units)

| End of year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| Amount due from grantor* | 525 | 1,082 | 961 | 832 | 695 | 550 | 396 | 343 | 177 | - |
| Cash/(debt)** | (500) | (1,034) | (913) | (784) | (647) | (500) | (343) | (276) | (105) | 78 |
| Net assets | 25 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 48 | 50 | 53 | 67 | 72 | 78 |

* Amount due from grantor at start of year, plus revenue and finance income earned in year (table 5), less receipts in year (table 4).

** Debt at start of year plus net cash flow in year (table 4).

IE10 To make this illustration as clear as possible, it has been assumed that the arrangement period is only ten years and that the operator's annual receipts are

Copyright © 2006 IASCF All rights reserved. No permission granted to reproduce or distribute.

constant over that period. In practice, arrangement periods may be much longer and annual revenues may increase with time. In such circumstances, the changes in net profit from year to year could be greater.

Example 2: The grantor gives the operator an intangible asset (a licence to charge users)

Arrangement terms

IE11 The terms of a service arrangement require an operator to construct a road—completing construction within two years—and maintain and operate the road to a specified standard for eight years (ie years 3-10). The terms of the arrangement also require the operator to resurface the road when the original surface has deteriorated below a specified condition. The operator estimates that it will have to undertake the resurfacing at the end of the year 8. At the end of year 10, the service arrangement will end. The operator estimates that the costs it will incur to fulfil its obligations will be:

Table 1 Contract costs

| | Year | CU* |
|------------------------------|------|-----|
| Construction Services | 1 | 500 |
| | 2 | 500 |
| Operation Service (per year) | 3-10 | 10 |
| Road resurfacing | 8 | 100 |

* in this example, monetary amounts are denominated in 'currency units' (CU).

IE12 The terms of the arrangement allow the operator to collect tolls from drivers using the road. The operator forecasts that vehicle numbers will remain constant over the duration of the contract and that it will receive tolls of 200 currency units (CU200) in each of years 3-10.

IE13 For the purpose of this illustration, it is assumed that all cash flows take place at the end of the year.

Intangible asset

IE14 The operator provides construction services to the grantor in exchange for an intangible asset, ie a right to collect tolls from road users in years 3-10. In accordance with IAS 38 *Intangible Assets*, the operator recognises the intangible asset at cost, ie the fair value of consideration transferred to acquire the asset which is the fair value of the consideration received or receivable for the construction services delivered.

IE15 During the construction phase of the arrangement the operator's asset (representing its accumulating right to be paid for providing construction services) is classified as an

intangible asset (licence to charge users of the infrastructure). The operator estimates the fair value of its consideration received to be equal to the forecast construction costs plus 5 per cent margin. It is also assumed that the operator adopts the allowed alternative treatment in IAS 23 *Borrowing Costs* and therefore capitalises the borrowing costs, estimated at 6.7 per cent, during the construction phase of the arrangement:

Table 2 Initial measurement of intangible asset

| | CU |
|--|---------------------|
| Construction services in year 1 (CU500 x (1 + 5%)) | 525 |
| Capitalisation of borrowing costs (table 4) | 34 |
| Construction services in year 2 (CU500 x (1 + 5%)) | <u>525</u> |
| Intangible asset at end of year 2 | <u>1,084</u> |

- IE16 In accordance with IAS 38, the intangible asset is amortised over the period in which it is expected to be available for use by the operator, ie years 3-10. The depreciable amount of the intangible asset (CU1,084) is allocated using a straight-line method. The annual amortisation charge is therefore CU1,084 divided by 8 years, ie CU135 per year.

Construction costs and revenue

- IE17 The operator recognises the revenue and costs in accordance with IAS 11 *Construction Contracts*, ie by reference to the stage of completion of the construction. It measures contract revenue at the fair value of the consideration received or receivable. Thus in each of years 1 and 2 it recognises in its income statement construction costs of CU500, construction revenue of CU525 (cost plus 5 per cent) and, hence, construction profit of CU25.

Toll revenue

- IE18 The road users pay for the public services at the same time as they receive them, ie when they use the road. The operator therefore recognises toll revenue when it collects the tolls.

Resurfacing obligations

- IE19 The operator's resurfacing obligation arises as a consequence of use of the road during the operating phase. It is recognised and measured in accordance with IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*, ie at the best estimate of the expenditure required to settle the present obligation at the balance sheet date.

- IE20 For the purpose of this illustration, it is assumed that the terms of the operator's contractual obligation are such that the best estimate of the expenditure required to settle the obligation at any date is proportional to the number of vehicles that have

used the road by that date and increases by CU17 (discounted to a current value) each year. The operator discounts the provision to its present value in accordance with IAS 37. The income statement charge each period is:

Table 3 Resurfacing obligation (currency units)

| Year | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| Obligation arising in year (CU17 discounted at 6%) | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 87 |
| Increase in earlier years' provision arising from passage of time | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 13 |
| Total expense recognised in income statement | 12 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 100 |

Overview of cash flows, income statement and balance sheet

IE21 For the purposes of this illustration, it is assumed that the operator finances the arrangement wholly with debt and retained profits. It pays interest at 6.7 per cent per year on outstanding debt. If the cash flows and fair values remain the same as those forecast, the operator's cash flows, income statement and balance sheet over the duration of the arrangement will be:

Table 4 Cash flows (currency units)

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|---------|
| Receipts | - | - | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 1,600 |
| Contract costs* | (500) | (500) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (110) | (10) | (10) | (1,180) |
| Borrowing costs [†] | - | (34) | (69) | (61) | (53) | (43) | (33) | (23) | (19) | (7) | (342) |
| Net inflow/ (outflow) | (500) | (534) | 121 | 129 | 137 | 147 | 157 | 67 | 171 | 183 | 78 |

* Table 1

[†] Debt at start of year (table 6) x 6.7%

Draft

Draft

Table 5 Income statement (currency units)

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
|------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| Revenue | 525 | 525 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 2,650 |
| Amortisation | - | - | (135) | (135) | (136) | (136) | (136) | (136) | (135) | (135) | (1,084) |
| Resurfacing expense | - | - | (12) | (14) | (15) | (17) | (20) | (22) | - | - | (100) |
| Other operating costs [†] | (500) | (500) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (1,080) |
| Borrowing costs* (table 4) | - | - | (69) | (61) | (53) | (43) | (33) | (23) | (19) | (7) | (308) |
| Net profit | 25 | 25 | (26) | (20) | (14) | (6) | 1 | 9 | 36 | 48 | 78 |

* Borrowing costs are capitalised during the construction phase

[†] Table 1**Table 6 Balance sheet** (currency units)

| End of year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------------------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| Intangible asset | 525 | 1,084 | 949 | 814 | 678 | 542 | 406 | 270 | 135 | - |
| Cash/(debt)* | (500) | (1,034) | (913) | (784) | (647) | (500) | (343) | (276) | (105) | 78 |
| Resurfacing obligation | - | - | (12) | (26) | (41) | (58) | (78) | - | - | - |
| Net assets | 25 | 50 | 24 | 4 | (10) | (16) | (15) | (6) | 30 | 78 |

* Debt at start of year plus net cash flow in year (table 4).

IE22 To make this illustration as clear as possible, it has been assumed that the arrangement period is only ten years and that the operator's annual receipts are constant over that period. In practice, arrangement periods may be much longer and annual revenues may increase with time. In such circumstances, the changes in net profit from year to year could be greater.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Example 3: The grantor gives the operator a financial asset and an intangible asset**Arrangement terms**

IE23 The terms of a service arrangement require an operator to construct a road—completing construction within two years—and to operate the road and maintain it to a specified standard for eight years (ie years 3-10). The terms of the arrangement also require the operator to resurface the road when the original surface has deteriorated below a specified condition. The operator estimates that it will have to undertake the resurfacing at the end of the year 8. At the end of year 10, the arrangement will end. The operator estimates that the costs it will incur to fulfil its obligations will be:

Table 1 Contract costs

| | Year | CU* |
|-------------------------------|------|-----|
| Construction services | 1 | 500 |
| | 2 | 500 |
| Operation services (per year) | 3-10 | 10 |
| Road resurfacing | 8 | 100 |

* in this example, monetary amounts are denominated in 'currency units' (CU).

IE24 The operator estimates the consideration in respect of construction services to be cost plus 5 per cent.

IE25 The terms of the arrangement allow the operator to collect tolls from drivers using the road. In addition, the grantor guarantees the operator a minimum amount of CU700 and interest at a specified rate of 6.18% to reflect the timing of cash receipts. The operator forecasts that vehicle numbers will remain constant over the duration of the contract and that it will receive tolls of CU200 in each of years 3-10.

IE26 For the purpose of this illustration, it is assumed that all cash flows take place at the end of the year.

Dividing the arrangement

IE27 The contractual right to receive cash from the grantor for the services and the right to charge users for the public services should be regarded as two separate assets under IFRSs. Therefore in this arrangement it is necessary to divide the operator's consideration into two components—a financial asset component based on the guaranteed amount and an intangible asset for the remainder.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Table 2 Dividing the operator's consideration

| Year | Total | Financial asset | Intangible asset |
|---|-------|-----------------|------------------|
| Construction services in year 1 (CU500 x (1 + 5%)) | 525 | 350 | 175 |
| Construction services in year 2 (CU500 x (1 + 5%)) | 525 | 350 | 175 |
| Total construction services | 1,050 | 700 | 350 |
| | 100% | 67%* | 33% |
| Finance income, at specified rate of 6.18% on receivable (see table 3) | 22 | 22 | - |
| Borrowing costs capitalised (interest paid in year 1 and 2 x 33%) see table 7 | 11 | - | 11 |
| Total fair value of the operator's consideration | 1,083 | 722 | 361 |

* Amount guaranteed by the grantor as a proportion of the construction services

Financial asset

IE28 The amount due from or at the direction of the grantor in exchange for the construction services meets the definition of a receivable in IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*. The receivable is measured initially at fair value. It is subsequently measured at amortised cost, ie the amount initially recognised plus the cumulative interest on that amount minus repayments.

IE29 On this basis the receivable recognised at the end of years 2-3 will be:

Table 3 Measurement of receivable

| | CU |
|---|--------------|
| Construction services in year 1 allocated to the financial asset | <u>350</u> |
| Receivable at the end of year 1 | <u>350</u> |
| Construction services in year 2 allocated to the financial asset | <u>350</u> |
| Interest in year 2 on receivable at end of year 1 (6.18% x CU350) | <u>22</u> |
| Receivable at the end of year 2 | <u>722</u> |
| Interest in year 3 on receivable at end of year 2 (6.18% x CU722) | 45 |
| Cash receipts in year 3 (see table 5) | <u>(117)</u> |
| Receivable at the end of year 3 | 650 |

Draft

Draft

Draft

Intangible asset

Draft

- IE30 In accordance with IAS 38 *Intangible Assets*, the operator recognises the intangible asset at cost, ie the fair value of the consideration received or receivable.
- IE31 During the construction phase of the arrangement the operator's asset (representing its accumulating right to be paid for providing construction services) is classified as a right to receive a licence to charge users of the infrastructure. The operator estimates the fair value of its consideration received or receivable as equal to the forecast construction costs plus 5 per cent. It is also assumed that the operator adopts the allowed alternative treatment in IAS 23 *Borrowing Costs* and therefore capitalises the borrowing costs, estimated at 6.7 per cent, during the construction phase:

Table 4 Initial measurement of intangible asset

| | CU |
|---|-------------------|
| Construction services in year 1 (CU500 x (1 + 5%) x 33%) | 175 |
| Borrowing costs (interest paid in year 1 and 2 x 33%) see table 7 | 11 |
| Construction services in year 2 (CU500 x (1 + 5%) x 33%) | <u>175</u> |
| Intangible asset at the end of year 2 | <u>361</u> |

- IE32 In accordance with IAS 38, the intangible asset is amortised over the period in which it is expected to be available for use by the operator, ie years 3-10. The depreciable amount of the intangible asset (CU361 including borrowing costs) is allocated using a straight-line method. The annual amortisation charge is therefore CU361 divided by 8 years, ie CU45 per year.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Contract revenue and costs

- IE33 The operator provides construction services to the grantor in exchange for a financial asset and an intangible asset. Under both the financial asset model and intangible asset model, the operator recognises contract revenue and costs in accordance with IAS 11 *Construction Contracts*, ie by reference to the stage of completion of the construction. It measures contract revenue at the fair value of the consideration receivable. Thus in each of years 1 and 2 it recognises in its income statement construction costs of CU500, construction revenue of CU525 (cost plus 5 per cent).

Toll revenue

- IE34 The road users pay for the public services at the same time as they receive them, ie when they use the road. Under the terms of this arrangement the cash flows are allocated to the financial asset and intangible asset in proportion, so the operator allocates the receipts from tolls between repayment of the financial asset and revenue earned from the intangible asset:

Table 5 Allocation of toll receipts

| Year | CU |
|--|------------|
| Guaranteed receipt from grantor | 700 |
| Finance income (see table 8) | 237 |
| Total | 937 |
| Cash allocated to repayment of the financial asset per year (CU937 / 8 years) | 117 |
| Receipts attributable to intangible asset (CU200 x 8 years - CU937) | 663 |
| Annual receipt from intangible asset (CU663 / 8 years) | 83 |

Resurfacing obligations

- IE35 The operator's resurfacing obligation arises as a consequence of use of the road during the operation phase. It is recognised and measured in accordance with IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*, ie at the best estimate of the expenditure required to settle the present obligation at the balance sheet date.
- IE36 For the purpose of this illustration, it is assumed that the terms of the operator's contractual obligation are such that the best estimate of the expenditure required to settle the obligation at any date is proportional to the number of vehicles that have used the road by that date and increases by CU17 each year. The operator discounts the provision to its present value in accordance with IAS 37. The income statement charge each period is:

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Table 6 Resurfacing obligation (CU)

| Year | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| Obligation arising in year (CU17 discounted at 6%) | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 87 |
| Increase in earlier years' provision arising from passage of time | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 13 |
| Total expense recognised in income statement | 12 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 100 |

Overview of cash flows, income statement and balance sheet

IE37 For the purposes of this illustration, it is assumed that the operator finances the arrangement wholly with debt and retained profits. It pays interest at 6.7 per cent per year on outstanding debt. If the cash flows and fair values remain the same as those forecast, the operator's cash flows, income statement and balance sheet over the duration of the arrangement will be:

Table 7 Cash flows (CU)

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|---------|
| Receipts | - | - | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 1,600 |
| Contract costs* | (500) | (500) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (110) | (10) | (10) | (1,180) |
| Borrowing costs [†] | - | (34) | (69) | (61) | (53) | (43) | (33) | (23) | (19) | (7) | (342) |
| Net inflow/ (outflow) | (500) | (534) | 121 | 129 | 137 | 147 | 157 | 67 | 171 | 183 | 78 |

* Table 1

[†] Debt at start of year (table 7) x 6.7%

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Table 8 Income statement (CU)

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|
| Revenue on construction | 525 | 525 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,050 |
| Revenue from intangible asset | - | - | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 663 |
| Finance income* | - | 22 | 45 | 40 | 35 | 30 | 25 | 19 | 13 | 7 | 237 |
| Amortisation | - | - | (45) | (45) | (45) | (45) | (45) | (45) | (45) | (46) | (361) |
| Resurfacing expense | - | - | (12) | (14) | (15) | (17) | (20) | (22) | - | - | (100) |
| Construction costs | (500) | (500) | | | | | | | | | (1,000) |
| Other operating costs† | | | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (10) | (80) |
| Borrowing costs (table 7)** | - | (23) | (69) | (61) | (53) | (43) | (33) | (23) | (19) | (7) | (331) |
| Net profit | 25 | 24 | (8) | (7) | (5) | (2) | 0 | 2 | 22 | 27 | 78 |

* Interest on receivable

** In year 2, borrowing costs are stated net of amount capitalised in the intangible (see table 4)

† Table 1

Table 9 Balance sheet (CU)

| End of year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|------------------------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| Receivable | 350 | 722 | 650 | 573 | 491 | 404 | 312 | 214 | 110 | - |
| Intangible asset | 175 | 361 | 316 | 271 | 226 | 181 | 136 | 91 | 46 | - |
| Cash/(debt)* | (500) | (1,034) | (913) | (784) | (647) | (500) | (343) | (276) | (105) | 78 |
| Resurfacing obligation | - | - | (12) | (26) | (41) | (58) | (78) | - | - | - |
| Net assets | 25 | 49 | 41 | 34 | 29 | 27 | 27 | 29 | 51 | 78 |

* Debt at start of year plus net cash flow in year (table 7).

IE38 To make this illustration as clear as possible, it has been assumed that the arrangement period is only ten years and that the operator's annual receipts are constant over that period. In practice, arrangement periods may be much longer and annual revenues may increase with time. In such circumstances, the changes in net profit from year to year could be greater.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Basis for Conclusions

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, IFRIC X.

Introduction

BC1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises the IFRIC's considerations in reaching its consensus. Individual IFRIC members gave greater weight to some factors than to others.

Background (paragraphs 1-3)

BC2 SIC-29 *Service Concession Arrangements: Disclosures* (formerly *Disclosure—Service Concession Arrangements*) contains disclosure requirements in respect of public-to-private service arrangements, but does not specify how they should be accounted for.

BC3 There was widespread concern about the lack of such guidance. In particular, operators wished to know how to account for infrastructure that they either constructed or acquired for the purpose of a public-to-private service concession arrangement, or were given access to for the purpose of providing the public service. They also wanted to know how to account for other rights and obligations arising from these types of arrangements.

BC4 In response to this concern, the International Accounting Standards Board asked a working group comprising representatives of the standard-setters of Australia, France, Spain and the United Kingdom (four of the countries that had expressed such concern) to carry out initial research on the subject. The working group recommended that the IFRIC should seek to clarify how certain aspects of existing accounting standards were to be applied.

BC5 In March 2005 the IFRIC published for public comment three draft Interpretations: D12 *Service Concession Arrangements—Determining the Accounting Model*, D13 *Service Concession Arrangements—The Financial Asset Model* and D14 *Service Concession Arrangements—The Intangible Asset Model*. In response to the proposals 77 comment letters were received. In addition, in order to understand better the practical issues that would have arisen on implementing the proposed Interpretation, IASB staff met various interested parties, including preparers, auditors and regulators.

BC6 Most respondents to D12-D14 supported the IFRIC's proposal to develop an Interpretation. However, nearly all respondents expressed concern with fundamental aspects of the proposals, some urging that the project be passed to the Board to develop a comprehensive standard.

BC7 In its redeliberation of the proposals the IFRIC acknowledged that the project was a large undertaking but concluded that it should continue its work because, given the limited scope of the project, it was by then better placed than the Board to deal with the issues in a timely way.

Draft

Draft

Draft
Terminology

Draft

BC8 SIC-29 used the terms ‘Concession Provider’ and ‘Concession Operator’ to describe, respectively, the grantor and operator of the service arrangement. Some commentators, and some members of the IFRIC, found these terms confusingly similar. The IFRIC decided to adopt the terms ‘grantor’ and ‘operator’, and amended SIC-29 accordingly.

Scope (paragraphs 4-9)

BC9 The IFRIC observed that public-to-private service arrangements take a variety of forms. The continued involvement of both grantor and operator over the term of the arrangement, accompanied by heavy upfront investment, raises questions over what assets and liabilities should be recognised by the operator.

BC10 The working group recommended that the scope of the IFRIC’s project should be restricted to public-to-private service concession arrangements.

BC11 In developing the proposals the IFRIC decided to address only arrangements in which the grantor (a) controlled or regulated the services provided by the operator, and (b) controlled any significant residual interest in the infrastructure at the end of the term of the arrangement. It also decided to specify the accounting treatment only for infrastructure that the operator constructed or acquired from a third party, or to which it was given access by the grantor, for the purpose of the arrangement. The IFRIC concluded that these conditions were likely to be met in most of the public-to-private arrangements for which guidance had been sought.

BC12 Commentators on the draft Interpretations argued that the proposals ignored many arrangements that were found in practice, in particular, when the infrastructure was leased to the operator or, conversely, when it was held as the property, plant and equipment of the operator before the start of the service arrangement.

BC13 In considering these comments, the IFRIC decided that the scope of the project should not be expanded because it already included the arrangements most in need of interpretative guidance and expansion would have significantly delayed the Interpretation. The scope of the project was considered at length during the initial stage, as indicated above. The IFRIC confirmed its view that the proposed Interpretation should address the issues set out in paragraph 10. Nonetheless, during its redeliberation the IFRIC considered the range of typical arrangements for private sector participation in the provision of public services, including some that were outside the scope of the proposed Interpretation. The IFRIC decided that the Interpretation could provide references to relevant standards that apply to arrangements outside the scope of the Interpretation without giving guidance on their application. If experience showed that such guidance was needed, a separate project could be undertaken at a later date. Information Note 2 contains a table of references to relevant standards for the types of arrangements considered by the IFRIC.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Private-to-private arrangements

BC14 Some respondents to the draft Interpretations suggested that the scope of the proposed Interpretation should be extended to include private-to-private service arrangements. The IFRIC noted that addressing the accounting for such arrangements was not the primary purpose of the project because the IFRIC had been asked to provide guidance for public-to-private arrangements that meet the requirements set out in paragraph 5 and have the characteristics described in paragraph 3. The IFRIC noted that application by analogy would be appropriate under the hierarchy set out in paragraphs 7-12 of IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors*.

Grantor accounting

BC15 The Interpretation does not specify the accounting by grantors, because the IFRIC's objective and priority were to establish guidance for operators. Some commentators asked the IFRIC to establish guidance for the accounting by grantors. The IFRIC discussed these comments but reaffirmed its view. It noted that in many cases the grantor is a government body, and that IFRSs are not designed to apply to not-for-profit activities in the private sector, public sector or government, though entities with such activities may find them appropriate. See Preface to IFRSs paragraph 9.

Existing assets of the operator

BC16 The Interpretation does not specify the treatment of existing assets of the operator because the IFRIC decided that it was unnecessary to address the derecognition requirements of existing standards.

BC17 Some respondents asked the IFRIC to provide guidance on the accounting for existing assets of the operator, stating that the scope exclusion would create uncertainty about the treatment of these assets.

BC18 In its redeliberations the IFRIC noted that one objective of the Interpretation is to address whether the operator should recognise as its property, plant and equipment the infrastructure it constructs or to which it is given access. The accounting issue to be addressed for existing assets of the operator is one of derecognition, which is already addressed in IFRSs (*IAS16 Property, Plant and Equipment*). In the light of the comments received from respondents, the IFRIC decided to clarify that certain public-to-private service arrangements may convey to the grantor a right to use existing assets of the operator, in which case the operator would apply the derecognition requirements of IFRSs to determine whether it should derecognise its existing assets.

The significant residual interest criterion

BC19 Paragraph 5(b) of D12 proposed that for a service arrangement to be within its scope the residual interest in the infrastructure handed over to the grantor at the end of the arrangement must be significant. Respondents argued, and the IFRIC agreed, that the significant residual interest criterion would limit the usefulness of the guidance because a service arrangement for the entire physical life of the infrastructure would be excluded from the scope of the guidance. That result was not the IFRIC's

intention. In its redeliberation of the proposals, the IFRIC decided that it would not retain the proposal that the residual interest in the infrastructure handed over to the grantor at the end of the arrangement must be significant. As a consequence, ‘whole of life’ infrastructure (ie where the infrastructure is used in a public-to-private service arrangement for the entirety of its useful life) is within the scope of the Interpretation.

Treatment of the operator’s rights over the infrastructure (paragraph 11)

BC20 The IFRIC considered the nature of the rights conveyed to the operator in a service concession arrangement. It first examined whether the infrastructure used to provide public services could be classified as property, plant and equipment of the operator under IAS 16. It started from the principle that infrastructure used to provide public services should be recognised as property, plant and equipment of the party that controls its use. This principle determines which party should recognise the property, plant and equipment as its own. The reference to control stems from the *Framework*:

- (a) an asset is defined by the *Framework* as ‘a resource controlled by the entity as a result of past events and from which future economic benefits are expected to flow to the entity.’
- (b) the *Framework* notes that many assets are associated with legal rights, including the right of ownership. It goes on to clarify that the right of ownership is not essential.
- (c) rights are often unbundled. For example, they may be divided proportionately (undivided interests in land) or by specified cash flows (principal and interest on a bond) or over time (a lease).

BC21 The IFRIC concluded that treatment of infrastructure that the operator constructs or acquires or to which the grantor gives the operator access for the purpose of the service arrangement should be determined by whether it is controlled by the grantor in the manner described in paragraph 5. If it is so controlled (as will be the case for all arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation), then, regardless of which party has legal title to it during the arrangement, the infrastructure should not be recognised as property, plant and equipment of the operator because the operator does not control the use of the public service infrastructure.

BC22 In reaching this conclusion the IFRIC observed that it is control of the right to use an asset that determines recognition under IAS 16 and IAS 17 *Leases*. IAS 16 defines property, plant and equipment as tangible items that ‘are held for use in the production or supply of goods or services, for rental to others or for administrative purposes ...’. It requires items within this definition to be recognised as property, plant and equipment unless another standard requires or permits a different approach. As an example of a different approach, it highlights the requirement in IAS 17 for recognition of leased property, plant and equipment to be evaluated on the basis of the transfer of risks and rewards. That standard defines a lease as ‘an agreement whereby the lessor conveys to the lessee in return for a series of payments the right to use an asset’ and it sets out the requirements for classification of leases. IFRIC 4 *Determining Whether an Arrangement contains a Lease* interprets the meaning of

Draft

Draft

right to use an asset as ‘the arrangement conveys the right to control the use of the underlying asset.’

- BC23 Accordingly, it is only if an arrangement conveys the right to control the use of the underlying asset that reference is made to IAS 17 to determine how such a lease should be classified. A lease is classified as a finance lease if it transfers substantially all the risks and rewards incidental to ownership. A lease is classified as an operating lease if it does not transfer substantially all the risks and rewards incidental to ownership.
- BC24 The IFRIC considered whether arrangements within the scope of IFRIC X convey ‘the right to control the use of the underlying asset’ (the public service infrastructure) to the operator. The IFRIC decided that, if an arrangement met the conditions in paragraph 5, the operator would not have the right to control the use of the underlying asset and should therefore not recognise the infrastructure as a leased asset.
- BC25 In arrangements within the scope of this Interpretation the operator acts as a service provider. The operator constructs or upgrades infrastructure used to provide a public service. Under the terms of the contract the operator has access to operate the infrastructure to provide the public service on the grantor’s behalf. The asset recognised by the operator is the consideration it receives in exchange for its services, not the public service infrastructure that it constructs or upgrades.
- BC26 Respondents to the draft Interpretations disagreed that recognition should be determined solely on the basis of control of use without any assessment of the extent to which the operator or the grantor bears the risks and rewards of ownership. They questioned how the proposed approach could be reconciled to IAS 17, in which the leased asset is recognised by the party that bears substantially all the risks and rewards incidental to ownership.
- BC27 During its redeliberation the IFRIC affirmed its decision that if an arrangement met the control conditions in paragraph 5 of the Interpretation the operator would not have the right to control the use of the underlying asset (public service infrastructure) and should therefore not recognise the infrastructure as its property, plant and equipment under IAS 16 or a leased asset under IAS 17. The contractual service arrangement between the grantor and operator would not convey the right to use the infrastructure to the operator. The IFRIC concluded that this treatment is also consistent with IAS 18 because, for arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation, the second condition of paragraph 14 of IAS 18 is not satisfied. The grantor retains continuing managerial involvement to the degree usually associated with ownership and control over the infrastructure as described in paragraph 5.
- BC28 In service concession arrangements rights are usually conveyed for a limited period, which is similar to a lease. However, for arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation, the operator’s right is different from that of a lessee: the grantor retains control over the use to which the infrastructure is put, by controlling or regulating what services the operator must provide, to whom it must provide them, and at what price, as described in paragraph 5(a). The grantor also retains control over any significant residual interest in the infrastructure throughout the period of the arrangement. Unlike a lessee, the operator does not have a right of use of the

Draft

Draft

Draft

underlying asset: rather it has access to operate the infrastructure to provide the public service on behalf of the grantor in accordance with the terms specified in the contract.

- BC29 The IFRIC considered whether the scope of the Interpretation might overlap with IFRIC 4. In particular, it noted the views expressed by some respondents that the contractual terms of certain service arrangements would be regarded as leases under IFRIC 4 and would also be regarded as meeting the scope criterion set out in paragraph 5 of IFRIC X. The IFRIC did not regard the choice between accounting treatments as appropriate because it could lead to different accounting treatments for contracts that have similar economic effects. In the light of comments received the IFRIC amended the scope of IFRIC 4 to specify that if a service arrangement met the scope requirements of IFRIC X it would not be within the scope of IFRIC 4.

Recognition and measurement of arrangement consideration (paragraphs 12-13)

- BC30 The accounting requirements for construction and service contracts are addressed in IAS 11 *Construction Contracts* and IAS 18 *Revenue*. They require revenue to be recognised by reference to the stage of completion of the contract activity. IAS 18 states the general principle that revenue is measured at the fair value of the consideration received or receivable. However, the IFRIC observed that the fair value of the construction services delivered may in practice be the most appropriate method of establishing the fair value of the consideration received or receivable for the construction services. This will be the case in service concession arrangements, because the consideration attributable to the construction activity often has to be apportioned from a total sum receivable on the contract as a whole and, if it consists of an intangible asset, may also be subject to uncertainty in measurement.

- BC31 The IFRIC noted that IAS 18 requires its recognition criteria to be applied separately to identifiable components of a single transaction in order to reflect the substance of the transaction. For example, when the selling price of a product includes an identifiable amount for subsequent servicing, that amount is deferred and is recognised as revenue over the period during which the service is performed. The IFRIC concluded that this requirement was relevant to service arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation. Arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation involve an operator providing more than one service, ie construction or upgrade services, and operation services. Although the contract for each service is generally negotiated as a single contract, its terms call for separate phases or elements because each separate phase or element has its own distinct skills, requirements and risks. The IFRIC noted that, in these circumstances, IAS 18 paragraphs 4 and 13 require the contract to be separated into two separate phases or elements, a construction element within the scope of IAS 11 and an operations element within the scope of IAS 18. Thus the operator might report different profit margins on each phase or element. The IFRIC noted that the amount for each service would be identifiable because such services were often provided as a single service. The IFRIC also noted that the combining and segmenting criteria of IAS 11 applied only to the construction element of the arrangement.

- BC32 In some circumstances, the grantor makes a non-cash payment for the construction services, ie it gives the operator an intangible asset (a right to charge users of the

public service) in exchange for the operator providing construction services. The operator then uses the intangible asset to generate further revenues from users of the public service.

BC33 Paragraph 12 of IAS 18 states:

When goods are sold or services are rendered in exchange for dissimilar goods or services, the exchange is regarded as a transaction which generates revenue. The revenue is measured at the fair value of the goods or services received, adjusted by the amount of any cash or cash equivalents transferred. When the fair value of the goods or services received cannot be measured reliably, the revenue is measured at the fair value of the goods or services given up, adjusted by the amount of any cash or cash equivalents transferred.

BC34 The IFRIC noted that total revenue does not equal total cash inflows. The reason for this outcome is that, when the operator receives an intangible asset in exchange for its construction services, there are two sets of inflows and outflows rather than one. In the first set, the construction services are exchanged for the intangible asset in a barter transaction with the grantor. In the second set, the intangible asset received from the grantor is used up to generate cash flows from users of the public service. This result is not unique to service arrangements within the scope of this Interpretation. Any situation in which an entity provides goods or services in exchange for another dissimilar asset that is subsequently used to generate cash revenues would lead to a similar result.

BC35 Some IFRIC members were uncomfortable with such a result, and would have preferred a method of accounting under which total revenues were limited to the cash inflows. However, they accepted that it is consistent with the treatment accorded to a barter transaction, ie an exchange of dissimilar goods or services.

Consideration given by the grantor to the operator (paragraphs 14-19)

BC36 The IFRIC observed that the contractual rights that the operator receives in exchange for providing construction services can take a variety of forms. They are not necessarily rights to receive cash or other financial assets.

BC37 The draft Interpretations proposed that the nature of the operator's asset depended on who had the primary responsibility to pay the operator for the services. The operator should recognise a financial asset when the grantor had the primary responsibility to pay the operator for the services. The operator should recognise an intangible asset in all other cases.

BC38 Respondents to the draft Interpretations argued that determining which accounting model to apply by looking at who has the primary responsibility to pay the operator for the services, irrespective of who bears demand risk (ie ability and willingness of users to pay for the service), would result in an accounting treatment that did not reflect the economic substance of the arrangement. Respondents were concerned that the proposal would require operators with essentially identical cash flow streams to adopt different accounting models. This would impair users' understanding of entities involved in providing public-to-private service concession arrangements. Several gave the example of a shadow toll road and a toll road, where the economics (demand risk) of the arrangements would be similar, pointing out that under the proposals the

two arrangements would be accounted for differently. In the light of comments received on the proposals, the IFRIC decided to clarify (see paragraphs 15-19) the extent to which an operator should recognise a financial asset and an intangible asset.

BC39 Responses to the draft Interpretations provided only limited information about the impact of the proposals. To obtain additional information, IASB staff arranged for discussions with preparers, auditors and regulators. The consensus of those consulted was that the identity of the payee has no effect on the risks to the operator's cash flow stream. The operator typically relies on the terms of the service arrangement contract to determine the risks to its cash flow stream. The operator's cash flows may be guaranteed by the grantor, in which case the grantor bears demand risk, or the operator's cash flows may be conditional on usage levels, in which case the operator bears demand risk.

BC40 The IFRIC noted that the operator's cash flows are guaranteed when (a) the grantor agrees to pay the operator specified or determinable amounts whether or not the public service is used (sometimes known as take-or-pay arrangements) or (b) the grantor grants a right to the operator to charge users of the public service and the grantor guarantees the operator's cash flows by way of a shortfall guarantee described in paragraph 16. The operator's cash flows are conditional on usage when it has no such guarantee but must obtain its revenue either directly from users of the public service or from the grantor in proportion to public usage of the service (road tolls or shadow tolls for example).

A financial asset (operator's cash flows are guaranteed by the grantor)

BC41 Paragraph 11 of IAS 32 *Financial Instruments: Presentation* defines a financial asset to include 'a contractual right to receive cash or another financial asset from another entity'. Paragraph 13 of that standard clarifies that 'contractual' refers to 'an agreement between two or more parties that has clear economic consequences that the parties have little, if any, discretion to avoid, usually because the agreement is enforceable by law.'

BC42 The IFRIC decided that a financial asset should be recognised to the extent that the operator has an unconditional present right to receive cash from or at the direction of the grantor for the construction services; and the grantor has little, if any, discretion to avoid payment, usually because the agreement is enforceable by law. The operator has a contractual right to receive cash for the construction services if the grantor contractually guarantees the operator's cash flows, in the manner described in paragraph 16. The IFRIC noted that the operator has an unconditional right to receive cash to the extent that the grantor bears the risk (demand risk) that the cash flows generated by the users of the public service will not be sufficient to recover the operator's investment.

BC43 The IFRIC noted that:

- (a) An agreement to pay for the shortfall, if any, between amounts received from users of the service and specified or determinable amounts does not meet the definition of a financial guarantee in paragraph 9 of IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* because the operator has an

unconditional contractual right to receive cash from the grantor. Furthermore, the amendments made to IAS 39 in August 2005 by *Financial Guarantee Contracts* do not address the treatment of financial guarantee contracts by the holder. The objective of the amendments was to ensure that issuers of financial guarantee contracts recognise a liability for the obligations the guarantor has undertaken in issuing that guarantee.

- (b) Users or the grantor may pay the contractual amount receivable directly to the operator. The method of payment is a matter of form only. In both cases the operator has a present, unconditional, contractual right to receive the specified or determinable cash flows from or at the direction of the grantor. The nature of the operator's asset is not altered solely because the contractual amount receivable may be paid directly by users of the public service. The IFRIC observed that accounting for these contractual cash flows in accordance with IASs 32 and 39 faithfully reflects the economics of the arrangements, which is to provide finance to the grantor for the construction of the infrastructure.

Operator's cash flows are contingent on the operator meeting specified quality or efficiency requirements

- BC44 The IFRIC concluded that the definition of a financial asset is met even if the contractual right to receive cash is contingent on the operator meeting specified quality or efficiency requirements or targets. Before the grantor is required to pay the operator for its construction services, the operator may have to ensure that the infrastructure is capable of generating the public services specified by the grantor or that the infrastructure is up to or exceeds operating standards or efficiency targets specified by the grantor to ensure a specified level of service and capacity can be delivered. In this respect the operator's position is the same as that of any other entity in which payment for goods or services is contingent on subsequent performance of the goods or service sold.
- BC45 Therefore IFRIC X treats the consideration given by the grantor to the operator as giving rise to a financial asset irrespective of whether the contractual amounts receivable are contingent on the operator meeting levels of performance or efficiency targets.

An intangible asset (operator's cash flows are conditional on usage)

- BC46 IAS 38 *Intangible Assets* defines an intangible asset as 'an identifiable non-monetary asset without physical substance'. It mentions licences as examples of intangible assets. It describes an asset as being identifiable when it arises from contractual rights.
- BC47 The IFRIC concluded that the right of an operator to charge users of the public service meets the definition of an intangible asset, and therefore should be accounted for in accordance with IAS 38. In these circumstances the operator's revenue is conditional on usage and it bears the risk (demand risk) that the cash flows generated by users of the public service will not be sufficient to recover its investment.
- BC48 In the absence of contractual arrangements designed to ensure that the operator receives a minimum amount (see paragraphs BC53 and BC54), the operator has no

contractual right to receive cash even if receipt of the cash is highly probable. Rather, the operator has an opportunity to charge those who use the public service in the future. The operator bears the demand risk and hence its commercial return is contingent on users using the public service. The operator's asset is a licence, which would be classified as an intangible asset within the scope of IAS 38. And, as clarified in paragraph AG10 of the application guidance in IAS 32:

Physical assets (such as inventories, property, plant and equipment), leased assets and intangible assets (such as patents and trademarks) are not financial assets. Control of such physical and intangible assets creates an opportunity to generate an inflow of cash or another financial asset, but it does not give rise to a present right to receive cash or another financial asset.

BC49 The IFRIC considered whether a right to charge users unsupported by any shortfall guarantee from the grantor could be regarded as an indirect right to receive cash arising from the contract with the grantor. It concluded that although the operator's asset might have characteristics that are similar to those of a financial asset, it would not meet the definition of a financial asset in IAS 32: the operator would not at the balance sheet date have a contractual right to receive cash from another entity. That other entity (ie the user) would still have the ability to avoid any obligation. The grantor would be passing to the operator an opportunity to charge users in future, not a present right to receive cash.

Contractual arrangements eliminate substantially all variability in the operator's return

BC50 The IFRIC considered whether agreements incorporating contractual arrangements designed to eliminate substantially all variability in the operator's return would meet the definition of a financial asset, for example:

- (a) the price charged by the operator would be varied by regulation designed to ensure that the operator received a substantially fixed return; or
- (b) the operator would be permitted to collect revenues from users or the grantor until it achieved a specified return on its investment, at which point the arrangement would come to an end.

BC51 The IFRIC noted that, as a result of such contractual arrangements, the operator's return would be low risk. Only if usage were extremely low would the contractual mechanisms fail to give the operator the specified return. The likelihood of usage being that low could be remote. Commercially, the operator's return would be regarded as fixed, giving its asset many of the characteristics of a financial asset.

BC52 However, the IFRIC concluded that the fact that the operator's asset was low risk did not influence its classification. IAS 32 does not define financial assets by reference to the amount of risk in the return—it defines them solely by reference to the existence or absence of an unconditional contractual right to receive cash. There are other examples of licences that offer the holders of the rights predictable, low risk returns, but such licences are not regarded as giving the holder a contractual right to cash. And there are other industries in which price regulation is designed to provide the operators with substantially fixed returns—but the rights of operators in these other industries are not classified as financial assets as a result. The operator's asset is a variable term licence, which would be classified as an intangible asset within the scope of IAS 38.

Draft

Draft

A financial asset and an intangible asset

- BC53 The IFRIC concluded that if the operator is paid for its construction services partly by a financial asset and partly by an intangible asset it is necessary to account separately for each component of the operator's consideration. The IFRIC included the requirement to account separately for each component (sometimes known as a bifurcated arrangement) of the operator's consideration in response to a concern raised on the draft Interpretations. The concern was that, in some arrangements, both parties to the contract share the risk (demand risk) that the cash flows generated by users of the public service will not be sufficient to recover the operator's investment. In order to achieve the desired sharing of risk, the parties often agree to arrangements under which the grantor pays the operator for its services partly by a financial asset and partly by granting a right to charge users of the public service (an intangible asset). The IFRIC concluded that in these circumstances it would be necessary to divide the operator's consideration into a financial asset component for any guaranteed amount of cash or other financial asset and an intangible asset for the remainder.
- BC54 The IFRIC concluded that the nature of consideration given by the grantor to the operator is determined by reference to the contract terms and when it exists, relevant contract law. The IFRIC noted public-to-private service agreements are rarely if ever the same; technical requirements vary by sector and country. Furthermore, the terms of the contractual agreement may also depend on the specific features of the overall legal framework of the particular country. Public-to-private service contract laws, where they exist, may contain terms that do not have to be repeated in individual contracts.

Contractual obligations to restore the infrastructure to a specified level of serviceability (paragraph 21)

- BC55 The IFRIC noted that IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets* prohibits an entity from providing for the replacement of parts of its own property, plant and equipment. IAS 16 requires such costs to be recognised in the carrying amount of an item of property, plant and equipment if the recognition criteria in paragraph 7 are met. Each part of an item of property, plant and equipment with a cost that is significant in relation to the total cost of the item is depreciated separately. The IFRIC concluded that this prohibition would not apply to arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation because the operator does not recognise the infrastructure as its own property, plant and equipment. The operator has an unavoidable obligation that it owes to a third party, the grantor, in respect of the infrastructure. The operator should recognise its obligations in accordance with IAS 37.
- BC56 The IFRIC considered whether the Interpretation should contain guidance on the timing of recognition of the obligations. It noted that the precise terms and circumstances of the obligations would vary from contract to contract. It concluded that the requirements and guidance in IAS 37 were sufficiently clear to enable an operator to identify the period(s) in which different obligations should be recognised.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Borrowing costs (paragraph 22)

- BC57 IAS 23 *Borrowing Costs* permits borrowing costs to be capitalised as part of the cost of a qualifying asset to the extent that they are directly attributable to its acquisition, construction or production until the asset is ready for its intended use or sale. That Standard defines a qualifying asset as ‘an asset that necessarily takes a substantial period of time to get ready for its intended use for sale’.
- BC58 For arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation, the IFRIC decided that an intangible asset (ie the grantor gives the operator a right to charge users of the public service in return for construction services) meets the definition of a qualifying asset of the operator because generally the licence would not be ready for use until the infrastructure was constructed or upgraded. A financial asset (ie the grantor gives the operator a contractual right to receive cash or other financial asset in return for construction services) does not meet the definition of a qualifying asset of the operator. The IFRIC observed that interest is generally accreted on the carrying value of financial assets.
- BC59 The IFRIC noted that financing arrangements may result in an operator obtaining borrowed funds and incurring associated borrowing costs before some or all of the funds are used for expenditure relating to construction or operation services. In such circumstances the funds are often temporarily invested. Any investment income earned on such funds is recognised in accordance with IAS 39, unless the operator adopts the allowed alternative treatment, in which case investment income earned during the construction phase of the arrangement is accounted for in accordance with paragraph 16 of IAS 23.

Financial asset (paragraphs 23-25)

- BC60 Paragraph 9 of IAS 39 identifies and defines four categories of financial asset: (i) those held at fair value through profit or loss; (ii) held-to-maturity investments; (iii) loans and receivables; and (iv) available-for-sale financial assets.
- BC61 Paragraph 24 of IFRIC X assumes that public-to-private service arrangement financial assets will not be categorised as held-to-maturity investments. Paragraph 9 of IAS 39 states that a financial asset may not be classified as a held-to-maturity investment if it meets the definition of a loan or receivable. An asset that meets the definition of a held-to-maturity investment will meet the definition of a loan or receivable unless:
- (a) it is quoted in an active market; or
 - (b) the holder may not recover substantially all of its initial investment, other than because of credit deterioration.

It is not envisaged that a public-to-private service arrangement financial asset will be quoted in an active market. Hence the circumstances of (a) will not arise. In the circumstances of (b), the asset must be classified as available for sale (if not designated upon initial recognition as at fair value through profit or loss).

Draft

Draft

BC62 The IFRIC considered whether the contract would include an embedded derivative if the amount to be received by the operator could vary with the quality of subsequent services to be provided by the operator or performance or efficiency targets to be achieved by the operator. The IFRIC concluded that it would not, because the definition of a derivative in IAS 39 requires, among other things, that the variable is not specific to a party to the contract. The consequence is that the contract's provision for variations in payments does not meet the definition of a derivative and, accordingly, the requirements of IAS 39 in relation to embedded derivatives do not apply. The IFRIC observed that if the amount to be received by the operator is conditional on the infrastructure meeting quality or performance or efficiency targets as described in paragraph BC44, this would not prevent the amount from being classified as a loan or receivable. The IFRIC also concluded that during the construction phase of the arrangement the operator's asset (representing its accumulating right to be paid for providing construction services) should be classified as a financial asset when it represents cash or another financial asset due from or at the direction of the grantor.

Intangible asset (paragraph 26)

BC63 The Interpretation requires the operator to account for its intangible asset in accordance with IAS 38. Among other requirements, IAS 38 requires an intangible asset with a finite useful economic life to be amortised over that life. Paragraph 97 states that 'the amortisation method used shall reflect the pattern in which the asset's future economic benefits are expected to be consumed by the entity.'

BC64 The IFRIC considered whether it would be appropriate for intangible assets under paragraph 26 to be amortised using an 'interest' method of amortisation, ie one that takes account of the time value of money in addition to the consumption of the intangible asset, treating the asset more like a monetary than a non-monetary asset. However, the IFRIC concluded that there was nothing unique about these intangible assets that would justify use of a method of depreciation different from that used for other intangible assets. The IFRIC noted that paragraph 98 of IAS 38 provides for a number of amortisation methods for intangible assets with finite useful lives. These methods include the straight-line method, the diminishing balance method and the unit of production method. The method used is selected on the basis of the expected pattern of consumption of the expected future economic benefits embodied in the asset and is applied consistently from period to period, unless there is a change in the expected pattern of consumption of those future economic benefits. The IFRIC noted the observation in paragraph 98 of IAS 38 that, for intangible assets with finite useful economic lives, there is rarely, if ever, persuasive evidence to support an amortisation method that results in less accumulated amortisation than would result from applying the straight-line method.

BC65 Further, the IFRIC noted that interest methods of amortisation are not permitted under IAS 38. Therefore, IFRIC X does not provide exceptions to permit use of interest methods of amortisation.

BC66 The IFRIC considered when the operator should first recognise the intangible asset. The IFRIC concluded that the intangible asset (the licence) received in exchange for

Draft

Draft

construction services should be recognised in accordance with general principles applicable to contracts for the exchange of assets or services.

- BC67 The IFRIC noted that it is current practice not to recognise executory contracts to the extent that they are unperformed by both parties (unless the contract is onerous). IAS 37 describes executory contracts as ‘contracts under which neither party has performed any of its obligations or both parties have partially performed their obligations to an equal extent’. Paragraph 91 of the *Framework* states:

In practice, obligations under contracts that are equally proportionately unperformed (for example, liabilities for inventory ordered but not yet received) are generally not recognised as liabilities in the financial statements.

- BC68 Therefore, the IFRIC concluded that contracts within the scope of the Interpretation should not be recognised to the extent that they are executory. The IFRIC noted that service concession arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation are generally executory when the contracts are signed. The IFRIC also concluded that during the construction phase of the arrangement the operator’s asset (representing its accumulating right to be paid for providing construction services) should be classified as an intangible asset to the extent that it represents a right to receive a right (licence) to charge users of the public service (an intangible asset).

Items provided to the operator by the grantor (paragraph 27)

- BC69 For service arrangements within the scope of the Interpretation, pre-existing infrastructure items made available to the operator by the grantor for the purpose of the service arrangement are not recognised as property, plant and equipment of the operator.
- BC70 However, different considerations apply to other assets provided to the operator by the grantor if the operator can keep or deal with the assets as it wishes. Such assets become assets of the operator and so should be accounted for in accordance with general recognition and measurement principles, as should the obligations undertaken in exchange for them.
- BC71 The IFRIC considered whether such assets would represent government grants, as defined in paragraph 3 of IAS 20 *Accounting for Government Grants and Disclosure of Government Assistance*:

Government grants are assistance by government in the form of transfers of resources to an entity in return for past or future compliance with certain conditions relating to the operating activities of the entity. They exclude those forms of government assistance which cannot reasonably have a value placed upon them and transactions with government which cannot be distinguished from the normal trading transactions of the entity.

The IFRIC concluded that if such assets were part of the overall consideration payable by the grantor on an arms’ length basis for the operator’s services, they would not constitute ‘assistance’. Therefore, they would not meet the definition of government grants in IAS 20 and that standard would not apply.

Draft

Draft

Draft

Draft

Transition (paragraph 29-30)

- BC72 IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors* states that an entity shall account for a change in accounting policy resulting from initial application of an Interpretation in accordance with any specific transitional provisions in that Interpretation. In the absence of any specific transitional provisions, the general requirements of IAS 8 apply. The general requirement in IAS 8 is that the changes should be accounted for retrospectively, except to the extent that retrospective application would be impracticable.
- BC73 The IFRIC noted that there are two aspects to retrospective determination: reclassification and remeasurement. The IFRIC took the view that it will usually be practicable to determine retrospectively the appropriate classification of all amounts previously included in an operator's balance sheet, but that retrospective remeasurement of service arrangement assets might not always be practicable.
- BC74 The IFRIC noted that, when retrospective restatement is not practicable, IAS 8 requires prospective application from the earliest practicable date, which could be the start of the current period. Under prospective application, the operator could be applying different accounting models to similar transactions, which the IFRIC decided would be inappropriate. The IFRIC regarded it as important that the correct accounting model should be consistently applied.
- BC75 The Interpretation reflects these conclusions.

Amendments to IFRS 1

- BC76 The amendments to IFRS 1 *First-time Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards* are necessary to ensure that the transitional arrangements are available to both existing users and first-time adopters of IFRSs. The IFRIC believes that the requirements will ensure that the balance sheet will exclude any items that would not qualify for recognition as assets and liabilities under IFRSs.

Summary of changes from the draft Interpretations

- BC77 The main changes from the IFRIC's proposals are as follows:
- (a) The proposals were issued in three separate draft Interpretations, D12 *Service Concession Arrangements—Determining the Accounting Model*, D13 *Service Concession Arrangements—The Financial Asset Model* and D14 *Service Concession Arrangements—The Intangible Asset Model*. In finalising IFRIC X, the IFRIC combined the three draft Interpretations.
 - (b) Compared with IFRIC X the draft Interpretations did not explain the reasons for the scope limitations and the reasons for the control approach adopted by the IFRIC in paragraph 5. The IFRIC added Information Note 2 to IFRIC X to provide references to Standards that apply to arrangements outside the scope of the Interpretation.

Draft

Draft

- (c) The scope of the proposals did not include ‘whole of life infrastructure’ (ie infrastructure used in a public-to-private service arrangement for its entire useful life). IFRIC X includes ‘whole of life infrastructure’ within its scope.
- (d) Under the approach proposed, an entity determined the appropriate accounting model by reference to whether the grantor or the user had primary responsibility to pay the operator for the services provided. IFRIC X requires an entity to recognise a financial asset to the extent that the operator has an unconditional contractual right to receive cash from or at the direction of the grantor. The operator should recognise an intangible asset to the extent that it receives a right to charge users of the public service.
- (e) Compared with IFRIC X, the draft Interpretations implied that the nature of asset recognised (a financial asset or an intangible asset) by the operator as consideration for providing construction services determined the accounting for the operation phase of the arrangement.
- (f) Under the approach proposed in the draft Interpretations, an entity could capitalise borrowing costs under the allowed alternative treatment in IAS 23. IFRIC X requires borrowing costs to be recognised as an expense in the period in which they are incurred unless the operator has a contractual right to receive an intangible asset (a right to charge users of the public service), in which case borrowing costs attributable to the arrangement may be capitalised in accordance with the allowed alternative treatment under that Standard.
- (g) In finalising IFRIC X, the IFRIC identified the need to amend IFRIC 4.