CC. Smith College

## FREDERIC W. COOK & CO., INC.

2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS - SUITE 990, LOS ANGELES, CA 90067 - TEL. (310) 277-5070

NEW YORK • CHICAGO • LOS ANGELES

August 23, 2005

Som

GEORGE B. PAULIN President

> Mr. Robert H. Herz Chairman Financial Accounting Standards Board 401 Merritt 7, P.O. Box 5116 Norwalk Connecticut 06856-5116

Letter of Comment No: 7
File Reference: 1102-SCU
Date Received: 08/31/05

"Date of Grant" for Equity Awards Under FAS 123(R)

Dear Mr. Herz:

The FASB's staff has recently caused considerable turmoil in the compensation community. This is the result of the staff's advice to one or more of the big four accounting firms that grant date for financial measurement purposes under FAS 123(R) does not occur until the terms of the grant have been communicated to the employee.

## The Problem

In most cases, communication to the employee takes several days after the board's compensation committee has approved the grant. Also, there may be different dates involved because companies typically want the grant information to be discussed in-private between the employee and his or her direct supervisor, as the receipt and size of the grant are related to the employee's performance. Scheduling and holding these discussions takes time.

Thus, the compensation community believes the FASB's staff has created an unnecessary and impractical administrative burden on companies. Compliance will increasingly require electronic communication, which will de-humanize the process and be undesirable from a motivation and employee-relations viewpoint.

## **Proposed Solution**

We have a practical solution to propose that would address the employee-relations issues but still be consistent with FAS 123(R), which defines grant date, in part, as "The date at which an employer and an employee reach a mutual understanding of the key terms and conditions of a share-based payment award."

The solution is to regard the "key terms and conditions" as including the fair market value per share of an award, but not including the total number of shares granted to the individual. In other words, a grant's fair market value or option price could be communicated immediately to

FAS 123(R), page 273

Mr. Robert H. Herz Page 2 August 23, 2005

the recipient, along with the other terms, leaving the personal communication regarding the size of the grant to come within a reasonable period of time thereafter.

Arguments in favor of this proposal are:

- 1. Communication would cover all terms and conditions *per share*, not the number of shares. Terms and conditions include price, maximum term, vesting, payment, treatment upon termination of employment, etc. (i.e., all the provisions covered in a grant agreement).
- 2. From an accounting perspective, what is important to determine for equity awards are these administrative provisions and the aggregate number of shares covered by grants, not the number of shares per participant.
- 3. There should be no inherent conflict with related tax and stock exchange regulations. For example, under IRC Section 409A, it would be difficult to envision a rationale for treating such a grant as a "discount" option when (1) the strike price was set at 100% of fair market value per share on the grant date and simultaneously communicated (with all relevant provisions), and (2) the number of shares per participant was formally approved and locked-in without a possible subsequent change.

We can think of no arguments against the proposal.

We respectively request your timely consideration and approval of this proposal, and assuming that there is support, dissemination via a staff interpretative bulletin or other appropriate means.

Sincerely,

George B. Paulin

GBP/sh