



FEMSA' S response on Revised Exposure Draft on Leases

September 2013

Scope

Question 1: identifying a lease

This revised Exposure Draft defines a lease as “a contract that conveys the right to use an asset (the underlying asset) for a period of time in exchange for consideration”. An entity would determine whether a contract contains a lease by assessing whether:

- (a) fulfilment of the contract depends on the use of an identified asset; and
- (b) the contract conveys the right to control the use of the identified asset for a period of time in exchange for consideration.

A contract conveys the right to control the use of an asset if the customer has the ability to direct the use and receive the benefits from use of the identified asset.

Do you agree with the definition of a lease and the proposed requirements in paragraphs 6–19 for how an entity would determine whether a contract contains a lease? Why or why not? If not, how would you define a lease? Please supply specific fact patterns, if any, to which you think the proposed definition of a lease is difficult to apply or leads to a conclusion that does not reflect the economics of the transaction.

We agree with the IASB’s proposal regarding the definition of a lease and how an entity would determine whether a contract contains a lease.

The accounting model

This revised Exposure Draft would require an entity to recognise assets and liabilities arising from a lease. When assessing how to account for a lease, a lessee and a lessor would classify a lease on the basis of whether a lessee is expected to consume more than an insignificant portion of the economic benefits embedded in the underlying asset. This revised Exposure Draft would require an entity to apply that consumption principle by presuming that leases of property are Type B leases and leases of assets other than property are Type A leases, unless specified classification criteria are met. Those classification criteria are different for leases of property and leases of assets other than property to reflect the different natures of property (which often embeds a land element) and assets other than property. The boards acknowledge that, for some leases, the application of the classification criteria might result in different outcomes than if the consumption principle were to be applied without additional requirements. Nonetheless, this revised Exposure Draft would require an entity to classify leases by applying the classification criteria in paragraphs 29–31 to simplify the proposals.

Lessee accounting

A lessee would do the following:

(a) for all leases, recognise a right-of-use asset and a lease liability, initially measured at the present value of lease payments (except if a lessee elects to apply the recognition exemption for short-term leases).

(b) for Type A leases, subsequently measure the lease liability on an amortised cost basis and amortise the right-of-use asset on a systematic basis that reflects the pattern in which the lessee expects to consume the right-of-use asset's future economic benefits. The lessee would present the unwinding of the discount on the lease liability as interest separately from the amortisation of the right-of-use asset.

(c) for Type B leases, subsequently measure the lease liability on an amortised cost basis and amortise the right-of-use asset in each period so that the lessee would recognise the total lease cost on a straight-line basis over the lease term. In each period, the lessee would present a single lease cost combining the unwinding of the discount on the lease liability with the amortisation of the right-of-use asset.

Lessor accounting

A lessor would do the following:

(a) for Type A leases, derecognise the underlying asset and recognise a lease receivable and a residual asset. The lessor would recognise both of the following:

(i) the unwinding of the discount on both the lease receivable and the residual asset as interest income over the lease term; and

(ii) any profit relating to the lease (as described in paragraph 74) at the commencement date.

(b) for Type B leases (and any short-term leases if the lessor elects to apply the exemption for short-term leases), continue to recognise the underlying asset and recognise lease income over the lease term, typically on a straight-line basis.

Question 2: lessee accounting

Do you agree that the recognition, measurement and presentation of expenses and cash flows arising from a lease should differ for different leases, depending on whether the lessee is expected to consume more than an insignificant portion of the economic benefits embedded in the underlying asset? Why or why not? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?

We do not concur with the perspective that there should essentially continue to be different models for accounting for leases depending on whether the lessee is expected to consume more than an insignificant portion of the economic benefits embedded in the underlying asset. We believe that in practice, the decision on whether to enter into a lease or not is based on a variety of different factors and that consumption should not be the principal factor to determine the accounting for such arrangements. As a result, we have a preference for accounting for all leases as Type B, which we believe will reduce complexity and provide comparability for our stakeholders.

Question 3: lessor accounting

Do you agree that a lessor should apply a different accounting approach to different leases, depending on whether the lessee is expected to consume more than an insignificant portion of the economic benefits embedded in the underlying asset? Why or why not? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?

We do not concur with the perspective that there should essentially continue to be different models for accounting for leases depending on whether the lessee is expected to consume more than an insignificant portion of the economic benefits embedded in the underlying asset. We believe that in practice, the decision on whether to enter into a lease or not is based on a variety of different factors and that consumption should not be the principal factor to determine the accounting for such arrangements. As a result, we have a preference for accounting for all leases as Type B, which we believe will reduce complexity and provide comparability for our stakeholders.

Question 4: classification of leases

Do you agree that the principle on the lessee's expected consumption of the economic benefits embedded in the underlying asset should be applied using the requirements set out in paragraphs 28–34, which differ depending on whether the underlying asset is property? Why or why not? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?

We do not concur with the perspective that there should essentially continue to be different models for accounting for leases depending on whether the underlying asset is property or something else. We believe that in practice, the decision on whether to enter into a lease or not is based on a variety of different factors and the nature of the asset should not be the principal factor to determine the accounting model. As a result, we have a preference for accounting for all leases as Type B, which we believe will reduce complexity and provide comparability for our stakeholders.

Measurement

This revised Exposure Draft would require that a lessee and a lessor measure assets and liabilities arising from a lease on a basis that:

(a) reflects a lease term determined as the non-cancellable period, together with both of the following:

(i) periods covered by an option to extend the lease if the lessee has a significant economic incentive to exercise that option; and (ii) periods covered by an option to terminate the lease if the lessee has a significant economic incentive not to exercise that option.

(b) includes fixed lease payments and variable lease payments that depend on an index or a rate (such as the Consumer Price Index or a market interest rate), but excludes other variable lease payments unless those payments are in-substance fixed payments. The lessee and lessor would measure variable lease payments that depend on an index or a rate using the index or rate as at the commencement date. A lessee would reassess the measurement of the lease liability, and a lessor would reassess the measurement of the lease receivable, if either of the following occurs:

(a) there is a change in relevant factors that would result in a change in the lease term (as described in paragraph B6); or

(b) there is a change in an index or a rate used to determine lease payments.

Question 5: lease term

Do you agree with the proposals on lease term, including the reassessment of the lease term if there is a change in relevant factors? Why or why not? If not, how do you propose that a lessee and a lessor should determine the lease term and why?

Regarding the term of the lease we believe the factors to determine the lease term should be consistently applied for both the lessee and lessor, eliminating the optional payments from the lease term and eliminating the analysis of the significant economic incentive to exercise the option, with this the ED will be avoiding asymmetric accounting.

In this respect we proposed to eliminate the concept of optional payment and its significant economic incentive to be exercised. Being the contract-based factors the only ones that should matter. We agree with the IASB's proposal regarding the reassessment of the lease term if there is a change in relevant factors, as a change in the lease contract could be.

Question 6: variable lease payments

Do you agree with the proposals on the measurement of variable lease payments, including reassessment if there is a change in an index or a rate used to determine lease payments? Why or why not? If not, how do you propose that a lessee and a lessor should account for variable lease payments and why? **Yes we agree**

Transition

Question 7: transition

Paragraphs C2–C22 state that a lessee and a lessor would recognise and measure leases at the beginning of the earliest period presented using either a modified retrospective approach or a full retrospective approach. Do you agree with those proposals? Why or why not? If not, what transition requirements do you propose and why? Are there any additional transition issues the boards should consider? If yes, what are they and why?

We believe the adoption of the new principles established by the standard should be prospectively applied given the cost benefit of retroactively restating and having to potentially evaluate and adjust the accounting for thousands of our lease contracts.

Question 8: disclosure

Paragraphs 58–67 and 98–109 set out the disclosure requirements for a lessee and a lessor. Those proposals include maturity analyses of undiscounted lease payments; reconciliations of amounts recognised in the statement of financial position; and narrative disclosures about leases (including information about variable lease payments and options). Do you agree with those proposals? Why or why not? If not, what changes do you propose and why?

We agree with the IASB's proposal regarding disclosures associated with lease agreements.

Nonpublic entities (FASB-only)

Question 9 (FASB-only): nonpublic entities

To strive for a reasonable balance between the costs and benefits of information, the FASB decided to provide the following specified reliefs for nonpublic entities:

(a) To permit a nonpublic entity to make an accounting policy election to use a risk-free discount rate to measure the lease liability. If an entity elects to use a risk-free discount rate, that fact should be disclosed.

(b) To exempt a nonpublic entity from the requirement to provide a reconciliation of the opening and closing balance of the lease liability. Will these specified reliefs for nonpublic entities help reduce the cost of implementing the new lease accounting requirements without unduly sacrificing information necessary for users of their financial statements? If not, what changes do you propose and why?

Related party leases (FASB-only)

The FASB decided that the recognition and measurement requirements for all leases should be applied by lessees and lessors that are related parties based on the legally enforceable terms and conditions of the lease, acknowledging that some related party transactions are not documented and/or the terms and conditions are not at arm's length. In addition, lessees and lessors would be

required to apply the disclosure requirements for related party transactions in Topic 850, Related Party Disclosures. Under existing US GAAP, entities are required to account for leases with related parties on the basis of their economic substance, which may be difficult when there are no legally enforceable terms and conditions of the agreement.

Question 10 (FASB-only): related party leases

Do you agree that it is not necessary to provide different recognition and measurement requirements for related party leases (for example, to require the lease to be accounted for based on the economic substance of the lease rather than the legally enforceable terms and conditions)? If not, what different recognition and measurement requirements do you propose and why?

Question 11 (FASB-only): related party leases

Do you agree that it is not necessary to provide additional disclosures (beyond those required by Topic 850) for related party leases? If not, what additional disclosure requirements would you propose and why?

IAS 40 Investment Property

Question 12 (IASB-only): Consequential amendments to IAS 40

The IASB is proposing amendments to other IFRSs as a result of the proposals in this revised Exposure Draft, including amendments to IAS 40 *Investment Property*. The amendments to IAS 40 propose that a right-of-use asset arising from a lease of property would be within the scope of IAS 40 if the leased property meets the definition of investment property. This would represent a change from the current scope of IAS 40, which permits, but does not require, property held under an operating lease to be accounted for as investment property using the fair value model in IAS 40 if it meets the definition of investment property.

Do you agree that a right-of-use asset should be within the scope of IAS 40 if the leased property meets the definition of investment property? If not, what alternative would you propose and why?

We agree with the IASB's proposal that a right-of-use asset should be within the scope of IAS 40 if the leased property meets the definition of investment property.

FEMSA is a leading company that participates in the beverage industry through Coca-Cola FEMSA, the largest franchise bottler of Coca-Cola products in the world; and in the beer industry, through its ownership of the second largest equity stake in Heineken, one of the world's leading brewers with operations in over 70 countries. In the retail industry it participates with FEMSA Comercio, operating various small-format chain stores, including OXXO, the largest and fastest-growing chain of stores in Latin America. All of which is supported by a Strategic Business area.