Comments on proposed amendments to IFRS 3, Business Combinations

Question 1—Objective, definition and scope

The proposed objective of the Exposure Draft is:

"...that all business combinations be accounted for by applying the acquisition method. A business combination is a transaction or other event in which an acquirer obtains control of one or more businesses (the acquiree). In accordance with the acquisition method, the acquirer measures and recognises the acquiree, as a whole, and the assets acquired and liabilities assumed at their fair values as of the acquisition date. [paragraph 1]"

The objective provides the basic elements of the acquisition method of accounting for a business combination (formerly called the purchase method) by describing:

(a) what is to be measured and recognised. An acquiring entity would measure and recognise the acquired business at its fair value, regardless of the percentage of the equity interests of the acquiree it holds at the acquisition date. That objective also provides the foundation for determining whether specific assets acquired or liabilities assumed are part of an acquiree and would be accounted for as part of the business combination.

(b) when to measure and recognise the acquiree. Recognition and measurement of a business combination would be as of the acquisition date, which is the date the acquirer obtains control of the acquiree.

(c) the measurement attribute as fair value, rather than as cost accumulation and allocation. The acquiree and the assets acquired and liabilities assumed would be measured at fair value as of the acquisition date, with limited exceptions. Consequently, the consideration transferred in exchange for the acquiree, including contingent consideration, would also be measured at fair value as of the acquisition date.

The objective and definition of a business combination would apply to all business combinations in the scope of the proposed IFRS, including business combinations:

(a) involving only mutual entities

(b) achieved by contract alone

(c) achieved in stages (commonly called step acquisitions)

(d) in which the acquirer holds less than 100 per cent of the equity interests in the acquiree at the acquisition date.

(See paragraphs 52-58 and paragraphs BC42-BC46 of the Basis for Conclusions.)

Question 1—Are the objective and the definition of a business combination appropriate for accounting for all business combinations? If not, for which business combinations are they not appropriate, why would you make an exception, and what alternative do you suggest?
Response

We do agree that the objectives and definitions of the business combinations are appropriate for accounting of all business combinations. However, since the ED specifically scopes out the formation of joint ventures and combinations involving only entities or businesses under common control, such combinations may be accounted by adopting differing accounting practices and there should be guidance on accounting of the same. Further, the ED does not recognize a business combination where an acquirer cannot be identified, which may merit fresh start accounting.

Question 2—Definition of a business

The Exposure Draft proposes to define a business as follows:

A business is an integrated set of activities and assets that is capable of being conducted and managed for the purpose of providing either:

1. a return to investors, or
2. dividends, lower costs, or other economic benefits directly and proportionately to owners, members, or participants. [paragraph 3(d)]

Paragraphs A2-A7 of Appendix A provide additional guidance for applying this definition. The proposed IFRS would amend the definition of a business in IFRS 3. (See paragraphs BC34-BC41.)

Question 2—Are the definition of a business and the additional guidance appropriate and sufficient for determining whether the assets acquired and the liabilities assumed constitute a business? If not, how would you propose to modify or clarify the definition or additional guidance?

Response

We believe that the revised definition of business and the additional guidance widens the definition of business and would result in a wider range of transactions falling within the scope of business combinations.

The definition of a business may not encompass certain activities, pursued by separate entities, which may not apparently constitute businesses. For instance, an Employee Stock Option Trust, or a hospital or a school run by an entity for its employees and also for general purposes or an organisation, which manages the social or environmental obligations of a business. Such activities are often carried out by an entity to meet its obligations and hence need to be included as part of business. Similarly, certain activities that may appear to be incidental to the business but are actually not so should be scoped out. The examples of such activities are Employee Benefit Funds, which operate under legal restrictions and ring-fenced from the business operations.

These situations may be addressed by including appropriate examples in the Application Guidance provided in Appendix A.

Unlike US GAAP where business combination of not for profit organisation (as defined in SFAS - 141) are accounted under APB Opinion 16, the ED, does not give any guidance on accounting of business combination of not for profit organisation.
Questions 3-7—Measuring the fair value of the acquiree

The Exposure Draft proposes that in a business combination that is an exchange of equal values, the acquirer should measure and recognise 100 per cent of the fair value of the acquiree as of the acquisition date. This applies even in business combinations in which the acquirer holds less than 100 per cent of the equity interests in the acquiree at that date. In those business combinations, the acquirer would measure and recognise the non-controlling interest as the sum of the non-controlling interest's proportional interest in the acquisition-date values of the identifiable assets acquired and liabilities assumed plus the goodwill attributable to the non-controlling interest. (See paragraphs 19, 58 and BC52-BC54.)

Question 3—In a business combination in which the acquirer holds less than 100 per cent of the equity interests of the acquiree at the acquisition date, is it appropriate to recognise 100 per cent of the acquisition-date fair value of the acquiree, including 100 per cent of the values of identifiable assets acquired, liabilities assumed and goodwill, which would include the goodwill attributable to the non-controlling interest? If not, what alternative do you propose and why?

Response

We agree with full goodwill approach of the ED. However, we believe that the measurement principle for goodwill as described in paragraph 49 is not appropriate. It does not recognise the fact that goodwill to be recorded by an acquirer should also include any premium paid by the acquirer for control rights. We believe that this paragraph does not reflect the Board's conclusion set out in paragraph 150. The relevant extract of BC 150 reads as follows:

"The Board noted that each alternative has merits. It concluded that the first alternative reflects best the assumption that any premium paid by the acquirer for control rights that is included in the full amount of goodwill should be allocated to the acquirer's interests, and not to the controlling interest."

Paragraph 49 of the ED and the example in guidance A-63 does not reflect the conclusion of the board at BC 150. We suggest a change in paragraph 49 to define goodwill recognized by an acquirer to include the premium, if any, paid by the acquirer for control rights.

For the reasons explained above, we believe that the Example 4 in A−63, goodwill allocated to the non-controlling interest in TC of CU 5 is not correct. The computation is on the basis that the goodwill of non-controlling interest is the residual number, which is conceptually incorrect. The goodwill of non-controlling interest should be equal to the proportion of the non-controlling interest in the excess of the fair value of the acquiree, as a whole over the amount of the recognised identified assets and liabilities. Accordingly, in the relevant example at A-63 the goodwill of the non−controlling interest should be CU 9 as against CU 5 (residual amount).

The revised computation based on the above discussion is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>Non-Controlling Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Interest</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Value of TC</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Net amount of the fair value of separately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognised identifiable assets acquired and liabilities assumed (CU 210 - CU 60)</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net consideration paid</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill -- Excess of fair value of TC over Net Assets</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill -- Attributable to AC being premium paid by the acquirer for the control rights (CU 160 - CU 158)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Goodwill</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the goodwill should be CU 49 and not CU 45 as computed in the example. The difference of CU 4 represents the excess paid by AC over its share of the fair value of the acquiree. This should be included in the goodwill determined for AC.

**Question**

The Exposure Draft proposes that a business combination is usually an arm's length transaction in which knowledgeable, unrelated willing parties are presumed to exchange equal values. In such transactions, the fair value of the consideration transferred by the acquirer on the acquisition date is the best evidence of the fair value of the acquirer's interest in the acquiree, in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Accordingly, in most business combinations, the fair value of the consideration transferred by the acquirer would be used as the basis for measuring the acquisition-date fair value of the acquirer's interest in the acquiree. However, in some business combinations, either no consideration is transferred on the acquisition date or the evidence indicates that the consideration transferred is not the best basis for measuring the acquisition-date fair value of the acquirer's interest in the acquiree. In those business combinations, the acquirer would measure the acquisition-date fair value of its interest in the acquiree and the acquisition-date fair value of the acquiree using other valuation techniques. (See paragraphs 19, 20 and A8-A26, Appendix E and paragraphs BC52-BC89.)

**Question 4**—Do paragraphs A8-A26 in conjunction with Appendix E provide sufficient guidance for measuring the fair value of an acquiree? If not, what additional guidance is needed?

**Response**

We believe that the fair valuations are subjective and judgmental in nature and there will be many practical difficulties in its determination. We believe that there should be a separate standard on the fair valuation, which may help to bring consistency in application of fair value principles.

**Question**

The Exposure Draft proposes a presumption that the best evidence of the fair value of the acquirer's interest in the acquiree would be the fair values of all items of consideration transferred by the acquirer in exchange for that interest measured as of the acquisition date, including:
(a) contingent consideration;
(b) equity interests issued by the acquirer; and
(c) any non-controlling equity investment in the acquiree that the acquirer owned immediately before the acquisition date.

(See paragraphs 20-25 and BC55-BC58.)

Question 5—Is the acquisition-date fair value of the consideration transferred in exchange for the acquirer's interest in the acquiree the best evidence of the fair value of that interest? If not, which forms of consideration should be measured on a date other than the acquisition date, when should they be measured, and why?

Response
We agree

Question
The Exposure Draft proposes that after initial recognition, contingent consideration classified as:

(a) equity would not be remeasured.
(b) liabilities would be remeasured with changes in fair value recognised in profit or loss unless those liabilities are in the scope of IAS 39 Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement or [draft] IAS 37 Non-financial Liabilities. Those liabilities would be accounted for after the acquisition date in accordance with those IFRSs.

(See paragraphs 26 and BC64-BC89.)

Question 6—Is the accounting for contingent consideration after the acquisition date appropriate? If not, what alternative do you propose and why?

Response
We agree, the accounting proposed is appropriate. It is more likely that changes to the contingent consideration after the combination, relate to events and outcomes after the combination. These should not impact the determination of fair value on the date of the acquisition.

Question
The Exposure Draft proposes that the costs that the acquirer incurs in connection with a business combination (also called acquisition-related costs) should be excluded from the measurement of the consideration transferred for the acquiree because those costs are not part of the fair value of the acquiree and are not assets. Such costs include finder's fees; advisory, legal, accounting, valuation and other professional or consulting fees; the cost of issuing debt and equity instruments; and general administrative costs, including the costs of maintaining an internal acquisitions department. The acquirer would account for those costs separately from the business combination accounting. (See paragraphs 27 and BC84-BC89.)
**Question 7**—Do you agree that the costs that the acquirer incurs in connection with a business combination are not assets and should be excluded from the measurement of the consideration transferred for the acquiree? If not, why?

**Response**

No, we do not agree. We are of the view that direct costs which are regulatory or statutory in nature relating to business combinations should be considered as part of cost of acquisition. Such costs like stamp duty or costs incurred relating to perfecting title etc are an integral part of a business combination. In most circumstances, such costs are considered by acquirers and acquirees in the determination of transaction consideration. Accordingly, these should be considered as a part of consideration.

**Questions 8 and 9**—Measuring and recognising the assets acquired and the liabilities assumed

The Exposure Draft proposes that an acquirer measure and recognise as of the acquisition date the fair value of the assets acquired and liabilities assumed as part of the business combination, with limited exceptions. (See paragraphs 28-41 and BC111-BC116.) That requirement would result in the following significant changes to accounting for business combinations:

(a) Receivables (including loans) acquired in a business combination would be measured at fair value. Therefore, the acquirer would not recognise a separate valuation allowance for uncollectible amounts as of the acquisition date.

(b) An identifiable asset or liability (contingency) would be measured and recognised at fair value at the acquisition date even if the amount of the future economic benefits embodied in the asset or required to settle the liability are contingent (or conditional) on the occurrence or non-occurrence of one or more uncertain future events. After initial recognition, such an asset would be accounted for in accordance with IAS 38 Intangible Assets or IAS 39 Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement, as appropriate, and such a liability would be accounted for in accordance with [draft] IAS 37 or other IFRSs as appropriate.

**Question 8**—Do you believe that these proposed changes to the accounting for business combinations are appropriate? If not, which changes do you believe are inappropriate, why, and what alternatives do you propose?

**Response**

We believe that the certain changes to the accounting for business combinations are not appropriate.

We believe that guidance on fair valuation of inventories and receivable is not appropriate and board should retained guidance on fair valuation of inventories and receivable contained in the present IFRS 3. The same is reproduced below:

- for receivables the acquirer shall use the present values of the amounts to be received, determined at appropriate current interest rates, less allowances for uncollectibility and collection costs, if necessary. However, discounting is not required for short-term receivables when the difference between the nominal and discounted amounts is not material.
Question for inventories of:

(i) finished goods and merchandise the acquirer shall use selling prices less the sum of (1) the costs of disposal and (2) a reasonable profit allowance for the selling effort of the acquirer based on profit for similar finished goods and merchandise;

(ii) work in progress the acquirer shall use selling prices of finished goods less the sum of (1) costs to complete, (2) costs of disposal and (3) a reasonable profit allowance for the completing and selling effort based on profit for similar finished goods; and

(iii) raw materials the acquirer shall use current replacement costs.

Question

The Exposure Draft proposes limited exceptions to the fair value measurement principle. Therefore, some assets acquired and liabilities assumed (for example, those related to deferred taxes, assets held for sale, or employee benefits) would continue to be measured and recognised in accordance with other IFRSs rather than at fair value. (See paragraphs 42-51 and BC117-BC150.)

Question 9—Do you believe that these exceptions to the fair value measurement principle are appropriate? Are there any exceptions you would eliminate or add? If so, which ones and why?

Response

We agree, the exceptions are appropriate.

Questions 10-12—Additional guidance for applying the acquisition method to particular types of business combinations

The Exposure Draft proposes that, for the purposes of applying the acquisition method, the fair value of the consideration transferred by the acquirer would include the fair value of the acquirer’s non-controlling equity investment in the acquiree at acquisition date that the acquirer owned immediately before the acquisition date. Accordingly, in a business combination achieved in stages (step acquisition) the acquirer would remeasure its non-controlling equity investment in the acquiree at fair value as of the acquisition date and recognise any gain or loss in profit or loss. If, before the business combination, the acquirer recognized changes in the value of its non-controlling equity investment directly in equity (for example, the investment was designated as available for sale), the amount that was recognised directly in equity would be reclassified and included in the calculation of any gain or loss as of the acquisition date. (See paragraphs 55, 56 and BC151-BC153.)

Question 10—Is it appropriate for the acquirer to recognise in profit or loss any gain or loss on previously acquired non-controlling equity investments on the date it obtains control of the acquiree? If not, what alternative do you propose and why?

Response

We agree, this is a consequence of the application of the acquisition method as described by the ED.
Question

The Exposure Draft proposes that in a business combination in which the consideration transferred for the acquirer's interest in the acquiree is less than the fair value of that interest (referred to as a bargain purchase) any excess of the fair value of the acquirer's interest in the acquiree over the fair value of the consideration transferred for that interest would reduce goodwill until the goodwill related to that business combination is reduced to zero, and any remaining excess would be recognised in profit or loss on the acquisition date. (See paragraphs 59-61 and paragraphs BC164-BC177.) However, the proposed IFRS would not permit the acquirer to recognise a loss at the acquisition date if the acquirer is able to determine that a portion of the consideration transferred represents an overpayment for the acquiree. The boards acknowledge that an acquirer might overpay to acquire a business, but they concluded that it is not possible to measure such an overpayment reliably at the acquisition date. (See paragraph BC178.)

Question 11—Do you agree with the proposed accounting for business combinations in which the consideration transferred for the acquirer's interest in the acquiree is less than the fair value of that interest? If not, what alternative do you propose and why?

Response

We agree. It is important to set out tests to confirm that such a situation does represent a bargain purchase. Further, in such a situation it is important to measure the fair value of the business by applying appropriate valuation technique. For instance in case of a business where there are losses expected in the near future then the same needs to be fair valued based on the income approach rather than replacement cost method.

Question

Question 12—Do you believe that there are circumstances in which the amount of an overpayment could be measured reliably at the acquisition date? If so, in what circumstances?

Response

We believe that the consideration paid represents the acquirer's perspective of the valuation of a business and it would be difficult to describe any part of the consideration as an overpayment on the acquisition date. The existing rules of impairment testing of the goodwill should address this issue.

Question 13—Measurement period

The Exposure Draft proposes that an acquirer should recognise adjustments made during the measurement period to the provisional values of the assets acquired and liabilities assumed as if the accounting for the business combination had been completed at the acquisition date. Thus, comparative information for prior periods presented in financial statements would be adjusted, including any change in depreciation, amortisation or other profit or loss effect recognized as a result of completing the initial accounting. (See paragraphs 62-68 and BC161-BC163.)

Question 13—Do you agree that comparative information for prior periods presented in financial
statements should be adjusted for the effects of measurement period adjustments? If not, what alternative do you propose and why?

Response

We do agree that comparative information for prior periods presented in financial statements should be adjusted for the effects of measurement period adjustments.

Question 14—Assessing what is part of the exchange for the acquiree

The Exposure Draft proposes that an acquirer assess whether any portion of the transaction price (payments or other arrangements) and any assets acquired or liabilities assumed or incurred are not part of the exchange for the acquiree. Only the consideration transferred by the acquirer and the assets acquired or liabilities assumed or incurred that are part of the exchange for the acquiree would be included in the business combination accounting. (See paragraphs 69, 70, A87-A109 and BC154-BC160.)

Question 14—Do you believe that the guidance provided is sufficient for making the assessment of whether any portion of the transaction price or any assets acquired and liabilities assumed or incurred are not part of the exchange for the acquiree? If not, what other guidance is needed?

Response

We believe that assessment relating to any transaction price or assets acquired and liabilities assumed are not part of exchange for price is very subjective and judgmental in nature. Further it is based on the fact patterns and any amount of guidance may not be sufficient.

Question 15—Disclosures

The Exposure Draft proposes broad disclosure objectives that are intended to ensure that users of financial statements are provided with adequate information to enable them to evaluate the nature and financial effects of business combinations. Those objectives are supplemented by specific minimum disclosure requirements. In most instances, the objectives would be met by the minimum disclosure requirements that follow each of the broad objectives. However, in some circumstances, an acquirer might be required to disclose additional information necessary to meet the disclosure objectives. (See paragraphs 71-81 and BC200-BC203.)

Question 15—Do you agree with the disclosure objectives and the minimum disclosure requirements? If not, how would you propose amending the objectives or what disclosure requirements would you propose adding or deleting, and why?

Response

We agree

Questions 16-18—The IASB’s and the FASB’s convergence decisions

The Exposure Draft is the result of the boards’ projects to improve the accounting for business combinations. The first phase of those projects led to the issue of IFRS 3 and FASB Statement No. 141. In 2002, the FASB and the IASB agreed to reconsider jointly their guidance for applying the purchase method of accounting, which the Exposure Draft calls the acquisition
method, for business combinations. An objective of the joint effort is to develop a common and comprehensive standard for the accounting for business combinations that could be used for both domestic and cross-border financial reporting. Although the boards reached the same conclusions on the fundamental issues addressed in the Exposure Draft, they reached different conclusions on a few limited matters. Therefore, the IASB’s version and the FASB’s version of the Exposure Draft provide different guidance on those limited matters. A comparison, by paragraph, of the different guidance provided by each board accompanies the draft IFRS. Most of the differences arise because each board decided to provide business combinations guidance that is consistent with its other standards. Even though those differences are candidates for future convergence projects, the boards do not plan to eliminate those differences before final standards on business combinations are issued.

The joint Exposure Draft proposes to resolve a difference between IFRS 3 and SFAS 141 relating to the criteria for recognising an intangible asset separately from goodwill. Both boards concluded that an intangible asset must be identifiable (arising from contractual-legal rights or separable) to be recognized separately from goodwill. In its deliberations that led to SFAS 141, the FASB concluded that, when acquired in a business combination, all intangible assets (except for an assembled workforce) that are identifiable can be measured with sufficient reliability to warrant recognition separately from goodwill. In addition to the identifiability criterion, IFRS 3 and IAS 38 required that an intangible asset acquired in a business combination be reliably measurable to be recognized separately from goodwill. Paragraphs 35-41 of IAS 38 provide guidance for determining whether an intangible asset acquired in a business combination is reliably measurable. IAS 38 presumes that the fair value of an intangible asset with a finite useful life can be measured reliably. Therefore, a difference between IFRS 3 and SFAS 141 would arise only if the intangible asset has an indefinite life. The IASB decided to converge with the FASB in the Exposure Draft by:

(a) eliminating the requirement that an intangible asset be reliably measurable to be recognised separately from goodwill; and
(b) precluding the recognition of an assembled workforce acquired in a business combination as an intangible asset separately from goodwill.

(See paragraphs 40 and BC100-BC102.)

Question 16—Do you believe that an intangible asset that is identifiable can always be measured with sufficient reliability to be recognised separately from goodwill? If not, why? Do you have any examples of an intangible asset that arises from legal or contractual rights and has both of the following characteristics:

(a) the intangible asset cannot be sold, transferred, licensed, rented, or exchanged individually or in combination with a related contract, asset, or liability; and
(b) cash flows that the intangible asset generates are inextricably linked with the cash flows that the business generates as a whole?

Response

No, in many cases the benefit from an identifiable intangible asset is obtained in combination with other assets and it may be difficult to measure its value on a standalone basis.

Examples of intangibles of the type referred to in the question may include state incentives or subsidies for setting up industries in specific locations or regulatory assets such as benefits given for revival of troubled enterprises.
Question

For the joint Exposure Draft, the boards considered the provisions of IAS 12 Income Taxes and FASB Statement No. 109 Accounting for Income Taxes, relating to an acquirer's deferred tax benefits that become recognisable because of a business combination. IAS 12 requires the acquirer to recognise separately from the business combination accounting any changes in its deferred tax assets that become recognisable because of the business combination. Such changes are recognised in post-combination profit or loss, or equity. On the other hand, SFAS 109 requires any recognition of an acquirer's deferred tax benefits (through the reduction of the acquirer's valuation allowance) that results from a business combination to be accounted for as part of the business combination, generally as a reduction of goodwill. The FASB decided to amend SFAS 109 to require the recognition of any changes in the acquirer's deferred tax benefits (through a change in the acquirer's previously recognised valuation allowance) as a transaction separately from the business combination. As amended, SFAS 109 would require such changes in deferred tax benefits to be recognised either in income from continuing operations in the period of the combination or directly to contributed capital, depending on the circumstances. Both boards decided to require disclosure of the amount of such acquisition-date changes in the acquirer's deferred tax benefits in the notes to the financial statements. (See paragraphs D4 and BC119-BC129.)

Question 17—Do you agree that any changes in an acquirer's deferred tax benefits that become recognisable because of the business combination are not part of the fair value of the acquiree and should be accounted for separately from the business combination? If not, why?

Response

We agree.

Question

The boards reconsidered disclosure requirements in IFRS 3 and SFAS 141 for the purposes of convergence. For some of the disclosures, the boards decided to converge. However, divergence continues to exist for some disclosures as described in the accompanying note Differences between the Exposure Drafts published by the IASB and the FASB. The boards concluded that some of this divergence stems from differences that are broader than the Business Combinations project.

Question 18—Do you believe it is appropriate for the IASB and the FASB to retain those disclosure differences? If not, which of the differences should be eliminated, if any, and how should this be achieved?

Response

We agree.

Question 19—Style of the Exposure Draft

The Exposure Draft was prepared in a style similar to the style used by the IASB in its standards in which paragraphs in bold type state the main principles. All paragraphs have equal authority.
Question 19—Do you find the bold type-plain type style of the Exposure Draft helpful? If not, why? Are there any paragraphs you believe should be in bold type, but are in plain type, or vice versa?

Response

We suggest the following changes to the bold text:

- Para 65 should be in Bold
- Para 68 should be in Bold

Further, Paragraphs 69 and 70 may be placed alongside the section on “Measuring and recognizing the assets acquired and liabilities assumed”.
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