



Deloitte.

Manufacturing Spotlight
Revenue Recognition
Remodelled

February 2015

Contents

Executive summary	3
Background	4
Key Accounting Issues	5
Considerations and Challenges for Manufacturing Entities	13
Thinking Ahead	14

Executive summary

- On May 28, 2014, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) issued their final standard on revenue from contracts with customers. The standard, issued as Accounting Standards Update 2014-09 (and codified as Topic 606 in the FASB Accounting Standards Codification) by the FASB and as IFRS 15 by the IASB, outlines a single comprehensive model for entities to use in accounting for revenue arising from contracts with customers and supersedes most current revenue recognition guidance, including industry-specific guidance¹.
- The Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI) has recently issued an Exposure Draft (ED) of the proposed Indian Accounting Standard (Ind AS) 115, Revenue from Contracts with Customers i.e. the proposed IFRS Converged accounting standard for Indian entities, which is similar to IFRS 15.
- The new revenue recognition standard requires management to use judgment to (1) determine whether contracts with one customer (or related parties) should be combined and treated as a single contract, (2) identify the performance obligations in a contract (i.e., the unit of account), and (3) determine the transaction price.
- Variable consideration that may be created by sales incentives, such as volume discounts or customer rebates, will need to be estimated and may be constrained.
- Revenue from contracts for customised parts that an entity creates by providing a “service” to a customer (i.e., the parts have no alternative use to the entity and the entity has a right to payment for performance to date) will need to be recognised over time as the parts are constructed.
- An entity will need to determine whether contract costs should be capitalised and amortised as goods and services are transferred to the customer or whether such costs should be expensed as incurred.
- Since the new standard requires significantly more extensive disclosures, manufacturing entities may need to modify their systems and processes to gather information about contracts with customers that is not otherwise readily available.
- This Manufacturing Spotlight discusses the framework of the new revenue model and highlights key accounting issues and potential challenges for manufacturing entities.

The new revenue standard outlines a single comprehensive model for entities to use in accounting for revenue arising from contracts with customers and supersedes most current revenue recognition guidance, including industry-specific guidance.

¹ The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has indicated that it plans to review and update the revenue recognition guidance in SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) Topic 13, “Revenue Recognition,” in light of the issue of the new standard. The extent to which the new standard will affect a public entity will depend on whether the SEC removes or amends the guidance in SAB Topic 13 to be consistent with the new revenue standard.

Background

The goals of the new revenue recognition standard are (1) streamlining, and removing inconsistencies from, revenue recognition requirements; (2) providing “a more robust framework for addressing revenue issues”; (3) making revenue recognition practices more comparable; and (4) increasing the usefulness of disclosures. The new revenue recognition standard states that the core principle for revenue recognition is that an “entity shall recognise revenue to depict the transfer of promised goods or services to customers in an amount that reflects the consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled in exchange for those goods or services.”

The new standard indicates that an entity should perform the following five steps in recognising revenue:-

- “Identify the contract(s) with a customer” (step 1);
- “Identify the performance obligations in the contract” (step 2);
- “Determine the transaction price” (step 3);
- “Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations in the contract” (step 4); and
- “Recognise revenue when (or as) the entity satisfies a performance obligation” (step 5)

As a result of the new standard, entities will need to comprehensively reassess their current revenue accounting and determine whether changes are necessary.

As a result of the new standard, entities will need to comprehensively reassess their current revenue accounting and determine whether changes are necessary. Entities are also required to provide significantly expanded disclosures about revenue recognition, including both quantitative and qualitative information about (1) the amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue (and related cash flows) from contracts with customers; (2) the judgment, and changes in judgment, used in applying the revenue model; and (3) the assets recognised from costs to obtain or fulfil a contract with a customer.

Key Accounting Issues

This manufacturing spotlight discusses the new revenue model and highlights key accounting issues and potential challenges for manufacturing entities including entities in chemicals, industrial products and metals sub-sectors.

Collectability

The new standard establishes a collectability threshold under which an entity must determine whether “[i]t is probable that the entity will collect the consideration to which it will be entitled.” If the threshold is not met, the entity is precluded from applying the remaining steps in the new standard and recognising revenue until it is probable² that the consideration will be collected. Any amounts received, before collectability is considered as probable, would be recorded as revenue only if the consideration received is non-refundable and either (1) all performance obligations in the contract have been satisfied and substantially all of the promised consideration has been received or (2) the contract has been terminated or canceled. If those conditions are not met, any consideration received would be recognised as a liability.

For contracts that have a variable sales price (including price concessions), entities would first estimate the consideration due under the contract (see **Variable Consideration** below) and would then apply the collectability threshold to the estimated transaction price.

Thinking It Through

Currently, certain entities under U.S. GAAP defer revenue recognition until cash is received as per SAB Topic 13.A. Under the new standard, further deferral could be recognised even when non-refundable cash has been received.

Contract Combination

Entities must also assess whether to account for multiple contracts as a single contract. The new standard requires entities to combine contracts entered into at or around the same time with the same customer (or parties related to the customer) if one or more of the following criteria are met:

- “The contracts are negotiated as a package with a single commercial objective.”
- “The amount of consideration to be paid in one contract depends on the price or performance of the other contract.”
- “The goods or services promised in the contracts (or some goods or services promised in each of the contracts) are a single performance obligation.”

Unlike current revenue recognition guidance, under which entities may consider combining contracts in certain circumstances, the new standard requires contract combination when certain criteria are met.

² Under U.S. GAAP, “probable” refers to a “future event or events [that] are likely to occur.” This threshold is considered higher than “probable” as used in IFRSs and Ind AS, under which the term means “more likely than not.”

Example

Entity A, an industrial products supplier located in India, enters into two separate contracts with Entity B to supply parts: one with Entity B's U.S. subsidiary and one with its Chinese subsidiary. Because the contracts are with the same customer, Entity A would be required to assess whether the contract-combination criteria are met. Specifically, if the pricing in one contract depends on the price or performance of the other contract, Entity A may be required to account for the two contracts as a single contract.

Thinking It Through

Unlike current revenue recognition guidance, under which entities may consider combining contracts in certain circumstances, the new standard requires contract combination when certain criteria are met. Manufacturing entities often enter into multiple contracts with the same customer around the same time but may not specifically evaluate whether those contracts are interdependent. After establishing controls to ensure that this evaluation is performed, manufacturing entities may need to use judgment to determine whether the new standard's contract-combination criteria are met. A conclusion that the criteria are met could significantly affect (1) how performance obligations are identified, (2) how consideration is allocated to those obligations, or (3) when revenue is ultimately recognised. Note that contracts with different customers (that are not related parties) would not be combined.

Contract Modification

The new standard requires entities to account for contract modifications as separate contracts if such modifications result in (1) the addition of "distinct" performance obligations (see **Identification of Performance Obligations** below) and (2) an increase in the price of the contract by an amount of consideration that reflects the entity's stand-alone selling price for the separate performance obligations. For a contract modification that does not meet the criteria to be accounted for as a separate contract, an entity must determine whether it should be accounted for (1) as a termination of the original contract and the creation of a new contract (i.e., the amount of consideration not yet recognised would be allocated to the remaining performance obligations) or (2) as if it were part of the original contract (i.e., the entity would update the transaction price and the measure of progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation and would record a cumulative catch-up adjustment to revenue). The new standard provides specific guidance on making this determination. Depending on how revenue is recognised (i.e., over time or at a point in time) and the terms of a contract modification, the amount of current and ongoing revenue recognised can dramatically differ.

Identification of Performance Obligations

The new standard requires entities to evaluate the goods and services promised in a contract to identify "performance obligations." Specifically, the new standard requires an entity to account for a "distinct" good or service (or bundle of goods or services) or a series of distinct goods or services (if they are substantially the same and have the same pattern of transfer) as a performance obligation (i.e., a separate unit of account).

The new standard defines a distinct good or service as one that meets both of the following criteria:

- "The customer can benefit from the good or service either on its own or together with other resources that are readily available to the customer (that is, the good or service is capable of being distinct)."
- "The entity's promise to transfer the good or service to the customer is separately identifiable from other promises in the contract (that is, the good or service is distinct within the context of the contract)."

The new standard requires entities to evaluate the goods and services promised in a contract to identify "performance obligations".

A good or service that does not meet these criteria would be combined with other goods or services in the contract until the criteria are met. The new standard provides the following indicators for evaluating whether a promised good or service is separable from other promises in a contract:

- “The entity does not provide a significant service of integrating the good or service with other goods or services promised in the contract In other words, the entity is not using the good or service as an input to produce or deliver the combined output specified by the customer.”
- “The good or service does not significantly modify or customise another good or service promised in the contract.”
- “The good or service is not highly dependent on, or highly interrelated with, other goods or services promised in the contract. For example, the fact that a customer could decide to not purchase the good or service without significantly affecting the other promised goods or services.”

Thinking It Through

Manufacturing entities may promise to provide multiple goods or services to their customers in a single contract. Under current revenue recognition guidance, entities may conclude that certain deliverables are inconsequential or perfunctory obligations or that they constitute “marketing” deliverables. However, the new revenue standard does not have an exception for inconsequential or perfunctory obligations or for obligations that constitute marketing deliverables. An entity may need to use significant judgment in identifying all the goods or services in contracts with a customer and applying the above criteria to determine each performance obligation (especially when considering the new concept of “distinct within the context of the contract”).

Variable Consideration

Manufacturing entities often offer sales incentives to their customers, such as volume discounts, rebates, or price concessions, which create variability in the pricing of the goods or services offered to customers. Under the new standard, if the transaction price is subject to variability, an entity would be required to estimate the transaction price by using either (1) the “expected value” (probability-weighted) approach or (2) the “most likely amount” approach, “depending on which method the entity expects to better predict the amount of consideration to which the entity will be entitled.” Therefore, entities will need to use judgment in determining whether the expected value or the most likely amount is more predictive of the amount of consideration in the contract.

Regardless of which technique is used to estimate the transaction price, some or all of an estimate of variable consideration is only included in the transaction price to the extent that it is probable³ “that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognised will not occur when the uncertainty associated with the variable consideration is subsequently resolved” (this concept is commonly referred to as the “constraint”). As a result, entities may have to recognise some or all of the probability-weighted amount or most likely amount estimated.

Entities will need to use judgment in determining whether the expected value or the most likely amount is more predictive of the amount of consideration in the contract.

³ Like the term “probable” regarding the collectability threshold, “probable” in this context has the same meaning i.e. the “event or events are likely to occur.” In IFRS 15 and Ind AS 115, the term “highly probable” is used, which has the same meaning as the U.S. GAAP’s “probable.”

Thinking It Through

Entities should consider factors that could indicate that an estimate of variable consideration is subject to significant reversal, such as susceptibility to factors outside the entity's influence (e.g., subsequent third-party sales, volatility in a market, weather conditions), limited experience with similar types of contracts, long period before uncertainty is resolved, practices of providing concessions, or a broad range of possible consideration amounts. Some or all of an estimate of variable consideration is only included in the transaction price to the extent that it is probable that subsequent changes in the estimate would not result in a "significant reversal" of revenue (this concept is commonly referred to as the "constraint"). The new standard requires entities to update this estimate in each reporting period to reflect changes in facts and circumstances.

Adjusting for the Time Value of Money

The new standard requires entities to adjust the transaction price for the time value of money when a significant financing component exists (and provides guidance on determining when such a financing exists). The objective of this requirement is to adjust the promised amount of consideration to reflect what the selling price would have been if the customer had paid cash for the goods or services at the time (or over the period during which) such goods or services were transferred to the customer.

As a practical expedient, an entity is not required to account for a significant financing component in a contract if, at contract inception, the expected time between payment and the transfer of the promised goods and services is one year or less.⁴

The new standard would not require an entity to account for a significant financing component if the payment terms were structured for reasons other than "for the provision of finance."

Thinking It Through

Manufacturing entities commonly enter into contracts with varying payment terms. To the extent that an entity receives an up-front payment for which the related revenue will be recognised over several years (i.e., the customer is providing the entity with financing) or the customer is not required to pay for a certain period after a performance obligation is satisfied (i.e., the entity is providing the customer with financing), the transaction price may need to be adjusted for the time value of money (as if a hypothetical loan was provided to one of the parties in the contract).

However, in some situations, the payment terms may be structured for reasons other than financing (e.g., to protect customers from the entity's failure to adequately complete some or all of its obligations under a contract). The new standard would not require an entity to account for a significant financing component if the payment terms were structured for reasons other than "for the provision of finance."

⁴ Example 30 in the new revenue standard under U.S. GAAP and IFRS mentions some of the illustrative factors to consider in the assessment of whether the payment terms in a contract were structured primarily for reasons other than the provision of finance to the entity.

Recognising Revenue

Under the new standard, entities recognise revenue as “control” of the goods or services underlying a performance obligation is transferred to the customer.⁵ This control-based model differs from the risks-and-rewards model generally applied under current revenue recognition guidance. Entities must first determine whether control is transferred over time. If not, it is transferred at a point in time. Under the new standard, control is transferred over time if any of the following criteria are met:

- “The customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits provided by the entity’s performance as the entity performs.”
- “The entity’s performance creates or enhances an asset . . . that the customer controls as the asset is created or enhanced.”
- “The entity’s performance does not create an asset with an alternative use to the entity and the entity has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date.”

If none of these criteria are met, an entity would determine the point in time at which the customer obtains control of the good or service. Factors indicating that control has been transferred at a point in time include, but are not limited to, the following:⁶

- “The entity has a present right to payment for the asset.”
- “The customer has legal title to the asset.”
- “The entity has transferred physical possession of the asset.”
- “The customer has the significant risks and rewards of ownership of the asset.”
- “The customer has accepted the asset.”

After carefully evaluating whether revenue should be recognised over time (as production occurs) or at a point in time (most likely when the customer obtains the goods or services), manufacturing entities will need to determine either how to measure progress toward satisfying the performance obligation over time or, if the performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time, the specific point at which control has been transferred to the customer.

Thinking It Through

A manufacturing entity may manufacture for a customer a customised part that will have no alternative use (e.g., only one customer can use the part because of its specialised nature). In evaluating the payment terms, when an entity determines under the new standard that it has an enforceable right to payment throughout the production process and the goods do not have an alternative use, the entity is providing a production service and is required to recognise revenue over time (as production occurs). If the entity recognises revenue at a point in time, it will have to use judgment in evaluating the indicators for determining when “delivery” has occurred.

Shipping Terms

Manufacturing entities may ship goods “FOB shipping point” but have arrangements with their customers under which the seller continues to bear risk of loss or damage (either explicitly or implicitly) that is not covered by the carrier while the product is in transit. If damage or loss occurs under these circumstances, the seller may be obligated to provide (or may have a practice of providing) the buyer with replacement products at no additional cost. The seller may insure this risk with a third party or “self-insure” the risk.

Such shipping terms are often called synthetic FOB destination shipping terms because the seller has retained the risk of loss or damage during transit. Under these terms, all risks and rewards of ownership have not been substantively transferred to the buyer, and it would not be appropriate to recognise revenue before the goods are ultimately delivered to the buyer under current revenue recognition guidance.

⁵ Control of an asset refers to the ability to direct the use of and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the asset as well as the ability to prevent other entities from directing the use of and obtaining the benefits from the asset.

⁶ The individual indicators listed here are not definitive in and of themselves. An entity would consider all relevant facts and circumstances when determining the point in time at which control is transferred to the customer.

Under the new standard, entities are required to recognise revenue by using a control-based model rather than the risks-and-rewards model of current revenue recognition guidance. Accordingly, entities would consider indicators (see **Recognising Revenue** above) in evaluating the point at which control of an asset has been transferred to a customer.

Thinking It Through

Under the new standard, arrangements involving synthetic FOB destination shipping terms may give rise to two performance obligations: (1) sale of a product and (2) protection against the risk of loss during transit. Instead of deferring all revenue recognition in such circumstances, manufacturing entities need to allocate the transaction price to each identified performance obligation and assess the satisfaction of each performance obligation separately. In such cases, revenue recognition could be accelerated depending on the determination of when control related to the underlying performance obligations is transferred.

Contract Costs

The new standard contains criteria for determining when to capitalise costs associated with obtaining and fulfilling a contract.

- *Incremental costs of obtaining a contract* — Entities are required to recognise an asset for incremental costs of obtaining a contract (e.g., sales commissions) when those costs are expected to be recovered (the new standard provides a practical expedient allowing entities to “expense these costs when incurred if the amortisation period is one year or less”).
- *Fulfillment costs* — Costs of fulfilling a contract (that are not within the scope of other guidance) would be capitalised only when they (1) are directly related to a contract, (2) generate or enhance resources that will be used to satisfy performance obligations, and (3) are expected to be recovered. The new standard also requires entities to expense certain costs, such as those related to satisfied (or partially satisfied) performance obligations.

The new standard contains criteria for determining when to capitalise costs associated with obtaining and fulfilling a contract.

Capitalised costs would be amortised in a manner consistent with the pattern of transfer of the goods or services to which the asset is related (i.e., as the related revenue is recognised). In certain circumstances, the amortisation period may extend beyond the original contract term (e.g., when future anticipated contracts or expected renewal periods exist). All capitalised-cost assets would be subject to impairment testing if any impairment indicators exist.

Thinking It Through

Manufacturing entities may need to consider the impact of the new standard on their current policies for capitalising the costs of obtaining a contract. Under current revenue recognition standards, there is limited guidance on the capitalisation of such costs, and entities generally make an accounting policy election to expense them or, in certain cases, to capitalise them.

Warranties

Manufacturing entities often sell products with warranties that assure customers that the products comply with agreed-upon specifications. In some cases, entities may also offer more extensive warranties (e.g., warranties that provide services for a fixed period after the initial warranty period has expired).

The new standard allows entities to continue to use a cost accrual model to account for warranty obligations, but only for warranties ensuring that the good or service complies with agreed-upon specifications. To the extent that a warranty provides a service beyond ensuring that the good or service complies with agreed-upon specifications, it would be accounted for as a performance obligation (consideration would be allocated to this obligation and recognised as it is satisfied). Further, if the customer has the option to purchase the warranty separately, it would also be accounted for as a performance obligation.

Product liabilities, such as compensation paid by an entity for harm or damage caused by its product, do not represent a performance obligation in the contract and would continue to be accounted for in accordance with the existing literature on loss contingencies/provisions.

Thinking It Through

The new standard should not change the accounting for most warranties (i.e., typical warranties assuring that the good or service complies with agreed-upon specifications), which are generally accounted for under a cost accrual model. However, manufacturing entities may want to reassess all of their warranties to ensure that the warranties are not providing any services beyond assuring the customer that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications.

Disclosures

The new standard requires entities to disclose both quantitative and qualitative information that enables “users of financial statements to understand the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows arising from contracts with customers.” The new standard’s disclosure requirements, which are significantly more comprehensive than those in existing revenue standards, include the following (with certain exceptions for nonpublic entities):

The new standard requires entities to disclose both quantitative and qualitative information that enables “users of financial statements to understand the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows arising from contracts with customers.”

- Presentation or disclosure of revenue and any impairment losses recognised separately from other sources of revenue or impairment losses from other contracts.
- A disaggregation of revenue to “depict how the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors” (the new standard also provides implementation guidance).
- Information about (1) contract assets and liabilities (including changes in those balances), (2) the amount of revenue recognised in the current period that was previously recognised as a contract liability, and (3) the amount of revenue recognised in the current period that is related to performance obligations satisfied in prior periods.
- Information about performance obligations (e.g., types of goods or services, significant payment terms, typical timing of satisfying obligations, and other provisions).
- Information about an entity’s transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations, including (in certain circumstances) the “aggregate amount of the transaction price allocated to the performance obligations that are unsatisfied (or partially unsatisfied)” and when the entity expects to recognise that amount as revenue.
- A description of the significant judgments, and changes in those judgments, that affect the amount and timing of revenue recognition (including information about the timing of satisfaction of performance obligations, the determination of the transaction price, and the allocation of the transaction price to performance obligations).
- Information about an entity’s accounting for costs to obtain or fulfill a contract (including account balances and amortisation methods).
- Information about the policy decisions (i.e., whether the entity used the practical expedients for significant financing components and contract costs allowed by the new standard).

Considerations and Challenges for Manufacturing Entities

Systems, Processes and Controls

To comply with the new standard's accounting and disclosure requirements, manufacturing entities will have to gather and track information that they may not have previously monitored. The systems and processes associated with such information may need to be modified to support the capture of additional data elements that may not currently be supported by legacy systems. Manufacturing entities with large volumes of sales deals may find it operationally challenging to assess each sales deal to categorise and account for customer incentives in accordance with the new standard. Such entities may need to make substantial system modifications to facilitate this process.

Manufacturing entities may also face challenges when they recognise as an asset certain costs of obtaining or fulfilling a contract (as opposed to recognising such costs as expenses immediately, if the amortisation period is one year or less). In such cases, manufacturing entities may need to revise their accounting practices and make appropriate system modifications to track data on contract duration, contract costs, and periodic amortisation and impairment testing of capitalised costs.

Further, to ensure the effectiveness of internal controls over financial reporting, management will need to assess whether additional controls should be implemented. Manufacturing entities may also need to begin aggregating essential data from new and existing contracts since many of these contracts will most likely be subject to the new standard.

Note that the above are only a few examples of changes manufacturing entities may need to make to their systems, processes, and controls. Manufacturing entities should evaluate all aspects of the new standard's requirements to determine whether any other modifications may be necessary.

Increased Use of Judgment

Management will need to exercise significant judgment in applying certain aspects of the new standard's requirements, including those related to the identification of performance obligations and allocation of revenue to each performance obligation. It is important for manufacturing entities to consider how the new standard specifically applies to them so that they can prepare for any changes in revenue recognition patterns.

Retrospective Application

Exposure Draft of Ind AS 115 does not provide for any transitional provisions and retrospective applications.

To comply with the new standard's accounting and disclosure requirements, consumer products entities will have to gather and track information that they may not have previously monitored.

Thinking Ahead

Although the exposure draft on revenue recognition is not effective until finalised by the ICAI and notified by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, manufacturing entities should start carefully examining the exposure draft and assessing the impact it may have on their current accounting policies, procedures, systems, and processes.

For more information, please contact – ingiosindia@deloitte.com

For our publication Automotive Spotlight on new revenue recognition model, click [here](#).

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee (“DTTL”), its network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL (also referred to as “Deloitte Global”) does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about for a more detailed description of DTTL and its member firms.

This material and the information contained herein prepared by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Private Limited (DTTIPL) is intended to provide general information on a particular subject or subjects and is not an exhaustive treatment of such subject(s) and DTTIPL, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, its member firms, or their related parties (collectively, the “Deloitte Network”) is not, by means of this publication, rendering accounting, business, financial, investment, legal, tax, or other professional advice or services. This publication is not a substitute for such professional advice or services, nor should it be used as a basis for any decision or action that may affect your business. Before making any decision or taking any action that might affect your personal finances or business, you should consult a qualified professional adviser.

No entity in the Deloitte Network shall be responsible for any loss whatsoever sustained by any person who relies on this material.

© 2015 Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Private Limited. Member of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited