

Ind AS Industry Insights

Hedge accounting under Ind AS 109 – Implications for the energy and resources industry



The bottom line

The new hedge accounting model under Ind AS 109 *Financial Instruments* will allow entities to reduce profit or loss and balance sheet volatility by applying hedge accounting in more circumstances. The change in accounting treatment is expected to prompt some companies to review their risk management activities which may have been previously restricted for the purpose of hedge accounting.

What's happened?

Currently, Indian accounting standards do not have a comprehensive framework for derivative instruments and hedge accounting. AS 11 *The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates* deals with foreign currency forward exchange contracts including those entered into to hedge the foreign currency risk of existing assets and liabilities. Forward exchange contracts entered into, to hedge a firm commitment or highly probably forecast transaction, are not within the scope of AS 11. As per ICAI's Announcement, where the accounting is not prescribed in current Indian GAAP, entities may apply the principles set out in AS 30 *Financial Instruments*:

Recognition and Measurement. However, if AS 30 is not applied, the ICAI Announcement *Accounting for Derivatives* requires that mark-to-market losses are recognized for outstanding derivative contracts as on the balance sheet date.

Going forward, for entities that transition to Ind AS, hedge accounting will be done as prescribed by Ind AS 109. The new model will more closely align an entity's hedge accounting with its risk management, resulting in more useful information for users of financial statements. The requirements are more principles-based than before and allow companies more opportunities to mitigate earnings volatility.

Some of the key areas impacting the energy and resources industry are highlighted below.

1. Hedged items

1.1 More opportunities to apply hedge accounting for non-financial items

The new Standard increases the range of economic hedges eligible for hedge accounting. For the energy and resources industry, this provides greater opportunity to achieve hedge accounting when hedging risk components of inputs to or outputs from operations.

What was the issue?

Previously, under AS 30, non-financial items could be designated as a hedged item (i) in their entirety i.e. for all risks, (ii) for foreign exchange (FX) risk, or (iii) for all risks except FX risk. Therefore, if an entity was hedging only a component of risk, for example the commodity component of a purchase contract, it could choose to (a) not apply hedge accounting for that component in isolation; or (b) designate the entire item or a proportion of it. Not applying hedge accounting or designating the entire item (or a proportion of it) when this was not the intention of the economic hedge gave rise to hedge ineffectiveness and profit or loss volatility that did not reflect the risk management objective of the hedge.

What has changed?

Upon transition to the new hedge accounting model under Ind AS 109, a risk component of a non-financial item will be eligible as a hedged item, provided it is "separately identifiable and reliably measurable". This criteria would generally be met if the risk component is contractually specified. It is also possible that non-specified risk components meet the criteria in some cases. Allowing a closer match between the hedged risk and the hedging derivative should result in more common risk management strategies to qualify for hedge accounting and therefore, lesser volatility (i.e., ineffectiveness) in profit or loss.

Example – Contractually specified risk components

Entity A has a long-term supply contract for natural gas that is priced using a contractually specified formula that references commodities and other factors (for example, gas oil, fuel oil and other components such as transport charges). Entity A hedges the gas oil component in its supply contract using a gas oil forward contract. The gas oil component is specified by the terms and conditions of the supply contract and therefore, it is a contractually specified risk component. In addition, because of the pricing formula, Entity A concludes that the gas oil price exposure is *separately identifiable*. At the same time, there is a market for gas oil forward contracts and therefore, Entity A concludes that the gas oil price exposure is *reliably measurable*. Consequently, the gas oil price exposure in the supply contract is a risk component that is eligible for designation as a hedged item.

Example – Non-contractually specified risk components

Entity B purchases coal of a particular quality of specific origin under a contract with the supplier. The purchase price comprises (i) a variable element that is linked to the benchmark price for coal

which is of a different grade/quality; and (ii) a fixed spread to reflect the different quality that is being purchased. Entity B enters into a coal futures contract to hedge its exposure to variability in cash flows from the benchmark coal price and designates it as the hedged item. However, the changes in the fixed spread relating to different quality may be excluded from the hedge relationship.

1.2 Fair value option for physically settled commodity contracts

Ind AS 109 introduces a fair value option for physically settled forward commodity contracts that meet the "own use" criteria and would otherwise be measured at cost (often nil and hence effectively off balance sheet). This option would be a practical alternative to applying fair value hedge accounting for entities that hedge such own use commodity contracts with financial derivatives measured at fair value through profit or loss.

What was the issue?

Certain contracts to buy or sell a non-financial item that qualify for "own use" are not subject to derivative accounting as they are outside the scope of AS 30 and are treated as regular sales and purchase contracts. A typical example includes a purchase of a commodity by an entity that uses it to produce goods for sale.

Some entities manage on an overall basis their net commodity risk exposure comprising the following – commodity inventories; physically settled executory forward purchase and sales contracts; and exchange traded futures and options measured at fair value. As some of the purchase and sale contracts may not be recognized in the statement of financial position this can lead to accounting mismatches. Because of the large number of transactions these entities enter into and the constant changes in the net exposure, hedge accounting is an onerous and sometimes impractical way of accounting for these transactions.

What has changed?

To mitigate the need for hedge accounting, the alternative requirements result in an extension of fair value option in Ind AS 109 to contracts that meet the "own use" scope exception if doing so eliminates or significantly reduces an accounting mismatch. On transition to Ind AS, entities will be allowed to designate contracts at fair value through profit or loss, but only if it meets the specific requirements and the entity designates all similar contracts.

2. Hedging instruments

2.1 Hedging with option contracts

Under the new standard, the accounting treatment of option contracts designated as hedging instruments would be less volatile in profit or loss. The new requirements apply to a variety of vanilla and structured option contracts including those that hedge commodity price risk, interest rate risk and foreign exchange risk.

What was the issue?

The fair value of an option consists of the intrinsic value and the time value. When using option contracts for hedging, only the intrinsic value is used for offsetting the fair value changes attributable to the hedged risk. Entities may designate an option as a hedging instrument in its entirety, or may separate the time value and designate only the intrinsic value. There is no change to this approach. However, under AS 30, the change in time value was recognized in profit or loss either way – (i) if the option was designated in its entirety, there was greater ineffectiveness resulting in a failed prospective assessment test with possible discontinuation of hedge accounting; (ii) if only the intrinsic value was designated, the time value would be accounted for at fair value through profit or loss, resulting in volatility in profit or loss.

What has changed?

Ind AS 109 does not change how an option is designated in a hedge relationship i.e., in its entirety or just the intrinsic value. However, the new standard requires the change in the time value of an option, which can be volatile, to be recognised initially in other comprehensive income (OCI), with subsequent recognition as a basis adjustment or in profit or loss on a more predictable basis (e.g. amortised over the life of the hedge or recognised as a single amount when the hedged item affects profit or loss). The objective of this approach is to eliminate the profit or loss volatility that would otherwise arise from fair valuing the time value directly through profit or loss.

Example

Entity D has INR as its functional currency and is in the process of purchasing new plant and machinery from a supplier in Europe. The purchase price is EUR 10 million and delivery is expected in 9 months' time. Entity D is exposed to foreign currency risk on this highly probable forecast transaction. The entity's risk management strategy is to hedge the downside risk by purchasing a call option for the foreign currency amount of EUR 10 million and designating only the intrinsic value of the call option. When the call option was purchased at inception, the time value was EUR 100,000. In this example, any fair value changes attributable to the time value of the option would be recognized in

OCI until the machinery is purchased and adjusted as a basis adjustment to the cost of the machinery rather than in profit or loss.

2.2 Forward element of forward contracts

What was the issue?

Previously, entities using foreign currency forward contracts in hedging relationships could designate either (i) the instrument in its entirety; or (ii) only the spot element. The second alternative i.e., to separate the interest element and designate only the spot price was permitted because the premium on the forward can generally be measured separately. Consequently, the interest element of the forward contract would be measured at fair value through profit or loss.

What has changed

Ind AS 109 allows an entity to exclude the forward element of a forward contract and designate only the changes in the spot element in a hedging relationship. In these cases, the normal hedge accounting mechanics apply to the designated spot element depending on the type of hedge (i.e., cash flow hedge, fair value hedge or net investment hedge).

For the undesignated forward element of the forward, there is a choice over how changes in its value are accounted for which allows the undesignated element to be treated in the same way as the undesignated time value of an option as discussed above. The choice is made on a hedge-by-hedge basis and applies for the term of the designated hedge.

Example

Entity E with INR functional currency has an investment in subsidiary S with € functional currency. In the group accounts, €1m of the net investment in the foreign operation is hedged for changes in the foreign exchange rate between INR and € using a forward contract where the forward points are calculated to be INR 200,000. The critical terms of the forward and the hedged item match. The term of the forward and the hedge is two years. The change in value of the undesignated forward element is deferred in other comprehensive income over the life of the hedge. Hence over the life INR 200,000 will be recognised in other comprehensive income. A hedge of a net investment in a foreign operation is a hedge of a time-period related hedged item hence the forward element amount is reclassified from equity to profit or loss over the two years of the hedge on a rational basis. In this situation, straight line amortisation would be regarded as

a rational basis hence INR 100,000 is reclassified from other comprehensive income to profit or loss each year such that at the end of two years the net accumulated forward element amount in equity is nil (i.e. INR 200,000 is deferred in other comprehensive income and INR 200,000 is reclassified from equity to profit or loss).

2.3 Synthetic or aggregated exposures

Entities often purchase or sell items that expose them to more than one type of risk. Common examples involve the purchase or sale of commodities in a foreign currency that involve exposures to commodity price risk, FX risk etc. The price risk may be hedged using a commodity futures contract while the FX risk may be hedged using a FX forward contract.

What was the issue?

The issue with using multiple derivatives for hedging a single transaction is that not all risks may be hedged for the same period – i.e., an entity may first enter into a futures contract to cover the price risk and enter into the FX forward contract after about a month. Since derivatives are precluded from being designated as part of a hedged item for hedge accounting under AS 30, the first hedge would have to be discontinued and re-designated along with the new derivative.

What has changed?

Under Ind AS 109, exposures that include derivatives (i.e. synthetic exposures) can be designated as eligible hedged items. Therefore, if an additional derivative is added to the hedge relationship at a subsequent date, it would not be necessary to discontinue and re-designate the original hedge relationship. This change should enhance the effectiveness of such hedges and make hedge accounting more achievable in practice.

Example

Consider Entity F with INR functional currency that has a forecast USD oil exposure hedged at \$100 with a forward oil contract designated in a hedging relationship. Unlike the previous requirements, Ind AS 109 allows the synthetic fixed price \$100

exposure to be treated as a hedged item in a subsequent hedge of the FX risk even though this hedged item includes a derivative (i.e. it includes the forward oil contract).

3. Effectiveness testing

Hedge accounting relationships would no longer have to meet the 80-125% offset criteria previously required for prospective and retrospective effectiveness testing. Instead an entity would need to demonstrate that an 'economic relationship' exists between the hedged item and hedging instrument on a prospective basis. This will reduce the burden of complying with the hedge accounting requirements. Under Ind AS 109, provided the economic relationship is present at the beginning of each hedged period, come the end of the period, actual hedge ineffectiveness is measured regardless of the amount. For example, if the hedge happens to be only 60% effective, then that is the effectiveness recorded (unlike previously where no hedge accounting would be applied because it falls outside the 80-125% range). This change could result in more hedging relationships qualifying for hedge accounting, especially when combined with other changes to the requirements.

Things to consider now

The changes introduced in Ind AS 109 should be well understood by not only the accounting function but also those responsible for risk management. Risk management policies should be reviewed in light of these changes and their effect on longer term risk management decisions considered. Furthermore, they should be considered as part of any planning and decisions around risk management, treasury and accounting systems.

Allowing hedge accounting for risk components in non-financial items will increase the scope for applying hedge accounting. However, greater judgement needs to be exercised when hedging risk components that are not contractually specified. Analysis to demonstrate that the hedged risk component is separately identifiable and reliably measurable will be necessary. Once these criteria are satisfied, the next hurdle will be to demonstrate that the hedge is expected to meet the hedge effectiveness requirements, although these are less restrictive under the new model.

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 has been prepared by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India LLP ("DTTILLP"), a member of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, on a specific request from you and contains proprietary and confidential information. This material may contain information sourced from publicly available information or other third party sources. DTTILLP does not independently verify any such sources and is not responsible for any loss whatsoever caused due to reliance placed on information sourced from such sources. The information contained in this material is intended solely for you. Any disclosure, copying or further distribution of this material or its contents is strictly prohibited. Nothing in this material creates any contractual relationship between DTTILLP and you. Any mutually binding legal obligations or rights may only be created between you and DTTILLP upon execution of a legally binding contract. By using this material and any information contained in it, the user accepts this entire notice and terms of use.

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

Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Private Limited (U74140MH199 5PTC093339), a private company limited by shares, was converted into Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India LLP, a limited liability partnership (LLP Identification No. AAE-8458), with effect from October 1, 2015.