

Contents

Foreword	iv
Acknowledgments and Contact Information	v
Introduction	vi
Updates to Guidance	1
Revenue Recognition	2
Leases	10
Financial Instruments	13
Impairment	13
Classification and Measurement	17
Measurement-Period Adjustments	18
Simplifying the Transition to the Equity Method of Accounting	20
Consolidation — Interests Held Through Related Parties That Are Under Common Control	21
Employee Share-Based Payment Accounting Improvements	22
Classification of Deferred Taxes	27
Alternatives for Private Companies	28
Statement of Cash Flows: Classification of Certain Cash Receipts and Cash Payments	30
Restricted Cash	33
On the Horizon	35
Financial Instruments	36
Hedging	36
Liabilities and Equity — Targeted Improvements	39
Simplifying the Balance Sheet Classification of Debt	41
Goodwill and Business Combinations	43
Subsequent Accounting for Goodwill for Public Business Entities and Not-for-Profit Entities, Including Goodwill Impairment	43
Clarifying the Definition of a Business	44
Accounting for Identifiable Intangible Assets in a Business Combination	46
Accounting for Derecognition and Partial Sales of Nonfinancial Assets	46
Modification Accounting for Share-Based Payment Arrangements	48
Nonemployee Share-Based Payment Accounting Improvements	51
Disclosures by Business Entities About Government Assistance	52

Contents

Disclosure Framework	53
FASB's Decision Process	53
Entity's Decision Process	54
Topic-Specific Disclosure Reviews	54
Next Steps	54
Fair Value Measurement	55
Income Taxes	58
Defined Benefit Plans	61
Other Topics	62
SEC and AICPA Updates	63
Summary of Accounting Pronouncements Effective in 2016	74
Appendixes	78
Appendix A — Glossary of Standards and Other Literature	79
Appendix B — Abbreviations	87

Foreword

December 2, 2016

To our clients and colleagues in the real estate sector:

We are pleased to announce our ninth annual accounting and financial reporting update. Some of the notable standard-setting developments that occurred since the previous edition were the issuance of (1) new guidance on the accounting for leases and the impairment of financial instruments, (2) new guidance to clarify the classification of certain cash receipts and payments in the statement of cash flows, and (3) refinements to the FASB's new guidance on the recognition of revenue from contracts with customers.

This publication is divided into three sections: (1) "Updates to Guidance," which highlights changes to accounting and reporting standards that real estate entities need to start preparing for now; (2) "On the Horizon," which discusses standard-setting topics that will affect real estate entities as they plan for the future; and (3) "Other Topics" that may be of interest to entities in the real estate sector.

The annual accounting and financial reporting updates for the banking and securities, insurance, and investment management sectors are available (or will be available soon) on [US GAAP Plus](#), Deloitte's Web site for accounting and financial reporting news.

As always, we encourage you to contact your local Deloitte office for additional information and assistance.

Sincerely,



Chris Dubrowski
Real Estate Industry
Professional Practice Director
Deloitte & Touche LLP



Bob O'Brien
Global Real Estate Leader
Deloitte & Touche LLP

Acknowledgments and Contact Information

We would like to thank the following individuals for their contributions to this publication:

Johnnie Akin	David Eisenberg	Stephen McKinney	Christine Reicheneder
Teri Asarito	Trevor Farber	Peter McLaughlin	Shahid Shah
Alex Braser	Mark Fischer	Morgan Miles	Inderjeet Singh
Ermir Berberi	John Franco	Adrian Mills	Stefanie Tamulis
Mark Bolton	Rachel Grandovic	Emily Montgomery	PJ Theisen
Lynne Campbell	Emily Hache	Rob Morris	Andrew Warren
Ashley Carpenter	Eric Hatch	Jeff Nick	John Wilde
Chris Cryderman	Ben Johnson	Magnus Orrell	Karen Wiltsie
Amy Davidson	Colin Kronmiller	Jeanine Pagliaro	Andrew Winters
Jamie Davis	Michelle Lacey	Amy Park	Sandy Zapata
Joe DiLeo	Michael Lorenzo	Taylor Paul	
Geri Driscoll	Mat Lorie	Lauren Pesa	

If you have any questions about this publication, please contact any of the following Deloitte industry specialists:

Chris Dubrowski

Real Estate Industry
Professional Practice Director
+1 203 708 4718
cdubrowski@deloitte.com

James Brant

Real Estate Industry
Deputy Professional Practice Director —
Engineering and Construction
+1 513 784 7348
jbrant@deloitte.com

Bob O'Brien

Global Real Estate Leader
+1 312 486 2717
robrien@deloitte.com

Wyn Smith

Real Estate Industry
Deputy Professional Practice Director
+1 469 417 2209
gesmith@deloitte.com

Susan L. Freshour

Financial Services Industry
Professional Practice Director
+1 212 436 4814
sfreshour@deloitte.com

Introduction

The real estate market continued its modest recovery from 2013 through 2016, but it may be approaching the peak of the recovery cycle. Looking ahead, we believe that the impact of financial regulations under the Dodd Frank Act and Basel III will likely create a challenging financing environment for many individuals looking to invest in real estate. Higher interest rates and risk are expected outcomes of the new regulations. Through the third quarter of 2016, the national home price index gained single-digit year-to-date returns compared with double-digit growth in 2013. We can expect this growth to further decrease as interest rates increase.

Accounting Changes

In February 2016, after working many years on a new lease accounting standard, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-02](#). The guidance is intended to address concerns related to off-balance sheet financing, as it brings most leases onto the balance sheets of lessees. From a lessor perspective, accounting for lease revenue will essentially be unchanged under the new standard, and most real estate leases will continue to be classified as operating leases.

In June 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-13](#), which provides guidance on the impairment of financial instruments. The ASU introduces the current expected credit loss model, which is an impairment model based on expected rather than incurred losses. This new impairment model is intended to result in more timely recognition of impairment losses since it requires an entity to recognize its estimate of expected credit losses at the earliest reporting date such expectations arise.

In August 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-15](#), which adds clarifying guidance on the classification of certain cash payments and receipts on the statement of cash flows. This guidance was based on a project of the FASB's Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF) that focused on eight types of cash flows including (1) debt prepayment or debt extinguishment costs, (2) settlement of zero-coupon bonds, (3) contingent consideration payments made after a business combination, (4) proceeds from the settlement of insurance claims, and (5) distributions received from equity method investees. The purpose of this project was to reduce diversity in practice and provide specific guidance for classification of these cash flows.

In November 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-18](#), which amends ASC 230 to clarify the guidance on the classification and presentation of restricted cash. The ASU was based on consensuses reached by the EITF.

The FASB is also currently working on projects that real estate entities should continue to monitor, including (1) clarifying the definition of a business, (2) clarifying the scope of asset derecognition in transactions with non-customers, (3) accounting for partial sales of nonfinancial assets, and (4) hedging of financial instruments.

For additional information about industry issues and trends, see Deloitte's [2016 Financial Services Industry Outlooks](#).

Updates to Guidance

Revenue Recognition

Background

In May 2014, the FASB issued [ASU 2014-09](#), which 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 (e.g., certain sections of ASC 360-20 and ASC 970-605). For additional information about ASU 2014-09 as issued, see Deloitte's May 28, 2014, [Heads Up](#) and July 2014 [Financial Services Spotlight](#).

In response to concerns the FASB received related to applying the ASU's requirements, the Board in 2016 issued the following four ASUs, which amend the ASU's new revenue recognition guidance:

- [ASU 2016-08, Principal Versus Agent Considerations \(Reporting Revenue Gross Versus Net\)](#) — The ASU addresses issues related to how an entity should assess whether it is the principal or the agent in contracts that include three or more parties. The amendments provide guidance on (1) how to determine the unit of account, (2) whether the indicators in ASU 2014-09 are intended to help entities perform a single evaluation of control or represent an additional evaluation, and (3) how certain indicators are related to the general control principle. The ASU also clarifies that an entity should evaluate whether it is the principal or the agent for each good or service specified in a contract and thus whether an entity could be both the principal and agent for different performance obligations in the same contract. See Deloitte's March 22, 2016, [Heads Up](#) for more information.
- [ASU 2016-10, Identifying Performance Obligations and Licensing](#) — The ASU's amendments clarify the guidance on an entity's identification of certain performance obligations. Changes include guidance on immaterial promised goods and services and separately identifiable promises as well as (1) a policy election for shipping and handling fees incurred after control transfers and (2) clarifications related to licenses. See Deloitte's April 15, 2016, [Heads Up](#) for more information.
- [ASU 2016-11, Rescission of SEC Guidance Because of Accounting Standards Updates 2014-09 and 2014-16 Pursuant to Staff Announcements at the March 3, 2016 EITF Meeting \(SEC Update\)](#) — The ASU rescinds the following guidance, which is based on announcements made by the SEC staff at the Emerging Issues Task Force's (EITF's) March 3, 2016, meeting, upon an entity's adoption of ASU 2014-09:
 - Revenue and expense recognition for freight services in process (ASC 605-20-S99-2).
 - Accounting for shipping and handling fees and costs (ASC 605-45-S99-1).
 - Accounting for consideration given by a vendor to a customer (ASC 605-50-S99-1).
 - Accounting for gas-balancing arrangements (ASC 932-10-S99-5).

Revenue Recognition

- [ASU 2016-12, Narrow-Scope Improvements and Practical Expedients](#) — The guidance (1) clarifies how to assess whether collectibility is probable in certain circumstances to support the existence of a contract, (2) adds a practical expedient for the presentation of sales taxes on a net basis in revenue, (3) clarifies how to account for noncash consideration at contract inception and throughout the contract period, and (4) establishes a practical expedient to address contract modifications upon transition. See Deloitte's May 11, 2016, [Heads Up](#) for more information.

In addition to the ASUs above, the FASB on [May 18, 2016](#), and [September 19, 2016](#), issued proposed ASUs that would make technical corrections (i.e., minor changes and improvements) to certain aspects of ASU 2014-09 related to the following topics:

- *Contract costs — impairment testing* — The proposed amendments “would clarify that when performing impairment testing an entity should (a) consider expected contract renewals and extensions and (b) include both the amount of consideration it already has received but has not recognized as revenue and the amount the entity expects to receive in the future.”
- *Disclosure of remaining performance obligations* — The proposed amendments would (1) “provide practical expedients to the disclosure requirement for remaining performance obligations for specific situations in which an entity need not estimate variable consideration in order to recognize revenue” and (2) “expand the information disclosed when an entity applies one of the practical expedients.”
- *Contract modifications example* — The proposed amendments “would improve the alignment of Example 7 and the [contract modifications] principles in Topic 606.”
- *Cost capitalization for advisers to private and public funds* — The proposed amendments “would align the cost-capitalization guidance for advisers to both public funds and private funds in Topic 946.”
- *Loan guarantee fees* — The proposed amendments “would clarify that guarantee fees within the scope of Topic 460 (other than product or service warranties) are not within the scope of Topic 606.”
- *Contract asset versus receivable* — The proposed amendments “would provide a better link between the analysis in Example 38, Case B and the receivables presentation guidance in Topic 606.”
- *Advertising costs* — The proposed amendments “would reinstate the guidance on the accrual of advertising costs.”

The amendments are being proposed in response to feedback received from several sources, including the transition resource group (TRG) for revenue recognition, and would clarify, rather than change, the new revenue standard's core revenue recognition principles. The Board discussed the proposed technical corrections at its August 31, 2016, and October 19, 2016, meetings. See Deloitte's [September 1, 2016](#), and [October 21, 2016](#), journal entries for more information on the Board's discussions.



Thinking It Through

ASU 2014-09 will significantly affect the accounting for real estate sales. The ASU eliminates the bright-line guidance that entities currently apply under ASC 360-20 when evaluating when to derecognize real estate assets and how to measure the profit on the disposal. It will change the accounting for both real estate sales that are part of an entity's ordinary activities (i.e., real estate transactions with customers) and real estate sales that are not part of the entity's ordinary activities. While the ASU eliminates the guidance in ASC 360-20 on real estate sales, entities will still need to apply ASC 360-20 to sales of real estate that are part of sale-leaseback transactions until their adoption of the new leasing standard.

Key Accounting Issues

Some of the key accounting issues and potential challenges as a result of the new revenue guidance are discussed below.

Financing Arrangements (Existence of a Contract)

Under current guidance, when the seller of real estate also provides financing to the buyer, the seller must consider the buyer's initial and continuing investments in the property to determine whether they constitute a stake sufficient to ensure that the risk of loss will motivate the buyer to honor its obligation to the seller. If the specified investment requirements are not met, the seller accounts for the sale by using the installment method, the cost recovery method, or the deposit method.

Under ASU 2014-09, an entity will need to evaluate several criteria to determine whether a contract exists. One particularly challenging criterion related to evaluating whether a real estate contract exists is that it must be "probable that the entity will collect the consideration to which it will be entitled." To make this determination, the entity should consider the buyer's ability and intention to pay the amount of consideration when it is due. The ASU does not retain the specific initial and continuing investment thresholds under current U.S. GAAP for performing this evaluation; however, some factors to consider may include the loan-to-value ratio of the property and the purchaser's intended use of the property.



Thinking It Through

The collectibility criterion should be evaluated on the basis of the amount to which the entity expects to be entitled, which may not be the stated transaction price. For example, these two amounts may differ because an entity anticipates offering the customer a price concession. Accordingly, entities should carefully assess the facts and circumstances to determine whether, on the basis of their assessment of the customer's credit risk (for example), they expect to grant a price concession.

If a seller determines that a contract does not exist, it would account for any amounts received as a deposit (even if such payments are nonrefundable). In addition, the seller would continually evaluate the amounts received to determine whether the arrangement subsequently qualifies as a valid contract under the ASU's criteria. Once it becomes probable that the seller will collect the consideration to which it will be entitled, the seller would evaluate the arrangement under the derecognition criteria in the ASU. If, instead, the contract is terminated, the seller would then recognize any nonrefundable deposits received as a gain.

Identifying Performance Obligations

Sometimes, a seller remains involved with property that has been sold (e.g., by providing additional services such as construction or development activities). Under current guidance, profit is generally

Revenue Recognition

deferred if a seller has continuing involvement with the sold property. Sometimes, instead of accounting for the transaction as a sale, the seller may be required to (1) apply the deposit method to the transaction or (2) account for the transaction as a financing, leasing, or profit-sharing arrangement. The current guidance focuses on whether the seller retains substantial risks or rewards of ownership as a result of its continuing involvement with the sold property.

In contrast, under the ASU, if the arrangement includes ongoing involvement with the property, the seller must evaluate each promised good or service under the contract to determine whether it represents a “separate performance obligation,” constitutes a guarantee, or prevents the transfer of control.¹ Goods and services are distinct (and considered separate performance obligations) if the two criteria in ASC 606-10-25-19 are met, including the requirement that goods or services are distinct in the context of the contract. Alternatively, an entity would bundle goods or services until they are distinct. Further, ASC 606-10-25-21 provides guidance on when goods or services would be distinct in the context of the contract. If a promised good or service is considered a separate performance obligation, an allocated portion of the transaction price should be recognized as revenue when (or as) the entity transfers the related good or service to the customer.



Thinking It Through

After the issuance of ASU 2014-09, stakeholders questioned how real estate developers should account for contracts under which it is expected that certain amenities or common areas will be provided in a community development (to be owned either by a homeowners association or by the local municipality). Some stakeholders believed that a developer that intends to provide common areas (e.g., a community center, parks, tennis courts) to a homeowners association as part of a development would generally not consider such an arrangement to represent a promise to deliver goods or services in the separate contract to sell the real estate (e.g., a single-family home) to its other customers. That is, the agreement with the homeowners association would not be combined with the agreement to sell the real estate to a separate customer. Therefore, the arrangement with the homeowners association to provide the common areas would not be considered a performance obligation in the real estate contract with the separate customer. Others, however, believed that arrangements to develop common areas are separate performance obligations in the real estate contract with the customer to which a portion of the consideration received for the sale of real estate would be allocated and deferred until control of the common areas transfers to the homeowners association. As part of implementation activities, the industry discussed this situation with standard setters and others to establish consistent application of the revenue standard. It is our understanding that the FASB did not intend to change current practice related to these activities (i.e., generally the provision of common area items to a homeowners association would not constitute separate performance obligations). Note that the ASU did not amend the guidance in ASC 970 that requires a developer to use a cost accrual approach upon sale of the real estate to account for costs of the common areas.

¹ Certain forms of continuing involvement would not constitute a separate performance obligation. For example, an option or obligation to repurchase a property is specifically addressed by the ASU and would preclude derecognition of the property. Further, a seller obligation that qualifies as a guarantee under ASC 460 would be outside the scope of the ASU.

Contracts with entities in the real estate industry — such as construction and engineering entities — often include deliverables that are completed over a number of phases. Such phases often are engineering, design, procurement, and construction of a facility or project. Stakeholders have raised questions and have had differing views about whether phases of a project (e.g., in typical design-and-build contracts) are distinct performance obligations or part of one combined performance obligation because they may not be distinct in the context of the contract.



Thinking It Through

Under the new standard, it may be difficult to assess whether phases of engineering, design, procurement, and construction are part of one combined performance obligation (e.g., because the phases are highly dependent and highly interrelated or part of a significant service of integration) or are distinct performance obligations. Such difficulty may also affect the way revenue is recognized (e.g., point in time or over time and the measure of progress if revenue is recognized over time). Accordingly, entities will need to exercise significant judgment and consider the specific facts and circumstances of each contract. Entities are also encouraged to monitor the AICPA's Engineering & Construction Contractors Revenue Recognition Task Force implementation activities, particularly the [working draft](#) of the implementation paper that addresses the identification of performance obligations. The working draft, which was exposed for public comment in July 2016, indicates that, when identifying performance obligations, entities should consider the following:

- “[T]he risk the entity assumes in performing the integration service [and whether that risk] is inseparable from the risk relating to the transfer of the other promised goods or services.”
- “[W]hether the integration service is significant.”

The working draft also contains an example illustrating the identification of performance obligations for a “design, build and maintenance contract,” which entities may find helpful.

Determining the Transaction Price

Under the new revenue standard, the determination of the transaction price includes an assessment of not only the stated contract price but also future events (e.g., exercise of contract options, issuance of change orders, filing of claims or incurrence of penalty or incentive payments). For example, a sales contract may allow the seller to participate in future profits related to the underlying real estate. Under current U.S. GAAP, the amount of revenue recognized is generally limited to the amount that is not contingent on a future event. Any additional revenue would be recorded only when the contingent revenue is realized. Under the ASU, some or all of the estimated variable consideration is included in the transaction price (and therefore eligible for recognition) to the extent that it is probable that the cumulative amount of the revenue recognized will not be subject to significant reversal (the “constraint”).

Accordingly, an entity will need to estimate the portion of the contingent (or variable) consideration to include in the transaction price, which may be recognized up front. As a result, revenue may be recognized earlier under the ASU than under current requirements.

The working draft of the implementation paper issued by the AICPA's Engineering & Construction Contractors Revenue Recognition Task Force provides insights on evaluating variable consideration and includes several illustrative examples.

Revenue Recognition

The ASU also requires entities to adjust the transaction price for the time value of money when the arrangement gives either the buyer or the seller a significant benefit of financing the transfer of real estate to the buyer. In such instances, the seller will be required to adjust the promised amount of consideration to reflect what the cash selling price would have been if the buyer had paid cash for the promised property at the time control was transferred to the buyer. In calculating the amount of consideration attributable to the significant financing component, the seller should use an interest rate that reflects a hypothetical financing-only transaction between the seller and the buyer. As a practical expedient, the ASU does not require entities to account for a significant financing component in a contract if, at contract inception, the expected time between substantially all the payments and the transfer of the promised goods and services is one year or less.

Accordingly, if an entity enters into a contract that either requires an up-front deposit before the transaction date or gives the buyer the right to defer payments for a significant period from the transaction date, it will need to determine whether the contract's payment terms (1) give the buyer or the seller a significant benefit of financing the transfer of the real estate or (2) are intended for other purposes (e.g., to ensure full performance by the seller or the buyer).

Recognizing Revenue When (or as) Performance Obligations Are Satisfied

When evaluating whether the disposal of real estate qualifies for sale accounting under current U.S. GAAP, entities focus on whether the usual risks and rewards of ownership have been transferred to the buyer.

Under the ASU, a seller of real estate would evaluate whether a performance obligation is satisfied (and the related revenue recognized) when "control" of the underlying assets is transferred to the purchaser.² An entity must first determine whether control is transferred over time or at a point in time. If control is transferred over time, the related revenue is recognized over time as the good or service is transferred. If control is transferred at a point in time, revenue is recognized when the good or service is transferred.

Under ASU 2014-09, control of a good or service (and therefore satisfaction of the related performance obligation) is transferred over time when at least one of the following criteria is 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."

The working draft of the implementation paper issued by the AICPA's Engineering & Construction Contractors Revenue Recognition Task Force addresses acceptable measures of progress for contracts that meet the criteria for over-time revenue recognition. Selecting a measure of progress is not a free choice but requires an entity to select the measure that most appropriately depicts the pattern of transfer. Accordingly, the paper describes several attribution models and gives examples of when the use such models may be appropriate.

² ASC 606-10-25-25 (added by the ASU) states that "[c]ontrol of an asset refers to the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset" and "includes the ability to prevent other entities from directing the use of, and obtaining the benefits from, an asset."



Thinking It Through

Real estate sales in most jurisdictions (including the United States) will typically not meet the criteria to be recognized as revenue over time because it is uncommon for the seller to either (1) have an enforceable right to payment for its cost plus a reasonable margin if the contract were to be canceled at any point during the construction period or (2) be legally restricted from transferring the asset to another customer, even if the contract were canceled at any point during the construction period. ASU 2014-09 contains an example³ in which a real estate developer enters into a contract to sell a specified condominium unit in a multifamily residential complex once construction is complete. In one scenario in this example, the seller does recognize revenue over time; however, the example indicates that this conclusion is based on legal precedent in the particular jurisdiction where the contract is enforceable.

If a performance obligation does not meet any of the three criteria for recognition over time, it is deemed satisfied at a point in time. Under ASU 2014-09, entities would consider the following indicators in evaluating the point in time at which control of real estate has been transferred to the buyer and when revenue should be recognized:

- “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.”

While entities will be required to determine whether they can derecognize real estate by using a control-based model rather than the risks-and-rewards model under current U.S. GAAP, the FASB decided to include “significant risks and rewards” as a factor for entities to consider in evaluating the point in time at which control of a good or service is transferred to a customer. Accordingly, although a seller of real estate would evaluate legal title and physical possession to determine whether control has transferred, it should also consider its exposure to the risks and rewards of ownership of the property as part of its “control” analysis under the ASU.⁴

Contract Modifications and Claims

Real estate entities that are involved with construction and engineering projects should consider how the ASU may affect the accounting for contract modifications, including unpriced change orders and claims. Examples of items that an entity will need to carefully assess before recognizing revenue related to such modifications include whether (1) the customer has approved scope or price changes and (2) the entity has an enforceable right to additional consideration (i.e., whether it has a legal basis for its claim). Examples such as these may indicate that the entity should include the change order or claim in its transaction price (i.e., as variable consideration under step 3 of the new revenue model) to the extent that it is probable that such an amount is not subject to significant revenue reversal in the future (i.e., the variable consideration constraint).

³ ASC 606-10-55-173 through 55-182.

⁴ An entity would not consider parts of a contract that are accounted for under guidance outside the ASU (e.g., guarantees within the scope of ASC 460) when determining whether control of the remaining goods and services in the contract has been transferred to a customer.



Thinking It Through

As a result of the ASU, revenue related to claims and unapproved change orders may be accelerated.

Other issues that are often subject to significant judgment under the ASU and may result in a change from current practice for real estate entities (particularly engineering and construction entities) include (1) the treatment of uninstalled materials; (2) gross versus net presentation of revenue (i.e., whether an entity is the principal or agent in a transaction with three or more parties); (3) the identification and recording of significant financing components (i.e., time value of money considerations) and warranties; (4) application of variable consideration guidance to milestone payments and what are commonly referred to in the real estate industry as “extras,” “add-ons,” and “back charges”; and (5) the types and amounts of costs that would meet the recognition criteria for capitalizing precontract costs.

These and other issues are the subject of several papers that have been written by the AICPA's Engineering & Construction Contractors Revenue Recognition Task Force. A list of all of the issues currently on the task force's agenda for discussion and their respective statuses is available on the AICPA's [Web site](#), which also contains the working drafts of the implementation papers discussed above.

Effective Date and Transition

In August 2015, as a result of stakeholder concerns, the FASB issued [ASU 2015-14](#), which delays the effective date of ASU 2014-09. Accordingly, the ASU is effective for public business entities for annual reporting periods (including interim reporting periods within those periods) beginning after December 15, 2017. Early adoption is permitted as of annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2016, including interim reporting periods within those annual periods.

For nonpublic entities, the standard is effective for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018, and interim reporting periods within annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019. Nonpublic entities can also elect to early adopt the standard as of the following:

- Annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2016, including interim periods.
- Annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2016, and interim periods within annual reporting periods beginning one year after the annual reporting period of initial application of the new standard.

Implementation and Transition Activities

A number of groups are involved in implementation activities related to the new standard, including the TRG (see Deloitte's [TRG Snapshot](#) newsletters), the AICPA's revenue recognition task forces, various firms, the SEC,⁵ and the PCAOB. Preparers should continue to monitor the activities of these groups before adoption of the new guidance. See Deloitte's January 14, 2016, [Heads Up](#) for additional adoption and transition observations.

⁵ The SEC has indicated that it plans to review and update the revenue recognition guidance in SAB Topic 13 in light of the ASU. The extent to which the ASU's guidance 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.



Thinking It Through

Real estate entities will need to reassess their historical accounting for all real estate disposals and construction contracts to determine whether any changes are necessary. Further, they will need to consider the guidance in ASU 2014-09 when accounting for repurchase options (the seller may be required to account for the transaction as a lease, a financing, or a sale with a right of return) as well as any guidance issued as a result of the FASB's project on partial sales (i.e., phase 2 of the Board's project on clarifying the definition of a business). In that project, the FASB has tentatively decided that any retained noncontrolling interest in a partial sale would be recorded at fair value and that the unit of account in the evaluation of whether control has transferred in a partial sale would be the underlying asset (see the FASB's [project update page](#) for more information). In addition, entities will most likely be required to dual track revenue balances during the transition period, given the potential difficulty associated with retroactively recalculating revenue balances when the ASU becomes effective.

Under the ASU, entities must also provide significantly expanded disclosures about revenue recognition, including both quantitative and qualitative information, regarding (1) the amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue (and related cash flows) from contracts with customers; (2) the judgment, and changes in judgment, entities used in applying the revenue model; (3) the assets recognized from costs to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer; and (4) information about unsatisfied performance obligations, including (a) "the aggregate amount of the transaction price allocated to the [unsatisfied] performance obligations" and (b) "an explanation of when the entity expect[ed] to recognize" that amount as revenue. To comply with the ASU's new accounting and disclosure requirements, real estate entities may want to consider whether they need to modify their systems, processes, and controls for gathering and reviewing information that may not have previously been monitored.

Leases

Background

After working for almost a decade, the FASB issued its new standard on accounting for leases, [ASU 2016-02](#), in February 2016. The primary objective of issuing the new leases standard was to address the off-balance-sheet treatment of lessees' operating leases. The standard's lessee model requires lessees to adopt a right-of-use (ROU) asset approach that brings substantially all leases, with the exception of short-term leases (i.e., those with a lease term of less than 12 months), on the balance sheet. Under this approach, a lessee would record an ROU asset representing its right to use the underlying asset during the lease term and a corresponding lease liability (in a manner similar to the current approach for capital leases).

The development of the new leases standard began as a convergence project between the FASB and the IASB. Although the project was a convergence effort and the boards conducted joint deliberations, there are several notable differences between the boards' respective leases standards.⁶ One of the more significant differences is related to the classification of a lease. Under the FASB's standard, an entity may classify a lease as either an operating lease or a finance lease. Under the IASB's standard, however, an entity would classify all leases as finance leases.

⁶ The IASB issued IFRS 16, *Leases*, in January 2016.



Thinking It Through

A lessee would include in the calculation of the ROU asset any initial direct costs related to a lease. A lessor would continue to account for initial direct costs in a manner consistent with the current requirements. However, the definition of an initial direct cost is more restrictive under the new standard and includes only those costs incremental to the arrangement and that the entity would not have incurred if the lease had not been obtained. The definition is consistent with that for incremental cost in the new revenue recognition standard (ASC 606). Thus, costs such as commissions and payments made to existing tenants to obtain the lease would be considered initial direct costs. By contrast, costs such as allocated internal costs and costs to negotiate and arrange the lease agreement (e.g., professional fees such as those paid for legal and tax advice) would be excluded from the definition. As a result, practice is likely to change for many real estate lessors.

Lease and Nonlease Components

Lessees and lessors are required to separate lease components and nonlease components (e.g., any services provided) in an arrangement and allocate the total transaction price to the individual components. Lessors would perform the allocation in accordance with the guidance in the new revenue recognition standard, and lessees would do so on a relative stand-alone price basis (by using observable stand-alone prices or, if the prices are not observable, estimated stand-alone prices). However, the ASU states that as “a practical expedient, a lessee may, as an accounting policy election by class of underlying asset, choose not to separate nonlease components from lease components and instead to account for each separate lease component and the nonlease components associated with that lease component as a single lease component.” The ASU also permits a similar accounting policy election from the lessor perspective, noting that it would “be reasonable for lessors to account for multiple components of a contract as a single component if the outcome from doing so would be the same as accounting for the components separately (for example, a lessor may be able to conclude that accounting for an operating lease and a related service element as a single component results in the same accounting as treating those two elements as separate components).” However, a lessor would need to consider presentation and the disclosure requirements under other U.S. GAAP, as applicable (e.g., ASU 2014-09).



Thinking It Through

If an amount is identified as a lease component, the amount is included in the measurement of the ROU asset and liability. When evaluating whether an activity should be a separate nonlease component, an entity should consider whether the activity transfers a separate good or service to the lessee. For example, maintenance services (including common area maintenance services) and utilities paid by the lessor but consumed by the lessee would be separate nonlease components because the lessee would have been required to otherwise contract for these services separately. However, payments for property taxes or insurance would most likely be considered a part of the lease component because they do not transfer a separate good or service to the lessee.

Lessee Accounting

While the boards agreed that a lessee should record an ROU asset and a corresponding lease liability when the lease commences, they supported different approaches for the lessee's subsequent accounting. The FASB chose a dual-model approach under which a lessee classifies a lease by using criteria similar to the lease classification criteria currently in IAS 17. Under IAS 17, there are no "bright lines" such as those under current U.S. GAAP (e.g., the 90 percent fair value test in ASC 840). For leases that are considered finance leases (many current capital leases are expected to qualify as finance leases), the lessee would account for the lease in a manner similar to a financed purchase arrangement. That is, the lessee would recognize interest expense and amortization of the ROU asset, which typically would result in a greater expense during the early years of the lease. For leases that are considered operating leases (many current operating leases are expected to continue to qualify as operating leases), the lessee would recognize a straight-line total lease expense. For both types of leases, the lessee would recognize an ROU asset for its interest in the underlying asset and a corresponding lease liability.



Thinking It Through

Under the FASB's dual-model approach, a lease would be classified as a finance lease if any of the following criteria are met at the commencement of the lease:

- "The lease transfers ownership of the underlying asset to the lessee by the end of the lease term."
- "The lease grants the lessee an option to purchase the underlying asset that the lessee is reasonably certain to exercise."
- "The lease term is for the major part of the remaining economic life of the underlying asset."
- "The present value of the sum of the lease payments and any residual value guaranteed by the lessee . . . equals or exceeds substantially all of the fair value of the underlying asset."
- "The underlying asset is of such a specialized nature that it is expected to have no alternative use to the lessor at the end of the lease term."

Each criterion except the last is essentially the same as (but not identical to) the existing lease classification criteria in ASC 840. The FASB decided to revise the criteria by eliminating their bright-line thresholds — namely, whether the lease term is for 75 percent or more of the economic life of the asset or whether the present value of the lease payments (including any guaranteed residual value) is at least 90 percent of the fair value of the leased asset. The elimination of the bright-line thresholds could affect a lease's classification. Also, while the last criterion is new, we generally would not expect it to be met in isolation because a lessor would be likely to structure a lease that compensates for the asset's having no alternative use (thereby satisfying another criterion).

Although the classification criteria are similar to those under current U.S. GAAP, some differences affect the real estate industry. First, the ASU requires entities to account for land and other elements separately unless the effects of not doing so are immaterial. Under current U.S. GAAP, the lease classification of land is evaluated separately from the building if its fair value at lease inception is 25 percent or more of the fair value of the leased property and the lease does not meet either the criteria related to transfer of ownership or the bargain purchase option criterion. This change may result in more bifurcation of real estate leases into separate land and building elements that are required to be evaluated separately for lease classification purposes and accounted for separately.

Lessor Accounting

The boards considered constituent feedback and decided not to make significant changes to the existing lessor accounting model. Rather, they agreed to adopt an approach that is similar to the existing capital/finance lease and operating lease models in ASC 840 and IAS 17. However, the FASB decided to align the U.S. GAAP classification requirements with the criteria in IAS 17. In addition, the FASB decided that for leases that are similar to current sales-type leases, the lessor would only be permitted to recognize the profit on the transaction if the arrangement would have qualified as a sale under the new revenue recognition guidance (ASC 606).



Thinking It Through

The inability to recognize profit on a transaction that would not have qualified as a sale under the new revenue recognition guidance is not likely to significantly affect real estate lessors since they typically do not enter into sales-type leases. However, the effect of the ASU's changes to conform the U.S. GAAP classification requirements to those under IFRSs may be similar to the effect discussed above for lessees. In addition, the new guidance requires real estate lessors to disclose more information.

Effective Date and Transition

ASU 2016-02 is effective for public business entities for annual years beginning after December 15, 2018, including interim periods therein. For all other entities, the standard is effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2019, and interim periods thereafter. Early adoption is permitted. Lessees and lessors are required to use a modified retrospective transition method for existing leases. Accordingly, they would apply the new accounting model for the earliest year presented in the financial statements.

For discussion of additional implementation considerations, see Deloitte's March 1, 2016, *Heads Up* and March 2016 *Real Estate Spotlight* (updated July 2016).

Financial Instruments

Impairment

Background

In June 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-13](#), which amends guidance on the impairment of financial instruments. The ASU adds to U.S. GAAP an impairment model (known as the current expected credit loss (CECL) model) that is based on expected losses rather than incurred losses. Under the new guidance, an entity recognizes as an allowance its estimate of expected credit losses, which the FASB believes will result in more timely recognition of such losses. The ASU is also intended to reduce the complexity of U.S. GAAP by decreasing the number of credit impairment models that entities use to account for debt instruments.

Once effective (see the "Effective Date" discussion [below](#)), the new guidance will significantly change the accounting for credit impairment. Banks and certain asset portfolios (e.g., loans, leases, and debt securities) will need to modify their current processes for establishing an allowance for loan and lease losses and other-than-temporary impairments to ensure that they comply with the ASU's new requirements. To do so, they may need to make changes to their operations and systems associated with credit modeling, regulatory compliance, and technology.

Key provisions of the ASU are discussed below. For additional information, see Deloitte's June 17, 2016, [Heads Up](#).



Thinking It Through

In late 2015, the FASB established a TRG for credit losses. Like the TRG for the new revenue recognition standard, the credit losses TRG does not issue guidance but provides feedback to the FASB on potential implementation issues. By analyzing and discussing such issues, the TRG helps the Board determine whether it needs to take further action (e.g., by clarifying or issuing additional guidance).

The CECL Model

Scope

The CECL model applies to most⁷ debt instruments (other than those measured at fair value), trade receivables, net investments in leases, reinsurance receivables that result from insurance transactions, financial guarantee contracts,⁸ and loan commitments. However, available-for-sale (AFS) debt securities are excluded from the model's scope and will continue to be assessed for impairment under the guidance in ASC 320 (the FASB moved the impairment model for AFS debt securities from ASC 320 to ASC 326-30 and has made limited amendments to the impairment model for AFS debt securities, as discussed [below](#)).

Recognition of Expected Credit Losses

Unlike the incurred loss models in existing U.S. GAAP, the CECL model does not specify a threshold for the recognition of an impairment allowance. Rather, an entity will recognize its estimate of expected credit losses for financial assets as of the end of the reporting period. Credit impairment will be recognized as an allowance — or contra-asset — rather than as a direct write-down of the amortized cost basis of a financial asset. However, the carrying amount of a financial asset that is deemed uncollectible will be written off in a manner consistent with existing U.S. GAAP.



Thinking It Through

Because the CECL model does not have a minimum threshold for recognition of impairment losses, entities will need to measure expected credit losses on assets that have a low risk of loss (e.g., investment-grade held-to-maturity (HTM) debt securities). However, the ASU states that “an entity is not required to measure expected credit losses on a financial asset . . . in which historical credit loss information adjusted for current conditions and reasonable and supportable forecasts results in an expectation that nonpayment of the [financial asset's] amortized cost basis is zero.” U.S. Treasury securities and certain highly rated debt securities may be assets the FASB contemplated when it decided to allow an entity to recognize zero credit losses on an asset, but the ASU does not so indicate. Regardless, there are likely to be challenges associated with measuring expected credit losses on financial assets whose risk of loss is low.

⁷ The following debt instruments would not be accounted for under the CECL model:

- Loans made to participants by defined contribution employee benefit plans.
- Policy loan receivables of an insurance entity.
- Pledge receivables (promises to give) of a not-for-profit entity.
- Loans and receivables between entities under common control.

⁸ The CECL model does not apply to financial guarantee contracts that are accounted for as insurance or measured at fair value through net income.

Measurement of Expected Credit Losses

The ASU describes the impairment allowance as a “valuation account that is deducted from the amortized cost basis of the financial asset(s) to present the net carrying value at the amount expected to be collected on the financial asset.” An entity can use a number of measurement approaches to determine the impairment allowance. Some approaches project future principal and interest cash flows (i.e., a discounted cash flow method) while others project only future principal losses. Regardless of the measurement method used, an entity’s estimate of expected credit losses should reflect those losses occurring over the contractual life of the financial asset.

When determining the contractual life of a financial asset, an entity is required to consider expected prepayments either as a separate input in the determination or as an amount embedded in the credit loss experience that it uses to estimate expected credit losses. The entity is not allowed to consider expected extensions of the contractual life unless it reasonably expects to execute a troubled debt restructuring with the borrower by the reporting date.

An entity must consider all available relevant information when estimating expected credit losses, including details about past events, current conditions, and reasonable and supportable forecasts and their implications for expected credit losses. That is, while the entity is able to use historical charge-off rates as a starting point for determining expected credit losses, it has to evaluate how conditions that existed during the historical charge-off period may differ from its current expectations and accordingly revise its estimate of expected credit losses. However, the entity is not required to forecast conditions over the contractual life of the asset. Rather, for the period beyond which the entity can make reasonable and supportable forecasts, the entity reverts to historical credit loss experience.



Thinking It Through

It will most likely be challenging for entities to measure expected credit losses. Further, one-time or recurring costs may be associated with the measurement, some of which may be related to system changes and data collection. While such costs will vary by institution, nearly all entities will incur some costs when using forward-looking information to estimate expected credit losses over the contractual life of an asset.

AFS Debt Securities

The CECL model does not apply to AFS debt securities. Instead, the FASB decided to make targeted improvements to the existing other-than-temporary impairment model in ASC 320 for certain AFS debt securities to eliminate the concept of “other than temporary” from that model.⁹ Accordingly, the ASU states that an entity:

- Must use an allowance approach (vs. permanently writing down the security’s cost basis).
- Must limit the allowance to the amount at which the security’s fair value is less than its amortized cost basis.
- May not consider the length of time fair value has been less than amortized cost.
- May not consider recoveries in fair value after the balance sheet date when assessing whether a credit loss exists.

⁹ The amendments do not apply to an AFS debt security that an entity intends to sell or will more likely than not be required to sell before the recovery of its amortized cost basis. If an entity intends to sell or will more likely than not be required to sell a security before recovery of its amortized costs basis, the entity would write down the debt security’s amortized cost to the debt security’s fair value as required under existing U.S. GAAP.

PCD Assets

For purchased financial assets with credit deterioration (PCD assets),¹⁰ the ASU requires an entity's method for measuring expected credit losses to be consistent with its method for measuring expected credit losses for originated and purchased non-credit-deteriorated assets. Upon acquiring a PCD asset, the entity would recognize its allowance for expected credit losses as an adjustment that increases the cost basis of the asset (the "gross-up" approach). After initial recognition of the PCD asset and its related allowance, the entity would continue to apply the CECL model to the asset — that is, any changes in the entity's estimate of cash flows that it expects to collect (favorable or unfavorable) would be recognized immediately in the income statement. Interest income recognition would be based on the purchase price plus the initial allowance accreting to the contractual cash flows.

Disclosures

Many of the disclosures required under the ASU are similar to those already required under U.S. GAAP as a result of [ASU 2010-20](#). Accordingly, entities must also disclose information about:

- Credit quality.¹¹
- Allowances for expected credit losses.
- Policies for determining write-offs.
- Past-due status.
- Nonaccrual status.
- PCD assets.
- Collateral-dependent financial assets.

Effective Date and Transition

For public business entities that meet the U.S. GAAP definition of an SEC filer, the ASU is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, including interim periods within those fiscal years.

For public business entities that do not meet the U.S. GAAP definition of an SEC filer, the ASU is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020, including interim periods within those fiscal years.

For all other entities, the ASU is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020, and interim periods within those fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021.

In addition, entities are permitted to early adopt the new guidance for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018, including interim periods within those fiscal years.

For most debt instruments, entities must record a cumulative-effect adjustment to the statement of financial position as of the first reporting period in which the guidance is effective. However, the ASU provides instrument-specific transition guidance on other-than-temporarily impaired debt securities, PCD assets, and certain beneficial interests within the scope of ASC 325-40.

¹⁰ The ASU defines PCD assets as "[a]cquired individual financial assets (or acquired groups of financial assets with similar risk characteristics) that, as of the date of acquisition, have experienced a more-than-insignificant deterioration in credit quality since origination, as determined by an acquirer's assessment."

¹¹ Short-term trade receivables resulting from revenue transactions within the scope of ASC 605 and ASC 606 are excluded from these disclosure requirements.

Classification and Measurement

Background

ASU 2016-01 amends the guidance on the classification and measurement of financial instruments. The amendments contain changes related to the following:

- Accounting for equity investments (apart from those that are accounted for under the equity method or those that are consolidated).
- Recognition of changes in fair value attributable to changes in instrument-specific credit risk for financial liabilities for which the fair value option has been elected.
- Disclosure requirements for financial assets and financial liabilities.

The ASU's key provisions are discussed below. For more information, see Deloitte's January 12, 2016, [Heads Up](#).

Classification and Measurement of Equity Investments

The amendments will require entities to carry all investments in equity securities at fair value, with changes in fair value recorded through earnings (FVTNI), unless the equity investments are accounted for under the equity method or are consolidated. For equity investments that do not have a readily determinable fair value, the guidance will permit a practicability exception under which the equity investment would be measured at cost less impairment, if any, plus or minus observable price changes in orderly transactions. This practicability exception would not be available to reporting entities that are investment companies or broker-dealers in securities.

An entity that has elected the practicability exception for equity investments that do not have a readily determinable fair value is required to assess whether the equity investment is impaired by qualitatively considering the indicators described in ASC 321-10-35-3. If, on the basis of the qualitative assessment, the equity investment is impaired, an entity would be required to record an impairment equal to the amount by which the carrying value exceeds fair value. The entity should no longer evaluate whether such impairment is other than temporary.



Thinking It Through

Under current U.S. GAAP, marketable equity securities that are not accounted for as equity-method investments are classified as either held for trading, with changes in fair value recognized in earnings, or AFS with changes in fair value recognized in other comprehensive income (OCI). For AFS investments, changes in fair value are accumulated in OCI and not recognized in earnings until the investment is sold or has an other-than-temporary impairment. Investments in nonmarketable equity securities other than equity method investments are measured at cost (less impairment) unless the fair value option is elected. Under the new guidance, since equity securities can no longer be accounted for as AFS or cost method investments and will need to be recorded at FVTNI, real estate entities holding such investments could see more volatility in earnings under the new guidance.

Changes in Fair Value of a Liability Attributed to Changes in Instrument-Specific Credit Risk

For financial liabilities (excluding derivative instruments) for which the fair value option has been elected, the amendments will require an entity to separately recognize in OCI any changes in fair value associated with instrument-specific credit risk. The guidance indicates that the portion of the total change in fair value that exceeds the amount resulting from a change in a base market risk (such as a risk-free interest rate) may be attributable to instrument-specific credit risk, but also acknowledges that there may be other methods an entity may use to determine instrument-specific credit risk.

Changes to Disclosure Requirements

For nonpublic business entities, the amendments eliminate the requirement to disclose the fair value of financial instruments measured at amortized cost. In addition, for such financial instruments, public business entities would not be required to disclose (1) the information related to the methods and significant assumptions used to estimate fair value or (2) a description of the changes in the methods and significant assumptions used to estimate fair value. The guidance also clarifies U.S. GAAP by eliminating the provisions in ASC 825 that had been interpreted to permit an “entry” price notion for estimating the fair value of loans for disclosure purposes. The amendments require a public business entity to disclose the fair value in accordance with the exit price notion in ASC 820. In addition, all entities are required to disclose in the notes to the financial statement all financial assets and financial liabilities grouped by (1) measurement category (i.e., amortized cost or fair value — net income or OCI) and (2) form of financial asset (i.e., securities and loans/receivables).

Effective Date and Transition

For public business entities, the new standard is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017, including interim periods therein. For all other entities, the standard is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019. Early adoption of certain of the standard’s provisions is permitted for all entities. Nonpublic business entities are permitted to adopt the standard in accordance with the effective date for public business entities.

Measurement-Period Adjustments

Background

In September 2015, the FASB issued [ASU 2015-16](#), which amended the guidance in ASC 805 on the accounting for measurement-period adjustments. The ASU was issued as part of the FASB’s simplification initiative in response to stakeholder feedback that restating prior periods to reflect adjustments made to provisional amounts recognized in a business combination adds cost and complexity to financial reporting but does not significantly improve the usefulness of the information provided to users. Key provisions of the ASU are discussed below. For more information, see Deloitte’s September 30, 2015, [Heads Up](#).

Key Provisions of the ASU

Under previous guidance, when an acquirer identified an adjustment to provisional amounts during the measurement period, the acquirer was required to revise comparative information for prior periods, including making any change in depreciation, amortization, or other income effects recognized in completing the initial accounting, as if the accounting for the business combination had been completed as of the acquisition date.

The ASU requires an acquirer to recognize adjustments to provisional amounts that are identified during the measurement period in the reporting period in which the adjustment amounts are determined. The effect on earnings of changes in depreciation or amortization, or other income effects (if any) as a result of the change to the provisional amounts, calculated as if the accounting had been completed as of the acquisition date, must be recorded in the reporting period in which the adjustment amounts are determined rather than retrospectively.



Thinking It Through

Although the ASU changes the accounting for measurement-period adjustments, it does not change the definition of a measurement-period adjustment, which is an adjustment to the amounts provisionally recognized for the consideration transferred, the assets acquired, and the liabilities assumed as a result of “new information obtained about facts and circumstances that existed as of the acquisition date that, if known, would have affected the measurement of the amounts recognized as of that date.” Errors, information received after the measurement period ends, or information received about events or circumstances that did not exist as of the acquisition date are not measurement-period adjustments.

Disclosure Requirements

The ASU also requires that the acquirer present separately on the face of the income statement, or disclose in the notes, the portion of the amount recorded in current-period earnings by line item that would have been recorded in previous reporting periods if the adjustment to the provisional amounts had been recognized as of the acquisition date.

Effective Date and Transition

For public business entities, the ASU is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2015, including interim periods within those fiscal years. For all other entities, the ASU is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017. The ASU must be applied prospectively to adjustments to provisional amounts that occur after the effective date. Early application is permitted for financial statements that have not been issued.

The only disclosures required at transition will be the nature of and reason for the change in accounting principle. An entity should disclose that information in the first annual period of adoption and in the interim periods within the first annual period if there is a measurement-period adjustment during the first annual period in which the changes are effective.

Simplifying the Transition to the Equity Method of Accounting

The FASB issued [ASU 2016-07](#) in March 2016 as part of its simplification initiative. Under the guidance in U.S. GAAP before the ASU's amendments, an investor that meets the conditions for applying the equity method of accounting is required to retrospectively apply such method to all prior periods in which it had historically accounted for the investment under the cost method or as an AFS security. The ASU removes the requirement to retrospectively apply the equity method of accounting. It also requires entities to recognize unrealized holding gains or losses in accumulated other comprehensive income (AOCI) related to an AFS security that becomes eligible for the equity method of accounting in earnings as of the date the investment qualifies for the equity method of accounting.

The guidance is effective for all entities for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, including interim periods within those fiscal years. The guidance must be applied prospectively to increases in the level of ownership interest or degree of influence occurring after the ASU's effective date. Early adoption is permitted.

Also as part of its simplification initiative, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) in June 2015 that would have eliminated the requirement to separately account for basis differences (i.e., the difference between the cost of an investment and the amount of underlying equity in net assets). The proposed guidance would have also eliminated the requirement for an investor to allocate basis differences to specific assets and liabilities of the investee and account for them accordingly (e.g., additional depreciation for basis differences assigned to tangible assets). However, many commenters on the proposed ASU indicated that eliminating the allocation of basis differences could create different complexities and result in inflated values of investments that would no longer be amortized over time as well as increase the likelihood of impairment in future periods. Accordingly, in May 2016, the FASB decided to remove the project from its agenda because of "insufficient support to change the equity method of accounting."



Thinking It Through

Application of the existing accounting requirements (i.e., before the ASU's amendments) can be particularly onerous because investments are often structured as partnerships or limited liability corporations, which may require use of the equity method at a relatively low ownership percentage, and investments in projects may evolve over time depending on stages of development, investment strategy, or changes in portfolio focus. For public companies, the existing U.S. GAAP requirements have been compounded by the SEC's guidance requiring registrants to provide (1) separate or summarized financial statements for prior periods once the equity method of accounting is applied to a significant investment (see paragraph 2405.5 of the SEC's [Financial Reporting Manual](#)) or (2) retroactively adjusted annual financial statements reflecting the equity method of accounting if a registration statement is filed after the first quarter in which the change to the equity method of accounting is reported but before the next annual report on Form 10-K is filed (see Topic 13 of the [Financial Reporting Manual](#)).

Accordingly, the ASU provides welcome relief from complex accounting considerations and SEC reporting requirements related to a transition to the equity method of accounting. However, the new ASU will also introduce new complexities after such transition. For example, application of the new method may result in additional basis differences if the earnings that would have affected the cost basis under existing U.S. GAAP are not recognized retrospectively.

Consolidation — Interests Held Through Related Parties That Are Under Common Control


Background

In February 2015, the FASB issued [ASU 2015-02](#), which amends the guidance in ASC 810-10 to require, among other things, a reporting entity that is a single decision maker to consider interests held by its related parties only if the reporting entity has a direct interest in the related parties. If the related parties and the reporting entity are not under common control, the indirect economic interests in a variable interest entity (VIE) held through related parties would be considered on a proportionate basis in the determination of whether the reporting entity is the primary beneficiary of the VIE. Alternatively, if the related parties and the reporting entity are under common control, the reporting entity would be required to consider the interests of the related parties in their entirety (not on a proportionate basis). As a result, the reporting entity may satisfy the “power” criterion (i.e., the ability to direct the activities that most significantly affect the VIE’s economic performance) in the consolidation analysis even if it has a relatively insignificant economic interest in the VIE.

In October 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-17](#) to remove the last sentence of ASC 810-10-25-42, which states, “Indirect interests held through related parties that are under common control with the decision maker should be considered the equivalent of direct interests in their entirety.” As a result of the ASU, a reporting entity would consider its indirect economic interests in a VIE held through related parties that are under common control on a proportionate basis in a manner consistent with its consideration of indirect economic interests held through related parties that are not under common control.

Example

A limited partnership (VIE) is formed to acquire a real estate property. The partnership has a GP (Subsidiary A) that holds a 1 percent interest in the partnership, an LP owned by the parent company of the GP (Subsidiary B) that holds a 25 percent interest in the partnership, and various unrelated investors that hold the remaining equity interests. In addition, A holds a 5 percent interest in B, and both A and B are wholly owned subsidiaries of Parent Company. Subsidiary A is the property manager and has full discretion to buy and sell properties, manage the properties, and obtain financing.



Under the guidance before ASU 2016-17, A and B must consider their own interests before evaluating which entity is the primary beneficiary of the VIE. Accordingly, A would conclude that it meets the power criterion as well as the economics criterion (i.e., the obligation to absorb losses of the VIE that could potentially be significant to the VIE or the right to receive benefits from the VIE that could potentially be significant to the VIE) because A must treat B’s 25 percent interest in the VIE as its own since A has an interest in B, and both are under the common control of Parent Company.

Example (continued)

Under the ASU, A will still conclude that it meets the power criterion on its own. However, in the evaluation of the economics criterion, since A owns a 20 percent interest in B, and B owns a 5 percent subordinated interest in the VIE, Subsidiary A will conclude that it has a 1 percent indirect interest in the VIE a result of its interest in B (20 percent interest in B multiplied by B's 5 percent interest in the VIE). Therefore, A will be unlikely to meet the economics criterion on its own. However, since A and B are under common control and as a group will satisfy the power and economics criteria, they will need to perform the related-party tiebreaker test to determine which party is most closely associated with the VIE.



Thinking It Through

As a result of the ASU, the related-party tiebreaker test will be performed more frequently because, as illustrated in the example above, it will be less likely for the decision maker to meet the economics criterion on its own when considering its exposure through a related party under common control on a proportionate basis.¹² Many decision makers view the ASU's guidance favorably because they would otherwise consolidate a legal entity with a small indirect interest. The ASU will instead require the decision maker to consider which party (the single decision maker or the related party under common control) is most closely associated with the VIE and therefore should consolidate. This guidance may have a significant impact on the individual financial statements of real estate subsidiaries because it could change which subsidiary consolidates a VIE.

Effective Date and Transition

For all reporting entities, the guidance will be effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016. Reporting entities that have not yet adopted the guidance in ASU 2015-02 will be required to adopt ASU 2016-17's amendments at the same time they adopt those in ASU 2015-02. Early adoption, including adoption in an interim period, is permitted as of October 26, 2016 (the ASU's issuance date).

Employee Share-Based Payment Accounting Improvements

Background

In March 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-09](#), which simplifies several aspects of the accounting for employee share-based payment transactions for both public and nonpublic entities, including the accounting for income taxes, forfeitures, and statutory tax withholding requirements, as well as classification in the statement of cash flows. The new guidance, which is part of the Board's simplification initiative, also contains practical expedients for nonpublic entities.

¹² This outcome is because the FASB has proposed to change only the guidance in ASC 810-10-25-42. The Board also considered amending the guidance on determining whether fees paid to a decision maker or service provider represent a variable interest in the evaluation of a decision maker's indirect interests held through related parties under common control. While the proposal would retain that guidance, the Board will consider clarifying it, as well as other aspects of the guidance on common-control arrangements, as part of a separate initiative. The proposal therefore only affects the decision maker's consideration of indirect interests held through related parties under common control in the primary-beneficiary assessment.

Key Provisions of the ASU

Accounting for Income Taxes

Under current guidance, when a share-based payment award is granted to an employee, the fair value of the award is generally recognized over the vesting period, and a corresponding deferred tax asset (DTA) is recognized to the extent that the award is tax-deductible. The tax deduction is generally based on the intrinsic value at the time of exercise (for an option) or on the fair value upon vesting of the award (for restricted stock), and it can be either greater (excess tax benefit) or less (tax deficiency) than the compensation cost recognized in the financial statements. All excess tax benefits are recognized in additional paid-in capital (APIC), and tax deficiencies are recognized either in the income tax provision or in APIC to the extent that there is a sufficient “APIC pool” related to previously recognized excess tax benefits.

Under the ASU, an entity recognizes all excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies as income tax expense or benefit in the income statement. This change eliminates the notion of the APIC pool and significantly reduces the complexity and cost of accounting for excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies. In addition, excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies are considered discrete items in the reporting period in which they occur and are not included in the estimate of an entity’s annual effective tax rate.

The ASU’s guidance on recording excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies in the income statement also has a corresponding effect on the computation of diluted earnings per share (EPS) when an entity applies the treasury stock method. An entity that applies such method under current guidance estimates the excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies to be recognized in APIC in determining the assumed proceeds available to repurchase shares. However, under the ASU, excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies are excluded from the calculation of assumed proceeds since such amounts are recognized in the income statement. In addition, the new guidance affects the accounting for tax benefits of dividends on share-based payment awards, which will now be reflected as income tax expense or benefit in the income statement rather than as an increase to APIC.

Further, the ASU eliminates the requirement to defer recognition of an excess tax benefit until the benefit is realized through a reduction to taxes payable.

In addition to addressing the recognition of excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies, the ASU provides guidance on the related cash flow presentation. Under existing guidance, excess tax benefits are viewed as a financing transaction and are presented as financing activities in the statement of cash flows. However, there is no cash receipt but only a reduction in taxes payable. Therefore, a reclassification is made in the statement of cash flows to reflect a hypothetical inflow in the financing section and a hypothetical outflow from the operating section.

Under the ASU, excess tax benefits no longer represent financing activities since they are recognized in the income statement; therefore, excess tax benefits are not separate cash flows and should be classified as operating activities in the same manner as other cash flows related to income taxes. Accordingly, the ASU eliminates the requirement to reclassify excess tax benefits from operating activities to financing activities.

Accounting for Forfeitures

The ASU allows an entity to elect as an accounting policy either to continue to estimate the total number of awards for which the requisite service period will not be rendered (as currently required) or to account for forfeitures when they occur. This entity-wide accounting policy election only applies to service conditions; for performance conditions, the entity continues to assess the probability that such conditions will be achieved. An entity must also disclose its policy election for forfeitures.



Thinking It Through

An entity that adopts a policy to account for forfeitures as they occur must still estimate forfeitures when an award is (1) modified (the estimate applies to the original award in the measurement of the effects of the modification) and (2) exchanged in a business combination (the estimate applies to the amount attributed to precombination service). However, the accounting policy for forfeitures will apply to the subsequent accounting for awards that are modified or exchanged in a business combination.

Statutory Tax Withholding Requirements

The ASU modifies the current exception to liability classification of an award when an employer uses a net-settlement feature to withhold shares to meet the employer's minimum statutory tax withholding requirement. Currently, the exception only applies when no more than the number of shares necessary for the minimum statutory tax withholding requirement to be met is repurchased or withheld. The new guidance stipulates that the net settlement of an award for statutory tax withholding purposes would not result, by itself, in liability classification of the award provided that the amount withheld for taxes does not exceed the maximum statutory tax rate in the employees' relevant tax jurisdictions.

Further, to eliminate diversity in practice, the ASU requires that cash payments to tax authorities in connection with shares withheld to meet statutory tax withholding requirements be presented as a financing activity in the statement of cash flows because such payments represent an entity's cash outflow to reacquire the entity's shares.



Thinking It Through

Under current guidance, an entity is required to track the minimum statutory tax withholding requirement applicable to each specific award grantee in each applicable jurisdiction if shares are repurchased or withheld. Under the new guidance, the maximum rate is determined on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis even if that rate exceeds the highest rate applicable to a specific award grantee. However, the classification exception would not apply to entities that do not have a statutory tax withholding obligation; for such entities, any net settlement for tax withholding would result in a liability-classified award.

In addition, an entity may change the terms of its awards related to net settlement for withholding taxes from the minimum statutory tax rate to a higher rate up to the maximum statutory tax rate. While this change may be made to existing awards, the entity would not be required to account for such a change as a modification. However, this accounting treatment applies only in these narrow circumstances (i.e., solely to change the net-settlement provisions from the minimum statutory tax rate to a higher rate up to the maximum statutory tax rate for statutory tax withholding purposes) and should not be analogized to other situations.

Practical Expedients for Nonpublic Entities

Expected-Term Practical Expedient

The ASU allows nonpublic entities to use the simplified method to estimate the expected term for awards (including liability-classified awards measured at fair value) with service or performance conditions that meet certain requirements. Such entities would apply this practical expedient as follows:

- For awards with only a service condition, nonpublic entities can estimate the expected term as the midpoint between the requisite service period and the contractual term of the award.
- For awards with a performance condition, the estimate of the expected term would depend on whether it is probable that the performance condition will be achieved:
 - If it is probable that the performance condition will be achieved, nonpublic entities can estimate the expected term as the midpoint between the requisite service period and the contractual term.
 - If it is not probable that the performance condition will be achieved, nonpublic entities can estimate the expected term as (1) the contractual term if the award does not contain an explicit service period or (2) the midpoint between the requisite service period and the contractual term if the award does contain an explicit service period.

Intrinsic Value Practical Expedient

The ASU allows nonpublic entities to make a one-time election to switch from fair value measurement to intrinsic value measurement, without demonstrating preferability, for share-based payment awards classified as liabilities.

Nonpublic entities are not allowed to make this election on an ongoing basis after the effective date of the new guidance.

Transition and Related Disclosures

The following table outlines the transition methods for an entity's adoption of ASU 2016-09:

Type	Transition Method
Recognition of excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies (accounting for income taxes)	Prospective
Unrecognized excess tax benefits (accounting for income taxes)	Modified retrospective
Classification of excess tax benefits in the statement of cash flows	Retrospective or prospective
Accounting for forfeitures	Modified retrospective
Classification and statutory tax withholding requirements	Modified retrospective
Classification of employee taxes paid in the statement of cash flows when an employer withholds shares for tax withholding purposes	Retrospective
Nonpublic entity practical expedient for expected term	Prospective
Nonpublic entity practical expedient for intrinsic value	Modified retrospective



Thinking It Through

An entity's prior-year APIC pool is not affected because prior-year excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies have already been recognized in the financial statements, and the recognition of excess tax benefits and tax deficiencies in the income statement is prospective only in the fiscal year of adoption. As a result, there is no reclassification between APIC and retained earnings in the fiscal years before adoption. The modified retrospective transition guidance for taxes only applies to previously unrecognized excess tax benefits outstanding upon adoption of ASU 2016-09 with a cumulative-effect adjustment to retained earnings.

In the period of adoption, entities are required to disclose (1) the nature of and reason for the changes in accounting principle and (2) any cumulative effects of the changes on retained earnings or other components of equity as of the date of adoption.

In addition, because the change in presentation in the statement of cash flows related to excess tax benefits can be applied either prospectively or retrospectively, entities are required to disclose (1) "that prior periods have not been adjusted" if the change is applied prospectively or (2) the "effect of the change on prior periods retrospectively adjusted" if the change is applied retrospectively. For the change in presentation in the statement of cash flows related to statutory tax withholding requirements, entities are required to disclose the "effect of the change on prior periods retrospectively adjusted."

Effective Date

For public business entities, the ASU is effective for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2016, including interim periods within those annual reporting periods. For all other entities, the ASU is effective for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2017, and interim periods within annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018.

Early adoption will be permitted in any interim or annual period for which financial statements have not yet been issued or have not been made available for issuance. If early adoption is elected, all amendments in the ASU that apply must be adopted in the same period. In addition, if early adoption is elected in an interim period, any adjustments should be reflected as of the beginning of the annual period that includes that interim period.

Example

Entity A, an SEC registrant, adopts ASU 2016-09 in its third fiscal quarter. Entity A had \$50 of excess tax benefits in each quarter in its current fiscal year to date and is not affected by adopting any of the other provisions of ASU 2016-09. In its previously issued financial statements in Form 10-Q, A recognized a total of \$100 (\$50 in each quarter) of excess tax benefits in APIC. In its third fiscal quarter, the period in which the ASU is adopted, A recognizes \$50 of excess tax benefits in its income statement. That is, the quarter-to-date income tax provision will only include the third fiscal quarter excess tax benefits (\$50). In addition, the year-to-date income tax provision will include excess tax benefits of \$150 to reflect the reversal of the excess tax benefits recognized in APIC for the first two fiscal quarters (\$100) and the recognition of those benefits in the income statement in those prior quarters (the \$100 in excess tax benefits related to the first and second fiscal quarters are not recognized in the third quarter but are reflected on a recasted basis in the applicable prior quarters). In the quarterly information footnote of its subsequent Form 10-K filing, A will present a schedule reflecting the first and second fiscal quarters' excess tax benefits (\$50 each quarter) in the income statement even though these amounts were reported in APIC in previously issued financial statements in Form 10-Q. Finally, A's financial statements in Form 10-Q issued in the year after A's adoption of the ASU will reflect the prior-year quarterly excess tax benefits (i.e., first and second fiscal quarters of the prior year) on a recasted basis in the income statement rather than in APIC.

Classification of Deferred Taxes

Background and Key Provisions

In November 2015, the FASB issued [ASU 2015-17](#), which will require entities to present DTAs and deferred tax liabilities (DTLs) as noncurrent in a classified balance sheet. The ASU simplifies the current guidance, which requires entities to separately present DTAs and DTLs as current and noncurrent in a classified balance sheet.

The project on simplifying the balance sheet presentation of deferred taxes is part of the FASB's simplification initiative. Launched in June 2014, the simplification initiative is intended to improve U.S. GAAP by reducing costs and complexity while maintaining or enhancing the usefulness of the related financial information.

Under current guidance (ASC 740-10-45-4), entities "shall separate deferred tax liabilities and assets into a current amount and a noncurrent amount. Deferred tax liabilities and assets shall be classified as current or noncurrent based on the classification of the related asset or liability for financial reporting." Stakeholder feedback indicated that the separate presentation of deferred taxes as current or noncurrent provided little useful information to financial statement users and resulted in additional costs to preparers. Therefore, the FASB issued the ASU to simplify the presentation of deferred taxes in a classified balance sheet. Netting of DTAs and DTLs by tax jurisdiction will still be required under the new guidance.

Noncurrent balance sheet presentation of all deferred taxes eliminates the requirement to allocate a valuation allowance on a pro rata basis between gross current and noncurrent DTAs, which constituents had also identified as an issue contributing to complexity in accounting for income taxes.



Thinking It Through

The ASU will align with the current guidance in IAS 12, which requires entities to present DTAs and DTLs as noncurrent in a classified balance sheet.

The example below compares the classification of DTAs and DTLs under current U.S. GAAP with their classification under the new guidance.

Example

Company ABC has a net DTA of \$100 million as of December 31, 20X1, as shown in the table below (amounts in millions):

Balance Sheet as of 12/31/X1	
	DTA/(DTL)
Inventory	\$ 50
Net operating loss (NOL) carryforward	350
Fixed assets	_____(300)
Total DTA/(DTL)	<u>\$ 100</u>

Alternatives for Private Companies

Company ABC expects that \$100 million of the NOL carryforward will be used in the following year. Below are the current and noncurrent classifications of the DTA/(DTL) as of December 31, 20X1 (amounts in millions):

Description	Current U.S. GAAP		ASU 2015-17	
	Current	Noncurrent	Current	Noncurrent
Inventory	\$ 50			\$ 50
NOL carryforward	100	\$ 250		350
Fixed assets	_____	_____(300)	_____	_____(300)
Total DTA/(DTL)	<u>\$ 150</u>	<u>\$ (50)</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 100</u>

Effective Date and Transition

The ASU requires the following:

- For public business entities, the ASU will be effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016, and interim periods within those years.
- For entities other than public business entities, the ASU will be effective for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2017, and interim reporting periods within annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018.

The Board decided to allow all entities to early adopt the ASU for any interim or annual financial statements that have not been issued. In addition, entities are permitted to apply the amendments either prospectively or retrospectively.

In the period the ASU is adopted, an entity will need to disclose “the nature of and reason for the change in accounting principle.” If the new guidance is applied prospectively, the entity should disclose that prior balance sheets were not retrospectively adjusted. However, if the new presentation is applied retrospectively, the entity will need to disclose the quantitative effects of the change on the prior balance sheets presented.

Alternatives for Private Companies

Background

The following guidance (developed in 2014 by the Private Company Council (PCC)) is effective in 2016:

- *Goodwill* — In January 2014, the FASB issued [ASU 2014-02](#), which allows private companies to use a simplified approach to account for goodwill after an acquisition. Under such approach, an entity would (1) amortize goodwill on a straight-line basis, generally over 10 years; (2) test goodwill for impairment only when a triggering event occurs; and (3) make an accounting policy election to test for impairment at either the entity level or the reporting-unit level. The ASU also eliminates “step 2” of the goodwill impairment test; as a result, an entity would measure goodwill impairment as the excess of the entity’s (or reporting unit’s) carrying amount over its fair value. An entity that elects the simplified approach should adopt the ASU’s guidance prospectively and apply it to all existing goodwill (and any goodwill arising from future acquisitions) existing as of the beginning of the period of adoption.

The ASU is effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2014, and interim periods within annual periods beginning after December 15, 2015. See Deloitte's January 27, 2014, [Heads Up](#) for more information.

- *Hedge accounting* — In January 2014, the FASB issued [ASU 2014-03](#), which gives private companies a simplified method of accounting for certain receive-variable, pay-fixed interest rate swaps used to hedge variable-rate debt. An entity that elects to apply the simplified hedge accounting to a qualifying hedging relationship would continue to account for the interest rate swap and the variable-rate debt separately on the face of the balance sheet. However, the entity would be able to assume no ineffectiveness in the hedging relationship, thereby essentially achieving the same income statement profile as with a fixed-rate borrowing expense. In addition, the entity is allowed more time to complete its initial hedge documentation. An entity that applies the simplified approach also may elect to measure the related swap at its settlement value rather than at fair value. Financial institutions (including banks, savings and loan associations, savings banks, credit unions, finance companies, and insurance entities) are specifically ineligible to elect this accounting alternative. The ASU is effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2014, and interim periods within annual periods beginning after December 15, 2015. Entities that elect the simplified approach should adopt the ASU under either a full retrospective or a modified retrospective method. See Deloitte's January 27, 2014, [Heads Up](#) for more information.
- *Identified intangible assets* — In December 2014, the FASB issued [ASU 2014-18](#), which gives private companies an exemption from having to recognize certain intangible assets for (1) assets acquired in a business combination or (2) investments accounted for under the equity method or upon the adoption of fresh-start accounting. Specifically, an entity would not be required to separately recognize intangible assets for noncompete agreements and certain customer-related intangible assets that arise within the scope of the ASU. Because the amounts associated with these items would be subsumed into goodwill, an entity that elects this accounting alternative would also be required to adopt ASU 2014-02 (see discussion above), resulting in the amortization of goodwill. Entities that elect the alternative should adopt the ASU prospectively to the first eligible transaction within the scope of the ASU that occurs in the annual period beginning after December 15, 2015 (with early adoption permitted), and all transactions thereafter. See Deloitte's December 30, 2014, [Heads Up](#) for more information.

Changes to Effective Date and Transition Guidance in Certain Private-Company ASUs

In March 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-03](#), which gives private companies a one-time unconditional option to forgo a preferability assessment the first time they elect a PCC accounting alternative within the ASU's scope. However, private companies would still be required to perform a preferability assessment in accordance with ASC 250 for any subsequent change to their accounting policy election in a manner consistent with all accounting policy changes under ASC 250.

The ASU also eliminates the effective dates of PCC accounting alternatives that are within the ASU's scope and extends the transition guidance for such alternatives indefinitely. The new guidance is effective immediately and affects all private companies within the scope of [ASU 2014-02](#) (goodwill), [ASU 2014-03](#) (derivatives and hedging), [ASU 2014-07](#) (common-control leasing arrangements), and [ASU 2014-18](#) (identifiable intangible assets). While the new standard extends the transition guidance in ASU 2014-07 (VIEs) and ASU 2014-18, it does not change the manner in which such guidance is applied. See Deloitte's March 16, 2016, [Heads Up](#) for more information.

Other Private-Company Matters

Throughout 2016, the PCC has discussed aspects of financial reporting that are complex and costly for private companies, including the application of VIE guidance to common-control arrangements, balance-sheet classification of debt, and liabilities and equity short-term improvements. During its April 2016 meeting, the PCC voted to recommend that the FASB add to its agenda [PCC Issue 15-02, "Applying Variable Interest Entity Guidance to Entities Under Common Control."](#)

Statement of Cash Flows: Classification of Certain Cash Receipts and Cash Payments

Background

In August 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-15](#), which amends ASC 230 to add or clarify guidance on the classification of certain cash receipts and payments in the statement of cash flows. ASC 230 lacks consistent principles for evaluating the classification of cash payments and receipts in the statement of cash flows. This has led to diversity in practice and, in certain circumstances, financial statement restatements. Therefore, the FASB issued the ASU with the intent of reducing diversity in practice with respect to eight types of cash flows.

Key Provisions of the ASU

The ASU is a result of consensus reached by the EITF on issues related to the eight types of cash flows. Key provisions of the amendments are summarized below.

Cash Flow Issues	Amendments
Debt prepayment or debt extinguishment costs	Cash payments for debt prepayment or extinguishment costs (including third-party costs, premiums paid, and other fees paid to lenders) must "be classified as cash outflows for financing activities."
Settlement of zero-coupon bonds	The cash outflows for the settlement of a zero-coupon bond must be bifurcated into operating and financing activities. The portion of the cash payment related to accreted interest should be classified in operating activities, while the portion of the cash payment related to the original proceeds (i.e., the principal) should be classified in financing activities.
Contingent consideration payments made after a business combination	Contingent consideration payments that were not made soon after a business combination (on the basis of the consummation date) must be separated and classified in operating and financing activities. Cash payments up to the amount of the contingent consideration liability recognized as of the acquisition date, including any measurement-period adjustments, should be classified in financing activities, while any excess cash payments should be classified in operating activities.
Proceeds from the settlement of insurance claims	Cash proceeds from the settlement of insurance claims should be classified on the basis of the nature of the loss. For insurance proceeds received in a lump-sum settlement, an entity should determine the classification on the basis of the nature of each loss included in the settlement.
Proceeds from the settlement of corporate-owned life insurance (COLI) policies and bank-owned life insurance (BOLI) policies	Cash proceeds from the settlement of COLI and BOLI policies must be classified in investing activities. However, an entity is permitted, but not required, to align the classification of premium payments on COLI and BOLI policies with the classification of COLI and BOLI proceeds (i.e., payments for premiums may be classified as investing, operating, or a combination thereof).

Statement of Cash Flows: Classification of Certain Cash Receipts and Cash Payments

(Table continued)

Cash Flow Issues	Amendments
Distributions received from equity method investees	<p>An entity is required to make an accounting policy election to classify distributions received from equity method investees under either of the following methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Cumulative-earnings approach</i> — Under this approach, distributions are presumed to be returns on investment and classified as operating cash inflows. However, if the cumulative distributions received, less distributions received in prior periods that were determined to be returns of investment, exceed the entity's cumulative equity in earnings, such excess is a return of capital and should be classified as cash inflows from investing activities.• <i>Nature of the distribution approach</i> — Under this approach, each distribution is evaluated on the basis of the source of the payment and classified as either operating cash inflows or investing cash inflows. <p>If an entity whose chosen policy is the nature of the distribution approach cannot apply the approach because it does not have enough information to determine the appropriate classification (i.e., the source of the distribution), the entity must apply the cumulative-earnings approach and report a change in accounting principle on a retrospective basis. The entity is required to disclose that a change in accounting principle has occurred as a result of the lack of available information as well as the information required under ASC 250-10-50-2, as applicable.</p> <p>The amendments do not address equity method investments measured under the fair value option.</p>
Beneficial interests in securitization transactions	<p>A transferor's beneficial interests received as proceeds from the securitization of an entity's financial assets must be disclosed as a noncash activity. Subsequent cash receipts of beneficial interests from the securitization of an entity's trade receivables must be classified as cash inflows from investing activities.</p>
Separately identifiable cash flows and application of the predominance principle	<p>The guidance provides a three-step approach for classifying cash receipts and payments that have aspects of more than one class of cash flows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. An entity should first apply specific guidance in U.S. GAAP, if applicable.2. If there is no specific guidance related to the cash receipt or payment, an entity should bifurcate the cash payment or receipt into "each separately identifiable source or use [of cash] on the basis of the nature of the underlying cash flows." Each separately identifiable source or use of cash will be classified as operating, investing, or financing activities by applying the guidance in ASC 230.3. If the cash payment or receipt cannot be bifurcated, the entire payment or receipt should be classified as operating, investing, or financing activities on the basis of the activity that is likely to be the predominant source or use of cash.



Thinking It Through

The FASB's objective in the ASU is to eliminate the diversity in practice related to the classification of certain cash receipts and payments. As a result, there could be significant changes for some entities under the revised guidance, particularly with respect to the issues discussed below.

Settlement of Zero-Coupon Bonds

The lack of guidance on the classification of payments to settle zero-coupon bonds in the statement of cash flows has led to diversity in the classification of the cash payment made by a bond issuer at the settlement of a zero-coupon bond. Some entities bifurcate the settlement payment between the principal (the amount initially received by the entity) and accreted interest. In those situations, the portion of the repayment related to principal is classified in financing activities, and the portion related to accreted interest is classified in operating activities. However, other entities do not bifurcate the settlement payment between principal and accreted interest and present the entire repayment in financing activities.

Under the ASU, entities are required to bifurcate the repayment of zero-coupon bonds into principal and accreted interest, with the principal portion classified in financing activities and the accreted interest portion classified in operating activities. As a result, entities that currently classify the entire repayment of zero-coupon bonds in financing activities will need to identify the portion of such payments that are related to accreted interest and apply the provisions of the ASU accordingly.

Distributions Received From Equity Method Investees

While ASC 230 distinguishes between returns of investment (which should be classified as inflows from investing activities) and returns on investment (which should be classified as inflows from operating activities), it does not prescribe a method for differentiating between the two. With respect to distributions from equity method investees, entities make this determination by applying a cumulative-earnings approach or a nature of the distribution approach. The ASU formalizes each of these methods and allows an entity to choose either one as an accounting policy election.

However, the ASU requires entities that choose the nature of the distribution approach to report a change in accounting principle if the information required under this approach is unavailable with respect to a particular investee. Therefore, while the ASU will not eliminate diversity in practice, entities that are currently applying the nature of the distribution approach should be mindful of the additional information and disclosure requirements under the ASU in electing a method as their accounting policy.

Beneficial Interests in Securitization Transactions

There is no specific guidance in ASC 230 on how to classify cash receipts associated with beneficial interests in securitization transactions. As a result, entities have classified the subsequent cash receipts from payments on beneficial interests obtained by the transferor in a securitization of the transferor's trade receivables as either operating activities or investing activities in the statement of cash flows. Although there is diversity in practice, we believe that entities have predominantly presented cash receipts from payments on a transferor's beneficial interests in securitized trade receivables as a cash inflow from operating activities. Accordingly, the requirement to present such cash receipts as a cash inflow from investing activities could change practice significantly.

Separately Identifiable Cash Flows and Application of the Predominance Principle

ASC 230 acknowledges that certain cash inflows and outflows may have characteristics of more than one cash flow class (e.g., financing, investing, or operating) and states that the “appropriate classification shall depend on the activity that is likely to be the predominant source of cash flows for the item.” Although ASC 230 gives examples illustrating the application of the predominance principle, entities often have difficulty applying the guidance.

As a result, when cash flows have aspects of more than one cash flow class, the ASU requires that entities first determine the classification of those cash receipts and payments by applying the specific guidance in ASC 230 and other applicable ASC topics. Further, the ASU notes that “[i]n the absence of specific guidance, a reporting entity shall determine each separately identifiable source or each separately identifiable use within the cash receipts and cash payments on the basis of the nature of the underlying cash flows.” The ASU goes on to observe that “[i]n situations in which cash receipts and payments have aspects of more than one class of cash flows and cannot be separated by source or use . . . the appropriate classification shall depend on the activity that is likely to be the predominant source or use of cash flows for the item.” However, because the ASU does not define the term “separately identifiable” in this context, we believe that challenges may be presented related to identifying separately identifiable cash receipts and payments as well as applying the term “predominant.”

Effective Date and Transition

For public business entities, the guidance is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017, including interim periods within those fiscal years. For all other entities, it is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019. Early adoption will be permitted for all entities.

Entities must apply the guidance retrospectively to all periods presented but may apply it prospectively if retrospective application would be impracticable.

Restricted Cash

Background

In November 2016, the FASB issued [ASU 2016-18](#), which amends ASC 230 to clarify guidance on the classification and presentation of restricted cash. The ASU is the result of the following consensus reached by the EITF:

- An entity should include in its cash and cash-equivalent balances in the statement of cash flows those amounts that are deemed to be restricted cash and restricted cash equivalents. The Task Force decided not to define the terms “restricted cash” and “restricted cash equivalents” but observed that an entity should continue to provide appropriate disclosures about its accounting policies pertaining to restricted cash in accordance with other GAAP. The Task Force also observed that any change in accounting policy will need to be assessed under ASC 250.
- A reconciliation between the statement of financial position and the statement of cash flows must be disclosed when the statement of financial position includes more than one line item for cash, cash equivalents, restricted cash, and restricted cash equivalents.

Restricted Cash

- Changes in restricted cash and restricted cash equivalents that result from transfers between cash, cash equivalents, and restricted cash and restricted cash equivalents should not be presented as cash flow activities in the statement of cash flows.
- An entity with a material balance of amounts generally described as restricted cash and restricted cash equivalents must disclose information about the nature of the restrictions.

Effective Date and Transition

For public business entities, the guidance is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017, including interim periods within those fiscal years. For all other entities, it is effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2018, and interim periods beginning after December 15, 2019. Early adoption of the guidance in the ASU is permitted. A reporting entity will apply the guidance retrospectively.

On the Horizon

Financial Instruments

Hedging

In September 2016, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would amend the hedge accounting recognition and presentation requirements of ASC 815 to (1) reduce their complexity and simplify their application by preparers and (2) improve the transparency and understandability of information conveyed to financial statement users about an entity's risk management activities by better aligning those activities with the entity's financial reporting for hedging relationships.

Although the changes proposed by the FASB are significant, constituents also should take note of those aspects of existing hedge accounting that the Board decided to retain. The proposal still would require all hedging relationships to be highly effective. Moreover, an entity would retain the ability to voluntarily dedesignate a hedging relationship, designate certain component risks of the hedged item as the hedged risk, and apply the critical-terms-match method or the shortcut method.

The FASB will determine the effective date of the proposed amendments after it considers constituent feedback; however, it has tentatively determined that earlier application of the proposed amendments will be permitted at the beginning of any fiscal year before the effective date. Comments on the proposal (see Deloitte's [comments](#)) were due by November 22, 2016.

The sections below summarize the proposed ASU's key provisions. For additional information about the proposed ASU, see Deloitte's September 14, 2016, [Heads Up](#).

Key Proposed Changes to the Hedge Accounting Model

Hedge Documentation and Qualitative Assessments of Hedge Effectiveness

Under the proposed model, an entity would be required to perform an initial prospective quantitative assessment of hedge effectiveness at hedge inception (unless the hedging relationship qualifies for application of one of the expedients that permit an assumption of perfect hedge effectiveness, such as the shortcut method or critical-terms-match method); however, the entity generally would have until its first quarterly hedge effectiveness assessment date (i.e., up to three months) to complete this quantitative assessment. All other hedge documentation still would need to be in place at hedge inception. The entity could elect to perform subsequent prospective and retrospective hedge effectiveness assessments qualitatively if certain criteria are satisfied; however, the entity could be forced to revert to quantitative assessments if, because facts and circumstances have changed, the entity may no longer assert qualitatively that the hedging relationship was and continues to be highly effective. Once an entity is forced to perform a quantitative assessment, it would be prohibited from performing qualitative assessments in future periods.

Cash Flow Hedges of Forecasted Purchases or Sales of Nonfinancial Items

For a forecasted purchase or sale of a nonfinancial item, the proposed model would permit an entity to designate the variability in cash flows attributable to changes in a contractually specified component as the hedged risk if certain criteria are satisfied. An entity could also hedge exposures arising from a contractually specified component of an agreement to purchase or sell a nonfinancial item for a period that extends beyond the contractual term or when a contract does not yet exist if the qualifying criteria will be met in a future contract and all the other cash flow hedging requirements are met.

Recognition and Presentation of the Effects of Hedging Instruments

The proposed amendments would eliminate the concept of separately recognizing periodic hedge ineffectiveness (although under the mechanics of fair value hedging, economic ineffectiveness would still be reflected in current earnings for those hedges).

For highly effective fair value hedging relationships, all changes in the fair value of the hedging instrument, including any amounts excluded from the assessment of hedge effectiveness, would be recorded in current earnings in the same income statement line as the earnings effect of the hedged item.

For highly effective cash flow hedging relationships, the change in the fair value of the hedging instrument used to assess hedge effectiveness would initially be recorded in OCI and would be reclassified out of AOCI into earnings and presented in the same income statement line as the earnings effect of the hedged item when the hedged item affects earnings. Any amounts excluded from the assessment of hedge effectiveness would be recognized immediately in earnings in the same income statement line as the earnings effect of the hedged item. Furthermore, an entity would immediately reclassify out of AOCI amounts associated with any hedged forecasted transaction whose occurrence is not probable. Such amounts would be presented in current earnings in the same income statement line in which the earnings effect of the hedged item would have been recorded had the hedged forecasted transaction occurred.

For highly effective net investment hedges, the change in the fair value of the hedging instrument used to assess hedge effectiveness would initially be recorded in the cumulative translation adjustment in OCI. When the hedged net investment affects earnings (i.e., upon a sale or liquidation), amounts would be reclassified out of the cumulative translation adjustment and be presented in the same income statement line in which the earnings effect of the net investment is presented. The portion (if any) of the hedging instrument's change in fair value that is excluded from the hedge effectiveness assessment would be recognized immediately in income (although the income statement presentation would not be prescribed).

Financial Hedging Relationships

For hedges of financial items, the proposed model (1) allows the contractually specified index rate in a variable-rate hedged item to be the designated interest rate risk, (2) retains the existing benchmark interest rate definition for fixed-rate hedged items with minor modifications to eliminate inconsistencies, and (3) designates the SIFMA Municipal Swap index as a permitted benchmark interest rate.

Fair Value Hedges of Interest Rate Risk

Under the proposal, for a fair value hedge of interest rate risk, an entity would be allowed to:

- Designate the change in only the benchmark component of total coupon cash flows attributable to changes in the benchmark interest rate as the hedged risk in a hedge of a fixed-rate financial asset or liability. However, if the current market yield of the hedged item is less than the benchmark interest rate at hedge inception (i.e., a “sub-benchmark” hedge), the entity would be required to use the total contractual coupon cash flows for its calculation.
- Consider, for prepayable financial instruments, only how changes in the benchmark interest rate affect a decision to settle a debt instrument before its scheduled maturity in calculating the change in the fair value of the hedged item attributable to interest rate risk.
- Designate as the hedged risk only a portion of the hedged item’s term and measure the change in the fair value of the hedged item attributable to changes in the benchmark interest rate by “using an assumed term that begins with the first hedged cash flow and ends with the last hedged cash flow.” The hedged item’s assumed maturity would be the date on which the last hedged cash flow is due and payable.

Shortcut Method and Critical-Terms-Match Method

The proposal would retain both the shortcut and critical-terms-match methods and provide additional relief for entities applying those methods. It would amend the shortcut accounting requirements to allow an entity to specify, at the inception of the hedging relationship, the quantitative (long-haul) method it will use to assess hedge effectiveness and measure hedge results if it later determines that application of the shortcut method was not or no longer is appropriate. In addition, the proposal would amend certain shortcut-method criteria to allow partial-term fair value hedges to qualify for the shortcut method.

Further, the proposal would expedite an entity’s ability to apply the critical-terms-match method to cash flow hedges of groups of forecasted transactions. If all other critical-terms-match criteria were satisfied, such hedges would qualify for the critical-terms-match method if all the forecasted transactions occurred within 31 days of the hedging derivative’s maturity.

Disclosure Requirements

The proposed ASU would add new disclosure requirements and amend existing ones. Also, to align the disclosure requirements with the proposed changes to the hedge accounting model, the proposal would remove the requirement for entities to disclose amounts of hedge ineffectiveness. In addition, an entity would be required to provide:

- Tabular disclosure of (1) the total amounts reported in the statement of financial performance for each income and expense line item that is affected by hedging and (2) the effects of hedging on those line items.
- Disclosures about the carrying amounts and cumulative basis adjustments of items designated and qualifying as hedged items in fair value hedges.
- Qualitative disclosures describing (1) quantitative hedging goals, if any, established in developing its hedging objectives and strategies and (2) whether those goals were met.

These disclosures would be required for every annual and interim reporting period for which a statement of financial position and statement of financial performance are presented.

Adoption and Transition

Entities would adopt the proposal's provisions by applying a modified retrospective approach to existing hedging relationships as of the adoption date. After adoption, in all interim and annual periods, entities would begin to apply the new accounting and presentation model and provide the new and amended disclosures.

In each annual and interim reporting period in the fiscal year of adoption, entities would also be required to furnish certain disclosures required by ASC 250 about (1) the nature and reason for the change in accounting principle and (2) the cumulative effect of the change on the components of equity or net assets as of the date of adoption.

The proposal also describes (1) specific transition considerations related to the accounting for fair value hedges of interest rate risk, (2) one-time transition elections that allow entities to amend the documentation for existing hedging relationships and to take advantage of the guidance on qualitative assessments and the shortcut method of accounting, and (3) a one-time transition election that allows entities, for certain existing cash flow hedging relationships, to take advantage of the amendments that permit designation of a contractually specified interest rate (for variable-rate instruments) or a contractually specified component (for forecasted purchases or sales of nonfinancial items).

Liabilities and Equity — Targeted Improvements

Background

The FASB added a project to its technical agenda in 2014 to consider making targeted improvements to its guidance on the classification of financial instruments as either liabilities or equity. The objective of the project was to simplify the guidance in existing U.S. GAAP on distinguishing liabilities from equity, which involves the application of numerous complex rules and is one of the most common sources of errors and restatements.

However, the FASB tentatively decided in February 2016 to largely abandon the project after concluding that targeted improvements would not adequately address the pervasive problems related to this topic. Instead, the Board decided to seek feedback on whether it should recommence a comprehensive project on distinguishing liabilities from equity to holistically examine the associated issues. Nevertheless, the FASB issued an [Invitation to Comment](#) in August 2016 to determine whether it should undertake such a project. As a result, the Board has tentatively decided to proceed with making targeted improvements related to two narrow issues and is expected to issue a proposed ASU during the first quarter of 2017.

The tentative changes would affect the guidance in U.S. GAAP on:

- The accounting for instruments with “down-round” provisions.
- The indefinite deferral of certain pending content in ASC 480-10.

Down-Round Provisions

Background

A down-round provision is a term in an equity-linked financial instrument (e.g., a freestanding warrant contract or an equity conversion feature embedded within a host debt or equity contract) that triggers a downward adjustment to the instrument's strike price (or conversion price) if the entity issues equity shares at a lower price (or equity-linked financial instruments with a lower strike price) than the instrument's then-current strike price. The purpose of the feature is to protect the instrument's counterparty from future issuances of equity shares at a more favorable price.

Under current U.S. GAAP, a contract (or embedded equity conversion feature) that contains a down-round provision does not qualify as equity because such arrangement precludes a conclusion that the contract is indexed to the entity's own stock under ASC 815-40-15 (as illustrated in ASC 815-40-55-33 and 55-34). As a result, contracts and features that include down-round provisions do not currently qualify for the scope exception from derivative accounting in ASC 815-10 for contracts that are indexed to, and classified in, stockholders' equity. Therefore, freestanding contracts on an entity's own equity that contain a down-round feature and meet the definition of a derivative (including net settlement) are accounted for at fair value with changes in fair value recognized in earnings. Similarly, features embedded in an entity's own equity that contain down-round provisions must be separated and accounted for as derivative instruments at fair value if they meet the bifurcation criteria in ASC 815-15.

Tentative Changes

The tentative changes would apply to issuers of financial instruments (e.g., a warrant or a convertible instrument) with down-round features. Specifically excluded from the scope would be (1) freestanding financial instruments and embedded conversion options that are accounted for at fair value with changes in fair value recognized in earnings (e.g., freestanding and bifurcated embedded derivative instruments within the scope of ASC 815 and debt for which the issuer has elected the fair value option in ASC 825-10) and (2) convertible debt instruments that are separated into liability and equity components (e.g., convertible debt with beneficial conversion features or cash conversion features pursuant to ASC 470-20).

Under the tentative proposed approach, a down-round provision would not preclude an entity from concluding that the instrument or feature that includes the provision is indexed to the entity's own stock. For example, when an entity evaluates whether it is required to classify a freestanding warrant that gives the counterparty the right to acquire the entity's common stock as a liability or equity under ASC 815-40, the existence of the down-round feature would not affect the analysis. If the warrant otherwise meets the condition for equity classification, it would be classified as equity. Similarly, in the analysis of whether an embedded conversion feature in a debt host contract must be bifurcated as an embedded derivative under ASC 815-15, the existence of a down-round provision would not prevent the contract from qualifying for the scope exception in ASC 815-10-15-74 for contracts indexed to an entity's own stock and classified in stockholders' equity.

While instruments that contain down-round features would no longer be expressly precluded from equity classification, such instruments may still not qualify for equity classification for other reasons (e.g., if the issuer could be forced to net cash settle the contract). The classification of instruments as liabilities or equity would not, under the proposal, be dictated by the down-round feature. Instead, the down-round feature would affect the accounting only if it were "triggered" (i.e., the entity issued shares at a price below the strike price). Once the feature was triggered, entities would determine the value that was transferred to the holder when the price adjustment occurred.



Thinking It Through

Under current U.S. GAAP, down-round protection often results in instruments being accounted for as liabilities, with changes in fair value recorded through earnings. Under the proposed changes, fewer instruments are expected to require such classification and resulting fair value treatment. However, many instruments or embedded features are precluded from equity classification because of the existence of other terms (e.g., warrants on contingently redeemable preferred stock) and would therefore be unaffected by this proposed change.

Further, entities that present fair value financial statements (e.g., in accordance with ASC 946) would be largely unaffected by this change.

Removal of the Indefinite Deferral Under ASC 480

The transition guidance in ASC 480-10 indefinitely defers the application of some of its requirements for certain instruments and entities (i.e., certain mandatorily redeemable financial instruments of nonpublic entities that are not SEC registrants and certain mandatorily redeemable noncontrolling interests). Accordingly, such instruments may qualify as equity under U.S. GAAP even though ASC 480-10-25 suggests that they should be classified as liabilities.

ASC 480-10 requires issuers to classify mandatorily redeemable financial instruments as liabilities. Because of the indefinite deferral noted above, these requirements are labeled “pending content” in the Codification, but the transition guidance in ASC 480-10-65 provides no effective date for them. Therefore, the transition requirements under the tentative guidance would effectively provide scope exceptions for parts of the guidance in ASC 480-10 for affected entities and instruments.

Simplifying the Balance Sheet Classification of Debt

Background

The FASB recently directed its staff to draft a proposed ASU that would simplify the classification of debt as either current or noncurrent on the balance sheet. The guidance currently in ASC 470-10 consists of an assortment of fact-specific rules and exceptions, the application of which varies according to the terms and conditions of the debt arrangement, management’s expectations of when debt may be settled or refinanced, and certain post-balance-sheet events. The objective of the project is to reduce the cost and complexity of applying this guidance while maintaining or improving the usefulness of the information provided to financial statement users.

Principles-Based Approach

The FASB’s tentative approach would replace the current, fact-specific guidance with a unified principle for determining the classification of a debt arrangement in a classified balance sheet as either current or noncurrent. Specifically, an entity would classify a debt arrangement as noncurrent if *either* of the following criteria is met as of the financial reporting date:¹

- “The liability is contractually due to be settled more than 12 months (or operating cycle, if longer) after the balance sheet date.”
- “The entity has a contractual right to defer settlement of the liability for at least 12 months (or operating cycle, if longer) after the balance sheet date.”

¹ Quoted text is from the FASB’s [summary](#) of tentative Board decisions reached at its January 28, 2015, meeting.

As an exception to this classification principle, debt that is due to be settled within 12 months as a result of a covenant violation as of the balance sheet date would be classified as noncurrent if the debtor receives a waiver that meets certain conditions after the balance sheet date (see [Covenant Violations](#) below).

Scope

The FASB has tentatively decided to clarify that the balance sheet classification guidance in ASC 470-10 applies not only to nonconvertible debt arrangements but also to convertible debt and to mandatorily redeemable financial instruments that are classified as liabilities under ASC 480-10.

Short-Term Obligations Expected to Be Refinanced on a Long-Term Basis

Under current guidance, entities that have the intent and ability to refinance a short-term obligation on a long-term basis *after* the financial reporting date — as evidenced by the post-balance-sheet-date issuance of a long-term obligation, equity securities, or a qualifying refinancing agreement — are required to present the obligation as a noncurrent liability as of the financial reporting date. The tentative approach, however, would require such short-term obligations to be classified within current liabilities because the refinancing of debt after the financial reporting date would be viewed as a new transaction that should not be retroactively reflected in the balance sheet as of that date.

Subjective Acceleration Clauses and Debt Covenants

Under existing GAAP, the classification of long-term obligations depends in part on whether they are governed by subjective acceleration clauses (SACs) for which exercise is probable (e.g., because of recurring losses or liquidity problems). Under the Board's tentative approach, however, SACs and covenants within long-term obligations would affect the classification of long-term obligations only when triggered or violated, in which case disclosure of the SAC or covenant would be required.



Thinking It Through

Under the Board's tentative approach, some liabilities that are now classified as noncurrent would be classified as current, and vice versa. For example, as a result of the proposed change to the treatment of the refinancing of short-term obligations, an entity would not be allowed to consider refinancing events after the financial reporting date but before the financial statements were issued. Thus, such debt obligations would be classified as current liabilities as of the financial reporting date. Entities should consider the timing of refinancing plans and the potential effect on the classification of short-term obligations.

Covenant Violations

Under current guidance, if the creditor can demand the repayment of a long-term obligation as of the financial reporting date because of the debtor's violation of a debt covenant, the corresponding debt obligation is classified as noncurrent if the debtor obtains a covenant waiver *before* the date the financial statements are issued and certain other conditions are met. While the Board's tentative approach would retain similar guidance, it would classify such debt as current if the waiver results in the debt's being accounted for as having been extinguished. Because debt extinguishment accounting treats the debt as a newly issued instrument, the original debt obligation, as of the balance sheet date, should be classified within current liabilities since the debtor could demand repayment as of that date.

At its October 19, 2016, meeting, the Board decided to clarify the application of the probability assessment that is associated with the waiver exception. Entities would be required to assess whether a violation of any other covenant not covered by the waiver is probable within 12 months from the reporting date. If so, the related debt would be required to be classified as current.

Presentation and Disclosure

Under the Board's tentative approach, debt that is classified as noncurrent in accordance with the exception for debt covenant waivers would be presented separately in the balance sheet. Further, as previously noted, the tentative approach would require entities to disclose information about debt covenants and SACs upon violation or trigger.

Effective Date and Transition

The Board will determine an effective date for the guidance after it considers feedback on the proposed ASU. Once finalized, the proposed approach will be applicable on a prospective basis to debt that exists as of the effective date. Early adoption will be permitted.

Next Steps

The proposed ASU is expected to be released in December 2016 or early January 2017. The comment period is expected to end no earlier than May 5, 2017.

Goodwill and Business Combinations

Subsequent Accounting for Goodwill for Public Business Entities and Not-for-Profit Entities, Including Goodwill Impairment

Background

In November 2013, the FASB endorsed (and later issued guidance on²) a decision by the PCC to give nonpublic business entities an accounting alternative under which they can elect to amortize goodwill and perform a simplified impairment test. The Board received feedback on the PCC accounting alternative indicating that many public business entities and not-for-profit entities had similar concerns about the cost and complexity of the annual goodwill impairment test.

In response, the Board in 2014 added to its agenda a goodwill simplification project that would be completed in two phases. The Board later separated the undertaking into two individual projects: (1) accounting for goodwill impairment and (2) subsequent accounting for goodwill for public business entities and not-for-profit entities.

Current Status and Next Steps

Under ASC 350, impairment of goodwill "is the condition that exists when the carrying amount of goodwill exceeds its implied fair value." The implied fair value of goodwill is determined in the same manner as the amount of goodwill recognized in a business combination. The process of measuring the implied fair value of goodwill is currently referred to as step 2 of the goodwill impairment test. Step 2 requires an entity to "assign the fair value of a reporting unit to all of the assets and liabilities of that unit (including any unrecognized intangible assets) as if the reporting unit had been acquired in a business

² For more information, see Deloitte's January 27, 2014, *Heads Up*.

combination.” Consequently, the performance of step 2 of the goodwill impairment test can result in significant cost and complexity.

As part of its goodwill impairment project, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) in May 2016 that would remove step 2 from the goodwill impairment test. The proposed guidance, which is intended to simplify the accounting for goodwill impairment, would require an entity to “recognize an impairment charge for the amount by which the carrying amount exceeds the reporting unit’s fair value. However, that amount should not exceed the carrying amount of goodwill allocated to that reporting unit.”

The qualitative assessment of goodwill would be unchanged under the proposed ASU. However, all reporting units, even those with a zero or negative carrying amount, would apply the same impairment test. As noted in the proposal’s Basis for Conclusions, goodwill of reporting units with a zero or negative carrying amount would not be impaired even when conditions underlying the reporting unit indicate that it was impaired. However, entities would be required to disclose any reporting units with a zero or negative carrying amount and the respective amounts of goodwill allocated to those reporting units.



Thinking It Through

The proposed guidance would significantly change the accounting for goodwill for reporting units with zero or negative carrying amounts. While current guidance addresses the assignment of liabilities to a reporting unit, practitioners have had questions about the assignment of debt. A reporting unit may have a negative carrying amount because of an entity’s decision to assign debt to it, resulting in diversity in practice and different goodwill impairment outcomes.

Comments on the proposed ASU were due by July 11, 2016.³ The FASB is redeliberating the proposed ASU and has not yet determined a proposed effective date for the final standard. A nonpublic business entity that has already elected the PCC’s accounting alternative for goodwill and would like to apply the final guidance would need to perform an assessment of preferability in accordance with ASC 250.

As part of its project on the subsequent accounting for goodwill, the Board expects to consider whether to permit or require amortization of goodwill or make further changes to impairment testing methods.

Clarifying the Definition of a Business

Background

In November 2015, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) related to the first phase of its project on the definition of a business. The proposal is in response to concerns that the current definition of a business has been interpreted too broadly and that many transactions are accounted for as business combinations when they are more akin to asset acquisitions. Comments on the proposed guidance were due by January 22, 2016, and were analyzed by the FASB staff at its meeting on August 24, 2016. The proposal’s key provisions are discussed below. For more information, see Deloitte’s December 4, 2015, [Heads Up](#).

Under the proposal:

- To be a business, a set of assets and activities (“set”) must include an input and a substantive process that together contribute to the ability to create outputs.
- If substantially all the fair value of the gross assets is concentrated in a single identifiable asset or group of similar identifiable assets, the set would not be a business.
- The definition of outputs is narrowed to be consistent with ASC 606.

³ See Deloitte’s [comment letter](#) on the proposed ASU.



Thinking It Through

The proposed guidance may significantly affect the real estate industry as a result of the different accounting for business combinations and asset acquisitions. For example, acquisition costs are expensed in a business combination and capitalized in an asset acquisition. Thus, a more narrow definition of a business will result in more asset acquisitions and, therefore, more capitalized costs.

Single or Similar Asset Concentration

Under the proposal, if substantially all of the fair value of the gross assets acquired is concentrated in a single identifiable asset or group of similar identifiable assets, the set would not be considered a business. Gross assets acquired would exclude cash and cash equivalents, DTAs, and the effects of DTLs. If the fair value of the gross assets cannot be concentrated, the entity would apply the proposed ASU's framework for evaluating whether an input and a substantive process are both present and together contribute to the ability to produce outputs.

In the determination of gross asset concentration, a tangible asset that is attached to and cannot be physically removed and used separately from another tangible asset without incurring significant cost or significant diminution in utility or fair value to either asset (e.g., land and building) would qualify as a single identifiable asset. The FASB also indicated that while tangible and intangible assets should generally not be combined, an in-place lease intangible asset, including any favorable and unfavorable intangible asset or liability, and the related real estate asset would qualify as a single identifiable asset.



Thinking It Through

The introduction of a gross asset concentration threshold is likely to have a significant effect on the real estate industry since many acquisitions of properties with in-place leases that are accounted for as business combinations under current guidance may qualify as asset acquisitions under the proposed guidance.

Input and Substantive Process Requirement

The proposal provides a framework for determining whether a set has an input and a substantive process that collectively contribute to the ability to create outputs. When a set does not yet have outputs, the set would have a substantive process only if it has an organized workforce (or an acquired contract that provides access to an organized workforce) that has the necessary skills, knowledge, or experience to perform an acquired process (or group of processes) that, when applied to an acquired input or inputs, is critical to the ability to continue producing outputs. For a set with outputs, the FASB proposed less stringent criteria for determining that the set has a substantive process. An organized workforce may represent a substantive process. However, a set may have a substantive process even without an organized workforce if an acquired process or processes contribute to the ability to continue producing outputs and cannot be replaced without significant cost, effort, or delay or are considered unique or scarce.

Definition of Outputs

Under current guidance (ASC 805-10-55-4), outputs are defined as “[t]he result of inputs and processes applied to those inputs that provide or have the ability to provide a return in the form of dividends, lower costs, or other economic benefits directly to investors or other owners, members, or participants.” The proposal would change this definition to the “result of inputs and processes applied to those inputs that provide goods or services to customers, other revenues, or investment income, such as dividends or interest.” The revised definition of outputs aligns the definition with the new revenue guidance in ASC 606.

Transition and Effective Date

The amendments in the proposal would be applied prospectively to any transaction that occurs on or after the effective date of the final standard. No disclosures would be required at transition. The FASB will determine the effective date and whether the proposed amendments may be applied before the effective date after it redeliberates its proposal on clarifying the scope of asset derecognition guidance and accounting for partial sales of nonfinancial assets.

Accounting for Identifiable Intangible Assets in a Business Combination

Background

In November 2014, the FASB agreed to add to its agenda a project to explore potential changes to the guidance on accounting for identifiable intangible assets in a business combination for public business entities and not-for-profit entities. The Board will evaluate whether certain intangible assets should be subsumed into goodwill.

Current Status and Next Steps

The project is in the initial deliberations phase. At the FASB’s October 28, 2015, meeting, the Board decided to conduct further research in conjunction with the IASB. The boards discussed the status of their respective projects on this topic at their June 20, 2016, meeting; however, no decisions were made.

Accounting for Derecognition and Partial Sales of Nonfinancial Assets

Background

In June 2016, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would clarify the scope of the Board’s recently established guidance on nonfinancial asset derecognition (ASC 610-20) as well as the accounting for partial sales of nonfinancial assets. The proposed guidance is in response to stakeholder feedback indicating that (1) the meaning of the term “in-substance nonfinancial asset” is unclear because the Board’s new revenue standard does not define it and (2) the scope of the guidance on nonfinancial assets is complex and does not specify how a partial sales transaction should be accounted for or which model entities should apply. The proposed ASU would conform the derecognition guidance on nonfinancial assets with the model for revenue transactions in ASC 606. Comments on the proposed guidance (see Deloitte’s [comments](#)) were due by August 5, 2016, and the FASB is analyzing the comment letters received.

Key provisions of the proposed ASU are discussed below. For more information, see Deloitte’s June 14, 2016, [Heads Up](#).

Scope of the Guidance on Nonfinancial Asset Derecognition and Unit of Account

The proposed ASU would clarify the scope of ASC 610-20 and require entities to apply that guidance to the derecognition of all nonfinancial assets and in-substance nonfinancial assets. While the concept of in-substance assets resided in ASC 360-20, this guidance would not have applied to transactions outside of real estate. The FASB is therefore proposing to add to the ASC master glossary the following definition of an in-substance nonfinancial asset:

An asset of a reporting entity that is included in either of the following:

- a. A contract in which substantially all the fair value of the assets (recognized and unrecognized) promised to a counterparty is concentrated in nonfinancial assets
- b. A consolidated subsidiary in which substantially all the fair value of the assets (recognized and unrecognized) in the subsidiary is concentrated in nonfinancial assets.

An in substance nonfinancial asset does not include:

- a. A group of assets or a subsidiary that is a business or nonprofit activity
- b. An investment of a reporting entity that is being accounted for within the scope of Topic 320 on investments — debt securities, Topic 321 on investments — equity securities, Topic 323 on investments — equity method and joint ventures, or Topic 325 on other investments regardless of whether the assets underlying the investment would be considered in substance nonfinancial assets.



Thinking It Through

The proposed ASU's guidance would significantly affect the real estate industry. Under the current guidance, all transfers of real estate (including in-substance real estate and transactions that are considered a business) are accounted for under ASC 360-20. Under the proposed guidance, since business or nonprofit activities are not in-substance nonfinancial assets, they would be excluded from the scope of ASC 610-20 and accounted for under the consolidation guidance in ASC 810-10. Further, all investments would be accounted for under the guidance in ASC 860 on transfers and servicing transactions, regardless of whether the investments were businesses or nonprofit activities or in-substance nonfinancial assets.

Partial Sales

“Partial sales” are sales or transfers of a nonfinancial asset to another entity in exchange for a noncontrolling ownership interest in that entity. Entities account for partial sales before adoption of the new revenue standard principally under the transaction-specific guidance in ASC 360-20 on real estate sales and partly under ASC 845-10-30. Since ASC 606 and ASC 610-20 supersede that guidance, the proposed ASU would clarify that any transfer of a nonfinancial asset in exchange for the noncontrolling ownership interest in another entity (including a noncontrolling ownership interest in a joint venture or other equity method investment) would be accounted for in accordance with ASC 610-20.

In addition, if the reporting entity no longer retained a controlling financial interest in the nonfinancial asset, it would derecognize the asset when it transferred control of that asset in a manner consistent with the principles in ASC 606. Further, any retained noncontrolling ownership interest (and resulting gain or loss to be recognized) would be measured at fair value in a manner consistent with the guidance on noncash consideration in ASC 606-20-32-21 through 32-24.



Thinking It Through

Partial sales are common in the real estate industry (e.g., a seller transfers an asset to a buyer but retains either an interest in the asset or has an interest in the buyer). Under the current real estate guidance in ASC 360-20, entities are required to recognize a partial gain and measure the retained ownership interest in a partial sale of real estate at carryover basis. The proposed ASU would eliminate the differences in the accounting between transactions with assets and businesses and would require an entity that sells real estate assets to recognize full gain when it loses its controlling financial interest and any retained interest in such real estate would be measured at fair value.

Effective Date and Transition

The effective date of the new guidance and the transition methods would be aligned with the requirements in the new revenue standard as amended by [ASU 2015-14](#),⁴ which delays the effective date of the new revenue standard by one year and permits early adoption on a limited basis. However, an entity would be permitted to use a transition approach to adopt ASC 610-20 that is different from the one it uses to adopt ASC 606 (e.g., the entity may use the modified retrospective approach to adopt ASC 610-20 and the full retrospective approach to adopt ASC 606). If different methods are used, an entity would need to provide the transition-method disclosures required by ASC 606 and indicate the method it used to adopt ASC 610-20.

Modification Accounting for Share-Based Payment Arrangements

Background

In November 2016, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would amend the scope of modification accounting for share-based payment arrangements. The proposed ASU provides guidance on the types of changes to the terms or conditions of share-based payment awards to which an entity would be required to apply modification accounting under ASC 718. Specifically, an entity would not apply modification accounting if the fair value, vesting conditions, and classification of the awards are the same immediately before and after the modification.

When [ASU 2016-09](#) was issued in March 2016 under the Board's simplification initiative, it made a change to ASC 718 regarding the exception to liability classification of an award related to an employer's use of a net-settlement feature to withhold shares to meet the employer's statutory tax withholding requirement. Under ASU 2016-09, the net settlement of an award for statutory tax withholding purposes does not result, by itself, in liability classification of the award as long as the amount withheld for taxes does not exceed the *maximum* statutory tax rate in the employee's relevant tax jurisdiction(s). Before an entity adopts ASU 2016-09, the exception applies only when no more than the number of shares necessary for the *minimum* statutory tax withholding requirement to be met is repurchased or withheld.

⁴ For public business entities, the standard is effective for annual reporting periods (including interim reporting periods within those periods) beginning after December 15, 2017. For nonpublic entities, the standard is effective for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018, and interim reporting periods within annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019.

Modification Accounting for Share-Based Payment Arrangements

Upon adopting ASU 2016-09, some entities may change the net-settlement terms of their share-based payment arrangements from the minimum statutory tax rate to a higher rate up to the maximum statutory tax rate. Some constituents questioned whether this change, if made to existing awards, would require the application of modification accounting under ASC 718-20-35-3. When an entity applies modification accounting to equity-classified awards and the original awards are expected to vest (because of any service or performance conditions) on the modification date, a modification may result in incremental compensation cost.

The proposed ASU's key provisions are discussed below. For more information, see Deloitte's November 18, 2016, [Heads Up](#).

Key Provisions of the Proposed ASU

Scope of Modification Accounting

The proposed ASU would amend ASC 718 to limit the instances in which modification accounting is applied. Entities "would account for the effects of a modification unless all the following are the same immediately before and after the modification":

- "The fair value (or calculated value or intrinsic value, if such an alternative measurement method is used) of the award."
- "The vesting conditions of the award."
- "The classification of the award as an equity instrument or a liability instrument."

In addition, as a consequential amendment, the proposal would remove the phrase "any of" from the definition of "modification." Under the proposed ASU, a modification would be defined as a "change in the terms or conditions of a share-based payment award."

The proposal's Basis for Conclusions provides additional clarity on the application of proposed ASC 718-20-35-2A(a), which requires that the fair value be the same immediately before and after the modification for modification accounting not to be applied. In paragraph BC11, the Board clarified that the evaluation should be based on whether the fair value has changed, not on whether the compensation cost recognized has changed. In addition, BC14 clarifies that a computation of the fair value before and after the modification is not expected in all cases. Rather, if the entity determines that the modification does not affect any of the inputs used in its fair value calculation, the entity most likely could conclude that the fair value would be the same immediately before and after the modification.

The proposed ASU's Basis for Conclusions also provides examples (that "are educational in nature, are not all-inclusive, and should not be used to override the guidance in paragraph 718-20-35-2A") of changes to awards for which the Board believes that modification accounting would not be required as well as those for which the Board believes that it would be required. The following table summarizes those examples:

Examples of Changes for Which Modification Accounting Would Not Be Required	Examples of Changes for Which Modification Accounting Would Be Required
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Administrative changes, such as a change to the company name, company address, or plan name.• Changes in net-settlement provisions related to tax withholdings that do not affect the classification of the award.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Repricing of options that results in a change in value.• Changes in a service condition.• Changes in a performance condition or a market condition.• Changes in an award that results in a reclassification of the award (equity to liability or vice versa).• The addition of a change-in-control provision under which awards are immediately vested upon occurrence of the event.

Disclosures

ASC 718 currently requires entities to disclose a description of significant modifications, including the terms of the modifications, the number of employees affected, and the total incremental compensation cost resulting from the modifications. Under the proposed ASU, additional disclosures would not be required.



Thinking It Through

Entities would still be required to disclose any significant changes to the terms or conditions of share-based payment awards that meet the definition of a modification under ASC 718-20-20, even if modification accounting is not applied under the proposed ASU. For example, under the proposed ASU, if an entity changes the settlement terms of its share-based payment awards but such a change does not result in a change in fair value, vesting condition, or classification, modification accounting would not be applied. However, the entity may still be required to disclose the change in settlement terms if the modification is significant.

Effective Date and Transition

The FASB plans to determine an effective date for the final guidance after considering stakeholder feedback on the proposed ASU. Entities would apply the proposed amendments prospectively to modifications on or after the effective date, and transition disclosures would not be required.

Nonemployee Share-Based Payment Accounting Improvements

Background

In December 2015, the FASB decided to add to its agenda a project on improving the accounting for nonemployee share-based payment arrangements. When the Board previously deliberated its initial share-based payment simplification project, it decided that potential improvements to the nonemployee model could involve broader changes and take longer to complete than other simplification projects. As a result, the Board concluded that reconsideration of the accounting for nonemployee share-based payments should be moved to a separate project.

Tentative Decisions

In May 2016, the FASB tentatively decided to expand the scope of ASC 718 to include all share-based payment arrangements related to acquiring both goods and services from nonemployees. The Board's tentative decision would require an entity to apply most of the guidance in ASC 718 to nonemployee share-based payments. In addition, a nonpublic entity would be permitted to use certain practical expedients, including the use of (1) calculated value to measure certain nonemployee awards and (2) intrinsic value to measure liability-classified nonemployee awards. Further, nonemployee share-based payments initially within the scope of ASC 718 would remain within the scope of that guidance for classification and measurement purposes (even after the nonemployee awards have vested) unless the awards are modified after performance is complete.

However, the FASB tentatively decided that attribution of any cost associated with nonemployee share-based payments would continue to be accounted for under other applicable accounting literature as though the issuer had paid cash for the goods or services.



Thinking It Through

Nonemployee share-based payments issued for goods and services are accounted for under ASC 505-50. The guidance in ASC 505-50 differs significantly from ASC 718, including the (1) determination of the measurement date, (2) accounting for performance conditions, (3) ability to use nonpublic entity practical expedients, and (4) classification of awards after vesting. The tentative decisions of this project would align such guidance.

Transition

The Board tentatively decided that a modified retrospective transition approach, with a cumulative-effect adjustment to retained earnings, would generally be required for outstanding nonemployee awards at the time of adoption. However, in allowing nonpublic companies to use calculated values to measure certain nonemployee awards, the Board tentatively decided that a prospective approach should be used for all nonemployee awards that are measured at fair value after the date of adoption.

Disclosures

With the exception of disclosures specifying the income statement effects of the change in principle in the year of adoption (or interim periods therein), the Board tentatively decided that an entity should apply the disclosure requirements in ASC 250 related to a change in accounting principle.

Finally, the Board tentatively decided that the disclosure requirements for nonemployee awards should be aligned with those in ASC 718 and that these requirements did not need to be modified.

Next Steps

At its November 30, 2016, board meeting, the FASB directed its staff to draft a proposed ASU with a 90-day comment period. The staff indicated that it expects to issue the proposal in the first quarter of 2017.

Disclosures by Business Entities About Government Assistance

Background and Key Provisions of the Proposed Guidance

In November 2015, the FASB issued for public comment a [proposed ASU](#) to increase transparency in financial reporting by requiring specific disclosures about government assistance received by businesses. Government assistance arrangements are legally enforceable agreements under which the government provides value to the entity (e.g., grants, loan guarantees, tax incentives). The objective of the proposed disclosure requirements is to enable financial statement users to better assess (1) the nature of the government assistance, (2) the accounting policies for the government assistance, (3) the impact of the government assistance on the financial statements, and (4) the significant terms and conditions of the government assistance arrangements.

There is no explicit guidance in current U.S. GAAP on the recognition, measurement, and disclosure of government assistance received by business entities. As a result, there is diversity in practice related to how business entities account for, and disclose information about, government assistance arrangements.

The proposed ASU would require business entities to disclose the following information about government assistance arrangements in their annual financial statements:

1. Information about the nature of the assistance, including a general description of the significant categories and the related accounting policies adopted or the method applied to account for government assistance
2. Which line items on the balance sheet and income statement are affected by government assistance and the amounts applicable to each line item
3. Significant terms and conditions of the agreement, including commitments and contingencies
4. Unless impracticable, the amount of government assistance received but not recognized directly in the financial statements. The amount of government assistance received but not recognized includes value that was received by an entity for which no amount has been recorded directly in any financial statement line item (for example, a benefit of a loan guarantee, a benefit of a below-market rate loan, or a benefit from tax or other expenses that have been abated).

Such disclosures would provide financial statement users with information about the effect of government assistance on an entity's financial results and prospects for future cash flows. In addition, the disclosures would help users better assess the nature of the assistance.

The proposed amendments would apply to entities (other than not-for-profit entities within the scope of ASC 958, employee benefit plans, and entities that have entered into government assistance agreements within the scope of ASC 740) that have entered into a “legally enforceable agreement with a government to receive value.” However, such provisions would not apply to transactions in which the government is (1) “legally required to provide a nondiscretionary level of assistance to an entity simply because the entity meets applicable eligibility requirements that are broadly available without specific agreement between the entity and the government” or (2) “solely a customer” of the entity.

Effective Date and Transition

The FASB plans to determine an effective date for the final guidance after considering stakeholder feedback on the proposed ASU. To apply the guidance, entities would use a prospective approach; however, retrospective application would be allowed.

Redeliberations and Next Steps

Since the conclusion of the comment letter period on February 10, 2016, the FASB has held redeliberation sessions to discuss comments received from constituents. The tentative decisions reached as a result of the Board’s redeliberations at its meeting on June 8, 2016, are reflected above.

The Board will continue to conduct additional redeliberations at future meetings before issuing a final ASU.

Disclosure Framework

Background

In July 2012, the FASB issued a [discussion paper](#) as part of its project to develop a framework to make financial statement disclosures “more effective, coordinated, and less redundant.” The paper identifies aspects of the notes to the financial statements that need improvement and explores possible ways to improve them. The FASB subsequently decided to distinguish between the “FASB’s decision process” and the “entity’s decision process” for evaluating disclosure requirements.

FASB’s Decision Process

Overview

In March 2014, the FASB released for public comment a [proposed concepts statement](#) that would add a new chapter to the Board’s conceptual framework for financial reporting. The proposal outlines a decision process to be used by the Board and its staff for determining what disclosures should be required in notes to financial statements. The FASB’s objective in issuing the proposal is to improve the effectiveness of such disclosures by ensuring that reporting entities clearly communicate the information that is most important to users of financial statements. See Deloitte’s March 6, 2014, [Heads Up](#) for additional information.

In February 2015, the Board tentatively decided that the disclosure section of each Codification subtopic (1) would state that an entity should apply materiality as described in the proposed amendments to ASC 235 in complying with the disclosure requirements and (2) would not contain language that precludes an entity from exercising discretion in determining what disclosures are necessary (e.g., “shall at a minimum provide”).

Disclosure Framework

In September 2015, in response to feedback from outreach activities and to maintain consistency with both current practice and the FASB's [proposed ASU](#) on the omission of immaterial disclosures (see [Entity's Decision Process](#) below for discussion of the proposed ASU), the Board issued a [proposal](#) to modify the definition of materiality in Concepts Statement 8. The proposal would replace the original discussion of materiality in Concepts Statement 8 with the U.S. Supreme Court's definition. See Deloitte's September 28, 2015, [Heads Up](#) for additional information.

Comments on the proposed changes to Concepts Statement 8 have been provided to the FASB.

Entity's Decision Process

In September 2015, to reduce entities' reluctance to omit immaterial disclosures, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would amend the Codification to indicate that the omission of disclosures about immaterial information is not an accounting error. The proposal, which is part of the FASB's disclosure effectiveness initiative, notes that materiality is a legal concept applied to assess quantitative and qualitative disclosures individually and in the aggregate in the context of the financial statements taken as a whole. See Deloitte's September 28, 2015, [Heads Up](#) for additional information.

Comments on the proposed ASU have been provided to the FASB.

Next Steps

The FASB will continue deliberating concerns raised in comment letters and will review feedback received as a result of its outreach activities, which include testing the Board's and entity's decision processes against various Codification topics. A final concepts statement is expected to be issued after the outreach process is complete.

Topic-Specific Disclosure Reviews

In addition to proposing amendments to guidance, the FASB is analyzing ways to "further promote [entities'] appropriate use of discretion"⁵ in determining proper financial statement disclosures. The Board is applying the concepts in both the entity's and the Board's decision process in considering topic-specific modifications. The FASB reached tentative decisions about disclosure requirements in the following Codification topics:

- ASC 820 (fair value measurement).
- ASC 740 (income taxes).
- ASC 715-20 (defined benefit plans).

Proposed changes to the disclosure requirements are discussed below.

⁵ Quoted from "What You Need to Know About Disclosure Framework" on the FASB's Web site.

Fair Value Measurement

Objective for Disclosures

In December 2015, the FASB issued for public comment a [proposed ASU](#) that would amend the requirements in ASC 820 for disclosing fair value measurements. The proposed ASU would add the following objective to ASC 820 to encourage preparers to use discretion in complying with the disclosure requirements:

The objective of the disclosure requirements in this Subtopic is to provide users of financial statements with information about all of the following:

- a. The valuation techniques and inputs that a reporting entity uses to arrive at its measures of fair value, including judgments and assumptions that the entity makes
- b. The effects of changes in fair value on the amounts reported in financial statements
- c. The uncertainty in the fair value measurement of Level 3 assets and liabilities as of the reporting date
- d. How fair value measurements change from period to period.

In addition, the proposed ASU would make changes (eliminations, modifications, and additions) to the fair value disclosure requirements in ASC 820, as discussed below.

Eliminated and Modified Disclosure Requirements

Policy on Timing of Transfers Between Levels and Transfers Between Levels 1 and 2

The proposed ASU would remove the requirement in ASC 820-10-50-2C for an entity to disclose its policy on the timing of transfers between levels of the fair value hierarchy. An entity would still be required to have a consistent policy on timing of such transfers. The requirement to separately disclose the amounts transferred between Level 1 and Level 2 and the corresponding reason for doing so would also be removed.

Level 3 Fair Value Measurements

The disclosure requirements for Level 3 fair value measurements would be amended as follows:

- *Valuation process* — The proposed ASU would remove requirements in ASC 820-10-50-2(f) (and related implementation guidance in ASC 820-10-55-105) for an entity to disclose its valuation processes for Level 3 fair value measurements.



Thinking It Through

Removing the disclosure requirement in ASC 820-10-50-2(f) will result in divergence between U.S. GAAP and IFRSs. The requirement was added to the FASB's and IASB's jointly issued standard on the basis of a recommendation by the IASB's expert panel. The panel explained that the disclosure would help users understand the quality of the entity's fair value estimates and give investors more confidence in management's estimate. The FASB has proposed to remove the requirement because it would conflict with the Board's proposed concepts statement. The Board indicated that disclosure of internal control procedures is outside the purpose of the notes to the financial statements and is not required under other topics in U.S. GAAP.

Removing this requirement does not change management's responsibility for internal controls over the valuation process and related auditor testing. Further, it should not affect investor confidence in the quality of the fair value estimate given the regulatory environment in the United States (e.g., SEC and PCAOB) as well as the intense scrutiny in this area. The Board also noted that investors are typically familiar with the overall valuation process.

- *Measurement uncertainty* — The proposed ASU would retain the requirement in ASC 820-10-50-2(g) to provide a narrative description of the sensitivity of the fair value measurement to changes in unobservable inputs. However, it would clarify that this disclosure is intended to communicate information about the uncertainty in measurement as of the reporting date and not to provide information about sensitivity to future changes in fair value.
- *Quantitative information about unobservable inputs* — The proposed ASU would require disclosure of the range and weighted average of the unobservable inputs to comply with the requirement in ASC 820-10-50-2(bbb) (as shown by example in the implementation guidance in ASC 820-10-55-103). Disclosing the period used to develop significant unobservable inputs based on historical data would also be required. A private company would be exempt from such a disclosure requirement.
- *Level 3 rollforward* — The proposed ASU would retain the Level 3 rollforward requirement for entities that are not private companies. For entities that are private companies, the proposed ASU would modify the Level 3 rollforward requirement and remove the requirement to disclose the change in unrealized appreciation or depreciation related to investments held as of the balance sheet date under ASC 820-10-50-2(d). Instead, disclosures would be required about transfers into and out of Level 3 and purchases (and issues) of Level 3 investments. The Board indicated that entities are already required to disclose the ending balance in the fair value hierarchy table, and they could disclose transfers into (and out of) and purchases (or issues) of Level 3 investments in a sentence rather than in a full rollforward as required today. A defined benefit plan sponsor that is a private company would also remove the reconciliation of beginning and ending balances for plan investments categorized as Level 3 within the fair value hierarchy (i.e., the Level 3 rollforward) and would be required to disclose transfers into and out of Level 3 and purchases (or issues) of Level 3 assets only in its defined benefit plan footnote (for more information about the FASB's project on reviewing defined benefit plan disclosures, see discussion [below](#)).



Thinking It Through

In its outreach on the Level 3 rollforward, the Board noted that some financial statement users believe that the rollforward is useful because it helps them understand management's decisions, especially for different economic cycles. The full rollforward was generally deemed less useful for users of private-company financial statements. Transfers into and out of Level 3 were generally considered to be the most useful aspect of the rollforward.

Net Asset Value Disclosures of Estimates of Timing of Future Events

The following disclosures currently required under ASC 820-10-50-6A(b) and ASC 820-10-50-6A(e) would apply only when they have been communicated to the reporting entity by the investee or are otherwise made publicly available (even if not specifically communicated to the investor):

- “For each class of investment that includes investments that can never be redeemed with the investees, but the reporting entity receives distributions through the liquidation of the underlying assets of the investees, the reporting entity’s estimate of the period of time over which the underlying assets are expected to be liquidated by the investees.”
- “[W]hen the restriction from redemption might lapse.”

If the timing is unknown, the entity would be required to disclose that fact.



Thinking It Through

The objective of this change is to prevent an investor from having to make its own estimate when it does not have knowledge of the timing from the investee or other public source. In addition, ASU 2015-07 removed the requirement for entities to categorize within the levels of the fair value hierarchy all investments they have measured under the net asset value practical expedient.

New Disclosure Requirements — Unrealized Gains and Losses

Entities that are not private companies would disclose fair value changes for assets and liabilities held as of the balance sheet date disaggregated by fair value hierarchy level (i.e., Levels 1, 2, and 3) for (1) net income before taxes and (2) comprehensive income. This is currently required only for the Level 3 amounts within net income under ASC 820-10-50-2(c) and (d). This requirement would not apply to private companies in accordance with the private-company decision-making framework.

Transition and Next Steps

The proposed ASU requires that the modifications to disclosures about changes in unrealized gains and losses and the changes in the quantitative information about unobservable inputs (see discussion above) would be applied prospectively beginning in the period of adoption. Entities would apply all other changes in disclosures retrospectively to all periods presented.

The FASB did not propose an effective date. Rather, the Board indicated that it plans to determine such date after considering stakeholders’ feedback on the proposed guidance.

Comments on the proposed ASU were due by February 29, 2016, and were discussed at the FASB’s meeting on June 1, 2016, at which it was decided that additional outreach would be conducted with investors and other financial statement users. It is not currently expected that a final ASU will be issued in 2016.

Income Taxes

Background

In July 2016, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would modify or eliminate certain disclosure requirements related to income taxes as well as establish new requirements. The proposed ASU is the result of the application of the Board's March 2014 proposed concepts statement to disclosures about income taxes. Comments on the proposed ASU were due by September 30, 2016.

Key Provisions of the Proposed ASU

Scope

Although many of the amendments would apply to all entities that are subject to income taxes, certain amendments would apply only to public business entities.

As part of the proposal, the FASB decided that it would also replace the term “public entity,” as defined in the glossary in ASC 740-10, with “public business entity,” as defined in the ASC master glossary. The definition of a public business entity includes certain types of entities that the definition of a public entity under ASC 740 does not include. Thus, the disclosure requirements in ASC 740 that currently apply only to public entities would apply to other entities as well.

Indefinitely Reinvested Foreign Earnings

The proposed ASU would require all entities to explain any change to an indefinite reinvestment assertion made during the year, including the circumstances that caused such change in assertion. All entities would also be required to disclose the amount of earnings for which there was a change in assertion made during the year. In addition, all entities would be required to disclose the aggregate of cash, cash equivalents, and marketable securities held by their foreign subsidiaries.

Such information is intended to give financial statement users information that will help them predict the likelihood of future repatriations and the associated income tax consequences related to foreign indefinitely reinvested earnings.

Unrecognized Tax Benefits

The proposed ASU would modify the disclosure requirements for a public business entity related to unrecognized tax benefits. It would also add a requirement for entities to disclose, in the tabular reconciliation of the total amount of unrecognized tax benefits required by ASC 740-10-50-15A(a), settlements disaggregated by those that have been (or will be) settled in cash and those that have been (or will be) settled by using existing DTAs (e.g., settlement by using existing net operating loss or tax credit carryforwards).

A public business entity would also be required to provide a breakdown (i.e., a mapping) of the amount of total unrecognized tax benefits shown in the tabular reconciliation by the respective balance-sheet lines on which such unrecognized tax benefits are recorded. If an unrecognized tax benefit is not included in a balance-sheet line, such amount would be disclosed separately. In addition, a public business entity would be required to disclose the total amount of unrecognized tax benefits that are offset against existing DTAs for net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards.

Under the guidance currently in ASC 740-10-50-15(d), all entities must disclose details of tax positions for which it is reasonably possible that the total amount of unrecognized tax benefits will significantly increase or decrease in the next 12 months. The proposed ASU would eliminate this disclosure requirement.

Further, the proposed ASU would amend the example in ASC 740-10-55-217 to illustrate the applicability of the proposed disclosure requirements related to unrecognized tax benefits.

Operating Loss and Tax Credit Carryforwards

Currently, entities are required to disclose the amount and expiration dates of operating losses and tax credit carryforwards for tax purposes. Historically, there has been diversity in practice related to this disclosure requirement. The proposed ASU would reduce this diversity by requiring a public business entity to disclose the total amount of:

- Federal, state, and foreign gross net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards (i.e., not tax effected) by period of expiration for each of the first five years after the reporting date and a total for any remaining years.
- Federal, state, and foreign DTAs related to net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards (i.e., tax effected) before any valuation allowance.



Thinking It Through

Generally, an entity should measure a DTA in accordance with the recognition and measurement criteria in ASC 740. While the proposed ASU uses the term “deferred tax asset,” it is unclear whether that term as used in the proposal refers to a DTA measured under the ASC 740 criteria or simply the tax-effected amount of the net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards as reflected on the income tax returns as filed.

As discussed previously, a public business entity would also be required to disclose the total amount of unrecognized tax benefits that are offset against existing DTAs for net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards.

In addition, the proposed ASU would modify the disclosure requirement related to net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards for entities other than public business entities. An entity other than a public business entity would be required to disclose the total gross amounts of federal, state, and foreign net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards (i.e., not tax effected) along with their expiration dates. The example in ASC 740-10-55-218 through 55-222 (as amended) would illustrate the applicability of these disclosure requirements.

Rate Reconciliation

ASC 740-10-50-12 currently requires a public business entity to disclose a reconciliation of the reported amount of income tax expense (or benefit) from continuing operations to the amount of income tax expense (or benefit) that would result from multiplying the pretax income (or loss) from continuing operations by the domestic federal statutory tax rate. The proposed ASU would amend the requirement for a public business entity to disclose the income tax rate reconciliation in a manner consistent with SEC Regulation S-X, Rule 4-08(h).

As amended, ASC 740-10-50-12 would continue to require a public business entity to disclose a reconciliation of the reported amount of income tax expense (or benefit) from continuing operations to the amount of income tax expense (or benefit) that would result from multiplying the pretax income (or loss) from continuing operations by the domestic federal statutory tax rate. However, the amendment would modify the requirement to disaggregate and separately present components in the rate reconciliation that are greater than or equal to 5 percent of the tax at the statutory rate in a manner consistent with the requirement in Rule 4-08(h).

Government Assistance

As a result of deliberations on its November 2015 [proposed ASU](#) on government assistance, the FASB decided to require an entity to disclose certain information related to assistance received from a governmental unit that reduces the entity's income taxes. Accordingly, the proposed ASU on income tax disclosures would require all entities that receive income tax-related government assistance to disclose a "description of a legally enforceable agreement with a government, including the duration of the agreement and the commitments made with the government under that agreement and the amount of benefit that reduces, or may reduce, its income tax burden." This disclosure requirement would apply only when the government determined whether, under such agreement, the entity would receive assistance and, if so, how much it would receive even if it met the applicable eligibility requirements. In the absence of a specific agreement between the entity and the government, the entity would not be required to disclose this information if the entity obtained the government assistance because it met eligibility requirements that apply to all taxpayers.

Other Income Tax Disclosure Requirements

The proposed ASU would require all entities to disclose the following:

- The amount of pretax income (or loss) from continuing operations disaggregated by foreign and domestic amounts.
- The amount of income tax expense (or benefit) from continuing operations disaggregated by foreign and domestic amounts.
- The amount of income taxes paid disaggregated by foreign and domestic amounts. A further disaggregation would be required for any country that is significant to the total amount of income taxes paid.
- An enacted tax law change if it is probable that such change would have an effect on the entity in the future.

In the determination of pretax income (or loss), foreign income tax expense (or benefit), or foreign income taxes paid, "foreign" refers to any country outside the reporting entity's home country.

In addition, the proposal would require public business entities to explain any valuation allowance recognized or released during the year along with the corresponding amount.

The proposed ASU is also aligned with the guidance in the [proposed ASU](#) on assessing the materiality of disclosures, which allows an entity to consider materiality when assessing income tax disclosure requirements.

Transition Guidance and Effective Date

The proposed ASU's amendments would be applied prospectively. The FASB will determine an effective date for the final guidance after it has considered feedback from stakeholders.

Defined Benefit Plans

In January 2016, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would modify the disclosure requirements for employers that sponsor defined benefit pension or other postretirement plans. The proposed ASU contains an overall objective for the disclosures and guidance on how an entity would consider materiality in determining the extent of its defined benefit plan disclosures. The proposed ASU would add to or remove from ASC 715 a number of disclosure requirements related to an entity's defined benefit pension and other postretirement plans. The Board believes that additional costs incurred by entities as a result of implementing the proposed new disclosure requirements would be offset by cost reductions associated with the elimination of other disclosure requirements as well as the omission of immaterial disclosures.

The amendments in the proposed ASU would be applied retrospectively to all periods presented, except for those related to disclosures about plan assets that entities measure by using the net asset value practical expedient. Such changes would be applied beginning with the initial period of adoption.

The FASB received more than 30 comment letters (which were due by April 25, 2016) on the proposal from various respondents, including preparers, professional and trade organizations, and accounting firms. At its meeting on July 13, 2016, the FASB discussed a summary of the comments received and directed its staff to perform research on particular aspects of the proposed ASU. For additional information about the proposed ASU, see Deloitte's January 28, 2016, [Heads Up](#).

Other Topics

SEC and AICPA Updates

Background

The SEC continues to focus on rulemaking, particularly in connection with its efforts to complete mandated actions under the Dodd-Frank Act and to implement provisions under the FAST Act. Key SEC rulemaking activities and other developments that have occurred since the last edition of this publication are discussed below.

Non-GAAP Measures

Press coverage and SEC scrutiny of non-GAAP measures have resulted from the SEC's concerns about (1) the increased use and prominence of such measures, (2) their potential to be misleading, and (3) the progressively larger difference between the amounts reported for them and for GAAP measures. In a [speech](#) on June 27, 2016, SEC Chair Mary Jo White reiterated the SEC's concerns about practices that can result in misleading non-GAAP disclosures. She exhorted companies "to carefully consider [SEC guidance on this topic] and revisit their approach to non-GAAP disclosures." She also urged "that appropriate controls be considered and that audit committees carefully oversee their company's use of non-GAAP measures and disclosures."

In May 2016, the SEC staff issued new and updated [Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations \(C&DIs\)](#) that clarify the SEC's guidance on non-GAAP measures. The updated guidance was intended to change certain practices about which the SEC has expressed concern. In remarks after the issuance of the C&DIs, the SEC staff strongly encouraged registrants to "self-correct" before the staff considers any further rulemaking or enforcement action related to non-GAAP measures.

For more information, see Deloitte's [A Roadmap to Non-GAAP Financial Measures](#).



Thinking It Through

For the 12 months ended July 31, 2016, non-GAAP measures ranked second in the top-ten list of topics frequently commented on by the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division") as part of its filing review process, moving up from fourth place for the comparable prior year. Over the next year, we expect the number of SEC comments to continue to remain high and even increase until the guidance in the updated C&DIs has been fully incorporated into practice. The SEC staff's most recent comment letters have particularly focused on the use and prominence of non-GAAP measures in press releases. Comments on press releases and filed documents have also centered on disclosures, including reconciliation requirements and the purpose and use of such measures. In addition, we expect to see more comments about the use of misleading measures, including measures that use individually tailored accounting principles, and the tax effect of non-GAAP adjustments. For more information about SEC comment letter trends, see Deloitte's [SEC Comment Letters — Including Industry Insights: What "Edgar" Told Us](#) and the 2016 supplement, [SEC Comment Letters — Statistics According to "Edgar."](#)

SEC Adopts Rules to Modernize Information Reported by Funds, Require Liquidity Risk Management Programs, and Permit Swing Pricing

In October 2016, the SEC voted to adopt changes to modernize and enhance the reporting and disclosure of information by registered investment companies and to enhance liquidity risk management by open-end funds, including mutual funds and exchange traded funds. The new rules will enhance the quality of information available to investors and will allow the SEC to more effectively collect and use data reported by funds. The rules will also promote effective liquidity risk management across the open-end-fund industry and will enhance disclosure regarding fund liquidity and redemption practices. The new rules permit the use of “swing pricing” by certain open-end management investment companies.

The changes are part of the Commission’s initiative to enhance its monitoring and regulation of the asset management industry.

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Issues Rules for Securities Clearing Agencies

In September 2016, the SEC issued a [final rule](#) and a [proposed rule](#) related to covered clearing agencies.

The final rule establishes “enhanced standards for the operation and governance” of covered clearing agencies. The final rule’s scope includes “SEC-registered securities clearing agencies that have been designated as systemically important by the Financial Stability Oversight Council . . . or that are involved in more complex transactions.” Such clearing agencies “will be subject to new requirements regarding, among other things, their financial risk management, governance, recovery planning, operations, and disclosures to market participants and the public.”

Under the proposed rule, a covered clearing agency would be defined as “any registered clearing agency that provides the services of a central counterparty, central securities depository, or a securities settlement system.” The proposal would also define various terms related to covered clearing agencies.

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Reminds Registrants of Best Practices for Implementing New Revenue, Lease, and Credit Loss Accounting Standards

In recent speeches, the SEC staff has reminded registrants about best practices to follow in the periods leading up to the adoption of ASU 2014-09 (on revenue), ASU 2016-02 (on leases), and ASU 2016-13 (on credit losses). The staff’s comments, which reiterated themes the Commission has addressed over the past year, focused on internal control over financial reporting (ICFR), auditor independence, and disclosures related to implementation activities.

For more information, see Deloitte’s September 22, 2016, [Financial Reporting Alert](#).

SEC Proposes to Shorten Standard Settlement Cycle for Broker-Dealer Securities Transactions

In September 2016, the SEC issued a [proposed rule](#) that would “shorten the standard settlement cycle for most broker-dealer transactions from three business days after the trade date (‘T+3’) to two business days after the trade date (‘T+2’).” The purpose of the proposed amendments is “to reduce a number of risks, including credit risk, market risk, and liquidity risk and, as a result, reduce systemic risk for U.S. market participants.”

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Publishes Final Rule on Cross-Border Security-Based Swaps

In February 2016, the SEC issued a [final rule](#) related to cross-border security-based swaps (SBSs). Under the final rule, which is being issued in response to a mandate of the Dodd-Frank Act, “a non-U.S. company that uses personnel located in a U.S. branch or office to arrange, negotiate, or execute a security-based swap transaction in connection with its dealing activity [must] include that transaction in determining whether it is required to register as a security-based swap dealer.”

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Publishes Final Rules on SBSs

In April 2016, the SEC issued [final rules](#) on SBSs that “implement provisions of Title VII relating to business conduct standards and the designation of a chief compliance officer for [SBS] dealers and major [SBS] participants.” In addition, the rules address “the cross-border application of the rules and the availability of substituted compliance.” The final rules, which became effective on July 12, 2016, include:

- *Rule 15Fh-1* — Defines the scope of the rules.
- *Rule 15Fh-2* — Defines terms used throughout the rules.
- *Rule 15Fh-3* — Addresses the business conduct requirements applicable to SBS entities.
- *Rule 15Fh-4* — Outlines unlawful activities for SBS entities and contains requirements for SBS dealers that advise special entities.
- *Rule 15Fh-5* — Provides requirements for SBS entities that act as counterparties to special entities.
- *Rule 15Fh-6* — Imposes pay-to-play restrictions on SBS dealers.
- *Rule 15k-1* — Outlines requirements for chief compliance officers.

For more information, see the [speech](#) by SEC Chair Mary Jo White on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Issues Final Rule to Establish Trade Acknowledgment and Verification Requirements for SBS Transactions

In June 2016, the SEC issued a [final rule](#) to establish trade acknowledgment and verification requirements for SBS transactions. Under the final rule, which is being issued in response to a mandate of the Dodd-Frank Act, an SBS entity that enters into an SBS transaction is required to do the following:

- “Provide a trade acknowledgment electronically to its transaction counterparty promptly, and no later than the end of the first business day following the day of execution.”
- “Promptly verify or dispute with its counterparty the terms of a trade acknowledgment it receives.”
- “Have written policies and procedures in place that are reasonably designed to obtain verification of the terms outlined in any trade acknowledgment that it provides.”

In addition, certain broker-dealers that are SBS entities will be exempt from the requirements in Exchange Act Rule 10b-10 if they meet the requirements of the final rule. The final rule became effective on August 16, 2016.

For more information, the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Issues Final Rule on Regulation SBSR

In July 2016, the SEC issued a [final rule](#) that amends Regulation SBSR on the reporting and dissemination of SBS information. The purpose of the final rule, which implements requirements in Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act, is to “increase transparency in the security-based swap market.” The final rule became effective on October 11, 2016.

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Issues Final Rule Granting Regulatory Access to Data Held by SBS Data Repositories

In August 2016, the SEC issued a [final rule](#) that amends Rule 13n-4 of the Exchange Act to give certain regulators and other authorities access to SBS data repositories. Specifically, the final rule:

- Requires “either a memorandum of understanding or other arrangement between the Commission and the recipient of the data to address the confidentiality of the security-based swap data provided to the recipient.”
- Identifies “the five prudential regulators named in the statute, as well as the Federal Reserve banks and the Office of Financial Research, as being eligible to access data.”
- Addresses “factors that the Commission may consider in determining whether to permit other entities to access data.”

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Issues Proposed and Final Rules Related to Investment Advisers

In June 2016, the SEC issued a [proposed rule](#) that would require “SEC-registered investment advisers to adopt and implement written business continuity and transition plans reasonably designed to address operational and other risks related to a significant disruption in the investment adviser’s operations.” Further, such advisers would need to “make and keep all business continuity and transition plans that are currently in effect or at any time within the past five years were in effect.”

In August 2016, the SEC issued a [final rule](#) (effective October 31, 2016) to improve the reporting and disclosure requirements for investment advisers. Specifically, the final rule amends:

- Form ADV to (1) require investment advisers to disclose additional information (e.g., about their “separately managed account business”), (2) include an approach under which “private fund adviser entities operating a single advisory business” can use a single Form ADV to register, and (3) make certain technical corrections to “Form ADV items and instructions.”
- Investment Advisers Act rules to (1) require advisers to maintain additional records of performance-related calculations and communications and (2) “remove transition provisions that are no longer necessary.”

Advisers will need to begin complying with the amendments on October 1, 2017.

For more information on the proposed rule, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

For more information on the final rule, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Requests Comments on Regulation S-K

In April 2016, the SEC issued a [concept release](#) that seeks feedback from constituents on modernizing certain business and financial disclosure requirements of Regulation S-K. The main requirements of Regulation S-K, which is the central repository for nonfinancial statement disclosure requirements for public companies, were established more than 30 years ago, and the modernization and optimization of these requirements may be called for as a result of evolving business models, new technology, and changing investor interests.

The release is part of the SEC’s ongoing [disclosure effectiveness initiative](#), which is a broad-based review of the Commission’s disclosure, presentation, and delivery requirements for public companies. It follows the SEC’s issuance last fall of a request for comment that sought feedback on the effectiveness of financial disclosure requirements in Regulation S-X that apply to certain entities other than the registrant.

For more information, see Deloitte’s April 18, 2016, [Heads Up](#).

SEC Requests Comments on Certain Regulation S-K Disclosure Requirements

In August 2016, the SEC published a [request for comment](#) (with an October 31, 2016, comment deadline) as part of its disclosure effectiveness initiative. The request for comment seeks feedback on certain disclosure requirements in Subpart 400 of Regulation S-K related to management, certain security holders, and corporate governance matters. The Commission plans to take the comments received into account when it develops its study on Regulation S-K, which is required by the FAST Act.

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC's Web site.

SEC Proposes to Eliminate Outdated and Duplicative Disclosure Requirements

In July 2016, the SEC issued a [proposed rule](#) that would amend certain of the Commission's disclosure requirements that may be redundant, duplicative, or outdated, or may overlap with other SEC, U.S. GAAP, or IFRS disclosure requirements. The proposal also seeks comment on whether certain of the SEC's disclosure requirements that overlap with requirements under U.S. GAAP should be retained, modified, eliminated, or referred to the FASB for potential incorporation into U.S. GAAP.

The proposed amendments are the next step in the SEC's ongoing disclosure effectiveness initiative. As part of the initiative, the SEC in April 2016 also issued a [concept release](#) that sought feedback on modernizing certain business and financial disclosure requirements of Regulation S-K.



Thinking It Through

The implications of the proposal are likely to vary depending on the category of change (e.g., duplicate, overlapping, superseded). The effect of some changes may not be significant if their purpose is only to eliminate a duplicated or superseded requirement. Changes to address overlapping requirements could have a more significant effect since they can result in what the SEC describes as (1) disclosure location considerations and (2) bright-line threshold considerations.

For more information, see Deloitte's July 18, 2016, [Heads Up](#) and the [press release](#) on the SEC's Web site.

SEC Staff Updates C&DIs Related to Regulation S-K, the Securities Act, and Other Topics

In October 2016, the Division updated C&DIs related to Regulation S-K, Item 402(u), and added the following new questions:

- [Question 128C.01](#) — Clarifies what type of consistently applied compensation measure (CACM) a registrant should select to identify the median employee when a registrant does not use annual total compensation calculated in accordance with Regulation S-K, Item 402(c)(2)(x).
- [Question 128C.02](#) — Clarifies whether a registrant may use hourly or annual rates of pay in determining its CACM.
- [Question 128C.03](#) — Clarifies the time period a registrant may use when it uses a CACM to identify the median employee.

- [Question 128C.04](#) — Clarifies the treatment of furloughed employees by registrants in the identification of the median employee.
- [Question 128C.05](#) — Clarifies the circumstances under which a worker is considered an independent contractor or a leased worker.

In September 2016, the Division issued the following C&DIs:

- [Question 139.33](#) and [Question 126.41](#) related to *Securities Act sections and forms* — Include guidance on self-directed “brokerage windows.”
- [Question 301.03](#) related to *Regulation AB* — Clarifies whether a funding-agreement-backed note with certain characteristics should be considered an “asset-backed security,” as that term is defined in either Item 1101(c) of Regulation AB or Section 3(a)(79) of the Exchange Act.

In July 2016, the Division issued the following C&DIs:

- [Question 103.11](#) related to *filing Schedules 13D and 13G (Rule 13d-1)* — Addresses whether a shareholder is exempt from filing Schedule 13G on the basis of the provisions in the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act.
- [Question 111.02](#) and [Question 125.13](#) related to *Securities Act sections and forms* — Contain questions related to an issuer’s representation about the absence of a distribution of the securities received in an exchange.
- [Question 140.02](#) related to *Regulation S-K* — Discusses how, in situations in which “a selling security holder is not a natural person,” a registrant should “satisfy the obligation in Item 507 of Regulation S-K to disclose the nature of any position, office, or other material relationship that the selling security holder has had within the past three years with the registrant or any of its predecessors or affiliates.”

In June 2016, the Division updated Section 271 of its [C&DIs](#) on rules related to the Securities Act. The updated guidance addresses questions about the completion of a merger transaction.

SEC Proposes Amendments to Broker-Dealers’ Disclosures About Order Handling Information

In July 2016, the SEC issued a [proposed rule](#) that would enhance the requirements related to broker-dealers’ disclosures about order handling information. Specifically, the proposal would require broker-dealers to “disclose the handling of institutional orders to customers” and to include additional information in their existing retail order disclosures.

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Proposes Amendments to the Definition of Smaller Reporting Company

In June 2016, the SEC issued a [proposed rule](#) that “would expand the number of companies that qualify as smaller reporting companies, thus qualifying for certain existing scaled disclosures provided in Regulation S-K and Regulation S-X.” Specifically, the proposal would increase the qualification threshold from less than \$75 million of public float to less than \$250 million. Further, companies with public float of zero “would be permitted to provide scaled disclosures if [their] annual revenues are less than \$100 million, as compared to the current threshold of less than \$50 million in annual revenues.”

For more information, see Deloitte's June 29, 2016, [journal entry](#) and the [press release](#) on the SEC's Web site.



Thinking It Through

The proposal does not change the \$75 million public float threshold in the SEC's definition of "accelerated filer." Therefore, a company could qualify as a smaller reporting company and be eligible for the scaled disclosures but may also be an accelerated filer and subject to those requirements, including the shorter deadlines for periodic filings and the requirement to include an auditor's attestation report on ICFR.

FAST Act Amends JOBS Act and SEC Disclosure Requirements

The FAST Act became law in December 2015. Among its many provisions, it amends the JOBS Act and certain SEC disclosure requirements as well as establishes a new statutory exemption for private resales of securities. Specific provisions of the FAST Act include those related to JOBS Act changes for IPOs of emerging growth companies (EGCs), Form 10-K and Regulation S-K disclosure changes, a new Section 4(a)(7) exemption for private resales, incorporation by reference for smaller reporting companies, and an amendment to registration thresholds applicable to savings and loan holding companies.

For more information, see Deloitte's December 8, 2015, [journal entry](#) as well as the [announcement](#) on the SEC's Web site.



Thinking It Through

The aim of this legislation is make it easier for EGCs to gain exposure to the capital markets to access funding by easing regulations related to when an EGC can begin its road show as well as the omission of certain historical financial information to the extent that such information is not expected to be required at the time of an IPO's effectiveness.

SEC Releases Guidance Related to FAST Act

In January 2016, the SEC issued [interim final rules and form amendments](#) to implement certain provisions of the FAST Act. Among other aspects, the rules revise Forms S-1 and F-1 to permit an EGC to omit financial information from registration statements filed before an IPO (or confidentially submitted to the SEC for review) for historical periods required by Regulation S-X if the EGC reasonably believes that it will not be required to include these historical periods at the time the contemplated offering becomes effective. The rules and amendments became effective on January 19, 2016.

In addition, in December 2015, the SEC issued a number of C&DIs related to the FAST Act. Topics addressed in the C&DIs include (1) whether, and in what circumstances, an EGC can omit interim financial statements or financial statements of other entities from its registration statement and (2) FAST Act requirements that affect savings and loan holding companies.

See Deloitte's December 8, 2015, [journal entry](#) for more information about the FAST Act's effects on securities laws and regulations. Also see Deloitte's January 15, 2016, [journal entry](#) for further details on the interim final rules and [January 12, 2016](#), and [December 18, 2015](#), journal entries for more information about the C&DIs.

SEC Adopts Rules to Implement FAST Act and JOBS Act Provisions

In May 2016, the SEC issued a [final rule](#) that (1) marks the completion of the Commission's rulemaking mandates under the JOBS Act and (2) implements provisions of the FAST Act. Specifically, the final rule:

- Amends "Exchange Act Rules 12g-1 through 12g-4 and 12h-3 which govern the procedures relating to registration and termination of registration under Section 12(g), and suspension of reporting obligations under Section 15(d), to reflect the new thresholds established by the JOBS Act and the FAST Act."
- Applies "the definition of 'accredited investor' in Securities Act Rule 501(a) to determinations as to which record holders are accredited investors for purposes of Exchange Act Section 12(g)(1)." The final rule also revises the definition of "held of record" and establishes a nonexclusive safe harbor under Exchange Act Section 12(g).

The final rule became effective on June 9, 2016. For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC's Web site.

In June 2016, the SEC issued an [interim final rule](#) that implements provisions mandated by the FAST Act. The interim final rule allows Form 10-K filers to provide a summary of business and financial information contained in the annual report. The rule indicates that "a registrant may, at its option, include a summary in its Form 10-K provided that each item in the summary includes a cross-reference by hyperlink to the material contained in the registrant's Form 10-K to which such item relates." In addition, the rule solicits comments on whether it should (1) include specific requirements or guidance related to the form and content of the summary and (2) be expanded to include other annual reporting forms. The interim final rule became effective on June 9, 2016.

For more information on the interim final rule, see Deloitte's June 2, 2016, [journal entry](#) and the [press release](#) on the SEC's Web site.



Thinking It Through

The SEC considered the interim final rule's effects on registrants and noted that the rule was not likely to significantly alter their current disclosure practices. SEC rules do not currently prohibit registrants from voluntarily including a summary in their Form 10-K; however, on the basis of the SEC staff's review of select Form 10-K filings, most do not include such a summary. Instead, the vast majority of registrants include a fully hyperlinked table of contents that allows users to easily navigate to corresponding disclosure items.

SEC and Other Organizations Propose Guidance on Incentive-Based Compensation Arrangements

In May 2016, the SEC and several other government agencies, including the Federal Reserve Board, OCC, FDIC, FHFA, and NCUA, jointly issued a [proposed rule](#) on incentive-based compensation arrangements to implement Section 956 of the Dodd-Frank Act. The proposed rule would:

- Prohibit "incentive-based payment arrangements that the Agencies determine encourage inappropriate risks by certain financial institutions by providing excessive compensation or that could lead to material financial loss."
- Require "financial institutions to disclose information concerning incentive-based compensation arrangements to the appropriate Federal regulator."

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC's Web site.

SEC Updates *Financial Reporting Manual*

In March 2016, the Division updated its Financial Reporting Manual to clarify or add guidance on the following topics:

- *Paragraph 2410.8* — Significance testing related to equity method investments.
- *Topic 10* — Requirements as a result of the FAST Act.
- *Topic 11* — Implementation of the FASB's and IASB's new revenue standard.

In November 2016, the Division updated its Financial Reporting Manual to clarify or add guidance on the following topics:

- *Paragraphs 1140.3 and 10220.7* — The number of years of a target company's financial statements that an EGC should present.
- *Paragraph 1330.5* — Filings required after Form 10 is effective.
- *Paragraph 5120.1* — Effect of loss of smaller reporting company status on accelerated filer determination and filing due dates.
- *Paragraph 8110.2* — The May 2016 C&DI updates on non-GAAP financial measures.
- *Paragraph 10220.5* — EGC guidance on the financial statements of entities other than the registrant; pro forma information.
- *Paragraph 11120.4, Index* — Implementation of the FASB's and IASB's new revenue standard.
- *Section 11200, Index* — Implementation of the FASB's and IASB's new leases standard.
- *Section 11300, Index* — Implementation of the FASB's new standard on disclosures about short-duration insurance contracts.

For more information, see Deloitte's [March 22, 2016](#), and [November 9, 2016](#), journal entries.

SEC and FDIC Issue Proposed Rule on Covered Broker-Dealer Provisions

In February 2016, the SEC and FDIC issued a [proposed rule](#) that establishes certain “provisions applicable to the orderly liquidation of covered brokers and dealers.” The proposal is being issued in response to a mandate of the Dodd-Frank Act.

SEC Publishes Examination Priorities for 2016

In January 2016, the SEC's Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations published its [examination priorities](#) for 2016. New priorities include liquidity controls, public pension advisers, product promotion, exchange-traded funds, and variable annuities. Further, the priorities “reflect a continuing focus on protecting investors in ongoing risk areas such as cybersecurity, microcap fraud, fee selection, and reverse churning.”

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC's Web site.

2015 AICPA Conference on Current SEC and PCAOB Developments

At the 2015 AICPA Conference on Current SEC and PCAOB Developments, numerous speakers and discussion panels shared their insights into current accounting, reporting, and auditing practice issues. Key topics addressed at the event included the following:

- *Disclosure effectiveness* — Speakers focused on improving disclosure requirements, with the goal of enhancing the information provided to investors and promoting efficiency, competition, and capital formation. The SEC reiterated its continued focus on disclosure effectiveness, including its outreach to the investor community and its ongoing collaboration with the FASB.
- *ICFR* — This topic continues to be a key focus for regulators, preparers, and auditors. SEC Chief Accountant James Schnurr stated that “[m]anagement’s ability to fulfill its financial reporting responsibilities depends, in large part, on the design and effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting.” Several speakers commented that the frequency of ICFR-related findings in PCAOB inspections highlights the need for management, auditors, and audit committees to work together to address potential underlying issues with controls and assessments.
- *IFRSs* — The SEC’s consideration of the potential incorporation of IFRSs into the U.S. financial reporting system has long been a topic at the conference, and this year was no exception. At the 2014 conference, Mr. Schnurr introduced a potential fourth alternative regarding the use of IFRSs in the United States that would allow U.S.-based filers to voluntarily provide supplemental IFRS-based information without reconciliation to U.S. GAAP. In his remarks at the 2015 conference, Mr. Schnurr indicated that the OCA is likely to recommend that the SEC consider and commence rulemaking that is consistent with this fourth alternative.
- *Audit committees* — Speakers observed that the roles and responsibilities now frequently imposed on audit committees in addition to their core SEC-required duties may interfere with their primary responsibility of overseeing the company’s financial reporting. Mr. Schnurr recapped the SEC staff’s efforts over the past year to address “whether investors are interested in hearing from audit committees on *how* (not just *if*) they have fulfilled their responsibilities; and . . . whether the Commission’s rules support such reporting.” As part of these efforts, the SEC issued a [concept release](#) in July 2015 to seek feedback on the proposed changes to the reporting requirements as well as on additional disclosures investors may want.

For more information, see Deloitte’s December 15, 2015, [Heads Up](#).

SEC Proposes Rule on Use of Derivatives

In December 2015, the SEC issued a [proposed rule](#) on use of derivatives by registered investment companies and business development companies. The proposal would “place restrictions on funds, such as mutual funds and exchange-traded funds . . . that would limit their use of derivatives and require funds to put in place risk management measures resulting in better protection for investors.”

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

SEC Proposes Enhancements to Disclosure Requirements for Alternative Trading Systems

In November 2015, the SEC issued a [proposed rule](#) that would amend the requirements for alternative trading systems under the Exchange Act. Specifically, the proposal would require alternative trading systems that “trade stocks listed on a national securities exchange (NMS stocks), including ‘dark pools,’ to publicly disclose detailed information about the operations and activities of a broker-dealer operator and its affiliates.”

For more information, see the [press release](#) on the SEC’s Web site.

Summary of Accounting Pronouncements Effective in 2016

The table below lists ASUs that became effective for calendar year 2016. (Note that it is assumed that the ASUs were not early adopted before 2016 if early adoption was permitted.)

ASU (Issuance Month)	Affects	Effective Date for Public Business Entities	Effective Date for All Other Entities
ASU 2016-03, <i>Intangibles — Goodwill and Other (Topic 350), Business Combinations (Topic 805), Consolidation (Topic 810), Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Effective Date and Transition Guidance</i> — a consensus of the Private Company Council (March 2016)	Private entities.	Not applicable.	Upon issuance.
ASU 2015-16, <i>Simplifying the Accounting for Measurement-Period Adjustments</i> (September 2015)	Entities that have reported provisional amounts for items in a business combination for which the accounting is incomplete by the end of the reporting period in which the business combination occurs and during the measurement period have an adjustment to provisional amounts recognized.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017.

Summary of Accounting Pronouncements Effective in 2016

(Table continued)

ASU (Issuance Month)	Affects	Effective Date for Public Business Entities	Effective Date for All Other Entities
ASU 2015-12, <i>(Part I) Fully Benefit-Responsive Investment Contracts, (Part II) Plan Investment Disclosures, (Part III) Measurement Date Practical Expedient</i> — consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (July 2015)	Reporting entities within the scope of ASC 960, ASC 962, or ASC 965. Effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2015.		
ASU 2015-10, <i>Technical Corrections and Improvements</i> (June 2015)	All entities.	Transition guidance varies on the basis of the amendments in the ASU. The amendments that require transition guidance are effective for all entities for fiscal years and interim periods within those fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2015.	
ASU 2015-09, <i>Disclosures About Short-Duration Contracts</i> (May 2015)	All insurance entities that issue short-duration contracts as defined in ASC 944. The amendments do not apply to the holder (i.e., policyholder) of short-duration contracts.	Fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2015, and interim periods within annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016.	Fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, and interim periods within annual periods beginning after December 15, 2017.
ASU 2015-07, <i>Disclosures for Investments in Certain Entities That Calculate Net Asset Value per Share (or Its Equivalent)</i> — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (May 2015)	All entities.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2016.
ASU 2015-06, <i>Effects on Historical Earnings per Unit of Master Limited Partnership Dropdown Transactions</i> — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (April 2015)	All entities.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	
ASU 2015-05, <i>Customer's Accounting for Fees Paid in a Cloud Computing Arrangement</i> (April 2015)	All entities.	Annual periods (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Annual periods beginning after December 15, 2015, and interim periods within annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016.

Summary of Accounting Pronouncements Effective in 2016

(Table continued)

ASU (Issuance Month)	Affects	Effective Date for Public Business Entities	Effective Date for All Other Entities
ASU 2015-04, <i>Practical Expedient for the Measurement Date of an Employer's Defined Benefit Obligation and Plan Assets</i> (April 2015)	All entities.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017.
ASU 2015-03, <i>Simplifying the Presentation of Debt Issuance Costs</i> (April 2015)	All entities.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2015, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016.
ASU 2015-02, <i>Amendments to the Consolidation Analysis</i> (February 2015)	Entities that are required to evaluate whether they should consolidate certain legal entities.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, and for interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017.
ASU 2015-01, <i>Simplifying Income Statement Presentation by Eliminating the Concept of Extraordinary Items</i> (January 2015)	All entities.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	
ASU 2014-18, <i>Accounting for Identifiable Intangible Assets in a Business Combination</i> — a consensus of the Private Company Council (December 2014)	All entities except public business entities and not-for-profit entities, as those terms are defined in the ASC master glossary.	Not applicable.	If the first in-scope transaction occurs in the first fiscal year beginning after December 15, 2015, the elective adoption will be effective for that fiscal year's annual financial reporting and all interim and annual periods thereafter. If the first transaction occurs in fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016, the elective adoption will be effective in the interim period that includes the date of the transaction and subsequent interim and annual periods thereafter.

Summary of Accounting Pronouncements Effective in 2016

(Table continued)

ASU (Issuance Month)	Affects	Effective Date for Public Business Entities	Effective Date for All Other Entities
ASU 2014-16, <i>Determining Whether the Host Contract in a Hybrid Financial Instrument Issued in the Form of a Share Is More Akin to Debt or to Equity</i> — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (November 2014)	Entities that are issuers of, or investors in, hybrid financial instruments that are issued in the form of a share.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2015, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2016.
ASU 2014-13, <i>Measuring the Financial Assets and the Financial Liabilities of a Consolidated Collateralized Financing Entity</i> — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (August 2014)	A reporting entity that is required to consolidate a collateralized financing entity under the variable interest entities subsections of ASC 810-10 and that measures assets and liabilities of the collateralized financing entity by using fair value.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	Fiscal years ending after December 15, 2016, and interim periods beginning after December 15, 2016.
ASU 2014-12, <i>Accounting for Share-Based Payments When the Terms of an Award Provide That a Performance Target Could Be Achieved After the Requisite Service Period</i> — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (June 2014)	Reporting entities that grant their employees share-based payments in which the terms of the award stipulate that a performance target that affects vesting could be achieved after the requisite service period.	Fiscal years (and interim periods therein) beginning after December 15, 2015.	

Appendixes

Appendix A — Glossary of Standards and Other Literature

The following are the titles of standards and other literature mentioned in this publication:

AICPA

Working Draft: Engineering & Construction Contractors Revenue Recognition Implementation Issues; Issue #4-1: Identifying the Unit of Account

FASB ASUs

ASU 2016-18, *Statement of Cash Flows (Topic 230): Restricted Cash* — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2016-17, *Consolidation (Topic 810): Interests Held Through Related Parties That Are Under Common Control*

ASU 2016-15, *Statement of Cash Flows (Topic 230): Classification of Certain Cash Receipts and Cash Payments* — a consensus of the Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2016-13, *Financial Instruments — Credit Losses (Topic 326): Measurement of Credit Losses on Financial Instruments*

ASU 2016-12, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606): Narrow-Scope Improvements and Practical Expedients*

ASU 2016-11, *Revenue Recognition (Topic 605) and Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Rescission of SEC Guidance Because of Accounting Standards Updates 2014-09 and 2014-16 Pursuant to Staff Announcements at the March 3, 2016 EITF Meeting (SEC Update)*

ASU 2016-10, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606): Identifying Performance Obligations and Licensing*

ASU 2016-09, *Compensation — Stock Compensation (Topic 718): Improvements to Employee Share-Based Payment Accounting*

ASU 2016-08, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606): Principal Versus Agent Considerations (Reporting Revenue Gross Versus Net)*

ASU 2016-07, *Investments — Equity Method and Joint Ventures (Topic 323): Simplifying the Transition to the Equity Method of Accounting*

ASU 2016-03, *Intangibles — Goodwill and Other (Topic 350), Business Combinations (Topic 805), Consolidation (Topic 810), Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Effective Date and Transition Guidance* — a consensus of the Private Company Council

ASU 2016-02, *Leases (Topic 842)*

Appendix A — Glossary of Standards and Other Literature

ASU 2016-01, *Financial Instruments — Overall (Subtopic 825-10): Recognition and Measurement of Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities*

ASU 2015-17, *Income Taxes (Topic 740): Balance Sheet Classification of Deferred Taxes*

ASU 2015-16, *Business Combinations (Topic 805): Simplifying the Accounting for Measurement-Period Adjustments*

ASU 2015-14, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606): Deferral of the Effective Date*

ASU 2015-12, *Plan Accounting: Defined Benefit Pension Plans (Topic 960), Defined Contribution Pension Plans (Topic 962), Health and Welfare Benefit Plans (Topic 965): (Part I) Fully Benefit-Responsive Investment Contracts, (Part II) Plan Investment Disclosures, (Part III) Measurement Date Practical Expedient —* consensuses of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2015-10, *Technical Corrections and Improvements*

ASU 2015-09, *Financial Services — Insurance (Topic 944): Disclosures About Short-Duration Contracts*

ASU 2015-07, *Fair Value Measurement (Topic 820): Disclosures for Investments in Certain Entities That Calculate Net Asset Value per Share (or Its Equivalent) —* a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2015-06, *Earnings per Share (Topic 260): Effects on Historical Earnings per Unit of Master Limited Partnership Dropdown Transactions —* a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2015-05, *Intangibles — Goodwill and Other — Internal-Use Software (Subtopic 350-40): Customer's Accounting for Fees Paid in a Cloud Computing Arrangement*

ASU 2015-04, *Compensation — Retirement Benefits (Topic 715): Practical Expedient for the Measurement Date of an Employer's Defined Benefit Obligation and Plan Assets*

ASU 2015-03, *Interest — Imputation of Interest (Subtopic 835-30): Simplifying the Presentation of Debt Issuance Costs*

ASU 2015-02, *Consolidation (Topic 810): Amendments to the Consolidation Analysis*

ASU 2015-01, *Income Statement — Extraordinary and Unusual Items (Subtopic 225-20): Simplifying Income Statement Presentation by Eliminating the Concept of Extraordinary Items*

ASU 2014-18, *Business Combinations (Topic 805): Accounting for Identifiable Intangible Assets in a Business Combination —* a consensus of the Private Company Council

ASU 2014-16, *Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Determining Whether the Host Contract in a Hybrid Financial Instrument Issued in the Form of a Share Is More Akin to Debt or to Equity —* a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2014-13, *Consolidation (Topic 810): Measuring the Financial Assets and the Financial Liabilities of a Consolidated Collateralized Financing Entity —* a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2014-12, *Compensation — Stock Compensation (Topic 718): Accounting for Share-Based Payments When the Terms of an Award Provide That a Performance Target Could Be Achieved after the Requisite Service Period —* a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2014-09, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606)*

ASU 2014-07, *Consolidation (Topic 810): Applying Variable Interest Entities Guidance to Common Control Leasing Arrangements —* a consensus of the Private Company Council

Appendix A — Glossary of Standards and Other Literature

ASU 2014-03, *Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Accounting for Certain Receive-Variable, Pay-Fixed Interest Rate Swaps — Simplified Hedge Accounting Approach* — a consensus of the Private Company Council

ASU 2014-02, *Intangibles — Goodwill and Other (Topic 350): Accounting for Goodwill* — a consensus of the Private Company Council

ASU 2014-01, *Investments — Equity Method and Joint Ventures (Topic 323): Accounting for Investments in Qualified Affordable Housing Projects* — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2010-20, *Receivables (Topic 310): Disclosures About the Credit Quality of Financing Receivables and the Allowance for Credit Losses*

ASU 2010-10, *Consolidation (Topic 810): Amendments for Certain Investment Funds*

ASU 2009-17, *Consolidations (Topic 810): Improvements to Financial Reporting by Enterprises Involved With Variable Interest Entities*

FASB ASC Topics and Subtopics

ASC 230, *Statement of Cash Flows*

ASC 235, *Notes to Financial Statements*

ASC 250, *Accounting Changes and Error Corrections*

ASC 250-10, *Accounting Changes and Error Corrections: Overall*

ASC 320, *Investments — Debt and Equity Securities*

ASC 321-10, *Investments — Equity Securities: Overall*

ASC 325-40, *Investments — Other: Beneficial Interests in Securitized Financial Assets*

ASC 326-30, *Financial Instruments — Credit Losses: Available-for-Sale Debt Securities*

ASC 350, *Intangibles — Goodwill and Other*

ASC 360-20, *Property, Plant, and Equipment: Real Estate Sales*

ASC 460, *Guarantees*

ASC 470-10, *Debt: Overall*

ASC 470-20, *Debt: Debt With Conversion and Other Options*

ASC 480, *Distinguishing Liabilities From Equity*

ASC 480-10, *Distinguishing Liabilities From Equity: Overall*

ASC 505-50, *Equity: Equity-Based Payments to Non-Employees*

ASC 605, *Revenue Recognition*

ASC 605-20, *Revenue Recognition: Services*

ASC 605-45, *Revenue Recognition: Principal Agent Considerations*

ASC 605-50, *Revenue Recognition: Customer Payments and Incentives*

ASC 606, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers*

ASC 606-10, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers: Overall*

Appendix A — Glossary of Standards and Other Literature

ASC 610-20, Other Income: Gains and Losses From the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets

ASC 715, Compensation — Retirement Benefits

ASC 715-20, Compensation — Retirement Benefits: Defined Benefit Plans — General

ASC 718, Compensation — Stock Compensation

ASC 718-20, Compensation — Stock Compensation: Awards Classified as Equity

ASC 740, Income Taxes

ASC 740-10, Income Taxes: Overall

ASC 805, Business Combinations

ASC 805-10, Business Combinations: Overall

ASC 810, Consolidation

ASC 810-10, Consolidation: Overall

ASC 815, Derivatives and Hedging

ASC 815-10, Derivatives and Hedging: Overall

ASC 815-15, Derivatives and Hedging: Embedded Derivatives

ASC 815-40: Derivatives and Hedging: Contracts in Entity's Own Equity

ASC 820, Fair Value Measurement

ASC 820-10, Fair Value Measurement: Overall

ASC 825, Financial Instruments

ASC 825-10, Financial Instruments: Overall

ASC 840, Leases

ASC 845-10, Nonmonetary Transactions: Overall

ASC 860, Transfers and Servicing

ASC 932-10, Extractive Activities — Oil and Gas: Overall

ASC 944, Financial Services — Insurance

ASC 946, Financial Services — Investment Companies

ASC 958, Not-for-Profit Entities

ASC 960, Plan Accounting — Defined Benefit Pension Plans

ASC 962, Plan Accounting — Defined Contribution Pension Plans

ASC 965, Plan Accounting — Health and Welfare Benefit Plans

ASC 970, Real Estate — General

ASC 970-605, Real Estate — General: Revenue Recognition

FASB Proposed ASUs

Proposed ASU 2016-360, *Compensation — Stock Compensation (Topic 718) — Scope of Modification Accounting*

Proposed ASU 2016-320, *Technical Corrections and Improvements to Update No. 2014-09, Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606) — Additional Corrections*

Proposed ASU 2016-310, *Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Targeted Improvements to Accounting for Hedging Activities*

Proposed ASU 2016-270, *Income Taxes (Topic 740): Disclosure Framework — Changes to the Disclosure Requirements for Income Taxes*

Proposed ASU 2016-250, *Other Income — Gains and Losses From the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets (Subtopic 610-20): Clarifying the Scope of Asset Derecognition Guidance and Accounting for Partial Sales of Nonfinancial Assets*

Proposed ASU 2016-240, *Technical Corrections and Improvements to Update 2014-09, Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606)*

Proposed ASU 2016-230, *Intangibles — Goodwill and Other (Topic 350): Simplifying the Accounting for Goodwill Impairment*

Proposed ASU 2016-210, *Compensation — Retirement Benefits — Defined Benefit Plans — General (Subtopic 715-20): Changes to the Disclosure Requirements for Defined Benefit Plans*

Proposed ASU 2015-350, *Fair Value Measurement (Topic 820): Disclosure Framework — Changes to the Disclosure Requirements for Fair Value Measurement*

Proposed ASU 2015-330, *Business Combinations (Topic 805): Clarifying the Definition of a Business*

Proposed ASU 2015-340, *Government Assistance (Topic 832): Disclosures by Business Entities About Government Assistance*

Proposed ASU 2015-300, *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting — Chapter 3: Qualitative Characteristics of Useful Financial Information*

Proposed ASU 2015-310, *Notes to Financial Statements (Topic 235): Assessing Whether Disclosures Are Material*

Proposed ASU 2015-280, *Investments — Equity Method and Joint Ventures (Topic 323): Simplifying the Equity Method of Accounting*

Other FASB Proposals

Invitation to Comment 2016-290, *Agenda Consultation*

Proposed Concepts Statement 2015-300, *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting: Chapter 3: Qualitative Characteristics of Useful Financial Information*

Proposed Concepts Statement 2014-200, *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting: Chapter 8: Notes to Financial Statements*

Invitation to Comment 2012-220, *Disclosure Framework*

FASB Concepts Statement

CON 8, *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting*

EITF Issue

15-F, "Statement of Cash Flows: Classification of Certain Cash Receipts and Cash Payments"

Private Company Council Literature

PCC Issue No. 15-02, "Applying Variable Interest Entity Guidance to Entities Under Common Control"

SEC Division of Corporation Finance *Financial Reporting Manual*

Topic 2, "Other Financial Statements Required"; Section 2400, "Equity Method Investments, Including Fair Value Option"

Topic 10, "Emerging Growth Companies"

Topic 11, "Reporting Issued Related to Adoption of New Revenue Recognition Standard"

Topic 13, "Effects of Subsequent Events on Financial Statements Required in Filings"

SEC Regulation AB (Asset-Backed Securities)

Item 1101(c), "Definitions; Asset-Backed Security"

SEC Regulation S-X

Rule 4-08(h), "General Notes to Financial Statements: Income Tax Expense"

SEC Regulation S-K

Item 402(c), "Executive Compensation; Summary Compensation Table"

Item 402(u), "Executive Compensation; Pay Ratio Disclosure"

Item 507, "Selling Security Holders"

SEC Final Rules

34-78961, *Standards for Covered Clearing Agencies*

34-78716, *Access to Data Obtained by Security-Based Swap Data Repositories*

IA-4509, *Form ADV and Investment Advisers Act Rules*

34-78321, *Regulation SBSR — Reporting and Dissemination of Security-Based Swap Information*

34-78011, *Trade Acknowledgment and Verification of Security-Based Swap Transactions*

33-10075, *Changes to Exchange Act Registration Requirements to Implement Title V and Title VI of the JOBS Act*

34-77617, *Business Conduct Standards for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants*

SIPA-175, *Securities Investor Protection Corporation*

34-77104, *Security-Based Swap Transactions Connected With a Non-U.S. Person's Dealing Activity That Are Arranged, Negotiated, or Executed by Personnel Located in a U.S. Branch or Office or in a U.S. Branch or Office of an Agent; Security-Based Swap Dealer De Minimis Exception*

SEC Interim Final Rules

34-77969, *Request for Comment, Form 10-K Summary*

33-10003, *Request for Comment, Simplification of Disclosure Requirements for Emerging Growth Companies and Forward Incorporation by Reference on Form S-1 for Smaller Reporting Companies*

SEC Proposed Rules and Concept Releases

34-78963, *Definition of "Covered Clearing Agency"*

34-78962, *Amendment to Securities Transaction Settlement Cycle*

34-78309, *Disclosure of Order Handling Information*

33-10110, *Disclosure Update and Simplification*

IA-4439, *Adviser Business Continuity and Transition Plans*

33-10107, *Amendments to Smaller Reporting Company Definition*

33-10064, *Business and Financial Disclosure Required by Regulation S-K*

34-77776, *Incentive-Based Compensation Arrangements*

34-77157, *Covered Broker-Dealer Provisions Under Title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act*

IC-31933, *Use of Derivatives by Registered Investment Companies and Business Development Companies*

34-76474, *Regulation of NMS Stock Alternative Trading Systems*

33-9862, *Possible Revisions to Audit Committee Disclosures*

Other SEC Proposal

33-10198, *Request for Comment on Subpart 400 of Regulation S-K Disclosure Requirements Relating to Management, Certain Security Holders and Corporate Governance Matters*

SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin

SAB Topic 13, "Revenue Recognition"

SEC Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations

Examination Priorities for 2016

SEC C&DI Topics

Exchange Act Sections 13(d) and 13(g) and Regulation 13D-G Beneficial Ownership Reporting

Non-GAAP Financial Measures

Regulation AB and Related Rules

Regulation S-K

Securities Act Forms

Securities Act Rules

Securities Act Sections

Securities Act of 1933 Rule

Rule 501(a), “Definitions and Terms Used in Regulation D; Accredited Investor”

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Rules

Rule 10b-10 “Manipulative and Deceptive Devices and Contrivances; Confirmation of Transactions”

Rule 12g “Extensions and Temporary Exemptions”:

- Rule 12g-1, “Definitions; Exemption From Section 12(g)”
- Rule 12g-2, “Securities Deemed to Be Registered Pursuant to Section 12(g)(1) Upon Termination of Exemption Pursuant to Section 12(g)(2) (A) or (B)”
- Rule 12g-3, “Registration of Securities of Successor Issuers Under Section 12(b) or 12(g)”
- Rule 12g-4, “Certifications of Termination of Registration Under Section 12(g)”

Rule 12h-3, “Suspension of Duty to File Reports Under Section 15(d)”

Rule 13n-4, “Regulation SBSR; Duties and Core Principles of Security-Based Swap Data Repository”

International Standards

IFRS 16, *Leases*

IAS 17, *Leases*

IAS 12, *Income Taxes*

Appendix B — Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description	Abbreviation	Description
AFS	available for sale	GP	general partner
AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants	HTM	held to maturity
AOCI	accumulated other comprehensive income	IAS	International Accounting Standard
APIC	additional paid-in capital	IASB	International Accounting Standards Board
ASC	FASB Accounting Standards Codification	ICFR	internal control over financial reporting
ASU	FASB Accounting Standards Update	IFRS	International Financial Reporting Standard
AUP	agreed-upon procedures	IPO	initial public offering
BOLI	bank-owned life insurance	LP	limited partner
C&DI	SEC compliance and disclosure interpretation	NCUA	National Credit Union Administration
CACM	consistently applied compensation measure	NMS	National Market System
CECL	current expected credit loss	NOL	net operating loss
COLI	corporate-owned life insurance	OCA	SEC's Office of the Chief Accountant
DTA	deferred tax asset	OCC	Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (U.S. Department of the Treasury)
DTL	deferred tax liability	OCI	other comprehensive income
EGC	emerging growth company	PCAOB	Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
EITF	Emerging Issues Task Force	PCC	Private Company Council
EPS	earnings per share	PCD asset	purchased financial assets with credit deterioration
FASB	Financial Accounting Standards Board	ROU	right of use
FDIC	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	SAB	SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin
FHFA	Federal Housing Finance Agency	SAC	subjective acceleration clause
FINRA	Financial Industry Regulatory Authority	SBS	security-based swap
GAAP	generally accepted accounting principles	SEC	Securities and Exchange Commission

Appendix B — Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
SIFMA	Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association
SIPC	Securities Investor Protection Corporation
TRG	transition resource group
VIE	variable interest entity

The following is a list of short references for the Acts mentioned in this publication:

Abbreviation	Act
Dodd-Frank Act	Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act
Exchange Act	Securities Exchange Act of 1934
FAST Act	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act
Hart-Scott-Rodino Act	Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act
Investment Advisers Act	Investment Advisers Act of 1940
JOBS Act	Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act
Securities Act	Securities Act of 1933

This publication contains general information only and Deloitte 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 may affect your business, you should consult a qualified professional advisor.

Deloitte shall not be responsible for any loss sustained by any person who relies on this publication.

Copyright © 2016 Deloitte Development LLC. All rights reserved.