



Investment Management

Accounting and Financial
Reporting Update

November 6, 2020

The *FASB Accounting Standards Codification*[®] material is copyrighted by the Financial Accounting Foundation, 401 Merritt 7, PO Box 5116, Norwalk, CT 06856-5116, and is reproduced with permission.

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.

The services described herein are illustrative in nature and are intended to demonstrate our experience and capabilities in these areas; however, due to independence restrictions that may apply to audit clients (including affiliates) of Deloitte & Touche LLP, we may be unable to provide certain services based on individual facts and circumstances.

As used in this document, "Deloitte" means Deloitte & Touche LLP, Deloitte Consulting LLP, Deloitte Tax LLP, and Deloitte Financial Advisory Services LLP, which are separate subsidiaries of Deloitte LLP. Please see www.deloitte.com/us/about for a detailed description of our legal structure.

Copyright © 2020 Deloitte Development LLC. All rights reserved.

Other Deloitte Publications

Other Deloitte publications, such as our [Roadmap Series](#), are available on the [Deloitte Accounting Research Tool \(DART\)](#), a comprehensive online library of accounting and financial disclosure literature. The Roadmap series includes titles on the following topics:

Business Combinations

Business Combinations — SEC Reporting Considerations

Carve-Out Transactions

Comparing IFRS Standards and U.S. GAAP

Consolidation — Identifying a Controlling Financial Interest

Contingencies, Loss Recoveries, and Guarantees

Contracts on an Entity's Own Equity

Convertible Debt

Current Expected Credit Losses

Distinguishing Liabilities From Equity

Earnings per Share

Environmental Obligations and Asset Retirement Obligations

Equity Method Investments and Joint Ventures

Equity Method Investees — SEC Reporting Considerations

Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures (Including the Fair Value Option)

Foreign Currency Transactions and Translations

Guarantees and Collateralizations — SEC Reporting Considerations

Impairments and Disposals of Long-Lived Assets and Discontinued Operations

Income Taxes

Initial Public Offerings

Leases

Noncontrolling Interests

Non-GAAP Financial Measures and Metrics

Revenue Recognition

SEC Comment Letter Considerations, Including Industry Insights

Segment Reporting

Share-Based Payment Awards

Statement of Cash Flows

Contacts

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

Rajan Chari

Investment Management — Professional Practice Director
+1 312 486 4845
rchari@deloitte.com

Mindy Dominek

Investment Management — Deputy Professional Practice Director
+1 619 237 6695
mdominek@deloitte.com

Bryan Johnston

Investment Management — Senior Manager
+1 609 806 7063
bryjohnston@deloitte.com

Tania Lynn Taylor

Investment Management — Audit Industry Leader
+1 212 436 2910
tlynn@deloitte.com

Patrick Henry

Vice Chairman
U.S. Investment Management Practice Leader
+1 212 436 4853
phentry@deloitte.com

Hugh Guyler

Financial Services Industry — Professional Practice Director
+1 212 436 4848
hguyler@deloitte.com

Mike Croke

Investment Management — Professional Practice Director
+1 617 437 2062
mcroke@deloitte.com

Jeff Schmit

Investment Management — Senior Manager
+1 215 405 5541
jschmit@deloitte.com

Stacey Wilson

Investment Management — Managing Director
+1 303 312 4079
stwilson@deloitte.com

Paul Kraft

Mutual Fund and Investment Adviser
+1 617 437 2175
pkraft@deloitte.com

Monica O'Reilly

U.S. Financial Services Industry Leader
+1 415 783 5780
monoreilly@deloitte.com

Contents

Preface	vi
Introduction	1
Revenue Recognition	2
Financial Instruments	3
Leases	11
Income Taxes	13
Consolidation	15
Compensation	17
Cloud Computing Arrangements	17
Appendix A — Titles of Standards and Other Literature	19
Appendix B — Abbreviations	22

Preface

November 6, 2020

To our clients and colleagues in the investment management sector:

We are pleased to present the 2020 edition of Deloitte's *Investment Management — Accounting and Financial Reporting Update*. The topics discussed in this publication were selected because they may be of particular interest to investment management entities.

Developments in 2020 include the standard setters' continued work on issues related to the implementation of several standards. The publication also lists selected ASUs that were issued in calendar year 2020 and summarizes the current status of, and next steps for, selected active FASB projects.

The 2020 accounting and financial reporting updates for the insurance, banking and capital markets, and real estate sectors will be available soon on [DART](#) — the Deloitte Accounting Research Tool.

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

Sincerely,

Rajan Chari
Investment Management
Professional Practice Director
Deloitte & Touche LLP

Mike Croke
Investment Management
Professional Practice Director
Deloitte & Touche LLP

Tania Lynn Taylor
Investment Management
Audit Industry Leader
Deloitte & Touche LLP

Introduction

The standard setters made limited changes to accounting and financial reporting guidance in 2020, so industry participants focused mainly on adopting or preparing to adopt the major standards issued previously by the FASB.

COVID-19

After a novel coronavirus detected in China in December 2019 had spread rapidly around the globe, the World Health Organization declared the coronavirus disease 2019 (“COVID-19”) a pandemic in March 2020. The impacts of COVID-19 were far-reaching, and investment management firms were not immune. Turmoil in the financial markets marked much of 2020 as uncertainty reigned (heightened by both COVID-19 and the upcoming presidential election). Investment management firms had to navigate these turbulent markets while also dealing with the unprecedented issues of remote working arrangements and travel restrictions.

In response to COVID-19, the SEC issued several forms of [regulatory relief](#). In August 2020, the SEC’s Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations followed this up with a [Risk Alert](#) specific to broker-dealers and investment advisers. The SEC’s Division of Investment Management also prepared COVID-19 response [FAQs](#) to assist the industry.

Other Noteworthy Events

The SEC has also been busy in 2020 tackling a variety of issues that could have significant impacts on the investment management industry. Its activity has included the issuance of:

- A [proposed rule](#) on the good faith determinations of fair value that is designed to give boards and investment advisers of registered investment companies a consistent modern approach to the determination of fair value.
- A [proposed rule](#) on the disclosure framework for open-end management investment companies that, among other things, would require them to create new concise shareholder reports.
- A [final rule](#) on business development company and closed-end fund offering reform that allows these entities to use certain securities offering rules that are already available to operating companies.
- [Amendments](#) to the definitions of “accelerated filer” and “large accelerated filer” under Rule 12b-2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (including a specific provision for business development companies).
- A [final rule](#) and amendments under the Investment Company Act of 1940 that update the regulatory framework for funds that invest in other funds (“fund of funds” arrangements).

Additional Information

For additional information about industry issues and trends, see Deloitte’s [2021 Financial Services Industry Outlooks](#).

Revenue Recognition

Standard Setting

On June 3, 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-05](#), which amends the effective dates of the new revenue standard (ASC 606) to give immediate relief to certain entities as a result of the business disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the widespread adverse economic effects. ASU 2020-05 permits certain entities that had not issued financial statements (or made financial statements available for issuance) reflecting the adoption of ASC 606 as of June 3, 2020, to adopt ASC 606 for (1) annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019, and (2) interim reporting periods within annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2020. For more information, see Deloitte's June 3, 2020, [Heads Up](#).

In the [2017 edition](#) of this publication, we addressed implementation issues that apply to investment managers, including those related to (1) performance-based fees, (2) the costs of managing investment companies, (3) incentive-based capital allocations, (4) gross versus net presentation, (5) management fee waivers and customer expense reimbursements, (6) distribution fees received, (7) third-party distribution fees paid, and (8) the transfer of rights to certain future distribution fees. See also Chapter 4 of the AICPA's Audit and Accounting Guide *Revenue Recognition*, which was developed by the AICPA's [Asset Management Revenue Recognition Task Force](#). The task force did not evaluate any additional significant implementation topics in 2020.

Disclosure Themes Upon Adoption

While some companies made wholesale changes to their financial statements upon the adoption of ASC 606, others were not significantly affected by the new guidance. However, the standard's new and modified quantitative and qualitative disclosure guidance significantly increased the amount of information investment managers must disclose about revenue activities and related transactions.

Deloitte's [A Roadmap to SEC Comment Letter Considerations, Including Industry Insights](#) highlights some key themes regarding the application of ASC 606 in connection with accounting and disclosure requirements and includes excerpts of SEC comments. As entities navigate ASC 606's disclosure requirements, they may benefit from evaluating the trends described in that publication.

For more information on ASC 606, see Deloitte's [A Roadmap to Applying the New Revenue Recognition Standard](#).

Financial Instruments

Codification Improvements

In April 2019, the FASB issued [ASU 2019-04](#), which clarified certain aspects of the guidance in [ASU 2016-01](#) on the accounting for financial instruments:

- *Held-to-maturity debt securities fair value disclosures* — Entities other than PBEs are exempt from the “fair value disclosure requirements for financial instruments not measured at fair value on the balance sheet.”
- *Measurement alternative in ASC 321-10-35-2* — The measurement alternative in ASC 321-10-35-2 for equity securities without readily determinable fair values represents a nonrecurring fair value measurement under ASC 820; therefore, such securities should be remeasured at fair value when an entity identifies an orderly transaction “for an identical or similar investment of the same issuer,” and applicable ASC 820 disclosures are required.
- *Remeasurement of equity securities at historical exchange rates* — An entity should remeasure foreign-denominated equity securities without readily determinable fair values subject to the measurement alternative at historical exchange rates. In addition, the historical exchange rate used should be the rate that existed on the later of (1) the acquisition date or (2) the most recent fair value measurement date.

The amendments in ASU 2019-04 related to ASU 2016-01 are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, including interim periods therein. Early adoption is permitted in any interim period after the issuance of ASU 2019-04 for those entities that have already adopted ASU 2016-01.

The amendments related to equity securities without readily determinable fair values require prospective application; however, the remaining amendments should be “applied on a modified-retrospective transition basis by means of a cumulative-effect adjustment to the opening retained earnings balance in the statement of financial position as of the date an entity adopted all of the amendments in Update 2016-01.” ASU 2019-04 also requires certain transition disclosures.

In March 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-03](#), which affects all reporting entities and clarifies the guidance in U.S. GAAP related to the following:

1. *Fair value option disclosures* — ASU 2016-01 relieves entities other than public entities from the requirement to disclose the fair values of financial instruments measured at an amortized cost basis. However, entities that elect the fair value option would measure the financial instruments at fair value. ASU 2020-03 clarifies that such entities are required to disclose the fair values of the financial instruments.
2. *Disclosures for depository and lending institutions* — ASU 2020-03 clarifies that the disclosure requirements in ASC 320-10-50-3 and ASC 320-10-50-5 through 50-5C related to securities classified as held to maturity apply to the disclosure requirements in ASC 942. In addition, securities with multiple maturity dates, such as mortgaged-backed securities, may be disclosed separately rather than allocated to several maturity groupings.
3. *Cross-reference to line-of-credit or revolving-debt arrangements* — ASU 2020-03 added cross-references between ASC 470-50-40-21 (modifications and extinguishments for line-of-credit or revolving-debt arrangements) and ASC 470-50-40-17 and 40-18 (modifications and extinguishments “for fees between the debtor and creditor and third-party costs, respectively”).

4. *Disclosures for net asset value practical expedient* — ASU 2020-03 clarifies that the disclosure requirement in ASC 820-10-50-2 does not apply to entities using the net asset value practical expedient.
5. *Interaction of leases and credit losses* — ASU 2020-03 added a definition of “lease term” to ASC 842 and clarifies that the lease term of a net investment in a lease should be the contractual term used to measure expected credit losses.
6. *Interaction of sales of financial assets and credit losses* — ASU 2020-03 clarifies that an entity should record an allowance for credit losses in accordance with ASC 326 when it regains control of financial assets sold under ASC 860-20.

The amendments in ASU 2020-03 are effective as follows:

- *Items 1, 3, and 4 above* — For PBEs, they were effective when the ASU was issued (March 2020). For all other entities, they are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, and interim periods within those fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020. Early adoption is permitted.
- *Item 2 above* — For all entities, they are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, including interim periods within those fiscal years.
- *Items 5 and 6 above* — For PBES **that have not yet adopted ASU 2016-13**, they are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, including interim periods within those fiscal years. For all other entities **that have not yet adopted ASU 2016-13**, they are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2022, including interim periods within those fiscal years. **For entities that have adopted ASU 2016-13, they are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, including interim periods within those fiscal years.**

In August 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-06](#), which simplifies the accounting for convertible instruments and contracts on an entity's own equity. Key provisions include the following:

- Removal from ASC 470-20 of the separation models for (1) convertible debt with a cash conversion feature and (2) convertible instruments with a beneficial conversion feature. After adoption, entities will not separate embedded conversion features unless such features require bifurcation as derivatives or the convertible debt instrument is issued at a substantial premium.
- Expansion of the disclosure requirements for convertible instruments related to terms and features.
- Removal from ASC 815-40-25-10 of the following three conditions for equity classification:
 - “Settlement permitted in unregistered shares. The contract permits the entity to settle in unregistered shares.”
 - “No counterparty rights rank higher than shareholder rights. There are no provisions in the contract that indicate that the counterparty has rights that rank higher than those of a shareholder of the stock underlying the contract.”
 - “No collateral required. There is no requirement in the contract to post collateral at any point or for any reason.”
- For calculation of diluted EPS, entities must apply the if-converted method to all convertible instruments. The treasury stock method is no longer available.

The amendments in ASU 2020-06 are effective as follows:

- For PBEs that are not smaller reporting companies, fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021, and interim periods within those fiscal years.
- For all other entities, fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2023, and interim periods within those fiscal years.
- Early adoption is allowed for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020, and interim periods within those fiscal years.

For more information about ASU 2020-06, see Deloitte's August 5, 2020, [Heads Up](#).

In addition, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) in September 2019 aimed at reducing the cost and complexity of determining whether debt should be classified as current or noncurrent in a classified balance sheet. The proposed ASU would amend the current guidance in ASC 470-10 and establish a uniform principle for determining debt classification. It would also provide application guidance that clarifies how covenant violations, covenant waivers, post-balance-sheet refinancing transactions, and subjective acceleration clauses affect debt classification. For more information, see Deloitte's September 19, 2019, [Heads Up](#).

Receivables — Nonrefundable Fees and Other Costs

In March 2017, the FASB issued [ASU 2017-08](#), which amends the amortization period for certain purchased callable debt securities held at a premium, shortening such period to the earliest call date.

Under the current guidance in ASC 310-20, entities generally amortize the premium on a callable debt security as an adjustment of yield over the contractual life (to maturity date) of the instrument. Accordingly, entities do not take into account early payment of principal, and any unamortized premium is recorded as a loss in earnings upon the debtor's exercise of a call on a purchased callable debt security held at a premium.

The amendments will require entities to amortize the premium on certain purchased callable debt securities to the earliest call date regardless of how the premium is generated (e.g., deferred acquisition costs and cumulative fair value hedge adjustments that increase the amortized cost basis of a callable security above par value). Therefore, entities will no longer recognize a loss in earnings upon the debtor's exercise of a call on a purchased callable debt security held at a premium.

ASU 2017-08 could affect investment management entities, including investment companies that invest in securities such as municipal bonds since these securities are commonly issued at a premium and have call features that are consistent with the scope of the ASU. Further, entities may want to consider the ASU's potential effect on their tax reporting.



Connecting the Dots

Under ASU 2017-08, if an entity amortizes a premium to a call price greater than the par value of the debt security (e.g., because the debt security is callable at a premium to par on the earliest call date) and the debt security is not called on the earliest call date, the entity should reset the yield by using the payment terms of the debt security. If the security contains additional future call dates, the entity should consider whether the amortized cost basis exceeds the amount repayable by the issuer on the next call date. If the entity determines that the amortized cost basis does exceed the amount repayable, it should amortize the excess to the next call date.

Purchased callable debt securities within the scope of ASU 2017-08 are those that contain explicit, noncontingent call features that are exercisable at fixed prices and on preset dates (see the [2019 edition](#) of this publication for additional information about ASU 2017-08, including detailed discussion of the ASU's scope, as well as its effective dates and transition approaches). In October 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-08](#), which clarifies that an entity should reevaluate whether a callable debt security with multiple call dates is within the scope of ASC 310-20-35-33 for each reporting period.

For PBEs, the amendments in ASU 2020-08 are effective for fiscal years, and interim periods within those fiscal years, beginning after December 15, 2020. Early application is not permitted. For all other entities, the amendments in the ASU are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2022. Early application is permitted for all other entities for fiscal years, and interim periods within those fiscal years, beginning after December 15, 2020.

Credit Losses

Background

The approach used to recognize impairment losses on financial assets has long been identified as a major weakness in current U.S. GAAP, resulting in delayed recognition of such losses and leading to increased scrutiny during the 2008 financial crisis. After years of deliberating various models to remedy that weakness (some jointly with the International Accounting Standards Board), the FASB issued its new standard on the measurement of expected credit losses, [ASU 2016-13](#) (codified as ASC 326).

ASU 2016-13 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. That is, the expected credit losses estimated over the lifetime of a financial instrument are recognized at inception (i.e., on day 1). Under the new guidance, an entity recognizes its estimate of expected credit losses as an allowance, which is presented as either (1) an offset to the amortized cost basis of the related asset (for on-balance-sheet exposures) or (2) a separate liability (for off-balance-sheet exposures). The FASB believes that the new guidance will result in more timely recognition of such losses. ASU 2016-13 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. For comprehensive guidance, see Deloitte's [A Roadmap to Accounting for Current Expected Credit Losses](#).



Connecting the Dots

At the November 1, 2018, public meeting of the FASB's credit losses transition resource group, the FASB staff indicated that the scope of ASC 326-20 excludes financial assets measured at fair value through net income. Accordingly, investment companies would not recognize an allowance for credit losses on beneficial interests in securitized financial assets within the scope of ASC 325-40 since they are measured at fair value through net income. However, the FASB staff also noted at that meeting that ASC 325-40-15-7, which addresses interest income recognition, applies to beneficial interests in securitized financial assets measured at fair value through net income. Furthermore, the FASB staff indicated that entities will need to apply reasonable judgment in determining the amount of accretable yield for beneficial interests measured at fair value through net income.

Effective Date and Transition

Upon the adoption of ASU 2016-13, all entities record a cumulative-effect adjustment in retained earnings on the balance sheet as of the beginning of the year of adoption (i.e., retrospective application is prohibited). In November 2019, the FASB issued [ASU 2019-10](#), which gives private companies, not-for-profit (NFP) organizations, and certain small public companies additional time to implement the FASB's standards on credit losses, leases, and hedging (for more information about ASU 2019-10, see Deloitte's November 19, 2019, [Heads Up](#)).

For more information about ASU 2016-13, see Deloitte's June 17, 2016, [Heads Up](#).

Other Developments

In February 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-02](#), which, in accordance with [SAB 119](#), adds the text of [SAB Topic 6.M](#) to ASC 326-20-S99-1. Further, in March 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-03](#) to address various financial instrument issues, including two topics related to ASC 326. ASU 2020-03 clarifies that:

- The contractual term of a net investment in a lease under ASC 842 should be the contractual term used to measure expected credit losses under ASC 326.
- When an entity regains control of financial assets sold, it should record an allowance for credit losses in accordance with ASC 326.

Derivatives, Hedging, and Equity Method Investments

Clarifying the Interaction of ASC 321, ASC 323, and ASC 815

In January 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-01](#), which clarifies the interaction of the accounting for equity securities under ASC 321, equity method investments under ASC 323, and certain forward contracts and purchased options under ASC 815. The ASU, which was issued in response to the EITF's consensus on Issue 19-A, addresses the accounting for certain equity securities for entities that apply or discontinue the equity method of accounting and provides scope considerations related to forward contracts and purchased options on certain securities.

For more information, see Deloitte's November 2019 [EITF Snapshot](#) as well as the FASB's [press release](#).

Key Provisions of ASU 2020-01

Accounting for Certain Equity Securities if the Equity Method of Accounting Is Applied or Discontinued

[ASU 2016-01](#), which added ASC 321, provides a measurement alternative that an entity can use "to measure equity investments that do not have readily determinable fair values at cost minus impairment, if any, plus or minus changes resulting from observable price changes in orderly transactions for the identical or a similar investment of the same issuer." ASU 2020-01 clarifies that when an investment that was accounted for by using the measurement alternative in ASC 321 becomes subject to the equity method under ASC 323 (e.g., an additional purchase causes the investment to qualify for the equity method), the investor should remeasure the investment at fair value immediately before applying the equity method if it determines that the transaction results in an observable price change in an orderly transaction for an identical or a similar investment of the same issuer. Similarly, if an investment that was accounted for by using the equity method becomes subject to ASC 321 (e.g., a partial sale of the investment results in the discontinuance of the equity method), the investor should remeasure the investment at fair value immediately before applying the measurement alternative in ASC 321 if it determines that the transaction results in an observable price change in an orderly transaction for an identical or a similar investment of the same issuer.

Scope Considerations Related to Forward Contracts and Purchased Options on Certain Securities

ASU 2020-01 clarifies that if certain forward contracts and purchased options to acquire securities do not meet the definition of a derivative under ASC 815, such forward contracts and purchased options should be accounted for under ASC 321 even if they would otherwise be accounted for under the equity method of accounting in ASC 323 upon their settlement. Further, an entity should not consider whether, upon the settlement of a forward contract or exercise of a purchased option, individually or with existing investments, the underlying securities would be accounted for under the equity method in ASC 323 or the fair value option in accordance with the financial instruments guidance in ASC 825.

Effective Date and Transition

For PBEs, ASU 2020-01 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020, including interim periods therein. For all other entities, the ASU is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021, including interim periods therein. Early adoption is permitted, including in an interim period for which financial statements have not yet been issued (PBEs) and for periods for which financial statements have not yet been made available to issue (for all other entities). The ASU should be applied prospectively.

Targeted Improvements to the Accounting for Hedging Activities

Background

In August 2017, the FASB issued [ASU 2017-12](#), which amends the hedge accounting recognition and presentation requirements in ASC 815. The Board's objectives in issuing the ASU were to (1) improve the transparency and understandability of information conveyed to financial statement users about an entity's risk management activities by better aligning the entity's financial reporting for hedging relationships with those risk management activities and (2) reduce the complexity, and simplify the application, of hedge accounting by preparers. However, as a result of subsequent stakeholder feedback on the ASU, the FASB decided to make certain Codification improvements, some of which were addressed in [ASU 2019-04](#) (see discussion below).

Key Changes to the Hedge Accounting Model

ASU 2019-04 clarified various aspects of ASU 2017-12, including its guidance on the following:

- Certain aspects of partial-term fair value hedges of interest rate and foreign exchange risk.
- The amortization period for fair value hedge basis adjustments.
- Disclosure requirements for fair value hedge basis adjustments when the hedged item is an available-for-sale debt instrument.
- Consideration of the hedged contractually specified interest rate for measuring hedge effectiveness for a cash flow hedge when the hypothetical derivative method is used.
- Application of a first-payments-received cash flow hedging technique to overall cash flows on a group of variable interest payments.
- The requirements for NFP entities related to the treatment of an excluded component in a fair value hedge.
- The transition relief provided for certain NFP entities.
- Transition guidance for all entities.

See Deloitte's May 7, 2019, [Heads Up](#) for more information about ASU 2019-04.

Effective Date and Transition

In November 2019, the FASB issued [ASU 2019-10](#), which (1) provides a framework to stagger effective dates for future major accounting standards and (2) gives private companies, NFP organizations, and certain small public companies additional time to implement the FASB's major standards on credit losses, leases, and hedging.

ASU 2019-10 does not change the effective date of ASU 2017-12 and ASU 2019-04 for PBEs. Thus, for PBEs, the ASUs are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018, and interim periods therein. However, ASU 2019-10 amends the effective date of ASU 2017-12 and ASU 2019-04 for all other entities. Accordingly, such entities will apply the ASUs for years beginning after December 15, 2020, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021.

For more information about ASU 2019-10, see Deloitte's November 19, 2019, [Heads Up](#).

Implementation Developments

The FASB is continuing its efforts to improve ASU 2017-12. In November 2019, the Board issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would clarify certain aspects of its guidance related to (1) changes in hedged risk in a cash flow hedge, (2) contractually specified components in cash flow hedges of nonfinancial forecasted transactions, (3) foreign-currency-denominated debt instruments designated as hedging instruments and hedged items, and (4) use of the term "prepayable" under the shortcut method. Comments on the proposed ASU were due to the FASB by January 13, 2020. The Board is redeliberating the proposed ASU on the basis of feedback received from stakeholders, and a final standard will be drafted after those redeliberations. See Deloitte's November 26, 2019, [Heads Up](#) for more information about the proposed ASU.

In addition, the FASB has on its technical agenda a narrow-scope project on the last-of-layer method. As indicated on the Board's [project update](#) page, the FASB held a meeting on January 22, 2020, at which it made tentative decisions regarding disclosures and transition considerations related to the last-of-layer hedging proposed amendments. See the [tentative Board decisions](#) from the January 22, 2020, meeting for further details.

Reference Rate Reform

As global markets transition away from the use of LIBOR and other interbank offered reference rates in favor of alternative reference rates, the FASB and SEC have made efforts to address the accounting and reporting implications of reference rate reform.

In March 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-04](#) (codified as ASC 848), which provides optional guidance for a limited period to ease the potential burden of accounting for or recognizing the effects of reference rate reform on financial reporting. The ASU applies "to all entities, subject to meeting certain criteria, that have contracts, hedging relationships, and other transactions that reference LIBOR or another reference rate expected to be discontinued because of reference rate reform."

The main forms of relief offered by ASU 2020-04 are related to the accounting of the following:

- Contract modifications for receivables under ASC 310, debt under ASC 470, leases under ASC 840 or ASC 842, embedded derivatives under ASC 815-15, and other contracts.
- Hedging relationships.
- Sales or transfers of held-to-maturity securities.

The optional relief under ASU 2020-04 is available to entities from March 12, 2020, through December 31, 2022.

For more information about the ASU, see Deloitte's March 23, 2020, [Heads Up](#).

In connection with reference rate reform, certain central clearing parties have been enacting changes to the interest rate used for discounting cash flows and computing variation margin settlements and price alignment interest. In addition, bilateral counterparties to noncleared cash-collateralized derivatives are considering enacting similar changes. To address how ASU 2020-04 could apply to derivative contracts affected by such reference rate reform activities and certain corresponding hedging relationships, on October 29, 2020, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would refine the scope of and clarify certain guidance in ASC 848. Comments on the proposed ASU are due by November 13, 2020.

For more information about the proposed ASU, see Deloitte's November 6, 2020, [Heads Up](#).

The FASB's technical agenda also contains a narrow-scope project on reference rate reform related to fair value hedging. As indicated on the Board's [project update](#) page, the FASB held a meeting on July 29, 2020, at which it decided to consider developing a principle for identifying benchmark interest rates eligible for fair value hedge accounting both within and outside the United States.

In addition to the FASB's activity, in July 2019 the SEC staff issued a [statement](#) on LIBOR transition that includes:

- A discussion of the expected discontinuation of LIBOR use and how the transition from LIBOR may significantly affect financial markets and market participants (including public companies, investment companies and advisers, and broker-dealers).
- Questions and considerations for market participants related to new or existing contracts and other business risks.
- Specific guidance from the SEC's divisions of Corporation Finance, Investment Management, and Trading and Markets and its Office of the Chief Accountant.

The SEC staff strongly encourages market participants that have not already done so to begin assessing their risks associated with the transition. The SEC staff notes that it is actively monitoring participants' progress with their risk identification and risk management efforts related to the LIBOR transition for both existing and new contracts. Further, the SEC staff urges registrants to consider other business risks that may be affected by the discontinuation of LIBOR as well as to consider providing additional disclosures about the status of risk identification and appropriate information regarding exposures.

See Deloitte's August 6, 2019, [Heads Up](#) for more information about the statement.

TDR Relief Under the CARES Act and Interagency Statement

On March 27, 2020, President Trump signed into law the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (the "CARES Act"), which provides relief from certain requirements under U.S. GAAP. Section 4013 of the CARES Act gives entities temporary relief from the accounting and disclosure requirements for troubled debt restructurings (TDRs) under ASC 310-40 in certain situations. In addition, on April 7, 2020, a group of banking agencies issued an [interagency statement](#) that offers some practical expedients for evaluating whether loan modifications that occur in response to the COVID-19 pandemic are TDRs. (The interagency statement was originally issued in March 2020 but revised in April to address the relationship between the statement's TDR accounting and disclosure guidance and the TDR guidance in Section 4013 of the CARES Act.)

Under Section 4013 of the CARES Act, a loan modification made in response to the COVID-19 pandemic that would normally be considered a TDR in accordance with ASC 310-40 would not be considered a TDR if (1) the borrower was not more than 30 days past due as of December 31, 2019, and (2) the modification is related to arrangements that defer or delay the payment of principal or interest, or change the interest rate on the loan.

By contrast, the interagency statement interprets, but does not suspend, ASC 310-40. It indicates that a lender can conclude that a borrower is not experiencing financial difficulty if short-term (e.g., six months) modifications are made in response to COVID-19, such as payment deferrals, fee waivers, extensions of repayment terms, or other delays in payment that are insignificant related to loans on which the borrower is less than 30 days past due on its contractual payments at the time a modification program is implemented. In addition, a modification or deferral program that is mandated by the federal government or a state government (e.g., a state program that requires all institutions within that state to suspend mortgage payments for a specified period) does not represent a TDR because the lender did not choose to provide a concession. Accordingly, any loan modification made in response to the COVID-19 pandemic that meets either of these practical expedients would not be considered a TDR. Note that in its discussion of short-term modifications, the interagency statement does not interpret the meaning of an insignificant delay in payment; ASC 310-40 provides guidance on determining whether a delay in payment is insignificant.

See Deloitte's [Heads Up](#), "Frequently Asked Questions About Troubled Debt Restructurings Under the CARES Act and Interagency Statement" for more information about the TDR relief provided by the CARES Act and interagency statement.

Leases

As discussed in the [2019 edition](#) of this publication, the primary objective of the FASB's leases project was to address the off-balance-sheet treatment of lessees' operating leases. The standard's lessee model requires a lessee to adopt a right-of-use (ROU) asset approach that brings substantially all leases, with the exception of short-term leases¹ (i.e., those with a lease term of less than 12 months), on the balance sheet. Under this approach, the 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). For comprehensive guidance, see Deloitte's [A Roadmap to Applying the New Leasing Standard](#).

2020 Developments

FASB Relief for Rent Concessions Offered as a Result of COVID-19

On April 10, 2020, the FASB issued a [staff Q&A](#)² (the "Staff Q&A") to clarify its remarks at the April 8, 2020, Board meeting about accounting for rent concessions that result from the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, the Staff Q&A affirms the guidance provided at the April 8 meeting by allowing entities to forgo performing a legal analysis to determine whether contractual provisions in an existing lease agreement provide enforceable rights and obligations related to lease concessions as long as the concessions are related to COVID-19 and the changes to the lease do not result in a substantial increase in the lessor's rights or the lessee's obligations. In addition, the Staff Q&A affirms that entities may make an election (the "Election") to account for eligible concessions, regardless of their form, by either (1) applying the modification framework for these concessions in accordance with ASC 840 or ASC 842

¹ Assuming that the lessee has made an accounting policy election not to account for short-term leases on the balance sheet.

² FASB Staff Q&A, *Topic 842 and Topic 840: Accounting for Lease Concessions Related to the Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic*.

as applicable or (2) accounting for the concessions as if they were made under the enforceable rights included in the original agreement and are thus outside of the modification framework.

This Election applies to all entities, including both lessees and lessors. Thus, the lessees that have rights to receive, or may ask for, rent rebates or other rent relief (such as a temporary decrease in rent) should consider whether such relief is within the scope of the FASB's guidance. For more information, see the Lease/Rent Concessions section of Deloitte's [Financial Reporting Alert](#), "Financial Reporting Considerations Related to COVID-19 and an Economic Downturn."

FASB Roundtable

On September 18, 2020, the FASB held a public roundtable to discuss ASC 842 implementation challenges. This roundtable was part of the Board's broader outreach effort to solicit feedback from stakeholders on the difficulties they experienced in applying the new standard, whether because of the complexity of interpreting the new guidance or undue difficulty in operationalizing it. The roundtable was held in two separate sessions and included all FASB Board members as well as members of industry groups, preparers (representing both public and private companies), users, and public accounting firms. Representatives from the staffs of the SEC and PCAOB also observed the meeting.

The roundtable discussion addressed five topics identified by the FASB staff through their outreach efforts. To facilitate the discussion, the staff provided a [handout](#) that summarized, for each topic, the background on the issue, the relevant guidance, and the feedback the staff had received through outreach efforts made before the roundtable. The handout also raised potential proposed solutions. The topics discussed were as follows:

- Topic 1 — Lessee Application of Rate Implicit in the Lease.
- Topic 2 — Lessee Application of Incremental Borrowing Rate.
- Topic 3 — Embedded Leases.
- Topic 4 — Lease Modifications.
- Topic 5 — Lessee Allocation of Fixed and Variable Payments.

See Deloitte's September 28, 2020, [Heads Up](#) for more information on each of these topics and the ensuing discussion.

On the Horizon

As a result of the implementation challenges identified by the Board through its outreach activities and feedback received from PBEs that have already adopted the standard, the FASB decided at its July 29, 2020, Board meeting to add a project to its technical agenda to amend certain aspects of the new leasing standard. On October 20, 2020, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that is intended to provide targeted improvements to the standard to address a number of issues identified, which include:

1. Sales-type leases involving substantial variable lease payments (lessor only).
2. Option to remeasure lease liability for index or rate changes.
3. Modifications that reduce the scope of a lease contract.

Comments on the proposed ASU are due by December 4, 2020. The Board will consider the comment letter feedback received on the proposed ASU during its redeliberations of the standard. Stay tuned for further information.

Effective Date Changes

In November 2019, the FASB issued [ASU 2019-10](#), which (1) provides a framework for staggering effective dates for future major accounting standards and (2) gives private companies, NFP organizations, and certain small public companies additional time to implement the FASB's major standards on credit losses, leases, and hedging. Before this deferral was provided, the SEC staff announcement codified in ASC 842-10-S65-1 had offered relief from the requirement to apply the PBE effective date in ASU 2016-02 to entities that met the definition of a PBE solely because their financial statements or financial information was included in an SEC filing, such as a disclosure required by SEC Regulation S-X, Rules 3-05, 3-09, 3-14, or 4-08(g). However, the dates specified in the SEC staff announcement were not amended in connection with the issuance of ASU 2019-10. Therefore, at the 2019 AICPA Conference on Current SEC and PCAOB Developments, the SEC staff announced that it would not object if those specified PBEs adopt ASC 842 by using ASU 2019-10's effective dates that apply to non-PBEs. This position was subsequently codified in [ASU 2020-02](#), which was issued in February 2020.

On June 3, 2020, the FASB issued [ASU 2020-05](#), which further amends the effective dates of ASC 842 to give immediate relief to certain entities as a result of the widespread adverse economic effects and business disruptions caused by COVID-19. Specifically, the Board deferred the effective dates of ASC 842 for private companies, private NFP entities, and public NFP entities.³ The deferrals apply only if those entities have not yet issued their financial statements (or made them available for issuance) as of June 3, 2020. We understand that the SEC staff will not object if specified PBEs adopt ASC 842 on the basis of the additional deferral of the effective dates of ASC 842 for non-PBEs to fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021, under ASU 2020-05.

See Deloitte's November 19, 2019, [Heads Up](#) for more information about ASU 2019-10 and Deloitte's June 3, 2020, [Heads Up](#) for more information about ASU 2020-05.

Income Taxes

New and Proposed Accounting Standards

FASB Issues ASU 2019-12 to Simplify the Accounting for Income Taxes

In December 2019, the FASB issued [ASU 2019-12](#), which modifies ASC 740 to simplify the accounting for income taxes under GAAP. The ASU's amendments are based on changes that were suggested by stakeholders in connection with the FASB's simplification initiative, which is intended to reduce complexity in accounting standards.

ASU 2019-12 affects various aspects of ASC 740, including the accounting for taxes under hybrid tax regimes, the accounting for increases in goodwill, the allocation of tax amounts to separate company financial statements within a group that files a consolidated tax return, intraperiod tax allocation, interim-period accounting, and the accounting for ownership changes in investments, among other minor codification improvements.

For PBEs, the amendments in ASU 2019-12 are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020, including interim periods therein. Early adoption is permitted, including adoption in any interim period for which financial statements have not yet been issued.

³ A public NFP entity is an NFP entity that has issued or is a conduit bond obligor for securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market.

For all other entities, the amendments in the ASU are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021, and for interim periods beginning after December 15, 2022. Early adoption for these entities is also permitted, including adoption in any interim period for which financial statements have not yet been made available for issuance.

For additional information about the ASU, see Deloitte's December 19, 2019, [Heads Up](#).

FASB Proposes Changes to Income Tax Disclosure Requirements

In March 2019, the FASB issued a [proposed ASU](#) that would modify or eliminate certain requirements related to income tax disclosures as well as establish new disclosure requirements. The proposed guidance, which is part of the Board's disclosure framework project, is intended to increase the relevance of income tax disclosures for financial statement users.

The proposed ASU is a revised version of the FASB's July 2016 exposure draft on changes to the income tax disclosure requirements. The Board discussed stakeholder feedback on the initial exposure draft in January 2017 and again in November 2018, when it also assessed whether updates would be needed as a result of the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

The proposed ASU would affect various disclosure topics in ASC 740, including those related to the disaggregation of certain metrics (i.e., income (or loss) from continuing operations), indefinitely reinvested foreign earnings, unrecognized tax benefits, valuation allowances, a company's rate reconciliation, and operating loss and tax credit carryforwards. It would also affect interim disclosure requirements and make other minor changes to existing guidance. Entities would be required to adopt the proposed ASU's guidance prospectively. The FASB will determine an effective date, and whether early adoption is permitted, in subsequent meetings about the proposal.

Comments on the proposed ASU were due by May 31, 2019. At its February 2020 meeting, the Board discussed comment letter feedback on the March 2019 proposed ASU and directed the staff to perform additional research and outreach. The final standard will be drafted after those redeliberations.

For more information about the proposed ASU, see Deloitte's March 29, 2019, [Heads Up](#).

SEC Comment Letter Themes Related to Income Taxes

The SEC staff's comments to registrants about income taxes continue to focus on (1) valuation allowances, (2) disclosures related to the income tax rate, (3) the tax effects of significant or unusual transactions that occurred during a period, and (4) noncompliance with disclosure requirements (e.g., omission of required disclosures).

Further, the SEC staff often asks registrants to provide early-warning disclosures to help financial statement users understand key estimates and assumptions related to recording these items and how changes to those estimates and assumptions could potentially affect the financial statements in the future. The SEC staff also continues to issue comments on non-GAAP measures, with a particular focus on the income tax impact of adjustments made to GAAP measures. For additional information about non-GAAP measures, see Deloitte's [A Roadmap to Non-GAAP Financial Measures and Metrics](#).

Historically, the SEC staff has stated that boilerplate language should be avoided with respect to income tax disclosures in MD&A and that approaches more conducive to effective disclosure would include:

- Using the income tax rate reconciliation as a starting point and describing the details of the material items.
- Discussing significant foreign jurisdictions, including statutory rates, effective rates, and the current and future impact of reconciling items.
- Providing meaningful disclosures about known trends and uncertainties, including expectations regarding the countries where registrants operate.

For more information about SEC comment letter themes that pertain to the investment management industry, see Deloitte's [A Roadmap to SEC Comment Letter Considerations, Including Industry Insights](#) and Appendix E of Deloitte's [A Roadmap to Accounting for Income Taxes](#), which contains sample disclosures of income taxes.

Consolidation

ASU 2018-17

In October 2018, the FASB issued [ASU 2018-17](#), which amends two aspects of the related-party guidance in ASC 810. Specifically, the ASU (1) adds an elective private-company scope exception to the variable interest entity (VIE) guidance for entities under common control and (2) removes a sentence in ASC 810-10-55-37D regarding the evaluation of fees paid to decision makers to conform with the amendments in [ASU 2016-17](#) (issued in October 2016).

Key Provisions of ASU 2018-17

Private-Company Scope Exception to the VIE Guidance for Certain Entities

ASU 2018-17 broadens the existing accounting alternative available to private companies by allowing all legal entities under common control to elect not to apply the VIE guidance as long as the reporting entity, the common-control parent, and the legal entity being evaluated for consolidation are not PBEs and meet the criteria in ASC 810-10-15-17AD (added by the ASU). ASC 810-10-15-17AD states, in part:

A legal entity need not be evaluated by a private company (reporting entity) under the guidance in the Variable Interest Entities Subsections if all of the following criteria are met:

- a. The reporting entity and the legal entity are under common control.
- b. The reporting entity and the legal entity are not under common control of a public business entity.
- c. The legal entity under common control is not a public business entity.
- d. The reporting entity does not directly or indirectly have a controlling financial interest in the legal entity when considering the General Subsections of this Topic. The Variable Interest Entities Subsections shall not be applied when making this determination.

ASC 810-10-15-17AE (added by the ASU) provides guidance on applying criterion (a) above, which requires a determination that “[t]he reporting entity and the legal entity are under common control.” Specifically, ASC 810-10-15-17AE states that *solely* for the purpose of applying criterion (a), a private-company reporting entity should consider *only* the voting interest model when making this determination. That is, a private-company reporting entity is not required to consider the VIE guidance when determining whether criterion (a) is met.

As stated above, a reporting entity that wishes to apply the private-company scope exception in ASU 2018-17 is required to determine whether the reporting entity and legal entity are under common control solely on the basis of the voting interest model. Therefore, in structures in which a common-control parent has the majority vote in both the reporting entity and the legal entity and no other investors have substantive participating rights, criterion (a) in ASC 810-10-15-17AD would be met (i.e., the reporting entity and legal entity would be determined to be under common control). In addition, criterion (d) would be met because the common-control parent rather than the reporting entity would have a controlling financial interest in the legal entity. Consequently, the reporting entity would be eligible to apply the scope exception provided that the common-control parent, reporting entity, and legal entity are not PBEs in accordance with criteria (b) and (c) in ASC 810-10-15-17AD.

The FASB decided that the guidance in ASU 2018-17 would supersede the existing accounting alternative under ASC 810 (from ASU 2014-07) because the Board believes that the new guidance on common-control relationships for private companies would encompass existing leasing arrangements that qualified for the previous scope exception. Like the accounting alternative under current guidance, the private-company scope exception in ASU 2018-17 would be considered an accounting policy that, if elected, should be applied consistently to all legal entities that qualify for it.

Private-company reporting entities that apply the scope exception because they have met all the criteria in ASC 810-10-15-17AD would not consolidate under the VIE model and also would not consolidate under the voting interest entity model since those entities would not have qualified for the scope exception if they had a controlling financial interest under the voting interest entity model per criterion (d). Consequently, private-company reporting entities that apply the scope exception will be required to provide enhanced disclosures in a manner similar to entities that apply the VIE guidance. For a list of the disclosure requirements, see the appendix of Deloitte's November 19, 2018, *Heads Up*.

If a reporting entity applies the new private-company scope exception upon transition to ASU 2018-17 and one of the entities (the parent, reporting entity, or legal entity) subsequently becomes a PBE, the reporting entity can no longer apply the scope exception. In that case, the accounting would depend on which entity became a PBE. If the reporting entity is not the entity that became a PBE, prospective application of the VIE guidance would be required. However, if the reporting entity is the entity that became a PBE, retrospective application of the VIE guidance would be required. Therefore, the reporting entity must continually assess whether it can continue to apply the scope exception.

For further discussion of private-company accounting alternatives, see [Section 3.5](#) of Deloitte's *A Roadmap to Consolidation — Identifying a Controlling Financial Interest*.

Evaluation of Fees Paid to a Decision Maker

ASC 810 currently requires indirect interests held by related parties under common control to be considered in their entirety⁴ in the evaluation of whether a decision maker's fee arrangement is a variable interest under ASC 810-10-55-37(c). ASU 2016-17 amended ASC 810-10-25-42 to require consideration of these indirect interests on a proportionate basis in the primary-beneficiary analysis but did not align current guidance with the considerations related to the variable interest analysis. Accordingly, ASU 2018-17 aligns the guidance by removing a sentence in ASC 810-10-55-37D⁵ to conform the guidance in that paragraph with the amendments in ASU 2016-17.

The changes made by ASU 2018-17 do not affect interests held through a subsidiary since such interests should be treated as direct interests of the consolidated group in a consolidation assessment.

⁴ Specifically, ASC 810-10-55-37D.

⁵ ASU 2018-17 removes the following sentence: "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."

For further discussion, see [Section 4.3.11.4](#) of Deloitte's *A Roadmap to Consolidation — Identifying a Controlling Financial Interest*.

Effective Date and Transition

For entities other than private companies, ASU 2018-17 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, including interim periods therein. For private companies, the ASU is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2021. Early adoption is permitted. Like the amendments in previously issued ASUs related to ASC 810, the amendments in ASU 2018-17 must be applied retrospectively, with a cumulative-effect adjustment to retained earnings at the beginning of the earliest period presented.

Compensation

Improvements to Nonemployee Share-Based Payment Accounting

In June 2018, the FASB issued [ASU 2018-07](#), which simplifies the accounting for share-based payments granted to nonemployees for goods and services. Before adopting the ASU, entities apply ASC 505-50 to account for share-based payments to nonemployees and ASC 718 to account for share-based payments to employees, and the guidance in ASC 505-50 and ASC 718 differs significantly. The ASU supersedes ASC 505-50 and expands the scope of ASC 718 to include all share-based payment arrangements related to the acquisition of goods and services from both nonemployees and employees. However, some differences remain between the accounting for employees and nonemployees under ASC 718, primarily related to (1) the manner and period of cost recognition and (2) fair-value-based measurement.

For additional information about the ASU, see [Chapter 9](#) of Deloitte's *A Roadmap to Accounting for Share-Based Payment Awards* and Deloitte's June 21, 2018, *Heads Up*.

FASB Clarifies the Accounting for Share-Based Payments Issued as Sales Incentives to Customers

In November 2019, the FASB issued [ASU 2019-08](#), which clarifies the accounting for share-based payments issued as consideration payable to a customer in accordance with ASC 606. Under the ASU, entities apply the guidance in ASC 718 to measure and classify share-based payments issued to a customer that are not in exchange for a distinct good or service (i.e., share-based sales incentives).

For more information about the ASU, see Deloitte's November 13, 2019, *Heads Up*.

Cloud Computing Arrangements

Background

In August 2018, the FASB issued [ASU 2018-15](#), which amends ASC 350-40 to address a customer's accounting for implementation costs incurred in a cloud computing arrangement (CCA) that is a service contract. ASU 2018-15 aligns the accounting for costs incurred to implement a CCA that is a service arrangement with the guidance on capitalizing costs associated with developing or obtaining internal-use software. Therefore, a customer should apply the framework in ASC 350-40 to determine which implementation costs should be capitalized in a CCA that is considered a service contract.

The FASB clarified in [ASU 2015-05](#) that a CCA is considered to be a service contract if the customer either does not have the “right to take possession of the software at any time during the hosting period without significant penalty” or cannot feasibly “either run the software on its own hardware or contract with another party unrelated to the vendor to host the software.”

Common examples of CCAs include software as a service, platform or infrastructure as a service, and other similar types of hosting arrangements. Many investment management firms have taken the first steps toward implementing CCAs and are now focused on identifying appropriate cloud services models for specific business functions.

See Deloitte’s April 17, 2015, [Heads Up](#) for more information about ASU 2015-05 and Deloitte’s September 11, 2018, [Heads Up](#); Deloitte’s October 29, 2019, [Accounting Spotlight](#); or the [2018 edition](#) of Deloitte’s *Investment Management — Accounting and Financial Reporting Update* for more information about ASU 2018-15, including detailed discussion of its key provisions as well as the effective dates and transition approaches.

Appendix A — Titles of Standards and Other Literature

AICPA Literature

Audit and Accounting Guide

Revenue Recognition

EITF Literature

Issue No.19-A, "Financial Instruments — Clarifying the Interactions Between Topic 321, Topic 323, and Topic 815"

FASB Literature

ASC Topics

ASC 310, *Receivables*

ASC 320, *Investments — Debt and Equity Securities*

ASC 321, *Investments — Equity Securities*

ASC 323, *Investments — Equity Method and Joint Ventures*

ASC 325, *Investments — Other*

ASC 326, *Financial Instruments — Credit Losses*

ASC 350, *Intangibles — Goodwill and Other*

ASC 470, *Debt*

ASC 505, *Equity*

ASC 606, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers*

ASC 718, *Compensation — Stock Compensation*

ASC 740, *Income Taxes*

ASC 810, *Consolidation*

ASC 815, *Derivatives and Hedging*

ASC 820, *Fair Value Measurement*

ASC 825, *Financial Instruments*

ASC 840, *Leases*

ASC 842, *Leases*

ASC 942, *Financial Services — Depository and Lending*

ASUs

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

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

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

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

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

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

ASU 2017-08, *Receivables — Nonrefundable Fees and Other Costs (Subtopic 310-20): Premium Amortization on Purchased Callable Debt Securities*

ASU 2017-12, *Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Targeted Improvements to Accounting for Hedging Activities*

ASU 2018-07, *Compensation — Stock Compensation (Topic 718): Improvements to Nonemployee Share-Based Payment Accounting*

ASU 2018-15, *Customer's Accounting for Implementation Costs Incurred in a Cloud Computing Arrangement That Is a Service Contract*

ASU 2018-17, *Consolidation (Topic 810): Targeted Improvements to Related Party Guidance for Variable Interest Entities*

ASU 2019-04, *Codification Improvements to Topic 326, Financial Instruments — Credit Losses, Topic 815, Derivatives and Hedging, and Topic 825, Financial Instruments*

ASU 2019-08, *Compensation — Stock Compensation (Topic 718) and Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606): Codification Improvements — Share-Based Consideration Payable to a Customer*

ASU 2019-10, *Financial Instruments — Credit Losses (Topic 326), Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815), and Leases (Topic 842): Effective Dates*

ASU 2019-12, *Income Taxes (Topic 740): Simplifying the Accounting for Income Taxes*

ASU 2020-01, *Investments — Equity Securities (Topic 321), Investments — Equity Method and Joint Ventures (Topic 323), and Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Clarifying the Interactions Between Topic 321, Topic 323, and Topic 815* — a consensus of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force

ASU 2020-02, *Financial Instruments — Credit Losses (Topic 326) and Leases (Topic 842): Amendments to SEC Paragraphs Pursuant to SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 119 and Update to SEC Section on Effective Date Related to Accounting Standards Update No. 2016-02, Leases (Topic 842)*

ASU 2020-03, *Codification Improvement to Financial Instruments*

ASU 2020-04, *Reference Rate Reform (Topic 848): Facilitation of the Effects of Reference Rate Reform on Financial Reporting*

ASU 2020-05, *Revenue From Contracts With Customers (Topic 606) and Leases (Topic 842): Effective Dates for Certain Entities*

ASU 2020-06, *Debt — Debt With Conversion and Other Options (Subtopic 470-20) and Derivatives and Hedging — Contracts in Entity's Own Equity (Subtopic 815-40): Accounting for Convertible Instruments and Contracts in an Entity's Own Equity*

ASU 2020-08, *Codification Improvements to Subtopic 310-20, Receivables — Nonrefundable Fees and Other Costs*

Proposed ASUs

No. 2019-500, *Income Taxes (Topic 740): Disclosure Framework — Changes to the Disclosure Requirements for Income Taxes (Revised)*

No. 2019-780, *Debt (Topic 470): Simplifying the Classification of Debt in a Classified Balance Sheet (Current Versus Noncurrent) (Revised)*

No. 2019-790, *Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Codification Improvements to Hedge Accounting*

No. 2020-700, *Leases (Topic 842): Targeted Improvements*

No. 2020-900, *Reference Rate Reform (Topic 848): Scope Refinement*

SEC Literature

Final Rules

No. 33-10771, *Securities Offering Reform for Closed-End Investment Companies*

No. 33-10871, *Fund of Funds Arrangements*

Proposed Rules

No. IC-33845, *Good Faith Determinations of Fair Value*

No. 33-10814, *Tailored Shareholder Reports, Treatment of Annual Prospectus Updates for Existing Investors, and Improved Fee and Risk Disclosure for Mutual Funds and Exchange-Traded Funds; Fee Information in Investment Company Advertisements*

SAB Topics

No. 6.M, "Financial Reporting Release No. 28 — Accounting for Loan Losses by Registrants Engaged in Lending Activities Subject to FASB ASC Topic 326"

SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 119 [Untitled]

Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Rule 12b-2, "Definitions"

Appendix B — Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
ASC	FASB Accounting Standards Codification
ASU	FASB Accounting Standards Update
CCA	cloud computing arrangement
CECL	current expected credit loss
EITF	FASB's Emerging Issues Task Force
EPS	earnings per share
FAQ	frequently asked question
FASB	Financial Accounting Standards Board
GAAP	generally accepted accounting principles

Abbreviation	Description
LIBOR	London Interbank Offered Rate
MD&A	Management's Discussion and Analysis
NFP	not-for-profit entity
PBE	public business entity
PCAOB	Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
Q&A	question and answer
ROU	right of use
SAB	SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin
SEC	U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
TDR	troubled debt restructurings
VIE	variable interest entity