



ශ්‍රී ලංකා ප්‍රජාතාන්ත්‍රික සමාජවාදී ජනරජයේ ගැසට් පත්‍රය
අති විශේෂ
The Gazette of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka
EXTRAORDINARY

අංක 2321/54 - 2023 මාර්තු මස 02 වැනි බ්‍රහස්පතින්දා - 2023.03.02
No. 2321/54 - THURSDAY, MARCH 02, 2023

(Published by Authority)

PART I : SECTION (I) — GENERAL

Government Notifications

SRI LANKA ACCOUNTING AND AUDITING STANDARDS ACT, No. 15 of 1995

Publication under Section 4(2)

By virtue of the powers vested in the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Sri Lanka (hereinafter referred to as the “Institute”), the Institute has adopted the Interest Rate Benchmark Reform Phase 1-Amendments to SLFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after 01st January 2020 published herewith for the purpose of the Sri Lanka Accounting and Auditing Standards, Act, No. 15 of 1995. This Standard shall be effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after 01st January 2020.

By Order of the Council,

R.S. ANOMA PRIYADARSHANI,
Secretary

The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Sri Lanka,
No. 30A,
Malalasekera Mawatha,
Colombo 07.
02nd March, 2023.



Amendments to SLFRS 9 *Financial Instruments*

Paragraphs 6.8.1–6.8.12 and 7.1.8 are added. A new heading is added before paragraph 6.8.1. New subheadings are added before paragraphs 6.8.4, 6.8.5, 6.8.6, 6.8.7 and 6.8.9. These paragraphs have not been underlined for ease of reading.

Paragraph 7.2.26 is amended. New text in this paragraph is underlined.

Chapter 6 Hedge accounting

...

6.8. Temporary exceptions from applying specific hedge accounting requirements

6.8.1 An entity shall apply paragraphs 6.8.4–6.8.12 and paragraphs 7.1.8 and 7.2.26(d) to all hedging relationships directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform. These paragraphs apply only to such hedging relationships. A hedging relationship is directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform only if the reform gives rise to uncertainties about:

- (a) the interest rate benchmark (contractually or non-contractually specified) designated as a hedged risk; and/or
- (b) the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument.

6.8.2 For the purpose of applying paragraphs 6.8.4–6.8.12, the term ‘interest rate benchmark reform’ refers to the market-wide reform of an interest rate benchmark, including the replacement of an interest rate benchmark with an alternative benchmark rate such as that resulting from the recommendations set out in the Financial Stability Board’s July 2014 report ‘Reforming Major Interest Rate Benchmarks’.¹

6.8.3 Paragraphs 6.8.4–6.8.12 provide exceptions only to the requirements specified in these paragraphs. An entity shall continue to apply all other hedge accounting requirements to hedging relationships directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform.

Highly probable requirement for cash flow hedges

6.8.4 For the purpose of determining whether a forecast transaction (or a component thereof) is highly probable as required by paragraph 6.3.3, an entity shall assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows (contractually or non-contractually specified) are based is not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform.

Reclassifying the amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve

6.8.5 For the purpose of applying the requirement in paragraph 6.5.12 in order to determine whether the hedged future cash flows are expected to occur, an entity shall assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows (contractually or non-contractually specified) are based is not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform.

Assessing the economic relationship between the hedged item and the hedging instrument

6.8.6 For the purpose of applying the requirements in paragraphs 6.4.1(c)(i) and B6.4.4–B6.4.6, an entity shall assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows and/or the hedged risk

¹ The report, ‘Reforming Major Interest Rate Benchmarks’, is available at http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_140722.pdf.

(contractually or non- contractually specified) are based, or the interest rate benchmark on which the cash flows of the hedging instrument are based, is not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform.

Designating a component of an item as a hedged item

- 6.8.7 Unless paragraph 6.8.8 applies, for a hedge of a non-contractually specified benchmark component of interest rate risk, an entity shall apply the requirement in paragraphs 6.3.7(a) and B6.3.8—that the risk component shall be separately identifiable—only at the inception of the hedging relationship.
- 6.8.8 When an entity, consistent with its hedge documentation, frequently resets (ie discontinues and restarts) a hedging relationship because both the hedging instrument and the hedged item frequently change (ie the entity uses a dynamic process in which both the hedged items and the hedging instruments used to manage that exposure do not remain the same for long), the entity shall apply the requirement in paragraphs 6.3.7(a) and B6.3.8—that the risk component is separately identifiable—only when it initially designates a hedged item in that hedging relationship. A hedged item that has been assessed at the time of its initial designation in the hedging relationship, whether it was at the time of the hedge inception or subsequently, is not reassessed at any subsequent redesignation in the same hedging relationship.

End of application

- 6.8.9 An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 6.8.4 to a hedged item at the earlier of:
- (a) when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item; and
 - (b) when the hedging relationship that the hedged item is part of is discontinued.
- 6.8.10 An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 6.8.5 at the earlier of:
- (a) when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based future cash flows of the hedged item; and
 - (b) when the entire amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve with respect to that discontinued hedging relationship has been reclassified to profit or loss.
- 6.8.11 An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 6.8.6:
- (a) to a hedged item, when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the hedged risk or the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item; and
 - (b) to a hedging instrument, when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedging instrument.

If the hedging relationship that the hedged item and the hedging instrument are part of is discontinued earlier than the date specified in paragraph 6.8.11(a) or the date specified in paragraph 6.8.11(b), the entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 6.8.6 to that hedging relationship at the date of discontinuation.

- 6.8.12 When designating a group of items as the hedged item, or a combination of financial instruments as the hedging instrument, an entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraphs 6.8.4–6.8.6 to an individual item or financial instrument in accordance with paragraphs 6.8.9, 6.8.10, or 6.8.11, as relevant, when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the hedged risk and/or the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of that item or financial instrument.

Chapter 7 Effective date and transition

7.1 Effective date

...

- 7.1.8 *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform*, which amended SLFRS9, LKAS39 and SLFRS7, issued in September 2019, added Section 6.8 and amended paragraph 7.2.26. An entity shall apply these amendments for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2020. Earlier application is permitted. If an entity applies these amendments for an earlier period, it shall disclose that fact.

Transition

...

Transition for hedge accounting (Chapter 6)

...

- 7.2.26 As an exception to prospective application of the hedge accounting requirements of this Standard, an entity:

...

- (d) shall apply the requirements in Section 6.8 retrospectively. This retrospective application applies only to those hedging relationships that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies those requirements or were designated thereafter, and to the amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies those requirements.

Amendments to LKAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*

Paragraphs 102A–102N and 108G are added. A new heading is added before paragraph 102A. New subheadings are added before paragraphs 102D, 102E, 102F, 102H and 102J. These paragraphs have not been underlined for ease of reading.

Hedging

....

Temporary exceptions from applying specific hedge accounting requirements

- 102A An entity shall apply paragraphs 102D–102N and 108G to all hedging relationships directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform. These paragraphs apply only to such hedging relationships. A hedging relationship is directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform only if the reform gives rise to uncertainties about:
- (a) the interest rate benchmark (contractually or non-contractually specified) designated as a hedged risk; and/or
 - (b) the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument.

102B For the purpose of applying paragraphs 102D–102N, the term ‘interest rate benchmark reform’ refers to the market-wide reform of an interest rate benchmark, including the replacement of an interest rate benchmark with an alternative benchmark rate such as that resulting from the recommendations set out in the Financial Stability Board’s July 2014 report ‘Reforming Major Interest Rate Benchmarks’.²

102C Paragraphs 102D–102N provide exceptions only to the requirements specified in these paragraphs. An entity shall continue to apply all other hedge accounting requirements to hedging relationships directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform.

Highly probable requirement for cash flow hedges

102D For the purpose of applying the requirement in paragraph 88(c) that a forecast transaction must be highly probable, an entity shall assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows (contractually or non- contractually specified) are based is not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform.

Reclassifying the cumulative gain or loss recognised in other comprehensive income

102E For the purpose of applying the requirement in paragraph 101(c) in order to determine whether the forecast transaction is no longer expected to occur, an entity shall assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows (contractually or non-contractually specified) are based is not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform.

Effectiveness assessment

102F For the purpose of applying the requirements in paragraphs 88(b) and AG105(a), an entity shall assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows and/or the hedged risk (contractually or non- contractually specified) are based, or the interest rate benchmark on which the cash flows of the hedging instrument are based, is not altered as a result of interest rate benchmark reform.

102G For the purpose of applying the requirement in paragraph 88(e), an entity is not required to discontinue a hedging relationship because the actual results of the hedge do not meet the requirements in paragraph AG105(b). For the avoidance of doubt, an entity shall apply the other conditions in paragraph 88, including the prospective assessment in paragraph 88(b), to assess whether the hedging relationship must be discontinued.

Designating financial items as hedged items

102H Unless paragraph 102I applies, for a hedge of a non-contractually specified benchmark portion of interest rate risk, an entity shall apply the requirement in paragraphs 81 and AG99F—that the designated portion shall be separately identifiable—only at the inception of the hedging relationship.

102I When an entity, consistent with its hedge documentation, frequently resets (ie discontinues and restarts) a hedging relationship because both the hedging instrument and the hedged item frequently change (ie the entity uses a dynamic process in which both the hedged items and the hedging instruments used to manage that exposure do not remain the same for long), the entity shall apply the requirement in paragraphs 81 and AG99F—that the designated portion is separately identifiable—only when it initially designates a hedged item in that hedging relationship. A hedged item that has been assessed at the time of its initial designation in the hedging relationship, whether it was at the time of the hedge inception or subsequently, is not reassessed at any subsequent redesignation in the same hedging relationship.

² The report, 'Reforming Major Interest Rate Benchmarks', is available at http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_140722.pdf.

End of application

- 102J An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 102D to a hedged item at the earlier of:
- (a) when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item; and
 - (b) when the hedging relationship that the hedged item is part of is discontinued.
- 102K An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 102E at the earlier of:
- (a) when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based future cash flows of the hedged item; and
 - (b) when the entire cumulative gain or loss recognised in other comprehensive income with respect to that discontinued hedging relationship has been reclassified to profit or loss.
- 102L An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 102F:
- (a) to a hedged item, when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the hedged risk or the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item; and
 - (b) to a hedging instrument, when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedging instrument.
- If the hedging relationship that the hedged item and the hedging instrument are part of is discontinued earlier than the date specified in paragraph 102L(a) or the date specified in paragraph 102L(b), the entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 102F to that hedging relationship at the date of discontinuation.
- 102M An entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraph 102G to a hedging relationship at the earlier of:
- (a) when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the hedged risk and the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument; and
 - (b) when the hedging relationship to which the exception is applied is discontinued.
- 102N When designating a group of items as the hedged item, or a combination of financial instruments as the hedging instrument, an entity shall prospectively cease applying paragraphs 102D–102G to an individual item or financial instrument in accordance with paragraphs 102J, 102K, 102L, or 102M, as relevant, when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the hedged risk and/or the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of that item or financial instrument.

Effective date and transition

...

- 108G *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform*, which amended SLFRS 9, LKAS 39 and SLFRS 7, issued in September 2019, added paragraphs 102A–102N. An entity shall apply these amendments for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2020. Earlier application is permitted. If an entity applies these amendments for an earlier period, it shall disclose that fact. An entity shall apply these amendments retrospectively to

those hedging relationships that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies these amendments or were designated thereafter, and to the gain or loss recognised in other comprehensive income that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies these amendments.

Amendments to SLFRS 7 Financial Instruments: Disclosures

Paragraphs 24H and 44DE–44DF are added and a subheading is added before paragraph 24H. These paragraphs have not been underlined for ease of reading.

Hedge accounting

...

Uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform

24H For hedging relationships to which an entity applies the exceptions set out in paragraphs 6.8.4–6.8.12 of SLFRS 9 or paragraphs 102D–102N of LKAS 39, an entity shall disclose:

- (a) the significant interest rate benchmarks to which the entity's hedging relationships are exposed;
- (b) the extent of the risk exposure the entity manages that is directly affected by the interest rate benchmark reform;
- (c) how the entity is managing the process to transition to alternative benchmark rates;
- (d) a description of significant assumptions or judgements the entity made in applying these paragraphs (for example, assumptions or judgements about when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present with respect to the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows); and
- (e) the nominal amount of the hedging instruments in those hedging relationships.

Effective date and transition

...

44DE *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform*, which amended SLFRS 9, LKAS 39 and SLFRS 7, issued in September 2019, added paragraphs 24H and 44DF. An entity shall apply these amendments when it applies the amendments to SLFRS 9 or LKAS 39.

44DF In the reporting period in which an entity first applies *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform*, issued in September 2019, an entity is not required to present the quantitative information required by paragraph 28(f) of LKAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors*.

Amendments to the Basis for Conclusions on SLFRS 9 Financial Instruments

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part, of SLFRS 9.

After paragraph BC6.545, new headings and paragraphs BC6.546–BC6.603 are added.

Hedge accounting (Chapter 6)

...

Amendments for Interest Rate Benchmark Reform (September 2019)

- BC6.546 Interest rate benchmarks such as interbank offered rates (IBORs) play an important role in global financial markets. These interest rate benchmarks index trillions of dollars and other currencies in a wide variety of financial products, from derivatives to residential mortgages. However, cases of attempted market manipulation of some interest rate benchmarks, together with the post-crisis decline in liquidity in interbank unsecured funding markets, have undermined confidence in the reliability and robustness of some interest rate benchmarks. Against this background, the G20 asked the Financial Stability Board (FSB) to undertake a fundamental review of major interest rate benchmarks. Following the review, the FSB published a report setting out its recommended reforms of some major interest rate benchmarks such as IBORs. Public authorities in many jurisdictions have since taken steps to implement those recommendations. In some jurisdictions, there is already clear progress towards the reform of interest rate benchmarks, or the replacement of interest rate benchmarks with alternative, nearly risk-free interest rates that are based, to a greater extent, on transaction data (alternative benchmark rates). This has in turn led to uncertainty about the long-term viability of some interest rate benchmarks. In these amendments, the term ‘interest rate benchmark reform’ refers to the market-wide reform of an interest rate benchmark including its replacement with an alternative benchmark rate, such as that resulting from the FSB’s recommendations set out in its July 2014 report ‘Reforming Major Interest Rate Benchmarks’ (the reform).³
- BC6.547 In 2018 the LKASB noted the increasing levels of uncertainty about the long-term viability of some interest rate benchmarks and decided to address as a priority the issues affecting financial reporting in the period before the reform (referred to as pre-replacement issues).
- BC6.548 As part of the pre-replacement issues, the LKASB considered the implications for specific hedge accounting requirements in SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39, which require forward-looking analysis. As a result of the reform, contractual cash flows of hedged items and hedging instruments based on an existing interest rate benchmark will likely change when that interest rate benchmark is subject to the reform—in these amendments, contractual cash flows encompass both contractually specified and non-contractually specified cash flows. The same uncertainty arising from the reform regarding the timing and the amount of future cash flows will likely affect the changes in fair value of hedged items and hedging instruments in a fair value hedge of the interest rate benchmark exposure. Until decisions are made about what the alternative benchmark rate is, and when and how the reform will occur, including specifying its effects on particular contracts, uncertainties will exist regarding the timing and the amount of future cash flows of the hedged item and the hedging instrument.
- BC6.549 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that the hedge accounting requirements in SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 provide a clear basis for accounting for such uncertainties. In applying these requirements, the uncertainties about the timing and the amount of future cash flows could affect an entity’s ability to meet those specific forward-looking hedge accounting requirements in the period when uncertainty is created by the reform. In some cases, solely due to such uncertainties, entities could be required to discontinue hedge accounting for hedging relationships that would otherwise qualify for hedge accounting. Also, because of the uncertainties arising from the reform, entities may not be able to designate new hedging relationships that would otherwise qualify for hedge accounting applying SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39. In some cases, discontinuation of hedge accounting would require an entity to recognise gains or losses in profit or loss.
- BC6.550 In the council of CA Sri Lanka’s view, discontinuation of hedge accounting solely due to such uncertainties before the reform’s economic effects on hedged items and hedging instruments are known would not provide useful information to users of financial statements. Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided to publish in May 2019 the Exposure Draft *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform*

(2019 Exposure Draft), which proposed exceptions to SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 to provide relief during this period of uncertainty.

- BC6.551 The 2019 Exposure Draft proposed exceptions to specific hedge accounting requirements such that entities would apply those requirements assuming the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged risk and/or cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument are based is not altered as a result of the reform. The proposed exceptions applied only to the hedge accounting requirements specified in that Exposure Draft and were not intended to provide relief from all consequences arising from the reform.
- BC6.552 Almost all respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft agreed with the council of CA Sri Lanka's decision to address pre-replacement issues. Many highlighted the urgency of these issues, especially in some jurisdictions where there is already clear progress towards the reform or replacement of interest rate benchmarks with alternative benchmark rates.
- BC6.553 In September 2019 the council of CA Sri Lanka amended SLFRS 9, LKAS 39 and SLFRS 7 by issuing *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform*, which confirmed with modifications the proposals in the 2019 Exposure Draft. In the amendments issued in September 2019, the council of CA Sri Lanka added paragraphs 6.8.1–6.8.12 and 7.1.8 to SLFRS 9 and amended paragraph 7.2.26 of SLFRS 9.
- BC6.554 The council of CA Sri Lanka decided to propose amendments to LKAS 39 as well as SLFRS 9 because when entities first apply SLFRS 9, they are permitted to choose as an accounting policy to continue to apply the hedge accounting requirements of LKAS 39. The council of CA Sri Lanka understands that a significant number of SLFRS preparers—financial institutions in particular—have made such an accounting policy choice.

Scope of the exceptions

- BC6.555 In the 2019 Exposure Draft, the council of CA Sri Lanka noted that the hedge accounting issues being addressed arise in the context of interest rate benchmark reform, and, therefore, the proposed exceptions would apply only to hedging relationships of interest rate risk that are affected by the reform. However, some respondents expressed the view that the scope of the exceptions, as set out in the 2019 Exposure Draft, would not include other types of hedging relationships that may be affected by uncertainties arising from the reform such as hedging relationships in which an entity designates cross-currency interest rate swaps to hedge its exposure to both foreign currency and interest rate risk. These respondents asked the council of CA Sri Lanka to clarify whether the scope of the exceptions was meant to include such hedging relationships.
- BC6.556 In its redeliberations on the 2019 Exposure Draft, the council of CA Sri Lanka clarified that it did not intend to exclude from the scope of the amendments hedging relationships in which interest rate risk is not the only designated hedged risk. The council of CA Sri Lanka agreed with respondents that other hedging relationships could be directly affected by the reform when the reform gives rise to uncertainties about the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument. Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka confirmed that the exceptions would apply to the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows in these situations. The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that many derivatives, designated in hedging relationships in which there is no uncertainty about the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows, could be indirectly affected by the reform. For example, this would be the case when the valuation of the derivatives is affected by general uncertainty in the market caused by the reform. The council of CA Sri Lanka confirmed that the exceptions do not apply to these hedging relationships, despite the indirect effect the uncertainties arising from the reform could have on the valuation of derivatives.

BC6.557 Consequently, the council of CA Sri Lanka clarified the wording in paragraph 6.8.1 of SLFRS 9 to refer to all hedging relationships that are directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform. Paragraph 6.8.1 of SLFRS 9 explains that a hedging relationship is directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform only if the reform gives rise to uncertainties about the interest rate benchmark (contractually or non-contractually specified) designated as a hedged risk and/or the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument. The scope of the exceptions does not exclude hedging relationships in which interest rate risk is not the only hedged risk.

Highly probable requirement

BC6.558 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that, if an entity designates a forecast transaction as the hedged item in a cash flow hedge, applying paragraph 6.3.3 of SLFRS 9, that transaction must be highly probable (highly probable requirement). This requirement is intended to ensure that changes in the fair value of designated hedging instruments are recognised in the cash flow hedge reserve only for those hedged forecast transactions that are highly probable to occur. This requirement is an important discipline in applying hedge accounting to forecast transactions. The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that the requirements in SLFRS 9 provide a clear basis to account for the effects of the reform—that is, if the effects of the reform are such that the hedged cash flows are no longer highly probable, hedge accounting should be discontinued. As set out in paragraph BC6.550, in the council of CA Sri Lanka's view, discontinuing all affected hedging relationships solely due to such uncertainty would not provide useful information to users of financial statements.

BC6.559 Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka amended SLFRS 9 to provide an exception to the highly probable requirement that would provide targeted relief during this period of uncertainty. More specifically, applying the exception, if the hedged future cash flows are based on an interest rate benchmark that is subject to the reform, an entity assumes that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based is not altered when assessing whether the future cash flows are highly probable. If the hedged future cash flows are based on a highly probable forecast transaction, by applying the exception in paragraph 6.8.4 of SLFRS 9 when performing the assessment of the highly probable requirement for that forecast transaction, the entity would assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based will not be altered in the future contract as a result of the reform. For example, for a future issuance of a London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR)-referenced debt instrument, the entity would assume that the LIBOR benchmark rate on which the hedged cash flows are based will not be altered as a result of the reform.

BC6.560 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that this exception does not necessarily result in an entity determining that the hedged cash flows are highly probable. In the example described in paragraph BC6.559, the entity assumed that the interest rate benchmark in the future contract would not be altered as a result of the reform when determining whether that forecast transaction is highly probable. However, if the entity decides not to issue the debt instrument because of uncertainty arising from the reform or for any other reason, the hedged future cash flows are no longer highly probable (and are no longer expected to occur). The exception would not permit or require the entity to assume otherwise. In this case, the entity would conclude that the LIBOR-based cash flows are no longer highly probable (and are no longer expected to occur)

BC6.561 The council of CA Sri Lanka also included an exception for discontinued hedging relationships. Applying this exception, any amount remaining in the cash flow hedge reserve when a hedging relationship is discontinued would be reclassified to profit or loss in the same period(s) during which the hedged cash flows affect profit or loss, based on the assumption that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based is not altered as a result of the reform. If, however, the hedged future cash flows are no longer expected to occur for other reasons, the entity is required to immediately reclassify to profit or loss any amount remaining in the cash flow hedge reserve. In addition, the

exception would not exempt entities from reclassifying the amount that is not expected to be recovered into profit or loss as required by paragraph 6.5.11(d)(iii) of SLFRS 9.

Assessment of the economic relationship between the hedged item and the hedging instrument

- BC6.562 Applying SLFRS 9, a hedging relationship qualifies for hedge accounting only if there is an economic relationship between the hedged item and the hedging instrument.
- BC6.563 Demonstrating the existence of an economic relationship requires the estimation of future cash flows because the assessment is prospective in nature. Interest rate benchmark reform could affect this assessment for hedging relationships that may extend beyond the timing of the reform. That is because entities would have to consider possible changes to the fair value or future cash flows of hedged items and hedging instruments to assess whether an economic relationship continues to exist between the hedged item and hedging instrument. Consequently, at some point in time, it is possible that entities would not be able to demonstrate the existence of an economic relationship solely because of uncertainties arising from the reform.
- BC6.564 The council of CA Sri Lanka considered the usefulness of the information that would result from the potential discontinuation of hedge accounting for affected hedging relationships and decided to amend the requirements in SLFRS 9 to provide an exception for assessing the economic relationship between the hedged item and the hedging instrument for the same reasons discussed in paragraph BC6.550.
- BC6.565 Applying this exception, an entity shall assess whether the economic relationship as required by paragraph 6.4.1(c)(i) of SLFRS 9 exists based on the assumption that the hedged risk or the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged item or the hedging instrument is based is not altered as a result of the reform. Similarly, if an entity designates a highly probable forecast transaction as the hedged item, the entity shall perform the assessment based on the assumption that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based will not change as a result of the reform.
- BC6.556 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that an offset between the hedged item and the hedging instrument is a fundamental principle of the hedge accounting model in SLFRS 9 and, therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka considered it critical to maintain this principle. The exception addresses only the uncertainties arising from the reform. Therefore, if an entity is unable to demonstrate the existence of an economic relationship between the hedged item and the hedging instrument for other reasons, the entity shall discontinue hedge accounting as required by SLFRS 9.

Measurement of ineffectiveness

- BC6.567 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that the exceptions were not intended to change the requirement that entities measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness. The council of CA Sri Lanka considered that the actual results of the hedging relationships would provide useful information to users of financial statements during the period of uncertainty arising from the reform. Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided that entities should continue to measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness as required by SLFRS Standards.
- BC6.568 The council of CA Sri Lanka also considered whether any exceptions should be made to the measurement of hedged items or hedging instruments because of the uncertainty arising from the

reform. However, the council of CA Sri Lanka noted that such an exception would be inconsistent with the decision not to change the requirements to measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness in the financial statements. Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided not to provide an exception from the measurement of hedging instruments and hedged items. This means that the fair value of a derivative designated as the hedging instrument should continue to be measured using the assumptions that market participants would use when pricing that derivative as required by SLFRS 13 *Fair Value Measurement*.

BC6.569 For a hedged item designated in a fair value hedge, SLFRS 9 requires an entity to remeasure the hedged item for changes in fair value attributable to the hedged risk and recognise the gain or loss related to that fair value hedge adjustment in profit or loss. In doing so, the entity uses the assumptions that market participants would use when pricing the hedged item for changes in fair value attributable to the hedged risk. This would include a risk premium for uncertainty inherent in the hedged risk that market participants would consider. For example, to measure changes in fair value attributable to the hedged risk such as the IBOR component of a fixed-rate loan, an entity needs to reflect the uncertainty caused by the reform. When applying a present value technique to calculate the changes in fair value attributable to the designated risk component, such measurement should reflect market participants' assumptions about the uncertainty arising from the reform.

BC6.570 When an entity designates interest rate benchmark-based cash flows as the hedged item in a cash flow hedge, to calculate the change in the value of the hedged item for the purpose of measuring hedge ineffectiveness, the entity may use a derivative that would have terms that match the critical terms of the designated cash flows and the hedged risk (this is commonly referred to as a 'hypothetical derivative'). As the council of CA Sri Lanka decided that entities should continue to measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness as required by SLFRS Standards, entities should continue to apply assumptions that are consistent with those applied to the hedged risk of the hedged item. For example, if an entity designated interest rate benchmark-based cash flows as the hedged item in a cash flow hedge, the entity would not assume for the purpose of measuring hedge ineffectiveness that the expected replacement of the interest rate benchmark with an alternative benchmark rate will result in zero cash flows after the replacement. The hedging gain or loss on the hedged item should be measured using the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows (that is, the cash flows on which the hypothetical derivative is based) when applying a present value technique, discounted at a market-based discount rate that reflects market participants' assumptions about the uncertainty arising from the reform. The council of CA Sri Lanka concluded that reflecting market participants' assumptions when measuring hedge ineffectiveness provides useful information to users of financial statements about the effects of the uncertainty arising from the reform on an entity's hedging relationships. Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided that no exceptions are needed for the measurement of actual ineffectiveness.

Hedges of risk components

BC6.571 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that in accordance with SLFRS 9 an entity may designate an item in its entirety or a component of an item as the hedged item in a hedging relationship. For example, an entity that issues a 5-year floating-rate debt instrument that bears interest at 3-month LIBOR + 1%, could designate as the hedged item either the entire debt instrument (that is, all of the cash flows) or only the 3-month LIBOR risk component of the floating-rate debt instrument. Specifically, paragraph 6.3.7(a) of SLFRS 9 allows entities to designate only changes in the cash flows or fair value of an item attributable to a specific risk or risks (risk component) provided that the risk component is separately identifiable and reliably measurable.

BC6.572 The council of CA Sri Lanka observed that an entity's ability to conclude that an interest rate benchmark is a separately identifiable component in accordance with paragraph 6.3.7(a) of SLFRS 9 requires a continuous assessment over the duration of the hedging relationship and could be affected

by the reform. For example, if the outcome of the reform affects the market structure of an interest rate benchmark, it could affect an entity's assessment of whether a non-contractually specified LIBOR component is separately identifiable and, therefore, an eligible hedged item in a hedging relationship. The council of CA Sri Lanka considered only risk components that are implicit in the fair value or the cash flows of an item of which they are a part (referred to as non-contractually specified) because the same issue does not arise for risk components that are explicitly specified in the contract.

- BC6.573 For the reasons outlined in paragraph BC6.550, the council of CA Sri Lanka noted that discontinuing hedging relationships due to uncertainty arising from the reform would not provide useful information. Consequently, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided to propose amending SLFRS 9 so that entities would not discontinue hedge accounting solely because the risk component is no longer separately identifiable as a result of the reform. In the 2019 Exposure Draft, the council of CA Sri Lanka proposed that the separately identifiable requirement for hedges of the benchmark component of interest rate risk be applied only at the inception of those hedging relationships affected by the reform.
- BC6.574 The council of CA Sri Lanka proposed not to extend the relief to allow entities to designate the benchmark component of interest rate risk as the hedged item in a new hedging relationship if the risk component is not separately identifiable at the inception of the hedging relationship. In the council of CA Sri Lanka's view, allowing hedge accounting for risk components that are not separately identifiable at the inception would be inconsistent with the objective of the exception. The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that such circumstances are different from allowing continued designation as the hedged item for risk components that had met the requirement at the inception of the hedging relationship.
- BC6.575 Furthermore, the council of CA Sri Lanka did not propose any exception from the requirement that changes in the fair value or cash flows of the risk component must be reliably measurable. As noted in paragraph BC6.566, in the council of CA Sri Lanka's view, an offset between the hedged item and the hedging instrument is a fundamental principle of the hedge accounting model in SLFRS 9 and, therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka considered reliable measurement of the hedged item and the hedging instrument to be critical to maintain this principle.
- BC6.576 Almost all respondents agreed with the exception proposed in the 2019 Exposure Draft to apply the separately identifiable requirement only at the inception of a hedging relationship. However, some respondents noted that the proposed exception did not provide equivalent relief to hedging relationships that frequently reset (ie discontinue and restart). In those hedging relationships both the hedging instrument and the hedged item frequently change (ie the entity uses a dynamic process in which both the hedged items and the hedging instruments used to manage that exposure do not remain the same for long). As hedging instruments and hedged items are being added or removed from a portfolio, entities are de-designating and redesignating hedging relationships regularly to adjust the exposure. If each redesignation of the hedging relationship is considered to be the inception of a new hedging relationship (even though it is still the same hedging strategy), then the separately identifiable requirement would need to be assessed for all hedged items at each redesignation even if they have been assessed previously. For the same reasons as those noted in paragraph BC6.572, this could affect an entity's ability to conclude that a non-contractually specified risk component remains separately identifiable and, therefore, an eligible hedged item for hedge accounting purposes.
- BC6.577 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that the exception proposed in the 2019 Exposure Draft has the effect that if a non-contractually specified risk component meets the separately identifiable requirement at the inception of a hedging relationship, then that requirement would not be reassessed subsequently. Hence, providing a similar exception for hedging relationships that frequently reset (ie

discontinue and restart) would be consistent with the objective of the exception originally provided in the 2019 Exposure Draft.

BC6.578 Thus, the council of CA Sri Lanka confirmed the proposal that a risk component is only required to be separately identifiable at the inception of the hedging relationship. In addition, to respond to the feedback described in paragraph BC6.576, the council of CA Sri Lanka added the exception in paragraph 6.8.8 of SLFRS 9 for hedging relationships that, consistent with an entity's hedge documentation, frequently reset (ie discontinue and restart) because both the hedging instrument and the hedged item frequently change. Applying that paragraph, an entity shall determine whether the risk component is separately identifiable only when it initially designates an item as a hedged item in the hedging relationship. The hedged item is not reassessed at any subsequent redesignation in the same hedging relationship.

BC6.579 In reaching its decision for the exception in paragraph 6.8.8 of SLFRS 9 the council of CA Sri Lanka considered an example where an entity uses a dynamic process to manage interest rate risk as discussed in paragraph B6.5.24(b) of SLFRS 9 and designates the LIBOR risk component of floating-rate loans as the hedged risk. At the inception of the relationship, the entity assesses whether LIBOR is a separately identifiable risk component for all loans designated within the hedging relationship. As the entity updates the risk position with the origination of new loans and the maturity or repayment of existing loans, the hedging relationship is adjusted by de-designating the 'old' hedging relationship and redesignating a 'new' hedging relationship for the updated amount of the hedged items. Applying the exception in paragraph 6.8.8 of SLFRS 9 requires the entity to assess whether LIBOR is a separately identifiable risk component only for the new loans added to the hedging relationship. The entity would not reassess the separately identifiable requirement for the loans that have been redesignated.

Mandatory application

BC6.580 The council of CA Sri Lanka decided to require entities to apply the exceptions in Section 6.8 of SLFRS 9 to all hedging relationships to which the exceptions are applicable. In other words, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided that an entity is required to apply the exceptions to all hedging relationships that are directly affected by the uncertainties arising from the reform and continue to apply the exceptions until required to cease their application as specified in paragraphs 6.8.9–6.8.12 of SLFRS 9.

BC6.581 The council of CA Sri Lanka considered but rejected alternatives that would have allowed entities to apply the exceptions voluntarily. In the council of CA Sri Lanka's view, voluntary application of these exceptions could give rise to selective discontinuation of hedge accounting and selective reclassification of the amounts recorded in other comprehensive income related to previously discontinued hedging relationships. The council of CA Sri Lanka does not expect that requiring entities to apply the exceptions would entail significant cost for preparers and other affected parties because the exceptions require entities to assume that the interest rate benchmark, on which the hedged risk and the hedged cash flows, and cash flows of the hedging instrument are based, is not altered as a result of the reform.

BC6.582 In addition, the council of CA Sri Lanka observed that in some circumstances, the exceptions in Section 6.8 of SLFRS 9 may not be applicable. For example, for a particular interest rate benchmark not subject to the reform or replacement with an alternative benchmark rate, there is no uncertainty affecting the timing or the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows arising from a hedged item or a hedging instrument. The exceptions set out in Section 6.8 of SLFRS 9 would not be applicable to such a hedging relationship.

BC6.583 Furthermore, for a particular hedging relationship the exceptions may be applicable to some but not all aspects of the hedging relationship. For example, if an entity designates a hedged item that is based on LIBOR against a hedging instrument that is already referenced to an alternative benchmark rate

(assuming the entity can demonstrate that hedging relationship meets the qualifying criteria for hedge accounting in SLFRS 9), the exceptions in paragraphs 6.8.4 and 6.8.6 of SLFRS 9 would apply for the hedged item because there is uncertainty related to its future cash flows. However, there is no uncertainty regarding how the reform would impact the cash flows of the hedging instrument and, therefore, the exception in paragraph 6.8.6 of SLFRS 9 is not applicable for the hedging instrument. Similarly, the exception applicable to non-contractually specified components would not be relevant for hedging relationships that do not involve the designation of non-contractually specified risk components.

End of application

- BC6.584 As described in paragraph BC6.550, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided to amend SLFRS 9 to address specific aspects of hedge accounting affected by uncertainties in relation to the hedged items and hedging instruments about when the interest rate benchmarks will change to alternative benchmark rates, when any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate will be determined (collectively, timing) and what the cash flows based on the alternative benchmark rate will be, including their frequency of reset, and any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate (collectively, amount). Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka intended the exceptions set out in Section 6.8 of SLFRS 9 to be available only while these uncertainties are present.
- BC6.585 The council of CA Sri Lanka considered whether to provide an explicit end date for the exceptions but decided not to do so. The reform is following different timelines in different markets and jurisdictions and contracts are being modified at different times and, therefore, at this stage, it is not possible to define a period of applicability for the exceptions
- BC6.586 The council of CA Sri Lanka decided that an entity ceases applying the exceptions at the earlier of (a) when the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows is no longer present as it relates to a hedged item and/or hedging instrument (depending on the particular exception) and (b) the discontinuation of the hedging relationship.⁴ The exceptions require entities to apply specific hedge accounting requirements assuming the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged risk, hedged cash flows or the cash flows of the hedging instrument are based is not altered as a result of the reform. The end of applicability of the exceptions means that entities would from that date apply all hedge accounting requirements in SLFRS 9 without applying these exceptions.
- BC6.587 In the council of CA Sri Lanka's view, for uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows arising from a change in an interest rate benchmark to be eliminated, the underlying contracts are generally required to be amended to specify the timing and the amount of cash flows based on the alternative benchmark rate (and any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate). The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that, in some cases, a contract may be amended to include reference to the alternative benchmark rate without actually altering the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows in the contract. Such an amendment may not eliminate the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows in the contract. The council of CA Sri Lanka considered the following scenarios to assess the robustness of the end of application requirements. However, these scenarios are not exhaustive and other scenarios

⁴ or the purpose of applying the exception in paragraph 6.8.5 of SLFRS 9 to a discontinued hedging relationship, the amendments require an entity to cease applying the exception at the earlier of (a) as described above and (b) when the entire amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve with respect to the hedging relationship has been reclassified to profit or loss. See paragraph 6.8.10 of SLFRS 9.

may exist in which the uncertainties arising from the reform regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows would no longer be present.

- BC6.588 Scenario A—a contract is amended to include a clause that specifies (a) the date the interest rate benchmark will be replaced by an alternative benchmark rate and (b) the alternative benchmark rate on which the cash flows will be based and the relevant spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate. In this case, the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows for this contract is eliminated when the contract is amended to include this clause.
- BC6.589 Scenario B—a contract is amended to include a clause that states modifications of contractual cash flows will occur due to the reform but that specifies neither the date that the interest rate benchmark will be replaced nor the alternative benchmark rate on which the amended cash flows will be based. In this case, the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows for this contract has not been eliminated by amending the contract to include this clause.
- BC6.590 Scenario C—a contract is amended to include a clause which states that conditions specifying the amount and timing of interest rate benchmark- based cash flows will be determined by a central authority at some point in the future. But the clause does not specify those conditions. In this case, the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows for this contract has not been eliminated by including this clause in the contract. Uncertainty regarding both the timing and the amount of cash flows for this contract will be present until the central authority specifies when the replacement of the benchmark will become effective, and what the alternative benchmark rate and any related spread adjustment will be.
- BC6.591 Scenario D—a contract is amended to include a clause in anticipation of the reform that specifies the date the interest rate benchmark will be replaced and any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate will be determined. However, the amendment does not specify the alternative benchmark rate, or the spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate, on which the cash flows will be based. In this scenario, by amending the contract to include this clause, uncertainty regarding the timing has been eliminated but uncertainty about the amount remains.
- BC6.592 Scenario E—a contract is amended to include a clause in anticipation of the reform that specifies the alternative benchmark rate on which the cash flows will be based and the spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate, but does not specify the date from which the amendment to the contract will become effective. In this scenario, by amending the contract to include this clause, uncertainty about the amount has been eliminated but uncertainty with respect to timing remains.
- BC6.593 Scenario F—in preparation for the reform, a central authority in its capacity as the administrator of an interest rate benchmark undertakes a multi-step process to replace an interest rate benchmark with an alternative benchmark rate. The objective of the reform is to cease the publication of the current interest rate benchmark and replace it with an alternative benchmark rate. As part of the reform, the administrator introduces an interim benchmark rate and determines a fixed spread adjustment based on the difference between the interim benchmark rate and the current interest rate benchmark. Uncertainty about the timing or the amount of the alternative benchmark rate-based cash flows will not be eliminated during the interim period because the interim benchmark rate (including the fixed spread adjustment determined by the administrator) represent an interim measure in progressing towards the reform but it does not represent the alternative benchmark rate (or any related spread adjustment agreed between parties to the contract).

- BC6.594 For reasons similar to those described in paragraph BC6.583, the council of CA Sri Lanka noted that there could be situations in which the uncertainty for particular elements of a single hedging relationship could end at different times. For example, assume an entity is required to apply the relevant exceptions to both the hedged item and the hedging instrument. If the hedging instrument in that hedging relationship is subsequently amended through market protocols covering all derivatives in that market, and will be based on an alternative benchmark rate such that the uncertainty about the timing and the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedging instrument is eliminated, the relevant exceptions would continue to apply to the hedged item but would no longer apply to the hedging instrument.⁵
- BC6.595 The council of CA Sri Lanka observed that continuing to apply the exception after the uncertainty was resolved would not faithfully represent the actual characteristics of the elements of the hedging relationship in which the uncertainty arising from the reform is eliminated. The council of CA Sri Lanka considered whether it should extend the relief provided such that the exceptions would apply at the hedging relationship level for as long as any element of that hedging relationship was affected by the uncertainties arising from the reform. The council of CA Sri Lanka agreed that doing so would be beyond the objective of addressing only those issues directly affected by the uncertainty arising from the reform. This is also because the exceptions in paragraphs 6.8.4–6.8.12 of SLFRS 9 and the respective requirements in SLFRS 9 apply to the same elements of the hedging relationship. Therefore, applying each exception at the hedging relationship level would be inconsistent with how the underlying requirements are applied.
- BC6.596 The council of CA Sri Lanka decided that the end of application requirement would also apply to hedges of a forecast transaction. The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that SLFRS 9 requires an entity to identify and document a forecast transaction with sufficient specificity so that, when the transaction occurs, the entity is able to determine whether the transaction is the hedged transaction. For example, if an entity designates a future issuance of a LIBOR-based debt instrument as the hedged item, although there may be no contract at the time of designation, the hedge documentation would refer specifically to LIBOR. Consequently, the council of CA Sri Lanka concluded that entities should be able to identify when the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of the resulting cash flows of a forecast transaction is no longer present.
- BC6.597 In addition, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided not to require end of application with respect to the exception for the separately identifiable requirements set out in paragraphs 6.8.7 and 6.8.8 of SLFRS 9. Applying these exceptions, entities would continue applying hedge accounting when an interest rate benchmark meets the separately identifiable requirement at the inception of the hedging relationship (assuming all other hedge accounting requirements continue to be met). If the council of CA Sri Lanka included an end date for these exceptions, an entity may be required to immediately discontinue hedge accounting because, at some point, as the reform progresses, the component based on the interest rate benchmark may no longer be separately identifiable (for example, as the market for the alternative benchmark rate is established). Such immediate discontinuation of hedge accounting would be inconsistent with the objective of the exception. The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that linking the end of application for these exceptions to contract amendments would not achieve the council of CA Sri Lanka's intention either because, by definition, non-contractually specified risk components are not explicitly stated in a contract and, therefore, these contracts may not be amended for the reform. This is

⁵ In this scenario, the entity would first consider the accounting consequences of amending the contractual terms of the hedging instrument. The council of CA Sri Lanka will consider the accounting consequences of the actual amendment of financial instruments as a result of interest rate benchmark reform in the next phase of this project (ie the replacement phase)

particularly relevant for fair value hedges of a fixed-rate debt instrument. Therefore, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided that an entity should cease applying the exceptions to a hedging relationship only when the hedging relationship is discontinued applying SLFRS 9

BC6.598 Some respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft noted that the council of CA Sri Lanka had not addressed when an entity ceases applying the proposed exceptions to a group of items designated as the hedged item or a combination of financial instruments designated as the hedging instrument. Specifically, when assessing whether the uncertainty arising from the reform is no longer present, these respondents asked whether that assessment should be performed on an individual basis (that is, for each individual item within the group or financial instrument within the combination) or on a group basis (that is, for all items in the group or all financial instruments in the combination until there is no uncertainty surrounding any of the items or financial instruments).

BC6.599 Consequently, the council of CA Sri Lanka decided to add paragraph 6.8.12 of SLFRS 9 to clarify that, when designating a group of items as the hedged item or a combination of financial instruments as the hedging instrument, entities assess when the uncertainty arising from the reform with respect to the hedged risk and/or the timing and amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of that item or financial instrument is no longer present on an individual basis—that is, for each individual item in the group or financial instrument in the combination

Effective date and transition

BC6.600 The council of CA Sri Lanka decided that entities shall apply the amendments for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2020, with earlier application permitted.

BC6.601 The council of CA Sri Lanka decided that the amendments apply retrospectively. The council of CA Sri Lanka highlighted that retrospective application of the amendments would not allow reinstating hedge accounting that has already been discontinued. Nor would it allow designation in hindsight. If an entity had not designated a hedging relationship, the exceptions, even though applied retrospectively, would not allow the entity to apply hedge accounting in prior periods to items that were not designated for hedge accounting. Doing so would be inconsistent with the requirement that hedge accounting applies prospectively. Retrospective application of the exceptions would enable entities to continue hedge accounting for a hedging relationship that the entity had previously designated and that qualifies for hedge accounting applying SLFRS 9.

BC6.602 Many respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft commented on the clarity of the proposed retrospective application and suggested that further explanation be provided in the Standard. Consequently, the council of CA Sri Lanka amended the transition paragraph to specify that retrospective application applies only to those hedging relationships that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies those requirements or were designated thereafter, and to the amount accumulated in the cash flow hedge reserve that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies those requirements. The council of CA Sri Lanka used this wording to permit an entity to apply the amendments from the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies these amendments even if the reporting period is not an annual period.

BC6.603 The council of CA Sri Lanka noted that these amendments would also apply to entities adopting SLFRS Standards for the first time as required by SLFRS 1 First time Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards. Accordingly, the council of CA Sri Lanka did not provide specific transition provisions for those entities.

Amendments to the Basis for Conclusions on LKAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, LKAS 39.

After paragraph BC222, new headings and paragraphs BC223–BC288 are added.

Hedging

...

Amendments for Interest Rate Benchmark Reform (September 2019)

- BC223 Interest rate benchmarks such as interbank offered rates (IBORs) play an important role in global financial markets. These interest rate benchmarks index trillions of dollars and other currencies in a wide variety of financial products, from derivatives to residential mortgages. However, cases of attempted market manipulation of some interest rate benchmarks, together with the post-crisis decline in liquidity in interbank unsecured funding markets, have undermined confidence in the reliability and robustness of some interest rate benchmarks. Against this background, the G20 asked the Financial Stability Board (FSB) to undertake a fundamental review of major interest rate benchmarks. Following the review, the FSB published a report setting out its recommended reforms of some major interest rate benchmarks such as IBORs. Public authorities in many jurisdictions have since taken steps to implement those recommendations. In some jurisdictions, there is already clear progress towards the reform of interest rate benchmarks, or the replacement of interest rate benchmarks with alternative, nearly risk-free interest rates that are based, to a greater extent, on transaction data (alternative benchmark rates). This has in turn led to uncertainty about the long-term viability of some interest rate benchmarks. In these amendments, the term ‘interest rate benchmark reform’ refers to the market-wide reform of an interest rate benchmark including its replacement with an alternative benchmark rate, such as that resulting from the FSB’s recommendations set out in its July 2014 report ‘Reforming Major Interest Rate Benchmarks’ (the reform).⁶
- BC224 In 2018 the Council noted the increasing levels of uncertainty about the long-term viability of some interest rate benchmarks and decided to address as a priority the issues affecting financial reporting in the period before the reform (referred to as pre-replacement issues)
- BC225 As part of the pre-replacement issues, the Council considered the implications for specific hedge accounting requirements in SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39, which require forward-looking analysis. As a result of the reform, contractual cash flows of hedged items and hedging instruments based on an existing interest rate benchmark will likely change when that interest rate benchmark is subject to the reform—in these amendments, contractual cash flows encompass both contractually specified and non-contractually specified cash flows. The same uncertainty arising from the reform regarding the timing and the amount of future cash flows will likely affect the changes in fair value of hedged items and hedging instruments in a fair value hedge of the interest rate benchmark exposure. Until decisions are made about what the alternative benchmark rate is, and when and how the reform will occur,

⁶ The report, ‘Reforming Major Interest Rate Benchmarks’, is available at http://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/r_140722.pdf.

including specifying its effects on particular contracts, uncertainties will exist regarding the timing and the amount of future cash flows of the hedged item and the hedging instrument.

- BC226 The Council noted that the hedge accounting requirements in SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 provide a clear basis for accounting for such uncertainties. In applying these requirements, the uncertainties about the timing and the amount of future cash flows could affect an entity's ability to meet those specific forward- looking hedge accounting requirements in the period when uncertainty is created by the reform. In some cases, solely due to such uncertainties, entities could be required to discontinue hedge accounting for hedging relationships that would otherwise qualify for hedge accounting. Also, because of the uncertainties arising from the reform, entities may not be able to designate new hedging relationships that would otherwise qualify for hedge accounting applying SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39. In some cases, discontinuation of hedge accounting would require an entity to recognise gains or losses in profit or loss.
- BC227 In the Council's view, discontinuation of hedge accounting solely due to such uncertainties before the reform's economic effects on hedged items and hedging instruments are known would not provide useful information to users of financial statements. Therefore, the Council decided to publish in May 2019 the Exposure Draft *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform* (2019 Exposure Draft), which proposed exceptions to SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 to provide relief during this period of uncertainty
- BC228 The 2019 Exposure Draft proposed exceptions to specific hedge accounting requirements such that entities would apply those requirements assuming the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged risk and/or cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument are based is not altered as a result of the reform. The proposed exceptions applied only to the hedge accounting requirements specified in that Exposure Draft and were not intended to provide relief from all consequences arising from the reform.
- BC229 Almost all respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft agreed with the Council's decision to address pre-replacement issues. Many highlighted the urgency of these issues, especially in some jurisdictions where there is already clear progress towards the reform or replacement of interest rate benchmarks with alternative benchmark rates.
- BC230 In September 2019 the Council amended SLFRS 9, LKAS 39 and SLFRS 7 by issuing *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform*, which confirmed with modifications the proposals in the 2019 Exposure Draft. In the amendments issued in September 2019, the Council added paragraphs 102A–102N and 108G to LKAS 39.
- BC231 The Council decided to propose amendments to LKAS 39 as well as SLFRS 9 because when entities first apply SLFRS 9, they are permitted to choose as an accounting policy to continue to apply the hedge accounting requirements of LKAS 39. The Council understands that a significant number of SLFRS preparers—financial institutions in particular—have made such an accounting policy choice.

Scope of the exceptions

- BC232 In the 2019 Exposure Draft, the Council noted that the hedge accounting issues being addressed arise in the context of interest rate benchmark reform, and, therefore, the proposed exceptions would apply only to hedging relationships of interest rate risk that are affected by the reform. However, some respondents expressed the view that the scope of the exceptions, as set out in the 2019 Exposure Draft, would not include other types of hedging relationships that may be affected by uncertainties arising from the reform such as hedging relationships in which an entity designates cross-currency interest rateswaps to hedge its exposure to both foreign currency and interest rate risk. These respondents asked

the Council to clarify whether the scope of the exceptions was meant to include such hedging relationships.

BC233 In its redeliberations on the 2019 Exposure Draft, the Council clarified that it did not intend to exclude from the scope of the amendments hedging relationships in which interest rate risk is not the only designated hedged risk. The Council agreed with respondents that other hedging relationships could be directly affected by the reform when the reform gives rise to uncertainties about the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument. Therefore, the Council confirmed that the exceptions would apply to the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows in these situations. The Council noted that many derivatives, designated in hedging relationships in which there is no uncertainty about the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows, could be indirectly affected by the reform. For example, this would be the case when the valuation of the derivatives is affected by general uncertainty in the market caused by the reform. The Council confirmed that the exceptions do not apply to these hedging relationships, despite the indirect effect the uncertainties arising from the reform could have on the valuation of derivatives.

BC234 Consequently, the Council clarified the wording in paragraph 102A of LKAS 39 to refer to all hedging relationships that are directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform. Paragraph 102A of LKAS 39 explains that a hedging relationship is directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform only if the reform gives rise to uncertainties about the interest rate benchmark (contractually or non-contractually specified) designated as a hedged risk and/or the timing or the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedged item or of the hedging instrument. The scope of the exceptions does not exclude hedging relationships in which interest rate risk is not the only hedged risk.

Highly probable requirement

BC235 The Council noted that if an entity designates a forecast transaction as the hedged item in a cash flow hedge, applying paragraph 88(c) of LKAS 39, that transaction must be highly probable (highly probable requirement). This requirement is intended to ensure that changes in the fair value of designated hedging instruments are recognised in other comprehensive income only for those hedged forecast transactions that are highly probable to occur. This requirement is an important discipline in applying hedge accounting to forecast transactions. The Council noted that the requirements in LKAS 39 provide a clear basis to account for the effects of the reform—that is, if the effects of the reform are such that the hedged cash flows are no longer highly probable, hedge accounting should be discontinued. As set out in paragraph BC227, in the Council's view, discontinuing all affected hedging relationships solely due to such uncertainty would not provide useful information to users of financial statements.

BC236 Therefore, the Council amended LKAS 39 to provide an exception to the highly probable requirement that would provide targeted relief during this period of uncertainty. More specifically, applying the exception, if the hedged future cash flows are based on an interest rate benchmark that is subject to the reform, an entity assumes that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based is not altered when assessing whether the future cash flows are highly probable. If the hedged future cash flows are based on a highly probable forecast transaction, by applying the exception in paragraph 102D of LKAS 39 when performing the assessment of the highly probable requirement for that forecast transaction, the entity would assume that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based will not be altered in the future contract as a result of the reform. For

example, for a future issuance of a London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR)- referenced debt instrument, the entity would assume that the LIBOR benchmark rate on which the hedged cash flows are based will not be altered as a result of the reform.

BC237 The Council noted that this exception does not necessarily result in an entity determining that the hedged cash flows are highly probable. In the example described in paragraph BC236, the entity assumed that the interest rate benchmark in the future contract would not be altered as a result of the reform when determining whether that forecast transaction is highly probable. However, if the entity decides not to issue the debt instrument because of uncertainty arising from the reform or for any other reason, the hedged future cash flows are no longer highly probable (and are no longer expected to occur). The exception would not permit or require the entity to assume otherwise. In this case, the entity would conclude that the LIBOR- based cash flows are no longer highly probable (and are no longer expected to occur).

BC238 The Council also included an exception for discontinued hedging relationships. Applying this exception, any amount remaining in other comprehensive income when a hedging relationship is discontinued would be reclassified to profit or loss in the same period(s) during which the hedged cash flows affect profit or loss, based on the assumption that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based is not altered as a result of the reform. If, however, the hedged future cash flows are no longer expected to occur for other reasons, the entity is required to immediately reclassify to profit or loss any amount remaining in other comprehensive income. In addition, the exception would not exempt entities from reclassifying the amount that is not expected to be recovered into profit or loss as required by paragraph 97 of LKAS 39.

Effectiveness assessment

BC239 Applying LKAS 39, a hedging relationship qualifies for hedge accounting only if the conditions in paragraph 88 are met. Two of the conditions in that paragraph—the prospective assessment and the retrospective assessment— require that the hedging relationship is highly effective in achieving offsetting changes in fair value or cash flows attributable to the hedged risk. If either of these conditions is not met, paragraphs 91(b) and 101(b) require the entity to discontinue hedge accounting prospectively.

Prospective assessment

BC240 When applying paragraph 88(b) of LKAS 39, demonstrating that a hedging relationship is expected to be highly effective requires the estimation of future cash flows because the assessment is prospective in nature. Interest rate benchmark reform could affect this assessment for hedging relationships that may extend beyond the timing of the reform. That is because entities would have to consider possible changes to the fair value or future cash flows of hedged items and hedging instruments in determining whether a hedging relationship is expected to be highly effective. Consequently, at some point in time, it is possible that entities would not be able to meet the condition in paragraph 88(b) of LKAS 39 solely because of uncertainties arising from the reform.

BC241 The Council considered the usefulness of the information that would result from the potential discontinuation of hedge accounting for affected hedging relationships and decided to amend the requirement in LKAS 39 to provide an exception for the prospective assessment for the same reasons as discussed in paragraph BC227.

BC242 Applying this exception, an entity shall assess whether the hedge is expected to be highly effective in achieving offsetting as required by LKAS 39, based on the assumption that the hedged risk or the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged item or the hedging instrument is based is not altered as a

result of the reform. Similarly, if an entity designates a highly probable forecast transaction as the hedged item, the entity shall perform the prospective assessment based on the assumption that the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged cash flows are based will not change as a result of the reform.

- BC243 The Council noted that an offset between the hedged item and the hedging instrument is a fundamental principle of the hedge accounting model in LKAS 39 and, therefore, the Council considered it critical to maintain this principle. The exception addresses only the uncertainties arising from the reform. Therefore, if an entity is unable to demonstrate that a hedging relationship is expected to be highly effective for other reasons, the entity shall discontinue hedge accounting as required by LKAS 39.

Retrospective assessment

- BC244 When developing the 2019 Exposure Draft, the Council decided not to propose an exception to the retrospective assessment required by paragraph 88(e) and AG105(b) of LKAS 39 for the effects of the reform. As described in the 2019 Exposure Draft, that assessment is based on the actual results of the hedging relationship based on the extent to which hedging gains or losses on the hedged item attributable to the hedged risk offset changes in the fair value of the hedging instrument. The Council noted that existing SLFRS Standards already provide an adequate basis for measuring ineffectiveness.
- BC245 Most respondents disagreed with the Council's decision not to propose an exception to the retrospective assessment. Respondents noted that due to the inherent interaction between the assessment of the forward-looking cash flows of the hedged item and its effect on both prospective and retrospective assessments, the proposed amendments would not achieve their intended effect unless an exception is also provided for the retrospective assessment.
- BC246 Furthermore, these respondents expressed the view that the discontinuation of hedge accounting because hedging relationships do not meet the requirements in paragraph AG105(b) of LKAS 39, as a result of the temporary ineffectiveness caused by the reform, would not reflect an entity's risk management strategy and, therefore, would not provide useful information to users of financial statements.
- BC247 In its redeliberations on the amendments to LKAS 39, the Council considered the feedback received. The Council discussed three approaches that it could apply for providing an exception to the retrospective assessment for the impact of the uncertainty arising from the reform.
- BC248 The Council observed that one possible approach would be to require entities to assume that the interest rate benchmark is not altered similar to the prospective assessment. Applying this approach would require entities to separate the assessment of retrospective effectiveness from the measurement of hedge ineffectiveness. More specifically, the Council considered that the objective of this approach would be to exclude the uncertainty arising from the reform from the assessment of whether a hedge is considered to be highly effective and that hedge accounting is continued when the results of this assessment are within the range of 80–125 per cent as required in paragraph AG105(b) of LKAS 39, even if the measurement of actual ineffectiveness is outside that range. The Council was of the view that even though this approach is consistent with the other exceptions provided in the amendments to LKAS 39, the requirement to perform two effectiveness calculations

based on different assumptions could be burdensome on preparers. The Council therefore rejected this approach.

BC249 The Council also considered an approach that was recommended by respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft, in which entities would be required, for the purposes of the retrospective assessment, to demonstrate the existence of an economic relationship between the hedged item and hedging instrument similar to the requirements in SLFRS 9. However, the Council noted that the existence of an economic relationship between the hedged item and the hedging instrument, is only one of the requirements in SLFRS 9 for a hedging relationship to be highly effective. The Council considered that the requirements in paragraph 6.4.1(c) of SLFRS 9 are inherently linked and the application of the economic relationship in isolation might not achieve the intended objective and could result in unintended consequences. The Council therefore rejected this approach.

BC250 The Council decided on an approach whereby an entity could continue to apply hedge accounting for hedging relationships directly affected by the reform, even if the actual results of the hedging relationship do not meet the requirements in paragraph AG105(b) of LKAS 39, if the ineffectiveness arose from uncertainty arising from the reform or other sources, subject to satisfying the other conditions in paragraph 88 of LKAS 39, including the prospective assessment (as amended by paragraph 102F of LKAS 39).

BC251 The Council acknowledged that such an approach might provide less discipline compared to the approach described in paragraph BC248, which would introduce additional requirements to mitigate the risk of continuing hedge accounting for hedging relationships that failed the retrospective assessment for reasons other than the reform. However, the Council noted that its approach still maintains a level of discipline around the application of the LKAS 39 hedge accounting model through the prospective assessment and neither imposes additional costs or burden for preparers nor introduces new requirements in LKAS 39.

BC252 The Council noted that any exception to the retrospective assessment will apply only to a well-defined population of hedging relationships during the period of uncertainty on the hedged items and hedging instruments arising from the reform. Furthermore, the Council noted that the risk of allowing hedge accounting to be applied for hedging relationships that would not otherwise qualify for hedge accounting is mitigated by the required prospective assessment as only the uncertainty arising from the reform is excluded from that assessment. Any other sources of ineffectiveness would continue to be included in the assessment of whether the hedge is expected to be highly effective in future periods. The Council noted that any high level of ineffectiveness arising in a hedging relationship is expected to be captured by the prospective assessment. The Council also noted that all ineffectiveness would be recognised and measured and thus be transparent in financial reporting. The Council, therefore, decided to provide an exception from the requirement to discontinue hedge accounting as a result of paragraph 88(e) of LKAS 39 because the actual results of the hedge do not meet the requirements in paragraph AG105(b) of LKAS 39.

Measurement of ineffectiveness

BC253 The Council noted that the exceptions were not intended to change the requirement that entities measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness. The Council considered that the actual results of the hedging relationships would provide useful information to users of financial statements during the period of uncertainty arising from the reform. Therefore, the Council decided that entities should continue to measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness as required by SLFRS Standards.

BC254 The Council also considered whether any exceptions should be made to the measurement of hedged items or hedging instruments because of the uncertainty arising from the reform. However, the

Council noted that such an exception would be inconsistent with the decision not to change the requirements to measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness in the financial statements. Therefore, the Council decided not to provide an exception from the measurement of hedging instruments and hedged items. This means that the fair value of a derivative designated as the hedging instrument should continue to be measured using the assumptions that market participants would use when pricing that derivative as required by SLFRS 13 Fair Value Measurement.

BC255 For a hedged item designated in a fair value hedge, LKAS 39 requires an entity to remeasure the hedged item for changes in fair value attributable to the hedged risk and recognise the gain or loss related to that fair value hedge adjustment in profit or loss. In doing so, the entity uses the assumptions that market participants would use when pricing the hedged item for changes in fair value attributable to the hedged risk. This would include a risk premium for uncertainty inherent in the hedged risk that market participants would consider. For example, to measure changes in fair value attributable to the hedged risk such as the IBOR component of a fixed-rate loan, an entity needs to reflect the uncertainty caused by the reform. When applying a present value technique to calculate the changes in fair value attributable to the designated risk component, such measurement should reflect market participants' assumptions about the uncertainty arising from the reform

BC256 When an entity designates interest rate benchmark-based cash flows as the hedged item in a cash flow hedge, to calculate the change in the value of the hedged item for the purpose of measuring hedge ineffectiveness, the entity may use a derivative that would have terms that match the critical terms of the designated cash flows and the hedged risk (this is commonly referred to as a 'hypothetical derivative'). As the Council decided that entities should continue to measure and recognise hedge ineffectiveness as required by SLFRS Standards, entities should continue to apply assumptions that are consistent with those applied to the hedged risk of the hedged item. For example, if an entity designated interest rate benchmark-based cash flows as the hedged item in a cash flow hedge, the entity would not assume for the purpose of measuring hedge ineffectiveness that the expected replacement of the interest rate benchmark with an alternative benchmark rate will result in zero cash flows after the replacement. The hedging gain or loss on the hedged item should be measured using the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows (that is, the cash flows on which the hypothetical derivative is based) when applying a present value technique, discounted at a market-based discount rate that reflects market participants' assumptions about the uncertainty arising from the reform. The Council concluded that reflecting market participants' assumptions when measuring hedge ineffectiveness provides useful information to users of financial statements about the effects of the uncertainty arising from the reform on an entity's hedging relationships. Therefore, the Council decided that no exceptions are needed for the measurement of actual ineffectiveness.

Hedges of designated portions

BC257 The Council noted that in accordance with LKAS 39 an entity may designate an item in its entirety or only a portion thereof, as the hedged item in a hedging relationship. For example, an entity that issues a 5-year floating-rate debt instrument that bears interest at 3-month LIBOR + 1%, could designate as the hedged item either the entire debt instrument (that is, all of the cash flows) or only the 3-month LIBOR portion of the floating-rate debt instrument. Specifically, paragraphs 81 and AG99F of LKAS 39 allow entities to designate only changes in the cash flows or fair value of an item attributable to a specific risk or risks (designated portion), provided that the designated portion is separately identifiable and reliably measurable.

- BC258 The Council observed that an entity's ability to conclude that an interest rate benchmark is a separately identifiable designated portion in accordance with paragraph 81 of LKAS 39 requires a continuous assessment over the duration of the hedging relationship and could be affected by the reform. For example, if the outcome of the reform affects the market structure of an interest rate benchmark, it could affect an entity's assessment of whether a non- contractually specified LIBOR portion is separately identifiable and, therefore, an eligible hedged item in a hedging relationship. The Council considered only those designated portions that are implicit in the fair value or the cash flows of an item of which they are a part (referred to as non-contractually specified) because the same issue does not arise for designated portions that are explicitly specified in the contract.
- BC259 For the reasons outlined in paragraph BC227, the Council noted that discontinuing hedging relationships due to uncertainty arising from the reform would not provide useful information. Consequently, the Council decided to propose amending LKAS 39 so that entities would not discontinue hedge accounting solely because the designated portion is no longer separately identifiable as a result of the reform. In the 2019 Exposure Draft, the Council proposed that the separately identifiable requirement for hedges of the benchmark portion of interest rate risk be applied only at the inception of those hedging relationships affected by the reform.
- BC260 The Council proposed not to extend the relief to allow entities to designate the benchmark portion of interest rate risk as the hedged item in a new hedging relationship if the designated portion is not separately identifiable at the inception of the hedging relationship. In the Council's view, allowing hedge accounting for designated portions that are not separately identifiable at the inception would be inconsistent with the objective of the exception. The Council noted that such circumstances are different from allowing continued designation as the hedged item for designated portions that had met the requirement at the inception of the hedging relationship.
- BC261 Furthermore, the Council did not propose any exception from the requirement that changes in the fair value or cash flows of the designated portion must be reliably measurable. As noted in paragraph BC243, in the Council's view, an offset between the hedged item and the hedging instrument is a fundamental principle of the hedge accounting model in LKAS 39 and, therefore, the Council considered reliable measurement of the hedged item and the hedging instrument to be critical to maintain this principle.
- BC262 Almost all respondents agreed with the exception proposed in the 2019 Exposure Draft to apply the separately identifiable requirement only at the inception of a hedging relationship. However, some respondents noted that the proposed exception did not provide equivalent relief to hedging relationships that frequently reset (ie discontinue and restart). In those hedging relationships both the hedging instrument and the hedged item frequently change (ie the entity uses a dynamic process in which both the hedged items and the hedging instruments used to manage that exposure do not remain the same for long). As hedging instruments and hedged items are being added or removed from a portfolio, entities are de-designating and redesignating hedging relationships regularly to adjust the exposure. If each redesignation of the hedging relationship is considered to be the inception of a new hedging relationship (even though it is still the same hedging strategy), then the separately identifiable requirement would need to be assessed for all hedged items at each redesignation even if they have been assessed previously. For the same reasons as those noted in paragraph BC258, this could affect an entity's ability to conclude that a non-contractually specified risk component remains separately identifiable and, therefore, an eligible hedged item for hedge accounting purposes.
- BC263 The Council noted that the exception proposed in the 2019 Exposure Draft has the effect that if a non-contractually specified designated portion meets the separately identifiable requirement at the inception of a hedging relationship, then that requirement would not be reassessed subsequently.

Hence, providing a similar exception for hedging relationships that frequently reset (ie discontinue and restart) would be consistent with the objective of the exception originally provided in the 2019 Exposure Draft.

BC264 Thus, the Council confirmed the proposal that a designated portion is only required to be separately identifiable at the inception of the hedging relationship. In addition, to respond to the feedback described in paragraph BC262, the Council added the exception in paragraph 102I of LKAS 39 for hedging relationships that, consistent with an entity's hedge documentation, frequently reset (ie discontinue and restart) because both the hedging instrument and the hedged item frequently change. Applying that paragraph, an entity shall determine whether the designated portion is separately identifiable only when it initially designates an item as a hedged item in the hedging relationship. The hedged item is not reassessed at any subsequent redesignation in the same hedging relationship.

BC265 In reaching its decision for the exception in paragraph 102I of LKAS 39 the Council considered an example when an entity applies hedge accounting for a portfolio hedge of interest rate risk under LKAS 39 and designates the LIBOR portion of floating-rate loans as the hedged risk. At the inception of the relationship, the entity assesses whether LIBOR is a separately identifiable designated portion for all loans designated within the hedging relationship. As the entity updates the risk position with the origination of new loans and the maturity or repayment of existing loans, the hedging relationship is adjusted by de-designating the 'old' hedging relationship and redesignating a 'new' hedging relationship for the updated amount of the hedged items. Applying the exception in paragraph 102I of LKAS 39 requires the entity to assess whether LIBOR is a separately identifiable designated portion only for the new loans added to the hedging relationship. The entity would not reassess the separately identifiable requirement for the loans that have been redesignated.

Mandatory application

BC266 The Council decided to require entities to apply the exceptions in paragraphs 102D–102N of LKAS 39 to all hedging relationships to which the exceptions are applicable. In other words, the Council decided that an entity is required to apply the exceptions to all hedging relationships that are directly affected by the uncertainties arising from the reform and continue to apply the exceptions until required to cease their application as specified in paragraphs 102J–102N of LKAS 39.

BC267 The Council considered but rejected alternatives that would have allowed entities to apply the exceptions voluntarily. In the Council's view, voluntary application of these exceptions could give rise to selective discontinuation of hedge accounting and selective reclassification of the amounts recorded in other comprehensive income related to previously discontinued hedging relationships. The Council does not expect that requiring entities to apply the exceptions would entail significant cost for preparers and other affected parties because the exceptions require entities to assume that the interest rate benchmark, on which the hedged risk and the hedged cash flows and cash flows of the hedging instrument are based, is not altered as a result of the reform.

BC268 In addition, the Council observed that in some circumstances the exceptions in paragraphs 102D–102N of LKAS 39 may not be applicable. For example, for a particular interest rate benchmark not subject to the reform or replacement with an alternative benchmark rate, there is no uncertainty affecting the timing or the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows arising from a

hedged item or a hedging instrument. The exceptions set out in paragraphs 102D–102N of LKAS 39 would not be applicable to such a hedging relationship.

- BC269 Furthermore, for a particular hedging relationship the exceptions may be applicable to some but not all aspects of the hedging relationship. For example, if an entity designates a hedged item that is based on LIBOR against a hedging instrument that is already referenced to an alternative benchmark rate (assuming the entity can demonstrate that hedging relationship meets the qualifying criteria for hedge accounting in LKAS 39), the exceptions in paragraphs 102D and 102F of LKAS 39 would apply for the hedged item because there is uncertainty related to its future cash flows. However, there is no uncertainty regarding how the reform would impact the cash flows of the hedging instrument and, therefore, the exception in paragraph 102F of LKAS 39 is not applicable for the hedging instrument. Similarly, the exception applicable to non-contractually specified designated portions would not be relevant for hedging relationships that do not involve the designation of non- contractually specified portions.

End of application

- BC270 As described in paragraph BC227, the Council decided to amend LKAS 39 to address specific aspects of hedge accounting affected by uncertainties in relation to the hedged items and hedging instruments about when the interest rate benchmarks will change to alternative benchmark rates, when any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate will be determined (collectively, timing) and what the cash flows based on the alternative benchmark rate will be, including their frequency of reset, and any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate (collectively, amount). Therefore, the Council intended the exceptions set out in paragraphs 102D–102N of LKAS 39 to be available only while these uncertainties are present.
- BC271 The Council considered whether to provide an explicit end date for the exceptions but decided not to do so. The reform is following different timelines in different markets and jurisdictions and contracts are being modified at different times and, therefore, at this stage, it is not possible to define a period of applicability for the exceptions.
- BC272 The Council decided that an entity ceases applying the exceptions at the earlier of (a) when the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows is no longer present as it relates to a hedged item and/or hedging instrument (depending on the particular exception) and (b) the discontinuation of the hedging relationship.⁷ The exceptions require entities to apply specific hedge accounting requirements assuming the interest rate benchmark on which the hedged risk, hedged cash flows or the cash flows of the hedging instrument are based is not altered as a result of the reform. The end of applicability of the exceptions means that entities would from that date apply all hedge accounting requirements in LKAS 39 without applying these exceptions.
- BC273 In the Council's view, for uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows arising from a change in an interest rate benchmark to be eliminated, the underlying contracts are generally required to be amended to specify the timing and the amount of cash flows based on the alternative benchmark rate (and any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate). The Council noted that, in some cases, a contract may be amended to include reference to the alternative benchmark rate without actually altering the interest rate benchmark-

⁷ For the purpose of applying the exception in paragraph 102E of LKAS 39 to a discontinued hedging relationship, the amendments require an entity to cease applying the exception at the earlier of (a) as described above and (b) when the entire amount that had been recognised in other comprehensive income with respect to the hedging relationship has been reclassified to profit or loss. See paragraph 102K of LKAS 39

based cash flows in the contract. Such an amendment may not eliminate the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of interest rate benchmark- based cash flows in the contract. The Council considered the following scenarios to assess the robustness of the end of application requirements. However, these scenarios are not exhaustive and other scenarios may exist in which the uncertainties arising from the reform regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows would no longer be present.

- BC274 Scenario A—a contract is amended to include a clause that specifies (a) the date the interest rate benchmark will be replaced by an alternative benchmark rate and (b) the alternative benchmark rate on which the cash flows will be based and the relevant spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate. In this case, the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows for this contract is eliminated when the contract is amended to include this clause.
- BC275 Scenario B—a contract is amended to include a clause that states modifications of contractual cash flows will occur due to the reform but that specifies neither the date that the interest rate benchmark will be replaced nor the alternative benchmark rate on which the amended cash flows will be based. In this case, the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of cash flows for this contract has not been eliminated by amending the contract to include this clause.
- BC276 Scenario C—a contract is amended to include a clause which states that conditions specifying the amount and timing of interest rate benchmark- based cash flows will be determined by a central authority at some point in the future. But the clause does not specify those conditions. In this case, the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows for this contract has not been eliminated by including this clause in the contract. Uncertainty regarding both the timing and the amount of cash flows for this contract will be present until the central authority specifies when the replacement of the benchmark will become effective and what the alternative benchmark rate and any related spread adjustment will be.
- BC277 Scenario D—a contract is amended to include a clause in anticipation of the reform that specifies the date the interest rate benchmark will be replaced and any spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate will be determined. However, the amendment does not specify the alternative benchmark rate or the spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate on which the cash flows will be based. In this scenario, by amending the contract to include this clause, uncertainty regarding the timing has been eliminated but uncertainty about the amount remains.
- BC278 Scenario E—a contract is amended to include a clause in anticipation of the reform that specifies the alternative benchmark rate on which the cash flows will be based and the spread adjustment between the interest rate benchmark and the alternative benchmark rate but does not specify the date from which the amendment to the contract will become effective. In this scenario, by amending the contract to include this clause, uncertainty about the amount has been eliminated but uncertainty with respect to timing remains.
- BC279 Scenario F—in preparation for the reform, a central authority in its capacity as the administrator of an interest rate benchmark undertakes a multi-step process to replace an interest rate benchmark with an alternative benchmark rate. The objective of the reform is to cease the publication of the current interest rate benchmark and replace it with an alternative benchmark rate. As part of the reform, the administrator introduces an interim benchmark rate and determines a fixed spread

adjustment based on the difference between the interim benchmark rate and the current interest rate benchmark. Uncertainty about the timing or the amount of the alternative benchmark rate-based cash flows will not be eliminated during the interim period because the interim benchmark rate (including the fixed spread adjustment determined by the administrator) represent an interim measure in progressing towards the reform but it does not represent the alternative benchmark rate (or any related spread adjustment agreed between parties to the contract).

- BC280 For reasons similar to those described in paragraph BC269, the Council noted that there could be situations in which the uncertainty for particular elements of a single hedging relationship could end at different times. For example, assume an entity is required to apply the relevant exceptions to both the hedged item and the hedging instrument. If the hedging instrument in that hedging relationship is subsequently amended through market protocols covering all derivatives in that market, and will be based on an alternative benchmark rate such that the uncertainty about the timing and the amount of interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of the hedging instrument is eliminated, the relevant exceptions would continue to apply to the hedged item but would no longer apply to the hedging instrument.⁸
- BC281 The Council observed that continuing to apply the exception after the uncertainty was resolved would not faithfully represent the actual characteristics of the elements of the hedging relationship in which the uncertainty arising from the reform is eliminated. The Council considered whether it should extend the relief provided such that the exceptions would apply at the hedging relationship level for as long as any element of that hedging relationship was affected by the uncertainties arising from the reform. The Council agreed that doing so would be beyond the objective of addressing only those issues directly affected by the uncertainty arising from the reform. This is also because the exceptions in paragraphs 102D–102N of LKAS 39 and the respective requirements in LKAS 39 apply to the same elements of the hedging relationship. Therefore, applying each exception at the hedging relationship level would be inconsistent with how the underlying requirements are applied.
- BC282 The Council decided that the end of application requirement would also apply to hedges of a forecast transaction. The Council noted that LKAS 39 requires an entity to identify and document a forecast transaction with sufficient specificity so that, when the transaction occurs, the entity is able to determine whether the transaction is the hedged transaction. For example, if an entity designates a future issuance of a LIBOR-based debt instrument as the hedged item, although there may be no contract at the time of designation, the hedge documentation would refer specifically to LIBOR. Consequently, the Council concluded that entities should be able to identify when the uncertainty regarding the timing and the amount of the resulting cash flows of a forecast transaction is no longer present.
- BC283 In addition, the Council decided not to require end of application with respect to the exception for the separately identifiable requirements set out in paragraphs 102H and 102I of LKAS 39. Applying these exceptions, entities would continue applying hedge accounting when an interest rate benchmark meets the separately identifiable requirement at the inception of the hedging relationship (assuming all other hedge accounting requirements continue to be met). If the Council included an end date for these exceptions, an entity may be required to immediately discontinue hedge accounting because, at some point, as the reform progresses, the designated portion based on the interest rate benchmark may no longer be separately identifiable (for example, as the market for the alternative benchmark rate is established). Such immediate discontinuation of hedge

⁸ In this scenario, the entity would first consider the accounting consequences of amending the contractual terms of the hedging instrument. The Council will consider the accounting consequences of the actual amendment of financial instruments as a result of interest rate benchmark reform in the next phase of this project (ie the replacement phase)

accounting would be inconsistent with the objective of the exception. The Council noted that linking the end of application for these exceptions to contract amendments would not achieve the Council's intention either because by definition, non-contractually specified designated portions are not explicitly stated in a contract and, therefore, these contracts may not be amended for the reform. This is particularly relevant for fair value hedges of a fixed-rate debt instrument. Therefore, the Council decided that an entity should cease applying the exceptions to a hedging relationship only when the hedging relationship is discontinued applying LKAS 39.

BC284 Some respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft noted that the Council had not addressed when an entity ceases applying the proposed exceptions to a group of items designated as the hedged item or a combination of financial instruments designated as the hedging instrument. Specifically, when assessing whether the uncertainty arising from the reform is no longer present, these respondents asked whether that assessment should be performed on an individual basis (that is, for each individual item within the group or financial instrument within the combination) or on a group basis (that is, for all items in the group or all financial instruments in the combination until there is no uncertainty surrounding any of the items or financial instruments).

BC285 Consequently, the Council decided to add paragraph 102N of LKAS 39 to clarify that, when designating a group of items as the hedged item or a combination of financial instruments as the hedging instrument, entities assess when the uncertainty arising from the reform with respect to the hedged risk and/or the timing and amount of the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows of that item or financial instrument is no longer present on an individual basis—that is, for each individual item in the group or financial instrument in the combination.

Effective date and transition

BC286 The Council decided that entities shall apply the amendments for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2020, with earlier application permitted.

BC287 The Council decided that the amendments apply retrospectively. The Council highlighted that retrospective application of the amendments would not allow reinstating hedge accounting that has already been discontinued. Nor would it allow designation in hindsight. If an entity had not designated a hedging relationship, the exceptions, even though applied retrospectively, would not allow the entity to apply hedge accounting in prior periods to items that were not designated for hedge accounting. Doing so would be inconsistent with the requirement that hedge accounting applies prospectively. Retrospective application of the exceptions would enable entities to continue hedge accounting for a hedging relationship that the entity had previously designated and that qualifies for hedge accounting applying LKAS 39.

BC288 Many respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft commented on the clarity of the proposed retrospective application and suggested that further explanation be provided in the Standard. Consequently, the Council amended the transition paragraph to specify that retrospective application applies only to those hedging relationships that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies these amendments or were designated thereafter, and to the gain or loss recognised in other comprehensive income that existed at the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies these amendments. The Council used this wording to permit an entity to apply the amendments from the beginning of the reporting period in which an entity first applies these amendments even if the reporting period is not an annual period.

Amendments to the Basis for Conclusions on SLFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures*

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, SLFRS 7

After paragraph BC35SS, a new subheading and paragraphs BC35TT–BC35CCC are added

Uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform

- BC35TT In May 2019 the Council published the Exposure Draft *Interest Rate Benchmark Reform* (2019 Exposure Draft), which proposed exceptions to specific hedge accounting requirements in SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 to provide relief in the period before the reform of interest rate benchmarks. The Council issued the final amendments to SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 in September 2019. Paragraphs BC6.546–BC6.603 of the Basis for Conclusions on SLFRS 9 and paragraphs BC223–BC288 of the Basis for Conclusions on LKAS 39 provide the background to these amendments.
- BC35UU In the 2019 Exposure Draft, the Council proposed that entities applying the exceptions provide disclosure about the magnitude of the hedging relationships to which the exceptions apply. As explained in paragraph BC44 of the Basis for Conclusions on the 2019 Exposure Draft, the Council noted that SLFRS 7 already requires specific disclosures about hedge accounting. The Council proposed that for some specifically identified disclosures, information be provided separately for hedging relationships to which the proposed exceptions apply. Specifically, the Council proposed that an entity provide separately the information required by paragraphs 24A(a), 24A(c)–(d), 24B(a) (i)–(ii), 24B(a)(iv) and 24B(b) of SLFRS 7 for hedging relationships affected by interest rate benchmark reform.
- BC35VV Most respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft agreed that information about the magnitude of the hedging relationships to which the proposed exceptions apply would be useful to users of financial statements. However, respondents had mixed views on whether the proposed disclosure requirements struck the right balance between the expected benefits for users of financial statements and the expected cost for preparers. As a result, these respondents suggested simplifying the proposed disclosure requirements.
- BC35WW In addition, users of financial statements told the Council that, since the proposed amendments to SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 would be mandatory, information about the extent to which an entity's hedging relationships are within the scope of the exceptions would provide useful information. Such information could be provided by requiring entities to disclose the nominal amounts of hedging instruments in hedging relationships in the scope of the amendments, supplemented with an explanation about how the entity is managing the process to transition to alternative benchmark rates. These disclosures would help users of financial statements understand how an entity's hedging relationships are affected by the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform.
- BC35XX On the basis of respondents' comments and feedback from users of financial statements, the Council decided to require entities to provide the disclosures set out in paragraph 24H of SLFRS 7 for hedging relationships directly affected by interest rate benchmark reform.
- BC35YY Specific to the disclosure requirement in paragraph 24H(d) of SLFRS 7, the Council acknowledged that given the objective and specificity of the amendments to SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39, there may be limited additional assumptions or judgements in the context of applying those exceptions. For example, the exceptions specify the assumptions to make about the interest rate benchmark-based cash flows. Nevertheless, the Council observed that if an entity makes significant assumptions or judgements in applying the exceptions in those amendments (for example, to determine when the uncertainty arising from interest rate benchmark reform is no longer present), that would be useful

information for the users of financial statements. Accordingly, the Council decided to require entities to disclose information about any significant assumptions or judgements that the entity makes in applying the exceptions in the amendments.

BC35ZZ The Council noted that the requirement in paragraph 24H(e) of SLFRS 7 is intended to provide users of financial statements with information about the quantum of hedging relationships which are directly affected by the uncertainties arising from the reform. That paragraph requires disclosure of the nominal amount of the hedging instruments in a hedging relationship directly affected by the uncertainties arising from the reform so that the information is disclosed on a gross basis rather than on a net basis (that is, offsetting hedging instruments in a liability position against those in an asset position).

BC35AAA Some respondents to the 2019 Exposure Draft raised concerns about the disclosure requirement in paragraph 28(f) of LKAS 8 Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors. This paragraph requires an entity, on the initial application of an SLFRS (or amendments to an SLFRS), to disclose, for the current period and each prior period presented, the amount of any adjustment for each financial statement line item affected.

BC35BBB These respondents said that requiring such disclosure for the amendments to SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39 would not provide useful information to users of financial statements and also would be onerous for preparers. This is because it would require an entity to maintain parallel systems in order to determine the amount of the adjustment for each financial statement line item affected. Furthermore, disclosing this information would be inconsistent with the Council's observation in paragraph BC6.550 of SLFRS 9 and paragraph BC227 of LKAS 39, that discontinuing hedge accounting solely due to uncertainties arising from the reform would not provide useful information to users of financial statements.

BC35CCC The Council agreed with these comments and decided to exempt entities from the requirement in paragraph 28(f) of LKAS 8 in the reporting period in which an entity first applies the amendments to SLFRS 9 and LKAS 39.

EOG 04-0146