Korea Accounting Institute KAI

Korea Accounting Standards Board KASB

Severance Building 24th Flr.
84-11, 5-ka Namdaemunro
Chungku, Seoul, 100-753, Korea
Tel : 02) 2259-0150~60
Fax : 02) 2259-0170~1

CL 161

14 March 2003

Kimberley Crook
Project Manager
International Accounting Standards Boards
30 Cannon Street, London EC4M 6XH
United Kingdom

Dear Ms. Kimberley Crook:

I am happy to inform you that the International Accounting Standards Review Committee (IASRC) of the Korea Accounting Standards Board (KASB) has held a successful meeting today and has finalized on its comments to the IAS ED 2 Share-Based Payment. I would appreciate your including our comments in your summary of analysis that will be presented to the IASB.

The enclosed comments are those of the IASRC and do not represent an official position of the KASB. Official position of the KASB is determined only after extensive due process and deliberation, to which this letter has not been subjected.

Once again, thank you for your understanding in allowing us the opportunity to comment on the ED 2 Share-based Payment with an extended due date. We do hope that there are no problems in including our comments in your summary of analysis. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any inquiries regarding our comments; you may forward your inquiries either to Mr. Jae-Ho Kim, KASB Research Staff (jhkim@kasb.or.kr) or Mr. Kyoung-Chun Yu, KASB Research Staff (yukc@kasb.or.kr).

Best regards,

김 경 호

Dr. Kyung-Ho Kim
Chairman, International Accounting Standards Review Committee
Vice Chairman, Korea Accounting Standards Board

Encl: IASRC comments on IAS ED 2 Share-based Payment.

IASRC Comments on ED 2 Share-Based Payment

Question 1

Paragraphs 1-3 of the draft IFRS set out the proposed scope of the IFRS. There are no proposed exemptions, apart from for transactions within the scope of another IFRS. Is the proposed scope appropriate? If not, which transactions should be excluded and why?

The IASRC agrees with the proposed scope.

Question 2

Paragraphs 4-6 of the draft IFRS propose requirements for the recognition of share-based payment transactions, including the recognition of an expense when the goods or services received or acquired are consumed. Are these recognition requirements appropriate? If not, why not, or in which circumstances are the recognition requirements inappropriate?

The IASRC agrees with the proposed requirements.

Question 3

For an equity-settled share-based payment transaction, the draft IFRS proposes that, in principle, the entity should measure the goods or services received, and the corresponding increase in equity, either directly, at the fair value of the goods or services received, or indirectly, by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted, whichever fair value is more readily determinable(paragraph 7). There are no exemptions to the requirement to measure sharebased payment transactions at fair value. For example, there are no exemptions for unlisted entities. Is this measurement principle appropriate? If not, why not, or in which circumstances is it not appropriate?

The IASRC supports the proposed measurement principle.

Question 4

If the fair value of the goods or services received in an equity-settled share-based payment transaction is measured directly, the draft IFRS proposes that fair value should be measured at the date when the entity obtains the goods or receives the services (paragraph 8). Do you agree that this is the appropriate date at which to measure the fair value of the goods or services received? If not, at which date should the fair value of the goods or services received be measured? Why?

The IASRC agrees that fair value should be measured at the date when the entity obtains the goods or receives the services, except for the following minority opinion:

In case of employee options the measurement date is the grant date. There is no reason for that the measurement date for share-based payment should be different depending on the nature of services or goods provided in return for the payment. The measurement date for non-employee transaction also should be consistent with employee payment. Grant date is the date when terms and conditions of share-payment are fixed and not the date of service provided.

Question 5

If the fair value of the goods or services received in an equity-settled sharebased payment transaction is measured by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted, the draft IFRS proposes that the fair value of the equity instruments granted should be measured at grant date (paragraph 8). Do you agree that this is the appropriate date at which to measure the fair value of the equity instruments granted? If not, at which date should the fair value of the equity instruments granted be measured? Why?

The IASRC agrees that the fair value of the equity instruments granted should be measured at grant date if the fair value of the goods or services received in an equity-settled share-based payment transaction is measured by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted.

Question 6

For equity-settled transactions with parties other than employees, the draft IFRS proposes a rebuttable presumption that the fair value of the goods or services received is more readily determinable than the fair value of the equity instruments granted (paragraphs 9 and 10). Do you agree that the fair value of the goods or services received is usually more readily determinable than the fair value of the equity instruments granted? In what circumstances is this not so?

The IASRC believes that the proposed presumption is appropriate. But, we also believe that there could be instances where fair value of equity instrument is more readily available. For example, a listed company may pay for goods or services by issuing immediately tradeable shares to the supplier. In such circumstances the fair value of the equity instruments granted is more readily determinable.

Question 7

For equity-settled transactions with employees, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the fair value of the employee services received by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted, because the latter fair value is more readily determinable (paragraphs 11 and 12). Do you agree that the fair value of the equity instruments granted is more readily determinable than the fair value of the employee services received? Are there any circumstances in which this is not so?

The IASRC agrees that the entity should measure the fair value of the employee services received by reference to the fair value of the equity instruments granted.

Question 8

Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the draft IFRS propose requirements for determining when the counterparty renders service for the equity instruments granted, based on whether the counterparty is required to complete a specified period of service before the equity instruments vest. Do you agree that it is reasonable to presume that the services rendered by the counterparty as consideration for the equity instruments are received during the vesting period? If not, when are the services received, in your view?

The IASRC's opinion concurs with the proposed requirements for determining when the counterparty renders service for the equity instruments granted.

Question 9

If the services received are measured by using the fair value of the equity instruments granted as a surrogate measure, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should determine the amount to attribute to each unit of service received, by dividing the fair value of the equity instruments granted by the number of units of service expected to be received during the vesting period (paragraph 15). Do you agree that if the fair value of the equity instruments granted is used as a surrogate measure of the fair value of the services received, it is necessary to determine the amount to attribute to each unit of service received? If not, what alternative approach do you propose? If an entity is required to determine the amount to attribute to each unit of service received, do you agree that this should be calculated by dividing the fair value of the equity instruments granted by the number of units of services expected to be received during the vesting period? If not, what alternative method do you propose?

The IASRC agrees that if the fair value of the equity instruments granted is used as a surrogate measure of the fair value of the services received, it is necessary to determine the amount to attribute to each unit of service received.

Question 10

In an equity-settled share-based payment transaction, the draft IFRS proposes that having recognised the services received, and a corresponding increase in equity, the entity should make no subsequent adjustment to total equity, even if the equity instruments granted do not vest or, in the case of options, the options are not exercised (paragraph 16). However, this requirement does not preclude the entity from recognising a transfer within equity, ie a transfer from one component of equity to another. Do you agree with this proposed requirement? If not, in what circumstances should an adjustment be

made to total equity and why?

The IASRC agrees that having recognised the services received, and a corresponding increase in equity, the entity should make no subsequent adjustment to total equity, even if the equity instruments granted do not vest or, in the case of options, the options are not exercised, except for the following minority opinion supporting SFAS 123:

Any amounts recognised for employee services received during the vesting period will be subsequently reversed if the equity instruments granted are forfeited.

Question 11

The draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the fair value of equity instruments granted, based on market prices if available, taking into account the terms and conditions of the grant (paragraph 17). In the absence of a market price, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should estimate the fair value of options granted, by applying an option pricing model that takes into account various factors, namely the exercise price of the option, the life of the option, the current price of the underlying shares, the expected volatility of the share price, the dividends expected on the shares (where appropriate) and the risk-free interest rate for the life of the option (paragraph 20). Paragraph 23 of the proposed IFRS explains when it is appropriate to take into account expected dividends. Do you agree that an option pricing model should be applied to estimate the fair value of options granted? If not, by what other means should the fair value of the options be estimated? Are there circumstances in which it would be inappropriate or impracticable to take into account any of the factors listed above in applying an option pricing model?

The IASRC agrees that an option pricing model should be applied to estimate the fair value of options granted.

Question 12

If an option is non-transferable, the draft IFRS proposes that the expected life of an option rather than its contracted life should be used in applying an option pricing model (paragraph 21). The draft IFRS also proposes requirements for options that are subject to vesting conditions and therefore cannot be exercised during the vesting period (paragraph 22). Do you agree that replacing an option's contracted life with its expected life when applying an option pricing model is an appropriate means of adjusting the option's fair value for the effects of non-transferability? If not, do you have an alternative suggestion? Is the proposed requirement for taking into account the inability to exercise an option during the vesting period appropriate?

The IASRC agrees that replacing an option's contracted life with its expected life when applying an option pricing model is an appropriate means of adjusting the option's fair value for the effects of non-transferability.

Question 13

If a grant of shares or options is conditional upon satisfying specified vesting conditions, the draft IFRS proposes that these conditions should be taken into account when an entity measures the fair value of the shares or options granted. In the case of options, vesting conditions should be taken into account either by incorporating them into the application of an option pricing model or by making an appropriate adjustment to the value produced by such a model(paragraph 24). Do you agree that vesting conditions should be taken into account when estimating the fair value of options or shares granted? If not, why not? Do you have any suggestions for how vesting conditions should be taken into account when estimating the fair value of shares or options granted?

The IASRC thinks that vesting conditions should be taken into account when estimating the fair value of options or shares granted.

Question 14

For options with a reload feature, the draft IFRS proposes that the reload feature should be taken into account, where practicable, when an entity measures the fair value of the options granted. However, if the reload feature is not taken into account in the measurement of the fair value of the options granted, then the reload option granted should be accounted for as a new option grant(paragraph 25). Is this proposed requirement appropriate? If not, why not? Do you have an alternative proposal for dealing with options with reload features?

The IASRC agrees with the proposed requirement.

Question 15

The draft IFRS proposes requirements for taking into account various features common to employee share options, such as non-transferability, inability to exercise the option during the vesting period, and vesting conditions(paragraphs 21-25). Are there other common features of employee share options for which the IFRS should specify requirements?

The IASRC thinks that there are other common features of employee share options for which the IFRS should specify requirements.

Question 16

The draft IFRS does not contain prescriptive guidance on the estimation of the fair value of options,

consistently with the Board's objective of setting principles-based standards and to allow for future developments in valuation methodologies. Do you agree with this approach? Are there specific aspects of valuing options for which such guidance should be given?

The IASRC agrees with the proposed approach.

Question 17

If an entity reprices a share option, or otherwise modifies the terms or conditions on which equity instruments were granted, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the incremental value granted upon repricing, and include that incremental value when measuring the services received. This means that the entity is required to recognise additional amounts for services received during the remainder of the vesting period, ie additional to the amounts recognised in respect of the original option grant. Example 3 in Appendix B illustrates this requirement. As shown in that example, the incremental value granted on repricing is treated as a new option grant, in addition to the original option grant. An alternative approach is also illustrated, whereby the two grants are averaged and spread over the remainder of the vesting period. Do you agree that the incremental value granted should be taken into account when measuring the services received, resulting in the recognition of additional amounts in the remainder of the vesting period? If not, how do you suggest repricing should be dealt with? Of the two methods illustrated in Example 3, which is more appropriate? Why?

The IASRC agrees that if an entity reprices a share option, or otherwise modifies the terms or conditions on which equity instruments were granted, the entity should measure the incremental value granted upon repricing, and include that incremental value when measuring the services received during the remainder of the vesting period.

The IASRC thinks that the alternative method illustrated in example 3 of Appendix B is more appropriate because under this method the total expense of the services received is better matched with the periods in which the service is actually received (i.e. year 3 and 4 in example 3).

Question 18

If an entity cancels a share or option grant during the vesting period (other than a grant cancelled by forfeiture when the vesting conditions are not satisfied), the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should continue to recognise the services rendered by the counterparty in the remainder of the vesting period, as if that grant had not been cancelled. The draft IFRS also proposes requirements for dealing with any payment made on cancellation and/or a grant of replacement options, and for the repurchase of vested equity instruments. Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please explain why not and provide details of your suggested alternative approach.

The IASRC agrees that the entity should continue to recognise the services rendered by the counterparty in the remainder of the vesting period, as if that grant had not been cancelled for the reasons given in the basis for conclusions (BC220, 221). However, in circumstances where an option granted is cancelled by raising the salary of the employee as a compensation, specific guidance is needed (1) to require a separate identification of the increased portion of the salary and (2) to direct accounting treatment of the increased portion as it has been specified in paragraph 29(b), not as a salary expense.

Question 19

For cash-settled share-based payment transactions, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should measure the goods or services acquired and the liability incurred at the fair value of the liability. Until the liability is settled, the entity should remeasure the fair value of the liability at each reporting date, with any changes in value recognised in the income statement. Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please provide details of your suggested alternative approach.

The IASRC thinks that the proposed requirements are appropriate for the reasons given in the Basis for Conclusions.

Question 20

For share-based payment transactions in which either the entity or the supplier of goods or services may choose whether the entity settles the transaction in cash or by issuing equity instruments, the draft IFRS proposes that the entity should account for the transaction, or the components of that transaction, as a cash-settled share-based payment transaction if the entity has incurred a liability to settle in cash, or as an equity-settled share-based payment transaction if no such liability has been incurred. The draft IFRS proposes various requirements to apply this principle. Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please provide details of your suggested alternative approach.

The IASRC agrees that a company should account for cash-settled share-based payment transactions if the company has incurred a liability to settle in cash and does not control whether it settles in cash or shares.

However, where the company has the option of settlement method, the transaction should be treated as a share-settled transaction only where it is highly probable that the company will exercise the option to use shares.

Question 21

The draft IFRS proposes that an entity should disclose information to enable users of financial statements to understand:

(a) the nature and extent of share-based payment arrangements that existed during the period,

(b) how the fair value of the goods or services received, or the fair value of the equity instruments

granted, during the period was determined, and

(c) the effect of expenses arising from share-based payment transactions on the entity's profit or loss.

Are these disclosure requirements appropriate? If not, which disclosure requirements do you suggest should be added, deleted or amended (and how)?

In general the IASRC's opinion concurs with the proposed disclosure requirements. However, certain disclosures appear onerous.

The disclosures of the model used and of the model's metrics looks necessary. However, the requirements of paragraph 48(ii) to (iv), such as the historical comparisons of volatility, appear very onerous.

Paragraph 46(c) will require information to be gathered on a person by person basis and there could be many different exercise dates during the year. It should be clarified whether for each separate exercise date the weighted average share price is required or whether it is a composite weighted average share price for all options exercised during the period.

It is not clear whether paragraph 48(f) provides useful information to the financial statements users.

Question 22

The draft IFRS proposes that an entity should apply the requirements of the IFRS to grants of equity instruments that were granted after the publication date of this Exposure Draft and had not vested at the effective date of the IFRS. It also proposes that an entity should apply retrospectively the requirements of the IFRS to liabilities existing at the effective date of the IFRS, except that the entity is not required to measure vested share appreciation rights (and similar liabilities) at fair value, but instead should measure such liabilities at their settlement amount(ie the amount that would have been paid on settlement of the liability had the counterparty demanded settlement at the date the liability is measured). Are the proposed requirements appropriate? If not, please provide details of your suggestions for the IFRS's transitional provisions.

The IASRC thinks that the proposed requirements are appropriate for the reasons given in the Basis for Conclusions.

Question 23

The draft IFRS proposes a consequential amendment to IAS 12 (revised 2000) Income Taxes to add an example to that standard illustrating how to account for the tax effects of share-based payment transactions. As shown in that example, it is proposed that all tax effects of share-based payment transactions should be recognised in the income statement. Are the proposed requirements appropriate?

The IASRC thinks that the proposed requirements are appropriate.

Question 24

In developing the Exposure Draft, the Board considered how various issues are dealt with under the US standard SFAS 123 Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation, as explained further in the Basis for Conclusions. Although the draft IFRS is similar to SFAS 123 in many respects, there are some differences. The main differences include the following.

(a) Apart from transactions within the scope of another IFRS, the draft IFRS does not propose any exemptions, either from the requirement to apply the IFRS or from the requirement to measure share-based payment transactions at fair value. SFAS 123 contains the following exemptions, none of which are included in the draft IFRS:

- **employee share purchase plans are excluded from SFAS 123, provided specified criteria are met, such as the discount given to employees is relatively small;**
- **SFAS 123 encourages, but does not require, entities to apply its fair value measurement method to recognise transactions with employees; entities are permitted to apply instead the intrinsic value measurement method in Accounting Principles Board Opinion No. 25 Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees (paragraphs BC70-BC74 in the Basis for Conclusions give an explanation of intrinsic value); and**
- **unlisted (non-public) entities are permitted to apply the minimum value method when estimating the value of share options, which excludes from the valuation the effects of expected share price volatility(paragraphs BC75-BC78 in the Basis for Conclusions give an explanation of minimum value).**

(b) For transactions in which equity instruments are granted to employees, both SFAS 123 and the draft IFRS have a measurement method that is based on the fair value of those equity instruments at grant date. However:

- **under SFAS 123, the estimate of the fair value of an equity instrument at grant date is not reduced for the possibility of forfeiture due to failure to satisfy the vesting conditions, whereas the draft IFRS proposes that the possibility of forfeiture should be taken into account in making such an estimate.**
- **under SFAS 123, the transaction is measured at the fair value of the equity instruments issued. Because equity instruments are not regarded as issued until any specified vesting conditions have been satisfied, the transaction amount is ultimately measured at the number of vested equity instruments multiplied by the fair value of those equity instruments at grant date. Hence, any amounts recognised for employee services received during the vesting period will be subsequently reversed if the equity instruments granted are forfeited.**

  Under the draft IFRS, the transaction is measured at the deemed fair value of the employee services received. The fair value of the equity instruments granted is used as a surrogate measure, to determine the deemed fair value of each unit of employee service received. The

transaction amount is ultimately measured at the number of units of service received during the vesting period multiplied by the deemed fair value per unit of service. Hence, any amounts recognised for employee services received are not subsequently reversed, even if the equity instruments granted are forfeited.

(c) If, during the vesting period, an entity settles in cash a grant of equity instruments, under SFAS 123 those equity instruments are regarded as having immediately vested, and therefore the amount of compensation expense measured at grant date but not yet recognised is recognized immediately at the date of settlement. The draft IFRS does not require immediate recognition of an expense but instead proposes that the entity should continue to recognise the services received (and hence the resulting expense) over the remainder of the vesting period, as if that grant of equity instruments had not been cancelled.

(d) SFAS 123 does not specify a measurement date for transactions with parties other than employees that are measured at the fair value of the equity instruments issued. Emerging Issues Task Force Issue 96-18 Accounting for Equity Instruments That Are Issued to Other Than Employees for Acquiring, or in Conjunction with Selling, Goods or Services requires the fair value of the equity instruments issued to be measured at the earlier of (i) the date a performance commitment is reached or (ii) the date performance is complete. This date might be later than grant date, for example, if there is no performance commitment at grant date. Under the draft IFRS, the fair value of the equity instruments granted is measured at grant date in all cases.

(e) SFAS 123 requires liabilities for cash-settled share appreciation rights(SARs) to be measured using an intrinsic value measurement method. The draft IFRS proposes that such liabilities should be measured using a fair value measurement method, which includes the time value of the SARs, in the same way that options have time value (refer to paragraphs BC70-BC81 of the Basis for Conclusions for a discussion of intrinsic value, time value and fair value).

(f) For a share-based payment transaction in which equity instruments are granted, SFAS 123 requires realised tax benefits to be credited direct to equity as additional paid-in capital, to the extent that those tax benefits exceed the tax benefits on the total amount of compensation expense recognised in respect of that grant of equity instruments. The draft IFRS, in a consequential amendment to IAS 12 (revised 2000) Income Taxes, proposes that all tax effects of share-based payment transactions should be recognised in profit or loss, as part of tax expense.

For each of the above differences, which treatment is the most appropriate? Why? If you regard neither treatment as appropriate, please provide details of your preferred treatment.

The IASRC's opinion generally concurs with the approach proposed by the IFRS. However, there has been a minority opinion that the approach taken by the SFAS 123 is more appropriate than the second item of paragraph (b) and the entire paragraph (c).

Question 25

Do you have any other comments on the Exposure Draft?

The IASRC does not have any other comments on this Exposure Draft.

* * *