International Public Sector Accounting Standard 36 Investments in Associates and Joint Ventures

IPSASB Basis for Conclusions

Published by: International Federation of Accountants®

Basis for Conclusions

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, IPSAS 36.

Objective

BC1. This Basis for Conclusions summarizes the IPSASB's considerations in reaching its conclusions on IPSAS 36. As this Standard is based on IAS 28, *Investments in Associates and Joint Ventures* (Amended in 2011, including amendments up to December 31, 2014) issued by the IASB, the Basis for Conclusions outlines only those areas where IPSAS 36 departs from the main requirements of IAS 28 (Amended in 2011), or where the IPSASB considered such departures.

Overview

BC2. In 2012 the IPSASB commenced work on a project to update those IPSASs that dealt with accounting for interests in controlled entities, associates and joint ventures. In October 2013 the IPSASB issued Exposure Drafts (EDs) 48 to 52 which were collectively referred to as *Interests in Other Entities*. ED 50, *Investments in Associates and Joint Ventures*, was based on IAS 28 (Amended in 2011), having regard to the relevant public sector modifications in IPSAS 7, *Investments in Associates* and IPSAS 8, *Interests in Joint Ventures*. In January 2015 the IPSASB issued five new IPSASs, including IPSAS 36. These new IPSASs supersede IPSAS 6, *Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements*, IPSAS 7 and IPSAS 8.

BC3. As a result of combining the accounting for associates and joint ventures the title of the Standard was changed to *Investments in Associates and Joint Ventures*.

BC4. In drafting IPSAS 36 the Board did not reconsider all the requirements of IPSAS 7, *Investments in Associates*. The most significant changes resulted from the decision to require the use of the equity method to account for investments in joint ventures and therefore to combine the accounting for investments in associates and joint ventures in one standard. The Board's views on the use of the equity method to account for investments in joint ventures are discussed in the Basis for Conclusions on IPSAS 37.

Scope

Quantifiable Ownership Interests

BC5. The IPSASB noted that the scope of IPSAS 7 had been limited to investments in associates "where the investment in the associate leads to the holding of an ownership interest in the form of a shareholding or other formal equity structure". In developing IPSAS 7 the IPSASB noted that it is unlikely equity accounting could be applied unless the associate had a formal or other reliably measurable equity structure. The IPSASB reflected on the intention of this modification and concluded that it was intended to prevent the inappropriate application of that Standard to interests other than ownership interests.

BC6. In contrast with IPSAS 7 this Standard applies to both associates and joint ventures. Because joint ventures can take many forms, including partnership arrangements which do not have formal equity structures, the scope limitation in IPSAS 7 was not appropriate. The IPSASB decided that the scope of this Standard should be limited to "quantifiable ownership interests". Respondents supported this proposal, but considered that disclosure of information about an entity's non-quantifiable ownership interests in other entities would be appropriate. The IPSASB agreed that IPSAS 38, *Disclosure of Interests in Other Entities* should require the disclosure of non-quantifiable ownership interests.

Temporary Joint Control and Significant Influence

BC7. IPSAS 7 and IPSAS 8, *Interests in Joint Ventures*, did not require application of the equity method or proportionate consolidation when joint control of, or significant influence over, another entity was intended to be temporary. The IPSASB noted that the IASB had removed these exemptions from the equivalent IFRSs in 2003, as a consequence of issuing IFRS 5, *Non-current Assets Held for Sale and Discontinued Operations*.

BC8. The IPSASB noted that in developing IPSAS 35, *Consolidated Financial Statements*, it had considered the related issue of whether to incorporate a temporary control exemption in that Standard, and had agreed not to do so. Accordingly the IPSASB decided not to provide exemptions based on temporary joint control or temporary significant influence in IPSAS 36.

Significant Influence

BC9. The Standard establishes a presumption that an entity has significant influence over an investee if an entity holds an ownership interest in the form of a shareholding or other formal equity structure and holds, directly, or indirectly, (e.g., through controlled entities) 20 per cent or more of the voting power of an investee. The IPSASB noted that the use of 20 percent in establishing a presumption of significant influence came initially from IAS 28 and had also been used in IPSAS 7 (December 2006). In deciding to retain this presumption in the Standard, the IPSASB noted that it was unaware of any public sector reason to use an amount other than 20 per cent.

Uniform Reporting Dates

BC10. The IPSASB considered whether to impose a time limit on the difference between the end of the reporting period of the entity and associate or joint venture of the entity. The IPSASB noted that IAS 28 requires that the most recent available financial statements of the associate or joint venture be used by an entity in applying the equity method and requires adjustments when they are not the same. In addition, IAS 28 limits the difference in dates to three months. The IPSASB noted that there may be instances in the public sector where entities have different reporting dates and it may not be possible to change those dates. The IPSASB agreed not to impose a three month limit on the difference in dates.

Investment Entities

BC11. Some respondents to ED 50 requested that the IPSASB clarify the application of the equity method by investment entities and by investors with investments in an associate or a joint venture that is an investment entity. Accordingly the IPSASB:

(a) Clarified that an investment entity will, by definition, have elected to account for investments in associates and joint ventures at fair value through surplus or deficit in accordance with IPSAS 29; and

(b) Required that an entity with an interest in an investment entity associate or an investment entity joint venture, shall, when applying the equity method, retain the fair value measurement applied by that investment entity associate or investment entity joint venture to its interests in controlled entities.

BC12. The IPSASB noted that IASB constituents had also sought clarification of some aspects of the accounting for investments in investment entity associates and investment entity joint ventures. The IASB issued ED 2014/2 *Investment Entities–Applying the Consolidation Exception (Proposed amendments to IFRS 10 and IAS 28)* in June 2014 and subsequently issued *Investment Entities: Applying the Consolidation Exception (Amendments to IFRS 10, IFRS 12 and IAS 28)* in December 2014. The IPSASB considered that these clarifications were helpful in addressing implementation issues identified by early adopters of the IASB's investment entity requirements and incorporated those aspects of the amendments that were relevant to this Standard.

Sale or Contribution of Assets between an Investor and its Associate or Joint Venture

BC13. At the time that IPSAS 36 was being developed, the IASB amended IFRS 10 and IAS 28 so that the requirements for the recognition of a partial gain or loss for transactions between an investor and its associate or joint venture would apply only to the gain or loss resulting from the sale or contribution of assets that do not constitute a business, as defined in IFRS 3, *Business Combinations*. The IASB issued *Sale or Contribution of Assets between an Investor and its Associate or Joint Venture (Amendments to IFRS 10 and IAS 28)* in September 2014. The IPSASB agreed not to incorporate the requirements introduced by these amendments in IPSAS 35 and IPSAS 36 on the grounds that it would be more appropriate to consider the recognition of full or partial gains and losses in the context of drafting standards-level requirements for public sector combinations.