

IAS 21 *the Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates* is issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (the Board).

IFRS Standards together with their accompanying documents are issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (the “Board”).

Disclaimer: To the extent permitted by applicable law, the Board and the IFRS Foundation (Foundation) expressly disclaim all liability howsoever arising from this publication or any translation thereof whether in contract, tort or otherwise (including, but not limited to, liability for any negligent act or omission) to any person in respect of any claims or losses of any nature including direct, indirect, incidental or consequential loss, punitive damages, penalties or costs.

Information contained in this publication does not constitute advice and should not be substituted for the services of an appropriately qualified professional.

Copyright © IFRS Foundation

All rights reserved. Reproduction and use rights are strictly limited. Contact the Foundation for further details at licences@ifrs.org.

Copies of IASB publications may be obtained from the Foundation’s Publications Department. Please address publication and copyright matters to:

IFRS Foundation Publications Department

Columbus Building, 7 Westferry Circus, Canary Wharf, London, E14 4HD, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 (0)20 7332 2730 Fax: +44 (0)20 7332 2749

Email: publications@ifrs.org Web: www.ifrs.org



The IFRS Foundation logo, the IASB logo, the IFRS for SMEs logo, the “Hexagon Device”, “IFRS Foundation”, “eIFRS”, “IAS”, “IASB”, “IFRS for SMEs”, “IASs”, “IFRS”, “IFRSs”, “International Accounting Standards” and “International Financial Reporting Standards”, “IFRIC” and “SIC” are **Trade Marks** of the IFRS Foundation.

Approval by the Board of IAS 21 issued in December 2003

International Accounting Standard 21 *The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates* (as revised in 2003) was approved for issue by the fourteen members of the International Accounting Standards Board.

Sir David Tweedie

Chairman

Thomas E Jones

Vice-Chairman

Mary E Barth

Hans-Georg Bruns

Anthony T Cope

Robert P Garnett

Gilbert G elard

James J Leisenring

Warren J McGregor

Patricia L O'Malley

Harry K Schmid

John T Smith

Geoffrey Whittington

Tatsumi Yamada

Approval by the Board of *Net Investment in a Foreign Operation* (Amendment to IAS 21) issued in December 2005

Net Investment in a Foreign Operation (Amendment to IAS 21) was approved for issue by the fourteen members of the International Accounting Standards Board.

Sir David Tweedie	Chairman
Thomas E Jones	Vice-Chairman
Mary E Barth	
Hans-Georg Bruns	
Anthony T Cope	
Jan Engström	
Robert P Garnett	
Gilbert Gélard	
James J Leisenring	
Warren J McGregor	
Patricia L O'Malley	
John T Smith	
Geoffrey Whittington	
Tatsumi Yamada	

Basis for Conclusions on IAS 21 *The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates*

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, IAS 21.

Paragraph BC1 was amended and paragraphs BC25A–BC25F were added in relation to the amendment to IAS 21 issued in December 2005.

In this Basis for Conclusions the terminology has not been amended to reflect the changes made by IAS 1 Presentation of Financial Statements (as revised in 2007).

Introduction

- BC1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises the International Accounting Standards Board’s considerations in reaching its conclusions on revising IAS 21 *The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates* in 2003, and on the amendment to IAS 21 *Net Investment in a Foreign Operation* in December 2005. Individual Board members gave greater weight to some factors than to others.
- BC2 In July 2001 the Board announced that, as part of its initial agenda of technical projects, it would undertake a project to improve a number of Standards, including IAS 21. The project was undertaken in the light of queries and criticisms raised in relation to the Standards by securities regulators, professional accountants and other interested parties. The objectives of the Improvements project were to reduce or eliminate alternatives, redundancies and conflicts within Standards, to deal with some convergence issues and to make other improvements. In May 2002 the Board published its proposals in an Exposure Draft of *Improvements to International Accounting Standards*, with a comment deadline of 16 September 2002. The Board received over 160 comment letters on the Exposure Draft.
- BC3 Because the Board’s intention was not to reconsider the fundamental approach to accounting for the effects of changes in foreign exchange rates established by IAS 21, this Basis for Conclusions does not discuss requirements in IAS 21 that the Board has not reconsidered.

Functional currency

- BC4 The term ‘reporting currency’ was previously defined as ‘the currency used in presenting the financial statements’. This definition comprises two separate notions (which were identified in SIC-19 *Reporting Currency—Measurement and Presentation of Financial Statements under IAS 21 and IAS 29*):
- the measurement currency (the currency in which the entity measures the items in the financial statements); and
 - the presentation currency (the currency in which the entity presents its financial statements).
- The Board decided to revise the previous version of IAS 21 to incorporate the SIC-19 approach of separating these two notions. The Board also noted that the term ‘functional currency’ is more commonly used than ‘measurement currency’ and decided to adopt the more common term.
- BC5 The Board noted a concern that the guidance in SIC-19 on determining a measurement currency could permit entities to choose one of several currencies, or to select an inappropriate currency. In particular, some believed that SIC-19 placed too much emphasis on the currency in which transactions are denominated and too little emphasis on the underlying economy that determines the pricing of those transactions. To meet these concerns, the Board defined functional currency as ‘the currency of the primary economic environment in which the entity operates’. The Board also provided guidance on how to determine the functional currency (see paragraphs 9–14 of the Standard). This guidance draws heavily on SIC-19 and equivalent guidance in US and other national standards, but also reflects the Board’s decision that some factors merit greater emphasis than others.
- BC6 The Board also discussed whether a foreign operation that is integral to the reporting entity (as described in the previous version of IAS 21) could have a functional currency that is different from that of its ‘parent’.¹ The Board decided that the functional currencies will always be the same, because it would be contradictory

¹ The term ‘parent’ is used broadly in this context to mean an entity that has a branch, associate or joint venture, as well as one with a subsidiary.

- for an integral foreign operation that ‘carries on business as if it were an extension of the reporting enterprise’s operations’² to operate in a primary economic environment different from its parent.
- BC7 It follows that it is not necessary to translate the results and financial position of an integral foreign operation when incorporating them into the financial statements of the parent—they will already be measured in the parent’s functional currency. Furthermore, it is not necessary to distinguish between an integral foreign operation and a foreign entity. When a foreign operation’s functional currency is different from that of its parent, it is a foreign entity, and the translation method in paragraphs 38–49 of the Standard applies.
- BC8 The Board also decided that the principles in the previous version of IAS 21 for distinguishing an integral foreign operation from a foreign entity are relevant in determining an operation’s functional currency. Hence it incorporated these principles into the Standard in that context.
- BC9 The Board agreed that the indicators in paragraph 9 are the primary indicators for determining the functional currency and that paragraphs 10 and 11 are secondary. This is because the indicators in paragraphs 10 and 11 are not linked to the primary economic environment in which the entity operates but provide additional supporting evidence to determine an entity’s functional currency.

Presentation currency

- BC10 A further issue is whether an entity should be permitted to present its financial statements in a currency (or currencies) other than its functional currency. Some believe it should not. They believe that the functional currency, being the currency of the primary economic environment in which the entity operates, most usefully portrays the economic effect of transactions and events on the entity. For a group that comprises operations with a number of functional currencies, they believe that the consolidated financial statements should be presented in the functional currency that management uses when controlling and monitoring the performance and financial position of the group. They also believe that allowing an entity to present its financial statements in more than one currency may confuse, rather than help, users of those financial statements. Supporters of this view believe that any presentation in a currency other than that described above should be regarded as a ‘convenience translation’ that is outside the scope of IFRSs.
- BC11 Others believe that the choice of presentation currency should be limited, for example, to the functional currency of one of the substantive entities within a group. However, such a restriction might be easily overcome—an entity that wished to present its financial statements in a different currency might establish a substantive, but relatively small operation with that functional currency.
- BC12 Still others believe that, given the rising trend towards globalisation, entities should be permitted to present their financial statements in any currency. They note that most large groups do not have a single functional currency, but rather comprise operations with a number of functional currencies. For such entities, they believe it is not clear which currency should be the presentation currency, or why one currency is preferable to another. They also point out that management may not use a single currency when controlling and monitoring the performance and financial position of such a group. In addition, they note that in some jurisdictions, entities are required to present their financial statements in the local currency, even when this is not the functional currency.³ Hence, if IFRSs required the financial statements to be presented in the functional currency, some entities would have to present two sets of financial statements: financial statements that comply with IFRSs presented in the functional currency and financial statements that comply with local regulations presented in a different currency.
- BC13 The Board was persuaded by the arguments in the previous paragraph. Accordingly, it decided that entities should be permitted to present their financial statements in any currency (or currencies).
- BC14 The Board also clarified that the Standard does not prohibit the entity from providing, as supplementary information, a ‘convenience translation’. Such a ‘convenience translation’ may display financial statements (or selected portions of financial statements) in a currency other than the presentation currency, as a convenience to some users. The ‘convenience translation’ may be prepared using a translation method other than that required by the Standard. These types of ‘convenience translations’ should be clearly identified as supplementary information to distinguish them from information required by IFRSs and translated in accordance with the Standard.

² IAS 21 (revised 1993), paragraph 24

³ This includes entities operating in another country and, for example, publishing financial statements to comply with a listing requirement of that country.

Translation method

- BC15 The Board debated which method should be used to translate financial statements from an entity's functional currency into a different presentation currency.
- BC16 The Board agreed that the translation method should not have the effect of substituting another currency for the functional currency. Put another way, presenting the financial statements in a different currency should not change the way in which the underlying items are measured. Rather, the translation method should merely express the underlying amounts, as measured in the functional currency, in a different currency.
- BC17 Given this, the Board considered two possible translation methods. The first is to translate all amounts (including comparatives) at the most recent closing rate. This method has several advantages: it is simple to apply; it does not generate any new gains and losses; and it does not change ratios such as return on assets. This method is supported by those who believe that the process of merely expressing amounts in a different currency should preserve the relationships among amounts as measured in the functional currency and, as such, should not lead to any new gains or losses.
- BC18 The second method considered by the Board is the one that the previous version of IAS 21 required for translating the financial statements of a foreign operation.⁴ This method results in the same amounts in the presentation currency regardless of whether the financial statements of a foreign operation are:
- (a) first translated into the functional currency of another group entity (eg the parent) and then into the presentation currency, or
 - (b) translated directly into the presentation currency.
- BC19 This method avoids the need to decide the currency in which to express the financial statements of a multinational group before they are translated into the presentation currency. As noted above, many large groups do not have a single functional currency, but comprise operations with a number of functional currencies. For such entities it is not clear which functional currency should be chosen in which to express amounts before they are translated into the presentation currency, or why one currency is preferable to another. In addition, this method produces the same amounts in the presentation currency for a stand-alone entity as for an identical subsidiary of a parent whose functional currency is the presentation currency.
- BC20 The Board decided to require the second method, ie that the financial statements of any entity (whether a stand-alone entity, a parent or an operation within a group) whose functional currency differs from the presentation currency used by the reporting entity are translated using the method set out in paragraphs 38–49 of the Standard.
- BC21 With respect to translation of comparative amounts, the Board adopted the approach required by SIC-30 for:
- (a) an entity whose functional currency is not the currency of the hyperinflationary economy (assets and liabilities in the comparative balance sheet are translated at the closing rate at the date of that balance sheet and income and expenses in the comparative income statement are translated at exchange rates at the dates of the transactions); and
 - (b) an entity whose functional currency is the currency of a hyperinflationary economy, and for which the comparative amounts are being translated into the currency of a hyperinflationary economy (both balance sheet and income statement items are translated at the closing rate of the most recent balance sheet presented).
- BC22 However, the Board decided not to adopt the SIC-30 approach for the translation of comparatives for an entity whose functional currency is the currency of a hyperinflationary economy, and for which the comparative amounts are being translated into a presentation currency of a non-hyperinflationary economy. The Board noted that in such a case, the SIC-30 approach requires restating the comparative amounts from those shown in last year's financial statements for both the effects of inflation and for changes in exchange rates. If exchange rates fully reflect differing price levels between the two economies to which they relate, the SIC-30 approach will result in the same amounts for the comparatives as were reported as current year amounts in the prior year financial statements. Furthermore, the Board noted that in the prior year, the relevant amounts had been already expressed in the non-hyperinflationary presentation currency, and there was no reason to change them. For these reasons the Board decided to require that all comparative amounts are those presented in the prior year financial statements (ie there is no adjustment for either subsequent changes in the price level or subsequent changes in exchange rates).
- BC23 The Board decided to incorporate into the Standard most of the disclosure requirements of SIC-30 *Reporting Currency—Translation from Measurement Currency to Presentation Currency* that apply when a different

⁴ This is to translate balance sheet items at the closing rate and income and expense items at actual (or average) rates, except for an entity whose functional currency is that of a hyperinflationary economy.

translation method is used or other supplementary information, such as an extract from the full financial statements, is displayed in a currency other than the functional currency (see paragraph 57 of the Standard). These disclosures enable users to distinguish information prepared in accordance with IFRSs from information that may be useful to users but is not the subject of IFRSs, and also tell users how the latter information has been prepared.

Capitalisation of exchange differences

- BC24 The previous version of IAS 21 allowed a limited choice of accounting for exchange differences that arise ‘from a severe devaluation or depreciation of a currency against which there is no practical means of hedging and that affects liabilities which cannot be settled and which arise directly on the recent acquisition of an asset’.⁵ The benchmark treatment was to recognise such exchange differences in profit or loss. The allowed alternative was to recognise them as an asset.
- BC25 The Board noted that the allowed alternative (of recognition as an asset) was not in accordance with the *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*⁶ because exchange losses do not meet the definition of an asset. Moreover, recognition of exchange losses as an asset is neither allowed nor required by any liaison standard-setter, so its deletion would improve convergence. Finally, in many cases when the conditions for recognition as an asset are met, the asset would be restated in accordance with IAS 29 *Financial Reporting in Hyperinflationary Economies*. Thus, to the extent that an exchange loss reflects hyperinflation, this effect is taken into account by IAS 29. For all of these reasons, the Board removed the allowed alternative treatment and the related SIC Interpretation is superseded.

Net investment in a foreign operation

- BC25A The principle in paragraph 32 is that exchange differences arising on a monetary item that is, in substance, part of the reporting entity’s net investment in a foreign operation are initially recognised in a separate component of equity⁷ in the consolidated financial statements of the reporting entity. Among the revisions to IAS 21 made in 2003 was the provision of guidance on this principle that required the monetary item to be denominated in the functional currency of either the reporting entity or the foreign operation. The previous version of IAS 21 did not include such guidance.
- BC25B The requirements can be illustrated by the following example. Parent P owns 100 per cent of Subsidiary S. Parent P has a functional currency of UK sterling. Subsidiary S has a functional currency of Mexican pesos. Parent P grants a loan of 100 US dollars to Subsidiary S, for which settlement is neither planned nor likely to occur in the foreseeable future. IAS 21 (as revised in 2003) requires the exchange differences arising on the loan to be recognised in profit or loss in the consolidated financial statements of Parent P, whereas those differences would be recognised initially in equity in the consolidated financial statements of Parent P, if the loan were to be denominated in sterling or Mexican pesos.
- BC25C After the revised IAS 21 was issued in 2003, constituents raised the following concerns:
- (a) It is common practice for a monetary item that forms part of an entity’s investment in a foreign operation to be denominated in a currency that is not the functional currency of either the reporting entity or the foreign operation. An example is a monetary item denominated in a currency that is more readily convertible than the local domestic currency of the foreign operation.
 - (b) An investment in a foreign operation denominated in a currency that is not the functional currency of the reporting entity or the foreign operation does not expose the group to a greater foreign currency exchange difference than arises when the investment is denominated in the functional currency of the reporting entity or the foreign operation. It simply results in exchange differences arising in the foreign operation’s individual financial statements and the reporting entity’s separate financial statements.
 - (c) It is not clear whether the term ‘reporting entity’ in paragraph 32 should be interpreted as the single entity or the group comprising a parent and all its subsidiaries. As a result, constituents questioned whether the monetary item must be transacted between the foreign operation and the reporting entity, or whether it could be transacted between the foreign operation and any member of the consolidated group, ie the reporting entity or any of its subsidiaries.

⁵ IAS 21 (revised 1993), paragraph 21.

⁶ The reference is to the IASC’s *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, adopted by the Board in 2001 and in effect when the Standard was revised.

⁷ As a consequence of the revision of IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements* in 2007 such differences are recognised in other comprehensive income.

- BC25D The Board noted that the nature of the monetary item referred to in paragraph 15 is similar to an equity investment in a foreign operation, ie settlement of the monetary item is neither planned nor likely to occur in the foreseeable future. Therefore, the principle in paragraph 32 to recognise exchange differences arising on a monetary item initially in a separate component of equity effectively results in the monetary item being accounted for in the same way as an equity investment in the foreign operation when consolidated financial statements are prepared. The Board concluded that the accounting treatment in the consolidated financial statements should not be dependent on the currency in which the monetary item is denominated, nor on which entity within the group conducts the transaction with the foreign operation.
- BC25E Accordingly, in 2005 the Board decided to amend IAS 21. The amendment requires exchange differences arising on a monetary item that forms part of a reporting entity's net investment in a foreign operation to be recognised initially in a separate component of equity in the consolidated financial statements. This requirement applies irrespective of the currency of the monetary item and of whether the monetary item results from a transaction with the reporting entity or any of its subsidiaries.
- BC25F The Board also proposed amending IAS 21 to clarify that an investment in a foreign operation made by an associate of the reporting entity is not part of the reporting entity's net investment in that foreign operation. Respondents to the exposure draft disagreed with this proposal. Many respondents said that the proposed amendment added a detailed rule that was not required because the principle in paragraph 15 was clear. In redeliberations, the Board agreed with those comments and decided not to proceed with that proposed amendment.

Goodwill and fair value adjustments

- BC26 The previous version of IAS 21 allowed a choice of translating goodwill and fair value adjustments to assets and liabilities that arise on the acquisition of a foreign entity at (a) the closing rate or (b) the historical transaction rate.
- BC27 The Board agreed that, conceptually, the correct treatment depends on whether goodwill and fair value adjustments are part of:
- (a) the assets and liabilities of the acquired entity (which would imply translating them at the closing rate); or
 - (b) the assets and liabilities of the parent (which would imply translating them at the historical rate).
- BC28 The Board agreed that fair value adjustments clearly relate to the identifiable assets and liabilities of the acquired entity and should therefore be translated at the closing rate.
- BC29 Goodwill is more complex, partly because it is measured as a residual. In addition, the Board noted that difficult issues can arise when the acquired entity comprises businesses that have different functional currencies (eg if the acquired entity is a multinational group). The Board discussed how to assess any resulting goodwill for impairment and, in particular, whether the goodwill would need to be 'pushed down' to the level of each different functional currency or could be accounted for and assessed at a higher level.
- BC30 One view is that when the parent acquires a multinational operation comprising businesses with many different functional currencies, any goodwill may be treated as an asset of the parent/acquirer and tested for impairment at a consolidated level. Those who support this view believe that, in economic terms, the goodwill is an asset of the parent because it is part of the acquisition price paid by the parent. Thus, they believe, it would be incorrect to allocate the goodwill to the many acquired businesses and translate it into their various functional currencies. Rather, the goodwill, being treated as an asset of the parent, is not exposed to foreign currency risks, and translation differences associated with it should not be recognised. In addition, they believe that such goodwill should be tested for impairment at a consolidated level. Under this view, allocating or 'pushing down' the goodwill to a lower level, such as each different functional currency within the acquired foreign operation, would not serve any purpose.
- BC31 Others take a different view. They believe that the goodwill is part of the parent's net investment in the acquired entity. In their view, goodwill should be treated no differently from other assets of the acquired entity, in particular intangible assets, because a significant part of the goodwill is likely to comprise intangible assets that do not qualify for separate recognition. They also note that goodwill arises only because of the investment in the foreign entity and has no existence apart from that entity. Lastly, they point out that when the acquired entity comprises a number of businesses with different functional currencies, the cash flows that support the continued recognition of goodwill are generated in those different functional currencies.
- BC32 The Board was persuaded by the reasons set out in the preceding paragraph and decided that goodwill is treated as an asset of the foreign operation and translated at the closing rate. Consequently, goodwill should be allocated to the level of each functional currency of the acquired foreign operation. This means that the level to which goodwill is allocated for foreign currency translation purposes may be different from the level

at which the goodwill is tested for impairment. Entities follow the requirements in IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets* to determine the level at which goodwill is tested for impairment.

Disposal or partial disposal of a foreign operation⁸

BC33 In the second phase of the business combinations project the Board decided that the loss of control, significant influence or joint control of an entity is accounted for as a disposal for the purposes of IAS 21. Accordingly, a former parent accounts for the loss of control over a subsidiary as a disposal of the subsidiary, even if the former subsidiary becomes an associate or jointly controlled entity of the former parent. Similarly an investor accounts for the loss of significant influence over an associate or the loss of joint control over a jointly controlled entity⁹ as a disposal. The Board decided that the change in the nature of the investment is a significant economic event.

BC34 The Board also decided in the second phase of the business combinations project that:

- (a) changes in the parent's ownership interest in a subsidiary that do not result in a loss of control are accounted for as equity transactions (ie transactions with owners in their capacity as owners);
- (b) if a parent loses control of a subsidiary, the parent reclassifies from equity to profit or loss (as a reclassification adjustment) the parent's share of the exchange differences recognised in other comprehensive income relating to a foreign operation in that subsidiary; and
- (c) if an investor loses significant influence over an associate or loses joint control over a jointly controlled entity, the investor reclassifies from equity to profit or loss (as a reclassification adjustment) the exchange differences recognised in other comprehensive income relating to a foreign operation in that associate or jointly controlled entity.

The amendments in paragraphs 48A–49 of the Standard reflect those decisions for the disposal or partial disposal of a foreign operation.

BC35 As part of *Cost of an Investment in a Subsidiary, Jointly Controlled Entity or Associate* (Amendments to IFRS 1 *First-time Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards* and IAS 27 *Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements*), issued in May 2008, the Board amended IAS 27 to remove the definition of the 'cost method'. The cost method required an entity to recognise distributions as income only if they came from post-acquisition retained earnings. Distributions received in excess of such profits were regarded as a recovery of the investment and were recognised as a reduction of its cost. Consequently, the Board amended paragraph 49 to remove the reference to pre-acquisition profits and to clarify that a dividend accounted for in accordance with paragraph 38A of IAS 27 cannot be a disposal or partial disposal of a net investment in IAS 21.¹⁰

Disposal or partial disposal of a foreign operation (amendment 2011)

BC36 During its redeliberation of the exposure draft ED 9 *Joint Arrangements*, the Board reconsidered whether its decision in the second phase of the business combinations project to characterise loss of joint control or loss of significant influence as a significant economic event (ie in the same way that loss of control is characterised as a significant economic event) was appropriate. If it were, the Board thought that the entity should be required to recalibrate the accounting as required by IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements*. However, the Board concluded that, although significant, the events are fundamentally different. In the case of loss of control, the cessation of the parent-subsidiary relationship results in the derecognition of assets and liabilities because the composition of the group changes. If joint control or significant influence is lost the composition of the group is unaffected.

BC37 The Board also noted that retaining the characterisation of significant economic event in the case of loss of joint control or significant influence when the retained interest is a financial asset is unnecessary. IFRS 9 already requires that in such cases the retained interest (ie a financial asset) must be measured at fair value.

⁸ This heading and paragraphs BC33 and BC34 were added as a consequence of amendments to IAS 27 *Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements* made as part of the second phase of the business combinations project in 2008. The consolidation requirements in IAS 27 were superseded by IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements* issued in May 2011. The accounting requirements did not change.

⁹ 'Jointly controlled entities' were defined in IAS 31 *Interests in Joint Ventures*. IFRS 11 *Joint Arrangements*, issued in May 2011, replaced IAS 31 and changed terminology.

¹⁰ The consolidation guidance was removed from IAS 27 and the Standard was renamed *Separate Financial Statements* by IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements* issued in May 2011. The accounting requirements for dividends were not changed.

- BC38 In the case of loss of joint control when significant influence is maintained, the Board acknowledged that the investor-investee relationship changes and, consequently, so does the nature of the investment. However, in this instance, both investments (ie the joint venture and the associate) continue to be measured using the equity method. Considering that there is neither a change in the group boundaries nor a change in the measurement requirements, the Board concluded that losing joint control and retaining significant influence is not an event that warrants remeasurement of the retained interest at fair value.
- BC39 Consequently, the Board removed all descriptions that characterise loss of joint control or significant influence as a significant economic event as introduced in the second phase of the Board's project on business combinations.
- BC40 The Board also decided to align the conclusions reached on the loss of joint control when significant influence is maintained with the requirements in IAS 21 so that the change from joint control to significant influence is treated as a 'partial' disposal rather than deemed to be an 'entire' disposal. As a consequence, the Board concluded that when an entity loses joint control of a joint arrangement that includes a foreign operation but retains significant influence, an entity reclassifies to profit or loss only the proportionate share of the cumulative amount of the exchange differences recognised in other comprehensive income relating to a foreign operation in that joint arrangement.