

International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRSs) together with their accompanying documents are issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB):

30 Cannon Street, London, EC4M 6XH, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 (0)20 7246 6410 Fax: +44 (0)20 7246 6411

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

Copyright © 2004 IFRS Foundation

IFRSs (which include International Accounting Standards and Interpretations) are copyright of the IFRS Foundation. The authoritative text of IFRSs is that issued by the IASB in the English language. Copies may be obtained from the IFRS Foundation Publications Department. Please address publication and copyright matters to:

IFRS Foundation Publications Department

30 Cannon Street, London, EC4M 6XH, United Kingdom.

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

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

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be translated, reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form either in whole or in part or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage and retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the IFRS Foundation.



The IFRS Foundation logo, the IASB logo, the IFRS for SMEs logo, the 'Hexagon Device', 'IFRS Foundation', 'eIFRS', 'IAS', 'IASB', 'IASB Foundation', 'IASCF', 'IFRS for SMEs', 'IASs', 'IFRS', 'IFRSs', 'International Accounting Standards' and 'International Financial Reporting Standards' are Trade Marks of the IFRS Foundation

Approval by the Board of IAS 38 issued in March 2004

International Accounting Standard 38 *Intangible Assets* (as revised in 2004) was approved for issue by thirteen of the fourteen members of the International Accounting Standards Board. Professor Whittington dissented. His dissenting opinion is set out after the Basis for Conclusions on IAS 38.

Sir David Tweedie

Chairman

Thomas E Jones

Vice-Chairman

Mary E Barth

Hans-Georg Bruns

Anthony T Cope

Robert P Garnett

Gilbert Gélard

James J Leisenring

Warren J McGregor

Patricia L O'Malley

Harry K Schmid

John T Smith

Geoffrey Whittington

Tatsumi Yamada

CONTENTS

**BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS ON
IAS 38 INTANGIBLE ASSETS***from paragraph*

| | |
|---|--------------|
| INTRODUCTION | BC1 |
| DEFINITION OF AN INTANGIBLE ASSET | BC4 |
| IDENTIFIABILITY | BC6 |
| Background to the Board's deliberations | BC7 |
| Clarifying identifiability | BC9 |
| Non-contractual customer relationships | BC11 |
| CRITERIA FOR INITIAL RECOGNITION | BC15 |
| Acquisition as part of a business combination | BC16A |
| Probability recognition criterion | BC17 |
| Reliability of measurement recognition criterion | BC19A |
| Separate acquisition | BC26 |
| Internally generated intangible assets | BCZ29 |
| Background on the requirements for internally generated intangible assets | BCZ30 |
| Combination of IAS 9 with the Standard on intangible assets | BCZ33 |
| Consequences of combining IAS 9 with IAS 38 | BCZ36 |
| Recognition of expenditure on all internally generated intangible assets as an expense | BCZ38 |
| Recognition of internally generated intangible assets | BCZ39 |
| IASC's view in approving IAS 38 | BCZ40 |
| Differences in recognition criteria for internally generated intangible assets and purchased intangible assets | BCZ42 |
| Initial recognition at cost | BCZ43 |
| Application of the recognition criteria for internally generated intangible assets | BCZ45 |
| SUBSEQUENT ACCOUNTING FOR INTANGIBLE ASSETS | BC47 |
| Accounting for intangible assets with finite useful lives acquired in business combinations | BC50 |
| Impairment testing intangible assets with finite useful lives | BC54 |
| Residual value of an intangible asset with a finite useful life | BC57 |
| Useful lives of intangible assets | BC60 |
| Useful life constrained by contractual or other legal rights | BC66 |
| Accounting for intangible assets with indefinite useful lives | BC73 |
| Non-amortisation | BC74 |
| Revaluations | BC76 |
| Revaluation method—proportionate restatement of accumulated amortisation when an intangible asset is revalued | BC77A |
| RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ACQUIRED IN BUSINESS COMBINATIONS | BC78 |
| Initial recognition separately from goodwill | BC80 |
| Subsequent accounting for IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination and recognised as intangible assets | BC83 |
| Subsequent expenditure on IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination and recognised as intangible assets | BC85 |
| TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS | BC90 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Revaluation method—proportionate restatement of accumulated amortisation when an intangible asset is revalued | BC100A |
| Early application | BC101 |
| SUMMARY OF MAIN CHANGES FROM THE EXPOSURE DRAFT | BC103 |
| HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STANDARD ON INTANGIBLE ASSETS | BCZ104 |

Basis for Conclusions on IAS 38 *Intangible Assets*

The International Accounting Standards Board revised IAS 38 as part of its project on business combinations. It was not the Board's intention to reconsider as part of that project all of the requirements in IAS 38.

The previous version of IAS 38 was accompanied by a Basis for Conclusions summarising the former International Accounting Standards Committee's considerations in reaching some of its conclusions in that Standard. For convenience the Board has incorporated into its own Basis for Conclusions material from the previous Basis for Conclusions that discusses (a) matters the Board did not reconsider and (b) the history of the development of a standard on intangible assets. That material is contained in paragraphs denoted by numbers with the prefix BCZ. Paragraphs describing the Board's considerations in reaching its own conclusions are numbered with the prefix BC.

Introduction

- BC1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises the International Accounting Standards Board's considerations in reaching the conclusions in IAS 38 *Intangible Assets*. Individual Board members gave greater weight to some factors than to others.
- BC2 The International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) issued the previous version of IAS 38 in 1998. It has been revised by the Board as part of its project on business combinations. That project has two phases. The first has resulted in the Board issuing simultaneously IFRS 3 *Business Combinations* and revised versions of IAS 38 and IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets*. Therefore, the Board's intention in revising IAS 38 as part of the first phase of the project was not to reconsider all of the requirements in IAS 38. The changes to IAS 38 are primarily concerned with:
- (a) the notion of 'identifiability' as it relates to intangible assets;
 - (b) the useful life and amortisation of intangible assets; and
 - (c) the accounting for in-process research and development projects acquired in business combinations.
- BC3 With the exception of research and development projects acquired in business combinations, the Board did not reconsider the requirements in the previous version of IAS 38 on the recognition of internally generated intangible assets. The previous version of IAS 38 was accompanied by a Basis for Conclusions summarising IASC's considerations in reaching some of its conclusions in that Standard. For convenience, the Board has incorporated into this Basis for Conclusions material from the previous Basis for Conclusions that discusses the recognition of internally generated intangible assets (see paragraphs BCZ29–BCZ46) and the history of the development of a standard on intangible assets (see paragraphs BCZ104–BCZ110). The views expressed in paragraphs BCZ29–BCZ46 and BCZ104–BCZ110 are those of IASC.

Definition of an intangible asset (paragraph 8)

- BC4 An intangible asset was defined in the previous version of IAS 38 as 'an identifiable non-monetary asset without physical substance held for use in the production or supply of goods or services, for rental to others, or for administrative services'. The definition in the revised Standard eliminates the requirement for the asset to be held for use in the production or supply of goods or services, for rental to others, or for administrative services.
- BC5 The Board observed that the essential characteristics of intangible assets are that they:
- (a) are resources controlled by the entity from which future economic benefits are expected to flow to the entity;
 - (b) lack physical substance; and
 - (c) are identifiable.

The Board concluded that the purpose for which an entity holds an item with these characteristics is not relevant to its classification as an intangible asset, and that all such items should be within the scope of the Standard.

Identifiability (paragraph 12)

- BC6 Under the Standard, as under the previous version of IAS 38, a non-monetary asset without physical substance must be identifiable to meet the definition of an intangible asset. The previous version of IAS 38 did not define 'identifiability', but stated that an intangible asset could be distinguished from goodwill if the asset was separable, but that separability was not a necessary condition for identifiability. The revised Standard requires an asset to be treated as meeting the identifiability criterion in the definition of an intangible asset when it is separable, or when it arises from contractual or other legal rights, regardless of whether those rights are transferable or separable from the entity or from other rights and obligations.

Background to the Board's deliberations

- BC7 The Board was prompted to consider the issue of 'identifiability' as part of the first phase of its Business Combinations project as a result of changes during 2001 to the requirements in Canadian and United States standards on the separate recognition of intangible assets acquired in business combinations. The Board observed that intangible assets comprise an increasing proportion of the assets of many entities, and that intangible assets acquired in a business combination are often included in the amount recognised as goodwill, despite the requirements in IAS 22 *Business Combinations* and IAS 38 for them to be recognised separately from goodwill. The Board agreed with the conclusion reached by the Canadian and US standard-setters that the usefulness of financial statements would be enhanced if intangible assets acquired in a business combination were distinguished from goodwill. Therefore, the Board concluded that the IFRS arising from the first phase of the Business Combinations project should provide a definitive basis for identifying and recognising intangible assets acquired in a business combination separately from goodwill.
- BC8 In revising IAS 38 and developing IFRS 3, the Board affirmed the view in the previous version of IAS 38 that identifiability is the characteristic that conceptually distinguishes other intangible assets from goodwill. The Board concluded that to provide a definitive basis for identifying and recognising intangible assets separately from goodwill, the concept of identifiability needed to be articulated more clearly.

Clarifying identifiability (paragraph 12)

- BC9 Consistently with the guidance in the previous version of IAS 38, the Board concluded that an intangible asset can be distinguished from goodwill if it is separable, ie capable of being separated or divided from the entity and sold, transferred, licensed, rented or exchanged. Therefore, in the context of intangible assets, separability signifies identifiability, and intangible assets with that characteristic that are acquired in a business combination should be recognised as assets separately from goodwill.
- BC10 However, again consistently with the guidance in the previous version of IAS 38, the Board concluded that separability is not the only indication of identifiability. The Board observed that, in contrast to goodwill, the values of many intangible assets arise from rights conveyed legally by contract or statute. In the case of acquired goodwill, its value arises from the collection of assembled assets that make up an acquired entity or the value created by assembling a collection of assets through a business combination, such as the synergies that are expected to result from combining entities or businesses. The Board also observed that, although many intangible assets are both separable and arise from contractual-legal rights, some contractual-legal rights establish property interests that are not readily separable from the entity as a whole. For example, under the laws of some jurisdictions some licences granted to an entity are not transferable except by sale of the entity as a whole. The Board concluded that the fact that an intangible asset arises from contractual or other legal rights is a characteristic that distinguishes it from goodwill. Therefore, intangible assets with that characteristic that are acquired in a business combination should be recognised as assets separately from goodwill.

Non-contractual customer relationships (paragraph 16)

- BC11 The previous version of IAS 38 and the Exposure Draft of Proposed Amendments to IAS 38 stated that 'An entity controls an asset if the entity has the power to obtain the future economic benefits flowing from the underlying resource and also can restrict the access of others to those benefits.' The documents then expanded on this by stating that 'in the absence of legal rights to protect, or other ways to control, the relationships with customers or the loyalty of the customers to the entity, the entity usually has insufficient control over the economic benefits from customer relationships and loyalty to consider that such items meet the definition of intangible assets.'
- BC12 However, the Draft Illustrative Examples accompanying ED 3 *Business Combinations* stated that 'If a customer relationship acquired in a business combination does not arise from a contract, the relationship is

recognised as an intangible asset separately from goodwill if it meets the separability criterion. Exchange transactions for the same asset or a similar asset provide evidence of separability of a non-contractual customer relationship and might also provide information about exchange prices that should be considered when estimating fair value.’ Whilst respondents to the Exposure Draft generally agreed with the Board’s conclusions on the definition of identifiability, some were uncertain about the relationship between the separability criterion for establishing whether a non-contractual customer relationship is identifiable, and the control concept for establishing whether the relationship meets the definition of an asset. Additionally, some respondents suggested that non-contractual customer relationships would, under the proposal in the Exposure Draft, be separately recognised if acquired in a business combination, but not if acquired in a separate transaction.

- BC13 The Board observed that exchange transactions for the same or similar non-contractual customer relationships provide evidence not only that the item is separable, but also that the entity is able to control the expected future economic benefits flowing from that relationship. Similarly, if an entity separately acquires a non-contractual customer relationship, the existence of an exchange transaction for that relationship provides evidence both that the item is separable, and that the entity is able to control the expected future economic benefits flowing from the relationship. Therefore, the relationship would meet the intangible asset definition and be recognised as such. However, in the absence of exchange transactions for the same or similar non-contractual customer relationships, such relationships acquired in a business combination would not normally meet the definition of an ‘intangible asset’—they would not be separable, nor would the entity be able to demonstrate that it controls the expected future economic benefits flowing from that relationship.
- BC14 Therefore, the Board decided to clarify in paragraph 16 of IAS 38 that in the absence of legal rights to protect customer relationships, exchange transactions for the same or similar non-contractual customer relationships (other than as part of a business combination) provide evidence that the entity is nonetheless able to control the future economic benefits flowing from the customer relationships. Because such exchange transactions also provide evidence that the customer relationships are separable, those customer relationships meet the definition of an intangible asset.

Criteria for initial recognition

- BC15 In accordance with the Standard, as with the previous version of IAS 38, an intangible asset is recognised if, and only if:
- (a) it is probable that the expected future economic benefits that are attributable to the asset will flow to the entity; and
 - (b) the cost of the asset can be measured reliably.
- In revising IAS 38 the Board considered the application of these recognition criteria to intangible assets acquired in business combinations. The Board’s deliberations on this issue are set out in paragraphs BC16–BC25.

Acquisition as part of a business combination (paragraphs 33–38)

- BC16 [Deleted]
- BC16A The Board observed that in a business combination both criteria, the probability criterion and the reliability of measurement criterion, will always be met.

Probability recognition criterion

- BC17 In revising IAS 38, the Board observed that the fair value of an intangible asset reflects market expectations about the probability that the future economic benefits associated with the intangible asset will flow to the acquirer. In other words, the effect of probability is reflected in the fair value measurement of an intangible asset.¹ Therefore, the probability recognition criterion is always considered to be satisfied for intangible assets acquired in business combinations.

¹ IFRS 13 *Fair Value Measurement*, issued in May 2011, defines fair value and contains the requirements for measuring fair value.

- BC18 The Board observed that this highlights a general inconsistency between the recognition criteria for assets and liabilities in the *Framework*² (which states that an item meeting the definition of an element should be recognised only if it is probable that any future economic benefits associated with the item will flow to or from the entity, and the item can be measured reliably) and the fair value measurements required in, for example, a business combination. However, the Board concluded that the role of probability as a criterion for recognition in the *Framework* should be considered more generally as part of a forthcoming Concepts project.

Reliability of measurement recognition criterion

- BC19 [Deleted]

- BC19A In developing IFRS 3, the IASB noted that the fair values of identifiable intangible assets acquired in a business combination are normally measurable with sufficient reliability to be recognised separately from goodwill. The effects of uncertainty because of a range of possible outcomes with different probabilities are reflected in measuring the asset's fair value³; the existence of such a range does not demonstrate an inability to measure fair value reliably. IAS 38 (as revised in 2004) included a rebuttable presumption that the fair value of an intangible asset with a finite useful life acquired in a business combination can be measured reliably. The Board had concluded that it might not always be possible to measure reliably the fair value of an asset that has an underlying contractual or legal basis. However, IAS 38 (revised 2004) provided that the only circumstances in which it might not be possible to measure reliably the fair value of an intangible asset acquired in a business combination that arises from legal or other contractual rights were if it either:

- (a) is not separable; or
- (b) is separable, but there is no history or evidence of exchange transactions for the same or similar assets, and otherwise estimating fair value would depend on immeasurable variables.

- BC19B In developing the 2005 Business Combinations exposure draft, the Board concluded that separate recognition of intangible assets, on the basis of an estimate of fair value, rather than subsuming them in goodwill, provides better information to the users of financial statements even if a significant degree of judgment is required to estimate fair value. For this reason, the Board decided to propose consequential amendments to IAS 38 to remove the reliability of measurement criterion for intangible assets acquired in a business combination. In redeliberating the proposals in the 2005 Business Combinations exposure draft, the Board affirmed those amendments to IAS 38.

- BC19C When the Board developed IFRS 3 (as revised in 2008), it decided that if an intangible asset acquired in a business combination is separable or arises from contractual or other legal rights, sufficient information exists to measure the fair value of the asset reliably. The Board made related amendments to IAS 38 to reflect that decision. However, the Board identified additional amendments that were needed to reflect clearly its decisions on the accounting for intangible assets acquired in a business combination. Consequently, in *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in April 2009, the Board amended paragraphs 36 and 37 of IAS 38 to clarify the Board's intentions.

- BC19D Additionally, in *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in April 2009, the Board amended paragraphs 40 and 41 of IAS 38 to clarify the description of valuation techniques commonly used to measure intangible assets at fair value⁴ when assets are not traded in an active market. The Board also decided that the amendments should be applied prospectively because retrospective application might require some entities to remeasure fair values associated with previous transactions. The Board does not think this is appropriate because the remeasurement might involve the use of hindsight in those circumstances.

- BC20–BC25 [Deleted]

Separate acquisition (paragraphs 25 and 26)

- BC26 Having decided to include paragraphs 33–38 in IAS 38, the Board also decided that it needed to consider the role of the probability and reliability of measurement recognition criteria for separately acquired intangible assets.
- BC27 Consistently with its conclusion about the role of probability in the recognition of intangible assets acquired in business combinations, the Board concluded that the probability recognition criterion is always considered to be satisfied for separately acquired intangible assets. This is because the price an entity pays

² References to the *Framework* are to the IASC's *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, adopted by the IASB in 2001. In September 2010 the IASB replaced the *Framework* with the *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting*.

³ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, contains the requirements for measuring fair value.

⁴ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, contains the requirements for measuring fair value. As a consequence paragraphs 40 and 41 of IAS 38 have been deleted.

to acquire separately an intangible asset normally reflects expectations about the probability that the expected future economic benefits associated with the intangible asset will flow to the entity. In other words, the effect of probability is reflected in the cost of the intangible asset.

- BC28 The Board also concluded that when an intangible asset is separately acquired in exchange for cash or other monetary assets, sufficient information should exist to measure the cost of that asset reliably. However, this might not be the case when the purchase consideration comprises non-monetary assets. Therefore, the Board decided to carry forward from the previous version of IAS 38 guidance clarifying that the cost of a separately acquired intangible asset can usually be measured reliably, particularly when the purchase consideration is cash or other monetary assets.

Internally generated intangible assets (paragraphs 51–67)

- BCZ29 The controversy relating to internally generated intangible assets surrounds whether there should be:
- (a) a requirement to recognise internally generated intangible assets in the balance sheet whenever certain criteria are met;
 - (b) a requirement to recognise expenditure on all internally generated intangible assets as an expense;
 - (c) a requirement to recognise expenditure on all internally generated intangible assets as an expense, with certain specified exceptions; or
 - (d) an option to choose between the treatments described in (a) and (b) above.

Background on the requirements for internally generated intangible assets

- BCZ30 Before IAS 38 was issued in 1998, some internally generated intangible assets (those that arose from development expenditure) were dealt with under IAS 9 *Research and Development Costs*. The development of, and revisions to, IAS 9 had always been controversial.

- BCZ31 Proposed and approved requirements for the recognition of an asset arising from development expenditure and other internally generated intangible assets had been the following:

- (a) in 1978, IASC approved IAS 9 *Accounting for Research and Development Activities*. It required expenditure on research and development to be recognised as an expense when incurred, except that an enterprise had the option to recognise an asset arising from development expenditure whenever certain criteria were met.
- (b) in 1989, Exposure Draft E32 *Comparability of Financial Statements* proposed retaining IAS 9's option to recognise an asset arising from development expenditure if certain criteria were met and identifying:
 - (i) as a preferred treatment, recognising all expenditure on research and development as an expense when incurred; and
 - (ii) as an allowed alternative treatment, recognising an asset arising from development expenditure whenever certain criteria were met.

The majority of commentators on E32 did not support maintaining an option or the proposed preferred treatment.

- (c) in 1991, Exposure Draft E37 *Research and Development Costs* proposed requiring the recognition of an asset arising from development expenditure whenever certain criteria were met. In 1993, IASC approved IAS 9 *Research and Development Costs* based on E37.
- (d) in 1995, consistently with IAS 9, Exposure Draft E50 *Intangible Assets* proposed requiring internally generated intangible assets—other than those arising from development expenditure, which would still have been covered by IAS 9—to be recognised as assets whenever certain criteria were met.
- (e) in 1997, Exposure Draft E60 *Intangible Assets* proposed:
 - (i) retaining E50's proposals for the recognition of internally generated intangible assets; but
 - (ii) extending the scope of the Standard on intangible assets to deal with all internally generated intangible assets—including those arising from development expenditure.
- (f) in 1998, IASC approved:
 - (i) IAS 38 *Intangible Assets* based on E60, with a few minor changes; and
 - (ii) the withdrawal of IAS 9.

- BCZ32 From 1989, the majority view at IASC and from commentators was that there should be only one treatment that would require an internally generated intangible asset—whether arising from development expenditure or other expenditure—to be recognised as an asset whenever certain recognition criteria are met. Several minority views were strongly opposed to this treatment but there was no clear consensus on any other single treatment.

Combination of IAS 9 with the Standard on intangible assets

- BCZ33 The reasons for not retaining IAS 9 as a separate Standard were that:
- (a) IASC believed that an identifiable asset that results from research and development activities is an intangible asset because knowledge is the primary outcome of these activities. Therefore, IASC supported treating expenditure on research and development activities similarly to expenditure on activities intended to create any other internally generated intangible assets.
 - (b) some commentators on E50, which proposed to exclude research and development expenditures from its scope,
 - (i) argued that it was sometimes difficult to identify whether IAS 9 or the proposed Standard on intangible assets should apply, and
 - (ii) perceived differences in accounting treatments between IAS 9 and E50's proposals, whereas this was not IASC's intent.
- BCZ34 A large majority of commentators on E60 supported including certain aspects of IAS 9 with the proposed Standard on intangible assets and the withdrawal of IAS 9. A minority of commentators on E60 supported maintaining two separate Standards. This minority supported the view that internally generated intangible assets should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis with separate requirements for different types of internally generated intangible assets. These commentators argued that E60's proposed recognition criteria were too general to be effective in practice for all internally generated intangible assets.
- BCZ35 IASC rejected a proposal to develop separate standards (or detailed requirements within one standard) for specific types of internally generated intangible assets because, as explained above, IASC believed that the same recognition criteria should apply to all types of internally generated intangible assets.

Consequences of combining IAS 9 with IAS 38

- BCZ36 The requirements in IAS 38 and IAS 9 differ in the following main respects:
- (a) IAS 9 limited the amount of expenditure that could initially be recognised for an asset arising from development expenditure (ie the amount that formed the cost of such an asset) to the amount that was probable of being recovered from the asset. Instead, IAS 38 requires that:
 - (i) all expenditure incurred from when the recognition criteria are met until the asset is available for use should be accumulated to form the cost of the asset; and
 - (ii) an enterprise should test for impairment, at least annually, an intangible asset that is not yet available for use. If the cost recognised for the asset exceeds its recoverable amount, an enterprise recognises an impairment loss accordingly. This impairment loss should be reversed if the conditions for reversals of impairment losses under IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets* are met.
 - (b) IAS 38 permits an intangible asset to be measured after recognition at a revalued amount less subsequent amortisation and subsequent impairment losses. IAS 9 did not permit this treatment. However, it is highly unlikely that an active market (the condition required to revalue intangible assets) will exist for an asset that arises from development expenditure.
 - (c) IAS 38 requires consideration of residual values in determining the depreciable amount of an intangible asset. IAS 9 prohibited the consideration of residual values. However, IAS 38 sets criteria that make it highly unlikely that an asset that arises from development expenditure would have a residual value above zero.
- BCZ37 IASC believed that, in practice, it would be unlikely that the application of IAS 38 would result in differences from the application of IAS 9.

Recognition of expenditure on all internally generated intangible assets as an expense

BCZ38 Those who favour the recognition of expenditure on all internally generated intangible assets (including development expenditure) as an expense argue that:

- (a) internally generated intangible assets do not meet the *Framework's* requirements for recognition as an asset because:
 - (i) the future economic benefits that arise from internally generated intangible assets cannot be distinguished from future economic benefits that arise from internally generated goodwill; and/or
 - (ii) it is impossible to distinguish reliably the expenditure associated with internally generated intangible assets from the expenditure associated with enhancing internally generated goodwill.
- (b) comparability of financial statements will not be achieved. This is because the judgement involved in determining whether it is probable that future economic benefits will flow from internally generated intangible assets is too subjective to result in similar accounting under similar circumstances.
- (c) it is not possible to assess reliably the amount that can be recovered from an internally generated intangible asset, unless its fair value can be determined by reference to an active market⁵. Therefore, recognising an internally generated intangible asset for which no active market exists at an amount other than zero may mislead investors.
- (d) a requirement to recognise internally generated intangible assets at cost if certain criteria are met results in little, if any, decision-useful or predictive information because:
 - (i) demonstration of technological feasibility or commercial success in order to meet the recognition criteria will generally not be achieved until substantial expenditure has been recognised as an expense. Therefore, the cost recognised for an internally generated intangible asset will not reflect the total expenditure on that asset.
 - (ii) the cost of an internally generated intangible asset may not have any relationship to the value of the asset.
- (e) in some countries, users are suspicious about an enterprise that recognises internally generated intangible assets.
- (f) the added costs of maintaining the records necessary to justify and support the recognition of internally generated intangible assets do not justify the benefits.

Recognition of internally generated intangible assets

BCZ39 Those who support the mandatory recognition of internally generated intangible assets (including those resulting from development expenditure) whenever certain criteria are met argue that:

- (a) recognition of an internally generated intangible asset if it meets the definition of an asset and the recognition criteria is consistent with the *Framework*. An enterprise can, in some instances:
 - (i) determine the probability of receiving future economic benefits from an internally generated intangible asset; and
 - (ii) distinguish the expenditure on this asset from expenditure on internally generated goodwill.
- (b) there has been massive investment in intangible assets in the last two decades. There have been complaints that:
 - (i) the non-recognition of investments in intangible assets in the financial statements distorts the measurement of an enterprise's performance and does not allow an accurate assessment of returns on investment in intangible assets; and
 - (ii) if enterprises do not track the returns on investment in intangible assets better, there is a risk of over- or under-investing in important assets. An accounting system that encourages such behaviour will become an increasingly inadequate signal, both for internal control purposes and for external purposes.

⁵ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, defines an active market.

- (c) certain research studies, particularly in the United States, have established a cost-value association for research and development expenditures. The studies establish that capitalisation of research and development expenditure yields value-relevant information to investors.
- (d) the fact that some uncertainties exist about the value of an asset does not justify a requirement that no cost should be recognised for the asset.
- (e) it should not matter for recognition purposes whether an asset is purchased externally or developed internally. Particularly, there should be no opportunity for accounting arbitrage depending on whether an enterprise decides to outsource the development of an intangible asset or develop it internally.

IASC's view in approving IAS 38

BCZ40 IASC's view—consistently reflected in previous proposals for intangible assets—was that there should be no difference between the requirements for:

- (a) intangible assets that are acquired externally; and
- (b) internally generated intangible assets, whether they arise from development activities or other types of activities.

Therefore, an internally generated intangible asset should be recognised whenever the definition of, and recognition criteria for, an intangible asset are met. This view was also supported by a majority of commentators on E60.

BCZ41 IASC rejected a proposal for an allowed alternative to recognise expenditure on internally generated intangible assets (including development expenditure) as an expense immediately, even if the expenditure results in an asset that meets the recognition criteria. IASC believed that a free choice would undermine the comparability of financial statements and the efforts of IASC to reduce the number of alternative treatments in International Accounting Standards.

Differences in recognition criteria for internally generated intangible assets and purchased intangible assets

BCZ42 IAS 38 includes specific recognition criteria for internally generated intangible assets that expand on the general recognition criteria for intangible assets. It is assumed that these criteria are met implicitly whenever an enterprise acquires an intangible asset. Therefore, IAS 38 requires an enterprise to demonstrate that these criteria are met for internally generated intangible assets only.

Initial recognition at cost

BCZ43 Some commentators on E50 and E60 argued that the proposed recognition criteria in E50 and E60 were too restrictive and that they would prevent the recognition of many intangible assets, particularly internally generated intangible assets. Specifically, they disagreed with the proposals (retained in IAS 38) that:

- (a) an intangible asset should not be recognised at an amount other than its cost, even if its fair value can be determined reliably; and
- (b) expenditure on an intangible asset that has been recognised as an expense in prior periods should not be reinstated.

They argued that these principles contradict the *Framework* and quoted paragraph 83 of the *Framework*,⁶ which specifies that an item that meets the definition of an asset should be recognised if, among other things, its '*cost or value* can be measured with reliability'. These commentators supported recognising an intangible asset—an internally generated intangible asset—at its fair value, if, among other things, its fair value can be measured reliably.

⁶ now paragraph 4.38 of the *Conceptual Framework*

- BCZ44 IASC rejected a proposal to allow the initial recognition of an intangible asset at fair value (except if the asset is acquired in a business combination, in exchange for a dissimilar asset⁷ or by way of a government grant) because:
- (a) this is consistent with IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment*. IAS 16 prohibits the initial recognition of an item of property, plant or equipment at fair value (except in the specific limited cases as those in IAS 38).
 - (b) it is difficult to determine the fair value of an intangible asset reliably if no active market exists for the asset⁸. Since active markets with the characteristics set out in IAS 38 are highly unlikely to exist for internally generated intangible assets, IASC did not believe that it was necessary to make an exception to the principles generally applied for the initial recognition and measurement of non-financial assets.
 - (c) the large majority of commentators on E50 supported the initial recognition of intangible assets at cost and the prohibition of the reinstatement of expenditure on an intangible item that was initially recognised as an expense.

Application of the recognition criteria for internally generated intangible assets

- BCZ45 IAS 38 specifically prohibits the recognition as intangible assets of brands, mastheads, publishing titles, customer lists and items similar in substance that are internally generated. IASC believed that internally generated intangible items of this kind would rarely, and perhaps never, meet the recognition criteria in IAS 38. However, to avoid any misunderstanding, IASC decided to set out this conclusion in the form of an explicit prohibition.
- BCZ46 IAS 38 also clarifies that expenditure on research, training, advertising and start-up activities will not result in the creation of an intangible asset that can be recognised in the financial statements. Whilst some view these requirements and guidance as being too restrictive and arbitrary, they are based on IASC's interpretation of the application of the recognition criteria in IAS 38. They also reflect the fact that it is sometimes difficult to determine whether there is an internally generated intangible asset distinguishable from internally generated goodwill.

Application of the recognition criteria for internally generated intangible assets

2008 Amendments⁹

- BC46A Paragraph 68 states that expenditure on an internally developed intangible item shall be recognised as an expense when it is incurred. The Board noted that it was unclear to some constituents how this should be interpreted. For example, some believed that an entity should recognise expenditure on advertising and promotional activities as an expense when it received the goods or services that it would use to develop or communicate the advertisement or promotion. Others believed that an entity should recognise an expense when the advertisement or promotion was delivered to its customers or potential customers. Therefore, the Board decided to amend paragraph 69 to clarify the meaning of 'incurred'.
- BC46B The Board noted that advertising and promotional activities enhance or create brands or customer relationships, which in turn generate revenues. Goods or services that are acquired to be used to undertake advertising or promotional activities have no other purpose than to undertake those activities. In other words, the only benefit of those goods or services is to develop or create brands or customer relationships, which in turn generate revenues. Internally generated brands or customer relationships are not recognised as intangible assets.
- BC46C The Board concluded that it would be inconsistent for an entity to recognise an asset in respect of an advertisement that it had not yet published if the economic benefits that might flow to the entity as a result of publishing the advertisement are the same as those that might flow to the entity as a result of the brand or customer relationship that it would enhance or create. Therefore, the Board concluded that an entity should not recognise as an asset goods or services that it had received in respect of its future advertising or promotional activities.

⁷ IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment* (as revised in 2003) requires an entity to measure an item of property, plant and equipment acquired in exchange for a non-monetary asset or assets, or a combination of monetary and non-monetary assets, at fair value unless the exchange transaction lacks commercial substance. Previously, an entity measured such an acquired asset at fair value unless the exchanged assets were similar. The IASB concluded that the same measurement criteria should apply to intangible assets acquired in exchange for a non-monetary asset or assets, or a combination of monetary and non-monetary assets.

⁸ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, defines an active market.

⁹ This heading and paragraphs BC46A–BC46I were added by *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2008.

- BC46D In reaching this conclusion the Board noted that, if an entity pays for advertising goods or services in advance and the other party has not yet provided those goods or services, the entity has a different asset. That asset is the right to receive those goods and services. Therefore, the Board decided to retain paragraph 70, which allows an entity to recognise as an asset the right to receive those goods or services. However, the Board did not believe that this paragraph should be used as a justification for recognising an asset beyond the point at which the entity gained a right to access the related goods or received the related services. Therefore, the Board decided to amend the paragraph to make clear that a prepayment may be recognised by an entity only until that entity has gained a right to access to the related goods or has received the related services.
- BC46E The Board noted that when the entity has received the related goods or services, it ceases to have the right to receive them. Because the entity no longer has an asset that it can recognise, it recognises an expense. However, the Board was concerned that the timing of delivery of goods should not be the determinant of when an expense should be recognised. The date on which physical delivery is obtained could be altered without affecting the commercial substance of the arrangement with the supplier. Therefore, the Board decided that an entity should recognise an expense for goods when they have been completed by the supplier in accordance with a contract to supply them and the entity could ask for delivery in return for payment—in other words, when the entity had gained a right to access the related goods.
- BC46F A number of commentators on the exposure draft of proposed *Improvements to International Financial Reporting Standards* published in 2007 thought that it was unclear when the Board intended an expense to be recognised. In response to those comments, the Board added paragraph 69A to clarify when entities would gain a right to access goods or receive services.
- BC46G The Board also received a number of comments arguing that mail order catalogues are not a form of advertising and promotion but instead give rise to a distribution network. The Board rejected these arguments, believing that the primary objective of mail order catalogues is to advertise goods to customers. To avoid confusion, the Board decided to include mail order catalogues in the Standard as an example of advertising activities.
- BC46H Some respondents who argued that the cost of mail order catalogues should be capitalised suggested that making an analogy to web site costs in SIC-32 *Intangible Assets—Web Site Costs* would be appropriate. The Board agreed and concluded that its proposed amendments would result in accounting that is almost identical to that resulting from the application of SIC-32. In particular, SIC-32 requires the cost of content (to the extent that it is developed to advertise and promote products and services) to be recognised as an expense as it is incurred. The Board concluded that in the case of a mail order catalogue, the majority of the content is intended to advertise and promote products and services. Therefore, permitting the cost of catalogues to be capitalised while at the same time requiring the cost of developing and uploading web site content used to advertise and promote an entity's products to be recognised as an expense would base the accounting on the nature of the media (paper or electronic) used to deliver the content rather than the nature of the expenditure.
- BC46I The Board also noted that SIC-32 permits expenditure on an internally developed web site to be capitalised only in the 'application and infrastructure development stage'. It requires costs associated with developing the functionality and infrastructure that make a web site operate to be capitalised. In the Board's view, the electronic infrastructure capitalised in accordance with SIC-32 is analogous to the property, plant and equipment infrastructure—for example, a sign—that permits advertising to be displayed to the public not the content that is displayed on that sign.

Subsequent accounting for intangible assets

- BC47 The Board initially decided that the scope of the first phase of its Business Combinations project should include a consideration of the subsequent accounting for intangible assets acquired in business combinations. To that end, the Board initially focused its attention on the following three issues:
- (a) whether an intangible asset with a finite useful life and acquired in a business combination should continue to be accounted for after initial recognition in accordance with IAS 38.
 - (b) whether, and under what circumstances, an intangible asset acquired in a business combination could be regarded as having an indefinite useful life.
 - (c) how an intangible asset with an indefinite useful life (assuming such an asset exists) acquired in a business combination should be accounted for after initial recognition.
- BC48 However, during its deliberations of the issues in (b) and (c) of paragraph BC47, the Board decided that any conclusions it reached on those issues would equally apply to recognised intangible assets obtained other than in a business combination. The Board observed that amending the requirements in the previous version

of IAS 38 only for intangible assets acquired in business combinations would create inconsistencies in the accounting for intangible assets depending on how they are obtained. Thus, similar items would be accounted for in dissimilar ways. The Board concluded that creating such inconsistencies would impair the usefulness of the information provided to users about an entity's intangible assets, because both comparability and reliability (which rests on the notion of representational faithfulness, ie that similar transactions are accounted for in the same way) would be diminished. Therefore, the Board decided that any amendments to the requirements in the previous version of IAS 38 to address the issues in (b) and (c) of paragraph BC47 should apply to all recognised intangible assets, whether generated internally or acquired separately or as part of a business combination.

- BC49 Before beginning its deliberations of the issues identified in paragraph BC47, the Board noted the concern expressed by some that, because of the subjectivity involved in distinguishing goodwill from other intangible assets as at the acquisition date, differences between the subsequent treatment of goodwill and other intangible assets increases the potential for intangible assets to be misclassified at the acquisition date. The Board concluded, however, that adopting the separability and contractual or other legal rights criteria provides a reasonably definitive basis for separately identifying and recognising intangible assets acquired in a business combination. Therefore, the Board decided that its analysis of the accounting for intangible assets after initial recognition should have regard only to the nature of those assets and not to the subsequent treatment of goodwill.

Accounting for intangible assets with finite useful lives acquired in business combinations

- BC50 The Board observed that the previous version of IAS 38 required an intangible asset to be measured after initial recognition:
- (a) at cost less any accumulated amortisation and any accumulated impairment losses; or
 - (b) at a revalued amount, being the asset's fair value, determined by reference to an active market¹⁰, at the date of revaluation less any subsequent accumulated amortisation and any subsequent accumulated impairment losses. Under this approach, revaluations must be made with such regularity that at the balance sheet date the carrying amount of the asset does not differ materially from its fair value.

Whichever of the above methods was used, the previous version of IAS 38 required the depreciable amount of the asset to be amortised on a systematic basis over the best estimate of its useful life.

- BC51 The Board observed that underpinning the requirement for all intangible assets to be amortised is the notion that they all have determinable and finite useful lives. Setting aside the question of whether, and under what circumstances, an intangible asset could be regarded as having an indefinite useful life, an important issue for the Board to consider was whether a departure from the above requirements would be warranted for intangible assets acquired in a business combination that have finite useful lives.
- BC52 The Board observed that any departure from the above requirements for intangible assets with finite lives acquired in business combinations would create inconsistencies between the accounting for recognised intangible assets based wholly on the means by which they are obtained. In other words, similar items would be accounted for in dissimilar ways. The Board concluded that creating such inconsistencies would impair the usefulness of the information provided to users about an entity's intangible assets, because both comparability and reliability would be diminished.
- BC53 Therefore, the Board decided that intangible assets with finite useful lives acquired in business combinations should continue to be accounted for in accordance with the above requirements after initial recognition.

Impairment testing intangible assets with finite useful lives (paragraph 111)

- BC54 The previous version of IAS 38 required the recoverable amount of an intangible asset with a finite useful life that is being amortised over a period of more than 20 years, whether or not acquired in a business combination, to be measured at least at each financial year-end.
- BC55 The Board observed that the recoverable amount of a long-lived tangible asset needs to be measured only when, in accordance with IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets*, there is an indication that the asset may be impaired. The Board could see no conceptual reason for requiring the recoverable amounts of some identifiable assets being amortised over very long periods to be determined more regularly than for other identifiable assets being amortised or depreciated over similar periods. Therefore, the Board concluded that the recoverable amount of

¹⁰ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, defines an active market.

an intangible asset with a finite useful life that is amortised over a period of more than 20 years should be determined only when, in accordance with IAS 36, there is an indication that the asset may be impaired. Consequently, the Board decided to remove the requirement in the previous version of IAS 38 for the recoverable amount of such an intangible asset to be measured at least at each financial year-end.

- BC56 The Board also decided that all of the requirements relating to impairment testing intangible assets should be included in IAS 36 rather than in IAS 38. Therefore, the Board relocated to IAS 36 the requirement in the previous version of IAS 38 that an entity should estimate at the end of each annual reporting period the recoverable amount of an intangible asset not yet available for use, irrespective of whether there is any indication that it may be impaired.

Residual value of an intangible asset with a finite useful life (paragraph 100)

- BC57 In revising IAS 38, the Board considered whether to retain for intangible assets with finite useful lives the requirement in the previous version of IAS 38 for the residual value of an intangible asset to be assumed to be zero unless:
- (a) there is a commitment by a third party to purchase the asset at the end of its useful life; or
 - (b) there is an active market¹¹ for the asset and:
 - (i) the asset's residual value can be determined by reference to that market; and
 - (ii) it is probable that such a market will exist at the end of the asset's useful life.
- BC58 The Board observed that the definition in the previous version of IAS 38 (as amended by IAS 16 when revised in 2003) of residual value required it to be estimated as if the asset were already of the age and in the condition expected at the end of the asset's useful life. Therefore, if the useful life of an intangible asset was shorter than its economic life because the entity expected to sell the asset before the end of that economic life, the asset's residual value would not be zero, irrespective of whether the conditions in paragraph BC57(a) or (b) are met.
- BC59 Nevertheless, the Board observed that the requirement for the residual value of an intangible asset to be assumed to be zero unless the specified criteria are met was included in the previous version of IAS 38 as a means of preventing entities from circumventing the requirement in that Standard to amortise all intangible assets. Excluding this requirement from the revised Standard for finite-lived intangible assets would similarly provide a means of circumventing the requirement to amortise such intangible assets—by claiming that the residual value of such an asset was equal to or greater than its carrying amount, an entity could avoid amortising the asset, even though its useful life is finite. The Board concluded that it should not, as part of the Business Combinations project, modify the criteria for permitting a finite-lived intangible asset's residual value to be other than zero. However, the Board decided that this issue should be addressed as part of a forthcoming project on intangible assets.

Useful lives of intangible assets (paragraphs 88–96)

- BC60 Consistently with the proposals in the Exposure Draft of Proposed Amendments to IAS 38, the Standard requires an intangible asset to be regarded by an entity as having an indefinite useful life when, based on an analysis of all of the relevant factors, there is no foreseeable limit to the period over which the asset is expected to generate net cash inflows for the entity.
- BC61 In developing the Exposure Draft and the revised Standard, the Board observed that the useful life of an intangible asset is related to the expected cash inflows that are associated with that asset. The Board observed that, to be representationally faithful, the amortisation period for an intangible asset generally should reflect that useful life and, by extension, the cash flow streams associated with the asset. The Board concluded that it is possible for management to have the intention and the ability to maintain an intangible asset in such a way that there is no foreseeable limit on the period over which that particular asset is expected to generate net cash inflows for the entity. In other words, it is conceivable that an analysis of all the relevant factors (ie legal, regulatory, contractual, competitive, economic and other) could lead to a conclusion that there is no foreseeable limit to the period over which a particular intangible asset is expected to generate net cash inflows for the entity.
- BC62 For example, the Board observed that some intangible assets are based on legal rights that are conveyed in perpetuity rather than for finite terms. As such, those assets may have cash flows associated with them that may be expected to continue for many years or even indefinitely. The Board concluded that if the cash

¹¹ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, defines an active market.

flows are expected to continue for a finite period, the useful life of the asset is limited to that finite period. However, if the cash flows are expected to continue indefinitely, the useful life is indefinite.

- BC63 The previous version of IAS 38 prescribed a presumptive maximum useful life for intangible assets of 20 years. In developing the Exposure Draft and the revised Standard, the Board concluded that such a presumption is inconsistent with the view that the amortisation period for an intangible asset should, to be representationally faithful, reflect its useful life and, by extension, the cash flow streams associated with the asset. Therefore, the Board decided not to include in the revised Standard a presumptive maximum useful life for intangible assets, even if they have finite useful lives.
- BC64 Respondents to the Exposure Draft generally supported the Board's proposal to remove from IAS 38 the presumptive maximum useful life and instead to require useful life to be regarded as indefinite when, based on an analysis of all of the relevant factors, there is no foreseeable limit to the period of time over which the intangible asset is expected to generate net cash inflows for the entity. However, some respondents suggested that an inability to determine clearly the useful life of an asset applies equally to many items of property, plant and equipment. Nonetheless, entities are required to determine the useful lives of those items of property, plant and equipment, and allocate their depreciable amounts on a systematic basis over those useful lives. Those respondents suggested that there is no conceptual reason for treating intangible assets differently.
- BC65 In considering these comments, the Board noted the following:
- (a) an intangible asset's useful life would be regarded as indefinite in accordance with IAS 38 only when, based on an analysis of all of the relevant factors, there is no foreseeable limit to the period of time over which the asset is expected to generate net cash inflows for the entity. Difficulties in accurately determining an intangible asset's useful life do not provide a basis for regarding that useful life as indefinite.
 - (b) although the useful lives of both intangible and tangible assets are directly related to the period during which they are expected to generate net cash inflows for the entity, the expected physical utility to the entity of a tangible asset places an upper limit on the asset's useful life. In other words, the useful life of a tangible asset could never extend beyond the asset's expected physical utility to the entity.

The Board concluded that tangible assets (other than land) could not be regarded as having indefinite useful lives because there is always a foreseeable limit to the expected physical utility of the asset to the entity.

Useful life constrained by contractual or other legal rights (paragraphs 94–96)

- BC66 The Board noted that the useful life of an intangible asset that arises from contractual or other legal rights is constrained by the duration of those rights. The useful life of such an asset cannot extend beyond the duration of those rights, and may be shorter. Accordingly, the Board concluded that in determining the useful life of an intangible asset, consideration should be given to the period that the entity expects to use the intangible asset, which is subject to the expiration of the contractual or other legal rights.
- BC67 However, the Board also observed that such rights are often conveyed for limited terms that may be renewed. It therefore considered whether renewals should be assumed in determining the useful life of such an intangible asset. The Board noted that some types of licences are initially issued for finite periods but renewals are routinely granted at little cost, provided that licensees have complied with the applicable rules and regulations. Such licences are traded at prices that reflect more than the remaining term, thereby indicating that renewal at minimal cost is the general expectation. However, renewals are not assured for other types of licences and, even if they are renewed, substantial costs may be incurred to secure their renewal.
- BC68 The Board concluded that because the useful lives of some intangible assets depend, in economic terms, on renewal and on the associated costs of renewal, the useful lives assigned to those assets should reflect renewal when there is evidence to support renewal without significant cost.
- BC69 Respondents to the Exposure Draft generally supported this conclusion. Those that disagreed suggested that:
- (a) when the renewal period depends on the decision of a third party and not merely on the fulfilment of specified conditions by the entity, it gives rise to a contingent asset because the third-party decision affects not only the cost of renewal but also the probability of obtaining it. Therefore, useful life should reflect renewal only when renewal is not subject to third-party approval.
 - (b) such a requirement would be inconsistent with the basis used to measure intangible assets at the date of a business combination, particularly contractual customer relationships. For example, it is not clear whether the fair value of a contractual customer relationship includes an amount that reflects the probability that the contract will be renewed. The possibility of renewal would have a fair value

regardless of the costs required to renew. This means the useful life of a contractual customer relationship could be inconsistent with the basis used to determine the fair value of the relationship.¹²

- BC70 In relation to (a) above, the Board observed that if renewal by the entity is subject to third-party (eg government) approval, the requirement that there be evidence to support the entity's ability to renew would compel the entity to make an assessment of the likely effect of the third-party approval process on the entity's ability to renew. The Board could see no conceptual basis for narrowing the requirement to situations in which the contractual or legal rights are not subject to the approval of third parties.
- BC71 In relation to (b) above, the Board observed the following:
- (a) the requirements relating to renewal periods address circumstances in which *the entity* is able to renew the contractual or other legal rights, notwithstanding that such renewal may, for example, be conditional on the entity satisfying specified conditions, or subject to third-party approval. Paragraph 94 of the Standard states that '... the useful life of the intangible asset shall include the renewal period(s) only if there is evidence to support renewal *by the entity* [emphasis added] without significant cost.' The ability to renew a customer contract normally rests with the customer and not with the entity.
 - (b) the respondents seem to regard as a single intangible asset what is, in substance, two intangible assets—one being the customer contract and the other being the related customer relationship. Expected renewals by the customer would affect the fair value of the customer relationship intangible asset, rather than the fair value of the customer contract. Therefore, the useful life of the customer contract would not, under the Standard, extend beyond the term of the contract, nor would the fair value of that customer contract reflect expectations of renewal by the customer. In other words, the useful life of the customer contract would not be inconsistent with the basis used to determine its fair value.
- BC72 However, in response to respondents' suggestions, the Board included paragraph 96 in the Standard to provide additional guidance on the circumstances in which an entity should be regarded as being able to renew the contractual or other legal rights without significant cost.

Intangible assets with finite useful lives (paragraph 98)¹³

- BC72A The last sentence of paragraph 98 previously stated, 'There is rarely, if ever, persuasive evidence to support an amortisation method for intangible assets with finite useful lives that results in a lower amount of accumulated amortisation than under the straight line method.' In practice, this wording was perceived as preventing an entity from using the unit of production method to amortise assets if it resulted in a lower amount of accumulated amortisation than the straight-line method. However, using the straight-line method could be inconsistent with the general requirement of paragraph 38 that the amortisation method should reflect the expected pattern of consumption of the expected future economic benefits embodied in an intangible asset. Consequently, the Board decided to delete the last sentence of paragraph 98.

Accounting for intangible assets with indefinite useful lives (paragraphs 107–110)

- BC73 Consistently with the proposals in the Exposure Draft, the Standard prohibits the amortisation of intangible assets with indefinite useful lives. Therefore, such assets are measured after initial recognition at:
- (a) cost less any accumulated impairment losses; or
 - (b) a revalued amount, being fair value determined by reference to an active market¹⁴ less any accumulated impairment losses.

Non-amortisation

- BC74 In developing the Exposure Draft and the revised Standard, the Board observed that many assets yield benefits to an entity over several periods. Amortisation is the systematic allocation of the cost (or revalued amount) of an asset, less any residual value, to reflect the consumption over time of the future economic benefits embodied in that asset. Thus, if there is no foreseeable limit on the period during which an entity expects to consume the future economic benefits embodied in an asset, amortisation of that asset over, for example, an arbitrarily

¹² IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, contains the requirements for measuring fair value.

¹³ This heading and paragraph BC72A were added by *Improvements to IFRSs* issued in May 2008.

¹⁴ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, defines an active market.

determined maximum period would not be representationally faithful. Respondents to the Exposure Draft generally supported this conclusion.

- BC75 Consequently, the Board decided that intangible assets with indefinite useful lives should not be amortised, but should be subject to regular impairment testing. The Board's deliberations on the form of the impairment test, including the frequency of impairment testing, are included in the Basis for Conclusions on IAS 36. The Board further decided that regular re-examinations should be required of the useful life of an intangible asset that is not being amortised to determine whether circumstances continue to support the assessment that the useful life is indefinite.

Revaluations

- BC76 Having decided that intangible assets with indefinite useful lives should not be amortised, the Board considered whether an entity should be permitted to carry such assets at revalued amounts. The Board could see no conceptual justification for precluding some intangible assets from being carried at revalued amounts solely on the basis that there is no foreseeable limit to the period over which an entity expects to consume the future economic benefits embodied in those assets.
- BC77 As a result, the Board decided that the Standard should permit intangible assets with indefinite useful lives to be carried at revalued amounts.

Revaluation method—proportionate restatement of accumulated amortisation when an intangible asset is revalued

- BC77A The IFRS Interpretations Committee reported to the Board that practice differed in calculating the accumulated depreciation for an item of property, plant and equipment that is measured using the revaluation method in cases in which the residual value, the useful life or the depreciation method has been re-estimated before a revaluation.
- BC77B The reasons for making the change are further explained in paragraphs BC25A–BC25G of IAS 16.
- BC77C The Board noted that the issue in paragraphs BC25A–BC25G of IAS 16 regarding accumulated depreciation upon revaluation could also occur when revaluing an intangible asset under IAS 38, because both IAS 16 and IAS 38 have the same requirements for accumulated depreciation/amortisation when revaluing items of property, plant and equipment/intangible assets. Differences in the revaluation models for items of property, plant and equipment and intangible assets do not result in different models for restating accumulated depreciation/amortisation. For example, IAS 38 requires that the fair value of an intangible asset is measured by reference to an active market. Otherwise, the revaluation model cannot be applied. However, IAS 38 requires fair value measurement by reference to an active market only for the carrying amount of an intangible asset in contrast to its gross carrying amount.
- BC77D Consequently, the Board decided to amend paragraph 80(a) to state that:
- (a) the gross carrying amount is adjusted in a manner that is consistent with the revaluation of the carrying amount; and
 - (b) the accumulated amortisation is calculated as the difference between the gross carrying amount and the carrying amount after taking into account accumulated impairment losses.
- The Board also decided to amend paragraph 80(b) to be consistent with the wording used in those amendments.
- BC77E The Board decided to include wording in paragraph 80(a) to require an entity to take into account accumulated impairment losses when adjusting the amortisation on revaluation. This was to ensure that when future revaluation increases occur, the correct split according to paragraph 85 of IAS 38 and paragraph 119 of IAS 36 is made between profit or loss and other comprehensive income when reversing prior accumulated impairment losses.

Research and development projects acquired in business combinations

- BC78 The Board considered the following issues in relation to in-process research and development (IPR&D) projects acquired in a business combination:
- (a) whether the proposed criteria for recognising intangible assets acquired in a business combination separately from goodwill should also be applied to IPR&D projects;
 - (b) the subsequent accounting for IPR&D projects recognised as assets separately from goodwill; and

- (c) the treatment of subsequent expenditure on IPR&D projects recognised as assets separately from goodwill.

The Board's deliberations on issue (a), although included in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 3, are also, for the sake of completeness, outlined below.

- BC79 The Board did not reconsider as part of the first phase of its Business Combinations project the requirements in the previous version of IAS 38 for internally generated intangibles and expenditure on the research or development phase of an internal project. The Board decided that a reconsideration of those requirements is outside the scope of this project.

Initial recognition separately from goodwill

- BC80 The Board observed that the criteria in IAS 22 *Business Combinations* and the previous version of IAS 38 for recognising an intangible asset acquired in a business combination separately from goodwill applied to all intangible assets, including IPR&D projects. Therefore, in accordance with those Standards, any intangible item acquired in a business combination was recognised as an asset separately from goodwill when it was identifiable and could be measured reliably, and it was probable that any associated future economic benefits would flow to the acquirer. If these criteria were not satisfied, the expenditure on the cost or value of that item, which was included in the cost of the combination, was part of the amount attributed to goodwill.
- BC81 The Board could see no conceptual justification for changing the approach in IAS 22 and the previous version of IAS 38 of using the same criteria for all intangible assets acquired in a business combination when assessing whether those assets should be recognised separately from goodwill. The Board concluded that adopting different criteria would impair the usefulness of the information provided to users about the assets acquired in a combination because both comparability and reliability would be diminished. Therefore, IAS 38 and IFRS 3 require an acquirer to recognise as an asset separately from goodwill any of the acquiree's IPR&D projects that meet the definition of an intangible asset. This will be the case when the IPR&D project meets the definition of an asset and is identifiable, ie is separable or arises from contractual or other legal rights.
- BC82 Some respondents to the Exposure Draft of Proposed Amendments to IAS 38 expressed concern that applying the same criteria to all intangible assets acquired in a business combination to assess whether they should be recognised separately from goodwill results in treating some IPR&D projects acquired in business combinations differently from similar projects started internally. The Board acknowledged this point, but concluded that this does not provide a basis for subsuming those acquired intangible assets within goodwill. Rather, it highlights a need to reconsider the conclusion in the Standard that an intangible asset can never exist in respect of an in-process research project and can exist in respect of an in-process development project only once all of the Standard's criteria for deferral have been satisfied. The Board decided that such a reconsideration is outside the scope of its Business Combinations project.

Subsequent accounting for IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination and recognised as intangible assets

- BC83 The Board observed that the previous version of IAS 38 required all recognised intangible assets to be accounted for after initial recognition at:
- (a) cost less any accumulated amortisation and any accumulated impairment losses; or
 - (b) revalued amount, being the asset's fair value, determined by reference to an active market¹⁵, at the date of revaluation less any subsequent accumulated amortisation and any subsequent accumulated impairment losses.
- Such assets included: IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination that satisfied the criteria for recognition separately from goodwill; separately acquired IPR&D projects that satisfied the criteria for recognition as an intangible asset; and recognised internally developed intangible assets arising from development or the development phase of an internal project.
- BC84 The Board could see no conceptual justification for changing the approach in the previous version of IAS 38 of applying the same requirements to the subsequent accounting for all recognised intangible assets. Therefore, the Board decided that IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination that satisfy the criteria for recognition as an asset separately from goodwill should be accounted for after initial recognition

¹⁵ IFRS 13, issued in May 2011, defines an active market.

in accordance with the requirements applying to the subsequent accounting for other recognised intangible assets.

Subsequent expenditure on IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination and recognised as intangible assets (paragraphs 42 and 43)

- BC85 The Standard requires subsequent expenditure on an IPR&D project acquired separately or in a business combination and recognised as an intangible asset to be:
- (a) recognised as an expense when incurred if it is research expenditure;
 - (b) recognised as an expense when incurred if it is development expenditure that does not satisfy the criteria for recognition as an intangible asset in paragraph 57; and
 - (c) added to the carrying amount of the acquired IPR&D project if it is development expenditure that satisfies the recognition criteria in paragraph 57.
- BC86 In developing this requirement the Board observed that the treatment required under the previous version of IAS 38 of subsequent expenditure on an IPR&D project acquired in a business combination and recognised as an asset separately from goodwill was unclear. Some suggested that the requirements in the previous version of IAS 38 relating to expenditure on research, development, or the research or development phase of an internal project should be applied. However, others argued that those requirements were ostensibly concerned with the initial recognition and measurement of internally generated intangible assets. Instead, the requirements in the previous version of IAS 38 dealing with subsequent expenditure should be applied. Under those requirements, subsequent expenditure on an intangible asset after its purchase or completion would have been recognised as an expense when incurred unless:
- (a) it was probable that the expenditure would enable the asset to generate future economic benefits in excess of its originally assessed standard of performance; and
 - (b) the expenditure could be measured and attributed to the asset reliably.
- If these conditions were satisfied, the subsequent expenditure would be added to the carrying amount of the intangible asset.
- BC87 The Board observed that this uncertainty also existed for separately acquired IPR&D projects that satisfied the criteria in the previous version of IAS 38 for recognition as intangible assets.
- BC88 The Board noted that applying the requirements in the Standard for expenditure on research, development, or the research or development phase of an internal project to subsequent expenditure on IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination and recognised as assets separately from goodwill would result in such subsequent expenditure being treated inconsistently with subsequent expenditure on other recognised intangible assets. However, applying the subsequent expenditure requirements in the previous version of IAS 38 to subsequent expenditure on IPR&D projects acquired in a business combination and recognised as assets separately from goodwill would result in research and development expenditure being accounted for differently depending on whether a project is acquired or started internally.
- BC89 The Board concluded that until it has had the opportunity to review the requirements in IAS 38 for expenditure on research, development, or the research or development phase of an internal project, more useful information will be provided to users of an entity's financial statements if all such expenditure is accounted for consistently. This includes subsequent expenditure on a separately acquired IPR&D project that satisfies the Standard's criteria for recognition as an intangible asset.

Transitional provisions (paragraphs 129–132)

- BC90 If an entity elects to apply IFRS 3 from any date before the effective dates outlined in IFRS 3, it is also required to apply IAS 38 prospectively from that same date. Otherwise, IAS 38 applies to the accounting for intangible assets acquired in business combinations for which the agreement date is on or after 31 March 2004, and to the accounting for all other intangible assets prospectively from the beginning of the first annual reporting period beginning on or after 31 March 2004. IAS 38 also requires an entity, on initial application, to reassess the useful lives of intangible assets. If, as a result of that reassessment, the entity changes its useful life assessment for an asset, that change is accounted for as a change in an accounting estimate in accordance with IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors*.

- BC91 The Board's deliberations on the transitional issues relating to the initial recognition of intangible assets acquired in business combinations and the impairment testing of intangible assets are addressed in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 3 and the Basis for Conclusions on IAS 36, respectively.
- BC92 In developing the requirements outlined in paragraph BC90, the Board considered the following three questions:
- (a) should the useful lives of, and the accounting for, intangible assets already recognised at the effective date of the Standard continue to be determined in accordance with the requirements in the previous version of IAS 38 (ie by amortising over a presumptive maximum period of twenty years), or in accordance with the requirements in the revised Standard?
 - (b) if the revised Standard is applied to intangible assets already recognised at its effective date, should the effect of a reassessment of an intangible asset's useful life as a result of the initial application of the Standard be recognised retrospectively or prospectively?
 - (c) should entities be required to apply the requirements in the Standard for subsequent expenditure on an acquired IPR&D project recognised as an intangible asset retrospectively to expenditure incurred before the effective date of the revised Standard?
- BC93 In relation to the first question above, the Board noted its previous conclusion that the most representationally faithful method of accounting for intangible assets is to amortise those with finite useful lives over their useful lives with no limit on the amortisation period, and not to amortise those with indefinite useful lives. Thus, the Board concluded that the reliability and comparability of financial statements would be diminished if the Standard was not applied to intangible assets recognised before its effective date.
- BC94 On the second question, the Board observed that a reassessment of an asset's useful life is regarded throughout IFRSs as a change in an accounting estimate, rather than a change in an accounting policy. For example, in accordance with the Standard, as with the previous version of IAS 38, if a new estimate of the expected useful life of an intangible asset is significantly different from previous estimates, the change must be accounted for as a change in accounting estimate in accordance with IAS 8. IAS 8 requires a change in an accounting estimate to be accounted for prospectively by including the effect of the change in profit or loss in:
- (a) the period of the change, if the change in estimate affects that period only; or
 - (b) the period of the change and future periods, if the change in estimate affects both.
- BC95 Similarly, in accordance with IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment*, if a new estimate of the expected useful life of an item of property, plant and equipment is significantly different from previous estimates, the change must be accounted for prospectively by adjusting the depreciation expense for the current and future periods.
- BC96 Therefore, the Board decided that a reassessment of useful life resulting from the initial application of IAS 38, including a reassessment from a finite to an indefinite useful life, should be accounted for as a change in an accounting estimate. Consequently, the effect of such a change should be recognised prospectively.
- BC97 The Board considered the view that because the previous version of IAS 38 required intangible assets to be treated as having a finite useful life, a change to an assessment of indefinite useful life for an intangible asset represents a change in an accounting policy, rather than a change in an accounting estimate. The Board concluded that, even if this were the case, the useful life reassessment should nonetheless be accounted for prospectively. This is because retrospective application would require an entity to determine whether, at the end of each reporting period before the effective date of the Standard, the useful life of an intangible asset was indefinite. Such an assessment requires an entity to make estimates that would have been made at a prior date, and therefore raises problems in relation to the role of hindsight, in particular, whether the benefit of hindsight should be included or excluded from those estimates and, if excluded, how the effect of hindsight can be separated from the other factors existing at the date for which the estimates are required.
- BC98 On the third question, and as noted in paragraph BC86, it was not clear whether the previous version of IAS 38 required subsequent expenditure on acquired IPR&D projects recognised as intangible assets to be accounted for:
- (a) in accordance with its requirements for expenditure on research, development, or the research or development phase of an internal project; or
 - (b) in accordance with its requirements for subsequent expenditure on an intangible asset after its purchase or completion.

The Board concluded that subsequent expenditure on an acquired IPR&D project that was capitalised under (b) above before the effective date of the Standard might not have been capitalised had the Standard applied when the subsequent expenditure was incurred. This is because the Standard requires such expenditure to be

capitalised as an intangible asset only when it is development expenditure and all of the criteria for deferral are satisfied. In the Board's view, those criteria represent a higher recognition threshold than (b) above.

- BC99 Thus, retrospective application of the revised Standard to subsequent expenditure on acquired IPR&D projects incurred before its effective date could result in previously capitalised expenditure being reversed. Such reversal would be required if the expenditure was research expenditure, or it was development expenditure and one or more of the criteria for deferral were not satisfied at the time the expenditure was incurred. The Board concluded that determining whether, at the time the subsequent expenditure was incurred, the criteria for deferral were satisfied raises the same hindsight issues discussed in paragraph BC97: it would require assessments to be made as of a prior date, and therefore raises problems in relation to how the effect of hindsight can be separated from factors existing at the date of the assessment. In addition, such assessments could, in many cases, be impossible: the information needed may not exist or no longer be obtainable.
- BC100 Therefore, the Board decided that the Standard's requirements for subsequent expenditure on acquired IPR&D projects recognised as intangible assets should not be applied retrospectively to expenditure incurred before the revised Standard's effective date. The Board noted that any amounts previously included in the carrying amount of such an asset would, in any event, be subject to the requirements for impairment testing in IAS 36.

Revaluation method—proportionate restatement of accumulated amortisation when an intangible asset is revalued

- BC100A *Annual Improvements to IFRSs 2010–2012 Cycle*, issued in December 2013, amended paragraph 80. The Board also decided that the amendment should be required to be applied to all revaluations occurring in annual periods beginning on or after the date of initial application of the amendment and in the immediately preceding annual period. The Board was concerned that the costs of full retrospective application might outweigh the benefits.

Early application (paragraph 132)

- BC101 The Board noted that the issue of any Standard reflects its opinion that application of the Standard will result in more useful information being provided to users about an entity's financial position, performance or cash flows. On that basis, a case exists for permitting, and indeed encouraging, entities to apply the revised Standard before its effective date. However, the Board also considered the assertion that permitting a revised Standard to be applied before its effective date potentially diminishes comparability between entities in the period(s) leading up to that effective date, and has the effect of providing entities with an option.
- BC102 The Board concluded that the benefit of providing users with more useful information about an entity's financial position and performance by permitting early application of the Standard outweighs the disadvantages of potentially diminished comparability. Therefore, entities are encouraged to apply the requirements of the revised Standard before its effective date, provided they also apply IFRS 3 and IAS 36 (as revised in 2004) at the same time.

Summary of main changes from the Exposure Draft

- BC103 The following are the main changes from the Exposure Draft of Proposed Amendments to IAS 38:
- (a) The Standard includes additional guidance clarifying the relationship between the separability criterion for establishing whether a non-contractual customer relationship is identifiable, and the control concept for establishing whether the relationship meets the definition of an asset. In particular, the Standard clarifies that in the absence of legal rights to protect customer relationships, exchange transactions for the same or similar non-contractual customer relationships (other than as part of a business combination) provide evidence that the entity is nonetheless able to control the future economic benefits flowing from the customer relationships. Because such exchange transactions also provide evidence that the customer relationships are separable, those customer relationships meet the definition of an intangible asset (see paragraphs BC11–BC14).
 - (b) The Exposure Draft proposed that, except for an assembled workforce, an intangible asset acquired in a business combination should always be recognised separately from goodwill; there was a presumption that sufficient information would always exist to measure reliably its fair value. The Standard states that the fair value of an intangible asset acquired in a business combination can *normally* be measured with sufficient reliability to qualify for recognition separately from goodwill. If an intangible asset acquired in a business combination has a finite useful life, there is a rebuttable presumption that its fair value can be measured reliably (see paragraphs BC16–BC25).

- (c) The Exposure Draft proposed, and the Standard requires, that the useful life of an intangible asset arising from contractual or other legal rights should not exceed the period of those rights. However, if the rights are conveyed for a limited term that can be renewed, the useful life should include the renewal period(s) only if there is evidence to support renewal by the entity without significant cost. Additional guidance has been included in the Standard to clarify the circumstances in which an entity should be regarded as being able to renew the contractual or other legal rights without significant cost (see paragraphs BC66–BC72).

History of the development of a standard on intangible assets

- BCZ104 IASC published a Draft Statement of Principles on Intangible Assets in January 1994 and an Exposure Draft E50 *Intangible Assets* in June 1995. Principles in both documents were consistent as far as possible with those in IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment*. The principles were also greatly influenced by the decisions reached in 1993 during the revisions to the treatment of research and development costs and goodwill.
- BCZ105 IASC received about 100 comment letters on E50 from over 20 countries. Comment letters on E50 showed that the proposal for the amortisation period for intangible assets—a 20-year ceiling for almost all intangible assets, as required for goodwill in IAS 22 (revised 1993)—raised significant controversy and created serious concerns about the overall acceptability of the proposed standard on intangible assets. IASC considered alternative solutions and concluded in March 1996 that, if an impairment test that is sufficiently robust and reliable could be developed, IASC would propose deleting the 20-year ceiling on the amortisation period for both intangible assets and goodwill.
- BCZ106 In August 1997, IASC published proposals for revised treatments for intangible assets and goodwill in Exposure Drafts E60 *Intangible Assets* and E61 *Business Combinations*. This followed the publication of Exposure Draft E55 *Impairment of Assets* in May 1997, which set out detailed proposals for impairment testing.
- BCZ107 E60 proposed two major changes to the proposals in E50:
- (a) as explained above, revised proposals for the amortisation of intangible assets; and
 - (b) combining the requirements relating to all internally generated intangible assets in one standard. This meant including certain aspects of IAS 9 *Research and Development Costs* in the proposed standard on intangible assets and withdrawing IAS 9.
- BCZ108 Among other proposed changes, E61 proposed revisions to IAS 22 to make the requirements for the amortisation of goodwill consistent with those proposed for intangible assets.
- BCZ109 IASC received about 100 comment letters on E60 and E61 from over 20 countries. The majority of the commentators supported most of the proposals in E60 and E61, although some proposals still raised significant controversy. The proposals for impairment tests were also supported by most commentators on E55.
- BCZ110 After considering the comments received on E55, E60 and E61, IASC approved:
- (a) IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets* (April 1998);
 - (b) IAS 38 *Intangible Assets* (July 1998);
 - (c) a revised IAS 22 *Business Combinations* (July 1998); and
 - (d) withdrawal of IAS 9 *Research and Development Costs* (July 1998).

Dissenting Opinions

Dissent of Geoffrey Whittington from IAS 38 issued in March 2004

- DO1 Professor Whittington dissents from the issue of this Standard because it does not explicitly require the probability recognition criterion in paragraph 21(a) to be applied to intangible assets acquired in a business combination, notwithstanding that it applies to all other intangible assets.
- DO2 The reason given for this (paragraphs 33 and BC17) is that fair value is the required measurement on acquisition of an intangible asset as part of a business combination, and fair value incorporates probability assessments. Professor Whittington does not believe that the *Framework*¹⁶ precludes having a prior recognition test based on probability, even when subsequent recognition is at fair value. Moreover, the application of probability may be different for recognition purposes: for example, it may be the ‘more likely than not’ criterion used in IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*, rather than the ‘expected value’ approach used in the measurement of fair value.
- DO3 This inconsistency between the recognition criteria in the *Framework* and fair values is acknowledged in paragraph BC18. In Professor Whittington’s view, the inconsistency should be resolved before changing the recognition criteria for intangible assets acquired in a business combination.

¹⁶ The references to the *Framework* are to IASC’s *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, adopted by the IASB in 2001. In September 2010 the IASB replaced the *Framework* with the *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting*.

Dissent of James J Leisenring from amendments issued in May 2008

- DO1 Mr Leisenring dissents from the amendments to IAS 38 *Intangible Assets* made by *Improvements* to IFRSs issued in May 2008.
- DO2 Mr Leisenring believes that the Board's amendments introduce a logical flaw into IAS 38. Paragraph 68 states that 'expenditure on an intangible item shall be recognised as an expense when it is incurred unless' specific conditions apply. The amendments to paragraph 69 include guidance on the accounting for expenditure on a tangible rather than an intangible item and therefore the amendment to paragraph 69 is inconsistent with paragraph 68.
- DO3 Extending the application of IAS 38 to tangible assets used for advertising also raises application concerns. Are signs constructed by a restaurant chain at their location an advertising expense in the period of construction? Would the costs of putting an entity's name on trucks, airplanes and buildings be an advertising expense in the year incurred? The logic of this amendment would suggest an affirmative answer to these questions even though the result of the expenditure benefits several periods.
- DO4 Mr Leisenring believes that if an entity acquires goods, including items such as catalogues, film strips or other materials, the entity should determine whether those goods meet the definition of an asset. In his view, IAS 38 is not relevant for determining whether goods acquired by an entity and which may be used for advertising should be recognised as an asset.
- DO5 Mr Leisenring agrees that the potential benefit that might result from having advertised should not be recognised as an intangible asset in accordance with IAS 38.

IAS 38 *Intangible Assets* Illustrative Examples

These examples accompany, but are not part of, IAS 38.

Assessing the useful lives of intangible assets

The following guidance provides examples on determining the useful life of an intangible asset in accordance with IAS 38.

Each of the following examples describes an acquired intangible asset, the facts and circumstances surrounding the determination of its useful life, and the subsequent accounting based on that determination.

Example 1 An acquired customer list

A direct-mail marketing company acquires a customer list and expects that it will be able to derive benefit from the information on the list for at least one year, but no more than three years.

The customer list would be amortised over management's best estimate of its useful life, say 18 months. Although the direct-mail marketing company may intend to add customer names and other information to the list in the future, the expected benefits of the acquired customer list relate only to the customers on that list at the date it was acquired. The customer list also would be reviewed for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 *Impairment of Assets* by assessing at the end of each reporting period whether there is any indication that the customer list may be impaired.

Example 2 An acquired patent that expires in 15 years

The product protected by the patented technology is expected to be a source of net cash inflows for at least 15 years. The entity has a commitment from a third party to purchase that patent in five years for 60 per cent of the fair value of the patent at the date it was acquired, and the entity intends to sell the patent in five years.

The patent would be amortised over its five-year useful life to the entity, with a residual value equal to the present value of 60 per cent of the patent's fair value at the date it was acquired. The patent would also be reviewed for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 by assessing at the end of each reporting period whether there is any indication that it may be impaired.

Example 3 An acquired copyright that has a remaining legal life of 50 years

An analysis of consumer habits and market trends provides evidence that the copyrighted material will generate net cash inflows for only 30 more years.

The copyright would be amortised over its 30-year estimated useful life. The copyright also would be reviewed for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 by assessing at the end of each reporting period whether there is any indication that it may be impaired.

Example 4 An acquired broadcasting licence that expires in five years

The broadcasting licence is renewable every 10 years if the entity provides at least an average level of service to its customers and complies with the relevant legislative requirements. The licence may be renewed indefinitely at little cost and has been renewed twice before the most recent acquisition. The acquiring entity intends to renew the licence indefinitely and evidence supports its ability to do so. Historically, there has been no compelling challenge to the licence renewal. The technology used in broadcasting is not expected to be replaced by another technology at any time in the foreseeable future. Therefore, the licence is expected to contribute to the entity's net cash inflows indefinitely.

The broadcasting licence would be treated as having an indefinite useful life because it is expected to contribute to the entity's net cash inflows indefinitely. Therefore, the licence would not be amortised until its useful life is determined to be finite. The licence would be tested for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 annually and whenever there is an indication that it may be impaired.

Example 5 The broadcasting licence in Example 4

The licensing authority subsequently decides that it will no longer renew broadcasting licences, but rather will auction the licences. At the time the licensing authority's decision is made, the entity's broadcasting licence has three years until it expires. The entity expects that the licence will continue to contribute to net cash inflows until the licence expires.

Because the broadcasting licence can no longer be renewed, its useful life is no longer indefinite. Thus, the acquired licence would be amortised over its remaining three-year useful life and immediately tested for impairment in accordance with IAS 36.

Example 6 An acquired airline route authority between two European cities that expires in three years

The route authority may be renewed every five years, and the acquiring entity intends to comply with the applicable rules and regulations surrounding renewal. Route authority renewals are routinely granted at a minimal cost and historically have been renewed when the airline has complied with the applicable rules and regulations. The acquiring entity expects to provide service indefinitely between the two cities from its hub airports and expects that the related supporting infrastructure (airport gates, slots, and terminal facility leases) will remain in place at those airports for as long as it has the route authority. An analysis of demand and cash flows supports those assumptions.

Because the facts and circumstances support the acquiring entity's ability to continue providing air service indefinitely between the two cities, the intangible asset related to the route authority is treated as having an indefinite useful life. Therefore, the route authority would not be amortised until its useful life is determined to be finite. It would be tested for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 annually and whenever there is an indication that it may be impaired.

Example 7 An acquired trademark used to identify and distinguish a leading consumer product that has been a market-share leader for the past eight years

The trademark has a remaining legal life of five years but is renewable every 10 years at little cost. The acquiring entity intends to renew the trademark continuously and evidence supports its ability to do so. An analysis of (1) product life cycle studies, (2) market, competitive and environmental trends, and (3) brand extension opportunities provides evidence that the trademarked product will generate net cash inflows for the acquiring entity for an indefinite period.

The trademark would be treated as having an indefinite useful life because it is expected to contribute to net cash inflows indefinitely. Therefore, the trademark would not be amortised until its useful life is determined to be finite. It would be tested for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 annually and whenever there is an indication that it may be impaired.

Example 8 A trademark acquired 10 years ago that distinguishes a leading consumer product

The trademark was regarded as having an indefinite useful life when it was acquired because the trademarked product was expected to generate net cash inflows indefinitely. However, unexpected competition has recently entered the market and will reduce future sales of the product. Management estimates that net cash inflows generated by the product will be 20 per cent less for the foreseeable future. However, management expects that the product will continue to generate net cash inflows indefinitely at those reduced amounts.

As a result of the projected decrease in future net cash inflows, the entity determines that the estimated recoverable amount of the trademark is less than its carrying amount, and an impairment loss is recognised. Because it is still regarded as having an indefinite useful life, the trademark would continue not to be amortised but would be tested for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 annually and whenever there is an indication that it may be impaired.

Example 9 A trademark for a line of products that was acquired several years ago in a business combination

At the time of the business combination the acquiree had been producing the line of products for 35 years with many new models developed under the trademark. At the acquisition date the acquirer expected to continue producing the line, and an analysis of various economic factors indicated there was no limit to the period the trademark would

contribute to net cash inflows. Consequently, the trademark was not amortised by the acquirer. However, management has recently decided that production of the product line will be discontinued over the next four years.

Because the useful life of the acquired trademark is no longer regarded as indefinite, the carrying amount of the trademark would be tested for impairment in accordance with IAS 36 and amortised over its remaining four-year useful life.