



Key FAS 133/IAS 39 Difference

Jeff Wallace
Managing Partner
Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

www.greenwichtreasury.com

Major Differences

- IAS 39 basically encompasses FAS 115 and FAS 133, so we will mention a few financial instrument accounting differences
- The major difference, of course, is IFRS's principles-based approach versus US GAAP's rules and bright lines
 - Under IFRS, preparers and auditors are required to look through to the economics of the transaction and pay less attention to the form
 - However, where IFRS is silent, often auditors and preparers will turn to US GAAP for guidance



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

1

Important Reference Sources

- **2008 IFRS Bound Volume** As of 1/1/08, it includes all approved IFRS and IASB standards, Interpretations and Implementation Guidance
 - The IG to IAS 39 is quite extensive and useful and is a must reference source for going to IAS 39 hedge accounting
 - IASCF shop at www.iasb.org.
- Also Deloitte's **iGAAP 2007 Financial Instruments: IAS 32, IAS 39 and IFRS 7 Explained**
 - Extremely valuable guide to IAS 39, with good discussions of FAS 133 differences
 - www.cch.co.uk, £65



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

2

Major Differences – Financial Instruments

| Issue | Differences |
|--|---|
| Loans and receivables can be designated as AFS | Allowed under IAS 39, not under FAS 115 |
| Investments in unlisted securities | Under 39, fair value if they can be reliably measured, otherwise historic cost. FAS 115 requires historic cost. |
| Reversal of impairment losses on investments | Under 39, required for AFS and HTM; not allowed at all under 115. |
| Convertible debt | IFRS requires convertible debt to be split between equity and debt, no such bifurcation in US GAAP. |



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

3

Major Differences – General Hedging

| Issue | Differences |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Derivative definition | IAS 39 defines a derivative similarly to FAS 133, except that it does not require a notional amount, unlike FAS 133. This distinction could make a difference regarding whether there exists an embedded derivative that needs to be bifurcated and reported separately. |
| Probability of Hedged CF Items | 39 requires that hedged forecasts must be highly probable and provides some detailed guidance, while FAS 133 requires that the forecast be probable and provides little guidance. It is possible that some FAS 133 probable hedges would not be allowed under FAS 133 by a strict auditor. |
| Critical Terms Match | Allowed prospectively under 39, but not retrospectively. Allowed for both under 133, but is now considered a dangerous choice |
| Shortcut Treatment | Allowed prospectively under 39, but not retrospectively. Allowed for both under 133, but is now considered a dangerous choice |



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

4

Major Differences – General & FX Hedging

| Issue | Differences |
|---|--|
| CF Hedged Item basis adjustment | Under IFRS, there is the option to adjust the hedged item's basis to reflect the AOCI gain/loss, while under 133, no basis adjustment is allowed. |
| Credit risk of derivative counterparty | Per IAS 39 Implementation Guidance F.4.3, counterparty credit risk must be included in any IAS 39 hedge documentation. This is not explicitly required in FAS 133, but is very often done. |
| Hedging FX Exposures | 133 requires that the entity with the FX exposure must do the hedging. 39 allows the hedging to be done in any group company. |
| Option hedging under G20 | 39 has nothing comparable to G20 and requires that option hedges must exclude time value in calculating effectiveness, something whose P&L impact makes option hedging unattractive to many. |
| Foreign currency acquisition firm commitments | Hedgeable under 39, not hedgeable under 133 |



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

5

Major Differences – FX & Interest Rate Hedging

| Issue | Differences |
|--|--|
| Hedging inter-co interest, royalties and O/H charges | Per the IAS 39 April 2005 Amendment, interco royalties, interco interest, O/H and other management charges between units are not considered to affect consolidated net income and thus they are not hedgeable items under IAS 39, unlike FAS 133. |
| Netting of cash flow hedges | IAS 39 has no equivalent of FAS 133.40A-C regarding netting of CF exposures. Under 39, hedges need to be hedged gross with an interco derivative from the hedging center to the sub and an external matching derivative. Practically, IFRS treasuries hedge the net and ask their banks to provide trade confirms for the gross exposures. |
| B/S foreign currency items | Can be used as Cash Flow hedge instruments under IAS 39, but not for FAS 133. |
| Partial term interest rate hedges | Effective hedges under 39. While permitted under 133, partial term hedges probably would not be effective hedges. |



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

6

Impact on FAS 133R on IAS 39

- Since the FAS 133R Exposure Draft was written in consultation with the IASB, it is likely that any changes made to FAS 133 will be reflected in IAS 39 at some point
- However, as explained in the FAS 133R presentation, it is not at all clear that FAS 133R will be finalized in its present form



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

7

About Greenwich Treasury — 1

Since 1992, Greenwich Treasury Advisors has been delivering integrated treasury solutions for over 300 global businesses:

- Risk
 - FX/IR/commodity risk assessment and policies
 - FAS 133/IAS 39 hedging and documentation
 - Performance measurement
 - Best practices
- Cash
 - Global liquidity management
 - Cross-border cash consolidation
 - Bank reviews and RFP development



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

8

About Greenwich Treasury — 2

- Structures
 - Diagnostic treasury reviews
 - Implementing spin-offs and merger treasuries
 - In-house banking and outsourcing
- Technology
 - Treasury system RFP's, review and selection
 - Treasury intranet and web application design
- For more info, visit www.greenwichtreasury.com
 - Free articles on risk management, FAS 133, treasury systems and treasury maxims at </articles.cfm>



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

9

Representative Clients

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Alcan | International Paper |
| Amgen | McDonald's |
| BP | Merck |
| CITGO | Nestle |
| DaimlerChrysler | Novartis |
| Dow Chemical | NZ Dairy Board |
| DuPont | Procter & Gamble |
| EDS | Saint-Gobain |
| General Motors | Siemens |
| Hydro-Quebec | TRW Automotive |



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

10

Jeff Wallace

- Founded GTA in 1992, and author of:
 - *The Group of 31 Report: Core Principles for Managing MNC FX Risk* (Association for Finance Professionals, 1999)
 - FAS 133 chapter of *The Handbook of International Finance & Accounting* (2004, John Wiley)
- Advised over 50 companies and six system vendors, Financial Sciences, FXpress, Principia Partners, Simcorp, SunGard and Wall Street Systems, on FAS 133 compliance
- Formerly VP-International Treasury at American Express, AT at Seagram and at D&B; CPA at PW
- Phone: 303-566-9119
- Email: jeff.wallace@greenwichtreasury.com



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

11

Why Clients Choose Greenwich Treasury

- Corporate Treasury Expertise
 - Each consultant brings over 25 years of **corporate** treasury experience
- Proven methodologies
 - Data gathering and analysis
- Collaborative approach
 - We work as part of your team
- Independent with no conflicts of interest
- 100% guarantee of your satisfaction
 - Or we will return your fee



© 2008 Greenwich Treasury Advisors LLC

12