



1235 Radio Road
Redwood City CA 94065
(800) 922-5272
www.calcpa.org

Via email: <www.iasb.org>

July 29, 2009

International Accounting Standards Board

Re: Exposure Draft ED/2009/3 *Derecognition Proposed amendments to IAS 39 and IFRS 7*

The Accounting Principles and Auditing Standards Committee (the AP&AS "Committee") of the California Society of Certified Public Accountants (CALCPA) is pleased to provide our comments to the International Accounting Standards Board (the "Board") on this proposed standard.

The AP&AS Committee is the senior technical committee of CALCPA. CALCPA has approximately 32,000 members. The Committee is comprised of 50 members, of whom 67 percent are from local or regional firms, 23 percent are sole practitioners in public practice, 5 percent are in industry and 5 percent are in academia.

Question 1—Assessment of 'the Asset' and 'continuing involvement' at reporting entity level

Do you agree that the determination of the item (ie the Asset) to be evaluated for derecognition and the assessment of continuing involvement should be made at the level of the reporting entity (see paragraphs 15A, AG37A and AG47A)? If not, why? What would you propose instead, and why?

Yes.

Question 2—Determination of 'the Asset' to be assessed for derecognition

Do you agree with the criteria proposed in paragraph 16A for what qualifies as the item (ie the Asset) to be assessed for derecognition? If not, why? What criteria would you propose instead, and why?

(Note: The criteria proposed in paragraph 16A are the same as those in IAS 39.)

See answer to question 7.

Question 3—Definition of 'transfer'

Do you agree with the definition of a transfer proposed in paragraph 9? If not, why? How would you propose to amend the definition instead, and why?

See answer to question 7.

Question 4—Determination of 'continuing involvement'

Do you agree with the ‘continuing involvement’ filter proposed in paragraph 17A(b), and also the exceptions made to ‘continuing involvement’ in paragraph 18A? If not, why? What would you propose instead, and why?

See answer to question 7.

Question 5—‘Practical ability to transfer for own benefit’ test

Do you agree with the proposed ‘practical ability to transfer’ derecognition test in paragraph 17A(c)? If not, why? What would you propose instead, and why?

(Note: Other than the ‘for the transferee’s own benefit’ supplement, the ‘practical ability to transfer’ test proposed in paragraph 17A(c) is the same as the control test in IAS 39.)

No. See answer to question 7.

Do you agree with the ‘for the transferee’s own benefit’ test proposed as part of the ‘practical ability to transfer’ test in paragraph 17A(c)? If not, why? What would you propose instead, and why?

No. The phrase “but the transferee has the practical ability to transfer the Asset for the transferee’s own benefit” provides too much room to interpret “practical ability” to allow an exception. There should be a stated ability to transfer without restrictions in the contract. See answer to question 7.

Question 6—Accounting for retained interests

Do you agree with the proposed accounting (both recognition and measurement) for an interest retained in a financial asset or a group of financial assets in a transfer that qualifies for derecognition (for a retained interest in a financial asset or group of financial assets, see paragraph 21A; for an interest in a financial asset or group of financial assets retained indirectly through an entity, see paragraph 22A)? If not, why? What would you propose instead, and why?

(Note: The accounting for a retained interest in a financial asset or group of financial assets that is proposed in paragraph 21A is not a change from IAS 39. However, the guidance for an interest in a financial asset or group of financial assets retained indirectly through an entity as proposed in paragraph 22A is new.)

No. See answer to question 7.

Question 7—Approach to derecognition of financial assets

Having gone through the steps/tests of the proposed approach to derecognition of financial assets (Questions 1–6), do you agree that the proposed approach as a whole should be established as the new approach for determining the derecognition of financial assets? If not, why? Do you believe that the alternative approach set out in the alternative views

should be established as the new derecognition approach instead, and, if so, why? If not, why? What alternative approach would you propose instead, and why?

The Committee believes that the alternative approach is more consistent with the definition of an asset and can be applied more consistently in practice. The Committee agrees with the reasoning set forth in paragraphs AV-1 through AV-16.

Question 8—Interaction between consolidation and derecognition

In December 2008, the Board issued an exposure draft ED 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements*. As noted in paragraphs BC28 and BC29, the Board believes that its proposed approach to derecognition of financial assets in this exposure draft is similar to the approach proposed in ED 10 (albeit derecognition is applied at the level of assets and liabilities, whereas consolidation is assessed at the entity level).

Do you agree that the proposed derecognition and consolidation approaches are compatible? If not, why? Should the Board consider any other aspects of the proposed approaches to derecognition and consolidation before it finalises the exposure drafts? If so, which ones, and why? If the Board were to consider adopting the alternative approach, do you believe that that approach would be compatible with the proposed consolidation approach?

See answer to question 7. Yes, the Committee believes that the approach is compatible.

Question 9—Derecognition of financial liabilities

Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the principle for derecognition of financial liabilities in paragraph 39A? If not, why? How would you propose to amend that principle instead, and why?

Yes.

Question 10—Transition

Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the transition guidance in paragraphs 106 and 107? If not, why? How would you propose to amend that guidance instead, and why?

Yes.


Question 11—Disclosures

Do you agree with the proposed amendments to IFRS 7? If not, why? How would you propose to amend those requirements instead, and why?

Yes. See answer to question 7.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. We would be glad to discuss our opinions with you further should you have any questions or require additional information.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "JoAnn Guattery". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J" and a long, sweeping underline.

JoAnn Guattery, Chair

Accounting Principles and Auditing Standards Committee
California Society of Certified Public Accountants