

Standards Tracker - Chart Results

Date Issued: last month (04/23/2013 - 05/23/2013)

Issuing Body	Document and Summary	Status	Date Issued▼	Effective Date	SEC Forms Affected
IASB	<p>IFRIC Interpretation 21: Levies</p> <p>The IASB's IFRS Interpretations Committee (the "Committee") has published IFRIC Interpretation 21, <i>Levies</i>, to provide guidance regarding the accounting for levies imposed by governments. IFRIC 21 was prompted by questions regarding whether to expand the guidance under IFRIC 6, <i>Liabilities Arising from Participating in a Specific Market—Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment</i>, to cover certain other levies, and it finalizes Draft IFRIC Interpretation DI/2012/1 published in May 2012.</p> <p>The key issue considered by the Committee in developing this Interpretation was when an entity should recognize in its financial statements a liability to pay a levy imposed by governments. In fact, IFRIC 21 is an interpretation of IAS 37, <i>Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets</i>, which sets forth criteria for the recognition of a liability, one of which is the requirement for the entity to have a present obligation as a result of a past event (i.e., an obligating event). IFRIC 21 clarifies that the obligating event that gives rise to a liability to pay a levy is the activity described in the relevant legislation that triggers the payment of the levy.</p> <p>Notably, IFRIC 21 includes guidance that illustrates its application, and it is effective for annual periods beginning on or after January 1, 2014.</p> <p>PRIMARY EDITORIAL REFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACCOUNTING & COMPLIANCE ALERT: IFRIC 21 Addresses Payments and Fees to Governments (May 22, 2013) 	Final	5/20/2013	1/1/2014	Financial Disclosures
SEC	<p>Small Entity Compliance Guide: Identity Theft Red Flags Rule</p> <p>This Small Entity Compliance Guide <i>Identity Theft Red Flags Rule</i>, discusses the amendments made by Final Rulemaking Release No. 34-69359, issued by the SEC on April 10, 2013. In particular, this Guide explains that Section 1088(a) of the Dodd-Frank Act amended Section 615 (e) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) to require that the SEC and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") adopt rules requiring entities that are subject to their respective enforcement authorities to address identity theft.</p> <p>Further, this Guide clarifies that the identity theft red flags rules apply to SEC-regulated entities that qualify as financial institutions or creditors under FCRA and require those financial institutions and creditors that maintain covered accounts to adopt identity theft programs.</p> <p>Among other things, this Guide also reveals (1) that entities that are required to adopt identity theft programs also must provide for the administration of the program, including staff training and oversight of service providers; (2) that SEC-regulated entities that issue debit cards or credit cards must take certain precautionary actions when they receive a request for a new or replacement card soon after they receive a notification of a change of address for a consumer's account; and (3) the meaning of the terms "financial institutions" "creditors" and "covered accounts." Finally,</p>	Relevant Guidance	5/20/2013		N/A

	the Guide notes that all SEC-regulated entities that fall within the rules' scope must comply with the rules by November 20, 2013.				
FASB	<p>Proposed Accounting Standards Update (ASU) No. 2013-270: Leases (Topic 842)—A revision of the 2010 proposed FASB Accounting Standards Update, Leases (Topic 840)</p> <p>The FASB has issued Proposed Accounting Standards Update (ASU) No. 2013-270, <i>Leases (Topic 842)—A revision of the 2010 proposed FASB Accounting Standards Update, Leases (Topic 840)</i>, which revises Proposed Accounting Standards Update (ASU) No. 1850-100, and proposes a new standard on leases. In 2006, the FASB and the IASB initiated a joint project to develop a new approach to lease accounting that would require assets and liabilities arising from leases to be recognized in the statement of financial position. Subsequently, after considering feedback from stakeholders on several exposure drafts and discussion papers on leases, the FASB and IASB, respectively, now issue revised drafts.</p> <p>Currently, the existing accounting models for leases require lessees and lessors to classify their leases as either capital leases or operating leases and account for those leases differently. Those models have been criticized for failing to meet the needs of users of financial statements because they do not always provide a faithful representation of leasing transactions. If adopted, the amendments in Proposed ASU No. 2013-270 would require assets and liabilities arising from leases to be recognized in the statement of financial position. Although many of the problems associated with existing lease requirements relate to the accounting for operating leases in the financial statements of lessees, this Proposed ASU would, if adopted, impact both lessee accounting and lessor accounting. Accordingly, the FASB solicits feedback from stakeholders on eleven questions that focus on the core principle in this Proposed ASU that entities should recognize assets and liabilities arising from a lease.</p> <p>The amendments in this Proposed ASU would affect any entity that enters into a lease, with some specified scope exemptions. If adopted, Proposed ASU No. 2013-270 would supersede IAS 17, <i>Leases</i> (and related interpretations) and Topic 840, <i>Leases</i> (and related subtopics). Comments on the proposal are due by September 13, 2013.</p> <p>PRIMARY IMPACTED CODIFICATION TOPICS: Topic 840, <i>Leases</i></p> <p>PRIMARY EDITORIAL REFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACCOUNTING & COMPLIANCE ALERT: Proposed ASU No. 2013-270 Aims to Establish New Standard for Lease Accounting (May 17, 2013) 	Proposed	5/16/2013		Financial Disclosures
IASB	<p>Exposure Draft No. 2013-6: Leases</p> <p>The IASB has issued Exposure Draft No. 2013-6, <i>Leases</i>, which revises Exposure Draft No. 2010-9, and proposes a new standard on leases. By way of background, the FASB and the IASB, in 2006, initiated a joint project to develop a new approach to lease accounting that would require assets and liabilities arising from leases to be recognized in the statement of financial position. Subsequently, after considering feedback from stakeholders on several exposure drafts and discussion papers on leases, the FASB and IASB, respectively, now issue revised drafts.</p> <p>Currently, the existing accounting models for leases require lessees and lessors to classify their leases as either finance leases or operating leases</p>	Proposed	5/16/2013		Financial Disclosures

	<p>and account for those leases differently. Those models have been criticized for failing to meet the needs of users of financial statements because they do not always provide a faithful representation of leasing transactions. The proposed amendments in ED No. 2013-6 would, if adopted, require assets and liabilities arising from leases to be recognized in the statement of financial position. Although many of the problems associated with existing lease requirements relate to the accounting for operating leases in the financial statements of lessees, this Exposure Draft would impact both lessee accounting and lessor accounting.</p> <p>Accordingly, the IASB solicits feedback from stakeholders on nine questions that focus on the core principle in this Exposure Draft that entities should recognize assets and liabilities arising from a lease. Further, if adopted, this Exposure Draft would supersede IAS 17, <i>Leases</i>, and amend IAS 40, <i>Investment Property</i>.</p> <p>Comments on this Exposure Draft are due by September 13, 2013.</p> <p>PRIMARY EDITORIAL REFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACCOUNTING & COMPLIANCE ALERT: Proposed ASU No. 2013-270 Aims to Establish New Standard for Lease Accounting (May 17, 2013) 				
SEC	<p>Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs): Exchange Act Form 8-K</p> <p>The SEC's Division of Corporation Finance has issued this updated version of the Compliance and Disclosure Interpretation (C&DIs), <i>Exchange Act Form 8-K</i>, to add new question 110.01 to Section 110 <i>Item 2.06—Material Impairments</i>, which discusses impairment conclusions in Item 2.06 of Form 8-K.</p>	Relevant Guidance	5/16/2013		Financial Disclosures
SEC	<p>Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs): Oil and Gas Rules</p> <p>The SEC's Division of Corporation Finance has issued this updated version of the Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs), <i>Oil and Gas Rules</i>, to add new question 106.01 to Section 106, <i>Regulation S-X—Rule 4-10(a)(5) Definitions — Deterministic Estimate</i>.</p>	Relevant Guidance	5/16/2013		Financial Disclosures
SEC	<p>Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs): Regulation S-K</p> <p>The Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs), <i>Regulation S-K</i>, has just been updated to add new question 118.09 to Section 118, <i>Item 402(b)—Executive Compensation; Compensation Discussion and Analysis</i>, new question 134.04 to Section 134, <i>Forepart of Registration Statement and Outside Front Cover Page of Prospectus</i>, and new question 146.17 to Section 146, <i>Item 601—Exhibits</i>.</p>	Relevant Guidance	5/16/2013		Financial Disclosures
SEC	<p>Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs): Securities Act Forms</p> <p>An updated version of the Compliance and Disclosure Interpretation (C&DIs), <i>Securities Act Forms</i>, adds two new questions. Specifically, question 116.24 of Section 116, <i>Form S-3—General Instructions I.B.1 to I.B.6 – Transaction Requirements</i>, and question 125.12 of Section 125, <i>Form S-4</i>.</p> <p>The first question discusses whether, in calculating the size of an offering consisting of common stock and warrants that exceeds the one-third cap in General Instruction I.B.6(a) of Form S-3, an issuer must follow Instruction 2 to General Instruction I.B.6.</p>	Relevant Guidance	5/16/2013		Financial Disclosures

	<p>The second question discusses whether a registrant, who “meets the requirements for use of Form S-3,” as set forth in General Instruction B of Form S-4, and incorporates by reference the registrant’s information into the Form S-4, pursuant to General Instruction B and either Item 11 or Item 13 of Form S-4, may incorporate the risk factors from its latest Form 10-K in response to Item 3 of Form S-4.</p>			
SEC	<p>Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs): Securities Act Rules</p> <p>Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs), <i>Securities Act Rules</i>, has been updated to add five new questions and a revised question. The five new questions added to the C&DIs are.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question 129.03 of Section 129, <i>Rule 144(a)—Definitions</i>, which discusses the applicability of Rule 144 to a donee who is a non-affiliate when he or she resells “restricted securities;” • Question 133.07 of Section 133, <i>Rule 144(e)—Limitation on Amount of Securities Sold</i>, which discusses whether an affiliate’s sales of securities back to the issuer in a non-public transaction is excludable when calculating the amount of securities that may be sold by the affiliate under Rule 144; • Question 210.3 of Section 210, <i>Rule 413—Registration of Additional Securities and Additional Classes of Securities</i>, which discusses whether an issuer may post-effectively amend Form S-3 to add more securities of the same class already registered on the same form in an automatic shelf registration; • Question 228.04 of Section 228, <i>Rule 430B—Prospectus in a Registration Statement After Effective Date</i>, discusses whether an issuer who files a non-automatic shelf registration statement is entitled to rely on Rule 430B (b) and not disclose until after effectiveness until after effectiveness the aggregate number of shares being registered; and • Question 256.22 of Section 256, <i>Rule 502—General Conditions to be Met</i>, which discusses when an acquiror must provide to target shareholders that are non-accredited investors financial statements and other data required by Rule 502 of Regulation D to approve a business combination involving the issuance of securities in reliance on Rule 505 and Rule 506 of Regulation D. <p>The revised question in this updated C&DIs concern question 532.01 of Section 532, <i>Rule 144(d)—Holding Period for Restricted Securities</i>, and discusses the applicability of Rule 144(d) to the resale of “restricted securities” by a pledgee who acquires securities from a pledgor who is an affiliate and who defaults on a loan secured by a bona fide pledge of company stock acquired in the open market.</p>	Relevant Guidance	5/16/2013	Financial Disclosures
SEC	<p>Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs): Securities Act Sections</p> <p>The SEC’s Division of Corporation Finance has issued this updated version of the Compliance and Disclosure Interpretations (C&DIs), <i>Securities Act Sections</i>, which revises Question 139.13 to Section 139, <i>Securities Act Section 5</i>, and explains when an Exchange Act reporting company may file a registration statement for the resale by the investors of securities sold in a private equity line financing.</p> <p>Since many companies will rely on the private placement exemption from</p>	Relevant Guidance	5/16/2013	Financial Disclosures

	<p>registration to sell such securities and register the "resale" of the securities sold in the equity line financing, the SEC analyzes private equity line financings as indirect primary offerings. Further, the SEC will permit a company to register the "resale" of the securities prior to its exercise of the put if the transactions meet the following: (1) the company completed the private transaction of all the securities it is registering for "resale" prior to the filing of the registration statement; (2) the "resale" registration statement must be on the form that the company is eligible to use for a primary offering; and (3) in the prospectus, the investor(s) must be identified as underwriter(s), as well as selling shareholder(s).</p> <p>Significantly, the SEC will not object to a private transaction that is not "completed" based on the lack of a fixed price if the agreement provides for pricing based on a formula tied to market price and there is an existing market for the securities as evidenced by trading on a national securities exchange or through the facilities of the OTC Bulletin Board or the OTCQX or OTCQB marketplaces of OTC Link ATS.</p>				
FASB	<p>Invitation to Comment No. 2013-280: FASB U.S. GAAP Financial Reporting Taxonomy (UGT)—A Proposal to Revise the UGT Calculation Hierarchy</p> <p>The FASB has issued Invitation to Comment No. 2013-280: <i>FASB U.S. GAAP Financial Reporting Taxonomy (UGT)—A Proposal to Revise the UGT Calculation Hierarchy</i>, to address the multiple calculation hierarchies currently in the UGT, which may have inconsistent summations and can vary between taxonomy release.</p> <p>Currently, the UGT contains thousands of financial reporting concepts expressed as elements with basic attributes that include the concepts' data type (monetary, string, etc.), period type — instant or duration, concept definition, references, and other important attributes that, taken together, describe the financial reporting concept. Further, the UGT also contains many thousands of relationships between these different concepts that aid taxonomy navigation, element selection, and provide contextual meaning. The key relationships are expressed as presentation, calculation, and dimension relationships. Invitation to Comment No. 2013-280 proposes to revise the UGT by replacing the current presentation-centric calculation hierarchy with a data-centric calculation hierarchy, resulting in a simpler structure, with fewer redundant or inconsistent summations.</p> <p>By way of example, the 2013 UGT Release includes nineteen (19) summations for Revenues, several of which are inconsistent. Invitation to Comment No. 2013-280 would reduce that summation count to three (3), which means that the calculation hierarchy would largely not match the presentation hierarchy, but FASB does not believe this symmetry is useful and is the primary reason for the current complexity and inconsistency in the calculation structure. With the goal of reducing complexity in mind, Invitation to Comment No. 2013-280 poses eight questions for stakeholders to consider in responding to the proposal.</p> <p>Invitation to Comment No. 2013-280 would affect all entities that rely on the current calculation hierarchy for XBRL document creation, aggregation, or analysis. The extent of the effect on users would depend on how much reliance they place on the existing calculation hierarchy in their software applications and analysis. Comments on the proposal are due by July 14, 2013.</p>	Proposed	5/15/2013		Financial Disclosures