

Financial reporting developments

A comprehensive guide

Revenue from contracts with customers (ASC 606)

Revised August 2016

To our clients and other friends

In May 2014, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB or Board) and the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) (collectively, the Boards) issued largely converged revenue recognition standards that will supersede virtually all revenue recognition guidance in US GAAP and IFRS.

The standards provide accounting guidance for all revenue arising from contracts with customers and affect all entities that enter into contracts to provide goods or services to their customers (unless the contracts are in the scope of other US GAAP or IFRS requirements, such as lease requirements). The standards also specify the accounting for costs an entity incurs to obtain and fulfill a contract to provide goods and services to customers (see Section 9.3) and provide a model for the measurement and recognition of gains and losses on the sale of certain nonfinancial assets, such as property and equipment, including real estate (see Chapter 11).


As a result, the standards will likely affect entities' financial statements, business processes and internal control over financial reporting. While some entities will be able to implement the standards with limited effort, others may find implementation to be a significant undertaking. Successful implementation will require an assessment and a plan for managing the change. Beginning in 2018, US GAAP public entities, as defined, and IFRS preparers will need to apply the standards.

Recently, the Boards amended their respective standards to address several implementation issues raised by constituents. The Boards did not agree on the nature and breadth of all of the changes to their revenue standards; however, the Boards expect the amendments to result in similar outcomes in many circumstances.

This publication summarizes the FASB's standard and highlights significant differences from the IASB's standard. It addresses all of the amendments the FASB has finalized to date, along with topics on which the members of the Transition Resource Group for Revenue Recognition (TRG) reached general agreement. It also discusses our views on certain topics, including those that are based on our understanding of the views of the FASB and/or its staff and the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

We also have issued industry-specific publications that address significant changes to legacy industry accounting. We encourage preparers and users of financial statements to read this publication and the industry supplements carefully and consider the potential effects of the new standard.

The views we express in this publication may continue to evolve as implementation continues and additional issues are identified. Conclusions in seemingly similar situations may differ from those reached in the illustrations due to differences in the underlying facts. We expect to periodically update our guidance to provide the latest implementation insights. Please see EY AccountingLink for our most recent revenue publications.

The logo for Ernst & Young LLP, featuring the company name in a stylized, handwritten-style script.

August 2016

Contents

Changes to the standards since issuance	1
1 Overview, effective date and transition	3
1.1 Overview	3
1.1.1 Core principle of the standard	4
1.2 Effective date	5
1.2.1 Definition of a 'public' entity	6
1.2.2 Effective date for public and nonpublic entities	7
1.3 Transition method	9
1.3.1 Full retrospective adoption	12
1.3.2 Modified retrospective application	15
1.3.3 Other transition considerations	18
1.3.4 Additional transition considerations for public entities	19
2 Scope	22
2.1 Other scope considerations	23
2.2 Definition of a customer	23
2.3 Collaborative arrangements	24
2.4 Interaction with other guidance	25
3 Identify the contract with the customer	30
3.1 Attributes of a contract	31
3.1.1 Parties have approved the contract and are committed to perform their respective obligations	32
3.1.2 Each party's rights regarding the goods or services to be transferred can be identified ...	33
3.1.3 Payment terms can be identified for the goods or services to be transferred	33
3.1.4 Commercial substance	33
3.1.5 Collectibility	33
3.2 Contract enforceability and termination clauses	40
3.3 Combining contracts	43
3.3.1 Portfolio approach practical expedient	44
3.4 Contract modifications	45
3.4.1 Contract modification represents a separate contract	49
3.4.2 Contract modification is not a separate contract	50
3.5 Arrangements that do not meet the definition of a contract under the standard	53
4 Identify the performance obligations in the contract	56
4.1 Identifying the promised goods and services in the contract	57
4.1.1 Promised goods or services that are immaterial in the context of a contract	61
4.1.2 Shipping and handling activities	65
4.2 Determining when promises are performance obligations	67
4.2.1 Determination of distinct	68
4.2.1.1 Capable of being distinct	68
4.2.1.2 Distinct within the context of the contract	70

4.2.2	Series of distinct goods and services that are substantially the same and that have the same pattern of transfer	73
4.2.3	Examples of identifying performance obligations	78
4.3	Promised goods and services that are not distinct.....	87
4.4	Principal versus agent considerations	87
4.4.1	Identifying the specified good or service.....	89
4.4.2	Control of the specified good or service.....	91
4.4.2.1	Principal indicators	93
4.4.3	Recognizing revenue as a principal or agent	96
4.4.4	Examples.....	98
4.5	Consignment arrangements	104
4.6	Customer options for additional goods or services	104
4.7	Sale of products with a right of return	113
5	Determine the transaction price.....	114
5.1	Presentation of sales (and other similar) taxes.....	115
5.2	Variable consideration	116
5.2.1	Forms of variable consideration	117
5.2.1.1	Implicit price concessions	119
5.2.2	Estimating variable consideration	121
5.2.3	Constraining estimates of variable consideration	123
5.2.4	Reassessment of variable consideration	130
5.3	Refund liabilities	131
5.4	Accounting for specific types of variable consideration	131
5.4.1	Rights of return.....	131
5.4.2	Sales- and usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property.....	136
5.5	Significant financing component	136
5.5.1	Examples.....	140
5.5.2	Financial statement presentation of financing component	147
5.6	Noncash consideration.....	147
5.7	Consideration paid or payable to a customer	151
5.7.1	Classification of the different types of consideration paid or payable to a customer	153
5.7.2	Forms of consideration paid or payable to a customer.....	153
5.7.3	Timing of recognition of consideration paid or payable to a customer	155
5.8	Nonrefundable up-front fees	156
5.9	Changes in the transaction price.....	159
6	Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations	160
6.1	Determining standalone selling prices	161
6.1.1	Factors to consider when estimating the standalone selling price.....	163
6.1.2	Possible estimation approaches	164
6.1.3	Updating estimated standalone selling prices.....	167
6.1.4	Additional considerations for determining the standalone selling price	167
6.1.5	Measurement of options that are separate performance obligations	169
6.2	Applying the relative standalone selling price method	173
6.3	Allocating variable consideration	174
6.4	Allocating a discount	179
6.5	Changes in transaction price after contract inception.....	182
6.6	Allocation of transaction price to elements outside the scope of the standard.....	183

7	Satisfaction of performance obligations	185
7.1	Performance obligations satisfied over time	186
7.1.1	Customer simultaneously receives and consumes benefits as the entity performs	187
7.1.2	Customer controls asset as it is created or enhanced	189
7.1.3	Asset with no alternative use and right to payment	190
7.1.4	Measuring progress.....	200
7.1.4.1	Output methods.....	203
7.1.4.2	Input methods	205
7.1.4.3	Examples	208
7.2	Control transferred at a point in time	212
7.2.1	Customer acceptance.....	214
7.3	Repurchase agreements	217
7.3.1	Forward or call option held by the entity.....	218
7.3.2	Put option held by the customer	220
7.3.3	Sales with residual value guarantees	223
7.4	Consignment arrangements	224
7.5	Bill-and-hold arrangements	225
7.6	Recognizing revenue for licenses of intellectual property	228
7.7	Recognizing revenue when a right of return exists	228
7.8	Recognizing revenue for customer options for additional goods and services	228
7.9	Breakage and prepayments for future goods or services.....	228
8	Licenses of intellectual property	232
8.1	Identifying performance obligations in a licensing arrangement.....	233
8.1.1	Licenses of intellectual property that are distinct	234
8.1.2	Licenses of intellectual property that are not distinct	236
8.1.3	Contractual restrictions.....	237
8.1.4	Guarantees to defend or maintain a patent	241
8.2	Determining the nature of the entity's promise in granting a license	242
8.2.1	Functional intellectual property.....	243
8.2.2	Symbolic intellectual property.....	246
8.2.3	Evaluating functional versus symbolic intellectual property	249
8.2.4	Applying the licenses guidance to a bundled performance obligation that includes a license of intellectual property	251
8.3	Transfer of control of licensed intellectual property	253
8.3.1	Right to access.....	254
8.3.2	Right to use	255
8.3.3	Use and benefit requirement.....	255
8.4	License renewals	256
8.5	Sales- or usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property.....	258
9	Other measurement and recognition topics	267
9.1	Warranties	267
9.1.1	Determining whether a warranty is a service- or assurance-type warranty	267
9.1.2	Service-type warranties.....	270
9.1.3	Assurance-type warranties	271
9.1.4	Contracts that contain both assurance- and service-type warranties.....	271
9.2	Loss contracts.....	273

9.3	Contract costs	274
9.3.1	Costs to obtain a contract.....	275
9.3.2	Costs to fulfill a contract.....	279
9.3.3	Amortization of capitalized costs	284
9.3.4	Impairment of capitalized costs.....	286
10	Presentation and disclosure	289
10.1	Presentation requirements for contract assets and contract liabilities.....	289
10.2	Other presentation considerations	296
10.3	Annual disclosure requirements.....	296
10.4	Disclosures for public entities	297
10.4.1	Contracts with customers.....	297
10.4.2	Significant judgments.....	308
10.4.3	Assets recognized for the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract	310
10.4.4	Practical expedients	311
10.5	Disclosures for nonpublic entities.....	312
10.5.1	Contracts with customers.....	312
10.5.2	Significant judgments.....	316
10.5.3	Assets recognized for the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract	318
10.5.4	Practical expedients	318
10.6	Interim disclosure requirements	319
10.7	Transition disclosure requirements	320
11	Gains and losses from the derecognition of nonfinancial assets.....	321
11.1	Scope of ASC 610-20	321
11.1.1	Definition of a customer	323
11.1.2	In substance nonfinancial assets	324
11.1.3	Real estate sale-leaseback transactions.....	324
11.1.4	Nonmonetary exchanges involving a noncontrolling ownership interest in an entity.....	325
11.2	Derecognition of the nonfinancial asset.....	325
11.2.1	Existence of a contract	326
11.2.2	Accounting for consideration received when the contract criteria are not met	326
11.2.3	Transferring control of the asset.....	327
11.3	Measuring the gain or loss.....	329
11.3.1	Variable consideration and the constraint.....	329
11.4	Other aspects of ASC 606	331
A	Summary of important changes	A-1
B	Index of ASC references used in this publication	B-1
C	Guidance abbreviations used in this publication	C-1
D	Disclosure checklist – Public entities.....	D-1
E	Disclosure checklist – Nonpublic entities	E-1
F	List of examples included in ASC 606 and references in this publication.....	F-1
G	TRG discussions and references in this publication.....	G-1
H	Summary of differences from IFRS	H-1
I	Glossary	I-1

Notice to readers:

This publication includes excerpts from and references to the FASB Accounting Standards Codification (the Codification or ASC). The Codification uses a hierarchy that includes Topics, Subtopics, Sections and Paragraphs. Each Topic includes an Overall Subtopic that generally includes pervasive guidance for the topic and additional Subtopics, as needed, with incremental or unique guidance. Each Subtopic includes Sections that in turn include numbered Paragraphs. Thus, a Codification reference includes the Topic (XXX), Subtopic (YY), Section (ZZ) and Paragraph (PP).

Throughout this publication references to guidance in the Codification are shown using these reference numbers. References are also made to certain pre-codification standards (and specific sections or paragraphs of pre-Codification standards) in situations in which the content being discussed is excluded from the Codification.

This publication has been carefully prepared but it necessarily contains information in summary form and is therefore intended for general guidance only; it is not intended to be a substitute for detailed research or the exercise of professional judgment. The information presented in this publication should not be construed as legal, tax, accounting, or any other professional advice or service. Ernst & Young LLP can accept no responsibility for loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any material in this publication. You should consult with Ernst & Young LLP or other professional advisors familiar with your particular factual situation for advice concerning specific audit, tax or other matters before making any decisions.

Changes to the standards since issuance

In May 2014, the FASB and the IASB issued largely converged revenue recognition standards that will supersede virtually all revenue recognition guidance in US GAAP and IFRS.¹ Since then, the Boards have finalized various amendments to their respective standards, as summarized below. Throughout the publication, we highlight these amendments and discuss the amended guidance. The Boards did not agree on the nature and breadth of all of the changes to their respective revenue standards; however, the Boards have said they expect the amendments to result in similar outcomes in many circumstances.

In addition to deferring the effective date of the standard (see Section 1.2) by one year to give entities more time to implement it, the FASB has issued the following Accounting Standards Updates (ASUs) to address implementation issues (many of which were discussed by the TRG).

The FASB issued ASU 2016-08 in March 2016 to amend the principal versus agent guidance as follows (see Section 4.4):

- ▶ Clarify how an entity should identify the unit of accounting (i.e., the specified good or service) for the principal versus agent evaluation
- ▶ Clarify how the control principle applies to certain types of arrangements such as service transactions by explaining what a principal controls before the specified good or service is transferred to the customer
- ▶ Clarify how the control principle relates to the indicators by reframing the indicators to focus on a principal rather than an agent relationship
- ▶ Revise the original examples in the standard and add new ones

The FASB issued ASU 2016-10 in April 2016 to amend the licenses of intellectual property guidance as follows (see Chapter 8):

- ▶ Clarify that when determining whether to recognize revenue from granting a license of intellectual property over time, entities will consider whether the licensor undertakes activities that significantly affect the intellectual property's "utility" and generally recognize revenue from the licensed intellectual property over time if the intellectual property does not have significant standalone functionality
- ▶ Require entities to classify intellectual property in one of two categories (i.e., functional or symbolic) after considering the nature of the intellectual property and the licensor's expected activities related to the intellectual property
- ▶ Clarify how the sales- and usage-based royalty constraint is applied in certain circumstances
- ▶ Clarify the accounting for license renewals and restrictions

¹ ASU 2014-09 (largely codified in Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) 606) and IFRS 15. Throughout this publication, when we refer to the FASB's standard, we mean ASC 606, unless otherwise noted. The ASUs the FASB has issued to change the new guidance amend ASC 606.

ASU 2016-10 also amended the guidance on identifying performance obligations as follows (see Sections 4.1 through 4.2):

- ▶ Clarify when a promised good or service is separately identifiable (i.e., distinct within the context of the contract)
- ▶ Allow entities to disregard items that are immaterial in the context of the contract
- ▶ Allow entities to elect to account for the cost of shipping and handling that is performed after control of a good has been transferred to the customer as a fulfillment cost (i.e., an expense)

The FASB issued ASU 2016-12 in May 2016 to make narrow-scope improvements and add practical expedients in the following areas:

- ▶ Collectibility – Clarify that the objective of the collectibility threshold is to assess an entity’s exposure to credit risk for the goods and services that will be transferred to the customer and when an entity should recognize revenue for nonrefundable consideration received from the customer when the arrangement does not meet the criteria to be accounted for as a revenue contract under the standard (see Sections 3.1.5 and Section 3.5)
- ▶ Noncash consideration – Clarify that the fair value of noncash consideration should be measured at contract inception and that the constraint on variable consideration applies only to the variability of noncash consideration due to reasons other than the form of the consideration (see Section 5.6)
- ▶ Presentation of sales (and other similar) taxes – Allow an entity to make an accounting policy election to exclude from the transaction price certain types of taxes collected from a customer (i.e., present revenue net of these taxes) (see Section 5.1)
- ▶ Transition – Provide a practical expedient to account for contract modifications executed prior to adoption of the new standard that can be used under either transition method, clarify that an entity that uses the full retrospective method does not need to disclose the effect of the accounting change on affected financial statement line items in the period of adoption and clarify that a completed contract is one for which all (or substantially all) of the revenue was recognized under legacy GAAP (see Section 1.3)

In May 2016, the FASB proposed nine technical corrections and improvements related to its revenue standard.² We highlight these when applicable throughout this publication. Included in this proposal is an additional practical expedient that would allow an entity not to disclose variable consideration allocated to unsatisfied performance obligations in certain situations, primarily when an estimate would be made solely for disclosure purposes (see Section 10.4.1). Comments were due 2 July 2016. To finalize these changes, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

The IASB also deferred the effective date of its standard by one year, which keeps the standards’ effective dates converged under IFRS and US GAAP. Early adoption is permitted for IFRS preparers, including first-time adopters of IFRS, provided that fact is disclosed. In April 2016, the IASB finalized amendments to its revenue standard to address principal versus agent considerations, identifying performance obligations, licenses of intellectual property and certain practical expedients on transition. The IASB’s amendments for principal versus agent considerations and clarifying when a promised good or service is separately identifiable when identifying performance obligations are converged with those of the FASB discussed above. The IASB’s other amendments were not the same as those of the FASB. We highlight these differences throughout this publication.

² Proposed ASU, *Technical Corrections and Improvements to Update No. 2014-09, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)*, issued 18 May 2016.

1 Overview, effective date and transition

1.1 Overview

The revenue recognition standards the Boards issued in May 2014 were largely converged and will supersede virtually all revenue recognition guidance in US GAAP³ and IFRS. The Boards' goal in joint deliberations was to develop revenue standards that would:

- ▶ Remove inconsistencies and weaknesses in the legacy revenue recognition literature in both US GAAP and IFRS
- ▶ Provide a more robust framework for addressing revenue recognition issues
- ▶ Improve comparability of revenue recognition practices across industries, entities within those industries, jurisdictions and capital markets
- ▶ Reduce the complexity of applying revenue recognition guidance by reducing the volume of the relevant guidance
- ▶ Provide more useful information to investors through new disclosure requirements

The standards provide accounting guidance for all revenue arising from contracts with customers and affect all entities that enter into contracts to provide goods or services to their customers (unless the contracts are in the scope of other US GAAP or IFRS requirements, such as lease requirements). The standards also specify the accounting for costs an entity incurs to obtain and fulfill a contract to provide goods and services to customers (see Section 9.3) and provide a model for the measurement and recognition of gains and losses on the sale of certain nonfinancial assets, such as property and equipment, including real estate (see Chapter 11).

As a result, the standards will likely affect entities' financial statements, business processes and internal control over financial reporting. While some entities will be able to implement the new standards with limited effort, others may find implementation to be a significant undertaking. Successful implementation will require an assessment and a plan for managing the change.

The standards the Boards issued in 2014 were converged except for a handful of differences.⁴ Since then, the Boards have finalized some converged amendments to their standards (i.e., principal versus agent considerations and clarifying when a promised good or service is separately identifiable when identifying performance obligations), but they have also finalized different amendments regarding the accounting for licenses of intellectual property and transition. The FASB has also finalized amendments relating to immaterial goods and services in a contract, accounting for shipping and handling, collectibility, noncash consideration and the presentation of sales and other similar taxes that the IASB has not. We highlight

³ The SEC staff has been reviewing its revenue guidance in light of the new standard and has rescinded four SEC Staff Observer comments on narrow issues related to revenue effective upon adoption of the new standard. However, it hasn't yet addressed what will happen with SAB Topic 13.

⁴ As originally issued, the standards under US GAAP and IFRS were identical except for these areas: (1) the Boards used the term "probable" to describe the level of confidence needed when assessing collectibility to identify contracts with customers, which will result in a lower threshold under IFRS than US GAAP; (2) the FASB required more interim disclosures than the IASB; (3) the IASB allowed early adoption; (4) the FASB did not allow reversals of impairment losses and the IASB did; and (5) the FASB provided relief for nonpublic entities relating to specific disclosure requirements and the effective date.

these differences throughout this publication. However, the primary purpose of this publication is to highlight the FASB's standard, including all amendments to date, and focuses on the effects for US GAAP preparers.⁵ As such, we generally refer to the singular "standard."

The TRG, which the FASB and the IASB formed to help them determine whether more guidance was needed to address implementation questions and to educate constituents, discussed many of the topics the Boards addressed in their amendments along with many other topics. TRG members include financial statement preparers, auditors and users from a variety of industries, countries and public and private entities. Members of the TRG met six times in 2014 and 2015. In January 2016, the IASB announced that it did not plan to schedule further meetings of the IFRS constituents of the TRG but said it will monitor any discussions of the US GAAP group, which met in April 2016 and is scheduled to meet again in November 2016.

While the TRG members' views are non-authoritative, entities should consider them as they implement the new standards. The SEC's Chief Accountant has previously made public statements that he expects SEC registrants to use the TRG discussions and meeting minutes to inform their implementation of the standards and has said that his office strongly encourages registrants, including foreign private issuers, that want to use accounting that differs from TRG discussions to discuss their accounting with the SEC staff.⁶ We have incorporated our summaries of topics on which TRG members generally agreed throughout this publication. Unless otherwise specified, these summaries represent the discussions of the joint TRG.

1.1.1 Core principle of the standard

The standard describes the principles an entity must apply to measure and recognize revenue and the related cash flows. The core principle, as stated below, is that an entity will recognize revenue at an amount that reflects the consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring goods or services to a customer:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Objectives

606-10-10-1

The objective of the guidance in this Topic is to establish the principles that an entity shall apply to report useful information to users of financial statements about the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows arising from a contract with a customer.

Meeting the Objective

606-10-10-2

To meet the objective in paragraph 606-10-10-1, the core principle of the guidance in this Topic is that an entity shall recognize revenue to depict the transfer of promised goods or services to customers in an amount that reflects the consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled in exchange for those goods or services.

606-10-10-3

An entity shall consider the terms of the **contract** and all relevant facts and circumstances when applying this guidance. An entity shall apply this guidance, including the use of any practical expedients, consistently to contracts with similar characteristics and in similar circumstances.

⁵ For more information on the effect of IFRS 15 for IFRS preparers, refer to our *Applying IFRS: A closer look at the new revenue recognition standard*.

⁶ Speech by James V. Schnurr, 22 March 2016. Refer to SEC website at <http://www.sec.gov/news/speech/schnurr-remarks-12th-life-sciences-accounting-congress.html>.

The principles in the standard will be applied using the following five steps:

1. Identify the contract(s) with a customer
2. Identify the performance obligations in the contract
3. Determine the transaction price
4. Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations in the contract
5. Recognize revenue when (or as) the entity satisfies a performance obligation

Entities will need to exercise judgment when considering the terms of the contract(s) and all of the facts and circumstances, including implied contract terms. Entities will have to apply the requirements of the standard consistently to contracts with similar characteristics and in similar circumstances. The FASB included more than 60 examples in the standard to illustrate how an entity might apply the new guidance. We list them in Appendix F to this publication and provide references to where certain examples are included in this publication.

1.2

Effective date



FASB amendments

In August 2015, the FASB issued ASU 2015-14 that deferred by one year the standard's effective dates for US GAAP public and nonpublic entities, as defined.

Due to the one-year deferral, the standard is effective for public entities, as defined, for fiscal years beginning after 15 December 2017 and for interim periods therein. Nonpublic entities are required to adopt the standard for fiscal years beginning after 15 December 2018, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after 15 December 2019. That is, nonpublic entities are not required to apply the standard in interim periods in the year of adoption.

Public and nonpublic entities will be permitted to adopt the standard as early as the original public entity effective date (i.e., annual reporting periods beginning after 15 December 2016 and interim periods therein). Early adoption prior to that date is not permitted.

The standard includes the following effective date guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Transition and Open Effective Date Information

Transition Related to Accounting Standards Update 2014-09, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)

606-10-65-1

The following represents the transition and effective date information related to Accounting Standards Updates No. 2014-09, *Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)*, and Accounting Standards Update No. 2016-08, *Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Principal versus Agent Considerations (Reporting Revenue Gross versus Net)*, and No. 2016-10, *Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Identifying Performance Obligations and Licensing*, and No. 2016-12, *Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Narrow-Scope Improvements and Practical Expedients*:

- a. A **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, and an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the Securities and Exchange Commission shall apply the pending content that links to this paragraph for annual

reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2017, including interim reporting periods within that reporting period. Earlier application is permitted only as of annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2016, including interim reporting periods within that reporting period.

- b. All other entities shall apply the pending content that links to this paragraph for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018, and interim reporting periods within annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019. However, all other entities may elect to apply the pending content that links to this paragraph earlier only as of either:
 1. An annual reporting period beginning after December 15, 2016, including interim reporting periods within that reporting period.
 2. An annual reporting period beginning after December 15, 2016, and interim reporting periods within annual reporting periods beginning one year after the annual reporting period in which an entity first applies the pending content that links to this paragraph.



IASB differences

The IASB also deferred the effective date of its standard by one year. As a result, IFRS 15 is effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2018. Early adoption is permitted for IFRS preparers, including first-time adopters of IFRS, provided that fact is disclosed. While the effective dates generally are converged under IFRS and US GAAP, IFRS 15 allows early adoption prior to the date permitted by the FASB standard. In addition, IFRS 15 does not distinguish between public and nonpublic entities so adoption is not staggered for IFRS preparers.

1.2.1

Definition of a 'public' entity

The FASB defined public entity for purposes of this standard more broadly than just entities that have publicly traded equity or debt. The standard defines a public entity as one of the following:

- ▶ A public business entity (PBE)
- ▶ A not-for-profit entity that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market
- ▶ An employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with the SEC

The standard uses the same definition of a PBE as ASU 2013-12. That is, a business entity (which would not include a not-for-profit entity or an employee benefit plan) is a PBE if it meets any of the following criteria:⁷

- ▶ "(a) It is required by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to file or furnish financial statements, or does file or furnish financial statements (including voluntary filers), with the SEC (including other entities whose financial statements or financial information are required to be or are included in a filing).
- ▶ (b) It is required by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the Act), as amended, or rules or regulations promulgated under the Act, to file or furnish financial statements with a regulatory agency other than the SEC.
- ▶ (c) It is required to file or furnish financial statements with a foreign or domestic regulatory agency in preparation for the sale of or for purposes of issuing securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer.

⁷ See our Technical Line, *A closer look at the new definition of a public business entity* (BB2708).

- ▶ (d) It has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market.
- ▶ (e) It has one or more securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer, and it is required by law, contract, or regulation to prepare U.S. GAAP financial statements (including footnotes) and make them publicly available on a periodic basis (for example, interim or annual periods). An entity must meet both of these conditions to meet this criterion.”

An entity may meet the definition of a PBE solely because its financial statements or financial information is included in another entity’s filing with the SEC. In that case, the entity is only a PBE for purposes of financial statements that are filed or furnished with the SEC.

An entity that does not meet any of the criteria above is considered a nonpublic entity for purposes of this standard.

How we see it

Because the standard applies to PBEs, certain non-issuer entities will likely be required to adopt the guidance sooner than they may have anticipated. That is because the definition of a PBE is broader than other definitions of public entities and publicly traded companies in US GAAP, and determining whether an entity is a PBE may require assistance from legal counsel. For example, the definition includes entities whose financial statements or financial information is furnished or filed in another entity’s SEC filing.

These entities also will have to make public company disclosures that are more extensive than those for nonpublic entities (see Chapter 10).

1.2.2

Effective date for public and nonpublic entities

The table below illustrates the effective date of the standard for public and nonpublic entities with differing fiscal year ends and options for early adoption:

Year end	Effective date		Options for early adoption
	Public	Nonpublic	
31 December	1 January 2018, first present in 31 March 2018 Form 10-Q.	1 January 2019, first present in the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2019. Present in interim financial statements starting 31 March 2020.	<p>Public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 1 January 2017 adoption date, first present in 31 March 2017 Form 10-Q. <p>Nonpublic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 1 January 2017 adoption date, first present in 31 March 2017 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2017. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 1 January 2018 adoption date, first present in 31 March 2018 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2018. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 1 January 2019 adoption date, first present in 31 March 2019 interim financial statements.

Year end	Effective date		Options for early adoption
	Public	Nonpublic	
31 March	1 April 2018, first present in 30 June 2018 Form 10-Q.	1 April 2019, first present in the financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2020. Present in interim financial statements starting 30 June 2020.	<p>Public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 April 2017 adoption date, first present in 30 June 2017 Form 10-Q. <p>Nonpublic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 April 2017 adoption date, first present in 30 June 2017 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2018. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 April 2018 adoption date, first present in 30 June 2018 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2019. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 April 2019 adoption date, first present in 30 June 2019 interim financial statements.
30 June	1 July 2018, first present in 30 September 2018 Form 10-Q.	1 July 2019, first present in the financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2020. Present in interim financial statements starting 30 September 2020.	<p>Public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 July 2017 adoption date, first present in 30 September 2017 Form 10-Q. <p>Nonpublic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 July 2017 adoption date, first present in 30 September 2017 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2018. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 July 2018 adoption date, first present in 30 September 2018 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2019. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▸ 1 July 2019 adoption date, first present in 30 September 2019 interim financial statements.

Year end	Effective date		Options for early adoption
	Public	Nonpublic	
30 September	1 October 2018, first present in 31 December 2018 Form 10-Q.	1 October 2019, first present in the financial statements for the year ended 30 September 2020. Present in interim financial statements starting 31 December 2020.	<p>Public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 October 2017 adoption date, first present in 31 December 2017 Form 10-Q. <p>Nonpublic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 October 2017 adoption date, first present in 31 December 2017 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 30 September 2018. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 October 2018 adoption date, first present in 31 December 2018 interim financial statements or first present in the financial statements for the year ended 30 September 2019. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 October 2019 adoption date, first present in 31 December 2019 interim financial statements.

1.3

Transition method



FASB amendments

In May 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-12 that (1) added a transition practical expedient for contract modifications, (2) clarified that an entity that uses the full retrospective method does not need to disclose the effect of the accounting change on affected financial statement line items in the period of adoption as would otherwise be required by ASC 250, (3) amended the definition of a “completed contract” and (4) allowed an entity to apply the modified retrospective method to all contracts (rather than only to completed contracts).

The standard requires retrospective application. However, it allows either a “full retrospective” adoption in which the standard is applied to all of the periods presented or a “modified retrospective” adoption.

The standard includes the following transition guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Transition and Open Effective Date Information

Transition Related to Accounting Standards Update 2014-09, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)

606-10-65-1

c. For the purposes of the transition guidance in (d) through (i):

- The date of initial application is the start of the reporting period in which an entity first applies the pending content that links to this paragraph.

2. A completed **contract** is a contract for which all (or substantially all) of the **revenue** was recognized in accordance with **revenue** guidance that is in effect before the date of initial application.
- d. An entity shall apply the pending content that links to this paragraph using one of the following two methods:
 1. Retrospectively to each prior reporting period presented in accordance with the guidance on accounting changes in paragraphs 250-10-45-5 through 45-10 subject to the expedients in (f).
 2. Retrospectively with the cumulative effect of initially applying the pending content that links to this paragraph recognized at the date of initial application in accordance with (h) through (i).
 - e. If an entity elects to apply the pending content that links to this paragraph retrospectively in accordance with (d)(1), the entity shall provide the disclosures required in paragraphs 250-10-50-1 through 50-2 in the period of adoption, except as follows. An entity need not disclose the effect of the changes on the current period, which otherwise is required by paragraph 250-10-50-1(b)(2). However, an entity shall disclose the effect of the changes on any prior periods that have been retrospectively adjusted.
 - f. An entity may use one or more of the following practical expedients when applying the pending content that links to this paragraph retrospectively in accordance with (d)(1):
 1. An entity need not restate contracts that begin and are completed within the same annual reporting period.
 2. For completed contracts that have variable consideration, an entity may use the **transaction price** at the date the contract was completed rather than estimating variable consideration amounts in the comparative reporting periods.
 3. For all reporting periods presented before the date of initial application, an entity need not disclose the amount of the transaction price allocated to the remaining **performance obligations** and an explanation of when the entity expects to recognize that amount as revenue (see paragraph 606-10-50-13).
 4. For contracts that were modified before the beginning of the earliest reporting period presented in accordance with the pending content that links to this paragraph, an entity need not retrospectively restate the contract for those contract modifications in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-12 through 25-13. Instead, an entity shall reflect the aggregate effect of all modifications that occur before the beginning of the earliest period presented in accordance with the pending content that links to this paragraph when:
 - a. Identifying the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations
 - b. Determining the transaction price
 - c. Allocating the transaction price to the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations.
 - g. For any of the practical expedients in (f) that an entity uses, the entity shall apply that expedient consistently to all contracts within all reporting periods presented. In addition, the entity shall disclose all of the following information:
 1. The expedients that have been used
 2. To the extent reasonably possible, a qualitative assessment of the estimated effect of applying each of those expedients.

- h. If an entity elects to apply the pending content that links to this paragraph retrospectively in accordance with (d)(2), the entity shall recognize the cumulative effect of initially applying the pending content that links to this paragraph as an adjustment to the opening balance of retained earnings (or other appropriate components of equity or net assets in the statement of financial position) of the annual reporting period that includes the date of initial application. Under this transition method, an entity may elect to apply this guidance retrospectively either to all contracts at the date of initial application or only to contracts that are not completed contracts at the date of initial application (for example, January 1, 2018, for an entity with a December 31 year-end). An entity shall disclose whether it has applied this guidance to all contracts at the date of initial application or only to contracts that are not completed at the date of initial application. Under this transition method, an entity may apply the practical expedient for contract modifications in (f)(4). If an entity applies the practical expedient for contract modifications in (f)(4), it shall comply with the guidance in (g).
- i. For reporting periods that include the date of initial application, an entity shall disclose the nature of and reason for the change in accounting principle and provide both of the following additional disclosures if the pending content that links to this paragraph is applied retrospectively in accordance with (d)(2):
 1. The amount by which each financial statement line item is affected in the current reporting period by the application of the pending content that links to this paragraph as compared with the guidance that was in effect before the change
 2. An explanation of the reasons for significant changes identified in (i)(1).

For purposes of applying the transition requirements, the Board clarified the following terms in ASC 606-10-65-1 above:

- ▶ The *date of initial application* is the start of the reporting period in which an entity first applies the new guidance. For example, for a public entity with a fiscal year end of 31 December that does not adopt the standard early, the date of initial application will be 1 January 2018, regardless of the transition method selected.
- ▶ A *completed contract* is a contract for which all (or substantially all) of the revenue was recognized under legacy GAAP that was in effect before the date of initial application. Elements of a contract that do not affect revenue under legacy GAAP are not considered when assessing whether a contract is complete. Consider the following examples:
 - ▶ Contract is completed – A retailer sells products to a customer on 31 December 2017. Under its loyalty rewards program, the retailer gives customers points based on the amounts they spend. Customers can redeem these points for discounts on future purchases. Under legacy GAAP, the retailer follows the incremental cost accrual model and recognizes revenue at the time of the initial sale (i.e., 31 December 2017) plus an accrual for the expected costs of satisfying the award credits. Because all (or substantially all) of the revenue related to this sale has been recognized under legacy GAAP prior to the date of initial application of the new standard (e.g., 1 January 2018), the contract is considered completed under the new standard.
 - ▶ Contract is NOT completed – An entity licenses software to a customer on 1 January 2017 with extended payment terms that are not a standard business practice. The customer is required to make payments in three annual installments beginning 31 December 2017. Legacy GAAP for software revenue generally required entities that provide extended payment terms to defer revenue until future installment payments are due because the fees are presumed to not be fixed or determinable because a significant portion of the fee is not due for more than a year after delivery. As of the date of initial application of the new standard (e.g., 1 January 2018), the entity

has recognized revenue only for the first installment payment. Because all (or substantially all) of the revenue has not been recognized under legacy GAAP, the contract is not considered completed under the new standard.

The Board also explained in the Background Information and Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2106-12⁸ that it included the phrase “substantially all” in the definition of a completed contract because it did not intend to exclude all contracts for which less than 100% of the revenue was recognized under legacy GAAP (e.g., because of a sales return reserve).



IASB differences

The definition of a “completed contract” is not converged between US GAAP and IFRS. A completed contract under IFRS 15 “is a contract for which the entity has transferred all of the goods or services identified in accordance with IAS 11 *Construction Contracts*, IAS 18 *Revenue* and related Interpretations.”

1.3.1

Full retrospective adoption

Entities electing full retrospective adoption will apply the standard to each period presented in the financial statements in accordance with the accounting changes guidance in ASC 250-10-45-5 through 45-10, subject to the practical expedients created to provide relief, as discussed below. This means entities will have to apply the standard as if it had been in effect since the inception of all its contracts with customers presented in the financial statements. That is, an entity electing the full retrospective method would have to transition all of its contracts with customers to the standard (subject to the practical expedients described below), not just those contracts that are not considered completed as of the beginning of the earliest period presented under the standard at the date of initial application. This means that for contracts that were considered completed (as defined) before the beginning of the earliest period presented under the standard, an entity would still need to evaluate the contract under the standard in order to determine whether there was an effect on revenue recognition in any of the year’s presented in the income statement upon transition (e.g., 2016, 2017, 2018). During its deliberations on the original standard, the FASB seemed to prefer the full retrospective method under which all contracts with customers are recognized and measured consistently in all periods presented within the financial statements, regardless of contract inception. This method also provides users of the financial statements with useful trend information across all periods presented.

However, to ease the potential burden of a full retrospective application, the FASB provided the following relief:

- ▶ An entity is not required to restate revenue from contracts that begin and are completed within the same annual reporting period. For example, a December year-end public entity that adopts the standard on 1 January 2018 does not have to apply the standard to any contract that began and was completed within 2016 or began and was completed within 2017 (i.e., all or substantially all of the revenue related to that contract was recorded within one fiscal year).
- ▶ For completed contracts that have variable consideration, an entity may use the transaction price at the date the contract was completed, rather than estimating variable consideration amounts in the comparative reporting periods. That is, an entity may use hindsight when considering variable consideration for purposes of determining the transaction price for completed contracts. Chapter 5 discusses determining the transaction price under the new model.

⁸ Paragraph BC52 of ASU 2016-12.

- ▶ For all reporting periods presented before the date of initial application, as defined above, an entity is not required to disclose the amount of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations or when the entity expects to recognize that amount as revenue. This is discussed further in Section 10.4.1.

Only entities that elect the full retrospective transition method can use the practical expedients described above.

The following practical expedient can be used by entities that elect either transition method:

- ▶ For contracts modified prior to the beginning of the earliest reporting period presented under the new standard (e.g., 1 January 2016 for a public entity electing the full retrospective method), an entity can reflect the aggregate effect of all modifications that occur before the beginning of the earliest period presented under the new standard when identifying the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations, determining the transaction price and allocating the transaction price to the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations for the modified contract at transition.

An entity that uses this expedient will have to identify all contract modifications from the inception of the contract until the beginning of the earliest period presented under the new standard and determine how each modification affected the identification of performance obligations as of the modification date. However, the entity would not need to determine or allocate the transaction price as of the date of each modification. Instead, at the beginning of the earliest period presented under the standard, the entity would determine the transaction price for all satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations identified in the contract from contract inception to the beginning of the earliest period presented and then perform a single allocation of the transaction price to those performance obligations, based on their relative standalone selling prices.

The FASB acknowledged in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12⁹ that even with this practical expedient, an entity will need to use judgment and make estimates to account for contract modifications at transition. For example, an entity will need to use judgment in estimating standalone selling prices when there has been a wide range of selling prices and when allocating the transaction price to satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations if there have been several performance obligations or contract modifications over an extended period. Further, an entity will be required to apply the standard's contract modification guidance (see Section 3.4) to modifications made after the beginning of the earliest period presented under the new standard.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 includes a similar practical expedient for contract modifications at transition for entities that elect to apply the full retrospective method. These entities also would apply the IASB's practical expedient to all contract modifications that occur before the beginning of the earliest period presented in the financial statements. However, this could be a different date between US GAAP and IFRS preparers depending on the number of comparative years included in an entity's statements (e.g., IFRS preparers often include only one comparative year in their financial statements).

IFRS 15 also provides a practical expedient that the FASB's standard does not. It allows an entity that uses the full retrospective method to apply the new standard only to contracts that are not completed (as defined) as of the beginning of the earliest period presented.

⁹ Paragraph BC46 of ASU 2016-12.

Entities can decide to apply some, all or none of these expedients. However, if an entity uses any of them, it must apply that expedient consistently to all contracts within all periods presented. For example, it would not be appropriate to apply the selected expedient to some but not all of the periods presented. Entities that choose to use some or all of the relief will be required to provide additional qualitative disclosures (i.e., explain which types of relief the entity applied and the likely effects of that application).

An entity that elects to apply the full retrospective method also must provide the disclosures required in ASC 250-10-50-1 through 50-2 as excerpted below (with certain exceptions):

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Accounting Changes and Error Corrections – Overall

Disclosure

Change in Accounting Principle

250-10-50-1

An entity shall disclose all of the following in the fiscal period in which a **change in accounting principle** is made:

- a. The nature of and reason for the change in accounting principle, including an explanation of why the newly adopted accounting principle is preferable.
- b. The method of applying the change, including all of the following:
 1. A description of the prior-period information that has been retrospectively adjusted, if any.
 2. The effect of the change on income from continuing operations, net income (or other appropriate captions of changes in the applicable net assets or performance indicator), any other affected financial statement line item, and any affected per-share amounts for the current period and any prior periods retrospectively adjusted. Presentation of the effect on financial statement subtotals and totals other than income from continuing operations and net income (or other appropriate captions of changes in the applicable net assets or performance indicator) is not required.
 3. The cumulative effect of the change on retained earnings or other components of equity or net assets in the statement of financial position as of the beginning of the earliest period presented.
 4. If **retrospective application** to all prior periods is impracticable, disclosure of the reasons therefore, and a description of the alternative method used to report the change (see paragraphs 250-10-45-5 through 45-7).
- c. If **indirect effects of a change in accounting principle** are recognized both of the following shall be disclosed:
 1. A description of the indirect effects of a change in accounting principle, including the amounts that have been recognized in the current period, and the related per-share amounts, if applicable.
 2. Unless impracticable, the amount of the total recognized indirect effects of the accounting change and the related per-share amounts, if applicable, that are attributable to each prior period presented. Compliance with this disclosure requirement is practicable unless an entity cannot comply with it after making every reasonable effort to do so.

Financial statements of subsequent periods need not repeat the disclosures required by this paragraph. If a change in accounting principle has no material effect in the period of change but is reasonably certain to have a material effect in later periods, the disclosures required by (a) shall be provided whenever the financial statements of the period of change are presented.

250-10-50-2

An entity that issues interim financial statements shall provide the required disclosures in the financial statements of both the interim period of the change and the annual period of the change.

Under ASC 606-10-65-1(e), an entity that elects to apply the full retrospective method is *not required* to disclose the effect of the changes on the current period (e.g., 2018 for a calendar year-end public entity that does not early adopt), as would otherwise be required by ASC 250-10-50-1(b)(2). These entities still will be required to disclose the effect of the changes on any prior periods that have been retrospectively adjusted (e.g., 2016 and 2017 for a calendar year-end public entity that does not early adopt) in accordance with ASC 250-10-50-1(b)(2).

ASC 250-10-50-1 requires an entity to make these disclosures in the fiscal period in which a change in accounting principle is made. Financial statements of subsequent periods need not repeat the required disclosures initially made in the period of an accounting change. However, entities that issue interim financial statements must provide the required disclosures in the financial statements of both the interim and annual periods that include the direct or indirect effects of a change in accounting principle. For example, a public entity that makes a change in accounting principle in the first quarter of 20X8 must include the required disclosures in its first-, second- and third-quarter interim financial statements. The entity must also include the required disclosures for the annual period in its annual financial statements for 20X8. These disclosures are not required in the financial statements for any interim or annual periods after 20X8.

For the indirect effects of a change in accounting principle, an entity is required to disclose a description of the indirect effects, the amounts recognized in the current period and the related per-share amounts, as well as, if practicable, the total recognized indirect effects of the accounting change and the related per-share amounts attributable to each prior period presented.

1.3.2 Modified retrospective application

Entities that elect the modified retrospective method will apply the guidance retrospectively only to the most current period presented in the financial statements. To do so, the entity will have to recognize the cumulative effect of initially applying the standard as an adjustment to the opening balance of retained earnings (or other appropriate components of equity or net assets) at the date of initial application.

An entity may elect to apply the modified retrospective method to either all contracts as of the date of initial application (i.e., 1 January 2018 for a public entity with a calendar year end that does not early adopt the standard) or only to contracts that are not completed as of this date. Depending on how an entity elects to apply the modified retrospective method, it will have to evaluate either all contracts or only those that are not completed before the date of initial application as if the entity had applied the new standard to them since inception. An entity will be required to disclose how it has applied the modified retrospective method (i.e., either to all contracts or only to contracts that are not completed at the date of initial application).

An entity may choose to apply the modified retrospective method to all contracts as of the date of initial application (rather than only to contracts that are not completed) in order to apply the same accounting to similar contracts after the date of adoption. For example, as discussed in Section 1.3, a sale by a retailer on 31 December 2017 that included loyalty rewards points accounted for as a cost accrual (rather than as a revenue element) would be considered a completed contract as of the date of initial application (e.g., 1 January 2018). If the retailer adopts the standard only for contracts that are not completed, it would not restate revenue for this contract and would continue to account for the loyalty points as a cost accrual under legacy GAAP after adoption of the new standard. However, for any similar sales on or after 1 January 2018, loyalty points will generally be identified as a performance obligation and revenue will be allocated to the points awarded and deferred at the time of sale (see Section 4.1).

Accordingly, if the retailer prefers to account for similar transactions under the same accounting model (i.e., rather than as cost accruals for points awarded prior to 1 January 2018 and revenue deferrals thereafter), it could choose to adopt the standard for all contracts that would have revenue recognized under the new standard. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12,¹⁰ the FASB noted that the application of the modified retrospective method to all contracts could result in financial information that is more comparable with financial information provided by entities using the full retrospective method.

How we see it

Entities that use the modified retrospective method will need to make this election at the entity-wide level. That is, they will need to carefully consider whether to apply the standard to all contracts or only to contracts that are not completed as of the date of initial application, considering the totality of all of the entity's revenue streams and the potential disparity in accounting for the same or similar types of transactions after they adopt the standard.

Under the modified retrospective method, an entity will:

- ▶ Present comparative periods under legacy GAAP
- ▶ Apply the new revenue standard to new and existing contracts (either all existing contracts or only to contracts that are not completed contracts) as of the date of initial application
- ▶ Recognize a cumulative catch-up adjustment to the opening balance of retained earnings at the effective date for all contracts or only contracts that are not completed
- ▶ In the year of adoption, disclose the amount by which each financial statement line item was affected as a result of applying the new standard and an explanation of significant changes

As discussed above in Section 1.3.1, an entity that chooses the modified retrospective method can use only one of the four practical expedients available to entities that apply the full retrospective method. For contracts modified prior to the beginning of the earliest reporting period presented under the new standard (e.g., 1 January 2018), an entity can reflect the aggregate effect of all modifications that occur before the beginning of the earliest period presented under the new standard when identifying the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations, determining the transaction price and allocating the transaction price to the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations for the modified contract at transition.

An entity that uses this expedient will have to identify all contract modifications from the inception of the contract until the beginning of the earliest period presented under the new standard and determine how each modification affected the identification of performance obligations as of the modification date. However, the entity would not need to determine or allocate the transaction price as of the date of each modification. Instead, at the beginning of the earliest period presented under the standard, the entity would determine the transaction price for all satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations identified in the contract from contract inception to the beginning of the earliest period presented and then perform a single allocation of the transaction price to those performance obligations, based on their relative standalone selling prices.

If an entity electing the modified retrospective method uses the practical expedient for contract modifications, it will be required to provide additional qualitative disclosures (i.e., the type of relief the entity applied and the likely effects of that application).

¹⁰ Paragraph BC53 of ASU 2016-12.

The FASB acknowledged in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12¹¹ that even with this practical expedient, an entity will need to use judgment and make estimates to account for contract modifications at transition. For example, an entity will need to use judgment in estimating standalone selling prices when there has been a wide range of selling prices and when allocating the transaction price to satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations if there have been several performance obligations or contract modifications over an extended period. Further, an entity will be required to apply the standard's contract modification guidance (see Section 3.4) to modifications made after the beginning of the earliest period presented under the new standard.



IASB differences

As discussed above, IFRS 15 includes a similar practical expedient for contract modifications at transition; however, an entity can choose to apply the IASB's practical expedient when using the modified retrospective method either to all contract modifications that occur before the beginning of the earliest period presented in the financial statements or to all contract modifications that occur before the date of initial application.

The following example illustrates the potential effects of modified retrospective adoption:

Illustration 1-1: Cumulative effect of adoption under modified retrospective

A public entity software vendor with a 31 December fiscal year end adopts the standard as of 1 January 2018. The vendor selects the modified retrospective method for adoption and elects to apply it only to contracts that are not completed.

The vendor frequently enters into contracts to provide a software license, professional services and post-contract support (PCS) and previously accounted for its contracts in accordance with ASC 985-605. Further, the vendor did not have vendor-specific objective evidence (VSOE) of the fair value for the PCS and, as a result, recognized the contract consideration ratably over the PCS period.

Under the new guidance, the vendor would likely reach a different conclusion regarding the units of accounting than it did under ASC 985-605 because the standard does not require VSOE of fair value to treat promised goods and services as separate performance obligations (discussed further in Section 4.2).

As a result, the vendor's analysis of contracts that are not complete as of 1 January 2018 would likely result in the identification of different performance obligations from the units of accounting it previously identified for revenue recognition. As part of this assessment, the entity would need to allocate the estimated transaction price based on the relative standalone selling price method (see Section 6.2) to the newly identified performance obligations.

The vendor would compare the revenue recognized for each contract from contract inception through 31 December 2017 to the amount that would have been recognized if it had applied the standard since contract inception. The difference between those amounts would be accounted for as a cumulative effect adjustment and recognized on 1 January 2018. Beginning on 1 January 2018, the amount of revenue recognized would be based on the new guidance.

¹¹ Paragraph BC46 of ASU 2016-12.

Regardless of the transition method selected, an entity is required to disclose the nature and reason for the change in accounting principle. In addition, an entity that elects to apply the modified retrospective method will be required to make certain disclosures in the year of initial application, including in interim periods. Specifically, the entity must disclose the amount by which each financial statement line item is affected as a result of applying the new standard. Further, an entity must disclose a qualitative explanation of the significant changes between the reported results under the new revenue recognition standard and the prior revenue recognition guidance.

How we see it

Depending on an entity's prior accounting, applying the modified retrospective method may be more difficult than the entity anticipates. Entities may encounter situations that likely will make this application more complex, including:

- ▶ The performance obligations identified under the new guidance are different from the separate units of accounting identified under legacy GAAP.
- ▶ The relative selling price allocation under the new guidance results in different amounts being allocated to performance obligations than had been allocated in the past.
- ▶ The contract contains variable consideration, and the amount of variable consideration that can be included in the allocable consideration differs from the amount under legacy GAAP.

Entities should also consider that the modified retrospective method effectively requires an entity to keep two sets of accounting records in the year of adoption in order to comply with the requirement to disclose all line items in the financial statements as if they were prepared under legacy GAAP.

1.3.3

Other transition considerations

Regardless of the transition method they select, many entities will have to apply the guidance to contracts they entered into in prior periods. The population of contracts will likely be larger under the full retrospective method; however, under the modified retrospective method, entities will at a minimum have to apply the guidance to all contracts that are not completed as of the initial application date, regardless of contract inception. Questions on the mechanics of retrospective application are likely to arise.

In addition, while the Board provided some relief from a full retrospective method in the form of four practical expedients and provided the option of a modified retrospective method with one practical expedient, there are still a number of implementation issues that may make transitioning to the new standard difficult and time-consuming.

For example:

- ▶ For full retrospective adoption, entities likely will be required to perform a relative standalone selling price allocation if there are changes to the identified units of accounting, the transaction price or both. If an entity previously performed a relative selling price allocation (e.g., when the transaction was accounted for under ASC 605-25), performing this step will likely be straightforward. However, if an entity did not previously perform a relative selling price allocation, an entity will be required to determine the standalone selling price of each performance obligation as of contract inception. Depending on the age of the contract, this information may not be readily available, and the prices may differ significantly from current standalone selling prices. While the standard is clear on when it is acceptable to use hindsight when considering variable consideration for purposes of determining the transaction price (see Section 5.2), the standard is silent on whether the use of hindsight is acceptable for other aspects of the model (e.g., for purposes of allocating the transaction price) or whether it would be acceptable to use current pricing information if that were the only information available.

- ▶ Estimating variable consideration for all contracts for the prior periods will likely require significant judgment. The standard does not permit the use of hindsight for contracts that are not completed when applying the full retrospective method. While the standard is silent on whether the use of hindsight is acceptable for entities applying the modified retrospective method, the FASB's discussion in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹² implied that it originally intended to make no practical expedients available for the modified retrospective method. Further, since entities applying the modified retrospective method may only be adjusting contracts that are not completed, it seems likely that the use of hindsight is not acceptable. As a result, entities must make this estimate based only on information that was available at contract inception. Contemporaneous documentation clarifying what (and when) information was available to management will likely be needed to support these estimates. In addition to estimating variable amounts using the expected value or a most likely amount approach, entities will have to make conclusions about whether such variable amounts are subject to the constraint (see Section 5.2.3 for further discussion).
- ▶ The modified retrospective method does not require entities to recast the amounts reported in prior periods. However, entities electing this method will still have to calculate, as of the adoption date, either for all contracts or only for contracts that are not completed (depending on how the entity elects to apply this transition method), the revenues they would have recognized if they had applied the new guidance since contract inception to determine the cumulative effect of adopting the standard. This is likely to be most challenging for contracts for which the unit of accounting or allocable contract consideration changes when the new guidance is applied.

Finally, an entity will need to consider a number of other issues as it prepares to adopt the standard. For example, an entity with significant deferred revenue balances before the date of initial application may experience what some refer to as "lost revenue" if those amounts will ultimately, be reflected in the restated prior periods or as part of the cumulative adjustment upon adoption but are never reported as revenue in a current period.

1.3.4 Additional transition considerations for public entities

In addition to determining its adoption date and transition method, a public entity also will have to consider how it will address certain SEC requirements and staff guidance:

SAB Topic 11.M – This guidance requires entities to provide disclosures about the effects, to the extent those effects are known, of recently issued accounting standards in registration statements and periodic reports filed with the SEC. Public entities should consider the following disclosures within management's discussion and analysis (MD&A) and the financial statements:

- ▶ A brief description of the new standard, the date that adoption is required and the date that the registrant plans to adopt, if earlier
- ▶ A discussion of the methods of adoption allowed by the standard and the method the registrant expects to use, if determined
- ▶ A discussion of the effect the standard is expected to have on the financial statements or, if the effect is not known or reasonably estimable, a statement to that effect
- ▶ Disclosure of other significant matters that the registrant believes might result from adopting the standard (e.g., planned or intended changes in business practices)

¹² Paragraph BC441 of ASU 2014-09.

How we see it

The SEC staff has stated several times that it expects an entity's disclosures to evolve as more information about the effects of the new standard becomes available. That is, the SEC staff expects that an entity's transition disclosures will increase as a company progresses in its implementation plans. In addition, entities that don't yet know how they will be affected should disclose that the effect is unknown, along with information about when they plan to complete their assessment of how they will be affected.

These disclosures should provide users with detailed information about the adoption and should not include boilerplate language. We believe this may become a focus area for the SEC staff in its reviews of filings.

Selected financial data table¹³ and ratio of earnings to fixed charges¹⁴ – While the SEC staff's longstanding view has been that all periods in the five-year selected financial data table must be recast to give effect to the full retrospective adoption of a new accounting standard or change in accounting principle, the SEC staff updated its Financial Reporting Manual (FRM)¹⁵ in March 2016 to state that it will not object if entities that elect full retrospective adoption of the standard do not recast the earliest two years in these disclosures. That is, the SEC staff will allow an entity to only adjust the table for the same years it presents in its primary financial statements (e.g., 2016, 2017 and 2018). Such entities will be required to include clear disclosure about the lack of comparability among the years in all instances. That is, registrants that elect full retrospective adoption and choose not to recast the earliest two years will need to disclose in a note to the table of selected financial data, or in a cross-referenced discussion, accounting changes that materially affect comparability among the years presented. A public entity that applies the standard using the modified retrospective method also will need to include clear disclosures on the lack of comparability, but it is not otherwise required to recast any year other than the current one.

The SEC staff also said in its FRM update that it would not object if entities that elect full retrospective adoption of the standard do not recast the earliest two years of the ratio of earnings to fixed charges requirements.

Registration statement requirements for previously issued financial statements – Item 11(b) of Form S-3 requires retrospective revision of the annual financial statements in a new or amended registration statement when a registrant adopts a new accounting principle retrospectively (i.e., following the full retrospective method under the new standard) and the change is considered material. For example, a calendar-year registrant filing a Form S-3 registration statement in 2018 after it adopts the revenue standard retrospectively in a Form 10-Q filing, but before it files the annual financial statements for the year of adoption, would be required to recast its prior-period annual financial statements (i.e., for 2015, 2016 and 2017). Absent this registration statement requirement, the entity would only have to recast its prior period financial statements for 2016 and 2017 when it files its full year 2018 10-K (which will include 2016, 2017 and 2018). This means that such an entity will need to recast an extra full year to reflect the effect of the new standard (i.e., 2015) just because it is filing a registration statement.

The recast financial statements (with accompanying MD&A and selected financial data) generally are filed in a Form 8-K and not an amended Form 10-K because the original financial statements did not contain errors.

The SEC staff has publicly discussed questions it has received about this requirement, specifically how it applies to adoption of the new revenue standard. The SEC staff acknowledged entities' concerns about having to recast an additional year of financial statements and reminded entities that the impracticability exception to retrospective application provided by ASC 250-10-45-9 can apply if the required criteria are

¹³ Item 301 of Regulation S-K.

¹⁴ Item 503(d) of Regulation S-K.

¹⁵ New Topic 11, *Reporting Issues Related to Adoption of New Revenue Recognition Standard*, of the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance's Financial Reporting Manual.

met. Entities are encouraged to consult with the SEC staff if they believe that, based on their facts and circumstances, a retrospective application of the new revenue recognition standard to all periods required to be presented in a Form S-3 is impracticable.

Similar considerations would apply to certain other Securities Act registration statements (e.g., Form S-1, Form S-4) when historical financial statements are incorporated by reference.

How we see it

If an entity knows that it will have a Form S-3 shelf registration statement that will expire in the same year as it adopts the new revenue standard, it can plan ahead and refresh that registration statement before adoption and avoid having to recast an additional year. That is, an entity can refresh a shelf registration statement at any time; it is not required to wait until the registration statement expires.

Financial information of equity method investees – Under Rules 3-09 and 4-08(g) of Regulation S-X, an equity method investee that was once insignificant could become significant because of a retrospective accounting change. While a registrant does not need to remeasure significance in any registration statement or proxy statement filed in the current fiscal year, under the current SEC rules, when the registrant files its next Form 10-K, it would have to recalculate significance of equity method investees for each fiscal year presented using the historical financial statements that are retrospectively revised for the accounting change.

Absent specific relief and depending on the level of significance based on the revised calculation, separate audited financial statements (under Rule 3-09) or summarized financial information (under Rule 4-08(g)) of the equity method investee could be required. However, in its March 2016 FRM update, the SEC staff said it would allow companies that adopt the revenue standard on a full retrospective basis to use their pre-adoption significance tests for evaluating the applicability of Rules 3-09 and 4-08(g) of Regulation S-X for periods before the date of initial application of the standard.

The SEC staff further stated in its March 2016 FRM update that registrants will not be required to conform the transition dates and methods of adopting (i.e., full or modified retrospective) the standard for equity method investees for purposes of computing the significance of equity method investees under Rules 3-09 and 4-08(g) of Regulation S-X.

Internal control over financial reporting (ICFR) disclosures – Public entities will also have to consider whether their implementation of new controls and processes related to adoption of the standard requires disclosure about material changes in ICFR under Item 308(c) of Regulation S-K.

Article 11 pro forma disclosures – In its March 2016 FRM update, the SEC staff said that the transition date and method of adopting (i.e., full or modified retrospective) the standard for significant acquired businesses must conform to those of the registrant when pro forma financial information is provided to comply with Article 11 of Regulation S-X.

2

Scope

The new guidance applies to all entities and all contracts with customers to provide goods or services in the ordinary course of business, except for contracts or transactions that are excluded from its scope, as described below:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Scope and Scope Exceptions

Entities

606-10-15-1

The guidance in this Subtopic applies to all entities.

Transactions

606-10-15-2

An entity shall apply the guidance in this Topic to all contracts with customers, except the following:

- a. Lease contracts within the scope of Topic 840, Leases.
- b. Insurance contracts within the scope of Topic 944, Financial Services–Insurance.
- c. Financial instruments and other contractual rights or obligations within the scope of the following Topics:
 1. Topic 310, Receivables
 2. Topic 320, Investments–Debt and Equity Securities
 3. Topic 323, Investments–Equity Method and Joint Ventures
 4. Topic 325, Investments–Other
 5. Topic 405, Liabilities
 6. Topic 470, Debt
 7. Topic 815, Derivatives and Hedging
 8. Topic 825, Financial Instruments
 9. Topic 860, Transfers and Servicing.
- d. Guarantees (other than product or service warranties) within the scope of Topic 460, Guarantees.
- e. Nonmonetary exchanges between entities in the same line of business to facilitate sales to customers or potential customers. For example, this Topic would not apply to a contract between two oil companies that agree to an exchange of oil to fulfill demand from their customers in different specified locations on a timely basis. Topic 845 on nonmonetary transactions may apply to nonmonetary exchanges that are not within the scope of this Topic.

606-10-15-3

An entity shall apply the guidance in this Topic to a contract (other than a contract listed in paragraph 606-10-15-2) only if the counterparty to the contract is a customer. A customer is a party that has contracted with an entity to obtain goods or services that are an output of the entity's ordinary activities in exchange for consideration. A counterparty to the contract would not be a customer if, for example, the counterparty has contracted with the entity to participate in an activity or process in which the parties to the contract share in the risks and benefits that result from the activity or process (such as developing an asset in a collaboration arrangement) rather than to obtain the output of the entity's ordinary activities.

UPDATE: In May 2016, the FASB proposed amending ASC 606-10-15-2(b) to delete the word "insurance" and say only that "contracts" within the scope of ASC 944 are excluded from the scope of ASC 606. This proposal would address the fact that ASC 944 includes guidance for non-insurance investment contracts as well as insurance contracts. Comments were due 2 July 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

2.1**Other scope considerations**

Certain agreements executed by entities include repurchase provisions, either as a component of a sales contract or as a separate contract that relates to the same or similar goods in the original agreement. The form of the repurchase agreement and whether the customer obtains control of the asset subject to the agreement will determine whether the agreement is within the scope of the standard. See Section 7.3 for a discussion on repurchase agreements.

Entities may enter into transactions that are partially within the scope of the new revenue recognition guidance and partially within the scope of other guidance. In these situations, the standard requires an entity to first apply any separation and/or measurement principles in the other guidance before applying the revenue standard. See Section 2.4 for further discussion.

The standard also provides guidance on the accounting for certain costs such as the incremental costs of obtaining a contract and the costs of fulfilling a contract. However, the standard requires that the guidance on costs of fulfilling a contract be applied only if there is no other guidance for accounting for these costs. See Section 9.3 for further discussion of the cost guidance in the new standard.

In addition, the consequential amendments associated with the standard include guidance on the recognition of a gain or loss on the transfer of certain nonfinancial assets (e.g., assets within the scope of ASC 360 and intangible assets within the scope of ASC 350). See Chapter 11 for further discussion.

2.2**Definition of a customer**

The standard defines a customer as "a party that has contracted with an entity to obtain goods or services that are an output of the entity's ordinary activities in exchange for consideration." The standard does not define the term "ordinary activities" because it was derived from CON 6, which refers to ordinary activities as an entity's "ongoing major or central operations." In many transactions, a customer is easily identifiable. However, in transactions involving multiple parties, it may be less clear which counterparties are customers of an entity. For some arrangements, multiple parties could be considered customers of the entity. However, for other arrangements, only one of the parties involved is considered a customer.

The illustration below shows how the party considered to be the customer may differ, depending on the arrangement:

Illustration 2-1: Identification of a customer

An entity provides internet-based advertising services to companies. As part of that service, the entity obtains banner space on various websites from a selection of publishers. For certain contracts, the entity provides a sophisticated service of matching the ad placement with the pre-identified criteria of the advertising party. In addition, the entity purchases the advertising space from the publishers before it finds advertisers for that space. Assume that the entity appropriately concludes it is acting as the principal in these contracts (see Section 4.4 for further discussion of principal versus agent considerations). Accordingly, the entity identifies its customer in this transaction as the advertiser to whom it is providing services.

In other contracts, the entity simply matches advertisers with the publishers in its portfolio, but the entity does not provide any ad-targeting services or purchase the advertising space from the publishers before it finds advertisers for that space. Assume that the entity appropriately concludes it is acting as the agent in these contracts. Accordingly, the entity identifies its customer as the publisher to whom it is providing services.

In addition, the identification of the performance obligations in a contract (discussed further in Chapter 4) can have a significant effect on the determination of which party is the entity's customer.

Also see the discussion of the identification of an entity's customer when applying the guidance on consideration paid or payable to a customer in Section 5.7.

2.3 Collaborative arrangements

In certain transactions, a counterparty may not be a "customer" of the entity. Instead, the counterparty may be a collaborator or partner that shares in the risks and benefits of developing a product to be marketed. These transactions, which are common in the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, oil and gas, and health care industries, generally are in the scope of ASC 808 on collaborative arrangements. However, depending on the facts and circumstances, these arrangements may also contain a vendor-customer aspect. Such arrangements could still be within the scope of the new revenue guidance, at least partially, if that collaborator or partner meets the definition of a customer for some or all aspects of the arrangement.

The FASB decided not to provide further guidance for determining whether certain revenue-generating collaborative arrangements would be in the scope of the new guidance. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁶ the FASB explained that it would not be possible to provide implementation guidance that applies to all collaborative arrangements. Therefore, the parties to such arrangements need to consider all of the facts and circumstances to determine whether a vendor-customer relationship exists that is subject to the new guidance.

However, the FASB did determine¹⁷ that in some circumstances (e.g., when more relevant guidance that could be applied is not available), it may be appropriate for an entity to apply the principles in the new revenue standard to collaborations or partnerships.

¹⁶ Paragraph BC54 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁷ Paragraph BC56 of ASU 2014-09.

How we see it

Under legacy guidance, identifying the customer can be difficult, especially when multiple parties are involved in a transaction. This evaluation can require significant judgment, and the new guidance does not provide any additional considerations.

While transactions among collaboration partners that are in the scope of ASC 808 aren't in the scope of the new revenue guidance, ASC 808-10-45-3 states that when payments between parties in a collaboration are not within the scope of other authoritative accounting literature, the income statement classification should be based on an analogy to authoritative accounting literature or, if there is no appropriate analogy, a reasonable, rational and consistently applied accounting policy election. Therefore, ASC 808 allows an entity to apply the new revenue recognition guidance by analogy to these types of arrangements, if that is the policy it has elected.

2.4

Interaction with other guidance

Under legacy GAAP, entities entering into transactions that fall within the scope of multiple areas of accounting guidance have to separate those transactions into the elements that are accounted for under different pieces of literature. The new revenue guidance does not change this.

However, under legacy guidance, revenue transactions often must be separated into elements that are accounted for under different pieces of revenue guidance (e.g., a multiple-element transaction that falls within the scope of both the multiple-element arrangements guidance in ASC 605-25 and the construction-type and production-type contracts guidance in ASC 605-35). Under the new guidance, this separation will not be required because there is a single revenue recognition model.

The standard provides guidance for arrangements partially in its scope and partially in the scope of other standards as follows:

Excerpt from the Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Scope and Scope Exceptions

Transactions

606-10-15-4

A contract with a customer may be partially within the scope of this Topic and partially within the scope of other Topics listed in paragraph 606-10-15-2.

- a. If the other Topics specify how to separate and/or initially measure one or more parts of the contract, then an entity shall first apply the separation and/or measurement guidance in those Topics. An entity shall exclude from the **transaction price** the amount of the part (or parts) of the contract that are initially measured in accordance with other Topics and shall apply paragraphs 606-10-32-28 through 32-41 to allocate the amount of the transaction price that remains (if any) to each **performance obligation** within the scope of this Topic and to any other parts of the contract identified by paragraph 606-10-15-4(b).
- b. If the other Topics do not specify how to separate and/or initially measure one or more parts of the contract, then the entity shall apply the guidance in this Topic to separate and/or initially measure the part (or parts) of the contract.

Only after applying any other applicable guidance will an entity apply the standard's revenue guidance to the remaining elements of an arrangement. Some examples of where separation and/or measurement are addressed in other literature include the following:

- ▶ ASC 460 provides that a liability should be recognized, based on the guarantee's estimated fair value, when a guarantee is issued as part of a multiple-element arrangement. Therefore, for contracts that include a guarantee and revenue elements, the fair value of the guarantee is deducted from the estimated contract consideration, and the remaining contract consideration is allocated among the other elements in the contract in accordance with the revenue recognition standard.
- ▶ Subsequent to the adoption of ASC 606, ASC 840 provides guidance on allocating an arrangement's consideration between the lease element (including related executory costs) and non-lease elements within a contractual arrangement that refers to the revenue guidance (i.e., ASC 606-10-15-4 and paragraphs 606-10-32-28 through 32-41). Accordingly, the arrangement consideration should be allocated between the elements within the scope of ASC 840 and any non-lease elements within the scope of other guidance (e.g., the revenue guidance) based on the relative standalone selling price of each element.

In February 2016, the FASB issued a new leases standard (that is codified as ASC 842) that has similar requirements to those in ASC 840 for how lessors allocate arrangement consideration between lease and non-lease components using the allocation principles in ASC 606. The new leases standard is effective for public entities, as defined, for annual and interim periods beginning after 15 December 2018 (i.e., one year after the new revenue standard). For nonpublic entities, the effective date will be annual periods beginning after 15 December 2019, and interim periods the following year. Early adoption is permitted for all entities.

If an element of the arrangement is covered by another ASC topic but that topic does not specify how to separate and/or initially measure that element, the entity will apply the revenue guidance for purposes of separation and/or measurement. For example, specific guidance does not exist on the separation and measurement of the different parts of an arrangement when an entity sells a business and also enters into a long-term supply agreement with the other party. Under legacy GAAP, entities account for these often complex arrangements in different ways. It is unclear how these arrangements will be accounted for under the new revenue standard. See Section 6.6 for further discussion of the effect on the allocation of arrangement consideration when an arrangement includes both revenue and non-revenue elements.

Question 2-1

Should contracts that guarantee performance (e.g., when a contract contains a service level agreement (SLA)) be accounted for under ASC 460 or ASC 606?

Consider an example in which an entity has a contract with a customer to operate a call center. The contract includes an SLA guaranteeing that the average service call response times will be below two minutes. If the call center does not meet the two minute average wait time, the entity will have to pay the customer a penalty.

ASC 606 specifically excludes from its scope contracts with customers for guarantees (other than product or service warranties discussed in Section 9.1) that are within the scope of ASC 460. As discussed above, ASC 606-10-15-4 also includes guidance on how to separate and measure a contract that is partially within the scope of ASC 606 and partially within the scope of other topics. Therefore, an entity must consider the scope of ASC 460 to determine whether a transaction falls within the scope of ASC 460, ASC 606 or partially between them. ASC 460-10-15-7(i) states that a guarantee or indemnification of an entity's own future performance is not within the scope of ASC 460.

Accordingly, because of the ASC 460-10-15-7(i) scope exception, contracts that guarantee an entity's own future performance do not contain a guarantee within the scope of ASC 460 and the entity should account for the contract under ASC 606. This contract provision will be accounted for as variable consideration (see Section 5.2).

Question 2-2 Should contracts that include a profit margin guarantee be accounted for under ASC 460 or ASC 606?

Consider an example in which a clothing manufacturer sells clothing to a retail store under a contract offering a refund of a portion of its sales price at the end of each season if the retailer has not met a minimum sales margin. The retail store takes title to the clothing and title remains with the retailer. The profit margin guarantee is agreed to at the inception of the contract and is a fixed amount.

As discussed in Question 2-1 above, the entity (i.e., the clothing manufacturer) will first consider whether the contract is in the scope of ASC 460. In this scenario, an entity would likely determine that such an arrangement would meet either (or both) of two scope exceptions in ASC 460. ASC 460-10-15-7(e) states that a contract that "provides for payments that constitute a vendor rebate (by the guarantor) based on either the sales revenues of, or the number of units sold by, the guaranteed party" is excluded from the scope of ASC 460. ASC 460-10-15-7(g) states that "a guarantee or an indemnification whose existence prevents the guarantor from being able to either account for a transaction as the sale of an asset that is related to the guarantee's underlying or recognize in earnings the profit from that sale transaction" also is excluded from the scope of ASC 460.

Accordingly, we believe contracts that include a profit margin guarantee not contain a guarantee within the scope of ASC 460 and the entity should account for the contract under ASC 606. This contract provision will be accounted for as variable consideration (see Section 5.2).

Question 2-3 Are certain fee-generating activities of financial institutions in the scope of the new revenue standard (i.e., servicing and sub-servicing financial assets, providing financial guarantees and providing deposit-related services)? [18 April FASB TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 52]

FASB TRG members generally agreed that the standard provides a framework for determining whether certain contracts are in the scope of ASC 606 or other guidance. As discussed above, the standard's scope includes all contracts with customers to provide goods or services in the ordinary course of business, except for contracts with customers that are within the scope of certain other ASC topics that are listed in ASC 606-10-15-2. If the guidance in another ASC topic specifies the accounting for the consideration (e.g., a fee) received in the arrangement, the consideration is outside the scope of ASC 606. If the guidance in other ASC topics does not specify the accounting for the consideration and there is a separate good or service provided, the consideration is in (or at least partially in) the scope of ASC 606. The FASB staff applied this framework in the TRG agenda paper to arrangements to service financial assets, provide financial guarantees and provide deposit-related services.

FASB TRG members generally agreed that income from servicing financial assets (e.g., loans) *is not in the scope* of ASC 606. An asset servicer performs various services, such as communication with the borrower and payment collection, in exchange for a fee. FASB TRG members generally agreed that an entity should look to ASC 860 to determine the appropriate accounting for these fees. This is because ASC 606 contains a scope exception for contracts that fall under ASC 860, which provides guidance on the accounting for the fees (despite not providing explicit guidance on revenue accounting).

FASB TRG members generally agreed that fees from providing financial guarantees *are not in the scope* of ASC 606. A financial institution may receive a fee for providing a guarantee of a loan. These types of financial guarantees are generally within the scope of ASC 460 or ASC 815. FASB TRG members generally agreed that an entity should look to ASC 460 or ASC 815 to determine the appropriate accounting for these fees. This is because ASC 606 contains a scope exception for contracts that fall under those topics, which provide principles an entity can follow to determine the appropriate accounting to reflect the financial guarantor's release from risk (and credit to earnings).

FASB TRG members generally agreed that fees from deposit-related services *are in the scope of* ASC 606. In contrast to the decisions for servicing income and financial guarantees, the guidance in ASC 405 that financial institutions apply to determine the appropriate liability accounting for customer deposits, does not provide a model for recognizing fees related to customer deposits (e.g., ATM fees, account maintenance or dormancy fees). Accordingly, FASB TRG members generally agreed that deposit fees and charges are in the scope of ASC 606, even though ASC 405 is listed as a scope exception in the standard, because of the lack of guidance on the accounting for these fees in ASC 405.

Question 2-4 **Are credit card fees in the scope of the new revenue standard?** [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 36]

A bank that issues credit cards can have various income streams (e.g., annual fees) from a cardholder under various credit card arrangements. Some of these fees may entitle cardholders to ancillary services (e.g., concierge services, airport lounge access). The card issuer also may provide rewards to cardholders based on their purchases. Stakeholders had questioned whether such fees and programs are within the scope of the new revenue standard, particularly when a good or service is provided to a cardholder.

FASB TRG members generally agreed that credit card fees that are accounted for under ASC 310 are not in the scope of ASC 606. This includes annual fees that may entitle cardholders to ancillary services. FASB TRG members noted that this conclusion is consistent with legacy accounting for credit card fees. However, the SEC Observer noted and FASB TRG members agreed that the nature of the arrangement must be truly that of a credit card lending arrangement in order to be in the scope of ASC 310, and entities will need to continue to evaluate their arrangements as they develop new types of programs.

While this question was raised by US GAAP stakeholders, IASB TRG members generally agreed that an IFRS entity would first need to determine whether the credit card fees are in the scope of IFRS 9 or IAS 39, which requires that any fees that are an integral part of the effective interest rate for a financial instrument be treated as an adjustment to the effective interest rate. Conversely, any fees that are not an integral part of the effective interest rate of the financial instrument generally will be accounted for under IFRS 15. As such, credit card fees could be treated differently under US GAAP and IFRS.

Question 2-5 **Are credit card holder rewards programs in the scope of the new revenue standard?** [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 36]

FASB TRG members generally agreed that if all consideration (i.e., credit card fees discussed in Question 2-4 above) related to the rewards program are determined to be in the scope of ASC 310, the rewards program would not be in the scope of ASC 606. However, this determination would have to be made based on the facts and circumstances due to the wide variety of credit card reward programs offered. IASB TRG members did not discuss this issue because the question was raised only in the context of US GAAP.

Question 2-6 **Are contributions in the scope of the new revenue standard?** [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 26]

Not-for-profit entities follow ASC 958-605 under legacy GAAP to account for contributions received (i.e., unconditional promises of cash or other assets in voluntary nonreciprocal transfers). Contributions are not explicitly excluded from the scope of the new standard. However, ASC 958-605 will not be wholly superseded by ASC 606.

FASB TRG members generally agreed that contributions are not within the scope of ASC 606 because they are nonreciprocal transfers. That is, contributions are generally not given in exchange for goods or services that are an output of the entity's ordinary activities. IASB TRG members did not discuss this issue because the question was raised only in the context of US GAAP.

Question 2-7

Are fixed-odds wagering contracts in the scope of the new revenue standard? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 47]

US GAAP gaming entities account for earnings from fixed-odds wagering contracts as gaming revenue under ASC 924-605 in legacy GAAP. This guidance will be superseded by ASC 606. In fixed-odds wagering contracts, the payout for wagers placed on gaming activities (e.g., table games, slot machines, sports betting) is known at the time the wager is placed. US GAAP stakeholders had questioned whether these contracts are in the scope of the new revenue standard or whether they could meet the definition of a derivative and be in the scope of ASC 815.

FASB TRG members generally agreed that it was not clear whether fixed-odds wagering contracts should be in the scope of the new revenue standard or ASC 815. ASC 606 scopes in all contracts with customers unless the contracts are in the scope of other existing guidance, such as ASC 815. FASB TRG members agreed that it was possible that fixed-odds wagering contracts would meet the definition of a derivative under ASC 815 and therefore be scoped out of ASC 606. If the FASB believes that these contracts should be considered revenue arrangements and should be accounted for under ASC 606 once the industry-specific guidance is superseded, FASB TRG members recommended that a clarification be codified in US GAAP.

UPDATE: In May 2016, the FASB proposed including a scope exception in ASC 815 and ASC 924 that would clarify that these arrangements are within the scope of ASC 606. Comments were due 2 July 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

IASB TRG members did not discuss this issue because the question was raised only in the context of US GAAP. Under IFRS, consistent with a July 2007 IFRS Interpretations Committee agenda decision, wagers that meet the definition of a derivative are within the scope of IFRS 9 or IAS 39, and those that do not meet the definition of a derivative are within the scope of IFRS 15.

3 Identify the contract with the customer

To apply the model, an entity must first identify the contract, or contracts, to provide goods and services to customers as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Identifying the Contract

606-10-25-2

A contract is an agreement between two or more parties that creates enforceable rights and obligations. Enforceability of the rights and obligations in a contract is a matter of law. Contracts can be written, oral, or implied by an entity's customary business practices. The practices and processes for establishing contracts with customers vary across legal jurisdictions, industries, and entities. In addition, they may vary within an entity (for example, they may depend on the class of customer or the nature of the promised goods or services). An entity shall consider those practices and processes in determining whether and when an agreement with a customer creates enforceable rights and obligations.

A contract must create enforceable rights and obligations to fall within the scope of the model in the standard. Such contracts may be written, oral or implied by an entity's customary business practices. For example, if an entity has an established practice of starting performance based on oral agreements with its customers, it may determine that such oral agreements meet the definition of a contract.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁸ the FASB acknowledged that entities will need to look at the relevant legal framework to determine whether the contract is enforceable because factors that determine enforceability may differ by jurisdiction. As a result, an entity may have to account for an arrangement as soon as performance begins rather than delay revenue recognition until the arrangement is documented in a signed contract, as is often the case under legacy GAAP. However, certain arrangements may require a written contract to comply with laws or regulations in a particular jurisdiction, and these requirements should be considered in determining whether a contract exists. The Board also clarified that while the contract must be legally enforceable to be within the scope of the model in the standard, all of the promises don't have to be enforceable to be considered performance obligations (see Section 4.1). That is, a performance obligation can be based on the customer's reasonable expectations (e.g., due to the entity's business practice of providing an additional good or service that isn't specified in the contract).

Illustration 3-1: Oral contract

IT Support Co. provides online technology support for consumers remotely via the internet. For a flat fee, IT Support Co. will scan a customer's personal computer (PC) for viruses, optimize the PC's performance and solve any connectivity problems. When a customer calls to obtain the scan services, IT Support Co. describes the services it can provide and states the price for those services. When the customer agrees to the terms stated by the representative, payment is made over the telephone. IT Support Co. then gives the customer the information needed to obtain the scan services (e.g., an access code for the website) and provides the services when the customer connects to the internet and logs on to the entity's website (which may be that day or a future date).

¹⁸ Paragraph BC32 of ASU 2014-09.

In this example, IT Support Co. and its customer are entering into an oral agreement, which is legally enforceable in this jurisdiction, for IT Support Co. to repair the customer's PC and for the customer to provide consideration by transmitting a valid credit card number and authorization over the telephone. The required criteria (discussed further in ASC 606-10-25-1 below) are all met, and this agreement will be within the scope of the model in the standard, even if the entity has not yet performed the scan services.

3.1

Attributes of a contract

To help entities determine whether (and when) their arrangements with customers are contracts within the scope of the model in the standard, the Board identified certain criteria that must be met. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁹ that the criteria are similar to those in legacy GAAP's revenue recognition guidance and in other existing standards and are important in an entity's assessment of whether the arrangement contains enforceable rights and obligations.

The criteria are as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Identifying the Contract

606-10-25-1

An entity shall account for a **contract** with a **customer** that is within the scope of this Topic only when all of the following criteria are met:

- a. The parties to the contract have approved the contract (in writing, orally, or in accordance with other customary business practices) and are committed to perform their respective obligations.
- b. The entity can identify each party's rights regarding the goods or services to be transferred.
- c. The entity can identify the payment terms for the goods or services to be transferred.
- d. The contract has commercial substance (that is, the risk, timing, or amount of the entity's future cash flows is expected to change as a result of the contract).
- e. It is probable that the entity will collect substantially all of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer (see paragraphs 606-10-55-3A through 55-3C). In evaluating whether collectibility of an amount of consideration is probable, an entity shall consider only the customer's ability and intention to pay that amount of consideration when it is due. The amount of consideration to which the entity will be entitled may be less than the price stated in the contract if the consideration is variable because the entity may offer the customer a price concession (see paragraph 606-10-32-7).

606-10-25-5

If a contract with a customer meets the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 at contract inception, an entity shall not reassess those criteria unless there is an indication of a significant change in facts and circumstances. For example, if a customer's ability to pay the consideration deteriorates significantly, an entity would reassess whether it is probable that the entity will collect the consideration to which the entity will be entitled in exchange for the remaining goods or services that will be transferred to the customer (see paragraphs 606-10-55-3A through 55-3C).

¹⁹ Paragraph BC33 of ASU 2014-09.

These criteria are assessed at the inception of the arrangement. If the criteria are met at that time, an entity does not reassess the criteria unless there is an indication of a significant change in facts and circumstances. For example, as noted in ASC 606-10-25-5, if the customer's ability to pay significantly deteriorates, an entity would have to reassess whether it is probable that the entity will collect the consideration to which it is entitled in exchange for transferring the remaining goods and services under the contract. The updated assessment is prospective in nature and would not change the conclusions associated with goods and services already transferred. That is, an entity would not reverse any receivables, revenue or contract assets already recognized under the contract.²⁰

If the criteria are not met, the arrangement should not be considered a revenue contract under the standard, and the guidance discussed in Section 3.5 should be applied.

3.1.1 **Parties have approved the contract and are committed to perform their respective obligations**

As indicated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²¹ the Board included this criterion because a contract might not be legally enforceable without approval of both parties. Further, the Board decided that the form of the contract (i.e., oral, written or implied) is not determinative in assessing whether the parties have approved the contract. Instead, an entity must consider all relevant facts and circumstances when assessing whether the parties intend to be bound by the terms and conditions of the contract. In some cases, the parties to an oral or implied contract may have the intent to fulfill their respective obligations while, in other cases, a written contract may be required before an entity can conclude that the parties have approved the arrangement.

In addition to approving the contract, the entity must also be able to conclude that both parties are committed to perform their respective obligations. That is, the entity must be committed to providing the promised goods and services, and the customer must be committed to purchasing those promised goods and services. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²² the Board clarified that an entity and a customer do not always have to be committed to fulfilling all of their respective rights and obligations for a contract to meet this requirement. The Board cited as an example a supply agreement between two parties with stated minimums under which the customer does not always buy the required minimum amount and the entity does not always enforce its right to make the customer make those minimum purchases. In this situation, the Board said that it may still be possible for the entity to demonstrate there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the parties are substantially committed to the contract. This criterion does not address a customer's intent and ability to pay the consideration (i.e., collectibility). Collectibility is a separate criterion and is discussed in Section 3.1.5.

Termination clauses are also an important consideration when determining whether both parties are committed to perform under a contract and, consequently, whether a contract exists. See Section 3.2 for further discussion of termination clauses and how they affect contract duration.

²⁰ Paragraph BC34 of ASU 2014-09.

²¹ Paragraph BC35 of ASU 2014-09.

²² Paragraph BC36 of ASU 2014-09.

3.1.2 Each party's rights regarding the goods or services to be transferred can be identified

This criterion is relatively straightforward. If the goods and services to be provided in the arrangement cannot be identified, it is not possible to conclude that an entity has a contract within the scope of the model in the standard. The Board indicated²³ that if the promised goods and services cannot be identified, the entity can't assess whether those goods and services have been transferred because the entity would be unable to assess each party's rights with respect to those goods and services.

3.1.3 Payment terms can be identified for the goods or services to be transferred

Identifying the payment terms does not require that the transaction price be fixed or stated in the contract with the customer. Provided there will be an enforceable right to payment (i.e., enforceability as a matter of law) and the contract contains sufficient information to enable the entity to estimate the transaction price (see further discussion on estimating the transaction price in Chapter 5), the contract would qualify for accounting under the model (assuming the remaining criteria in ASC 606-10-25-1 have been met).

3.1.4 Commercial substance

The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁴ that it included a criterion requiring a contract to have commercial substance (i.e., the risk, timing or amount of the entity's future cash flows is expected to change as a result of the contract) to prevent entities from artificially inflating revenue. An arrangement that does not have commercial substance should not be accounted for under the standard. Historically, some entities in high-growth industries engaged in round-tripping transactions in which goods and services were transferred back and forth between the same entities in an attempt to show higher transaction volume and higher gross revenue. This is also a risk in arrangements involving nonmonetary consideration. Determining whether an arrangement has commercial substance for purposes of the revenue standard is consistent with the commercial substance determination elsewhere in US GAAP, such as in the nonmonetary transactions guidance in ASC 845. This determination may require significant judgment. In all situations, the entity should be able to demonstrate a substantive business purpose for the nature and structure of its transactions.

In a change from legacy guidance, the standard does not contain prescriptive guidance for advertising barter transactions. We anticipate entities will need to carefully consider the "commercial substance" criterion when evaluating these types of transactions to make sure that they have commercial substance.

3.1.5 Collectibility



FASB amendments

In May 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-12 that amended the collectibility guidance to clarify that the objective of the collectibility threshold is to determine whether the contract is valid and represents a substantive transaction. It also clarified that this determination is based on whether a customer has the ability and intention to pay the promised consideration in exchange for the goods and services that *will* be transferred to the customer. In making this assessment, an entity will evaluate its exposure to credit risk for those goods and services that will be transferred to the customer. That is, in some circumstances, an entity may not need to assess its ability to collect all of the consideration in the contract.

²³ Paragraph BC37 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁴ Paragraph BC40 of ASU 2014-09.

Under the revenue standard, collectibility refers to the customer's ability and intent to pay substantially all of the amount of consideration to which the entity will be entitled in exchange for the goods and services that will be transferred to the customer. An entity should assess a customer's ability to pay based on the customer's financial capacity and its intention to pay considering all relevant facts and circumstances, including past experiences with that customer or customer class.

The standard describes the collectibility assessment as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Assessing Collectibility

606-10-55-3A

Paragraph 606-10-25-1(e) requires an entity to assess whether it is **probable** that the entity will collect substantially all of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to the **customer**. The assessment, which is part of identifying whether there is a **contract** with a customer, is based on whether the customer has the ability and intention to pay the consideration to which the entity will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer. The objective of this assessment is to evaluate whether there is a substantive transaction between the entity and the customer, which is a necessary condition for the contract to be accounted for under the revenue model in this Topic.

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁵ the purpose of the criteria in ASC 606-10-25-1 is to require an entity to assess whether a contract, as defined by the standard, exists and represents a valid transaction. The collectibility criterion (i.e., determining whether the customer has the ability and the intention to pay substantially all of the promised consideration) is a key part of that assessment. As stated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12,²⁶ if it is not probable that the customer will pay (i.e., fulfill its obligations under the contract), there is a question about whether the contract is valid and the revenue-generating transaction is substantive, regardless of whether a legal contract exists. However, the Board also noted²⁷ that entities generally only enter into contracts after concluding it is probable that they will be fairly compensated for their performance. That is, in most instances, an entity would not enter into a contract with a customer if there was significant credit risk associated with that customer without also having adequate economic protection to ensure that it would collect the consideration. Therefore, the Board expects many arrangements will not fail to meet the collectibility criterion.

The new standard requires an entity to evaluate at contract inception (and when significant facts and circumstances change) whether it is *probable* that it will collect substantially all of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to a customer. This threshold is similar to the one in legacy GAAP guidance. Under legacy guidance, revenue recognition is permitted only when collectibility is reasonably assured (assuming other basic revenue recognition criteria have been met). For purposes of this analysis, the term "probable" is defined as "the future event or events are likely to occur," consistent with the existing definition in US GAAP. If it is not probable that the entity will collect amounts to which it is entitled, the contract should not be accounted for under the revenue model until the concerns about collectibility have been resolved (see Section 3.5 for further discussion).

²⁵ Paragraph BC43 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁶ Paragraphs BC12 and BC14 of ASU 2016-12.

²⁷ Paragraph BC43 of ASU 2014-09 and BC10 of ASU 2016-12.

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12,²⁸ the Board used the term “substantially all” because a contract may represent a substantive transaction, even if it is not probable the entity will collect 100% of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer. That is, the entity can determine that it is probable that it will collect something short of 100% of the consideration, as long as that amount is substantially all of the consideration, and still have a substantive transaction.

The standard includes the following implementation guidance on how to apply the collectibility criterion:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Assessing Collectibility

606-10-55-3B

The collectibility assessment in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e) is partly a forward-looking assessment. It requires an entity to use judgment and consider all of the facts and circumstances, including the entity's customary business practices and its knowledge of the customer, in determining whether it is probable that the entity will collect substantially all of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that the entity expects to transfer to the customer. The assessment is not necessarily based on the customer's ability and intention to pay the entire amount of promised consideration for the entire duration of the contract.

606-10-55-3C

When assessing whether a contract meets the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e), an entity should determine whether the contractual terms and its customary business practices indicate that the entity's exposure to credit risk is less than the entire consideration promised in the contract because the entity has the ability to mitigate its credit risk. Examples of contractual terms or customary business practices that might mitigate the entity's credit risk include the following:

- a. **Payment terms** – In some contracts, payment terms limit an entity's exposure to credit risk. For example, a customer may be required to pay a portion of the consideration promised in the contract before the entity transfers promised goods or services to the customer. In those cases, any consideration that will be received before the entity transfers promised goods or services to the customer would not be subject to credit risk.
- b. **The ability to stop transferring promised goods or services** – An entity may limit its exposure to credit risk if it has the right to stop transferring additional goods or services to a customer in the event that the customer fails to pay consideration when it is due. In those cases, an entity should assess only the collectibility of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer on the basis of the entity's rights and customary business practices. Therefore, if the customer fails to perform as promised and, consequently, the entity would respond to the customer's failure to perform by not transferring additional goods or services to the customer, the entity would not consider the likelihood of payment for the promised goods or services that will not be transferred under the contract.

An entity's ability to repossess an asset transferred to a customer should not be considered for the purpose of assessing the entity's ability to mitigate its exposure to credit risk.

²⁸ Paragraph BC12 of ASU 2016-12.

An entity should consider the probability of collecting substantially all of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that *will* be transferred to the customer rather than the total amount promised for all goods or services in the contract. That is, if the customer were to fail to perform as promised and the entity would stop transferring additional goods or services to the customer, the entity would not consider the likelihood of payment for the goods or services that would not be transferred. The entity in this case would need to have the right to stop transferring goods or services when the customer fails to pay.

The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12²⁹ that an entity would evaluate the goods or services that it expects will be transferred based on the customary business practices of the entity in dealing with its exposure to the customer's credit risk throughout the contract. This assessment requires the entity to consider the relative position of the entity's contractual rights to the consideration and the entity's performance obligations, in addition to evaluating a customer's credit and payment history. For example, the entity could stop providing goods or services to the customer (provided it has the right to do so) or could require advance payments to mitigate its credit risk. When an entity stops providing goods or services to the customer, it mitigates its credit risk on the consideration for those additional goods and services. Consideration paid in advance of the goods and services being delivered is no longer subject to credit risk.

The standard specifically precludes an entity from evaluating its ability to repossess an asset as part of the collectibility assessment. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12³⁰ that the ability to repossess an asset does not mitigate an entity's exposure to credit risk for the consideration promised in the contract. However, that ability may affect the entity's assessment of whether it has transferred control of the asset to the customer.

The following example from the standard illustrates when an entity may conclude that a contract meets the collectibility criterion because the entity would respond to the customer's failure to pay by not transferring any additional goods or services to the customer:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 1 – Collectibility of the Consideration

Case B – Credit Risk is Mitigated

606-10-55-98A

An entity, a service provider, enters into a three-year service contract with a new customer of low credit quality at the beginning of a calendar month.

606-10-55-98B

The transaction price of the contract is \$720, and \$20 is due at the end of each month. The standalone selling price of the monthly service is \$20. Both parties are subject to termination penalties if the contract is cancelled.

606-10-55-98C

The entity's history with this class of customer indicates that while the entity cannot conclude it is probable the customer will pay the transaction price of \$720, the customer is expected to make the payments required under the contract for at least 9 months. If, during the contract term, the customer stops making the required payments, the entity's customary business practice is to limit its credit risk by not transferring further services to the customer and to pursue collection for the unpaid services.

²⁹ Paragraph BC11 of ASU 2016-12.

³⁰ Paragraph BC15 of ASU 2016-12.

606-10-55-98D

In assessing whether the contract meets the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1, the entity assesses whether it is probable that the entity will collect substantially all of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the services that will be transferred to the customer. This includes assessing the entity's history with this class of customer in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-3B and its business practice of stopping service in response to customer nonpayment in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-3C. Consequently, as part of this analysis, the entity does not consider the likelihood of payment for services that would not be provided in the event of the customer's nonpayment because the entity is not exposed to credit risk for those services.

606-10-55-98E

It is not probable that the entity will collect the entire transaction price (\$720) because of the customer's low credit rating. However, the entity's exposure to credit risk is mitigated because the entity has the ability and intention (as evidenced by its customary business practice) to stop providing services if the customer does not pay the promised consideration for services provided when it is due. Therefore, the entity concludes that the contract meets the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e) because it is probable that the customer will pay substantially all of the consideration to which the entity is entitled for the services the entity will transfer to the customer (that is, for the services the entity will provide for as long as the customer continues to pay for the services provided). Consequently, assuming the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1(a) through (d) are met, the entity would apply the remaining guidance in this Topic to recognize revenue and only reassess the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 if there is an indication of a significant change in facts or circumstances such as the customer not making its required payments.

In contrast to the previous example, the following example illustrates when an entity may conclude that a contract does not meet the collectibility criterion because there is substantial risk that the entity would not receive any payment for services provided, even when the entity would respond to the customer's failure to pay by not transferring any additional goods or services to the customer:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations****Example 1 – Collectibility of the Consideration****Case C – Credit Risk is Not Mitigated****606-10-55-98F**

The same facts as in Case B apply to Case C, except that the entity's history with this class of customer indicates that there is a risk that the customer will not pay substantially all of the consideration for services received from the entity, including the risk that the entity will never receive any payment for any services provided.

606-10-55-98G

In assessing whether the contract with the customer meets the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1, the entity assesses whether it is probable that it will collect substantially all of the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer. This includes assessing the entity's history with this class of customer and its business practice of stopping service in response to the customer's nonpayment in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-3C.

606-10-55-98H

At contract inception, the entity concludes that the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e) is not met because it is not probable that the customer will pay substantially all of the consideration to which the entity will be entitled under the contract for the services that will be transferred to the customer. The entity concludes that not only is there a risk that the customer will not pay for services received from the entity, but also there is a risk that the entity will never receive any payment for any services provided. Subsequently, when the customer initially pays for one month of service, the entity accounts for the consideration received in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-7 through 25-8. The entity concludes that none of the events in paragraph 606-10-25-7 have occurred because the contract has not been terminated, the entity has not received substantially all of the consideration promised in the contract, and the entity is continuing to provide services to the customer.

606-10-55-98I

Assume that the customer has made timely payments for several months. In accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-6, the entity assesses the contract to determine whether the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are subsequently met. In making that evaluation, the entity considers, among other things, its experience with this specific customer. On the basis of the customer's performance under the contract, the entity concludes that the criteria in 606-10-25-1 have been met, including the collectibility criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e). Once the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are met, the entity applies the remaining guidance in this Topic to recognize revenue.

The amount of consideration that is assessed for collectibility is the amount to which the entity expects to be entitled, which under the standard is the transaction price for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer rather than the stated contract price for those items. Entities will need to first determine the transaction price before assessing the collectibility of that amount. The contract price and transaction price most often will differ because of variable consideration (e.g., rebates, discounts or explicit or implicit price concessions) that reduces the amount of consideration stated in the contract. For example, the transaction price for the items expected to be transferred may be less than the stated contract price for those items if an entity concludes that it has offered or is willing to accept a price concession on products sold to a customer as a means to assist the customer in selling those items through to end consumers. As discussed in Section 5.2.1.1, an entity will deduct from the contract price any variable consideration that would reduce the amount of consideration an entity expects to be entitled to (e.g., the estimated price concession) at contract inception to derive the transaction price for those items.

How we see it

Although the overall notion of collectibility in the standard is similar to the collectibility requirement in SAB Topic 13, applying the concept to a portion of the contractual amount instead of the total contract price is a significant change. SAB Topic 13 requires that the entire contract price must be reasonably assured before an entity can recognize any revenue on the arrangement. This difference could result in the earlier recognition of revenue for a contract in which a portion of the contract price is considered to be at risk, but not the entire amount.

Significant judgment will be required to determine when an expected partial payment indicates that (1) there is an implied price concession in the contract, (2) there is an impairment loss or (3) the arrangement lacks sufficient substance to be considered a contract under the standard. See Section 5.2.1.1 for further discussion on implicit price concessions.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 also uses the term “probable” for the collectibility assessment, which means “more likely than not” under IFRS. That is a lower threshold than “probable” under US GAAP.

IFRS 15 does not include the implementation guidance in ASC 606-10-55-3A through 55-3C. However, the IASB stated in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments) that it does not expect differences in outcomes in relation to the evaluation of the collectibility criterion.

Question 3-1

How should an entity assess collectibility for a portfolio of contracts? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 13]

TRG members generally agreed that if an entity has determined it is probable that a customer will pay amounts owed under a contract, but the entity has historical experience that it will not collect consideration from some customers within a portfolio of contracts (see Section 3.3.1), it would be appropriate for the entity to record revenue for the contract in full and separately evaluate the corresponding contract asset or receivable for impairment. That is, the entity would not conclude the arrangement contains an implicit price concession and would not reduce revenue for the uncollectible amounts. See Section 5.2.1.1 for a discussion of evaluating whether an entity has offered an implicit price concession.

Consider the following example included in the TRG agenda paper: An entity has a large volume of similar customer contracts for which billings are done in arrears on a monthly basis. Before accepting a customer, the entity performs procedures designed to determine that it is probable that the customer will pay the amounts owed and it does not accept customers if it is not probable that the customer will pay the amounts owed. Because these procedures are only designed to determine whether collection is probable (and thus not a certainty), the entity anticipates that it will have some customers that will not pay all amounts owed. While the entity collects the entire amount due from the vast majority of its customers, on average, the entity’s historical evidence (which is representative of its expectations for the future) indicates that the entity will only collect 98% of the amounts billed. In this case, the entity would recognize revenue for the full amount due and recognize bad debt expense for the 2% of the amount due that the entity does not expect to collect.

In this example, the entity concludes that collectibility is probable for each customer based on its procedures performed prior to accepting each customer and on its historical experience with this customer class while also accepting that there is some credit risk inherent with this customer class. Further, the entity concludes that any amounts not collected do not represent implied price concessions and instead are due to general credit risk that was present in a limited number of customer contracts. Some TRG members cautioned that the analysis to determine when to record bad debt expense for a contract in the same period when revenue is recognized (instead of reducing revenue for an anticipated price concession) will require judgment.

Question 3-2

When should an entity reassess collectibility? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 13]

The standard requires an entity to reassess whether it is probable that it will collect the consideration to which it will be entitled when significant facts and circumstances change. Example 4 in the standard illustrates a situation in which a customer’s financial condition declines and its current access to credit and available cash on hand is limited. In this case, the entity does not reassess the collectibility criterion. However, in a subsequent year, the customer’s financial condition further declines after losing access to credit and its major customers. The example illustrates that this subsequent change in the customer’s financial condition is so significant that a reassessment of the criteria for identifying a contract is required, resulting in the collectibility criterion not being met. The TRG agenda paper says that this example illustrates that it was not the Board’s intent to require an entity to reassess collectibility when changes occur that are

relatively minor in nature (i.e., those that do not call into question the validity of the contract). TRG members generally agreed that entities would need to exercise judgment to determine whether changes in the facts and circumstances are significant enough to indicate that a contract no longer exists.

3.2 Contract enforceability and termination clauses

An entity will have to first determine the term of the contract to apply certain aspects of the revenue model (e.g., identifying performance obligations, determining the transaction price). The contract term to be evaluated is the period in which parties to the contract have present enforceable rights and obligations, as described in the standard:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Identifying the Contract

606-10-25-3

Some contracts with customers may have no fixed duration and can be terminated or modified by either party at any time. Other contracts may automatically renew on a periodic basis that is specified in the contract. An entity shall apply the guidance in this Topic to the duration of the contract (that is, the contractual period) in which the parties to the contract have present enforceable rights and obligations. In evaluating the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e), an entity shall assess the collectibility of the consideration promised in a contract for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer rather than assessing the collectibility of the consideration promised in the contract for all of the promised goods or services (see paragraphs 606-10-55-3A through 55-3C). However, if an entity determines that all of the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are met, the remainder of the guidance in this Topic shall be applied to all of the promised goods or services in the contract.

606-10-25-4

For the purpose of applying the guidance in this Topic, a contract does not exist if each party to the contract has the unilateral enforceable right to terminate a wholly unperformed contract without compensating the other party (or parties). A contract is wholly unperformed if both of the following criteria are met:

- a. The entity has not yet transferred any promised goods or services to the customer.
- b. The entity has not yet received, and is not yet entitled to receive, any consideration in exchange for promised goods or services.

The period in which enforceable rights and obligations exist may be affected by termination provisions in the contract. For example, an entity may apply the standard to only a portion of a contract with a stated term when the contract allows either party to terminate it at any time without penalty. Significant judgment will be required to determine the effect of termination provisions on the contract term. The contract term to which the standard is applied may affect the number of performance obligations identified and the determination of the transaction price. It may also affect the amounts disclosed in some of the required disclosures.

When evaluating collectibility and whether a valid contract exists, ASC 606-10-25-3 states that an entity should apply the guidance to the portion of the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer (as discussed in Section 3.1.5). This collectibility guidance should not affect the contract term an entity considers when applying the rest of the model (e.g., when determining or allocating the transaction price).

If each party has the unilateral right to terminate a “wholly unperformed” contract without compensating the counterparty, the standard states that, for purposes of the standard, a contract does not exist, and its accounting and disclosure requirements would not apply. This is because the contracts would not affect an entity’s financial position or performance until either party performs. Any arrangement in which the vendor has not provided any of the contracted goods or services and has not received or is not entitled to receive any of the contracted consideration is considered to be a “wholly unperformed” contract.

The guidance on “wholly unperformed” contracts does not apply if the parties to the contract have to compensate the other party if they exercise their right to terminate the contract and that termination payment is considered substantive. Significant judgment will be required to determine whether a termination payment is substantive, and all facts and circumstances related to the contract should be considered.

How we see it

Evaluating termination provisions will be a change from legacy GAAP, in which entities apply the revenue guidance for the stated term of the contract and generally only account for terminations when they occur. Under the new standard, entities may be required to account for contracts with stated terms as month-to-month (or possibly shorter duration) contracts if the parties to the contracts can terminate them without penalty.

Question 3-3

How do termination clauses and termination payments affect the duration of a contract (i.e., the contractual period)? [31 October 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 10]

Entities will need to carefully evaluate termination clauses and any related termination payments to determine how they affect contract duration (i.e., the period in which there are enforceable rights and obligations). TRG members generally agreed that enforceable rights and obligations exist throughout the term in which each party has the unilateral enforceable right to terminate the contract by compensating the other party. For example, if a contract includes a substantive termination payment, the duration of the contract should equal the term through which a termination penalty would be due (which could be the stated contractual term or a shorter duration if the termination penalty did not extend to the end of the contract). However, TRG members observed that the determination of whether a termination penalty is substantive, and what the enforceable rights and obligations are under a contract, will require judgment and consideration of the facts and circumstances.

TRG members also agreed that when a contract with a stated contractual term can be terminated by either party for no consideration at any time, the contract term ends when control of the goods or services already provided transfers to the customer (e.g., a month-to-month service contract), regardless of its stated contractual term. Entities will need to consider whether a contract includes a notification or cancellation period (e.g., the contract can be terminated with 90 days’ notice) that would cause the contract term to extend beyond the date when control of the goods or services already provided transferred to the customer. In these cases, the contract term would be shorter than the stated contractual term but would extend beyond the date when control of the goods or services already provided transferred to the customer.

Question 3-4

How do termination clauses that provide only the customer with the right to cancel the contract affect the duration of the contract, and how do termination penalties affect this conclusion? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 48]

Enforceable rights and obligations exist throughout the term in which each party has the unilateral enforceable right to terminate the contract by compensating the other party. Members of the TRG do not view a customer-only right to terminate sufficient to warrant a different conclusion than one in which both parties have the right to terminate, as discussed in Question 3-3.

TRG members generally agreed that a substantive termination penalty payable by a customer to the entity is evidence of enforceable rights and obligations of both parties throughout the period covered by the termination penalty. For example, in a four-year service contract in which the customer has the right to cancel without cause at the end of each year but would incur a termination penalty that decreases each year (and is determined to be substantive), TRG members generally agreed that the arrangement should be treated as a four-year contract.

TRG members also discussed situations when a contractual penalty would result in including optional goods or services in the accounting for the original contract (see Question 4-13 in Section 4.6).

TRG members observed that the determinations of whether a termination penalty is substantive, and what the enforceable rights and obligations are under a contract, will require judgment and consideration of the facts and circumstances.

If enforceable rights and obligations do not exist throughout the entire term stated in the contract (e.g., if there are no (or non-substantive) contractual penalties that compensate the entity upon cancellation, when the customer has the unilateral right to terminate the contract for reasons other than cause or contingent events outside the customer's control), TRG members generally agreed that customer cancellation rights would be treated as customer options. The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09³¹ that a cancellation option or termination right can be similar to a renewal option. An entity would then need to determine whether the cancellation option indicates that the customer has a material right that would need to be accounted for as a performance obligation (e.g., there is a discount for goods or services provided during the cancellable period that provides the customer with a material right).

Question 3-5 **Do termination payments that an entity has a past practice of not enforcing affect the duration of the contract?** [31 October 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 10]

The TRG agenda paper noted that the evaluation of the termination payment in determining the duration of a contract depends on whether the past practice is considered by law (which may vary by jurisdiction) to limit the parties' enforceable rights and obligations. An entity's past practice of allowing customers to terminate the contract early without enforcing collection of the termination payment affects the contract term only in cases in which the parties' legally enforceable rights and obligations are limited because of the lack of enforcement by the entity. If that past practice does not change the parties' legally enforceable rights and obligations, the contract term should equal the term through which a substantive termination penalty would be due (which could be the stated contractual term or a shorter duration if the termination penalty did not extend to the end of the contract).

Question 3-6 **How should an entity account for a partial termination of a contract (e.g., a change in the contract term from 3 years to 2 years prior to the beginning of year 2)?**

We believe an entity should account for the partial termination of a contract as a contract modification (see Section 3.4) because it results in a change in the scope of the contract. ASC 606-10-25-10 states that "a contract modification exists when the parties to a contract approve a modification that either creates new or changes existing enforceable rights and obligations of the parties to the contract." A partial termination of a contract results in a change to the enforceable rights and obligations in the existing contract. This conclusion is consistent with TRG agenda paper no. 48,³² which stated, "a substantive termination penalty is evidence of enforceable rights and obligations throughout the contract term. The termination penalty is ignored until the contract is terminated at which point it will be accounted for as a modification." Consider the following example:

³¹ Paragraph BC391 of ASU 2014-09.

³² 9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 48.

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to provide monthly maintenance services for three years at a fixed price of \$500 per month (i.e., total consideration of \$18,000). The contract includes a termination clause that allows the customer to cancel the third year of the contract by paying a termination penalty of \$1,000 (which is considered substantive for purposes of this example). The penalty would effectively result in an adjusted price per month for two years of \$542 (i.e., total consideration of \$13,000). At the end of the first year, the customer decides to cancel the third year of the contract and pays the \$1,000 termination penalty specified in the contract.

In this example, the modification would not be accounted for as a separate contract because it does not result in the addition of distinct goods or services (see Section 3.4.2). Since the remaining services are distinct, the entity would apply the guidance in ASC 606-10-25-13(a) and account for the modification prospectively. The remaining consideration of \$7,000 (\$6,000 under the original contract for the second year, plus the \$1,000 payment upon modification) would be recognized over the remaining revised contract period of one year. That is, the entity would recognize the \$1,000 termination penalty over the remaining performance period.

3.3

Combining contracts

In most cases, entities will apply the model to individual contracts with a customer. However, the standard *requires* entities to combine contracts entered into at or near the same time with the same customer (or related parties of the customer) if they meet one or more of the criteria indicated below:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Combination of Contracts

606-10-25-9

An entity shall combine two or more **contracts** entered into at or near the same time with the same **customer** (or related parties of the customer) and account for the contracts as a single contract if one or more of the following criteria are met:

- a. The contracts are negotiated as a package with a single commercial objective.
- b. The amount of consideration to be paid in one contract depends on the price or performance of the other contract.
- c. The goods or services promised in the contracts (or some goods or services promised in each of the contracts) are a single **performance obligation** in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-22.

The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09³³ that it included the guidance on combining contracts in the standard because in some cases, the amount and timing of revenue might differ depending on whether an entity accounts for contracts as a single contract or separately.

Entities will need to apply judgment to determine whether contracts are entered into at or near the same time because the standard does not provide a bright line for making this assessment. The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09³⁴ that the longer the period between entering into different contracts, the more likely it is that the economic circumstances affecting the negotiations of those contracts will have changed.

³³ Paragraph BC71 of ASU 2014-09.

³⁴ Paragraph BC75 of ASU 2014-09.

Negotiating multiple contracts at the same time is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the contracts represent a single arrangement for accounting purposes. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,³⁵ the Board noted that there are pricing interdependencies between two or more contracts when either of the first two criteria (i.e., the contracts are negotiated with a single commercial objective or the price in one contract depends on the price or performance of the other contract) are met, so the amount of consideration allocated to the performance obligations in each contract might not faithfully depict the value of the goods or services transferred to the customer if those contracts were not combined. The Board also explained that it decided to include the third criterion (i.e., the goods or services in the contracts are a single performance obligation) to avoid any structuring opportunities that would effectively allow entities to bypass the guidance for identifying performance obligations.

How we see it

The requirement to combine contracts is generally consistent with the underlying principles in legacy GAAP. As a result, entities may reach conclusions about combining contracts that are similar to those they reach under legacy GAAP.

3.3.1

Portfolio approach practical expedient

Under the standard, the five-step model is applied to individual contracts with customers. However, the FASB recognized that there may be situations in which it may be more practical for an entity to combine contracts for purposes of revenue recognition rather than attempt to account for each contract separately. Specifically, the standard includes the following practical expedient:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Objectives

606-10-10-4

This guidance specifies the accounting for an individual contract with a customer. However, as a practical expedient, an entity may apply this guidance to a portfolio of contracts (or **performance obligations**) with similar characteristics if the entity reasonably expects that the effects on the financial statements of applying this guidance to the portfolio would not differ materially from applying this guidance to the individual contracts (or performance obligations) within that portfolio. When accounting for a portfolio, an entity shall use estimates and assumptions that reflect the size and composition of the portfolio.

In order to use the portfolio approach, an entity must reasonably expect the accounting result will not be materially different from the result of applying the guidance to the individual contracts. However, the FASB said in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09³⁶ that it does not intend for an entity to quantitatively evaluate every possible outcome when concluding that the portfolio approach is not materially different. Instead, it indicated that an entity should be able to take a reasonable approach to determine the portfolios that would be representative of its types of customers, and that an entity should use judgment in selecting the size and composition of these portfolios.

How we see it

The application of the portfolio approach likely will vary based on the facts and circumstances of each entity. Management will need to determine whether to apply the portfolio approach to some or all of the entity's business lines. In addition, an entity may choose to apply the portfolio approach to only certain aspects of the new model (e.g., determining the transaction price in Step 3).

³⁵ Paragraph BC73 of ASU 2014-09.

³⁶ Paragraph BC69 of ASU 2014-09.

Question 3-7 How should an entity assess collectibility for a portfolio of contracts? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 13]

See response to Question 3-1 in Section 3.1.5.

Question 3-8 Can entities apply the portfolio approach practical expedient for the evaluation of and/or accounting for contracts costs under ASC 340-40?

See response to Question 9-5 in Section 9.3.

3.4 Contract modifications

Parties to an arrangement frequently agree to modify the scope or price (or both) of their contract. If that happens, an entity must determine whether the modification should be accounted for as a new contract or as part of the existing contract. Generally, it is clear when a contract modification has taken place, but in some circumstances, that determination is more difficult. To assist entities with making this determination, the standard contains the following guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Contract Modifications

606-10-25-10

A contract modification is a change in the scope or price (or both) of a **contract** that is approved by the parties to the contract. In some industries and jurisdictions, a contract modification may be described as a change order, a variation, or an amendment. A contract modification exists when the parties to a contract approve a modification that either creates new or changes existing enforceable rights and obligations of the parties to the contract. A contract modification could be approved in writing, by oral agreement, or implied by customary business practices. If the parties to the contract have not approved a contract modification, an entity shall continue to apply the guidance in this Topic to the existing contract until the contract modification is approved.

606-10-25-11

A contract modification may exist even though the parties to the contract have a dispute about the scope or price (or both) of the modification or the parties have approved a change in the scope of the contract but have not yet determined the corresponding change in price. In determining whether the rights and obligations that are created or changed by a modification are enforceable, an entity shall consider all relevant facts and circumstances including the terms of the contract and other evidence. If the parties to a contract have approved a change in the scope of the contract but have not yet determined the corresponding change in price, an entity shall estimate the change to the **transaction price** arising from the modification in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-5 through 32-9 on estimating variable consideration and paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration.

The guidance above illustrates that the Board intended it to apply more broadly than to only finalized modifications. That is, this guidance says that an entity may have to account for a contract modification prior to the parties reaching final agreement on changes in scope or pricing (or both). Instead of focusing on the finalization of a modified agreement, the guidance focuses on the enforceability of the changes to the rights and obligations in the contract. Once the entity determines the revised rights and obligations are enforceable, the entity should account for the contract modification.

The standard provides the following example to illustrate this point:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 9 – Unapproved Change in Scope and Price

606-10-55-134

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to construct a building on customer-owned land. The contract states that the customer will provide the entity with access to the land within 30 days of contract inception. However, the entity was not provided access until 120 days after contract inception because of storm damage to the site that occurred after contract inception. The contract specifically identifies any delay (including force majeure) in the entity's access to customer-owned land as an event that entitles the entity to compensation that is equal to actual costs incurred as a direct result of the delay. The entity is able to demonstrate that the specific direct costs were incurred as a result of the delay in accordance with the terms of the contract and prepares a claim. The customer initially disagreed with the entity's claim.

606-10-55-135

The entity assesses the legal basis of the claim and determines, on the basis of the underlying contractual terms, that it has enforceable rights. Consequently, it accounts for the claim as a contract modification in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-10 through 25-13. The modification does not result in any additional goods and services being provided to the customer. In addition, all of the remaining goods and services after the modification are not distinct and form part of a single performance obligation. Consequently, the entity accounts for the modification in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-13(b) by updating the transaction price and the measure of progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation. The entity considers the constraint on estimates of variable consideration in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 when estimating the transaction price.

Once an entity has determined that a contract has been modified, the entity has to determine the appropriate accounting for the modification. Certain modifications are treated as separate, standalone contracts, while others are combined with the original contract and accounted for in that manner. In addition, some modifications will be accounted for on a prospective basis and others on a cumulative catch-up basis. The Board developed different approaches to account for different types of modifications with an overall objective of faithfully depicting an entity's rights and obligations in each modified contract.³⁷ The standard includes the following guidance for determining the appropriate accounting approach:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Contract Modifications

606-10-25-12

An entity shall account for a contract modification as a separate contract if both of the following conditions are present:

- a. The scope of the contract increases because of the addition of promised goods or services that are distinct (in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-18 through 25-22).

³⁷ Paragraph BC76 of ASU 2014-09.


- b. The price of the contract increases by an amount of consideration that reflects the entity's **standalone selling prices** of the additional promised goods or services and any appropriate adjustments to that price to reflect the circumstances of the particular contract. For example, an entity may adjust the standalone selling price of an additional good or service for a discount that the customer receives, because it is not necessary for the entity to incur the selling-related costs that it would incur when selling a similar good or service to a new customer.

606-10-25-13

If a contract modification is not accounted for as a separate contract in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-12, an entity shall account for the promised goods or services not yet transferred at the date of the contract modification (that is, the remaining promised goods or services) in whichever of the following ways is applicable:

- a. An entity shall account for the contract modification as if it were a termination of the existing contract, and the creation of a new contract, if the remaining goods or services are distinct from the goods or services transferred on or before the date of the contract modification. The amount of consideration to be allocated to the remaining **performance obligations** (or to the remaining distinct goods or services in a single performance obligation identified in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b)) is the sum of:
1. The consideration promised by the customer (including amounts already received from the customer) that was included in the estimate of the transaction price and that had not been recognized as **revenue** and
 2. The consideration promised as part of the contract modification.
- b. An entity shall account for the contract modification as if it were a part of the existing contract if the remaining goods or services are not distinct and, therefore, form part of a single performance obligation that is partially satisfied at the date of the contract modification. The effect that the contract modification has on the transaction price, and on the entity's measure of progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation, is recognized as an adjustment to revenue (either as an increase in or a reduction of revenue) at the date of the contract modification (that is, the adjustment to revenue is made on a cumulative catch-up basis).
- c. If the remaining goods or services are a combination of items (a) and (b), then the entity shall account for the effects of the modification on the unsatisfied (including partially unsatisfied) performance obligations in the modified contract in a manner that is consistent with the objectives of this paragraph.

The following chart illustrates this guidance:



* Under ASC 606-10-25-12, an entity may make appropriate adjustments to the standalone selling price to reflect the circumstances of the contract and still meet the criteria to account for the modification as a separate contract.

When assessing how to account for a contract modification, an entity must consider whether any additional goods or services are distinct, often giving careful consideration to whether those goods or services are distinct within the context of the modified contract (see Section 4.2.1 for further discussion on evaluating whether goods or services are distinct). That is, although a contract modification may add a new good or service that would be distinct in a standalone transaction, that new good or service may not be distinct when considered in the context of the contract, as modified. For example, in a building renovation project, a customer may request a contract modification to add a new room. The construction firm may commonly sell the construction of a room addition on a standalone basis, which would indicate that the service is capable of being distinct. However, when that service is added to an existing contract and the entity has already determined that the entire project is a single performance obligation, the added goods and services normally would be combined with the existing bundle of goods and services.

In contrast to the construction example for which the addition of otherwise distinct goods or services are combined with the existing single performance obligation and accounted for in that manner, a contract modification that adds distinct goods or services to a single performance obligation that is a series of distinct goods or services (see Section 4.2.2) is accounted for either as a separate contract or as the termination of the old contract and the creation of a new contract (i.e., prospectively). The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09³⁸ that it clarified the accounting for modifications that affect a single performance obligation that is made up of a series of distinct goods or services (e.g., repetitive service contracts) to address some stakeholders' concerns that an entity otherwise would have been required to account for these modifications on a cumulative catch-up basis.

How we see it

The requirement to determine whether to treat a change in contractual terms as a separate contract or a modification to an existing contract is similar to guidance for contract accounting in ASC 605-35. However, there is no guidance outside of ASC 605-35 in legacy GAAP that provides a general framework for accounting for contract modifications. Entities should evaluate whether their processes and controls for contract modifications will need to be updated for the new guidance.

Question 3-9

When an arrangement that has already been determined to meet the standard's contract criteria is modified, should an entity reassess whether that arrangement still meets the criteria to be considered a contract within the scope of the model in the standard?

There is no specific requirement in the standard to reconsider whether a contract meets the definition of a contract when it is modified. However, if a contract is modified, we believe that may indicate that "a significant change in facts and circumstances" has occurred (see Section 3.1) and that the entity should reassess the criteria in ASC 606-10-25-1 for the modified contract. Any reassessment is prospective in nature and would not change the conclusions associated with goods and services already transferred. That is, an entity would not reverse any receivables, revenue or contract assets already recognized under the contract because of the reassessment. However, due to the contract modification accounting (see Section 3.4.2), the entity may need to adjust contract assets or cumulative revenue recognized in the period of the contract modification.

Question 3-10

How should an entity account for the exercise of a material right? That is, should it be accounted for as a contract modification, a continuation of the existing contract or as variable consideration? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 32]

See response to Question 4-16 in Section 4.6.

³⁸ Paragraph BC79 of ASU 2014-09.

Question 3-11 How should entities account for modifications to licenses of intellectual property?

See response to Question 8-1 in Section 8.1.4.

3.4.1 Contract modification represents a separate contract

Certain contract modifications are treated as separate, new contracts. For these modifications, the accounting for the original contract is not affected by the modification, and the revenue recognized to date on the original contract is not adjusted. Further, any performance obligations remaining under the original contract continue to be accounted for under the original contract. The accounting for this modification approach reflects the fact that there is no economic difference between a separate contract for additional goods and services and a modified contract for those same items, provided the two criteria required for this modification approach are met.

The first criterion that must be met for a modification to be treated as a separate contract is that the additional goods and services included in the modification must be distinct from the goods and services in the original contract. This assessment should be done in accordance with the standard's general requirements for determining whether promised goods and services are distinct (see Section 4.2.1). Only modifications that add distinct goods and services to the arrangement can be treated as separate contracts. Arrangements that reduce the amount of promised goods or services or change the scope of the original promised goods and services, by their very nature, cannot be considered separate contracts and have to be considered modifications of the original contracts (see Section 3.4.2).

The second criterion is that the amount of consideration expected for the added goods and services reflects the standalone selling price of those goods or services. In determining the standalone selling price, however, entities have some flexibility to adjust the selling price, depending on the facts and circumstances. For example, a vendor may give a current customer a discount on additional goods because the vendor would not incur selling-related costs that it typically incurs for new customers. In this example, the entity may determine that the additional transaction consideration meets this criterion, even though the discounted price is less than the standalone selling price of that good or service for a new customer. In another example, an entity may conclude that, with the additional purchases, the customer qualifies for a volume-based discount (see Questions 4-14 and 4-15 in Section 4.6 on volume discounts).

The following example illustrates a contract modification that represents a separate contract:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Implementation Guidance and Illustrations***Example 5 – Modification of a Contract for Goods****606-10-55-111**

An entity promises to sell 120 products to a customer for \$12,000 (\$100 per product). The products are transferred to the customer over a six-month period. The entity transfers control of each product at a point in time. After the entity has transferred control of 60 products to the customer, the contract is modified to require the delivery of an additional 30 products (a total of 150 identical products) to the customer. The additional 30 products were not included in the initial contract.

Case A – Additional Products for a Price That Reflects the Standalone Selling Price**606-10-55-112**

When the contract is modified, the price of the contract modification for the additional 30 products is an additional \$2,850 or \$95 per product. The pricing for the additional products reflects the standalone selling price of the products at the time of the contract modification, and the additional products are distinct (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19) from the original products.

606-10-55-113

In accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-12, the contract modification for the additional 30 products is, in effect, a new and separate contract for future products that does not affect the accounting for the existing contract. The entity recognizes revenue of \$100 per product for the 120 products in the original contract and \$95 per product for the 30 products in the new contract.

3.4.2 Contract modification is not a separate contract

In instances in which the criteria discussed in Section 3.4.1 are not met (i.e., distinct goods or services are not added or the distinct goods or services are not priced at their standalone selling price), contract modifications should be accounted for as changes to the original contract and not as separate contracts. This includes contract modifications that modify or remove previously agreed-upon goods and services or reduce the price of the contract. An entity would account for the effects of these modifications differently, depending on which one of the three scenarios described in ASC 606-10-25-13 most closely aligns with the facts and circumstances of the modification.

If the remaining goods and services after the contract modification are distinct from the goods or services transferred on or before the contract modification, the entity should account for the modification as if it were the termination of the old contract and the creation of a new contract. For these modifications, the revenue recognized to date on the original contract (i.e., the amount associated with the completed performance obligations) is not adjusted. Instead, the remaining portion of the original contract and the modification are accounted for together on a prospective basis by allocating the remaining consideration (i.e., the unrecognized transaction price from the existing contract plus the additional transaction price from the modification) to the remaining performance obligations, including those added in the modification. This scenario is illustrated as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 5 – Modification of a Contract for Goods

606-10-55-111

An entity promises to sell 120 products to a customer for \$12,000 (\$100 per product). The products are transferred to the customer over a six-month period. The entity transfers control of each product at a point in time. After the entity has transferred control of 60 products to the customer, the contract is modified to require the delivery of an additional 30 products (a total of 150 identical products) to the customer. The additional 30 products were not included in the initial contract.

Case B – Additional Products for a Price That Does Not Reflect the Standalone Selling Price

606-10-55-114

During the process of negotiating the purchase of an additional 30 products, the parties initially agree on a price of \$80 per product. However, the customer discovers that the initial 60 products transferred to the customer contained minor defects that were unique to those delivered products. The entity promises a partial credit of \$15 per product to compensate the customer for the poor quality of those products. The entity and the customer agree to incorporate the credit of \$900 (\$15 credit × 60 products) into the price that the entity charges for the additional 30 products. Consequently, the contract modification specifies that the price of the additional 30 products is \$1,500 or \$50 per product. That price comprises the agreed-upon price for the additional 30 products of \$2,400, or \$80 per product, less the credit of \$900.

606-10-55-115

At the time of modification, the entity recognizes the \$900 as a reduction of the transaction price and, therefore, as a reduction of revenue for the initial 60 products transferred. In accounting for the sale of the additional 30 products, the entity determines that the negotiated price of \$80 per product does not reflect the standalone selling price of the additional products. Consequently, the contract modification does not meet the conditions in paragraph 606-10-25-12 to be accounted for as a separate contract. Because the remaining products to be delivered are distinct from those already transferred, the entity applies the guidance in paragraph 606-10-25-13(a) and accounts for the modification as a termination of the original contract and the creation of a new contract.

606-10-55-116

Consequently, the amount recognized as revenue for each of the remaining products is a blended price of \$93.33 $\{[(\$100 \times 60 \text{ products not yet transferred under the original contract}) + (\$80 \times 30 \text{ products to be transferred under the contract modification})] \div 90 \text{ remaining products}\}$.

In Example 5, Case B, the entity attributed a portion of the discount provided on the additional products to the previously delivered products because they contained minor defects. That portion of the discount was recognized as a reduction of the transaction price (and therefore revenue) on the date of the modification.

In similar situations, an entity will need to have sufficient evidence to indicate that a portion of the discount on the additional products specifically relates to the previously delivered products to make a similar conclusion. In many circumstances, this evidence may not exist so the discount will be attributed only to the additional products and recognized when control of those products transfers to the customer.

If the remaining goods and services to be provided after the contract modification are not distinct from those goods and services already provided and, therefore, form part of a single performance obligation that is partially satisfied at the date of modification, the entity should account for the contract modification as if it were part of the original contract. For these modifications, the entity will adjust revenue previously recognized, either up or down, to reflect the effect that the contract modification has on the transaction price and update the measure of progress (i.e., the revenue adjustment is made on a cumulative catch-up basis). This scenario is illustrated as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall*****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations******Example 8 – Modification Resulting in a Cumulative Catch-Up Adjustment to Revenue*****606-10-55-129**

An entity, a construction company, enters into a contract to construct a commercial building for a customer on customer-owned land for promised consideration of \$1 million and a bonus of \$200,000 if the building is completed within 24 months. The entity accounts for the promised bundle of goods and services as a single performance obligation satisfied over time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27(b) because the customer controls the building during construction. At the inception of the contract, the entity expects the following:

Transaction price	\$ 1,000,000
Expected costs	\$ <u>700,000</u>
Expected profit (30%)	\$ <u>300,000</u>

606-10-55-130

At contract inception, the entity excludes the \$200,000 bonus from the transaction price because it cannot conclude that it is probable that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized will not occur. Completion of the building is highly susceptible to factors outside the entity's influence, including weather and regulatory approvals. In addition, the entity has limited experience with similar types of contracts.

606-10-55-131

The entity determines that the input measure, on the basis of costs incurred, provides an appropriate measure of progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation. By the end of the first year, the entity has satisfied 60 percent of its performance obligation on the basis of costs incurred to date (\$420,000) relative to total expected costs (\$700,000). The entity reassesses the variable consideration and concludes that the amount is still constrained in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13. Consequently, the cumulative revenue and costs recognized for the first year are as follows:

Revenue	\$ 600,000
Costs	<u>\$ 420,000</u>
Gross profit	<u>\$ 180,000</u>

606-10-55-132

In the first quarter of the second year, the parties to the contract agree to modify the contract by changing the floor plan of the building. As a result, the fixed consideration and expected costs increase by \$150,000 and \$120,000, respectively. Total potential consideration after the modification is \$1,350,000 (\$1,150,000 fixed consideration + \$200,000 completion bonus). In addition, the allowable time for achieving the \$200,000 bonus is extended by 6 months to 30 months from the original contract inception date. At the date of the modification, on the basis of its experience and the remaining work to be performed, which is primarily inside the building and not subject to weather conditions, the entity concludes that it is probable that including the bonus in the transaction price will not result in a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-11 and includes the \$200,000 in the transaction price. In assessing the contract modification, the entity evaluates paragraph 606-10-25-19(b) and concludes (on the basis of the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21) that the remaining goods and services to be provided using the modified contract are not distinct from the goods and services transferred on or before the date of contract modification; that is, the contract remains a single performance obligation.

606-10-55-133

Consequently, the entity accounts for the contract modification as if it were part of the original contract (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-13(b)). The entity updates its measure of progress and estimates that it has satisfied 51.2 percent of its performance obligation (\$420,000 actual costs incurred ÷ \$820,000 total expected costs). The entity recognizes additional revenue of \$91,200 [(51.2 percent complete × \$1,350,000 modified transaction price) – \$600,000 revenue recognized to date] at the date of the modification as a cumulative catch-up adjustment.

Finally, a change in a contract also may be treated as a combination of the two: a modification of the existing contract and the creation of a new contract. In this case, an entity would not adjust the accounting for completed performance obligations that are distinct from the modified goods or services. However, the entity would adjust revenue previously recognized, either up or down, to reflect the effect of the contract modification on the estimated transaction price allocated to performance obligations that are not distinct from the modified portion of the contract and update the measure of progress.

Question 3-12

How should an entity account for a contract asset that exists when a contract is modified if the modification is treated as the termination of an existing contract and the creation of a new contract? [18 April 2016 FASB TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 51]

See response to Question 10-5 in Section 10.1.

3.5

Arrangements that do not meet the definition of a contract under the standard



FASB amendments

In May 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-12 that added an additional event for when an entity can recognize revenue for consideration received from a customer when the arrangement does not meet the criteria to be accounted for as a revenue contract under the standard. Under this amendment, an entity should recognize revenue in the amount of nonrefundable consideration received when the entity has transferred control of the goods or services and has stopped transferring (and has no obligation to transfer) additional goods or services.

An arrangement that does not meet the criteria of a contract under the standard must be accounted for as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Identifying the Contract

606-10-25-6

If a contract with a customer does not meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1, an entity shall continue to assess the contract to determine whether the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are subsequently met.

606-10-25-7

When a contract with a customer does not meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 and an entity receives consideration from the customer, the entity shall recognize the consideration received as **revenue** only when one or more of the following events have occurred:

- a. The entity has no remaining obligations to transfer goods or services to the customer, and all, or substantially all, of the consideration promised by the customer has been received by the entity and is nonrefundable.
- b. The contract has been terminated, and the consideration received from the customer is nonrefundable.
- c. The entity has transferred control of the goods or services to which the consideration that has been received relates, the entity has stopped transferring goods or services to the customer (if applicable) and has no obligation under the contract to transfer additional goods or services, and the consideration received from the customer is nonrefundable.

606-10-25-8

An entity shall recognize the consideration received from a customer as a liability until one of the events in paragraph 606-10-25-7 occurs or until the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are subsequently met (see paragraph 606-10-25-6). Depending on the facts and circumstances relating to the contract, the liability recognized represents the entity's obligation to either transfer goods or services in the future or refund the consideration received. In either case, the liability shall be measured at the amount of consideration received from the customer.

Entities should continue to assess the criteria in ASC 606-10-25-1 (as discussed in Section 3.1) throughout the term of the arrangement to determine whether they are subsequently met. Once the criteria are met, the model in the standard would then apply, rather than the guidance discussed below.

In cases in which the contract does not meet those criteria (and continues not to meet them), an entity should recognize nonrefundable consideration received as revenue only when one of the following events has occurred:

- ▶ The entity has fully performed and substantially all of the consideration has been received
- ▶ The contract has been terminated
- ▶ The entity has transferred control of the goods or services and has stopped transferring (and has no obligation under the contract to transfer) additional goods or services to the customer, if applicable

Until one of these events happens, any consideration received from the customer is initially accounted for as a liability (not revenue), and the liability is measured at the amount of consideration received from the customer. The existing derecognition guidance in US GAAP should be applied to assets related to contracts that do not meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1. The Board noted³⁹ that whether these events have occurred does not have any effect on determining whether control of an asset has been transferred to a customer and, therefore, should not affect conclusions about when an asset should be derecognized. Once the buyer controls the asset (i.e., it has obtained control of the asset from the entity), the entity no longer controls that asset and should no longer recognize the asset. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,⁴⁰ the Board indicated it intended this accounting to be similar to the "deposit method" that was previously included in US GAAP and applied when there was no consummation of a sale.

The Board decided⁴¹ to include the guidance in ASC 606-10-25-7 to 25-8 to prevent entities from seeking alternative guidance or improperly analogizing to the revenue recognition guidance in circumstances in which an executed contract does not meet the criteria in ASC 606-10-25-1.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12,⁴² the Board noted that while some stakeholders did not support some of the accounting outcomes that result from the alternative recognition model described in ASC 606-10-25-7 to 25-8, it is the logical extension of the conclusion that a valid contract does not exist. That is, any cash received by the entity is deferred until either a contract exists under the standard or one of the events in ASC 606-10-25-7 occurs because if there is not a valid contract between the parties, there can be no assurance that consideration received from the customer is solely for past performance.

³⁹ Paragraph BC28 of ASU 2016-12.

⁴⁰ Paragraph BC48 of ASU 2014-09.

⁴¹ Paragraph BC47 of ASU 2014-09.

⁴² Paragraph BC22 of ASU 2016-12.

The FASB further explained⁴³ that the third event is not the equivalent of legacy GAAP's "cash basis" of accounting under which an entity would recognize revenue as cash is received from the customer if collectibility was not considered reasonably assured at contract inception but the other three basic revenue recognition criteria were met.⁴⁴ Under the standard, an entity would only meet the requirements of this event if it has transferred control of the goods or services and has stopped transferring (and has no obligation under the contract to transfer) additional goods or services to the customer (which is not a requirement of legacy GAAP's "cash basis" accounting). This assessment will require judgment about the specific facts and circumstances (e.g., an entity's right to stop transferring goods or services may vary by arrangement or jurisdiction).



IASB differences

IFRS 15 does not contain the third event (i.e., the entity has transferred control of the goods or services and has stopped transferring, and has no obligation under the contract to transfer, additional goods or services to the customer) for when an entity can recognize revenue for consideration received from a customer when the arrangement does not meet the criteria to be accounted for as a revenue contract under the standard.

However, the IASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments) that contracts often specify that an entity has a right to terminate the contract in the event of non-payment and that this clause would not generally affect the entity's legal rights to recover any amounts due. Therefore, the IASB concluded that the guidance in IFRS 15 would allow an entity to conclude that a contract is terminated when it stops providing goods or services to the customer.

Question 3-13

When is a contract considered terminated for purposes of applying ASC 606-10-25-7(b)?

Determining whether a contract is terminated may require significant judgment and may require a legal assessment. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12⁴⁵ that an entity may pursue collection for a significant period of time after control of goods or services has transferred to the customer and not legally terminate the contract to maintain its legal rights to continue to pursue collection or its other legal rights under the contract. In these situations, nonrefundable consideration received from the customer could be recognized as a liability for a significant period of time during the period that an entity pursues collection, even though the entity may have stopped transferring goods or services to the customer and has no further obligations to transfer goods or services to the customer. The FASB included the event in ASC 606-10-25-7(c) to address these situations. In contrast, the IASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 when a contract is considered terminated under IFRS 15.

Question 3-14

If an entity begins activities on a specifically anticipated contract either (1) before it agrees to the contract with the customer or (2) before the arrangement meets the criteria to be considered a contract under the standard, how should revenue be recognized at the date a contract exists? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 33]

See response to Question 7-8 in Section 7.1.4.3.

⁴³ Paragraph BC24 of ASU 2016-12.

⁴⁴ SAB Topic 13 requires that the following four basic criteria be met before revenue can be considered realized or earned: (1) persuasive evidence of the arrangement exists, (2) delivery has occurred or services have been rendered, (3) the seller's price to the buyer is fixed or determinable and (4) collectibility is reasonably assured.

⁴⁵ Paragraph BC23 of ASU 2016-12.

4 Identify the performance obligations in the contract

To apply the standard, an entity must identify the promised goods and services within the contract and determine which of those goods and services are separate performance obligations. The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09⁴⁶ that it developed the notion of a “performance obligation” to assist entities with appropriately identifying the unit of accounting for purposes of applying the standard. Because the standard requires entities to allocate the transaction price to performance obligations, identifying the correct unit of accounting is fundamental to recognizing revenue on a basis that faithfully depicts the entity’s performance in transferring the promised goods or services to the customer.

The standard provides the following guidance with respect to identifying the performance obligations in a contract:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Identifying Performance Obligations

606-10-25-14

At contract inception, an entity shall assess the goods or services promised in a contract with a customer and shall identify as a performance obligation each promise to transfer to the customer either:

- a. A good or service (or a bundle of goods or services) that is distinct**
- b. A series of distinct goods or services that are substantially the same and that have the same pattern of transfer to the customer (see paragraph 606-10-25-15).**

606-10-25-15

A series of distinct goods or services has the same pattern of transfer to the customer if both of the following criteria are met:

- a. Each distinct good or service in the series that the entity promises to transfer to the customer would meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-27 to be a performance obligation satisfied over time.**
- b. In accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-32, the same method would be used to measure the entity’s progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation to transfer each distinct good or service in the series to the customer.**

⁴⁶ Paragraph BC85 of ASU 2014-09.

4.1 Identifying the promised goods and services in the contract



FASB amendments

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that amended the guidance on identifying performance obligations to allow entities to disregard promises deemed to be immaterial in the context of a contract. The FASB's intent is to allow entities to disregard immaterial items at the contract level and not require that these items be aggregated and assessed for materiality at the entity level.

As a first step in identifying the performance obligation(s) in the contract, the standard requires an entity to identify, at contract inception, the promised goods and services in the contract. However, unlike legacy guidance, which does not define the term "deliverable," the new standard provides guidance on the types of items that may be goods or services promised in the contract as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Identifying Performance Obligations

Promises in Contracts with Customers

606-10-25-16

A **contract** with a **customer** generally explicitly states the goods or services that an entity promises to transfer to a customer. However, the promised goods and services identified in a contract with a customer may not be limited to the goods or services that are explicitly stated in that contract. This is because a contract with a customer also may include promises that are implied by an entity's customary business practices, published policies, or specific statements if, at the time of entering into the contract, those promises create a reasonable expectation of the customer that the entity will transfer a good or service to the customer.

606-10-25-16A

An entity is not required to assess whether promised goods or services are **performance obligations** if they are immaterial in the context of the contract with the customer. If the revenue related to a performance obligation that includes goods or services that are immaterial in the context of the contract is recognized before those immaterial goods or services are transferred to the customer, then the related costs to transfer those goods or services shall be accrued.

606-10-25-16B

An entity shall not apply the guidance in paragraph 606-10-25-16A to a customer option to acquire additional goods or services that provides the customer with a material right, in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-41 through 55-45.

606-10-25-17

Promised goods or services do not include activities that an entity must undertake to fulfill a contract unless those activities transfer a good or service to a customer. For example, a services provider may need to perform various administrative tasks to set up a contract. The performance of those tasks does not transfer a service to the customer as the tasks are performed. Therefore, those setup activities are not promised goods or services in the contract with the customer.

606-10-25-18

Depending on the **contract**, promised goods or services may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Sale of goods produced by an entity (for example, inventory of a manufacturer)

- b. Resale of goods purchased by an entity (for example, merchandise of a retailer)
- c. Resale of rights to goods or services purchased by an entity (for example, a ticket resold by an entity acting as a principal, as described in paragraphs 606-10-55-36 through 55-40)
- d. Performing a contractually agreed-upon task (or tasks) for a **customer**
- e. Providing a service of standing ready to provide goods or services (for example, unspecified updates to software that are provided on a when-and-if-available basis) or of making goods or services available for a customer to use as and when the customer decides
- f. Providing a service of arranging for another party to transfer goods or services to a customer (for example, acting as an agent of another party, as described in paragraphs 606-10-55-36 through 55-40)
- g. Granting rights to goods or services to be provided in the future that a customer can resell or provide to its customer (for example, an entity selling a product to a retailer promises to transfer an additional good or service to an individual who purchases the product from the retailer)
- h. Constructing, manufacturing, or developing an asset on behalf of a customer
- i. Granting licenses (see paragraphs 606-10-55-54 through 55-60 and paragraphs 606-10-55-62 through 55-65B)
- j. Granting options to purchase additional goods or services (when those options provide a customer with a material right, as described in paragraphs 606-10-55-41 through 55-45).

In addition, the standard indicates that certain activities are not promised goods or services, such as activities that an entity must perform to satisfy its obligation to deliver the promised goods and services (e.g., internal administrative activities). After identifying the promised goods or services in the contract, an entity will then determine which of these promised goods or services (or bundle of goods and services) represent separate performance obligations. This evaluation is similar to the evaluation in legacy GAAP, which requires entities to identify the deliverables in an arrangement and then determine whether those deliverables should be combined into a unit of accounting.

In order for an entity to identify the promised goods and services in a contract, the standard says that an entity should consider whether the customer has a reasonable expectation that the entity will provide those goods or services. If the customer has a reasonable expectation that it will receive certain goods or services, it would likely view those promises as part of the negotiated exchange. This expectation will most commonly be created from an entity's explicit promises in a contract to transfer a good(s) or service(s) to the customer.

However, in other cases, promises to provide goods or services might be implied by the entity's customary business practices or standard industry norms (i.e., outside of the written contract). As discussed in Chapter 3, the Board clarified⁴⁷ that while the contract must be legally enforceable to be within the scope of the revenue model, all of the promises (explicit or implicit) don't have to be enforceable to be considered when determining the entity's performance obligations. That is, a performance obligation can be based on a customer's reasonable expectations (e.g., due to the entity's business practice of providing an additional good or service that isn't specified in the contract).

⁴⁷ Paragraphs BC32 and BC87 of ASU 2014-09.

In addition, some items commonly considered to be marketing incentives or incidental goods or services under legacy GAAP will have to be evaluated under the standard to determine whether they represent promised goods and services in the contract. Such items may include “free” handsets provided by telecommunication entities; “free” maintenance provided by automotive manufacturers; and customer loyalty points awarded by supermarkets, airlines and hotels.⁴⁸ Although an entity might not consider those goods or services to be the “main” items the customer contracts to receive, the FASB concluded⁴⁹ that they are goods or services the customer pays for, and the entity should allocate consideration to them for purposes of revenue recognition.

ASC 606-10-25-18 provides examples of promised goods or services that may be included in a contract with a customer. Several of them are considered deliverables under legacy GAAP, including a good produced by an entity or a contractually agreed-upon task (or service) performed for a customer. However, the FASB also included other examples that may not be considered deliverables under legacy GAAP. For example, ASC 606-10-25-18(e) describes a stand-ready obligation as a promised service that consists of standing ready to provide goods or services or making goods or services available for a customer to use as and when it decides to use it. That is, a stand-ready obligation is the promise that the customer will have access to a good or service rather than a promise to transfer the underlying good or service itself. Stand-ready obligations are common in the software industry (e.g., unspecified updates to software on a when-and-if-available basis) and may be present in other industries. See Questions 4-2 and 4-3 below for further discussion on stand-ready obligations.

ASC 606-10-25-18(g) also notes that a promise to a customer may include granting rights to goods or services to be provided in the future that the customer can resell or provide to its customer if those rights existed at the time that the parties agreed to the contract. The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09⁵⁰ that it thought it was important to clarify that a performance obligation may exist for a promise to provide a good or service in the future (e.g., when an entity makes a promise to provide goods or services to its customer’s customer). These types of promises exist in distribution networks in various industries and are common in the automotive industry.

The standard includes the following example to illustrate how an entity should identify the promised goods and services in a contract (including both explicit and implicit promises). The example also evaluates whether the identified promises are performance obligations, which we discuss in Section 4.2:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 12 – Explicit and Implicit Promises in a Contract

606-10-55-151

An entity, a manufacturer, sells a product to a distributor (that is, its customer), who will then resell it to an end customer.

⁴⁸ Paragraph BC88 of ASU 2014-09.

⁴⁹ Paragraph BC89 of ASU 2014-09.

⁵⁰ Paragraph BC92 of ASU 2014-09.

Case A – Explicit Promise of Service**606-10-55-152**

In the contract with the distributor, the entity promises to provide maintenance services for no additional consideration (that is, “free”) to any party (that is, the end customer) that purchases the product from the distributor. The entity outsources the performance of the maintenance services to the distributor and pays the distributor an agreed-upon amount for providing those services on the entity’s behalf. If the end customer does not use the maintenance services, the entity is not obliged to pay the distributor.

606-10-55-153

The contract with the customer includes two promised goods or services—(a) the product and (b) the maintenance services (because the promise of maintenance services is a promise to transfer goods or services in the future and is part of the negotiated exchange between the entity and the distributor). The entity assesses whether each good or service is distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19. The entity determines that both the product and the maintenance services meet the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(a). The entity regularly sells the product on a standalone basis, which indicates that the customer can benefit from the product on its own. The customer can benefit from the maintenance services together with a resource the customer already has obtained from the entity (that is, the product).

606-10-55-153A

The entity further determines that its promises to transfer the product and to provide the maintenance services are separately identifiable (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(b)) on the basis of the principle and the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21. The product and the maintenance services are not inputs to a combined item in this contract. The entity is not providing a significant integration service because the presence of the product and the services together in this contract do not result in any additional or combined functionality. In addition, neither the product nor the services modify or customize the other. Lastly, the product and the maintenance services are not highly interdependent or highly interrelated because the entity would be able to satisfy each of the promises in the contract independent of its efforts to satisfy the other (that is, the entity would be able to transfer the product even if the customer declined maintenance services and would be able to provide maintenance services in relation to products sold previously through other distributors). The entity also observes, in applying the principle in paragraph 606-10-25-21, that the entity’s promise to provide maintenance is not necessary for the product to continue to provide significant benefit to the customer. Consequently, the entity allocates a portion of the transaction price to each of the two performance obligations (that is, the product and the maintenance services) in the contract.

Case B – Implicit Promise of Service**606-10-55-154**

The entity has historically provided maintenance services for no additional consideration (that is, “free”) to end customers that purchase the entity’s product from the distributor. The entity does not explicitly promise maintenance services during negotiations with the distributor, and the final contract between the entity and the distributor does not specify terms or conditions for those services.

606-10-55-155

However, on the basis of its customary business practice, the entity determines at contract inception that it has made an implicit promise to provide maintenance services as part of the negotiated exchange with the distributor. That is, the entity’s past practices of providing these services create reasonable expectations of the entity’s customers (that is, the distributor and end customers) in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-16. Consequently, the entity assesses whether the promise of maintenance services is a performance obligation. For the same reasons as in Case A, the entity determines that the product and maintenance services are separate performance obligations.

Case C – Services Are Not a Promised Service**606-10-55-156**

In the contract with the distributor, the entity does not promise to provide any maintenance services. In addition, the entity typically does not provide maintenance services, and, therefore, the entity's customary business practices, published policies, and specific statements at the time of entering into the contract have not created an implicit promise to provide goods or services to its customers. The entity transfers control of the product to the distributor and, therefore, the contract is completed. However, before the sale to the end customer, the entity makes an offer to provide maintenance services to any party that purchases the product from the distributor for no additional promised consideration.

606-10-55-157

The promise of maintenance is not included in the contract between the entity and the distributor at contract inception. That is, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-16, the entity does not explicitly or implicitly promise to provide maintenance services to the distributor or the end customers. Consequently, the entity does not identify the promise to provide maintenance services as a performance obligation. Instead, the obligation to provide maintenance services is accounted for in accordance with Topic 450 on contingencies.

606-10-55-157A

Although the maintenance services are not a promised service in the current contract, in future contracts with customers the entity would assess whether it has created a business practice resulting in an implied promise to provide maintenance services.

How we see it

Some “free” goods or services commonly considered marketing incentives or incidental goods or services under legacy GAAP will have to be evaluated under the standard to determine whether they represent promised goods and services in a contract.

4.1.1**Promised goods or services that are immaterial in the context of a contract**

As entities assess whether promised goods or services are performance obligations, the standard permits them to disregard goods and services that are deemed to be immaterial in the context of a contract. Because of this guidance, entities are not required to aggregate and assess immaterial items at the entity level. That is, when determining whether a good or service is immaterial in the context of a contract, the assessment is made based on the application of ASC 606 at the contract level, not in accordance with SAB Topic 1.M, which provides guidance on applying materiality thresholds to the preparation of financial statements filed with the SEC.

The Board decided that an entity is required to consider whether a promised good or service is material only at the contract level because it would be unduly burdensome to require an entity to aggregate and determine the effect on its financial statements of those items or activities determined to be immaterial at the contract level.⁵¹ Further, the Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁵² that assessing immaterial goods or services might obscure, rather than clarify, the entity's performance obligation(s) in a contract and that an entity is not required to allocate revenue to promised goods or services that are immaterial in the context of a contract.

⁵¹ Paragraph BC12 of ASU 2016-10.

⁵² Paragraph BC13 of ASU 2016-10.

The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions⁵³ that it did not intend for an entity to identify significantly more promised goods and services under the new standard than under legacy guidance, except for certain marketing incentives that generally are not considered deliverables under legacy guidance. However, ASC 606-10-25-16B states that this guidance that allows entities to disregard promises that are immaterial in the context of a contract may not be applied to customer options for additional goods or services. That is, an entity would still need to evaluate whether customer options for additional goods or services are material rights that should be accounted for as performance obligations in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-41 through 55-45 (see Section 4.6).

When evaluating whether a promised good or service is immaterial, an entity should consider the relative significance or importance of the good or service in the context of a contract as a whole. In doing so, entities will need to consider both quantitative and qualitative factors, just as they do when considering materiality in other areas of GAAP. If an entity determines that multiple goods or services are individually immaterial in the context of a contract, it will have to further assess the collective significance of those goods or services before concluding it is appropriate to consider them all immaterial in the context of the contract. This is because those individual immaterial items may be material in the aggregate to the contract. The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁵⁴ that an entity may not disregard some or all of those immaterial goods or services when identifying performance obligations if the disregarded goods or services are material to the contract in the aggregate. That is, an entity must account for a material portion of its promised goods or services in a contract and can't avoid accounting for any material portion of the contract.

The standard also contains guidance that requires entities to accrue for the costs of transferring immaterial goods or services to the customer in instances in which the costs will be incurred after the performance obligation (that includes those immaterial goods or services) has been satisfied. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁵⁵ that this requirement will more appropriately align the recognition of revenue and costs in the financial statements. The Board also observed that the cost accrual requirement in the standard only applies to items that are deemed to be promises *to a customer* in a contract. For example, an entity typically would not be required to accrue costs for operating a call desk to answer general inquiries about a product because doing that does not fulfill a promise to a customer.

How we see it

The inclusion of guidance that allows entities to disregard promised goods or services that are immaterial in the context of a contract will likely result in entities identifying similar promises to those that are identified as deliverables under legacy guidance (with some exceptions, such as certain types of marketing incentives). Although this assessment will require judgment, we anticipate that many of the promises deemed to be immaterial in the context of the contract will be similar to those items deemed inconsequential or perfunctory under the guidance in SAB Topic 13.

We also expect the cost accrual requirements in the new standard to be applied in a manner similar to the cost accrual guidance in SAB Topic 13, which requires that the costs to fulfill remaining performance obligations deemed inconsequential or perfunctory are accrued when revenue from the contract is recognized. We note that the Board used the guidance in SAB Topic 13 as a basis for the cost accrual guidance in the standard.

⁵³ Paragraph BC11 of ASU 2016-10.

⁵⁴ Paragraph BC14 of ASU 2016-10.

⁵⁵ Paragraph BC16 of ASU 2016-10.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 does not include explicit language that an entity can disregard promised goods and services that are immaterial in the context of the contract. However, the IASB clarified in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments) that it did not intend for entities to individually identify every possible promised good or service.

Question 4-1

How should an entity assess whether pre-production activities are a promised good or service? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 46]

TRG members generally agreed that the determination of whether pre-production activities are a promised good or service or fulfillment activities will require judgment and consideration of the facts and circumstances. Entities often need to perform pre-production activities before delivering any units under a production contract. For example, some long-term supply arrangements require an entity to perform up-front engineering and design services to create new, or adapt existing, technology to the needs of a customer.

TRG members generally agreed that if an entity is having difficulty determining whether a pre-production activity is a promised good or service in a contract, the entity should consider whether control of that good or service is transferred to the customer. For example, if an entity is performing engineering and development as part of developing a new product for a customer and the customer will own the intellectual property (e.g., patents) that results, the entity would likely conclude that it is transferring control of the intellectual property and that the engineering and development activities are a promised good or service in the contract.

However, TRG members noted that assessing whether control transfers in such arrangements may be challenging. In some arrangements, legal title of the good or service created from the pre-production activity is transferred to the customer. However, TRG members generally agreed that an entity would have to consider all indicators of control transfer under the new standard, and the transfer of legal title is not a presumptive indicator.

If a pre-production activity is determined to be a promised good or service, an entity will allocate a portion of the transaction price to that good or service (as a single performance obligation or as part of combined performance obligation that includes the pre-production activities along with other goods and services). If the pre-production activities are included in a performance obligation satisfied over time, they would be considered when measuring progress toward satisfaction of that performance obligation (see Section 7.1.4).

Question 4-2

What is the nature of the promise in a “typical” stand-ready obligation? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 16]

TRG members discussed numerous examples of stand-ready obligations and generally agreed that the nature of the promise in a stand-ready obligation is the promise that the customer will have access to a good or service, not the delivery of the underlying good or service. The standard describes a stand-ready obligation as a promised service that consists of standing ready to provide goods or services or making goods or services available for a customer to use as and when it decides to do so. Stand-ready obligations are common in the software industry (e.g., unspecified updates to software on a when-and-if-available basis) and may be present in other industries.

The TRG agenda paper included the following types of promises to a customer that could be considered stand-ready obligations, depending on the facts and circumstances:

- ▶ Obligations for which the delivery of the good, service or intellectual property is within the control of the entity but is still being developed (e.g., a software vendor's promise to transfer unspecified software upgrades at its discretion)
- ▶ Obligations for which the delivery of the underlying good or service is outside the control of the entity and the customer (e.g., an entity's promise to remove snow from an airport runway in exchange for a fixed fee for the year)
- ▶ Obligations for which the delivery of the underlying good or service is within the control of the customer (e.g., an entity's promise to provide periodic maintenance on a when-and-if needed basis on a customer's equipment after a pre-established amount of usage by the customer)
- ▶ Obligations to make a good or service available to a customer continuously (e.g., a gym membership that provides unlimited access to a customer for a specified period of time)

An entity will need to carefully evaluate the facts and circumstances of its contracts to appropriately identify whether the nature of a promise to a customer is the delivery of the underlying good(s) or service(s) or the service of standing ready to provide goods or services. Entities also will have to consider other promises in a contract that includes a stand-ready obligation to appropriately identify the performance obligations in the contract. TRG members generally agreed⁵⁶ that all contracts with a stand-ready element do not necessarily include a single performance obligation (refer to Question 4-3 below).

At the TRG meeting, a FASB staff member said the staff does not believe that the FASB intended to change practice from legacy GAAP for determining when software/technology transactions include specified upgrade rights (i.e., a separate performance obligation) or unspecified upgrade rights (i.e., a stand-ready obligation).

Question 4-3

Do all contracts with a stand-ready element include a single performance obligation that is satisfied over time? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 48]

TRG members generally agreed that the stand-ready element in a contract does not always represent a single performance obligation satisfied over time. This conclusion is consistent with the discussion in Question 4-2 that, when identifying the nature of a promise to a customer, an entity may determine that a stand-ready element exists but is not the promised good or service for revenue recognition purposes. Instead, the underlying goods or services are the goods or services promised to the customer and accounted for by the entity.

As an example, an entity may be required to stand ready to produce a part for a customer under a master supply arrangement (MSA). The customer is not obligated to purchase any parts (i.e., there is no minimum guaranteed volume); however, it is highly likely the customer will purchase parts because the part is required to manufacture the customer's product, and it is not practical for the customer to buy parts from multiple suppliers. TRG members generally agreed that the nature of the promise in this example is the delivery of the parts rather than a service of standing ready. When the customer submits a purchase order under the MSA, it is contracting for a specific number of distinct goods, and the purchase order creates new performance obligations for the entity. However, if the entity determined that the nature of the promise was a service of standing ready, the contract would be accounted for as a single performance obligation satisfied over time, and the entity may be required to estimate the number

⁵⁶ 9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 48.

of purchases to be made throughout the contract term (i.e., make an estimate of variable consideration and apply the constraint on variable consideration) and continually update the transaction price and its allocation among the transferred goods and services.

The TRG agenda paper also noted that in this example, the entity is not obligated to transfer any parts until the customer submits a purchase order (i.e., the customer makes a separate purchasing decision). This contrasts with a stand-ready obligation, which requires the entity to make a promised service available to the customer and doesn't require the customer to make any additional purchasing decisions.

See Question 4-12 for further discussion on determining whether a contract involving variable quantities of goods or services should be accounted for as variable consideration (i.e., if the nature of the promise is to transfer one overall service to the customer, such as a stand-ready obligation) or a contract containing customer options (i.e., if the nature of the promise is to transfer the underlying distinct goods or services.)

4.1.2 Shipping and handling activities



FASB amendments

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that amended the guidance on identifying performance obligations to allow an entity to elect to account for shipping and handling activities performed after control of a good has been transferred to the customer as a fulfillment cost.

The standard allows entities to elect to account for shipping and handling activities performed after the control of a good has been transferred to the customer as a fulfillment cost (i.e., not a promised good or service), as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Identifying Performance Obligations

Promises in Contracts with Customers

606-10-25-18A

An entity that promises a good to a customer also might perform shipping and handling activities related to that good. If the shipping and handling activities are performed before the customer obtains control of the good (see paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 for guidance on satisfying performance obligations), then the shipping and handling activities are not a promised service to the customer. Rather, shipping and handling are activities to fulfill the entity's promise to transfer the good.

606-10-25-18B

If shipping and handling activities are performed after a customer obtains control of the good, then the entity may elect to account for shipping and handling as activities to fulfill the promise to transfer the good. The entity shall apply this accounting policy election consistently to similar types of transactions. An entity that makes this election would not evaluate whether shipping and handling activities are promised services to its customers. If revenue is recognized for the related good before the shipping and handling activities occur, the related costs of those shipping and handling activities shall be accrued. An entity that applies this accounting policy election shall comply with the accounting policy disclosure requirements in paragraphs 235-10-50-1 through 50-6.

This election is intended to provide relief for entities that have free onboard shipping point arrangements and might otherwise determine that the act of shipping is a performance obligation under the standard. If that were the case, the entity would be required to allocate a portion of the transaction price to the shipping service and recognize it when (or as) the shipping occurs.

Shipping and handling activities performed before the transfer of control of a good are fulfillment activities rather than promised services because they relate to the entity's asset and not the customer's asset, and the costs are incurred to facilitate the sale of the good to the customer. The Board decided⁵⁷ that an entity's effort to deliver a good to a customer is no different from its efforts to procure raw materials, manufacture a good or ship a finished product from its manufacturing facility to its warehouse. Therefore, the question of whether shipping is a promised service in a contract is only relevant in situations in which shipping is performed after the customer has obtained control of the good.

The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁵⁸ that it provided an accounting policy election to account for shipping as a fulfillment activity because requiring entities that do not account for shipping as a deliverable under legacy guidance to change practice would be costly for them to implement and would provide little or no benefit to financial statement users. However, the Board further explained⁵⁹ that it provided a policy election, rather than a requirement, because an entity should not be precluded from accounting for shipping and handling as a promised service if doing so would be more consistent with the nature of its contract with a customer.

The accounting policy election should be applied consistently to similar types of transactions. The election is not required to be made at an entity level because the Board recognized⁶⁰ that some entities sell multiple classes of goods and contracts might vary significantly for different classes of goods.

The standard also contains guidance that requires entities to accrue for fulfillment costs when they apply the policy election for shipping and handling activities. That is, entities are required to accrue for the costs of shipping and handling activities if revenue is recognized before contractually agreed shipping and handling activities occur. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁶¹ that this requirement will more appropriately align the recognition of revenue and costs in the financial statements.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 does not include a similar election for shipping and handling activities. Accordingly, IFRS entities will need to assess all goods and services promised in a contract with a customer, including shipping and handling activities, in order to identify performance obligations.

⁵⁷ Paragraph BC22 of ASU 2016-10.

⁵⁸ Paragraph BC20 of ASU 2016-10.

⁵⁹ Paragraph BC21 of ASU 2016-10.

⁶⁰ Paragraph BC21 of ASU 2016-10.

⁶¹ Paragraphs BC16 and BC25 of ASU 2016-10.

Question 4-4 Can the shipping and handling election be applied to other types of activities (e.g., custodial or storage services) that occur after an entity transfers control of a good or service?

The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁶² that the scope of the election is limited only to shipping and handling activities performed after the transfer of control of a good. As a result, it is inappropriate for an entity to apply the election by analogy to any other activities that are performed after control transfer, such as custodial or storage services. An entity should consider whether these other activities transfer a promised good or service to the customer under ASC 606-10-25-17. If the other activities represent a promised good or service, it is possible that an entity could determine that these activities are immaterial in the context of the contract in accordance with ASC 606-10-25-16A. An entity will need to apply judgment when evaluating whether those other activities are immaterial in the context of the contract.

4.2 Determining when promises are performance obligations

After identifying the promised goods and services within a contract, an entity determines which of those goods and services will be accounted for as separate performance obligations. That is, the entity decides what will be the individual units of accounting. Promised goods and services represent separate performance obligations if the goods or services are distinct (by themselves or as part of a bundle of goods and services) or if the goods and services are part of a series of distinct goods and services that are substantially the same and have the same pattern of transfer to the customer (see Section 4.2.2).

If a promised good or service is not distinct, an entity is required to combine that good or service with other promised goods or services until it identifies a bundle of goods or services that is distinct. An entity will be required to account for all the goods or services promised in a contract as a single performance obligation if the entire bundle of promised goods and services is the only performance obligation identified. Refer to Section 4.3 for further discussion.

A single performance obligation may include a license of intellectual property and other promised goods or services. ASC 606-10-55-56 identifies two examples of licenses of intellectual property that are not distinct from other promised goods or services in a contract: (1) a license that is a component of a tangible good and that is integral to the functionality of the tangible good and (2) a license that the customer can benefit from only in conjunction with a related service (e.g., an online hosting service that enables a customer to access the content provided by the license of intellectual property). See Section 8.1.2 for further discussion on these two examples.

The standard also specifies that the following items are performance obligations: (1) customer options for additional goods or services that provide material rights to customers (see ASC 606-10-55-42 in Section 4.6) and (2) service-type warranties (see ASC 606-10-55-30 through 55-35 in Section 9.1.). Entities will not apply the general model to determine whether these goods or services are performance obligations because the Board deemed them to be performance obligations if they are identified as promises in a contract.

⁶² Paragraph BC23 of ASU 2016-10.

4.2.1 Determination of distinct

The standard outlines a two-step process for determining whether a promised good or service (or a bundle of goods and services) is distinct: (1) consideration at the level of the individual good or service (i.e., the good or service is capable of being distinct) and (2) consideration of whether the good or service is separable from other promises in the contract (i.e., the good or service is distinct within the context of the contract). Both of these criteria must be met to conclude that the good or service is distinct. If these criteria are met, the individual good or service must be accounted for as a separate unit of accounting (i.e., a performance obligation).

The Board concluded⁶³ that both steps are important to determine whether a promised good or service should be accounted for separately. The first criterion (i.e., capable of being distinct) establishes the minimum characteristics for a good or service to be accounted for separately. However, even if the individual goods or services promised in a contract may be capable of being distinct, it may not be appropriate to account for each of them separately because doing so would not result in a faithful depiction of the entity's performance in that contract or appropriately represent the nature of an entity's promise to the customer. Therefore, an entity would also need to consider the interrelationship of those goods or services to apply the second criterion (i.e., distinct within the context of the contract) and determine the performance obligations in a contract.

The standard provides the following guidance to determine whether a good or service is distinct:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Identifying Performance Obligations

Distinct Goods or Services

606-10-25-19

A good or service that is promised to a customer is distinct if both of the following criteria are met:

- a. The customer can benefit from the good or service either on its own or together with other resources that are readily available to the customer (that is, the good or service is capable of being distinct).
- b. The entity's promise to transfer the good or service to the customer is separately identifiable from other promises in the contract (that is, the promise to transfer the good or service is distinct within the context of the contract).

4.2.1.1 Capable of being distinct

The first criterion requires that a promised good or service must be capable of being distinct by providing a benefit to the customer either on its own or together with other resources that are readily available to the customer. The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁶⁴ that this criterion establishes a baseline level of economic substance that a promised good or service must have in order to be distinct from other promises in a contract.

⁶³ Paragraph BC102 of ASU 2014-09.

⁶⁴ Paragraph BC33(b) of ASU 2016-10.

The standard provides the following guidance on how to determine whether a promised good or service is capable of being distinct:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Identifying Performance Obligations

Distinct Goods or Services

606-10-25-20

A customer can benefit from a good or service in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(a) if the good or service could be used, consumed, sold for an amount that is greater than scrap value, or otherwise held in a way that generates economic benefits. For some goods or services, a customer may be able to benefit from a good or service on its own. For other goods or services, a customer may be able to benefit from the good or service only in conjunction with other readily available resources. A readily available resource is a good or service that is sold separately (by the entity or another entity) or a resource that the customer has already obtained from the entity (including goods or services that the entity will have already transferred to the customer under the contract) or from other transactions or events. Various factors may provide evidence that the customer can benefit from a good or service either on its own or in conjunction with other readily available resources. For example, the fact that the entity regularly sells a good or service separately would indicate that a customer can benefit from the good or service on its own or with other readily available resources.

Determining whether a good or service is capable of being distinct will be straightforward in many situations. For example, if an entity regularly sells a good or service separately, that would demonstrate that the good or service provides benefit to a customer on its own or with other readily available resources.

The evaluation may require more judgment in other situations, particularly when the good or service can only provide benefit to the customer with readily available resources provided by other entities. These are resources that meet either of the following conditions:

- ▶ They are sold separately by the entity (or another entity).
- ▶ The customer has already obtained them from the entity (including goods or services that the entity will have already transferred to the customer under the contract) or from other transactions or events.

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,⁶⁵ the assessment of whether the customer can benefit from the goods or services (either on its own or with other readily available resources) should be based on the characteristics of the goods or services themselves instead of how the customer might use the goods or services. Consistent with this notion, an entity should disregard any contractual limitations that may prevent the customer from obtaining readily available resources from a party other than the entity when making this assessment (as illustrated below in Example 11, Case D, excerpted in Section 4.2.3).

The Board also explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09⁶⁶ that the guidance for determining whether a good or service is capable of being distinct is comparable to the guidance on accounting for multiple-element arrangements in ASC 605-25. That legacy guidance specifies that a delivered item must have value to the customer on a standalone basis for an entity to account for that item separately. However, the Board did not use similar terminology in the standard in order to avoid the

⁶⁵ Paragraph BC100 of ASU 2014-09.

⁶⁶ Paragraph BC101 of ASU 2014-09.

implication that an entity must assess a customer's intended use for a promised good or service when identifying performance obligations. It observed that it may be difficult, if not possible, for an entity to know a customer's intent.

4.2.1.2 Distinct within the context of the contract



FASB amendments

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that clarified when a promised good or service is "separately identifiable" from other promises in a contract (i.e., distinct within the context of the contract). The amendments (1) reframed the principle for determining whether promised goods or services are separately identifiable to emphasize that the evaluation hinges on whether the multiple promised goods or services work together to deliver a combined output(s), (2) aligned the standard's three indicators for determining whether a promised good or service is separately identifiable with this principle and (3) added new examples and amended others to help entities apply these concepts.

Once an entity determines whether a promised good or service is capable of being distinct based on the individual characteristics of the promise, the entity considers the second criterion of whether the good or service is separately identifiable from other promises in the contract (i.e., whether the promise to transfer the good or service is distinct in the context of the contract).

The standard provides the following guidance to make this determination:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Identifying Performance Obligations

Distinct Goods or Services

606-10-25-21

In assessing whether an entity's promises to transfer goods or services to the customer are separately identifiable in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(b), the objective is to determine whether the nature of the promise, within the context of the contract, is to transfer each of those goods or services individually or, instead, to transfer a combined item or items to which the promised goods or services are inputs. Factors that indicate that two or more promises to transfer goods or services to a customer are not separately identifiable include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. The entity provides a significant service of integrating goods or services with other goods or services promised in the contract into a bundle of goods or services that represent the combined output or outputs for which the customer has contracted. In other words, the entity is using the goods or services as inputs to produce or deliver the combined output or outputs specified by the customer. A combined output or outputs might include more than one phase, element, or unit.
- b. One or more of the goods or services significantly modifies or customizes, or are significantly modified or customized by, one or more of the other goods or services promised in the contract.
- c. The goods or services are highly interdependent or highly interrelated. In other words, each of the goods or services is significantly affected by one or more of the other goods or services in the contract. For example, in some cases, two or more goods or services are significantly affected by each other because the entity would not be able to fulfill its promise by transferring each of the goods or services independently.

Separately identifiable principle

To determine whether promised goods or services are separately identifiable (i.e., whether a promise to transfer a good or service is distinct in the context of the contract), an entity will need to evaluate whether the contract is to deliver (1) multiple promised goods or services or (2) a combined item(s) that is comprised of the individual goods or service promised in the contract. That is, an entity will need to evaluate whether the multiple promised goods and services to be delivered to the customer are *outputs* or *inputs* to a combined item(s). The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁶⁷ that, in many cases, a combined item(s) would be greater than (or substantially different from) the sum of the underlying promised goods and services. The standard includes several examples to help entities further understand the separately identifiable principle. See Section 4.2.3 for full excerpts of these examples.

The evaluation of the separately identifiable principle should consider the utility of the promised goods or services (i.e., the ability of each good or service to provide benefit or value). As discussed in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,⁶⁸ an entity may be able to fulfill its promise to transfer each good or service in a contract independently of the other goods or services, but if each good or service significantly affects the other's utility to the customer, the promises would not be separately identifiable. The Board also noted that the capable of being distinct criterion also considers the utility of the promised good or service, but merely establishes a *baseline* level of economic substance a good or service must have to be capable of being distinct. In contrast, the separately identifiable criterion looks at the customer's ability to derive its *intended* benefit from the contract. For example, if two or more promises are capable of being distinct because the customer can derive some measure of benefit from each one individually, but the customer's ability to derive the intended benefit from the contract significantly depends on the entity transferring all of those goods or services, those promises would need to be combined into a single performance obligation because they are not separately identifiable in the context of the contract.

The FASB also explained⁶⁹ that the separately identifiable principle is intended to consider the level of integration, interrelation or interdependence among the multiple promised goods or services in a contract. That is, the principle is intended to help an entity evaluate when its performance in transferring a bundle of goods or services is, in substance, fulfilling a single promise to a customer. In evaluating how it fulfills its promises in a contract, an entity may also consider the notion of "separable risks"⁷⁰ and the relationship between the various goods or services in the contract. When considering the risks an entity undertakes in fulfilling its promises in a contract, it could conclude that individual goods or services in a bundle are not distinct if the risk that it assumes in transferring one of the promised goods or services to the customer is inseparable from the risk relating to the transfer of the other promised goods or services in the bundle. Therefore, to apply the separately identifiable principle, an entity should evaluate how two or more promised goods or services affect each other and not just evaluate whether one item, by its nature, depends on the other (e.g., an undelivered item that would never be obtained by a customer who didn't purchase the delivered item in the contract). That is, the conclusion about whether the promised goods or services are separately identifiable hinges on whether there is a *two-way dependency* between the items.

As an example of this evaluation, the FASB discussed in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09⁷¹ a typical construction contract that involves transferring to the customer many goods and services that are capable of being distinct (e.g., various building materials, labor, project management services). In this example, the FASB concluded that identifying all of the individual goods and services as separate performance obligations would be impractical and would not faithfully represent the nature of the

⁶⁷ Paragraph BC29 of ASU 2016-10.

⁶⁸ Paragraph BC33(b) of ASU 2016-10.

⁶⁹ Paragraph BC32 of ASU 2016-10.

⁷⁰ Paragraph BC30 of ASU 2016-10.

⁷¹ Paragraph BC102 of ASU 2014-09.

entity's promise to the customer. That is, the entity would recognize revenue when the materials and other inputs to the construction process are provided rather than when it performs (and uses those inputs) in the construction of the item the customer has contracted to receive (e.g., a building, a house). As such, when determining whether a promised good or service is distinct, an entity will not only determine whether the good or service is capable of being distinct but also whether the promise to transfer the good or service is distinct within the context of the contract.

ASC 606-10-25-21 includes three factors (discussed individually below) that are intended to help entities identify when the promises in a bundle of promised goods or services are *not* separately identifiable and, therefore, should be combined into a single performance obligation. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10⁷² that these three factors are not an exhaustive list and that not all of the factors need to be met in order to conclude that the entity's promised goods or services are not distinct and should be combined. The three factors also are not intended to be criteria that are evaluated independently of the separately identifiable principle. Given the wide variety of contracts that are within the scope of the standard, the Board concluded that there may be some instances in which the factors are less relevant to the evaluation of the separately identifiable principle. Entities may need to apply significant judgment to evaluate whether a promised good or service is separately identifiable. The evaluation will require a thorough understanding of the facts and circumstances present in each contract.

Significant integration service

The first factor included in ASC 606-10-25-21(a) is the presence of a significant integration service. The FASB determined⁷³ that, in circumstances in which an entity provides a significant service of integrating a good or service with other goods or services in a contract, the bundle of integrated goods or services represents a combined output or outputs. Said differently, in circumstances in which an entity provides a significant integration service, the risk of transferring individual goods or services is inseparable from the bundle of integrated goods or services because a substantial part of an entity's promise to the customer is to make sure the individual goods or services are incorporated into the combined output or outputs.

This factor applies even if there is more than one output. Further, as described in the standard, a combined output or outputs may include more than one phase, element or unit.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,⁷⁴ the FASB noted that this factor may be relevant in many construction contracts in which a contractor provides an integration (or contract management) service to manage and coordinate the various construction tasks and to assume the risks associated with the integration of those tasks. An integration service provided by the contractor often includes coordinating the activities performed by any subcontractors and making sure the quality of the work performed is in compliance with contract specifications and that the individual goods or services are appropriately integrated into the combined item the customer has contracted to receive. The Board also observed that this factor could apply to other industries as well.

Significant modification or customization

The second factor in ASC 606-10-25-21(b) is the presence of significant modification or customization. The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09⁷⁵ that in some industries, the notion of inseparable risks is more clearly illustrated by assessing whether one good or service significantly modifies or customizes another. This is because if a good or service modifies or customizes another good or service in a contract, each good or service is being assembled together (as an input) to produce a combined output.

⁷² Paragraph BC31 of ASU 2016-10.

⁷³ Paragraph BC107 of ASU 2014-09.

⁷⁴ Paragraph BC107 of ASU 2014-09.

⁷⁵ Paragraph BC109 of ASU 2014-09.

For example, assume that an entity promises to provide a customer with software that it will significantly customize to make the software function with the customer's existing infrastructure. Based on its facts and circumstances, the entity determines that it is providing the customer with a fully integrated system and that the customization service requires it to significantly modify the software in such a way that the risks of providing it and the customization service are inseparable (i.e., the software and customization service are not separately identifiable.)

Highly interdependent or highly interrelated

The third factor in ASC 606-10-25-21(c) is whether the promised goods or services are highly interdependent or highly interrelated. Promised goods or services are highly interdependent or highly interrelated if each of the promised goods or services is significantly affected by one or more of the other goods or services in the contract. As discussed above, the Board clarified that an entity should evaluate whether there is a *two-way dependency* between the promised goods or services to determine whether the promises are highly dependent or highly interrelated.

Examples

The FASB included a number of examples in the standard that illustrate the application of the guidance on identifying performance obligations. The examples include an analysis of how an entity may determine whether the promises to transfer goods or services are distinct in the context of the contract. Refer to Section 4.2.3 below for full excerpts of several of these examples.

How we see it

The first step of the two-step process to determine whether goods or services are distinct is similar to the principles for determining separate units of accounting under legacy guidance in ASC 605-25. However, the second step of considering the goods or services within the context of the contract is a new requirement. Therefore, entities will need to carefully evaluate this second step to determine whether their historical units of accounting for revenue recognition may need to change. This evaluation may require an entity to use significant judgment.

It is important to note that the assessment of whether a good or service is distinct must consider the specific contract with a customer. That is, an entity cannot assume that a particular good or service is distinct (or not distinct) in all instances. The manner in which promised goods and services are bundled in a contract can affect the conclusion of whether a good or service is distinct. We anticipate that entities may end up treating the same goods and services differently, depending on how those goods and services are bundled in a contract.

4.2.2

Series of distinct goods and services that are substantially the same and that have the same pattern of transfer

As discussed above, ASC 606-10-25-14(b) defines as a second type of performance obligation – a promise to transfer to the customer a series of distinct goods or services that are substantially the same and that have the same pattern of transfer to the customer, if both of the following criteria from ASC 606-10-25-15 are met:

- ▶ Each distinct good or service in the series that the entity promises to transfer represents a performance obligation that would be satisfied over time in accordance with ASC 606-10-25-27 (see Section 7.1) if it were accounted for separately.
- ▶ The entity would measure its progress toward satisfaction of the performance obligation using the same measure of progress for each distinct good or service in the series (see Section 7.1.4).

If a series of distinct goods or services meets the criteria in ASC 606-10-25-14(b) and 25-15 (the series provision), an entity is required to treat that series as a single performance obligation (i.e., it is not optional guidance). The Board incorporated this guidance⁷⁶ to simplify the model and promote consistent identification of performance obligations in cases when an entity provides the same good or service over a period of time. Without the series provision, the Board noted⁷⁷ that applying the revenue model might present operational challenges because an entity would have to identify multiple distinct goods or services, allocate the transaction price to each distinct good or service on a standalone selling price basis, and then recognize revenue when those performance obligations are satisfied. The FASB determined that this would not be cost effective. Instead, an entity will identify a single performance obligation and allocate the transaction price to that performance obligation. It will then recognize revenue by applying a single measure of progress to that performance obligation.

For distinct goods or services to be accounted for as a series, they must be substantially the same. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,⁷⁸ the Board provided three examples of repetitive services (i.e., cleaning, transaction processing and delivering electricity) that meet the series provision. In addition, TRG members⁷⁹ generally agreed that when determining whether distinct goods or services are substantially the same, entities will need to first determine the nature of their promise. This is because a series could consist of either specified quantities of the underlying good or service delivered (e.g., each unit of a good) or distinct time increments (e.g., an hourly service), depending on the nature of the promise. That is, if the nature of the promise is to deliver a specified quantity of service (e.g., monthly payroll services over a defined contract period), the evaluation should consider whether each *service* is distinct and substantially the same. In contrast, if the nature of the entity's promise is to stand ready or provide a single service for a period of time (i.e., because there is an unspecified quantity to be delivered), the evaluation should consider whether each *time increment* (e.g., hour, day), rather than the underlying activities, is distinct and substantially the same.

It is important to highlight that even if the underlying activities an entity performs to satisfy a promise vary significantly throughout the day and from day to day, that fact, by itself, does not mean the distinct goods or services are not substantially the same. Consider Example 12A in the standard (excerpted in full in Section 4.2.3), where the nature of the promise is to provide a daily hotel management service. The service is comprised of activities that may vary each day (e.g., cleaning services, reservation services, property maintenance). However, the entity determines that the daily hotel management services are substantially the same because the nature of the entity's promise is the same each day, and the entity is providing the same overall management service each day. See Question 4-7 for further discussion on determining the nature of an entity's promise and evaluating the substantially the same criterion.

A TRG agenda paper⁸⁰ discussed at the July 2015 TRG meeting explained that when considering the nature of the entity's promise and the applicability of the series provision, including whether a good or service is distinct, it may be helpful to consider which over-time criterion in ASC 606-10-25-27 was met (i.e., why the entity concluded that the performance obligation is satisfied over time). As discussed further in Section 7.1, a performance obligation is satisfied over time if one of three criteria are met. For example, if a performance obligation is satisfied over time because the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits provided as the entity performs (i.e., the first over-time criterion in ASC 606-10-25-27(a)), that might indicate that each increment of service is capable of being distinct. If that's the case, the entity would need to evaluate whether each increment of service is separately identifiable (and

⁷⁶ Paragraph BC113 of ASU 2014-09.

⁷⁷ Paragraph BC114 of ASU 2014-09.

⁷⁸ Paragraph BC114 of ASU 2014-09.

⁷⁹ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 39.

⁸⁰ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 39.

substantially the same). If a performance obligation is satisfied over time based on the other two criteria in ASC 606-10-25-27 (i.e., (1) the entity's performance creates or enhances an asset that the customer controls as the asset is created or enhanced or (2) the entity's performance does not create an asset with an alternative use to the entity and the entity has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date), the nature of that promise might be to deliver a single specified good or service (e.g., a contract to construct a single piece of equipment), which would not be considered a series because the individual goods or services within that performance obligation are not distinct.

An entity's determination of whether a performance obligation is a single performance obligation comprising a series of distinct goods or services or a single performance obligation comprising goods or services that are not distinct from one another will affect the accounting in the following areas: (1) allocation of variable consideration (see Chapter 6), (2) contract modifications (see Section 3.4) and (3) changes in transaction price (see Section 6.5). This is because, as the FASB discussed in the Basis for Conclusions in ASU 2014-09⁸¹ and members of the TRG discussed at their March 2015 meeting,⁸² an entity should consider the *underlying* distinct goods or services in the contract, rather than the single performance obligation identified under the series provision, when applying the guidance for these three areas of the model.

The following example, included in a TRG agenda paper,⁸³ illustrates how the allocation of variable consideration may differ for a single performance obligation identified under the series provision and a single performance obligation comprising non-distinct goods and/or services. Consider a five-year service contract that includes payment terms of a fixed annual fee plus a performance bonus upon completion of a milestone at the end of year two. If the entire service period is determined to be a single performance obligation comprising a series of distinct services, the entity may be able to conclude that the variable consideration (i.e., the bonus amount) should be allocated directly to its efforts to perform the distinct services up to the date that the milestone is achieved (e.g., the underlying distinct services in years one and two). This would result in the entity recognizing the entire bonus amount, if earned, at the end of year two. See Question 4-7 for several examples of services for which it would be reasonable to conclude that they meet the series provision.

In contrast, if the entity determines that the entire service period is a single performance obligation that is comprised of non-distinct services, the bonus would be included in the transaction price (subject to the constraint on variable consideration – see Section 5.2.3) and recognized based on the measure of progress determined for the entire service period. For example, if the bonus becomes part of the transaction price at the end of year two (when it is probable to be earned and not subject to a revenue reversal), a portion of the bonus would be recognized at that date based on performance completed to-date and a portion would be recognized as the remainder of the performance obligation is satisfied. As a result, the bonus amount would be recognized as revenue through the end of the five-year service period.

How we see it

The series provision is a new concept, and we believe that entities may need to apply significant judgment when determining whether a promised good or service in a contract with a customer meets the criteria to be accounted for as a series of distinct goods or services. As illustrated in Question 4-7 below, promised goods or services that meet the series criteria are not limited to a particular industry and can encompass a wide array of promised goods and services.

Entities should consider whether they need to add or make changes to their business processes or internal controls as a result of this new requirement.

⁸¹ Paragraph BC115 of ASU 2014-09.

⁸² 30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 27.

⁸³ 30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 27.

Question 4-5 In order to apply the series provision, must the goods or services be consecutively transferred? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 27]

TRG members generally agreed that a series of distinct goods or services need not be consecutively transferred. That is, the series provision must be applied when there is a gap or an overlap in an entity's transfer of goods or services, provided that the other criteria are met.

Stakeholders had asked this question because the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09 uses the term "consecutively" in discussions of the series provision.⁸⁴ However, the TRG agenda paper concluded that the Board's discussion was not meant to imply that the series provision *only* applies to circumstances in which the entity provides the same good or service consecutively over a period of time.

The TRG agenda paper included an example of a contract under which an entity provides a manufacturing service producing 24,000 units of a product over a two-year period. The conclusion in the TRG agenda paper was that the criteria for the series provision in ASC 606-10-25-15 were met because the units produced under the service arrangement were substantially the same and were distinct services that would be satisfied over time (see Section 7.1) because the units are manufactured to meet the customer's specifications (i.e., the entity's performance does not create an asset with alternative use to the entity), and if the contract were to be cancelled, the entity would have an enforceable right to payment (cost plus a reasonable profit margin).

The conclusion in the TRG agenda paper was not influenced by whether the entity would perform the service evenly over the two-year period (e.g., produce 1,000 units per month). That is, the entity could produce 2,000 units in some months and none in others, but this would not be a determining factor in concluding whether the contract met the criteria to be accounted for as a series.

Question 4-6 In order to apply the series provision, does the accounting result need to be the same as if the underlying distinct goods and services were accounted for as separate performance obligations? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 27]

TRG members generally agreed that the accounting result does not need to be the same and that an entity is not required to prove that the result would be the same as if the goods and services were accounted for as separate performance obligations.

Question 4-7 In order to apply the series provision, how should an entity consider whether a performance obligation consists of distinct goods or services that are "substantially the same?" [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 39]

As discussed above, TRG members generally agreed that the TRG agenda paper, which primarily focused on the application of the series provision to service contracts, will help entities understand the standard's requirement to determine whether a performance obligation consists of goods or services that are distinct and "substantially the same."

The TRG agenda paper noted that when making the evaluation of whether goods or services are distinct and substantially the same, an entity needs to first determine the nature of the entity's promise in providing services to the customer. That is, if the nature of the promise is to deliver a specified quantity of service (e.g., monthly payroll services over a defined contract period), the evaluation should consider whether each service is distinct and substantially the same. In contrast, if the nature of the entity's promise is to stand ready or provide a single service for a period of time (i.e., because there is an

⁸⁴ Paragraphs BC113 and BC116 of ASU 2014-09.

unspecified quantity to be delivered), the evaluation should consider whether each time increment (e.g., hour, day), rather than the underlying activities, is distinct and substantially the same. The TRG agenda paper noted that the Board intended that a series could consist of either specified quantities of the underlying good or service delivered (e.g., each unit of a good) or distinct time increments (e.g., an hourly service), depending on the nature of the promise.

As discussed above in Section 4.2.2, it is important to highlight that the underlying activities an entity performs to satisfy a performance obligation could vary significantly throughout a day and from day to day, but the TRG agenda paper noted that is not determinative to the conclusion of whether a performance obligation consists of goods or services that are distinct and substantially the same. Consider Example 12A (excerpted in full in Section 4.2.3) of the standard for which the nature of the promise is to provide a daily hotel management service. The hotel management service comprises various activities that may vary each day (e.g., cleaning services, reservation services, property maintenance). However, the entity determines that the daily hotel management services are substantially the same because the nature of the entity's promise is the same each day and the entity is providing the same overall management service each day.

The TRG agenda paper included several examples of promised goods and services that may meet the series provision and the analysis that supports that conclusion. The evaluation of the nature of the promise for each example is consistent with Example 13 and Example 12A of the standard on monthly payroll processing and hotel management services, respectively. Below we have summarized some of the examples and analysis in the TRG agenda paper:

Example of IT outsourcing

A vendor and customer execute a 10-year information technology (IT) outsourcing arrangement in which the vendor continuously delivers the outsourced activities over the contract term (e.g., it provides server capacity, manages the customer's software portfolio, runs an IT help desk). The total monthly invoice is calculated based on different units consumed for the respective activities, and the vendor concludes that the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits provided by its services as it performs (meeting over-time criterion ASC 606-10-25-27(a)).

The vendor first considers the nature of its promise to the customer. Because the vendor has promised to provide an unspecified quantity of activities, rather than a defined number of services, the TRG agenda paper noted that the vendor could reasonably conclude that the nature of the promise is an obligation to stand ready to provide the integrated outsourcing service each day. If the nature of the promise is the overall IT outsourcing service, each day of service could be considered distinct because the customer can benefit from each day of service on its own and each day is separately identifiable. The TRG agenda paper also noted that the vendor could reasonably conclude that each day of service is substantially the same. That is, even if the individual activities that comprise the performance obligation vary from day to day, the nature of the overall promise is the same from day to day.

Accordingly, it would be reasonable for an entity to conclude that this contract meets the series provision.

Example of transaction processing

A vendor enters into a 10-year contract with a customer to provide continuous access to its system and process all transactions on behalf of the customer. The customer is obligated to use the vendor's system, but the ultimate quantity of transactions is unknown. The vendor concludes that the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits as it performs.

If the vendor concludes that the nature of its promise is to provide continuous access to its system rather than process a particular quantity of transactions, it might conclude that there is a single performance obligation to stand ready to process as many transactions as the customer requires. If that is the case, the TRG agenda paper noted that it would be reasonable to conclude that there are multiple distinct time increments of the service. Each day of access to the service provided to the customer could be considered substantially the same since the customer is deriving a consistent benefit from the access each day, even if a different number of transactions are processed each day.

If the vendor concludes that the nature of the promise is the processing of each transaction, the TRG agenda paper noted that each transaction processed could be considered substantially the same even if there are multiple types of transactions that generate different payments. Further, the TRG agenda paper noted that each transaction processed could be a distinct service because the customer could benefit from each transaction on its own and each transaction could be separately identifiable.

Accordingly, it would be reasonable for an entity to conclude that this contract meets the series provision.

Example of hotel management

A hotel manager (HM) enters into a 20-year contract to manage properties on behalf of a customer. HM receives monthly consideration of 1% of monthly rental revenue, plus reimbursement of labor costs incurred to perform the service and an annual incentive payment. HM concludes that the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits of its services as it performs.

HM considers the nature of its promise to the customer. If the nature of its promise is the overall management service (because the underlying activities are not distinct from each other), the TRG agenda paper noted that each day of service could be considered distinct because the customer can benefit from each day of service on its own and each day of service is separately identifiable.

Assuming the nature of the promise is the overall management service, the TRG agenda paper noted that the service performed each day could be considered distinct and substantially the same, consistent with Example 12A in the standard. That is because even if the individual activities that comprise the performance obligation vary significantly throughout the day and from day to day, the nature of the *overall promise* to provide the management service is the same from day to day.

Accordingly, it would be reasonable for an entity to conclude that this contract meets the series provision.

4.2.3**Examples of identifying performance obligations**

The standard includes several examples that illustrate the application of the guidance on identifying performance obligations. The examples explain the judgments made to determine whether the promises to transfer goods or services are capable of being distinct and distinct in the context of the contract. We have excerpted these examples below.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,⁸⁵ the Board cautioned that the examples provided are not intended to establish explicit boundaries, and that no single fact or circumstance should be viewed as determinative. It further noted that some of the examples are based on fact patterns that entities thought were challenging to assess under the standard.

The following example illustrates contracts with promised goods and services that, while capable of being distinct, are not distinct in the context of the contract because of a significant integration service that combines the inputs (the underlying goods and services) into a combined output:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 10 – Goods and Services Are Not Distinct

Case A – Significant Integration Service

606-10-55-137

An entity, a contractor, enters into a contract to build a hospital for a customer. The entity is responsible for the overall management of the project and identifies various promised goods and services, including engineering, site clearance, foundation, procurement, construction of the structure, piping and wiring, installation of equipment, and finishing.

606-10-55-138

The promised goods and services are capable of being distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(a). That is, the customer can benefit from the goods and services either on their own or together with other readily available resources. This is evidenced by the fact that the entity, or competitors of the entity, regularly sells many of these goods and services separately to other customers. In addition, the customer could generate economic benefit from the individual goods and services by using, consuming, selling, or holding those goods or services.

606-10-55-139

However, the promises to transfer the goods and services are not separately identifiable in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(b) (on the basis of the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21). This is evidenced by the fact that the entity provides a significant service of integrating the goods and services (the inputs) into the hospital (the combined output) for which the customer has contracted.

606-10-55-140

Because both criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-19 are not met, the goods and services are not distinct. The entity accounts for all of the goods and services in the contract as a single performance obligation.

Case B – Significant Integration Service

606-10-55-140A

An entity enters into a contract with a customer that will result in the delivery of multiple units of a highly complex, specialized device. The terms of the contract require the entity to establish a manufacturing process in order to produce the contracted units. The specifications are unique to the customer based on a custom design that is owned by the customer and that were developed under the terms of a separate contract that is not part of the current negotiated exchange. The entity is responsible for the overall management of the contract, which requires the performance and integration of various activities including procurement of materials; identifying and managing subcontractors; and performing manufacturing, assembly, and testing.

⁸⁵ Paragraph BC34 of ASU 2016-10.

606-10-55-140B

The entity assesses the promises in the contract and determines that each of the promised devices is capable of being distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(a) because the customer can benefit from each device on its own. This is because each unit can function independently of the other units.

606-10-55-140C

The entity observes that the nature of its promise is to establish and provide a service of producing the full complement of devices for which the customer has contracted in accordance with the customer's specifications. The entity considers that it is responsible for overall management of the contract and for providing a significant service of integrating various goods and services (the inputs) into its overall service and the resulting devices (the combined output) and, therefore, the devices and the various promised goods and services inherent in producing those devices are not separately identifiable in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-19(b) and 606-10-25-21. In this Case, the manufacturing process provided by the entity is specific to its contract with the customer. In addition, the nature of the entity's performance and, in particular, the significant integration service of the various activities mean that a change in one of the entity's activities to produce the devices has a significant effect on the other activities required to produce the highly complex specialized devices such that the entity's activities are highly interdependent and highly interrelated. Because the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(b) is not met, the goods and services that will be provided by the entity are not separately identifiable, and, therefore, are not distinct. The entity accounts for all of the goods and services promised in the contract as a single performance obligation.

The determination of whether a "significant integration service" exists within a contract, as illustrated in Case A and Case B above, will require significant judgment and will be heavily dependent on the unique facts and circumstances for each individual contract with a customer.

The following example illustrates a contract for which the promised goods or services are combined into a single performance obligation because of a promised service that significantly modifies the other promise in the contract. The example also highlights, in applying the separately identifiable principle, the notion of "utility" and how the promised service is critical to maintain the intended use and benefit of the other promise:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall*****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations******Example 10 – Goods and Services Are Not Distinct******Case C – Combined Item*****606-10-55-140D**

An entity grants a customer a three-year term license to anti-virus software and promises to provide the customer with when-and-if available updates to that software during the license period. The entity frequently provides updates that are critical to the continued utility of the software. Without the updates, the customer's ability to benefit from the software would decline significantly during the three-year arrangement.

606-10-55-140E

The entity concludes that the software and the updates are each promised goods or services in the contract and are each capable of being distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(a). The software and the updates are capable of being distinct because the customer can derive economic benefit from the software on its own throughout the license period (that is, without the updates the software would still provide its original functionality to the customer), while the customer can benefit from the updates together with the software license transferred at the outset of the contract.

606-10-55-140F

The entity concludes that its promises to transfer the software license and to provide the updates, when-and-if available, are not separately identifiable (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(b)) because the license and the updates are, in effect, inputs to a combined item (anti-virus protection) in the contract. The updates significantly modify the functionality of the software (that is, they permit the software to protect the customer from a significant number of additional viruses that the software did not protect against previously) and are integral to maintaining the utility of the software license to the customer. Consequently, the license and updates fulfill a single promise to the customer in the contract (a promise to provide protection from computer viruses for three years). Therefore, in this Example, the entity accounts for the software license and the when-and-if available updates as a single performance obligation. In accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-33, the entity concludes that the nature of the combined good or service it promised to transfer to the customer in this Example is computer virus protection for three years. The entity considers the nature of the combined good or service (that is, to provide anti-virus protection for three years) in determining whether the performance obligation is satisfied over time or at a point in time in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 and in determining the appropriate method for measuring progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37.

The following example illustrates how the significance of installation services can affect an entity's conclusion about the number of identified performance obligations for similar fact patterns. In Case A, each of the promised goods and services are determined to be distinct. In Case B, two of the promised goods and services are combined into a performance obligation because one promise (the installation) significantly customizes another promise (the software).

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall*****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations******Example 11 – Determining Whether Goods or Services Are Distinct******Case A – Distinct Goods or Services*****606-10-55-141**

An entity, a software developer, enters into a contract with a customer to transfer a software license, perform an installation service, and provide unspecified software updates and technical support (online and telephone) for a two-year period. The entity sells the license, installation service, and technical support separately. The installation service includes changing the web screen for each type of user (for example, marketing, inventory management, and information technology). The installation service is routinely performed by other entities and does not significantly modify the software. The software remains functional without the updates and the technical support.

606-10-55-142

The entity assesses the goods and services promised to the customer to determine which goods and services are distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19. The entity observes that the software is delivered before the other goods and services and remains functional without the updates and the technical support. The customer can benefit from the updates together with the software license transferred at the outset of the contract. Thus, the entity concludes that the customer can benefit from each of the goods and services either on their own or together with the other goods and services that are readily available and the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(a) is met.

606-10-55-143

The entity also considers the principle and the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21 and determines that the promise to transfer each good and service to the customer is separately identifiable from each of the other promises (thus, the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(b) is met). In reaching this determination the entity considers that although it integrates the software into the customer's system, the installation services do not significantly affect the customer's ability to use and benefit from the software license because the installation services are routine and can be obtained from alternate providers. The software updates do not significantly affect the customer's ability to use and benefit from the software license because, in contrast with Example 10 (Case C), the software updates in this contract are not necessary to ensure that the software maintains a high level of utility to the customer during the license period. The entity further observes that none of the promised goods or services significantly modify or customize one another and the entity is not providing a significant service of integrating the software and the services into a combined output. Lastly, the entity concludes that the software and the services do not significantly affect each other and, therefore, are not highly interdependent or highly interrelated because the entity would be able to fulfill its promise to transfer the initial software license independent from its promise to subsequently provide the installation service, software updates, or technical support.

606-10-55-144

On the basis of this assessment, the entity identifies four performance obligations in the contract for the following goods or services:

- a. The software license
- b. An installation service
- c. Software updates
- d. Technical support.

606-10-55-145

The entity applies paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 to determine whether each of the performance obligations for the installation service, software updates, and technical support are satisfied at a point in time or over time. The entity also assesses the nature of the entity's promise to transfer the software license in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-59 through 55-60 and 606-10-55-62 through 55-64A (see Example 54 in paragraphs 606-10-55-362 through 55-363B).

Case B – Significant Customization**606-10-55-146**

The promised goods and services are the same as in Case A, except that the contract specifies that, as part of the installation service, the software is to be substantially customized to add significant new functionality to enable the software to interface with other customized software applications used by the customer. The customized installation service can be provided by other entities.

606-10-55-147

The entity assesses the goods and services promised to the customer to determine which goods and services are distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19. The entity first assesses whether the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(a) has been met. For the same reasons as in Case A, the entity determines that the software license, installation, software updates, and technical support each meet that criterion. The entity next assesses whether the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(b) has been met by evaluating the principle and the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21. The entity observes

that the terms of the contract result in a promise to provide a significant service of integrating the licensed software into the existing software system by performing a customized installation service as specified in the contract. In other words, the entity is using the license and the customized installation service as inputs to produce the combined output (that is, a functional and integrated software system) specified in the contract (see paragraph 606-10-25-21(a)). The software is significantly modified and customized by the service (see paragraph 606-10-25-21(b)). Consequently, the entity determines that the promise to transfer the license is not separately identifiable from the customized installation service and, therefore, the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(b) is not met. Thus, the software license and the customized installation service are not distinct.

606-10-55-148

On the basis of the same analysis as in Case A, the entity concludes that the software updates and technical support are distinct from the other promises in the contract.

606-10-55-149

On the basis of this assessment, the entity identifies three performance obligations in the contract for the following goods or services:

- a. Software customization (which is comprised of the license to the software and the customized installation service)
- b. Software updates
- c. Technical support.

606-10-55-150

The entity applies paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 to determine whether each performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time or over time and paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 to measure progress toward complete satisfaction of those performance obligations determined to be satisfied over time. In applying those paragraphs to the software customization, the entity considers that the customized software to which the customer will have rights is functional intellectual property and that the functionality of that software will not change during the license period as a result of activities that do not transfer a good or service to the customer. Therefore, the entity is providing a right to use the customized software. Consequently, the software customization performance obligation is completely satisfied upon completion of the customized installation service. The entity considers the other specific facts and circumstances of the contract in the context of the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 in determining whether it should recognize revenue related to the single software customization performance obligation as it performs the customized installation service or at the point in time the customized software is transferred to the customer.

The following example illustrates contracts that include multiple promised goods or services, all of which are determined to be distinct. The example highlights the importance of considering both the separately identifiable principle and the underlying factors in ASC 606-10-25-21.

Case C illustrates a contract that includes the sale of equipment and installation services. The equipment can be operated without any customization or modification, and the installation is not complex and can be performed by other vendors. The entity determines that the two promises in the contract are distinct.

Case D illustrates that certain types of contractual restrictions, including those that require a customer to use only the entity's services, should not affect the evaluation of whether a promised good or service is distinct.

Case E illustrates a contract that includes the sale of equipment and specialized consumables to be used with the equipment. Even though the consumables can only be produced by the entity, they are sold separately. The entity determines that the two promises in the contract are distinct and walks through the analysis for determining whether the promises are capable of being distinct and distinct in the context of the contract.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 11 – Determining Whether Goods or Services Are Distinct

Case C – Promises Are Separately Identifiable (Installation)

606-10-55-150A

An entity contracts with a customer to sell a piece of equipment and installation services. The equipment is operational without any customization or modification. The installation required is not complex and is capable of being performed by several alternative service providers.

606-10-55-150B

The entity identifies two promised goods and services in the contract: (a) equipment and (b) installation. The entity assesses the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-19 to determine whether each promised good or service is distinct. The entity determines that the equipment and the installation each meet the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(a). The customer can benefit from the equipment on its own, by using it or reselling it for an amount greater than scrap value, or together with other readily available resources (for example, installation services available from alternative providers). The customer also can benefit from the installation services together with other resources that the customer will already have obtained from the entity (that is, the equipment).

606-10-55-150C

The entity further determines that its promises to transfer the equipment and to provide the installation services are each separately identifiable (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(b)). The entity considers the principle and the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21 in determining that the equipment and the installation services are not inputs to a combined item in this contract. In this Case, each of the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21 contributes to, but is not individually determinative of, the conclusion that the equipment and the installation services are separately identifiable as follows:

- a. The entity is not providing a significant integration service. That is, the entity has promised to deliver the equipment and then install it; the entity would be able to fulfill its promise to transfer the equipment separately from its promise to subsequently install it. The entity has not promised to combine the equipment and the installation services in a way that would transform them into a combined output.
- b. The entity's installation services will not significantly customize or significantly modify the equipment.
- c. Although the customer can benefit from the installation services only after it has obtained control of the equipment, the installation services do not significantly affect the equipment because the entity would be able to fulfill its promise to transfer the equipment independently of its promise to provide the installation services. Because the equipment and the installation services do not each significantly affect the other, they are not highly interdependent or highly interrelated.

On the basis of this assessment, the entity identifies two performance obligations (the equipment and installation services) in the contract.

606-10-55-150D

The entity applies paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 to determine whether each performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time or over time.

Case D – Promises Are Separately Identifiable (Contractual Restrictions)**606-10-55-150E**

Assume the same facts as in Case C, except that the customer is contractually required to use the entity's installation services.

606-10-55-150F

The contractual requirement to use the entity's installation services does not change the evaluation of whether the promised goods and services are distinct in this Case. This is because the contractual requirement to use the entity's installation services does not change the characteristics of the goods or services themselves, nor does it change the entity's promises to the customer. Although the customer is required to use the entity's installation services, the equipment and the installation services are capable of being distinct (that is, they each meet the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(a)), and the entity's promises to provide the equipment and to provide the installation services are each separately identifiable (that is, they each meet the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(b)). The entity's analysis in this regard is consistent with Case C.

Case E – Promises Are Separately Identifiable (Consumables)**606-10-55-150G**

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to provide a piece of off-the-shelf equipment (that is, it is operational without any significant customization or modification) and to provide specialized consumables for use in the equipment at predetermined intervals over the next three years. The consumables are produced only by the entity, but are sold separately by the entity.

606-10-55-150H

The entity determines that the customer can benefit from the equipment together with the readily available consumables. The consumables are readily available in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-20 because they are regularly sold separately by the entity (that is, through refill orders to customers that previously purchased the equipment). The customer can benefit from the consumables that will be delivered under the contract together with the delivered equipment that is transferred to the customer initially under the contract. Therefore, the equipment and the consumables are each capable of being distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(a).

606-10-55-150I

The entity determines that its promises to transfer the equipment and to provide consumables over a three-year period are each separately identifiable in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(b). In determining that the equipment and the consumables are not inputs to a combined item in this contract, the entity considers that it is not providing a significant integration service that transforms the equipment and consumables into a combined output. Additionally, neither the equipment nor the consumables are significantly customized or modified by the other. Lastly, the entity concludes that the equipment and the consumables are not highly interdependent or highly interrelated because they do not significantly affect each other. Although the customer can benefit from the consumables in this contract only after it has obtained control of the equipment (that is, the consumables would have no use without the equipment) and the consumables are required for the equipment to function, the equipment and the consumables do not each significantly affect the other. This is because the entity would be able to fulfill each of its promises in the contract independently of the other. That is, the entity would be able to fulfill its promise to transfer the equipment even if the customer did not purchase any consumables and would be able to fulfill its promise to provide the consumables even if the customer acquired the equipment separately.

606-10-55-150J

On the basis of this assessment, the entity identifies two performance obligations in the contract for the following goods or services:

- a. The equipment
- b. The consumables.

606-10-55-150K

The entity applies paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 to determine whether each performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time or over time.

The following example illustrates a series of distinct services that meet the criteria to be accounted for as a single performance obligation under the series provision (as discussed in Section 4.2.2 above):

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall*****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations******Example 12A – Series of Distinct Goods or Services*****606-10-55-157B**

An entity, a hotel manager, enters into a contract with a customer to manage a customer-owned property for 20 years. The entity receives consideration monthly that is equal to 1 percent of the revenue from the customer-owned property.

606-10-55-157C

The entity evaluates the nature of its promise to the customer in this contract and determines that its promise is to provide a hotel management service. The service comprises various activities that may vary each day (for example, cleaning services, reservation services, and property maintenance). However, those tasks are activities to fulfill the hotel management service and are not separate promises in the contract. The entity determines that each increment of the promised service (for example, each day of the management service) is distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19. This is because the customer can benefit from each increment of service on its own (that is, it is capable of being distinct) and each increment of service is separately identifiable because no day of service significantly modifies or customizes another and no day of service significantly affects either the entity's ability to fulfill another day of service or the benefit to the customer of another day of service.

606-10-55-157D

The entity also evaluates whether it is providing a series of distinct goods or services in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-15. First, the entity determines that the services provided each day are substantially the same. This is because the nature of the entity's promise is the same each day and the entity is providing the same overall management service each day (although the underlying tasks or activities the entity performs to provide that service may vary from day to day). The entity then determines that the services have the same pattern of transfer to the customer because both criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-15 are met. The entity determines that the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-15(a) is met because each distinct service meets the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-27 to be a performance obligation satisfied over time. The customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits provided by the entity as it performs. The entity determines that the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-15(b) also is met because the same measure of progress (in this case, a time-based output method) would be used to measure the entity's progress toward satisfying its promise to provide the hotel management service each day.

606-10-55-157E

After determining that the entity is providing a series of distinct daily hotel management services over the 20-year management period, the entity next determines the transaction price. The entity determines that the entire amount of the consideration is variable consideration. The entity considers whether the variable consideration may be allocated to one or more, but not all, of the distinct days of service in the series in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-39(b). The entity evaluates the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 and determines that the terms of the variable consideration relate specifically to the entity's efforts to transfer each distinct daily service and that allocation of the variable consideration earned based on the activities performed by the entity each day to the distinct day in which those activities are performed is consistent with the overall allocation objective. Therefore, as each distinct daily service is completed, the variable consideration allocated to that period may be recognized, subject to the constraint on variable consideration.

4.3 Promised goods and services that are not distinct

If a promised good or service does not meet the criteria to be considered distinct, it is required to be combined with other promised goods or services until a distinct bundle of goods or services exists. This could result in an entity combining a good or service that is not considered distinct with another good or service that, on its own, would have met the criteria to be considered distinct (see Section 4.2.1).

The standard includes the following guidance on this topic:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Identifying Performance Obligations

Distinct Goods or Services

606-10-25-22

If a promised good or service is not distinct, an entity shall combine that good or service with other promised goods or services until it identifies a bundle of goods or services that is distinct. In some cases, that would result in the entity accounting for all the goods or services promised in a contract as a single **performance obligation**.

The standard provides two examples of contracts with promised goods and services that, while capable of being distinct, are not distinct in the context of the contract because of a significant integration service that combines the inputs (the underlying goods and services) into a combined output. Full excerpts of these examples (Example 10, Case A, and Example 10, Case B) are included in Section 4.2.3 above.

4.4 Principal versus agent considerations



FASB amendments

In March 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-08 that amended the principal versus agent guidance to clarify how an entity should identify the unit of accounting (i.e., the specified good or service) for the principal versus agent evaluation and how the control principle applies to certain types of arrangements such as service transactions. The amendments also reframed the indicators to focus on evidence that an entity is acting as a principal rather than as an agent, revised existing examples and added new ones.

When more than one party is involved in providing goods or services to a customer, the standard requires an entity to determine whether it is a principal or an agent in these transactions by evaluating the nature of its promise to the customer. An entity is a principal and therefore records revenue on a gross basis if it controls a promised good or service before transferring that good or service to the customer. An entity is an agent and records as revenue the net amount it retains for its agency services if its role is to arrange for another entity to provide the goods or services.

The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁸⁶ that in order for an entity to conclude that it is providing the good or service to the customer, it must first control that good or service. That is, the entity cannot provide the good or service to a customer if the entity does not first control it. If an entity controls the good or service, the entity is a principal in the transaction. If an entity does not control the good or service before it is transferred to the customer, the entity is an agent in the transaction.

The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁸⁷ that an entity that itself manufactures a good or performs a service is always a principal if it transfers control of that good or service to another party. There is no need for such an entity to evaluate the principal versus agent guidance because it transfers control of or provides its own good or service directly to its customer without the involvement of another party. For example, if an entity transfers control of a good to an intermediary that is a principal in providing that good to an end customer, the entity records revenue as a principal in the sale of the good to its customer (the intermediary).

How we see it

Consistent with legacy GAAP, entities will need to carefully evaluate whether a gross or net presentation is appropriate. While the standard includes guidance that is similar to legacy GAAP on principal versus agent, the key difference is that the new guidance focuses on control of the specified goods and services as the overarching principle for entities to consider in determining whether they are acting as a principal or an agent. This could result in entities reaching different conclusions than they do under legacy GAAP.

The standard states the overall principle for the principal versus agent evaluation as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Principal versus Agent Considerations

606-10-55-36

When another party is involved in providing goods or services to a **customer**, the entity should determine whether the nature of its promise is a **performance obligation** to provide the specified goods or services itself (that is, the entity is a principal) or to arrange for those goods or services to be provided by the other party (that is, the entity is an agent). An entity determines whether it is a principal or an agent for each specified good or service promised to the customer. A specified good or service is a distinct good or service (or a distinct bundle of goods or services) to be provided to the customer (see paragraphs 606-10-25-19 through 25-22). If a **contract** with a customer includes more than one specified good or service, an entity could be a principal for some specified goods or services and an agent for others.

⁸⁶ Paragraph BC12 of ASU 2016-08.

⁸⁷ Paragraph BC13 of ASU 2016-08.

606-10-55-36A

To determine the nature of its promise (as described in paragraph 606-10-55-36), the entity should:

- a. Identify the specified goods or services to be provided to the customer (which, for example, could be a right to a good or service to be provided by another party [see paragraph 606-10-25-18])
- b. Assess whether it controls (as described in paragraph 606-10-25-25) each specified good or service before that good or service is transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-37

An entity is a principal if it controls the specified good or service before that good or service is transferred to a customer. However, an entity does not necessarily control a specified good if the entity obtains legal title to that good only momentarily before legal title is transferred to a customer. An entity that is a principal may satisfy its performance obligation to provide the specified good or service itself or it may engage another party (for example, a subcontractor) to satisfy some or all of the performance obligation on its behalf.

4.4.1 Identifying the specified good or service

Under ASC 606-10-55-36A, an entity must first identify the specified good or service (or unit of accounting for the principal versus agent evaluation) to be provided to the customer in the contract in order to determine the nature of its promise (i.e., whether it is to provide the specified goods or services or to arrange for those goods or services to be provided by another party). A specified good or service is defined in ASC 606-10-55-36 as each “distinct good or service (or distinct bundle of goods or services) to be provided to the customer.” While this definition is similar to that of a performance obligation (see Section 4.2), the FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁸⁸ that it created this new term because using “performance obligation” would have been confusing in agency relationships. That is, because an agent’s performance obligation is to arrange for goods or services to be provided by another party, providing the specified goods or services to the end customer is not the agent’s performance obligation.

A specified good or service may be a distinct good or service or a distinct bundle of goods and services. The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁸⁹ that if individual goods or services are not distinct from one another, they may be inputs to a combined item and each good or service may represent only a part of a single promise to the customer. For example, in a contract in which goods or services provided by another party are inputs to a combined item(s), the entity should assess whether it controls the combined item(s) before that item(s) is transferred to the customer. That is, in determining whether it is a principal or an agent, an entity should evaluate that single promise to the customer rather than the individual inputs that make up that promise.

Appropriately identifying the good or service to be provided is a critical step in determining whether an entity is a principal or an agent in a transaction. In many situations, especially those involving tangible goods, identifying the specified good or service will be relatively straightforward. For example, if an entity is reselling laptop computers, the specified good that will be transferred to the customer is a laptop computer.

⁸⁸ Paragraph BC10 of ASU 2016-08.

⁸⁹ Paragraph BC29 of ASU 2016-08.

However, the assessment may require significant judgment in other situations, such as those involving intangible goods or services. In accordance with ASC 606-10-55-36A(a), the specified good or service may be the underlying good or service a customer ultimately wants to obtain (e.g., a flight, a meal) or a right to obtain that good or service (e.g., in the form of a ticket or voucher). The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁹⁰ that when the specified good or service is a right to a good or service that will be provided by another party, the entity would determine whether its performance obligation is a promise to provide that right (and it is therefore a principal) or whether it is arranging for the other party to provide that right (and it is therefore an agent). The fact that the entity will not provide the underlying goods or services itself is not determinative.

Because the Board acknowledged that it may be difficult in some cases to determine whether the specified good or service is the underlying good or service or a right to obtain that good or service, it provided examples in the standard. Example 47 (excerpted in full in Section 4.4.4) involves an airline ticket reseller. In this example, the entity pre-purchases airline tickets that it will sell later to customers. While the customer ultimately wants airline travel, the conclusion in Example 47 is that the specified good or service is the right to fly on a specified flight (in the form of a ticket), and not the underlying flight itself. In reaching that conclusion, the Board noted⁹¹ that the entity itself does not fly the plane, and it cannot change the service (e.g., change the flight time or destination). However, the entity obtained the ticket prior to identifying a specific customer to purchase the ticket. As such, the entity holds an asset (in the form of a ticket) that represents a right to fly. The entity could then transfer that right to a customer (as depicted in the example) or decide to use the right itself.

Example 46A (excerpted in full in Section 4.4.4) involves an office maintenance service provider. In this example, the entity concludes that the specified good or service is the underlying office maintenance service (rather than a right to that service). In reaching that conclusion, the Board noted⁹² that, while the entity obtained the contract with the customer prior to engaging a third party to perform the requested services, the right to the subcontractor's services is never transferred to the customer. Instead, the entity retains the right to direct the service provider. That is, the entity can direct the right to use the subcontractor's services as it chooses (e.g., to fulfill the customer contract, to fulfill another customer contract, to service its own facilities). Further, the Board noted that the customer in Example 46A is indifferent as to who carries out the office maintenance services. That is not the case in Example 47 where the customer wants the ticket reseller to sell one of its tickets on a specific flight.

If a contract with a customer includes more than one specified good or service, ASC 606-10-55-36 clarifies that an entity may be a principal for some specified goods or services and an agent for others. Example 48A (excerpted in full in Section 4.4.4) provides an illustration of this.

How we see it

As discussed above, appropriately identifying the specified good or service to be provided to the customer is a critical step in identifying whether the nature of an entity's promise is to act as a principal or an agent. Entities may need to apply significant judgment to determine whether the specified good or service is the underlying good or service or a right to obtain that good or service.

⁹⁰ Paragraph BC25 of ASU 2016-08.

⁹¹ Paragraph BC27 of ASU 2016-08.

⁹² Paragraph BC28 of ASU 2016-08.

4.4.2 Control of the specified good or service

Under ASC 606-10-55-36A, the second step in determining the nature of the entity's promise (i.e., whether it is to provide the specified goods or services or to arrange for those goods or services to be provided by another party) is for the entity to determine whether the entity controls the specified good or service before it is transferred to the customer. An entity cannot provide the specified good or service to a customer (and therefore be a principal) unless it controls that good or service prior to its transfer. That is, as the Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08,⁹³ control is the determining factor when assessing whether an entity is a principal or an agent.

In assessing whether an entity controls the specified good or service prior to transfer to the customer, ASC 606-10-55-36A(b) requires the entity to consider the definition of control included in Step 5 of the model under ASC 606-10-25-25 (included below and further discussed in Chapter 7):

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Satisfaction of Performance Obligations

606-10-25-25

Goods and services are assets, even if only momentarily, when they are received and used (as in the case of many services). Control of an asset refers to the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. Control includes the ability to prevent other entities from directing the use of, and obtaining the benefits from, an asset. The benefits of an asset are the potential cash flows (inflows or savings in outflows) that can be obtained directly or indirectly in many ways, such as by:

- a. Using the asset to produce goods or provide services (including public services)
- b. Using the asset to enhance the value of other assets
- c. Using the asset to settle liabilities or reduce expenses
- d. Selling or exchanging the asset
- e. Pledging the asset to secure a loan
- f. Holding the asset.

If, after evaluating the guidance in ASC 606-10-25-25, an entity concludes that it controls the specified good or service before transfer to the customer, the entity is a principal in the transaction. If the entity does not control that good or service before transfer to the customer, it is an agent.

Stakeholder feedback indicated that the control principle was easier to apply to tangible goods than to intangible goods and services because intangible goods and services generally exist only at the moment they are delivered. To address this concern, the standard includes guidance on how the control principle applies to certain types of arrangements (including service transactions) by explaining what a principal controls before the specified good or service is transferred to the customer:

⁹³ Paragraph BC31 of ASU 2016-08.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Principal versus Agent Considerations

606-10-55-37A

When another party is involved in providing goods or services to a customer, an entity that is a principal obtains control of any one of the following:

- a. A good or another asset from the other party that it then transfers to the customer.
- b. A right to a service to be performed by the other party, which gives the entity the ability to direct that party to provide the service to the customer on the entity's behalf.
- c. A good or service from the other party that it then combines with other goods or services in providing the specified good or service to the customer. For example, if an entity provides a significant service of integrating goods or services (see paragraph 606-10-25-21(a)) provided by another party into the specified good or service for which the customer has contracted, the entity controls the specified good or service before that good or service is transferred to the customer. This is because the entity first obtains control of the inputs to the specified good or service (which include goods or services from other parties) and directs their use to create the combined output that is the specified good or service.

The Board observed in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁹⁴ that an entity can control a service to be provided by another party when it controls the right to the specified service that will be provided to the customer. Generally, the entity will then either transfer the right (in the form of an asset such as a ticket) to its customer in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-37A(a) (as in Example 47 involving the airline ticket reseller discussed in Section 4.4.1) or use its right to direct the other party to provide the specified service to the customer on the entity's behalf in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-37A(b) (as in Example 46A involving the office maintenance services discussed in Section 4.4.1).

The condition described in ASC 606-10-55-37A(a) would include contracts in which an entity transfers to the customer a right to a future service to be provided by another party. If the specified good or service is a right to a good or service to be provided by another party, the entity evaluates whether it controls the right to the goods or services before that right is transferred to the customer (rather than whether it controls the underlying goods or services). In doing so, the Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁹⁵ that it is often relevant to assess whether the right is created only when it is obtained by the customer or whether the right exists before the customer obtains it. If the right does not exist before the customer obtains it, an entity would be unable to control it before its transfer to the customer.

The standard includes two examples to illustrate this point. In Example 47 (discussed above in Section 4.4.1 and excerpted in full in Section 4.4.4) involving an airline ticket reseller, the specified good or service is determined to be the right to fly on a specified flight (in the form of a ticket). One of the determining factors for the principal-agent evaluation in this example is that the entity pre-purchases the airline tickets before a specific customer is identified. Accordingly, the right existed prior to a customer obtaining it. The example concludes that the entity controls the right before it is transferred to the customer (and is therefore a principal).

⁹⁴ Paragraph BC34 of ASU 2016-08.

⁹⁵ Paragraph BC25 of ASU 2016-08.

In Example 48 (excerpted in full in Section 4.4.4), an entity sells vouchers that entitle customers to future meals at specified restaurants selected by the customer, and the specified good or service is determined to be the right to a meal (in the form of a voucher). One of the determining factors for the principal-agent evaluation is that the entity does not control the voucher (right to a meal) at any time. It does not pre-purchase or commit itself to purchase the vouchers from the restaurants before they are sold to a customer. Instead, the entity waits to purchase the voucher until a voucher for a particular restaurant is requested by a customer. In addition, vouchers are created only at the time that they are transferred to a customer and do not exist before that transfer. Accordingly, the right does not exist before the customer obtains it. Therefore, the entity does not at any time have the ability to direct the use of the vouchers or obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the vouchers before they are transferred to customers. The example concludes that the entity does not control the right before it is transferred to the customer (and is therefore an agent).

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08,⁹⁶ the FASB acknowledged that determining whether an entity is a principal or an agent may be more difficult when evaluating whether a contract falls under ASC 606-10-55-37A(b). That is, it might be difficult to determine whether an entity has the ability to direct another party to provide the service on its behalf (and is therefore a principal) or is only arranging for the other party to provide the service (and is therefore an agent). As depicted in Example 46A (as discussed in Section 4.4.1 and excerpted in full in Section 4.4.4), an entity could control the right to the specified service and be a principal by entering into a contract with the subcontractor in which the entity defines the scope of service to be performed by the subcontractor on its behalf. This situation is equivalent to the entity fulfilling the contract using its own resources, and the entity would remain responsible for the satisfactory provision of the specified service in accordance with the contract with the customer. In contrast, when the specified service is provided by another party and the entity does not have the ability to direct those services, the entity would typically be an agent because the entity would be facilitating, rather than controlling the rights to, the service.

In accordance with ASC 606-10-55-37A(c), if an entity provides a significant service of integrating two or more goods or services into a combined item that is the specified good or service the customer contracted to receive, the entity controls that specified good or service before it is transferred to the customer. This is because the entity first obtains controls of the inputs to the specified good or service, which can include goods or services from other parties, and directs their use to create the combined item that is the specified good or service. The inputs would be a fulfillment cost to the entity. However, as noted by the Board in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08,⁹⁷ if a third party provides the significant integration service, the entity's customer for its good or services (which would be inputs to the specified good or service) is likely to be the third party.

4.4.2.1 Principal indicators

Because it still may not be clear whether an entity controls the specified good or service after considering the guidance discussed above, the standard provides three indicators of when an entity controls the specified good or service and is therefore a principal:

⁹⁶ Paragraph BC35 of ASU 2016-08.

⁹⁷ Paragraph BC30 of ASU 2016-08.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Principal versus Agent Considerations

606-10-55-39

Indicators that an entity controls the specified good or service before it is transferred to the customer (and is therefore a principal [see paragraph 606-10-55-37]) include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. The entity is primarily responsible for fulfilling the promise to provide the specified good or service. This typically includes responsibility for the acceptability of the specified good or service (for example, primary responsibility for the good or service meeting customer specifications). If the entity is primarily responsible for fulfilling the promise to provide the specified good or service, this may indicate that the other party involved in providing the specified good or service is acting on the entity's behalf.
- b. The entity has inventory risk before the specified good or service has been transferred to a customer or after transfer of control to the customer (for example, if the customer has a right of return). For example, if the entity obtains, or commits to obtain, the specified good or service before obtaining a contract with a customer, that may indicate that the entity has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the good or service before it is transferred to the customer.
- c. The entity has discretion in establishing the price for the specified good or service. Establishing the price that the customer pays for the specified good or service may indicate that the entity has the ability to direct the use of that good or service and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits. However, an agent can have discretion in establishing prices in some cases. For example, an agent may have some flexibility in setting prices in order to generate additional revenue from its service of arranging for goods or services to be provided by other parties to customers.

606-10-55-39A

The indicators in paragraph 606-10-55-39 may be more or less relevant to the assessment of control depending on the nature of the specified good or service and the terms and conditions of the contract. In addition, different indicators may provide more persuasive evidence in different contracts.

The above indicators are meant to support an entity's assessment of control, not to replace it, and each indicator explains how it supports the assessment of control. As emphasized in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08,⁹⁸ the indicators do not override the assessment of control, should not be viewed in isolation, do not constitute a separate or additional evaluation, and should not be considered a checklist of criteria to be met in all scenarios. ASC 606-10-55-39A highlights that considering one or more of the indicators often will be helpful, and, depending on the facts and circumstances, individual indicators will be more or less relevant or persuasive to the assessment of control.

The first indicator that an entity is a principal, in ASC 606-10-55-39(a), is that the entity is primarily responsible for both fulfilling the promise to provide the specified good or service to the customer and for the acceptability of the specified good or service. We believe one of the ways that this indicator supports the assessment of control of the specified good or service is because an entity generally will control a specified good or service that it is responsible for transferring to a customer.

⁹⁸ Paragraph BC16 of ASU 2016-08.

The terms of the contract and representations (written or otherwise) made by an entity during marketing generally will provide evidence as to which party is responsible for fulfilling the promise to provide the specified good or service and for the acceptability of that good or service.

It is possible that one entity may not be solely responsible for both providing the specified good or service and for the acceptability of that same good or service. For example, a reseller may sell goods or services that are provided to the customer by a supplier. However, if the customer is dissatisfied with the goods or services it receives, the reseller may be solely responsible for providing a remedy to the customer. The reseller may promote such a role during the marketing process, or may agree to such a role as claims arise to maintain its relationship with its customer. In this situation, both the reseller and the supplier possess characteristics of this indicator and other indicators will likely need to be considered to determine which entity is the principal. However, if the reseller is responsible for providing a remedy to a dissatisfied customer but can then pursue a claim against the supplier to recoup any remedies it provides, that may indicate that the reseller is not ultimately responsible for the acceptability of the specified good or service.

The second indicator that an entity is a principal, in ASC 606-10-55-39(b), is that the entity has inventory risk (before the specified good or service is transferred to the customer or upon customer return). Inventory risk is the risk normally taken by an entity that acquires inventory in hopes of reselling it at a profit. Inventory risk exists if a reseller obtains (or commits to obtain) the specific good or service before that specified good or service is ordered by a customer. Inventory risk also exists if a customer has a right of return and the reseller will take back the specified good service if the customer exercises this right.

This indicator supports the assessment of control of the specified good or service because when an entity obtains (or commits to obtain) the specified good or service before it has contracted with a customer, it likely has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the good or service. For example, inventory risk can exist in a customer arrangement involving the provision of services if an entity is obligated to compensate the individual service provider(s) for work performed, regardless of whether the customer accepts that work. However, this indicator will often not apply for intangible goods and services.

Factors may exist that mitigate a reseller's inventory risk. For example, a reseller's inventory risk may be significantly reduced or eliminated if it has the right to return to the supplier goods it cannot sell or goods that are returned by customers or if it receives inventory price protection from the supplier. In these cases, the inventory risk indicator may be less relevant or persuasive to the assessment of control.

The third principal indicator, in ASC 606-10-55-39(c), is that the entity has discretion in establishing the price of the specified good or service. Reasonable latitude, within economic constraints, to establish the price with a customer for the product or service may indicate that the entity has the ability to direct the use of that good or service and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits (i.e., the entity controls the specified good or service). However, because an agent also may have discretion in establishing the price of the specified good or service, the facts and circumstances of the transaction will need to be carefully evaluated.

How we see it

The three indicators in ASC 606-10-55-39 are similar to some of those included in the legacy principal versus agent guidance in ASC 605-45, but they are based on the concepts of identifying performance obligations and the transfer of control of goods and services. In addition, the new standard does not carry forward from ASC 605-45 several other indicators (e.g., those relating to the form of the consideration as a commission and exposure to credit risk) or the concept of stronger and weaker indicators.

Accordingly, the FASB acknowledged in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08⁹⁹ that entities could reach different conclusions under the new guidance than they did under ASC 605-45. The Deputy Chief Accountant of the SEC's Office of the Chief Accountant also noted in a speech¹⁰⁰ that entities should not assume that their legacy principal versus agent conclusions will remain unchanged under the amended guidance. Entities will likely need to take a fresh look at their principal versus agent conclusions under the new guidance.

4.4.3 Recognizing revenue as a principal or agent

The determination of whether the entity is acting as a principal or an agent affects the amount of revenue the entity recognizes as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Principal versus Agent Considerations

606-10-55-37B

When (or as) an entity that is a principal satisfies a performance obligation, the entity recognizes **revenue** in the gross amount of consideration to which it expects to be entitled in exchange for the specified good or service transferred.

606-10-55-38

An entity is an agent if the entity's performance obligation is to arrange for the provision of the specified good or service by another party. An entity that is an agent does not control the specified good or service provided by another party before that good or service is transferred to the customer. When (or as) an entity that is an agent satisfies a performance obligation, the entity recognizes revenue in the amount of any fee or commission to which it expects to be entitled in exchange for arranging for the specified goods or services to be provided by the other party. An entity's fee or commission might be the net amount of consideration that the entity retains after paying the other party the consideration received in exchange for the goods or services to be provided by that party.

That is, when the entity is the principal in the arrangement, the revenue recognized is the gross amount to which the entity expects to be entitled. When the entity is the agent, the revenue recognized is the net amount the entity is entitled to retain in return for its services as the agent. The entity's fee or commission may be the net amount of consideration that the entity retains after paying the other party the consideration received in exchange for the goods or services to be provided by that party.

After an entity determines whether it is the principal or the agent and the amount of gross or net revenue that should be recognized, the entity recognizes revenue when or as it satisfies its performance obligation. An entity satisfies its performance obligation by transferring control of the specified good or service underlying the performance obligation either at a point in time or over time (as discussed in Chapter 7).

⁹⁹ Paragraph BC17 of ASU 2016-08.

¹⁰⁰ Speech by Wesley R. Bricker, 9 June 2016. Refer to SEC website at <https://www.sec.gov/news/speech/bricker-remarks-35th-financial-reporting-institute-conference.html>.

In some contracts in which the entity is the agent, the Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁰¹ that control of specified goods or services promised by the agent might transfer before the customer receives related goods or services from the principal. For example, an entity might satisfy its promise to provide customers with loyalty points when those points are transferred to the customer if:

- ▶ The entity's promise is to provide loyalty points to customers when the customer purchases goods or services from the entity.
- ▶ The points entitle the customers to future discounted purchases with another party (i.e., the points represent a material right to a future discount).
- ▶ The entity determines that it is an agent (i.e., its promise is to arrange for the customers to be provided with points), and the entity does not control those points (i.e., the specified good or service) before they are transferred to the customer.

In contrast, if the points entitle the customers to future goods or services to be provided by the entity, the entity may conclude it is not an agent. This is because the entity's promise is to provide those future goods or services and, thus, the entity controls both the points and the future goods or services before they are transferred to the customer. In these cases, the entity's performance obligation may only be satisfied when the future goods or services are provided.

In other cases, the points may entitle customers to choose between future goods or services provided by either the entity or another party. In this situation, the nature of the entity's performance obligation may not be known until the customer makes its choice. That is, until the customer has chosen the goods or services to be provided (and thus whether the entity or the third party will provide those goods or services), the entity is obliged to stand ready to deliver goods or services. Thus, the entity may not satisfy its performance obligation until it either delivers the goods or services or is no longer obliged to stand ready. If the customer subsequently chooses to receive the goods or services from another party, the entity would need to consider whether it was acting as an agent and thus should recognize revenue for only a fee or commission that it received for arranging the ultimate transaction between the customer and the third party.

How we see it

This discussion illustrates that control of specified goods or services promised by an agent might transfer before the customer receives related goods or services from the principal. An entity will need to assess each loyalty program in accordance with the principles of the principal versus agent guidance to determine if revenue should be reported on a gross or net basis.

¹⁰¹ Paragraphs BC383 through BC385 of ASU 2014-09.

In addition, although an entity may be able to transfer its obligation to provide its customer specified goods or services, the standard says that such a transfer may not always satisfy the performance obligation:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Principal versus Agent Considerations

606-10-55-40

If another entity assumes the entity's performance obligations and contractual rights in the contract so that the entity is no longer obliged to satisfy the performance obligation to transfer the specified good or service to the customer (that is, the entity is no longer acting as the principal), the entity should not recognize revenue for that performance obligation. Instead, the entity should evaluate whether to recognize revenue for satisfying a performance obligation to obtain a contract for the other party (that is, whether the entity is acting as an agent).

4.4.4

Examples

The standard includes six examples to illustrate the principal versus agent guidance discussed above. We have excerpted four of them below.

The standard includes the following example of when the specified good or service (see Section 4.4.1) is the underlying service, rather than the right to obtain that service. The entity in this example is determined to be a principal:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 46A – Promise to Provide Goods or Services (Entity Is a Principal)

606-10-55-324A

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to provide office maintenance services. The entity and the customer define and agree on the scope of the services and negotiate the price. The entity is responsible for ensuring that the services are performed in accordance with the terms and conditions in the contract. The entity invoices the customer for the agreed-upon price on a monthly basis with 10-day payment terms.

606-10-55-324B

The entity regularly engages third-party service providers to provide office maintenance services to its customers. When the entity obtains a contract from a customer, the entity enters into a contract with one of those service providers, directing the service provider to perform office maintenance services for the customer. The payment terms in the contracts with the service providers generally are aligned with the payment terms in the entity's contracts with customers. However, the entity is obliged to pay the service provider even if the customer fails to pay.

606-10-55-324C

To determine whether the entity is a principal or an agent, the entity identifies the specified good or service to be provided to the customer and assesses whether it controls that good or service before the good or service is transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-324D

The entity observes that the specified services to be provided to the customer are the office maintenance services for which the customer contracted and that no other goods or services are promised to the customer. While the entity obtains a right to office maintenance services from the service provider after entering into the contract with the customer, that right is not transferred to the customer. That is, the entity retains the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all the remaining benefits from, that right. For example, the entity can decide whether to direct the service provider to provide the office maintenance services for that customer, or for another customer, or at its own facilities. The customer does not have a right to direct the service provider to perform services that the entity has not agreed to provide. Therefore, the right to office maintenance services obtained by the entity from the service provider is not the specified good or service in its contract with the customer.

606-10-55-324E

The entity concludes that it controls the specified services before they are provided to the customer. The entity obtains control of a right to office maintenance services after entering into the contract with the customer but before those services are provided to the customer. The terms of the entity's contract with the service provider give the entity the ability to direct the service provider to provide the specified services on the entity's behalf (see paragraph 606-10-55-37A(b)). In addition, the entity concludes that the following indicators in paragraph 606-10-55-39 provide further evidence that the entity controls the office maintenance services before they are provided to the customer:

- a. The entity is primarily responsible for fulfilling the promise to provide office maintenance services. Although the entity has hired a service provider to perform the services promised to the customer, it is the entity itself that is responsible for ensuring that the services are performed and are acceptable to the customer (that is, the entity is responsible for fulfilment of the promise in the contract, regardless of whether the entity performs the services itself or engages a third-party service provider to perform the services).
- b. The entity has discretion in setting the price for the services to the customer.

606-10-55-324F

The entity observes that it does not commit itself to obtain the services from the service provider before obtaining the contract with the customer. Thus, the entity has mitigated its inventory risk with respect to the office maintenance services. Nonetheless, the entity concludes that it controls the office maintenance services before they are provided to the customer on the basis of the evidence in paragraph 606-10-55-324E.

606-10-55-324G

Thus, the entity is a principal in the transaction and recognizes revenue in the amount of consideration to which it is entitled from the customer in exchange for the office maintenance services.

The standard also includes the following example of when the specified good or service is the right to obtain a service and not the underlying service itself. The entity in this example is determined to be a principal:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations****Example 47 – Promise to Provide Goods or Services (Entity is a Principal)****606-10-55-325**

An entity negotiates with major airlines to purchase tickets at reduced rates compared with the price of tickets sold directly by the airlines to the public. The entity agrees to buy a specific number of tickets and must pay for those tickets regardless of whether it is able to resell them. The reduced rate paid by the entity for each ticket purchased is negotiated and agreed in advance.

606-10-55-326

The entity determines the prices at which the airline tickets will be sold to its customers. The entity sells the tickets and collects the consideration from customers when the tickets are purchased.

606-10-55-327

The entity also assists the customers in resolving complaints with the service provided by the airlines. However, each airline is responsible for fulfilling obligations associated with the ticket, including remedies to a customer for dissatisfaction with the service.

606-10-55-328

To determine whether the entity's performance obligation is to provide the specified goods or services itself (that is, the entity is a principal) or to arrange for those goods or services to be provided by another party (that is, the entity is an agent), the entity identifies the specified good or service to be provided to the customer and assesses whether it controls that good or service before the good or service is transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-328A

The entity concludes that with each ticket that it commits itself to purchase from the airline, it obtains control of a right to fly on a specified flight (in the form of a ticket) that the entity then transfers to one of its customers (see paragraph 606-10-55-37A(a)). Consequently, the entity determines that the specified good or service to be provided to its customer is that right (to a seat on a specific flight) that the entity controls. The entity observes that no other goods or services are promised to the customer.

606-10-55-328B

The entity controls the right to each flight before it transfers that specified right to one of its customers because the entity has the ability to direct the use of that right by deciding whether to use the ticket to fulfill a contract with a customer and, if so, which contract it will fulfill. The entity also has the ability to obtain the remaining benefits from that right by either reselling the ticket and obtaining all of the proceeds from the sale or, alternatively, using the ticket itself.

606-10-55-328C

The indicators in paragraph 606-10-55-39(b) through (c) also provide relevant evidence that the entity controls each specified right (ticket) before it is transferred to the customer. The entity has inventory risk with respect to the ticket because the entity committed itself to obtain the ticket from the airline before obtaining a contract with a customer to purchase the ticket. This is because the entity is obliged to pay the airline for that right regardless of whether it is able to obtain a customer to resell the ticket to or whether it can obtain a favorable price for the ticket. The entity also establishes the price that the customer will pay for the specified ticket.

606-10-55-329

Thus, the entity concludes that it is a principal in the transactions with customers. The entity recognizes revenue in the gross amount of consideration to which it is entitled in exchange for the tickets transferred to the customers.

In the following example, the entity also determines that the specified good or service is the right to obtain a service and not the underlying service itself. However, the entity in this example is determined to be an agent.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 48 – Arranging for the Provision of Goods or Services (Entity is an Agent)

606-10-55-330

An entity sells vouchers that entitle customers to future meals at specified restaurants, and the sales price of the voucher provides the customer with a significant discount when compared with the normal selling prices of the meals (for example, a customer pays \$100 for a voucher that entitles the customer to a meal at a restaurant that would otherwise cost \$200). The entity does not purchase or commit itself to purchase vouchers in advance of the sale of a voucher to a customer; instead, it purchases vouchers only as they are requested by the customers. The entity sells the vouchers through its website, and the vouchers are nonrefundable.

606-10-55-331

The entity and the restaurants jointly determine the prices at which the vouchers will be sold to customers. Under the terms of its contracts with the restaurants, the entity is entitled to 30 percent of the voucher price when it sells the voucher.

606-10-55-332

The entity also assists the customers in resolving complaints about the meals and has a buyer satisfaction program. However, the restaurant is responsible for fulfilling obligations associated with the voucher, including remedies to a customer for dissatisfaction with the service.

606-10-55-333

To determine whether the entity is a principal or an agent, the entity identifies the specified good or service to be provided to the customer and assesses whether it controls the specified good or service before that good or service is transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-333A

A customer obtains a voucher for the restaurant that it selects. The entity does not engage the restaurants to provide meals to customers on the entity's behalf as described in the indicator in paragraph 606-10-55-39(a). Therefore, the entity observes that the specified good or service to be provided to the customer is the right to a meal (in the form of a voucher) at a specified restaurant or restaurants, which the customer purchases and then can use itself or transfer to another person. The entity also observes that no other goods or services (other than the vouchers) are promised to the customers.

606-10-55-333B

The entity concludes that it does not control the voucher (right to a meal) at any time. In reaching this conclusion, the entity principally considers the following:

- a. The vouchers are created only at the time that they are transferred to the customers and, thus, do not exist before that transfer. Therefore, the entity does not at any time have the ability to direct the use of the vouchers or obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the vouchers before they are transferred to customers.
- b. The entity neither purchases nor commits itself to purchase vouchers before they are sold to customers. The entity also has no responsibility to accept any returned vouchers. Therefore, the entity does not have inventory risk with respect to the vouchers as described in the indicator in paragraph 606-10-55-39(b).

606-10-55-334

Thus, the entity concludes that it is an agent in the arrangement with respect to the vouchers. The entity recognizes revenue in the net amount of consideration to which the entity will be entitled in exchange for arranging for the restaurants to provide vouchers to customers for the restaurants' meals, which is the 30 percent commission it is entitled to upon the sale of each voucher.

ASC 606-10-55-36 clarifies that an entity may be a principal for some specified goods or services in a contract and an agent for others. The standard includes the following example of a contract in which an entity is both a principal and an agent:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations****Example 48A – Entity Is a Principal and an Agent in the Same Contract****606-10-55-334A**

An entity sells services to assist its customers in more effectively targeting potential recruits for open job positions. The entity performs several services itself, such as interviewing candidates and performing background checks. As part of the contract with a customer, the customer agrees to obtain a license to access a third party's database of information on potential recruits. The entity arranges for this license with the third party, but the customer contracts directly with the database provider for the license. The entity collects payment on behalf of the third-party database provider as part of its overall invoicing to the customer. The database provider sets the price charged to the customer for the license and is responsible for providing technical support and credits to which the customer may be entitled for service down-time or other technical issues.

606-10-55-334B

To determine whether the entity is a principal or an agent, the entity identifies the specified goods or services to be provided to the customer and assesses whether it controls those goods or services before they are transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-334C

For the purpose of this Example, it is assumed that the entity concludes that its recruitment services and the database access license are each distinct on the basis of its assessment of the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-25-19 through 25-22. Accordingly, there are two specified goods or services to be provided to the customer—access to the third-party's database and recruitment services.

606-10-55-334D

The entity concludes that it does not control the access to the database before it is provided to the customer. The entity does not at any time have the ability to direct the use of the license because the customer contracts for the license directly with the database provider. The entity does not control access to the provider's database—it cannot, for example, grant access to the database to a party other than the customer or prevent the database provider from providing access to the customer.

606-10-55-334E

As part of reaching that conclusion, the entity also considers the indicators in paragraph 606-10-55-39. The entity concludes that these indicators provide further evidence that it does not control access to the database before that access is provided to the customer:

- a. The entity is not responsible for fulfilling the promise to provide the database access service. The customer contracts for the license directly with the third-party database provider, and the database provider is responsible for the acceptability of the database access (for example, by providing technical support or service credits).

- b. The entity does not have inventory risk because it does not purchase or commit to purchase the database access before the customer contracts for database access directly with the database provider.
- c. The entity does not have discretion in setting the price for the database access with the customer because the database provider sets that price.

606-10-55-334F

Thus, the entity concludes that it is an agent in relation to the third-party's database service. In contrast, the entity concludes that it is the principal in relation to the recruitment services because the entity performs those services itself and no other party is involved in providing those services to the customer.

Question 4-8

How should entities determine the presentation of amounts billed to customers (e.g., shipping and handling, reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, taxes or other assessments) under the standard (i.e., as revenue or as a reduction of costs)? [18 July 2014 TRG meeting; TRG agenda paper no. 2]

TRG members generally agreed that the standard is clear that any amounts collected on behalf of third parties should not be included in the transaction price (i.e., revenue). As discussed in Chapter 5, ASC 606-10-32-2 says, "The transaction price is the amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring promised goods or services to a customer, excluding amounts collected on behalf of third parties (for example, some sales taxes)." That is, if the amounts were incurred by the entity in fulfilling its performance obligations, the amounts should be included in the transaction price and recorded as revenue.

Further, TRG members generally agreed that an entity should apply the principal versus agent guidance when it is not clear whether the amounts are collected on behalf of third parties. This could result in amounts billed to a customer being recorded as an offset to costs incurred.

However, several TRG members noted that this conclusion would require entities to evaluate taxes collected in all jurisdictions in which they operate to determine whether a tax is levied on the entity or the customer. In response, as discussed in Section 5.1, the FASB amended the standard to allow an entity to make an accounting policy election to exclude from the transaction price (i.e., present revenue net of) certain types of taxes collected from a customer, including sales, use, value-added and some excise taxes. As a result, entities will not need to evaluate taxes they collect in all jurisdictions in which they operate to determine whether a tax is levied on the entity or the customer.

Question 4-9

Should an entity that is a principal estimate its gross transaction price when it does not know (and expects not to know) the price charged to its customer for its goods and services by an intermediary?

No, an entity that is a principal should not estimate its gross transaction price when it does not know (and expects not to know) the price charged to its customer for its goods and services by an intermediary. The Board stated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-08¹⁰² that if uncertainty related to the transaction price is not ultimately expected to be resolved, it would not meet the definition of variable consideration and therefore should not be included in the transaction price.

¹⁰² Paragraph BC38 of ASU 2016-08.

How we see it

Stakeholder outreach on this question indicated that under legacy revenue guidance, some entities estimate the price charged to the customer by the intermediary and recognize that amount as their revenue, while others recognize only the amount to which they are entitled from the intermediary. The Board's conclusion on this question will change practice for entities that estimated their gross revenue in these situations.



IASB differences

The IASB did not specifically consider how the transaction price requirements would be applied in these situations (i.e., when an entity that is a principal does not know and expects not to know the price charged to its customer by an agent), but concluded in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments) that an entity that is a principal would generally be able to apply judgment and determine the consideration to which it is entitled using all information available to it. Accordingly, we believe that it is possible that US GAAP and IFRS entities will reach different conclusions on estimating the gross transaction price in these situations.

4.5 Consignment arrangements

The standard provides specific guidance for a promise to deliver goods on a consignment basis to other parties. See Section 7.4.

4.6 Customer options for additional goods or services

Many sales contracts give customers the option to acquire additional goods or services. These additional goods and services may be priced at a discount or may even be free of charge. Options to acquire additional goods or services at a discount can come in many forms, including sales incentives, volume-tiered pricing structures, customer award credits (e.g., frequent flyer points) or contract renewal options (e.g., waiver of certain fees, reduced future rates).

The standard provides the following guidance on customer options:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance

Customer Options for Additional Goods or Services

606-10-55-41

Customer options to acquire additional goods or services for free or at a discount come in many forms, including sales incentives, customer award credits (or points), contract renewal options, or other discounts on future goods or services.

606-10-55-42

If, in a contract, an entity grants a customer the option to acquire additional goods or services, that option gives rise to a performance obligation in the contract only if the option provides a material right to the customer that it would not receive without entering into that contract (for example, a discount that is incremental to the range of discounts typically given for those goods or services to that class of

customer in that geographical area or market). If the option provides a material right to the customer, the customer in effect pays the entity in advance for future goods or services, and the entity recognizes revenue when those future goods or services are transferred or when the option expires.

606-10-55-43

If a customer has the option to acquire an additional good or service at a price that would reflect the standalone selling price for that good or service, that option does not provide the customer with a material right even if the option can be exercised only by entering into a previous contract. In those cases, the entity has made a marketing offer that it should account for in accordance with the guidance in this Topic only when the customer exercises the option to purchase the additional goods or services.

As stated above, when an entity grants a customer the option to acquire additional goods or services, that option is a separate performance obligation only if it provides a material right to the customer that the customer would not receive without entering into the contract (e.g., a discount that exceeds the range of discounts typically given for those goods or services to that class of customer in that geographical area or market). The Board indicated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁰³ that the purpose of this guidance is to identify and account for options that customers are paying for (often implicitly) as part of the current transaction. The FASB did not provide any bright lines about what constitutes a “material” right. However, the guidance states that if the discounted price the customer would receive by exercising the option reflects the standalone selling price that a customer without an existing relationship with the entity would pay, the option doesn’t provide a material right, and the entity is deemed to have made a marketing offer.

How we see it

Significant judgment may be required to determine whether a customer option represents a material right. This determination is important because it will affect the accounting and disclosures for the contract at inception and throughout the life of the contract.

Legacy GAAP for software revenue recognition (ASC 985-605) includes guidance on distinguishing between an option and a marketing offer, and this guidance is often applied by analogy to other arrangements, including multiple-element arrangements. While the principles underlying the new guidance on determining whether an option represents a material right in a contract are similar to the principles underlying the guidance in ASC 985-605, the new guidance is not the same as legacy GAAP. The new guidance also will broadly apply to all contracts within the scope of ASC 606. Accordingly, entities will need to carefully evaluate how the new guidance will affect their transactions. Entities that have not followed the guidance in ASC 985-605 likely will see a change in their accounting, and even entities that have followed ASC 985-605 may need to change how they identify and/or measure options for additional goods or services that represent a material right.

The standard includes the following example to illustrate the determination of whether an option represents a material right (see Section 6.1.5 for a discussion of the measurement of options that are separate performance obligations):

¹⁰³ Paragraph BC386 of ASU 2014-09.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 49 – Option That Provides the Customer with a Material Right (Discount Voucher)

606-10-55-336

An entity enters into a contract for the sale of Product A for \$100. As part of the contract, the entity gives the customer a 40 percent discount voucher for any future purchases up to \$100 in the next 30 days. The entity intends to offer a 10 percent discount on all sales during the next 30 days as part of a seasonal promotion. The 10 percent discount cannot be used in addition to the 40 percent discount voucher.

606-10-55-337

Because all customers will receive a 10 percent discount on purchases during the next 30 days, the only discount that provides the customer with a material right is the discount that is incremental to that 10 percent (that is, the additional 30 percent discount). The entity accounts for the promise to provide the incremental discount as a performance obligation in the contract for the sale of Product A.

606-10-55-338

To estimate the standalone selling price of the discount voucher in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-44, the entity estimates an 80 percent likelihood that a customer will redeem the voucher and that a customer will, on average, purchase \$50 of additional products. Consequently, the entity's estimated standalone selling price of the discount voucher is \$12 (\$50 average purchase price of additional products × 30 percent incremental discount × 80 percent likelihood of exercising the option). The standalone selling prices of Product A and the discount voucher and the resulting allocation of the \$100 transaction price are as follows:

Performance obligation	Standalone selling price	
Product A	\$ 100	
Discount voucher	<u>12</u>	
Total	<u>\$ 112</u>	
Performance obligation	Allocated transaction price	
Product A	\$ 89	(\$100 ÷ \$112 × \$100)
Discount voucher	<u>11</u>	(\$12 ÷ \$112 × \$100)
Total	<u>\$ 100</u>	

606-10-55-339

The entity allocates \$89 to Product A and recognizes revenue for Product A when control transfers. The entity allocates \$11 to the discount voucher and recognizes revenue for the voucher when the customer redeems it for goods or services or when it expires.

Question 4-10 Should entities consider only the current transaction or should they consider past and future transactions with the same customer when determining whether an option for additional goods and services provides the customer with a material right? [31 October 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 6]

TRG members generally agreed that entities should consider all relevant transactions with a customer (i.e., current, past and future transactions), including those that provide accumulating incentives such as loyalty programs, when determining whether an option represents a material right. That is, the evaluation should not be performed only in relation to the current transaction.

Question 4-11 Is the material right evaluation solely a quantitative evaluation or should the evaluation also consider qualitative factors? [31 October 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 6]

TRG members generally agreed that the evaluation should consider both quantitative and qualitative factors (e.g., what a new customer would pay for the same service, the availability and pricing of competitors' service alternatives, whether the average customer life indicates that the fee provides an incentive for customers to remain beyond the stated contract term, whether the right accumulates) because a customer's perspective on what constitutes a "material right" might consider qualitative factors. This is consistent with the notion that when identifying promised goods or services in Step 2, an entity should consider reasonable expectations of the customer that the entity will transfer a good or service to it.

Question 4-12 How should an entity distinguish between a contract that contains an option to purchase additional goods and services and a contract that includes variable consideration (see Section 5.2) based on a variable quantity (e.g., a usage-based fee)? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 48]

TRG members generally agreed that this determination requires judgment and consideration of the facts and circumstances. They also generally agreed that the TRG agenda paper on this question provides a framework that will help entities make this determination.

This determination is important because it will affect the accounting for the contract at inception and throughout the life of the contract as well as disclosures. If an entity concludes that a customer option for additional goods or services provides a material right, the option itself is deemed to be a performance obligation in the contract, but the underlying goods or services are not until the option is exercised (as discussed below in Question 4-13). As a result, the entity will be required to allocate a portion of the transaction price to the material right at contract inception and to recognize that revenue when or as the option is exercised or the option expires. If an entity instead concludes that an option for additional goods or services is not a material right, there is no accounting for the option and no accounting for the underlying optional goods or services until those subsequent purchases occur.

However, if the contract includes variable consideration (rather than a customer option), an entity will have to estimate at contract inception the variable consideration expected over the life of the contract and update that estimate each reporting period (subject to a constraint) (see Section 5.2). There are also more disclosures required for variable consideration (e.g., the requirement to disclose the remaining transaction price for unsatisfied performance obligations) (see Section 10.4.1) than for options that are not determined to be material rights.

The TRG agenda paper explained that the first step in determining whether a contract involving variable quantities of goods or services should be accounted for as a contract containing customer options or variable consideration is for the entity to determine the nature of its promise in providing goods or services to the customer and the rights and obligations of the parties.

In a contract in which the variable quantity of goods or services results in variable consideration, the nature of the entity's promise is to transfer to the customer an overall service. In providing this overall service, an entity may perform individual tasks or activities. At contract inception, the entity is presently obligated by the terms and conditions of the contract to transfer all promised goods or services provided under the contract, and the customer is obligated to pay for those promised goods or services. The customer's subsequent actions to utilize the service affect the measurement of revenue (in the form of variable consideration).

For example, consider a contract between a transaction processor and a customer in which the processor will process all of the customer's transactions in exchange for a fee paid for each transaction processed. The ultimate quantity of transactions that will be processed is not known. The nature of the entity's promise is to provide the customer with continuous access to the processing platform so that submitted transactions are processed. By entering into the contract, the customer has made a purchasing decision that obligates the entity to provide continuous access to the transaction processing platform. The consideration paid by the customer results from events (i.e., additional transactions being submitted for processing to the processor) that occur after (or as) the entity transfers the payment processing service. The customer's actions do not obligate the processor to provide additional distinct goods or services because the processor is already obligated (starting at contract inception) to process all transactions submitted to it.

Another example described in the TRG agenda paper of contracts that may include variable consideration include certain information technology outsourcing contracts. Under this type of contract (similar to the transaction processing contract discussed above), the vendor provides continuous delivery of a service over the contract term and the amount of service provided is variable.

In contrast, with a customer option, the nature of the entity's promise is to provide the quantity of goods or services specified in the contract. The entity is *not obligated* to provide additional distinct goods or services *until* the customer exercises the option. The customer has a contractual right that allows it to choose the amount of additional distinct goods or services to purchase, but the customer has to make a separate purchasing decision to obtain those additional distinct goods or services. Prior to the customer's exercise of that right, the entity is not obligated to provide (nor does it have a right to consideration for transferring) those goods or services.

The TRG agenda paper included the following example of a contract that includes a customer option (rather than variable consideration): Entity B enters into a contract to provide 100 widgets to Customer Y at \$10 per widget. Each widget is a distinct good transferred at a point in time. The contract also gives Customer Y the right to purchase additional widgets at the standalone selling price of \$10 per widget. Therefore, the quantity that may be purchased by Customer Y is variable.

The conclusion in the TRG agenda paper was that, while the quantity of widgets that may be purchased is variable, the transaction price for the existing contract is fixed at \$1,000 [100 widgets x \$10/widget]. That is, the transaction price only includes the consideration for the 100 widgets specified in the contract, and the customer's decision to purchase additional widgets is an option. While Entity B may be required to deliver additional widgets in the future, Entity B is not legally obligated to provide the additional widgets until Customer Y exercises the option. In this example, the option is accounted for as a separate contract because there is no material right, given the pricing of the option at the standalone selling price of the widget.

The TRG agenda paper also included the following example of a contract in which the variable quantity of goods or services includes a customer option:

Example of customer option

A supplier enters into a five-year MSA in which the supplier is obligated to produce and sell parts to a customer at the customer's request. That is, the supplier is not obligated to transfer any parts until the customer submits a purchase order. In addition, the customer is not obligated to purchase any parts; however, it is highly likely it will because the part is required to manufacture the customer's product and it is not practical to get parts from multiple suppliers. Each part is determined to a distinct good that transfers to the customer at a point in time.

The conclusion in the TRG agenda paper is that the nature of the promise in this example is the delivery of parts (and not a service of standing ready to produce and sell parts). That is, the contract provides a right to the customer to choose the quantity of additional distinct goods (i.e., provides a customer option) versus a right to use the services for which control to the customer has (or is currently being) transferred (such as in the transaction processor example above). Similarly, the supplier is not obligated to transfer any parts until the customer submits the purchase order (another important factor in distinguishing a customer option from variable consideration), while in the other fact patterns the vendor is obligated to make the promised services available to the customer without any additional decisions made by the customer.

The TRG agenda paper contrasted this example with other contracts that may include a stand-ready obligation (e.g., a customer's use of a health club). When the customer submits a purchase order under the MSA, it is contracting for a specific number of distinct goods, which creates new performance obligations for the supplier. In contrast, a customer using services in a health club is using services that the health club is already obligated to provide under the present contract. That is, there are no new obligations arising from the customer's usage.

The TRG agenda paper also included the following example of a contract in which the variable quantity of goods or services results in variable consideration:

Example of variable consideration

Entity A enters into a contract to provide equipment to Customer X. The equipment is a single performance obligation transferred at a point in time. Entity A charges Customer X based on its usage of the equipment at a fixed rate per unit of consumption. The contract has no minimum payment guarantees. Customer X is not contractually obligated to use the equipment; however, Entity A is contractually obligated to transfer the equipment to Customer X.

The conclusion in the TRG agenda paper was that the usage of the equipment by Customer X is a variable quantity that affects the amount of consideration owed to Entity A. It does not affect Entity A's performance obligation, which is to transfer the piece of equipment. That is, Entity A has performed by transferring the distinct good, and Customer X's actions that result in payment to Entity A occur after the equipment has been transferred and do not require Entity A to provide additional goods or services.

Question 4-13

When, if ever, should an entity consider the goods or services underlying a customer option as a separate performance obligation? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 48]

If there are no contractual penalties (e.g., termination fees, monetary penalties for not meeting contractual minimums), TRG members generally agreed that, even if an entity may think that it is virtually certain (e.g., the customer is economically compelled) that a customer will exercise its option for additional goods and services, the entity should not identify the additional goods and services underlying

the option as promised goods or services (or performance obligations) at contract inception. Only the option should be assessed to determine whether it represents a material right to be accounted for as a performance obligation. As a result, consideration that would be received for optional goods or services should not be included in the transaction price at contract inception.

The TRG agenda paper included the following example of a contract in which it is virtually certain that a customer will exercise its option for additional goods and services:

Example of customer option with no contractual penalties

An entity sells equipment and consumables, both of which are determined to be distinct goods that are recognized at a point in time. The standalone selling price of the equipment and each consumable is \$10,000 and \$100, respectively. The equipment costs \$8,000, and each consumable costs \$60. The entity sells the equipment for \$6,000 (40% discount from its standalone selling price) with a customer option to purchase each consumable for \$100 (equal to its standalone selling price). There are no contractual minimums, but the entity estimates the customer will purchase 200 consumables over the next two years. This is an exclusive contract, and the customer cannot purchase the consumables from any other vendors during the contract term.

TRG members generally agreed that the consumables underlying each option would not be considered a part of the initial contract, and the option itself does not represent a material right because it is priced at the standalone selling price for the consumable. This is the case even though the customer is compelled to exercise its option for the consumables because the equipment cannot function without the consumables and the contract includes an exclusivity clause that requires the customer to acquire the consumables only from the entity. Accordingly, the transaction price is \$6,000, and it is entirely attributable to the equipment resulting in a loss for the entity of \$2,000 when the entity transfers control of the equipment to the customer.

If contractual penalties exist (e.g., termination fees, monetary penalties assessed for not meeting contractual minimums), the entity will need to further analyze the goods or services underlying customer options to determine which ones should be accounted for in the present contract. If there are substantive contractual penalties, it may be appropriate to include some or all of the goods or services underlying customer options as part of the contract at inception because the penalty effectively creates a minimum purchase obligation for the goods or services that would be purchased if the penalty were enforced.

Example of customer option with contractual penalties

Consider the same facts as in the example above except that the customer will incur a penalty if it does not purchase at least 200 consumables. That is, the customer will be required to repay some or all of the \$4,000 discount provided on the equipment. Per the contract terms, the penalty decreases as each consumable is purchased at a rate of \$20 per consumable.

The conclusion in the TRG agenda paper was that the penalty is substantive and it effectively creates a minimum purchase obligation. As a result, the entity would conclude that the minimum number of consumables required to avoid the penalty would be evidence of enforceable rights and obligations. The entity would then calculate the transaction price as \$26,000 [(200 consumables x \$100/consumable) + \$6,000 (the selling price of the equipment)]. Further, the conclusion in the TRG agenda paper was that, if the customer failed to purchase 200 consumables, the entity would account for the resulting penalty as a contract modification.

Question 4-14

Should volume rebates and/or discounts on goods or services be accounted for as variable consideration or as customer options to acquire additional goods or services at a discount?

It will depend on whether rebate or discount program is applied retrospectively or prospectively.

Generally, if a volume rebate or discount is applied prospectively, we believe the rebate or discount would be accounted for as a customer option (not variable consideration). This is because the consideration for the goods or services in the present contract is not contingent upon or affected by any future purchases. Rather, the discounts available from the rebate program affect the price of future purchases. Entities will need to evaluate whether the volume rebate or discount provides the customer with an option to purchase goods or services in the future at a discount that represents a material right (and is therefore accounted for as a performance obligation) (see Question 4-15 below).

However, we believe a volume rebate or discount that is applied retrospectively will be accounted for as variable consideration (see Section 5.2). This is because the final price of each good or service sold depends on the customer's total purchases subject to the rebate program. That is, the consideration is contingent upon the occurrence or nonoccurrence of future events. This view is consistent with Example 24 in the standard (which is excerpted in full in Section 5.2.1).

Entities should keep in mind that they will need to evaluate whether contract terms other than those specific to the rebate or discount program create variable consideration that would need to be separately evaluated (e.g., if the goods subject to the rebate program are also sold with a right of return).

Question 4-15

How should an entity consider whether prospective volume discounts determined to be customer options are material rights? [18 April 2016 FASB TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 54]

FASB TRG members generally agreed that in making this evaluation, an entity should first evaluate whether the option exists independently of the existing contract. That is, would the entity offer the same pricing to a similar high-volume customer independent of a prior contract with the entity? If yes, that will indicate that the volume discount is not a material right as it is not incremental to the discount typically offered to a similar high-volume customer. If the entity would typically charge a higher price to a similar customer that might indicate that the volume discount is a material right as the discount is incremental.

The TRG agenda paper included the following example: Entity enters into a long-term MSA with Customer A to provide an unspecified volume of non-customized parts. The price of the parts in subsequent years is dependent on Customer A's purchases in the current year. That is, Entity charges Customer A \$1.00 per part in year one and if Customer A purchases more than 100,000 parts, its year two price will be \$.90.

When making the determination whether the contract between Entity and Customer A includes a material right, Entity first evaluates whether the option provided to Customer A exists independently of the existing contract. To do this, Entity should compare the discount offered to Customer A with the discount typically offered to a similar high-volume customer that receives a discount independent of a prior contract with Entity. Such a similar customer could be Customer B who places a single order with Entity for 105,000 parts. Comparing the price offered to Customer A in year two with offers to other customers that also receive pricing that is contingent on prior purchases would not help Entity determine whether Customer A would have been offered the year two price had it not entered into the original contract.

The evaluation of when volume rebates results in material right will likely require significant judgment.

Question 4-16

How should an entity account for the exercise of a material right? That is, should it be accounted for as a contract modification, a continuation of the existing contract or as variable consideration?

[30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 32]

TRG members generally agreed that it would be reasonable for an entity to account for the exercise of a material right as either a contract modification or as a continuation of the existing contract (i.e., a change in the transaction price). TRG members also generally agreed it would not be appropriate to account for the exercise of a material right as variable consideration.

Although TRG members generally agreed that the standard could be interpreted to allow either approach, many TRG members favored treating the exercise of a material right as a continuation of the existing contract because the customer decided to purchase additional goods or services that were contemplated in the original contract (and not as part of a separate and subsequent negotiation). Under this approach, if a customer exercises a material right, an entity would update the transaction price of the contract to include any consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled as a result of the exercise in accordance with the guidance on changes in the transaction price included in ASC 606-10-32-42 through 32-45 (see Section 6.5).

Under this guidance, changes in the total transaction price generally are allocated to the separate performance obligations on the same basis as the initial allocation. However, ASC 606-10-32-44 requires an entity to allocate a change in the transaction price entirely to one or more, but not all, performance obligations if the criteria of ASC 606-10-32-40 are met. These criteria (discussed further in Section 6.3) are that the additional consideration specifically relates to the entity's efforts to satisfy the performance obligation(s), and allocating the additional consideration entirely to one or more, but not all, performance obligation(s) is consistent with the standard's allocation objective (see Chapter 6). The additional consideration received for the exercise of the option would likely meet the criteria to be allocated directly to the performance obligation(s) underlying the material right and recognized when or as the performance obligation(s) is satisfied.

The TRG agenda paper included the following example:

Example of material right exercise under the guidance on changes in the transaction price

Entity enters into a contract with Customer to provide two years of Service A for \$100 that also includes an option for Customer to purchase two years of Service B for \$300. The standalone selling prices of Services A and B are \$100 and \$400, respectively. Entity concludes the option represents a material right and its estimate of the standalone selling price of the option is \$33. Entity allocates the \$100 transaction price to each performance obligation as follows:

	Transaction Price	Standalone selling price	%	Allocation
Service A		\$ 100	75%	\$ 75
Option		\$ 33	25%	\$ 25
Totals	\$ 100	\$ 133	100%	\$ 100

Upon executing the contract, Customer pays \$100 and Entity begins transferring Service A to Customer. The \$75 allocated to Service A is recognized over the two-year service period. The \$25 allocated to the option is deferred until Service B is transferred to the customer or the option expires. Six months after executing the contract, Customer exercises the option to purchase two years of Service B for \$300. Under this approach, the \$300 of consideration related to Service B is added to the amount previously allocated to the option to purchase Service B (i.e., $\$300 + 25 = \325) and is recognized as revenue over the two-year period in which Service B is transferred. Entity is able to allocate the additional consideration received for the exercise of the option as it specifically relates to Entity's efforts to satisfy the performance obligation and the allocation in this manner is consistent with the standard's allocation objective.

TRG members who favored the contract modification approach generally did so because the exercise of a material right also meets the definition of a contract modification in the standard (i.e., a change in the scope and/or price of a contract). Under this approach, an entity would follow the contract modification guidance in ASC 606-10-25-10 through 25-13 (see Section 3.4).

Because more than one approach would be acceptable, TRG members generally agreed that an entity will need to consider which approach is most appropriate based on the facts and circumstances and consistently apply that approach to similar contracts.

Question 4-17

Is an entity required to evaluate whether a customer option that provides a material right includes a significant financing component? If so, are there any key factors an entity should consider when performing this evaluation? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 32]

TRG members generally agreed that an entity will have to evaluate whether a material right includes a significant financing component (see Section 5.5), as it would need to do for any other performance obligation. This will require judgment and consideration of the facts and circumstances.

However, as discussed in the TRG agenda paper on this question, a factor often present in customer options could be determinative in this evaluation. ASC 606-10-32-17(a) states that if a customer provides an advance payment for a good or service but the customer can choose when the good or service will be transferred, no significant financing component exists. As a result, if the customer can choose when to exercise the option, there likely is not a significant financing component.

4.7

Sale of products with a right of return

An entity may provide its customers with a right to return a transferred product. A right of return may be contractual, an implicit right that exists due to the entity's customary business practice or a combination of both (e.g., an entity has a stated return period but generally accepts returns over a longer period). A customer exercising its right to return a product may receive a full or partial refund, a credit applied to amounts owed, a different product in exchange or any combination of these items.

Offering a right of return in a sales agreement obliges the selling entity to stand ready to accept a returned product. ASC 606-10-55-24 states that such an obligation does not represent a performance obligation. Instead, the Board concluded¹⁰⁴ that an entity makes an uncertain number of sales when it provides goods with a return right. That is, until the right of return expires, the entity is not certain how many sales will fail. Therefore, the Board concluded that an entity should not recognize revenue for sales that are expected to fail as a result of the customer exercising its right to return the goods. Instead, the potential for customer returns should be considered when an entity estimates the transaction price because potential returns are a component of variable consideration. This concept is discussed further in Section 5.4.1.

ASC 606-10-55-28 states that exchanges by customers of one product for another of the same type, quality, condition and price (e.g., one color or size for another) are not considered returns for the purposes of applying the standard. Generally, this would be a nonmonetary transaction within the scope of ASC 845. Further, contracts in which a customer may return a defective product in exchange for a functioning product should be evaluated in accordance with the guidance on warranties included in the standard (see Section 9.1).

¹⁰⁴ Paragraph BC364 of ASU 2014-09.

5 Determine the transaction price

The standard provides the following guidance on determining the transaction price:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

606-10-32-1

When (or as) a performance obligation is satisfied, an entity shall recognize as revenue the amount of the transaction price (which excludes estimates of variable consideration that are constrained in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13) that is allocated to that performance obligation.

Determining the Transaction Price

606-10-32-2

An entity shall consider the terms of the contract and its customary business practices to determine the transaction price. The transaction price is the amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring promised goods or services to a customer, excluding amounts collected on behalf of third parties (for example, some sales taxes). The consideration promised in a contract with a customer may include fixed amounts, variable amounts, or both.

606-10-32-2A

An entity may make an accounting policy election to exclude from the measurement of the transaction price all taxes assessed by a governmental authority that are both imposed on and concurrent with a specific revenue-producing transaction and collected by the entity from a customer (for example, sales, use, value added, and some excise taxes). Taxes assessed on an entity's total gross receipts or imposed during the inventory procurement process shall be excluded from the scope of the election. An entity that makes this election shall exclude from the transaction price all taxes in the scope of the election and shall comply with the applicable accounting policy guidance, including the disclosure requirements in paragraphs 235-10-50-1 through 50-6.

606-10-32-3

The nature, timing, and amount of consideration promised by a customer affect the estimate of the transaction price. When determining the transaction price, an entity shall consider the effects of all of the following:

- a. Variable consideration (see paragraphs 606-10-32-5 through 32-10 and 606-10-32-14)
- b. Constraining estimates of variable consideration (see paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13)
- c. The existence of a significant financing component in the contract (see paragraphs 606-10-32-15 through 32-20)
- d. Noncash consideration (see paragraphs 606-10-32-21 through 32-24)
- e. Consideration payable to a customer (see paragraphs 606-10-32-25 through 32-27).

606-10-32-4

For the purpose of determining the transaction price, an entity shall assume that the goods or services will be transferred to the customer as promised in accordance with the existing contract and that the contract will not be cancelled, renewed, or modified.

The transaction price is based on the amount to which the entity expects to be “entitled.” This amount is meant to reflect the amount that the entity has rights to under the present contract (see Section 3.2 on contract enforceability and termination clauses). That is, the transaction price does not include estimates of consideration from future change orders for additional goods and services. The amount to which the entity expects to be entitled also excludes amounts collected on behalf of another party, such as sales taxes. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁰⁵ the Board decided that the transaction price should not include the effects of the customer’s credit risk unless the contract includes a significant financing component (see Section 5.5).

Determining the transaction price is an important step in applying the standard because this amount is allocated to the identified performance obligations and is recognized as revenue as those performance obligations are satisfied. In many cases, the transaction price is readily determinable because the entity receives payment when it transfers promised goods or services, and the price is fixed (e.g., a restaurant’s sale of food with a no refund policy). Determining the transaction price is more challenging when it is variable, when payment is received at a different time from when the entity provides the promised goods or services or when payment is in a form other than cash. Consideration paid or payable by the entity to the customer also may affect the determination of the transaction price.

5.1**Presentation of sales (and other similar) taxes****FASB amendments**

In May 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-12 that allowed an entity to make an accounting policy election to exclude from the transaction price certain types of taxes collected from a customer (i.e., present revenue net of these taxes), including sales, use, value-added and some excise taxes.

The standard includes a general principle that an entity should determine the transaction price excluding amounts collected on behalf of third parties (e.g., some sales taxes). Constituents raised concerns that compliance with this aspect of the standard could be complex and costly for many entities because they would need to evaluate taxes they collect in each jurisdiction in which they operate to determine whether a tax is levied on the entity (and thus, the entity would include that amount in revenue and expenses) or the customer (and thus, the entity would exclude that amount from revenue and expenses because it is acting as a pass-through agent).

To alleviate these concerns, ASC 606-10-32-2A allows entities to make an accounting policy election to exclude sales taxes and other similar taxes from the measurement of the transaction price. An entity that makes this election should comply with the disclosure requirements of ASC 235-10-50-1 through 50-6. The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12¹⁰⁶ that the scope of this accounting policy election is the same as the scope of the policy election in legacy GAAP, which the FASB determined is well established in practice. That is, the new guidance says the scope includes “all taxes assessed by a governmental authority that are both imposed on and concurrent with a specific revenue-producing transaction and collected by the entity from a customer (for example, sales, use, value added, and some excise taxes)” but not taxes imposed on an entity’s gross receipts or the inventory procurement process.

¹⁰⁵ Paragraph BC185 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁰⁶ Paragraph BC33 of ASU 2016-12.

As the FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12,¹⁰⁷ if an entity elects to exclude sales taxes and other similar taxes from the measurement of the transaction price, the entity would make that election for all sales taxes and other similar taxes in the scope of the policy election. If an entity elects not to present all taxes within the scope of the policy election on a net basis, the entity would apply the guidance on determining the transaction price and would consider the principal versus agent guidance (see Section 4.4) to determine whether amounts collected from customers for those taxes should be included in the transaction price.



IASB differences

The IASB did not add a similar election to IFRS 15. As explained in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments), the IASB concluded the election was unnecessary because legacy IFRS contains similar requirements to those in IFRS 15 (and therefore the assessment of whether sales taxes are collected on behalf of a third party is not a new requirement for IFRS preparers).

5.2

Variable consideration

The transaction price reflects an entity's expectations about the consideration it will be entitled to receive from the customer. The standard provides the following guidance to determine whether consideration is variable and, if so, how it should be treated under the model:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Variable Consideration

606-10-32-5

If the consideration promised in a **contract** includes a variable amount, an entity shall estimate the amount of consideration to which the entity will be entitled in exchange for transferring the promised goods or services to a **customer**.

606-10-32-6

An amount of consideration can vary because of discounts, rebates, refunds, credits, price concessions, incentives, performance bonuses, penalties, or other similar items. The promised consideration also can vary if an entity's entitlement to the consideration is contingent on the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a future event. For example, an amount of consideration would be variable if either a product was sold with a right of return or a fixed amount is promised as a performance bonus on achievement of a specified milestone.

606-10-32-7

The variability relating to the consideration promised by a customer may be explicitly stated in the contract. In addition to the terms of the contract, the promised consideration is variable if either of the following circumstances exists:

- a. The customer has a valid expectation arising from an entity's customary business practices, published policies, or specific statements that the entity will accept an amount of consideration that is less than the price stated in the contract. That is, it is expected that the entity will offer a price concession. Depending on the jurisdiction, industry, or customer this offer may be referred to as a discount, rebate, refund, or credit.

¹⁰⁷ Paragraph BC32 of ASU 2016-12.

- b. Other facts and circumstances indicate that the entity's intention, when entering into the contract with the customer, is to offer a price concession to the customer.

These concepts are discussed in more detail below.

5.2.1 Forms of variable consideration

As indicated in ASC 606-10-32-6, "variable consideration" is defined broadly and can take many forms, including discounts, rebates, refunds, credits, price concessions, incentives, performance bonuses and penalties. Variable consideration can result from explicit terms in a contract that the parties to the contract agreed on or can be implied by an entity's past business practices or intentions under the contract. It is important for entities to appropriately identify the different instances of variable consideration included in a contract because the second step of estimating variable consideration requires entities to apply a constraint (as discussed further in Section 5.2.3) to all variable consideration.

Many types of variable consideration identified in the standard are also considered variable consideration under legacy GAAP guidance. For example, if a portion of the transaction price depends on an entity meeting specified performance conditions and there is uncertainty about the outcome, this portion of the transaction price would be considered variable (or contingent) consideration under both legacy GAAP guidance and the new standard.

The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁰⁸ that consideration can be variable even when the stated price in the contract is fixed. This is because the entity may be entitled to consideration only upon the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a future event. For example, the standard's definition of variable consideration includes amounts resulting from variability due to customer refunds or returns. As a result, a contract to provide a customer with 100 widgets at a fixed price per widget would be considered to include a variable component if the customer has the ability to return the widgets (see Section 5.4.1).

In many transactions, entities have variable consideration as a result of rebates and/or discounts on the price of products or services they provide to customers once the customers meet specific volume thresholds. The standard contains the following example relating to volume discounts:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 24 – Volume Discount Incentive

606-10-55-216

An entity enters into a contract with a customer on January 1, 20X8, to sell Product A for \$100 per unit. If the customer purchases more than 1,000 units of Product A in a calendar year, the contract specifies that the price per unit is retrospectively reduced to \$90 per unit. Consequently, the consideration in the contract is variable.

606-10-55-217

For the first quarter ended March 31, 20X8, the entity sells 75 units of Product A to the customer. The entity estimates that the customer's purchases will not exceed the 1,000-unit threshold required for the volume discount in the calendar year.

¹⁰⁸ Paragraph BC191 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-55-218

The entity considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration, including the factors in paragraph 606-10-32-12. The entity determines that it has significant experience with this product and with the purchasing pattern of the entity. Thus, the entity concludes that it is probable that a significant reversal in the cumulative amount of revenue recognized (that is, \$100 per unit) will not occur when the uncertainty is resolved (that is, when the total amount of purchases is known). Consequently, the entity recognizes revenue of \$7,500 (75 units × \$100 per unit) for the quarter ended March 31, 20X8.

606-10-55-219

In May 20X8, the entity's customer acquires another company and in the second quarter ended June 30, 20X8, the entity sells an additional 500 units of Product A to the customer. In light of the new fact, the entity estimates that the customer's purchases will exceed the 1,000-unit threshold for the calendar year and, therefore, it will be required to retrospectively reduce the price per unit to \$90.

606-10-55-220

Consequently, the entity recognizes revenue of \$44,250 for the quarter ended June 30, 20X8. That amount is calculated from \$45,000 for the sale of 500 units (500 units × \$90 per unit) less the change in transaction price of \$750 (75 units × \$10 price reduction) for the reduction of revenue relating to units sold for the quarter ended March 31, 20X8 (see paragraphs 606-10-32-42 through 32-43).

Question 5-1

Should volume rebates and/or discounts on goods or services be accounted for as variable consideration or as customer options to acquire additional goods or services at a discount?

See response to Question 4-14 in Section 4.6.

Question 5-2

How should an entity distinguish between a contract that contains an option to purchase additional goods and services and a contract that includes variable consideration based on a variable quantity (e.g., a usage-based fee)? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 48]

See response to Question 4-12 in Section 4.6.

Question 5-3

Should liquidated damages, penalties or compensation from other similar clauses be accounted for as variable consideration or warranty provisions under the standard?

Most liquidated damages, penalties and similar payments should be accounted for as variable consideration. However, in limited situations, we believe that amounts that are based on the actual performance of a delivered good or service may be considered similar to warranty payments (e.g., in situations in which an entity pays the customer's direct costs to remedy a defect).

Some contracts provide for liquidated damages, penalties or other damages if an entity fails to deliver future goods or services or if the goods or services fail to meet certain specifications. ASC 606-10-32-6 includes "penalties" as an example of variable consideration and describes how promised consideration in a contract can be variable if the right to receive the consideration is contingent on the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a future event (e.g., the contract specifies that a vendor pays a penalty if it fails to perform according to the agreed-upon terms).

Penalties and other clauses that are considered similar to warranty provisions would be accounted for as (1) consideration paid or payable to a customer (which may be treated as variable consideration, see Section 5.7) or (2) an assurance- or service-type warranty (see Section 9.1 on warranties). Cash fines or penalties paid to a customer generally should be accounted for under the guidance on consideration

payable to a customer. However, we believe there may be situations in which it is appropriate to account for cash payments as an assurance-type warranty (e.g., an entity's direct reimbursement to the customer for costs paid by the customer to a third party for repair of a product).

Question 5-4 **If a contract includes an undefined quantity of outputs but the contractual rate per unit is fixed, is the consideration variable?** [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 39]

Yes. TRG members generally agreed that if a contract includes an unknown quantity of tasks throughout the contract period for which the entity has enforceable rights and obligations (i.e., the unknown quantity of tasks is not an option to purchase additional goods and services, as described in Question 4-12 in Section 4.6) and the consideration received is contingent upon the quantity completed, the total transaction price would be variable. That's because the contract has a range of possible transaction prices, and the ultimate consideration will depend on the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a future event (e.g., customer usage), even though the rate per unit is fixed.

The TRG agenda paper noted that an entity would need to consider contractual minimums (or other clauses) that would make some or all of the consideration fixed.

Question 5-5 **If a contract is denominated in a currency other than that of the entity's functional currency, should changes in the contract price due to exchange rate fluctuations be accounted for as variable consideration?**

We believe that changes to the contract price due to exchange rate fluctuations do not result in variable consideration. These price fluctuations are a consequence of entering into a contract that is denominated in a foreign currency rather than a result of a contract term like a discount or rebate or one that depends on the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a future event, as described in ASC 606-10-32-6.

This answer is consistent with the guidance on noncash consideration in ASC 606-10-32-23 that says that variability due to the form of noncash consideration should not be considered variable consideration. The variability resulting from changes in foreign exchange rates relates to the form of the consideration (i.e., it is in a currency other than the entity's functional currency) so, under the noncash consideration principles, it would not be considered variable consideration when determining the transaction price. This variability would be accounted for under ASC 830-20 on foreign currency transactions.

5.2.1.1 Implicit price concessions

For some contracts, the stated price has easily identifiable variable components. However, for other contracts, the consideration may be variable because the facts and circumstances indicate that the entity may accept a lower price than the amount stated in the contract (i.e., it expects to provide an implicit price concession). This could be a result of the customer having a reasonable expectation that the entity will reduce its price based on the entity's customary business practices, published policies or statements made by the entity.

An implicit price concession also could result from other facts and circumstances indicating that the entity intended to offer a price concession to the customer when it entered into the contract. For example, an entity may accept a lower price than the amount stated in the contract to develop or enhance a customer relationship or because the incremental cost of providing the service to the customer is not significant and the consideration it expects to collect provides a sufficient margin.

The standard provides the following example of when an implicit price concession exists and the transaction price therefore is not the amount stated in the contract:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 2 – Consideration Is Not the Stated Price – Implicit Price Concession

606-10-55-99

An entity sells 1,000 units of a prescription drug to a customer for promised consideration of \$1 million. This is the entity's first sale to a customer in a new region, which is experiencing significant economic difficulty. Thus, the entity expects that it will not be able to collect from the customer the full amount of the promised consideration. Despite the possibility of not collecting the full amount, the entity expects the region's economy to recover over the next two to three years and determines that a relationship with the customer could help it to forge relationships with other potential customers in the region.

606-10-55-100

When assessing whether the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e) is met, the entity also considers paragraphs 606-10-32-2 and 606-10-32-7(b). Based on the assessment of the facts and circumstances, the entity determines that it expects to provide a price concession and accept a lower amount of consideration from the customer. Accordingly, the entity concludes that the transaction price is not \$1 million and, therefore, the promised consideration is variable. The entity estimates the variable consideration and determines that it expects to be entitled to \$400,000.

606-10-55-101

The entity considers the customer's ability and intention to pay the consideration and concludes that even though the region is experiencing economic difficulty it is probable that it will collect \$400,000 from the customer. Consequently, the entity concludes that the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-1(e) is met based on an estimate of variable consideration of \$400,000. In addition, based on an evaluation of the contract terms and other facts and circumstances, the entity concludes that the other criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are also met. Consequently, the entity accounts for the contract with the customer in accordance with the guidance in this Topic.

Variable consideration also may result from extended payment terms in a contract and any resulting uncertainty about whether the entity will be willing to accept a lower payment amount in the future. That is, an entity will have to evaluate whether the extended payment terms represent an implied price concession because the entity does not intend to, or will not be able to, collect all amounts due in future periods. However, the standard does not require entities to presume that extended payment terms lead to a transaction price that is not fixed or determinable, as they are required to do under legacy software revenue guidance. As a result, the new guidance could be less onerous for entities that apply ASC 985-605 under legacy GAAP and may accelerate the recognition of revenue for some of them.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁰⁹ the FASB acknowledged that in some cases, it may be difficult to determine whether the entity has implicitly offered a price concession or whether the entity has chosen to accept the risk of default by the customer of the contractually agreed-upon consideration (i.e., impairment losses). The Board did not develop detailed guidance for distinguishing between price concessions (recognized as variable consideration through revenue) and impairment losses (recognized

¹⁰⁹ Paragraph BC194 of ASU 2014-09.

as bad debt expense outside of revenue). Therefore, entities should consider all relevant facts and circumstances when analyzing situations in which an entity is willing to accept a lower price than the amount stated in the contract.

Appropriately distinguishing between price concessions (i.e., reductions of revenue) and customer credit risk (i.e., bad debt) for collectibility concerns that were known at contract inception is important because it will affect whether a valid contract exists (see Section 3.1) and the subsequent accounting for the transaction. If an entity determines at contract inception that a contract includes a price concession (i.e., variable consideration), any change in the estimate of the amount the entity expects to collect, absent an identifiable credit event, will be accounted for as a change in the transaction price. That is, a decrease in the amount the entity expects to collect should be recorded as a reduction in revenue and not a bad debt expense, unless there is an event that affects a customer's ability to pay some or all of the transaction price (e.g., a known decline in a customer's operations, a bankruptcy filing). As illustrated in Example 2 above, entities may estimate a transaction price that is significantly lower than the stated invoice or contractual amount but still consider the difference between those amounts to be variable consideration (e.g., a price concession) rather than a collectibility issue related to bad debt.

5.2.2 Estimating variable consideration

An entity is required to estimate variable consideration using either an "expected value" or the "most likely amount" method, as described in the standard:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Variable Consideration

606-10-32-8

An entity shall estimate an amount of variable consideration by using either of the following methods, depending on which method the entity expects to better predict the amount of consideration to which it will be entitled:

- a. The expected value – The expected value is the sum of probability-weighted amounts in a range of possible consideration amounts. An expected value may be an appropriate estimate of the amount of variable consideration if an entity has a large number of contracts with similar characteristics.
- b. The most likely amount – The most likely amount is the single most likely amount in a range of possible consideration amounts (that is, the single most likely outcome of the contract). The most likely amount may be an appropriate estimate of the amount of variable consideration if the contract has only two possible outcomes (for example, an entity either achieves a performance bonus or does not).

606-10-32-9

An entity shall apply one method consistently throughout the contract when estimating the effect of an uncertainty on an amount of variable consideration to which the entity will be entitled. In addition, an entity shall consider all the information (historical, current, and forecast) that is reasonably available to the entity and shall identify a reasonable number of possible consideration amounts. The information that an entity uses to estimate the amount of variable consideration typically would be similar to the information that the entity's management uses during the bid-and-proposal process and in establishing prices for promised goods or services.

An entity should choose the expected value method or the most likely amount method based on which method better predicts the amount of consideration to which it will be entitled. That is, the method selected is not meant to be a “free choice.” Rather, an entity selects the method based on the specific facts and circumstances of the contract.

The entity should apply the selected method consistently to each type of variable consideration throughout the contract term and update the estimated variable consideration at each reporting date. The entity also should apply that method consistently for similar types of variable consideration in similar contracts. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹¹⁰ the FASB noted that a contract may contain different types of variable consideration and that it may be appropriate for an entity to use different methods (i.e., expected value or most likely amount) for estimating different types of variable consideration within a single contract.

Entities will determine the expected value of variable consideration using the sum of probability-weighted amounts in a range of possible amounts under the contract. To do this, an entity will need to identify the possible outcomes of a contract and the probabilities of those outcomes. The FASB indicated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹¹¹ that the expected value method may better predict expected consideration when an entity has a large number of contracts with similar characteristics. This method also may better predict consideration when an entity has a single contract with a large number of possible outcomes. The FASB clarified in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹¹² that an entity preparing an expected value calculation is not required to consider all possible outcomes, even if it has extensive data and can identify many possible outcomes. Instead, the FASB indicated that, in many cases, a limited number of discrete outcomes and probabilities can provide a reasonable estimate of the expected value.

Entities will determine the most likely amount of variable consideration using the single most likely amount in a range of possible consideration amounts. The FASB indicated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹¹³ that the most likely amount method may be the better predictor when the entity expects to be entitled to only one of two possible amounts (e.g., a contract in which an entity is entitled to receive all or none of a specified performance bonus, but not a portion of that bonus).

The standard states that when applying either of these methods, an entity should consider all information (historical, current and forecast) that is reasonably available to the entity. Some constituents questioned whether an entity would be applying the portfolio approach practical expedient in ASC 606-10-10-4 (see Section 3.3.1) when considering evidence from other, similar contracts to develop an estimate of variable consideration using an expected value method. TRG members discussed¹¹⁴ this question and generally agreed that an entity would not be applying the portfolio approach practical expedient if it used a portfolio of data from its historical experience with similar customers and/or contracts. TRG members noted that an entity could choose to apply the portfolio approach practical expedient but would not be required to do so. Use of this practical expedient requires an entity to assert that it does not expect the use of the expedient to differ materially from applying the guidance to an individual contract. The TRG agenda paper noted that using a portfolio of data is not equivalent to using the portfolio approach practical expedient, so entities that use the expected value method to estimate variable consideration would not be required to assert that the outcome from the portfolio is not expected to materially differ from an assessment of individual contracts.

¹¹⁰ Paragraph BC202 of ASU 2014-09.

¹¹¹ Paragraph BC200 of ASU 2014-09.

¹¹² Paragraph BC201 of ASU 2014-09.

¹¹³ Paragraph BC200 of ASU 2014-09.

¹¹⁴ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 38.

How we see it

Many entities will see significant changes in how they account for variable consideration. This will be an even more significant change for entities that do not attempt to estimate variable consideration under legacy GAAP and simply recognize such amounts when cash is received or known with a high degree of certainty (e.g., upon receipt of a report from a customer detailing the amount of revenue due to the entity).

For example, the standard will change practice for many entities that sell their products through distributors or resellers. Because the sales price to the distributor or reseller may not be finalized until the product is sold to the end customer, many of these entities wait until the product is sold to the end customer to recognize revenue under legacy GAAP. The basis for this practice, known as the “sell-through” method, is that the sales price is not considered “fixed or determinable,” one of the general revenue recognition requirements of SAB Topic 13, until the product is sold to the end customer.

Under the standard, the practice of waiting until the product is sold to the end customer to recognize any revenue may no longer be acceptable if the only uncertainty is the variability in the pricing. This is because the standard requires an entity to estimate the variable consideration (i.e., the end sales price) based on the information available, taking into consideration the effect of the constraint on variable consideration. However, in some cases, the outcomes under the standard and legacy methods could be similar if a significant portion of the estimated revenue is constrained.

5.2.3

Constraining estimates of variable consideration

Before it can include any amount of variable consideration in the transaction price, an entity must consider whether the amount of variable consideration is constrained. The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹¹⁵ that it created this constraint on variable consideration to address concerns raised by many constituents that the standard otherwise could require recognition of revenue before there is sufficient certainty that the amounts recognized would faithfully depict the consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for the goods or services transferred to a customer.

The FASB said in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹¹⁶ that it did not intend to eliminate the use of estimates from the revenue recognition guidance. Instead, it wanted to make sure estimates are robust and result in useful information. Following this objective, the FASB concluded it was appropriate to include estimates of variable consideration in revenue only when an entity has “a high degree of confidence” that revenue will not be reversed in a subsequent reporting period. Therefore, as the following excerpt from the standard states, the constraint is aimed at preventing the over-recognition of revenue (i.e., the language focuses on potential significant reversals of revenue):

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Constraining Estimates of Variable Consideration

606-10-32-11

An entity shall include in the transaction price some or all of an amount of variable consideration estimated in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-8 only to the extent that it is **probable** that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative **revenue** recognized will not occur when the uncertainty associated with the variable consideration is subsequently resolved.

¹¹⁵ Paragraph BC203 of ASU 2014-09.

¹¹⁶ Paragraph BC204 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-32-12

In assessing whether it is probable that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized will not occur once the uncertainty related to the variable consideration is subsequently resolved, an entity shall consider both the likelihood and the magnitude of the revenue reversal. Factors that could increase the likelihood or the magnitude of a revenue reversal include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- a. The amount of consideration is highly susceptible to factors outside the entity's influence. Those factors may include volatility in a market, the judgment or actions of third parties, weather conditions, and a high risk of obsolescence of the promised good or service.
- b. The uncertainty about the amount of consideration is not expected to be resolved for a long period of time.
- c. The entity's experience (or other evidence) with similar types of contracts is limited, or that experience (or other evidence) has limited predictive value.
- d. The entity has a practice of either offering a broad range of price concessions or changing the payment terms and conditions of similar contracts in similar circumstances.
- e. The contract has a large number and broad range of possible consideration amounts.

606-10-32-13

An entity shall apply paragraph 606-10-55-65 to account for consideration in the form of a sales-based or usage-based royalty that is promised in exchange for a license of intellectual property.

To include variable consideration in the estimated transaction price, the entity has to conclude that it is "probable" that a significant revenue reversal will not occur in future periods. For purposes of this analysis, the meaning of the term "probable" is consistent with the existing definition in US GAAP and is defined as "the future event or events are likely to occur." Further, the FASB noted¹¹⁷ that an entity's analysis to determine whether its estimate of variable consideration should (or should not) be constrained largely will be qualitative. That is, an entity will need to use judgment to evaluate whether it has met the objective of the constraint (i.e., it is probable that a significant revenue reversal will not occur in future periods) considering the factors provided in the standard that increase the probability of a significant revenue reversal.

An entity will need to consider both the likelihood and magnitude of a revenue reversal to apply the constraint.

- ▶ **Likelihood** – Assessing the likelihood of a future reversal of revenue will require significant judgment, and entities will want to make sure they adequately document the basis for their conclusions. The presence of any one of the indicators cited in the excerpt above does not necessarily mean that a reversal will occur if the variable consideration is included in the transaction price. The standard includes "factors" rather than "criteria" to signal that the list of items to consider is not a checklist for which all items have to be met. In addition, the indicators provided are not meant to be an all-inclusive list, and entities may consider additional factors that are relevant to their facts and circumstances.

¹¹⁷ Paragraph BC212 of ASU 2014-09.

- ▶ **Magnitude** – When assessing the probability of a significant revenue reversal, an entity also is required to assess the magnitude of that reversal. The constraint is based on the probability of a reversal of an amount that is “significant” relative to cumulative revenue recognized for the contract. When assessing the significance of the potential revenue reversal, the cumulative revenue recognized at the date of the potential reversal should include both fixed and variable consideration and should include revenue recognized from the entire contract, not only the transaction price allocated to a single performance obligation.

Some types of variable consideration that are frequently included in contracts have significant uncertainties. It will likely be more difficult for an entity to assert that it is probable that these types of estimated amounts will not be subsequently reversed. Such types of variable consideration include the following:

- ▶ Payments contingent on regulatory approval (e.g., Food and Drug Administration approval of a new drug)
- ▶ Long-term commodity supply arrangements that settle based on market prices at the future delivery date
- ▶ Contingency fees based on litigation or regulatory outcomes (e.g., fees based on the positive outcome of litigation or on the settlement of claims with governmental agencies)

When an entity determines that it cannot meet the probable threshold if it includes all of the variable consideration in the transaction price, the amount of variable consideration that must be included in the transaction price is limited to the amount that *will not* result in a significant revenue reversal. That is, an entity is required to include in the transaction price the portion of variable consideration that will not result in a significant revenue reversal when the uncertainty associated with the variable consideration is subsequently resolved.

The standard includes an example in which the application of the constraint limits the amount of variable consideration included in the transaction price and one in which it does not:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 23 – Price Concessions

606-10-55-208

An entity enters into a contract with a customer, a distributor, on December 1, 20X7. The entity transfers 1,000 products at contract inception for a price stated in the contract of \$100 per product (total consideration is \$100,000). Payment from the customer is due when the customer sells the products to the end customers. The entity’s customer generally sells the products within 90 days of obtaining them. Control of the products transfers to the customer on December 1, 20X7.

606-10-55-209

On the basis of its past practices and to maintain its relationship with the customer, the entity anticipates granting a price concession to its customer because this will enable the customer to discount the product and thereby move the product through the distribution chain. Consequently, the consideration in the contract is variable.

Case A – Estimate of Variable Consideration Is Not Constrained

606-10-55-210

The entity has significant experience selling this and similar products. The observable data indicate that historically the entity grants a price concession of approximately 20 percent of the sales price for these products. Current market information suggests that a 20 percent reduction in price will be sufficient to move the products through the distribution chain. The entity has not granted a price concession significantly greater than 20 percent in many years.

606-10-55-211

To estimate the variable consideration to which the entity will be entitled, the entity decides to use the expected value method (see paragraph 606-10-32-8(a)) because it is the method that the entity expects to better predict the amount of consideration to which it will be entitled. Using the expected value method, the entity estimates the transaction price to be \$80,000 ($\$80 \times 1,000$ products).

606-10-55-212

The entity also considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration to determine whether the estimated amount of variable consideration of \$80,000 can be included in the transaction price. The entity considers the factors in paragraph 606-10-32-12 and determines that it has significant previous experience with this product and current market information that supports its estimate. In addition, despite some uncertainty resulting from factors outside its influence, based on its current market estimates, the entity expects the price to be resolved within a short time frame. Thus, the entity concludes that it is probable that a significant reversal in the cumulative amount of revenue recognized (that is, \$80,000) will not occur when the uncertainty is resolved (that is, when the total amount of price concessions is determined). Consequently, the entity recognizes \$80,000 as revenue when the products are transferred on December 1, 20X7.

Case B – Estimate of Variable Consideration Is Constrained**606-10-55-213**

The entity has experience selling similar products. However, the entity's products have a high risk of obsolescence, and the entity is experiencing high volatility in the pricing of its products. The observable data indicate that historically the entity grants a broad range of price concessions ranging from 20 to 60 percent of the sales price for similar products. Current market information also suggests that a 15 to 50 percent reduction in price may be necessary to move the products through the distribution chain.

606-10-55-214

To estimate the variable consideration to which the entity will be entitled, the entity decides to use the expected value method (see paragraph 606-10-32-8(a)) because it is the method that the entity expects to better predict the amount of consideration to which it will be entitled. Using the expected value method, the entity estimates that a discount of 40 percent will be provided and, therefore, the estimate of the variable consideration is \$60,000 ($\$60 \times 1,000$ products).

606-10-55-215

The entity also considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration to determine whether some or all of the estimated amount of variable consideration of \$60,000 can be included in the transaction price. The entity considers the factors in paragraph 606-10-32-12 and observes that the amount of consideration is highly susceptible to factors outside the entity's influence (that is, risk of obsolescence) and it is likely that the entity may be required to provide a broad range of price concessions to move the products through the distribution chain. Consequently, the entity cannot include its estimate of \$60,000 (that is, a discount of 40 percent) in the transaction price because it cannot conclude that it is probable that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized will not occur. Although the entity's historical price concessions have ranged from 20 to 60 percent, market information currently suggests that a price concession of 15 to 50 percent will be necessary. The entity's actual results have been consistent with then-current market information in previous, similar transactions. Consequently, the entity concludes that it is probable that a significant reversal in the cumulative amount of revenue recognized will not occur if the entity includes \$50,000 in the transaction price (\$100 sales price and a 50 percent price concession) and, therefore, recognizes revenue at that amount. Therefore, the entity recognizes revenue of \$50,000 when the products are transferred and reassesses the estimates of the transaction price at each reporting date until the uncertainty is resolved in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-14.

In some situations, it will be appropriate for an entity to include in the transaction price an estimate of variable consideration that is not a possible outcome of an individual contract. The TRG discussed this topic¹¹⁸ using the following example from the TRG agenda paper:

Example of estimating variable consideration using the expected value method

Entity A develops websites for customers. The contracts include similar terms and conditions and contain a fixed fee plus variable consideration for a performance bonus related to the timing of Entity A completing the website. Based on Entity A's historical experience, the bonus amounts and associated probabilities for achieving each bonus are as follows:

Bonus amount	Probability of outcome
\$ -	15%
\$ 50,000	40%
\$ 100,000	45%

Entity A determines that using the expected value method would better predict the amount of consideration to which it will be entitled than using the most likely amount method because it has a large number of contracts that have characteristics that are similar to the new contract.

Under the expected value method, Entity A estimates variable consideration of \$65,000 ((0 x 15%) + (50,000 x 40%) + (100,000 x 45%)). Entity A must then consider the effect of applying the constraint on variable consideration. To do this, Entity A considered the factors that could increase the likelihood of a revenue reversal in ASC 606-10-32-12 and concluded that it has relevant historical experience with similar types of contracts and that the amount of consideration is not highly susceptible to factors outside of its influence.

In determining whether the entity would include \$50,000 or \$65,000 in the transaction price, TRG members generally agreed that when an entity has concluded that the expected value approach is the appropriate method to estimate variable consideration, the constraint is also applied based on the expected value method. That is, the entity is not required to switch from an expected value method to a most likely amount for purposes of applying the constraint. As a result, if an entity applies the expected value method for a particular contract, the estimated transaction price might not be a possible outcome in an individual contract. Therefore, the entity could conclude that, in this example, \$65,000 is the appropriate estimate of variable consideration to include in the transaction price. It is important to note that in this example, the entity had concluded that none of the factors in ASC 606-10-32-12 or any other factors indicate a likelihood of a significant revenue reversal.

When an entity uses the expected value method and determines that the estimated amount of variable consideration is not a possible outcome in the individual contract, the entity must still consider the constraint on variable consideration. Depending on the facts and circumstances of each contract, an entity may need to constrain its estimate of variable consideration, even though it used an expected value method, if the factors in ASC 606-10-32-12 indicate a likelihood of a significant revenue reversal. However, using the expected value method and considering probability-weighted amounts sometimes achieves the objective of the constraint on variable consideration. When an entity estimates the transaction price using the expected value method, the entity reduces the probability of a revenue reversal because the estimate does not include all of the potential consideration due to the probability weighting of outcomes and in some cases, the entity may not need to constrain the estimate of variable consideration if the factors in ASC 606-10-32-12 do not indicate a likelihood of a significant revenue reversal.

¹¹⁸ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 38.

The standard provides the following example of a situation in which a qualitative analysis of the factors in ASC 606-10-32-12 indicates that it is not probable that a significant reversal would not occur if an entity includes a performance-based incentive fee in the transaction price of an investment management contract:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 25 – Management Fees Subject to the Constraint

606-10-55-221

On January 1, 20X8, an entity enters into a contract with a client to provide asset management services for five years. The entity receives a 2 percent quarterly management fee based on the client's assets under management at the end of each quarter. In addition, the entity receives a performance-based incentive fee of 20 percent of the fund's return in excess of the return of an observable market index over the 5-year period. Consequently, both the management fee and the performance fee in the contract are variable consideration.

606-10-55-222

The entity accounts for the services as a single performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b), because it is providing a series of distinct services that are substantially the same and have the same pattern of transfer (the services transfer to the customer over time and use the same method to measure progress – that is, a time-based measure of progress).

606-10-55-223

At contract inception, the entity considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-5 through 32-9 on estimating variable consideration and the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration, including the factors in paragraph 606-10-32-12. The entity observes that the promised consideration is dependent on the market and, thus, is highly susceptible to factors outside the entity's influence. In addition, the incentive fee has a large number and a broad range of possible consideration amounts. The entity also observes that although it has experience with similar contracts, that experience is of little predictive value in determining the future performance of the market. Therefore, at contract inception, the entity cannot conclude that it is probable that a significant reversal in the cumulative amount of revenue recognized would not occur if the entity included its estimate of the management fee or the incentive fee in the transaction price.

606-10-55-224

At each reporting date, the entity updates its estimate of the transaction price. Consequently, at the end of each quarter, the entity concludes that it can include in the transaction price the actual amount of the quarterly management fee because the uncertainty is resolved. However, the entity concludes that it cannot include its estimate of the incentive fee in the transaction price at those dates. This is because there has not been a change in its assessment from contract inception – the variability of the fee based on the market index indicates that the entity cannot conclude that it is probable that a significant reversal in the cumulative amount of revenue recognized would not occur if the entity included its estimate of the incentive fee in the transaction price. At March 31, 20X8, the client's assets under management are \$100 million. Therefore, the resulting quarterly management fee and the transaction price is \$2 million.

606-10-55-225

At the end of each quarter, the entity allocates the quarterly management fee to the distinct services provided during the quarter in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-39(b) and 606-10-32-40. This is because the fee relates specifically to the entity's efforts to transfer the services for that quarter, which are distinct from the services provided in other quarters, and the resulting allocation will be consistent with the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28. Consequently, the entity recognizes \$2 million as revenue for the quarter ended March 31, 20X8.

See Chapter 6 for a discussion of allocating the transaction price.

How we see it

We anticipate that questions will arise involving the application of the constraint on variable consideration to specific fact patterns, including the determination of when it is probable that a significant revenue reversal would not occur. The constraint is a new way of evaluating variable consideration, and it applies to all types of variable consideration in all transactions. (However, there are specific requirements for sales- or usage-based royalties associated with a license of intellectual property that constrain the recognition of those royalties, which may result in a similar outcome to fully constraining the estimate of those royalties.)

Legacy GAAP has various requirements and thresholds for recognizing variable consideration. As a result, the accounting treatment varies depending on which guidance applies to a transaction. For example, the revenue recognition guidance in ASC 605-25 limits the recognition of contingent consideration when the amounts depend on the future performance of the entity, and SAB Topic 13 requires that the transaction price be fixed or determinable in order to recognize revenue. Other guidance is less restrictive and allows entities to estimate and recognize at least portions of the variable consideration in an arrangement. For example, under ASC 605-20,¹¹⁹ entities have the option of recognizing performance-based incentive fees on an “as if earned” basis, based on the amount due as if the contract had been terminated and the fees realized at that date (i.e., Method 2). As a result, depending on which guidance entities have been applying, some entities may recognize revenue sooner under the new standard, while others may recognize revenue later.



IASB differences

The IASB uses the term “highly probable” in its standard as the confidence threshold for applying the constraint. While a different term is used, it is intended to have the same meaning as probable under US GAAP.

Question 5-6

Should the constraint on variable consideration be applied at the contract or performance obligation level? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 14]

TRG members generally agreed that the constraint should be applied at the contract level and not at the performance obligation level. That is, the significance assessment of the potential revenue reversal should contemplate the total transaction price of the contract (and not the transaction price allocated to the performance obligation).

Constituents raised this question because the standard refers to “cumulative revenue recognized” without specifying the level at which this assessment should be performed (i.e., at the contract or performance obligation). Further, the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹²⁰ could be read to indicate that the assessment should occur in relation to the cumulative revenue recognized for a performance obligation.

¹¹⁹ ASC 605-20-S99-1 (formerly EITF D-96).

¹²⁰ Paragraph BC217 of ASU 2014-09.

Question 5-7 Does the variable consideration guidance (including the application of the constraint) apply to all types of variable consideration?

The measurement principles of variable consideration should be applied to all types of variable consideration. However, there are specific requirements for sales- or usage-based royalties associated with a license of intellectual property that constrain the recognition of those royalties, which may result in a similar outcome to fully constraining the estimate of those royalties. Such royalties should not be recognized as revenue until the later of the following: (1) the subsequent sales or usage occurs or (2) the performance obligation to which some or all of the sales- or usage-based royalty has been allocated has been satisfied (or partially satisfied), as discussed further in Section 8.5.

Question 5-8 Must an entity follow a two-step approach to estimate variable consideration (i.e., first estimate the variable consideration and then apply the constraint to that estimate)?

No. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹²¹ that an entity is not required to strictly follow a two-step process (i.e., first estimate the variable consideration and then apply the constraint to that estimate) if its internal processes incorporate the principles of both steps in a single step. For example, if an entity already has a single process to estimate expected returns when calculating revenue from the sale of goods in a manner consistent with the objectives of applying the constraint, the entity would not need to estimate the transaction price and then separately apply the constraint.

A TRG agenda paper¹²² also noted that applying the expected value method, which requires an entity to consider probability-weighted amounts, sometimes can achieve the objective of the constraint on variable consideration. That is, in developing its estimate of the transaction price in accordance with the expected value method, an entity reduces the probability of a revenue reversal and might not need to further constrain its estimate of variable consideration. However, to meet the objective of the constraint, the entity's estimated transaction price would need to incorporate its expectations of the possible consideration amounts (e.g., products not expected to be returned) at a level at which it is probable that including the estimate of variable consideration in the transaction price would not result in a significant revenue reversal (e.g., it is probable that additional returns above the estimated amount would not result in a significant reversal).

5.2.4 Reassessment of variable consideration

The standard includes the following guidance on reassessing variable consideration:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Reassessment of Variable Consideration

606-10-32-14

At the end of each reporting period, an entity shall update the estimated transaction price (including updating its assessment of whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained) to represent faithfully the circumstances present at the end of the reporting period and the changes in circumstances during the reporting period. The entity shall account for changes in the transaction price in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-42 through 32-45.

¹²¹ Paragraph BC215 of ASU 2014-09.

¹²² 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 38.

When a contract includes variable consideration, an entity will need to update its estimate of the transaction price throughout the term of the contract to depict conditions that exist at each reporting date. This will involve updating the estimate of the variable consideration (including any amounts that are constrained) to reflect an entity's revised expectations about the amount of consideration to which it expects to be entitled considering uncertainties that are resolved or new information that is gained about remaining uncertainties. See Section 6.5 for a discussion of allocating changes in the transaction price after contract inception.

5.3 Refund liabilities

An entity may receive consideration that it will need to refund to the customer in the future because the consideration is not an amount to which the entity ultimately will be entitled under the contract. These amounts received (or receivable) will need to be recorded as refund liabilities. The standard includes the following guidance on refund liabilities:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Refund Liabilities

606-10-32-10

An entity shall recognize a refund liability if the entity receives consideration from a customer and expects to refund some or all of that consideration to the customer. A refund liability is measured at the amount of consideration received (or receivable) for which the entity does not expect to be entitled (that is, amounts not included in the **transaction price**). The refund liability (and corresponding change in the transaction price and, therefore, the **contract liability**) shall be updated at the end of each reporting period for changes in circumstances. To account for a refund liability relating to a sale with a right of return, an entity shall apply the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-55-22 through 55-29.

While the most common form of refund liabilities may be related to sales with a right of return, the refund liability guidance also will apply when an entity expects that it will need to refund consideration received due to poor customer satisfaction with a service provided (i.e., there was no good delivered or returned) and/or if an entity expects to have to provide retrospective price reductions to a customer (e.g., if a customer reaches a certain threshold of purchases, the unit price will be retroactively adjusted). For a discussion of the accounting for sales with a right of return, see Section 5.4.1.

Question 5-9

Is a refund liability a contract liability (and thus subject to the presentation and disclosure requirements of a contract liability)?

See response to Question 10-4 in Section 10.1.

5.4 Accounting for specific types of variable consideration

5.4.1 Rights of return

As discussed in Section 4.7, the standard says that a right of return does not represent a separate performance obligation. Instead, a right of return affects the transaction price and the amount of revenue an entity can recognize for satisfied performance obligations. In other words, rights of return create variability in the transaction price.

The standard provides the following guidance to determine how rights of return should be treated under the model:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Sale with a Right of Return

606-10-55-22

In some **contracts**, an entity transfers control of a product to a **customer** and also grants the customer the right to return the product for various reasons (such as dissatisfaction with the product) and receive any combination of the following:

- a. A full or partial refund of any consideration paid
- b. A credit that can be applied against amounts owed, or that will be owed, to the entity
- c. Another product in exchange.

606-10-55-23

To account for the transfer of products with a right of return (and for some services that are provided subject to a refund), an entity should recognize all of the following:

- a. **Revenue** for the transferred products in the amount of consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled (therefore, revenue would not be recognized for the products expected to be returned)
- b. A refund liability
- c. An asset (and corresponding adjustment to cost of sales) for its right to recover products from customers on settling the refund liability.

606-10-55-24

An entity's promise to stand ready to accept a returned product during the return period should not be accounted for as a **performance obligation** in addition to the obligation to provide a refund.

606-10-55-25

An entity should apply the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-2 through 32-27 (including the guidance on constraining estimates of variable consideration in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13) to determine the amount of consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled (that is, excluding the products expected to be returned). For any amounts received (or receivable) for which an entity does not expect to be entitled, the entity should not recognize revenue when it transfers products to customers but should recognize those amounts received (or receivable) as a refund liability. Subsequently, at the end of each reporting period, the entity should update its assessment of amounts for which it expects to be entitled in exchange for the transferred products and make a corresponding change to the **transaction price** and, therefore, in the amount of revenue recognized.

606-10-55-26

An entity should update the measurement of the refund liability at the end of each reporting period for changes in expectations about the amount of refunds. An entity should recognize corresponding adjustments as revenue (or reductions of revenue).

606-10-55-27

An asset recognized for an entity's right to recover products from a customer on settling a refund liability initially should be measured by reference to the former carrying amount of the product (for example, inventory) less any expected costs to recover those products (including potential decreases in the value to the entity of returned products). At the end of each reporting period, an entity should update the measurement of the asset arising from changes in expectations about products to be returned. An entity should present the asset separately from the refund liability.

606-10-55-28

Exchanges by customers of one product for another of the same type, quality, condition, and price (for example, one color or size for another) are not considered returns for the purposes of applying the guidance in this Topic.

606-10-55-29

Contracts in which a customer may return a defective product in exchange for a functioning product should be evaluated in accordance with the guidance on warranties in paragraphs 606-10-55-30 through 55-35.

Under the standard, an entity will estimate the transaction price and apply the constraint to the estimated transaction price. In doing so, it will consider the products expected to be returned to determine the amount to which the entity expects to be entitled (excluding consideration for the products expected to be returned). The entity will recognize revenue based on the amount to which it expects to be entitled through the end of the return period (considering expected product returns). An entity will not recognize the portion of the revenue subject to the constraint until the amount is no longer constrained, which could be at the end of the return period. The entity will recognize the amount received or receivable that is expected to be returned as a refund liability, representing its obligation to return the customer's consideration (see Section 5.3).

As part of updating its estimate of amounts to which it expects to be entitled in a contract, an entity must update its assessment of expected returns and the related refund liabilities. This remeasurement is performed at each financial reporting date and reflects any changes in assumptions about expected returns. Any adjustments made to the estimate will result in a corresponding adjustment to amounts recognized as revenue for the satisfied performance obligations (e.g., if the entity expects the number of returns to be lower than originally estimated, it would have to increase the amount of revenue recognized and decrease the refund liability).

Finally, when customers exercise their rights of return, the entity may receive the returned product in salable or repairable condition. Under the standard, at the time of the initial sale (when recognition of revenue is deferred due to the anticipated return), the entity recognizes a return asset (and adjusts cost of sales) for its right to recover the goods returned by the customer. The entity initially measures this asset at the former carrying amount of the inventory, less any expected costs to recover the goods including potential decreases in value of the returned goods. Along with remeasuring the refund liability at each reporting date, the entity updates the measurement of the asset recorded for any revisions to its expected level of returns, as well as any additional decreases in the value of the returned products.

The standard requires the carrying value of the return asset to be presented separately from inventory and subject to impairment testing on its own, separately from inventory on hand. The standard also requires the refund liability to be presented separately from the corresponding asset (on a gross basis rather than a net basis).

The standard provides the following example of rights of return:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 22 – Right of Return

606-10-55-202

An entity enters into 100 contracts with customers. Each contract includes the sale of 1 product for \$100 (100 total products × \$100 = \$10,000 total consideration). Cash is received when control of a product transfers. The entity's customary business practice is to allow a customer to return any unused product within 30 days and receive a full refund. The entity's cost of each product is \$60.

606-10-55-203

The entity applies the guidance in this Topic to the portfolio of 100 contracts because it reasonably expects that, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-10-4, the effects on the financial statements from applying this guidance to the portfolio would not differ materially from applying the guidance to the individual contracts within the portfolio.

606-10-55-204

Because the contract allows a customer to return the products, the consideration received from the customer is variable. To estimate the variable consideration to which the entity will be entitled, the entity decides to use the expected value method (see paragraph 606-10-32-8(a)) because it is the method that the entity expects to better predict the amount of consideration to which it will be entitled. Using the expected value method, the entity estimates that 97 products will not be returned.

606-10-55-205

The entity also considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration to determine whether the estimated amount of variable consideration of \$9,700 (\$100 × 97 products not expected to be returned) can be included in the transaction price. The entity considers the factors in paragraph 606-10-32-12 and determines that although the returns are outside the entity's influence, it has significant experience in estimating returns for this product and customer class. In addition, the uncertainty will be resolved within a short time frame (that is, the 30-day return period). Thus, the entity concludes that it is probable that a significant reversal in the cumulative amount of revenue recognized (that is, \$9,700) will not occur as the uncertainty is resolved (that is, over the return period).

606-10-55-206

The entity estimates that the costs of recovering the products will be immaterial and expects that the returned products can be resold at a profit.

606-10-55-207

Upon transfer of control of the 100 products, the entity does not recognize revenue for the 3 products that it expects to be returned. Consequently, in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-10 and 606-10-55-23, the entity recognizes the following:

Cash	\$ 10,000		(\$100 × 100 products transferred)
Revenue		\$ 9,700	(\$100 × 97 products not expected to be returned)
Refund liability		\$ 300	(\$100 refund × 3 products expected to be returned)
Cost of sales	\$ 5,820		(\$60 × 97 products not expected to be returned)
Asset	\$ 180		(\$60 × 3 products for its right to recover products from customers on settling the refund liability)
Inventory		\$ 6,000	(\$60 × 100 products)

How we see it

While the standard's accounting treatment for rights of return may not significantly change practice under legacy GAAP, there are some notable differences. The changes in this area (primarily treating the right of return as a type of variable consideration that must be accounted for using the variable consideration guidance, including the application of the constraint) may affect manufacturers and retailers that otherwise may not be significantly affected by the new guidance. Entities will have to assess whether their models for estimating returns are appropriate, given the need to consider the constraint.

Separately presenting the right of return asset and refund liability on the balance sheet will be a change in practice from legacy GAAP for many entities. Under legacy GAAP, the carrying value associated with any product expected to be returned typically remains in inventory and is not subject to separate impairment testing (although when the value of returned product is expected to be zero, inventory is fully expensed at the time of sale).

Question 5-10

Is an entity applying the portfolio approach practical expedient when accounting for rights of return?
[13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 38]

An entity can, but would not be required to, apply the portfolio approach practical expedient to estimate variable consideration for expected returns using the expected value method. Similar to the discussion in Section 5.2.2 on estimating variable consideration, the TRG agenda paper noted that an entity can consider evidence from other, similar contracts to develop an estimate of variable consideration using the expected value method without applying the portfolio approach practical expedient. In order to estimate variable consideration in a contract, an entity frequently will make judgments considering its historical experience with other, similar contracts. Considering historical experience does not necessarily mean the entity is applying the portfolio approach practical expedient.

This question arises, in part, because Example 22 from the standard (above) states that the entity is using the portfolio approach practical expedient in ASC 606-10-10-4 to calculate its estimate of returns. Use of this practical expedient requires an entity to assert that it does not expect the use of the expedient to differ materially from applying the guidance to an individual contract.

We expect that entities often will use the expected value method to estimate variable consideration related to returns because doing so would likely better predict the amount of consideration to which the entities will be entitled. This is in spite of the fact that there are two potential outcomes for each contract from the variability of product returns: the product either will be returned or will not be returned. That is, the revenue for each contract ultimately either will be 100% or will be 0% of the total contract value (assuming returns create the only variability in the contract). However, entities may conclude that the expected value is the appropriate method for estimating variable consideration because they have a large number of contracts with similar characteristics. The TRG agenda paper noted that using a portfolio of data is not equivalent to using the portfolio approach practical expedient, so entities that use the expected value method to estimate variable consideration for returns would not be required to assert that the outcome from the portfolio is not expected to materially differ from an assessment of individual contracts.

Question 5-11

How should an entity account for restocking fees for goods that are expected to be returned?
[13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 35]

TRG members generally agreed that restocking fees for goods expected to be returned should be included in the estimate of the transaction price at contract inception and recorded as revenue when (or as) control of the good transfers.

For example, assume that an entity enters into a contract with a customer to sell 10 widgets for \$100 each. The customer has the right to return the widgets, but if it does so, it will be charged a 10% restocking fee (or \$10 per returned widget). The entity estimates that 10% of all widgets sold will be returned. Upon transfer of control of the 10 widgets, the entity will recognize revenue of \$910 ((9 widgets not expected to be returned x \$100 selling price) + (1 widget expected to be returned x \$10 restocking fee)). A refund liability of \$90 also will be recorded (1 widget expected to be returned x (\$100 selling price – \$10 restocking fee)).

Question 5-12 How should an entity account for restocking costs related to expected returns (e.g., shipping or repackaging costs)? [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 35]

TRG members generally agreed that restocking costs should be recorded as a reduction of the amount of the return asset when (or as) control of the good transfers. This accounting will be consistent with the standard's requirement that the return asset be initially measured at the former carrying amount of the inventory, less any expected costs to recover the goods (e.g., restocking costs).

Question 5-13 When an entity has a conditional call option to remove and replace expired products (e.g., out-of-date perishable goods, expired medicine), does the customer obtain control of the products (or is it akin to a right of return)?

See response to Question 7-10 in Section 7.3.2.

5.4.2 Sales- and usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property

The standard provides explicit guidance for recognizing consideration from sales- and usage-based royalties provided in exchange for licenses of intellectual property. The standard states that an entity should recognize sales- and usage-based royalties as revenue only when the later of the following events occurs: (1) the subsequent sales or usage occurs or (2) the performance obligation to which some or all of the sales-based or usage-based royalty has been allocated has been satisfied (or partially satisfied). In many cases, the application of this guidance will result in the same pattern of revenue recognition as fully constraining the estimate of variable consideration associated with the future royalty stream. See Section 8.5 for further discussion about the sales- and usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property.

5.5 Significant financing component

For some transactions, the receipt of consideration does not match the timing of the transfer of goods or services to the customer (e.g., the consideration is prepaid or is paid after the services are provided). When the customer pays in arrears, the entity is effectively providing financing to the customer. Conversely, when the customer pays in advance, the entity has effectively received financing from the customer.

The standard states the following in relation to a significant financing component in a contract:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

The Existence of a Significant Financing Component in the Contract

606-10-32-15

In determining the transaction price, an entity shall adjust the promised amount of consideration for the effects of the time value of money if the timing of payments agreed to by the parties to the **contract** (either explicitly or implicitly) provides the **customer** or the entity with a significant benefit of financing the transfer of goods or services to the customer. In those circumstances, the contract contains a significant financing component. A significant financing component may exist regardless of whether the promise of financing is explicitly stated in the contract or implied by the payment terms agreed to by the parties to the contract.

606-10-32-16

The objective when adjusting the promised amount of consideration for a significant financing component is for an entity to recognize **revenue** at an amount that reflects the price that a customer would have paid for the promised goods or services if the customer had paid cash for those goods or services when (or as) they transfer to the customer (that is, the cash selling price). An entity shall consider all relevant facts and circumstances in assessing whether a contract contains a financing component and whether that financing component is significant to the contract, including both of the following:

- a. The difference, if any, between the amount of promised consideration and the cash selling price of the promised goods or services
- b. The combined effect of both of the following:
 1. The expected length of time between when the entity transfers the promised goods or services to the customer and when the customer pays for those goods or services
 2. The prevailing interest rates in the relevant market.

606-10-32-17

Notwithstanding the assessment in paragraph 606-10-32-16, a contract with a customer would not have a significant financing component if any of the following factors exist:

- a. The customer paid for the goods or services in advance, and the timing of the transfer of those goods or services is at the discretion of the customer.
- b. A substantial amount of the consideration promised by the customer is variable, and the amount or timing of that consideration varies on the basis of the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a future event that is not substantially within the control of the customer or the entity (for example, if the consideration is a sales-based royalty).
- c. The difference between the promised consideration and the cash selling price of the good or service (as described in paragraph 606-10-32-16) arises for reasons other than the provision of finance to either the customer or the entity, and the difference between those amounts is proportional to the reason for the difference. For example, the payment terms might provide the entity or the customer with protection from the other party failing to adequately complete some or all of its obligations under the contract.

606-10-32-18

As a practical expedient, an entity need not adjust the promised amount of consideration for the effects of a significant financing component if the entity expects, at contract inception, that the period between when the entity transfers a promised good or service to a customer and when the customer pays for that good or service will be one year or less.

606-10-32-19

To meet the objective in paragraph 606-10-32-16 when adjusting the promised amount of consideration for a significant financing component, an entity shall use the discount rate that would be reflected in a separate financing transaction between the entity and its customer at contract inception. That rate would reflect the credit characteristics of the party receiving financing in the contract, as well as any collateral or security provided by the customer or the entity, including assets transferred in the contract. An entity may be able to determine that rate by identifying the rate that discounts the nominal amount of the promised consideration to the price that the customer would pay in cash for the goods or services when (or as) they transfer to the customer. After contract inception, an entity shall not update the discount rate for changes in interest rates or other circumstances (such as a change in the assessment of the customer's credit risk).

The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹²³ that, conceptually, a contract that includes a financing component includes two transactions – one for the sale of goods and/or services and one for the financing. Accordingly, the Board decided to require entities to adjust the amount of promised consideration for the effects of financing only if the timing of payments specified in the contract provides the customer or the entity with a significant benefit of financing. The FASB's objective¹²⁴ in requiring entities to adjust the promised amount of consideration for the effects of a significant financing component was for entities to recognize as revenue the "cash selling price" of the underlying goods or services at the time of transfer.

However, an entity is not required to adjust the promised amount of consideration for the effects of a significant financing component if the entity expects, at contract inception, that the period between when the entity transfers a promised good or service to a customer and when the customer pays for that good or service will be one year or less. The Board added¹²⁵ this practical expedient to the standard because it simplifies the application of this aspect of ASC 606 and because the effect of accounting for a significant financing component (or of not doing so) should be limited in financing arrangements with a duration of less than 12 months. If an entity uses this practical expedient, it should apply the expedient consistently to similar contracts in similar circumstances.¹²⁶

Entities may need to apply judgment to determine whether the practical expedient applies to some contracts. For example, the standard does not specify whether entities should assess the period between payment and performance at the contract level or at the performance obligation level. In addition, the TRG discussed how an entity should consider whether the practical expedient applies to contracts with a single payment stream for multiple performance obligations. See Question 5-19 below.

Absent the use of the practical expedient, to determine whether a significant financing component exists, an entity will need to consider all relevant facts and circumstances, including: (1) the difference between the cash selling price and the amount of promised consideration for the promised goods or services and (2) the combined effect of the expected length of time between the transfer of the goods or services and the receipt of consideration and the prevailing market interest rates. The Board acknowledged¹²⁷ that a difference in the timing between the transfer of and payment for goods and services is not determinative, but the combined effect of timing and the prevailing interest rates may provide a strong indication that an entity is providing (or receiving) a significant benefit of financing.

Even if conditions in a contract otherwise would indicate that a significant financing component exists, the standard includes several situations that the Board determined do not provide the customer or the entity with a significant benefit of financing. These situations, as described in ASC 606-10-32-17, include the following:

- ▶ The customer has paid for the goods or services in advance and the timing of the transfer of those goods or services is at the discretion of the customer. In these situations (e.g., prepaid phone cards, customer loyalty programs), the Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹²⁸ that the payment terms are not related to a financing arrangement between the parties and the costs of requiring an entity to account for a significant financing component would outweigh the benefits because an entity would need to continue to estimate when the goods or services will transfer to the customer.

¹²³ Paragraph BC229 of ASU 2014-09.

¹²⁴ Paragraph BC230 of ASU 2014-09.

¹²⁵ Paragraph BC236 of ASU 2014-09.

¹²⁶ Paragraph BC235 of ASU 2014-09.

¹²⁷ Paragraph BC232(b) of ASU 2014-09.

¹²⁸ Paragraph BC233 of ASU 2014-09.

- ▶ A substantial amount of the consideration promised by the customer is variable and based on factors outside the control of the customer or entity. In these situations, the Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹²⁹ that the primary purpose of the timing or terms of payment may be to allow for the resolution of uncertainties that relate to the consideration rather than to provide the customer or the entity with the significant benefit of financing. In addition, the terms or timing of payment in these situations may be to provide the parties with assurance of the value of the goods or services (e.g., an arrangement for which consideration is in the form of a sales-based royalty).
- ▶ The difference between the promised consideration and the cash selling price of the good or service arises for reasons other than the provision of financing to either the customer or the entity (e.g., a payment is made in advance or in arrears in accordance with the typical payment terms of the industry or jurisdiction). In certain situations, the Board determined the purpose of the payment terms may be to provide the customer with assurance that the entity will complete its obligations under the contract, rather than to provide financing to the customer or the entity. Examples include a customer withholding a portion of the consideration until the contract is complete (illustrated in Example 27 below) or a milestone is reached, or an entity requiring a customer to pay a portion of the consideration up front in order to secure a future supply of goods or services. See Question 5-14 for further discussion.

As explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹³⁰ the Board decided not to provide an overall exemption from accounting for the effects of a significant financing component arising from advance payments. This is because ignoring the effects of advance payments could skew the amount and timing of revenue recognized if the advance payment is significant and the purpose of the payment is to provide the entity with financing. For example, an entity may require a customer to make advance payments in order to avoid obtaining the financing from a third party. If the entity obtained third-party financing, it likely would charge the customer additional consideration to cover the finance costs incurred. The Board decided that an entity's revenue should be consistent regardless of whether it receives the significant financing benefit from a customer or from a third party because, in either scenario, the entity's performance is the same.

In order to conclude that an advance payment does not represent a significant financing component, we believe an entity will need to support why the advance payment does not provide a significant financing benefit and describe its substantive business purpose. As a result, it is important that entities analyze all of the facts and circumstances in a contract. Example 29 below illustrates an entity's determination that a customer's advance payment represents a significant financing component, and Example 30 illustrates an entity's determination that a customer's advance payment does not represent a significant financing component.

The assessment of significance is made at the individual contract level. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹³¹ the FASB decided that it would be an undue burden to require an entity to account for a financing component if the effects of the financing component are not significant to the individual contract but the combined effects of the financing components for a portfolio of similar contracts would be material to the entity as a whole.

When an entity concludes that a financing component is significant to a contract, in accordance with ASC 606-10-32-19, it determines the transaction price by applying an interest rate to the amount of promised consideration. The entity uses the same interest rate that it would use if it were to enter into a separate financing transaction with the customer. The interest rate has to reflect the credit characteristics of

¹²⁹ Paragraph BC233 of ASU 2014-09.

¹³⁰ Paragraph BC238 of ASU 2014-09.

¹³¹ Paragraph BC234 of ASU 2014-09.

the borrower in the contract, which could be the entity or the customer depending on who receives the financing. Using the risk-free rate or a rate explicitly stated in the contract that does not correspond with a separate financing rate would not be acceptable.¹³² While this is not explicitly stated in the standard, we believe an entity should consider the expected term of the financing when determining the interest rate in light of current market conditions at contract inception. Also, ASC 606-10-32-19 is clear that an entity should not update the interest rate for changes in circumstances or market interest rates after contract inception.

How we see it

The standard requires that the interest rate be a rate similar to what the entity would have used in a separate financing transaction with the customer. Because most entities are not in the business of entering into freestanding financing arrangements with their customers, they may find it difficult to identify an appropriate rate. However, most entities perform some level of credit analysis before financing purchases for a customer, so they will have some information about the customer's credit risk. For entities that have different pricing for products depending on the time of payment (e.g., cash discounts), the standard indicates that the appropriate interest rate in some cases could be determined by identifying the rate that discounts the nominal amount of the promised consideration to the cash sales price of the good or service.

Entities likely will have to exercise significant judgment to determine whether a significant financing component exists when there is more than one year between the transfer of goods or services and the receipt of contract consideration. Entities will need to make sure that they sufficiently document their analyses to support their conclusions.

5.5.1

Examples

The standard includes several examples to illustrate these concepts. Example 26 illustrates a contract that contains a significant financing component because the cash selling price differs from the promised amount of consideration and there are no other factors present that would indicate that this difference arises for reasons other than financing. In this example, the contract also contains an implicit interest rate that is determined to be commensurate with the rate that would be reflected in a separate financing transaction between the entity and its customer at contract inception as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 26 – Significant Financing Component and Right of Return

606-10-55-227

An entity sells a product to a customer for \$121 that is payable 24 months after delivery. The customer obtains control of the product at contract inception. The contract permits the customer to return the product within 90 days. The product is new, and the entity has no relevant historical evidence of product returns or other available market evidence.

606-10-55-228

The cash selling price of the product is \$100, which represents the amount that the customer would pay upon delivery for the same product sold under otherwise identical terms and conditions as at contract inception. The entity's cost of the product is \$80.

¹³² Paragraph BC239 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-55-229

The entity does not recognize revenue when control of the product transfers to the customer. This is because the existence of the right of return and the lack of relevant historical evidence means that the entity cannot conclude that it is probable that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized will not occur in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13. Consequently, revenue is recognized after three months when the right of return lapses.

606-10-55-230

The contract includes a significant financing component, in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-15 through 32-17. This is evident from the difference between the amount of promised consideration of \$121 and the cash selling price of \$100 at the date that the goods are transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-231

The contract includes an implicit interest rate of 10 percent (that is, the interest rate that over 24 months discounts the promised consideration of \$121 to the cash selling price of \$100). The entity evaluates the rate and concludes that it is commensurate with the rate that would be reflected in a separate financing transaction between the entity and its customer at contract inception. The following journal entries illustrate how the entity accounts for this contract in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-22 through 55-29:

- a. When the product is transferred to the customer, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-23.

Asset for right to recover product to be returned	\$	80 ^(a)	
Inventory			\$ 80

(a) This Example does not consider expected costs to recover the asset

- b. During the three-month right of return period, no interest is recognized in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-20 because no contract asset or receivable has been recognized.

- c. When the right of return lapses (the product is not returned).

Receivable	\$	100 ^(b)	
Revenue			\$ 100
Cost of sales	\$	80	
Asset for product to be returned			\$ 80

(b) The receivable recognized would be measured in accordance with Topic 310 on receivables. This Example does not consider the impairment accounting for the receivable

606-10-55-232

Until the entity receives the cash payment from the customer, interest income would be recognized consistently with the subsequent measurement guidance in Subtopic 835-30 on imputation of interest. The entity would accrete the receivable up to \$121 from the time the right of return lapses until customer payment.

In Example 27, the difference between the promised consideration and the cash selling price of the good or service arises for reasons other than the provision of financing. In this example, the customer withholds a portion of each payment until the contract is complete in order to protect itself from the entity failing to complete its obligations under the contract as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 27 – Withheld Payments on a Long-Term Contract

606-10-55-233

An entity enters into a contract for the construction of a building that includes scheduled milestone payments for the performance by the entity throughout the contract term of three years. The performance obligation will be satisfied over time, and the milestone payments are scheduled to coincide with the entity's expected performance. The contract provides that a specified percentage of each milestone payment is to be withheld (that is, retained) by the customer throughout the arrangement and paid to the entity only when the building is complete.

606-10-55-234

The entity concludes that the contract does not include a significant financing component. The milestone payments coincide with the entity's performance, and the contract requires amounts to be retained for reasons other than the provision of finance in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-17(c). The withholding of a specified percentage of each milestone payment is intended to protect the customer from the contractor failing to adequately complete its obligations under the contract.

Example 28 illustrates two situations. In one, a contractual discount rate reflects the rate in a separate financing transaction. In the other, it does not.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 28 – Determining the Discount Rate

606-10-55-235

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to sell equipment. Control of the equipment transfers to the customer when the contract is signed. The price stated in the contract is \$1 million plus a 5 percent contractual rate of interest, payable in 60 monthly installments of \$18,871.

Case A – Contractual Discount Rate Reflects the Rate in a Separate Financing Transaction

606-10-55-236

In evaluating the discount rate in the contract that contains a significant financing component, the entity observes that the 5 percent contractual rate of interest reflects the rate that would be used in a separate financing transaction between the entity and its customer at contract inception (that is, the contractual rate of interest of 5 percent reflects the credit characteristics of the customer).

606-10-55-237

The market terms of the financing mean that the cash selling price of the equipment is \$1 million. This amount is recognized as revenue and as a loan receivable when control of the equipment transfers to the customer. The entity accounts for the receivable in accordance with Topic 310 on receivables and Subtopic 835-30 on the imputation of interest.

Case B – Contractual Discount Rate Does Not Reflect the Rate in a Separate Financing Transaction

606-10-55-238

In evaluating the discount rate in the contract that contains a significant financing component, the entity observes that the 5 percent contractual rate of interest is significantly lower than the 12 percent interest rate that would be used in a separate financing transaction between the entity and its customer at contract inception (that is, the contractual rate of interest of 5 percent does not reflect the credit characteristics of the customer). This suggests that the cash selling price is less than \$1 million.

606-10-55-239

In accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-19, the entity determines the transaction price by adjusting the promised amount of consideration to reflect the contractual payments using the 12 percent interest rate that reflects the credit characteristics of the customer. Consequently, the entity determines that the transaction price is \$848,357 (60 monthly payments of \$18,871 discounted at 12 percent). The entity recognizes revenue and a loan receivable for that amount. The entity accounts for the loan receivable in accordance with Topic 310 on receivables and Subtopic 835-30 on the imputation of interest.

Example 29 illustrates a contract with an advance payment from the customer that the entity concludes represents a significant benefit of financing. It also illustrates a situation in which the implicit interest rate does not reflect the interest rate in a separate financing transaction between the entity and its customer at contract inception, as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Implementation Guidance and Illustrations***Example 29 – Advance Payment and Assessment of Discount Rate****606-10-55-240**

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to sell an asset. Control of the asset will transfer to the customer in two years (that is, the performance obligation will be satisfied at a point in time). The contract includes 2 alternative payment options: payment of \$5,000 in 2 years when the customer obtains control of the asset or payment of \$4,000 when the contract is signed. The customer elects to pay \$4,000 when the contract is signed.

606-10-55-241

The entity concludes that the contract contains a significant financing component because of the length of time between when the customer pays for the asset and when the entity transfers the asset to the customer, as well as the prevailing interest rates in the market.

606-10-55-242

The interest rate implicit in the transaction is 11.8 percent, which is the interest rate necessary to make the 2 alternative payment options economically equivalent. However, the entity determines that, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-19, the rate that should be used in adjusting the promised consideration is 6 percent, which is the entity's incremental borrowing rate.

606-10-55-243

The following journal entries illustrate how the entity would account for the significant financing component.

- a. Recognize a contract liability for the \$4,000 payment received at contract inception.

Cash	\$ 4,000	
Contract Liability		\$ 4,000

- b. During the 2 years from contract inception until the transfer of the asset, the entity adjusts the promised amount of consideration (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-20) and accretes the contract liability by recognizing interest on \$4,000 at 6 percent for 2 years.

Interest expense	\$ 494 ^(a)	
Contract liability		\$ 494

(a) $\$494 = \$4,000 \text{ contract liability} \times (6 \text{ percent interest per year for 2 years})$

- c. Recognize revenue for the transfer of the asset.

Contract liability	\$	4,494	
Revenue			\$ 4,494

In Example 30, involving a contract with an advance payment from the customer, the entity determines that a significant financing component does not exist because the difference between the amount of promised consideration and the cash selling price of the good or service arises for reasons other than the provision of financing as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 30 – Advance Payment

606-10-55-244

An entity, a technology product manufacturer, enters into a contract with a customer to provide global telephone technology support and repair coverage for three years along with its technology product. The customer purchases this support service at the time of buying the product. Consideration for the service is an additional \$300. Customers electing to buy this service must pay for it upfront (that is, a monthly payment option is not available).

606-10-55-245

To determine whether there is a significant financing component in the contract, the entity considers the nature of the service being offered and the purpose of the payment terms. The entity charges a single upfront amount, not with the primary purpose of obtaining financing from the customer but, instead, to maximize profitability, taking into consideration the risks associated with providing the service. Specifically, if customers could pay monthly, they would be less likely to renew, and the population of customers that continue to use the support service in the later years may become smaller and less diverse over time (that is, customers that choose to renew historically are those that make greater use of the service, thereby increasing the entity's costs). In addition, customers tend to use services more if they pay monthly rather than making an upfront payment. Finally, the entity would incur higher administration costs such as the costs related to administering renewals and collection of monthly payments.

606-10-55-246

In assessing the guidance in paragraph 606-10-32-17(c), the entity determines that the payment terms were structured primarily for reasons other than the provision of finance to the entity. The entity charges a single upfront amount for the services because other payment terms (such as a monthly payment plan) would affect the nature of the risks assumed by the entity to provide the service and may make it uneconomical to provide the service. As a result of its analysis, the entity concludes that there is not a significant financing component.

Question 5-14

The standard states that a significant financing component does not exist if the difference between the promised consideration and the cash selling price of the good or service arises for reasons other than providing financing. How broadly should this factor be applied? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 30]

TRG members generally agreed that there likely will be significant judgment involved in determining whether either party is providing financing or the payment terms are for another reason. TRG members generally agreed that the Board did not seem to intend to create a presumption that a significant financing component exists if the cash selling price is different from the promised consideration.

The TRG agenda paper noted that although ASC 606-10-32-16 states the measurement objective for a significant financing component is to recognize revenue for the goods and services at an amount that reflects the cash selling price, this guidance is only followed when an entity has already determined that a significant financing component exists. The fact that there is a difference in the promised consideration and the cash selling price is not a principle for determining whether a significant financing component actually exists, it is only one factor to consider.

Many TRG members noted that it will require significant judgment in some circumstances to determine whether a transaction includes a significant financing component.

Question 5-15

If the promised consideration is equal to the cash selling price, does a financing component exist?
[30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 30]

TRG members generally agreed that even if the list price, cash selling price and promised consideration of a good or service are all equal, an entity should not automatically assume that a significant financing component does not exist. This would be a factor to consider but would not be determinative.

As discussed above in Question 5-14, while ASC 606-10-32-16 states that the measurement objective for a significant financing component is to recognize revenue for the goods and services at an amount that reflects the cash selling price, this guidance is only followed when an entity has already determined that a significant financing component exists. The fact that there is no difference between the promised consideration and the cash selling price is not determinative in the evaluation of whether a significant financing component actually exists. It is a factor to consider, but it is not the only factor and is not determinative. As discussed above, an entity needs to consider all facts and circumstances in this evaluation.

The TRG agenda paper noted that the list price might not always equal the cash selling price (i.e., the price that a customer would have paid for the promised goods or services if the customer had paid cash for those goods or services when (or as) they transfer to the customer, as defined in ASC 606-10-32-16). For example, if a customer offers to pay cash up front when the entity is offering “free” financing to customers, the customer that offers the upfront payment might be able to pay less than the list price. Determining a “cash selling price” may require judgment and the fact that an entity provides “zero interest financing” does not necessarily mean that the cash selling price is the same as the price another customer will pay over time. Entities should consider the cash selling price as compared to the promised consideration in making the evaluation based on the overall facts and circumstances of the arrangement.

This notion is consistent with the guidance in ASC 606-10-32-32 on allocating the transaction price to performance obligations based on standalone selling prices (see Section 6.1) that states that a contractually stated price or a list price for a good or service may be (but is not presumed to be) the standalone selling price of that good or service. The TRG agenda paper noted that it may be possible that a financing component exists but that it may not be significant. As discussed above in this Section, entities will need to apply judgment in determining whether the financing component is significant.

Question 5-16

Does the standard preclude accounting for financing components that are not significant?
[30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 30]

TRG members generally agreed that the standard does not preclude an entity from deciding to account for a financing component that is not significant. For example, an entity may have a portfolio of contracts in which there is a mix of significant and insignificant financing components. An entity could choose to account for all of the financing components as significant in order to avoid having to apply different accounting methods to each.

An entity electing to apply the guidance on significant financing components for an insignificant financing should be consistent in its application to all similar contracts with similar circumstances.

- Question 5-17** **The standard includes a practical expedient, which allows an entity to not assess a contract for a significant financing component if the period between the customer’s payment and the entity’s transfer of the goods or services is one year or less. How should entities consider whether the practical expedient applies to contracts with a single payment stream for multiple performance obligations?** [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 30]
- TRG members generally agreed that entities will either apply an approach of allocating any consideration received (1) to the earliest good or service delivered or (2) proportionately to the goods and services, depending on the facts and circumstances.
- The TRG agenda paper on this question provided an example of a telecommunications entity that enters into a two-year contract to provide a device at contract inception and related data services over the remaining term in exchange for 24 equal monthly installments. The former approach would allow the entity to apply the practical expedient because the period between transfer of the good or service and customer payment would be less than one year for both the device and the related services. This is because, in the example provided, the device would be “paid off” after five months. The latter approach would not allow an entity to apply the practical expedient because the device would be deemed to be paid off over the full 24 months (i.e., greater than one year).
- The latter approach may be appropriate in circumstances similar to the example in the TRG agenda paper, when the cash payment is not directly tied to the earliest good or service delivered in a contract. The former approach may be appropriate when the cash payment is directly tied to the earliest good or service delivered. However, TRG members noted it may be difficult to tie a cash payment directly to a good or service because cash is fungible. Accordingly, judgment will be required based on the facts and circumstances.
- Question 5-18** **If a significant financing component exists in a contract, how should an entity calculate the adjustment to revenue?** [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 30]
- TRG members generally agreed that the standard does not contain guidance on how to calculate the adjustment to the transaction price due to a significant financing component. A financing component will be recognized as interest expense (when the customer pays in advance) or interest income (when the customer pays in arrears). Entities should consider guidance outside the revenue standard to determine the appropriate accounting (i.e., ASC 835-30 on interest).
- Question 5-19** **How should an entity allocate a significant financing component when there are multiple performance obligations in a contract?** [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 30]
- TRG members generally agreed that it may be reasonable for an entity to attribute a significant financing component to one or more, but not all, of the performance obligations in the contract. In doing so, the entity may analogize to other guidance in the standard that requires variable consideration or discounts to be allocated to one or more (but not all) performance obligations, if certain criteria are met (see Sections 6.3 and 6.4, respectively). However, attribution of a financing component to one (or some) of the performance obligations will require the use of judgment, especially because cash is fungible.
- The standard is clear that when determining the transaction price in Step 3 of the model, the effect of financing is excluded from the transaction price prior to the allocation of the transaction price to performance obligations (which occurs in Step 4). However, stakeholders had questioned whether an adjustment for a significant financing component should ever be attributed to only one or some of the performance obligations in the contract, rather than to all of the performance obligations in the contract because the standard only includes examples in which there is a single performance obligation.
- Question 5-20** **Is an entity required to evaluate whether a customer option that provides a material right includes a significant financing component? If so, are there any key factors an entity should consider when performing this evaluation?** [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 32]
- See response to Question 4-17 in Section 4.6.

5.5.2 Financial statement presentation of financing component

The standard states the following on the financial statement presentation of the effects of financing:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

The Existence of a Significant Financing Component in the Contract

606-10-32-20

An entity shall present the effects of financing (interest income or interest expense) separately from revenue from contracts with customers in the statement of comprehensive income (statement of activities). Interest income or interest expense is recognized only to the extent that a **contract asset** (or receivable) or a **contract liability** is recognized in accounting for a contract with a customer. In accounting for the effects of the time value of money, an entity also shall consider the subsequent measurement guidance in Subtopic 835-30, specifically the guidance in paragraphs 835-30-45-1A through 45-3 on presentation of the discount and premium in the financial statements and the guidance in paragraphs 835-30-55-2 through 55-3 on the application of the interest method.

As discussed above, when a significant financing component exists in a contract, the transaction price is adjusted so that the amount recognized as revenue is the “cash selling price” of the underlying goods or services at the time of transfer. Essentially, a contract with a customer that has a significant financing component would be separated into a revenue component (for the notional cash sales price) and a loan component (for the effect of the deferred or advance payment terms).¹³³ Consequently, the accounting for a trade receivable arising from a contract that has a significant financing component should be comparable to the accounting for a loan with the same features.¹³⁴

The amount allocated to the significant financing component should be presented separately from revenue recognized from contracts with customers. The financing component is recognized as interest expense (when the customer pays in advance) or interest income (when the customer pays in arrears). The interest income or expense is recognized over the financing period using the interest method described in ASC 835. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹³⁵ that an entity may present interest income as revenue only when interest income represents income from an entity’s ordinary activities.

5.6 Noncash consideration



FASB amendments

In May 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-12 that clarified that the fair value of noncash consideration should be measured at contract inception when determining the transaction price. In addition, when the variability of noncash consideration is due to both its form (e.g., share of stock) and other reasons (e.g., performance considerations that affect the amount of noncash consideration), the constraint on variable consideration applies only to the variability for reasons other than the form.

¹³³ Paragraph BC244 of ASU 2014-09.

¹³⁴ Paragraph BC244 of ASU 2014-09.

¹³⁵ Paragraphs BC247 of ASU 2014-09.

The standard provides the following guidance for noncash consideration:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Noncash Consideration

606-10-32-21

To determine the **transaction price** for **contracts** in which a **customer** promises consideration in a form other than cash, an entity shall measure the estimated fair value of the noncash consideration at contract inception (that is, the date at which the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are met).

606-10-32-22

If an entity cannot reasonably estimate the fair value of the noncash consideration, the entity shall measure the consideration indirectly by reference to the **standalone selling price** of the goods or services promised to the customer (or class of customer) in exchange for the consideration.

606-10-32-23

The fair value of the noncash consideration may vary after contract inception because of the form of the consideration (for example, a change in the price of a share to which an entity is entitled to receive from a customer). Changes in the fair value of noncash consideration after contract inception that are due to the form of the consideration are not included in the transaction price. If the fair value of the noncash consideration promised by a customer varies for reasons other than the form of the consideration (for example, the exercise price of a share option changes because of the entity's performance), an entity shall apply the guidance on variable consideration in paragraphs 606-10-32-5 through 32-14. If the fair value of the noncash consideration varies because of the form of the consideration and for reasons other than the form of the consideration, an entity shall apply the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-5 through 32-14 on variable consideration only to the variability resulting from reasons other than the form of the consideration.

606-10-32-24

If a customer contributes goods or services (for example, materials, equipment, or labor) to facilitate an entity's fulfillment of the contract, the entity shall assess whether it obtains control of those contributed goods or services. If so, the entity shall account for the contributed goods or services as noncash consideration received from the customer.

Customer consideration might be in the form of goods, services or other noncash consideration (e.g., property, plant and equipment, a financial instrument). When an entity (i.e., the seller or vendor) receives, or expects to receive, noncash consideration, the fair value of the noncash consideration at contract inception is included in the transaction price.¹³⁶

The Board decided¹³⁷ not to specify how the fair value of noncash consideration should be measured (e.g., the standard does not require an entity to apply ASC 820), in part, because the form of noncash consideration varies widely. Rather, the FASB observed that the concept of fair value exists in other parts of ASC 606 (e.g., the guidance on consideration payable to a customer) and that choosing the appropriate basis for measuring the fair value of noncash consideration requires judgment. If an entity cannot reasonably estimate the fair value of noncash consideration, it should measure the noncash consideration

¹³⁶ This statement applies only to transactions that are in the scope of the new guidance. Nonmonetary exchanges between entities in the same line of business that are arranged to facilitate sales to third parties (i.e., the entities involved in the exchange are not the end consumer) are excluded from the scope of the standard.

¹³⁷ Paragraph BC39 of ASU 2016-12.

indirectly by reference to the standalone selling price of the promised goods or services. For contracts with both noncash and cash consideration, an entity will only use fair value principles to measure the value of the noncash consideration and will look to other guidance within the revenue standard for the cash consideration. For example, in a contract for which an entity receives noncash consideration and a sales-based royalty, the entity would measure the fair value of the noncash consideration and look to the requirements within the revenue standard for sales-based royalties.

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12,¹³⁸ the FASB concluded that the measurement date of the transaction price should not vary based on the nature of the promised consideration and indicated that measuring noncash consideration at contract inception is consistent with other aspects of the model for determining the transaction price and allocating the transaction price to performance obligations. For example, the transaction price is adjusted for a significant financing component (if present) using an appropriate discount rate at contract inception. Additionally, the transaction price is allocated to the identified performance obligations in a contract based on the standalone selling prices of goods or services at contract inception.

As a result of measuring noncash consideration at contract inception, any changes in the fair value of noncash consideration due to its form after contract inception are not recognized as revenue. Instead, an entity will apply the relevant GAAP for the form of the noncash consideration (e.g., ASC 320 if the noncash received is a debt or equity security) to determine whether and how any changes in fair value that occurred after contract inception should be recognized upon receipt of the noncash consideration.¹³⁹ For example, if the GAAP related to the form of the noncash consideration requires that asset to be measured at fair value, an entity will recognize a gain or loss (outside of revenue) upon receipt of the asset if the fair value of the noncash consideration increased or decreased since contract inception.

The initial classification of amounts related to noncash consideration will depend on the timing of receipt of the consideration in relation to an entity's performance. If an entity performs by transferring goods or services to a customer before the customer pays the noncash consideration or before payment of the noncash consideration is due, the FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-12¹⁴⁰ that the entity will present the noncash consideration as a contract asset, excluding any amounts presented as a receivable. An entity should assess the contract asset or receivable for impairment.

The standard provides the following example of a transaction for which noncash consideration is received in exchange for services provided:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 31 – Entitlement to Noncash Consideration

606-10-55-248

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to provide a weekly service for one year. The contract is signed on January 1, 20X1, and work begins immediately. The entity concludes that the service is a single performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b). This is because the entity is providing a series of distinct services that are substantially the same and have the same pattern of transfer (the services transfer to the customer over time and use the same method to measure progress—that is, a time-based measure of progress).

¹³⁸ Paragraph BC38 of ASU 2016-12.

¹³⁹ Paragraph BC40 of ASU 2016-12.

¹⁴⁰ Paragraph BC40 of ASU 2016-12.

606-10-55-249

In exchange for the service, the customer promises 100 shares of its common stock per week of service (a total of 5,200 shares for the contract). The terms in the contract require that the shares must be paid upon the successful completion of each week of service.

606-10-55-250

To determine the transaction price (and the amount of revenue to be recognized), the entity measures the estimated fair value of 5,200 shares at contract inception (that is, on January 1, 20X1). The entity measures its progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation and recognizes revenue as each week of service is complete. The entity does not reflect any changes in the fair value of the 5,200 shares after contract inception in the transaction price. However, the entity assesses any related contract asset or receivable for impairment. Upon receipt of the noncash consideration, the entity would apply the guidance related to the form of the noncash consideration to determine whether and how any changes in fair value that occurred after contract inception should be recognized.

How we see it

The requirement to measure the fair value of noncash consideration at contract inception will result in a change in practice for some entities. For example, under legacy GAAP, entities receiving customer equity as payment for goods or services generally measure the fair value of the equity when performance is complete (upon vesting).

Also, the concept of accounting for noncash consideration at the fair value of the noncash consideration received is a change from legacy GAAP, under which an entity first looks to the fair value of the goods or services surrendered and then to the fair value of the asset acquired if it was more clearly evident, unless certain exceptions are met. Under the new standard, the order is reversed. That is, an entity first considers the fair value of the noncash consideration received and only considers the fair value (i.e., selling price) of the goods or services surrendered if the fair value of what was received is not reasonably estimable. As a result, an entity's measurement of noncash consideration received from a customer may differ from the customer's measurement of the same noncash consideration granted. In addition, under legacy GAAP, if any of the exceptions for recognizing a transaction at fair value within ASC 845 are met, the noncash consideration surrendered would be measured at its carrying amount. This concept is not included in the new standard.

Further, the new guidance does not contain the prescriptive guidance for advertising barter transactions in legacy GAAP. Therefore, more judgment about the specific facts and circumstances will be necessary when accounting for advertising barter transactions.

The fair value of noncash consideration could change both because of the form of consideration (e.g., a change in the price of a share an entity is entitled to receive from a customer) and for reasons other than the form of consideration (e.g., a change in the exercise price of a share option because of the entity's performance). Under the standard, the variable consideration guidance applies only to variability resulting from reasons other than the form of consideration (i.e., there is uncertainty as to whether the entity will receive the noncash consideration if a future event occurs or does not occur). The FASB decided¹⁴¹ that entities should apply the variable consideration guidance to the same types of variability, regardless of the form (i.e., cash or noncash) in which the consideration will be received.

¹⁴¹ Paragraph BC252 of ASU 2014-09 and paragraph BC42 of ASU 2016-12.

The following example illustrates the accounting for noncash consideration with variability due to both the form of the consideration and performance (i.e., a reason other than the form of the consideration):

Illustration 5-1: Noncash consideration with variability due to both form and other reasons

An entity enters into a contract to construct a building in exchange for 100,000 options to purchase a share of the customer's stock with an exercise price of \$15 per share. Under the terms of the arrangement, the exercise price of the options is affected by the entity's performance. If the entity completes the construction of the building within one year, the exercise price of the options is reduced to \$13 per share.

At contract inception, the fair value of an option with a \$15 exercise price is \$5, and the fair value of an option with a \$13 exercise price is \$8. The entity determines that the probability of it finishing the building within one year is only 10% and that the most likely amount method better predicts the amount of variable consideration to which it will be entitled.

Using the fair value of noncash consideration at contract inception, the entity determines that the transaction price is \$500,000 (100,000 options x \$5 per option) and recognizes revenue as the services are performed.

After nine months, the entity determines there is an 80% probability that it will finish the building in the next three months and that the exercise price of the options will decline to \$13 per share. After nine months, the fair value of an option with a \$15 strike price is \$10, and the fair value of an option with a \$13 strike price is \$13. The entity determines that the transaction price is \$800,000 (100,000 options x \$8 per option using the contract inception fair value of the option with a \$13 strike price). The change in transaction price is due to a change in the estimate of variable consideration using the most likely amount method (i.e., the variability results from something other than the form of consideration). The change in transaction price does not include any change since contract inception in fair value due to the form of the consideration (i.e., the entity uses the fair value of the option with a \$13 strike price determined at contract inception, not the fair value at the end month nine).



IASB differences

The IASB did not amend IFRS 15 to specify the measurement date of noncash consideration. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments), the IASB acknowledged that the use of a measurement date other than contract inception would not be precluded under IFRS. Consequently, it is possible that differences may exist in practice between IFRS and US GAAP entities. The IASB noted that legacy IFRS does not contain specific requirements about the measurement date for noncash consideration. Therefore, IFRS 15 is not expected to create more diversity than presently exists.

5.7

Consideration paid or payable to a customer

Many entities make payments to their customers. In some cases, the consideration paid or payable represents purchases by the entity of goods or services offered by the customer that satisfy a business need of the entity. In other cases, the consideration paid or payable represents incentives given by the entity to entice the customer to purchase, or continue purchasing, its goods or services.

The standard provides the following guidance for consideration paid or payable to a customer:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Consideration Payable to a Customer

606-10-32-25

Consideration payable to a **customer** includes cash amounts that an entity pays, or expects to pay, to the customer (or to other parties that purchase the entity's goods or services from the customer). Consideration payable to a customer also includes credit or other items (for example, a coupon or voucher) that can be applied against amounts owed to the entity (or to other parties that purchase the entity's goods or services from the customer). An entity shall account for consideration payable to a customer as a reduction of the **transaction price** and, therefore, of **revenue** unless the payment to the customer is in exchange for a distinct good or service (as described in paragraphs 606-10-25-18 through 25-22) that the customer transfers to the entity. If the consideration payable to a customer includes a variable amount, an entity shall estimate the transaction price (including assessing whether the estimate of variable consideration is constrained) in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-5 through 32-13.

606-10-32-26

If consideration payable to a customer is a payment for a distinct good or service from the customer, then an entity shall account for the purchase of the good or service in the same way that it accounts for other purchases from suppliers. If the amount of consideration payable to the customer exceeds the fair value of the distinct good or service that the entity receives from the customer, then the entity shall account for such an excess as a reduction of the transaction price. If the entity cannot reasonably estimate the fair value of the good or service received from the customer, it shall account for all of the consideration payable to the customer as a reduction of the transaction price.

606-10-32-27

Accordingly, if consideration payable to a customer is accounted for as a reduction of the transaction price, an entity shall recognize the reduction of revenue when (or as) the later of either of the following events occurs:

- a. The entity recognizes revenue for the transfer of the related goods or services to the customer.
- b. The entity pays or promises to pay the consideration (even if the payment is conditional on a future event). That promise might be implied by the entity's customary business practices.

The standard states that an entity should account for the consideration payable to a customer, regardless of whether the purchaser receiving the consideration is a direct or indirect customer of the entity. This includes consideration payable to any purchasers of the entity's products at any point along the distribution chain. This would include entities that make payments to the customers of resellers or distributors that purchase directly from the entity (e.g., manufacturers of breakfast cereals offer coupons to consumers, even though their direct customers are the grocery stores that sell to consumers). The requirements also apply to entities that derive revenue from sales of services, as well as entities that derive revenue from sales of goods.

Question 5-21

Who is considered an entity's customer when applying the guidance on consideration payable to a customer? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 28 and 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 37]

TRG members generally agreed that this guidance should be applied to all payments made to entities/customers in the distribution chain for that contract. However, they agreed there also could be situations in which the guidance should apply to payments made to any customer of an entity's customer outside the distribution chain if both parties are considered the entity's customers. For example, in an arrangement with a principal, an agent and an end customer, an agent may conclude that its only customer is the principal, or it may conclude that it has two customers – the principal and the end customer. Regardless of this assessment, an agent's payment to a principal's end customer that was contractually required based on an agreement between the entity (agent) and the principal would represent consideration payable to a customer. Absent similar contract provisions that clearly indicate when an amount is consideration payable, TRG members generally agreed that agents will need to evaluate their facts and circumstances to determine whether payments they make to an end customer should be considered a reduction of revenue or a marketing expense.

5.7.1 **Classification of the different types of consideration paid or payable to a customer**

To determine the appropriate accounting treatment, an entity must first determine whether the consideration paid or payable to a customer is a payment for a distinct good or service, a reduction of the transaction price or a combination of both.

For a payment by the entity to a customer to be treated as something other than a reduction of the transaction price, the good or service provided by the customer must be distinct (as discussed in Section 4.2.1). However, if the payment to the customer is in excess of the fair value of the distinct good or service received, the entity must account for such excess as a reduction of the transaction price.

5.7.2 **Forms of consideration paid or payable to a customer**

Consideration paid or payable to customers commonly takes the form of discounts and coupons, among other things. Further, the promise to pay the consideration might be implied by the entity's customary business practice.

Because consideration paid to a customer can take many different forms, entities will have to carefully evaluate each transaction to determine the appropriate treatment of such amounts. Some common examples of consideration paid to a customer include:

Slotting fees – Manufacturers of consumer products commonly pay retailers fees to have their goods displayed prominently on store shelves. Those shelves can be physical (i.e., in a building where the store is located) or virtual (i.e., they represent space in an internet reseller's online catalog). Generally, such fees do not provide a distinct good or service to the manufacturer and should be treated as a reduction of the transaction price.

Cooperative advertising arrangements – In some arrangements, a vendor agrees to reimburse a reseller for a portion of costs incurred by the reseller to advertise the vendor's products. The determination of whether the payment from the vendor is in exchange for a distinct good or service at fair value will depend on a careful analysis of the facts and circumstances of the contract.

Buy downs or margin/price protection – A vendor may agree to reimburse a retailer up to a specified amount for shortfalls in the sales price received by the retailer for the vendor’s products. Normally, such fees do not provide a distinct good or service to the manufacturer and should be treated as a reduction of the transaction price.

Coupons and rebates – An indirect customer of a vendor may receive a refund of a portion of the purchase price of the product or service acquired by returning a form to the retailer or the vendor. Generally, such fees do not provide a distinct good or service to the manufacturer and should be treated as a reduction of the transaction price.

“Pay to play” arrangements – In some arrangements, an entity pays an up-front fee to the customer in order to obtain a new contract. In most cases, these payments are not associated with any distinct good or service to be received from the customer and should be treated as a reduction of the transaction price.

Purchase of goods or services – Entities often enter into supplier-vendor arrangements with their customers in which the customers provide them with a distinct good or service. For example, a software entity may buy its office supplies from one of its software customers. In such situations, the entity has to carefully determine whether the payment made to the customer is solely for the goods and services received, or whether part of the payment is actually a reduction of the transaction price for the goods and services the entity is transferring to the customer.

How we see it

The new guidance for consideration payable to a customer is similar to legacy GAAP. However, determining whether a good or service is “distinct” may result in an entity reaching a different conclusion than under legacy GAAP, which requires the vendor to receive an “identifiable benefit” from the customer that is sufficiently separable from the customer’s purchases of the vendor’s products in order to treat the consideration payable to a customer as anything other than a reduction of revenue.

Question 5-22

Which payments to a customer are in the scope of the guidance on consideration payable to a customer?
[30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 28 and 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 37]

TRG members generally agreed that an entity may not have to separately analyze each payment to a customer if it is apparent that the payment is for a distinct good or service acquired in the normal course of business at a market price. However, if the business purpose of a payment to a customer is unclear or the goods or services are acquired in a manner that is inconsistent with market terms other entities would receive when purchasing the customer’s good or services, the payment should be evaluated under this guidance.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁴² the FASB noted that the amount of consideration received from a customer for goods or services, and the amount of any consideration paid to that customer for goods or services, could be linked even if they are separate events, similar to legacy GAAP.

When legacy GAAP on this topic was written, the intent was for the guidance to have a very broad application. This has caused some transactions that likely were not contemplated to be linked to revenue transactions to be in the scope of the guidance. Legacy GAAP requires completely separate transactions to be considered when applying the guidance. For example, if an entity makes contributions to a charitable organization and the charity is also a customer of the entity, the contributions are likely within the scope of legacy GAAP guidance.

¹⁴² Paragraph BC257 of ASU 2014-09.

5.7.3 Timing of recognition of consideration paid or payable to a customer

If the consideration paid or payable to a customer is a discount or refund for goods or services provided to a customer, the guidance on consideration payable to a customer says this reduction of the transaction price (and thus revenue) should be recognized at the later of when the entity transfers the promised goods or services to the customer or the entity promises to pay the consideration. For example, if goods subject to a discount through a coupon are already delivered to the retailers, the discount would be recognized when the coupons are issued. However, if a coupon is issued that can be used on a new line of products that have not yet been sold to retailers, the discount would be recognized upon sale of the product to a retailer.

However, to determine the appropriate timing of recognition of consideration payable to a customer, entities also will need to consider the guidance on variable consideration. That is, the standard's definition of variable consideration is broad and includes amounts such as coupons or other forms of credits that can be applied to the amounts owed to an entity by the customer. That guidance requires that all potential variable consideration be considered and reflected in the transaction price at inception and reassessed as the entity performs. In other words, if an entity has a history of providing this type of consideration to its customers, the guidance on estimating variable consideration would require that such amounts be considered at the inception of the contract, even if the entity has not yet provided or explicitly promised this consideration to the customer.

The TRG discussed¹⁴³ the potential inconsistency between the consideration payable guidance and the variable consideration guidance that arises because the guidance specific to "consideration payable to a customer" states that such amounts should not be recognized as a reduction of revenue until the *later* of when the related sales are recognized or the entity makes the promise to provide such consideration. A literal reading of this guidance seems to suggest that an entity should not anticipate that it may offer these types of programs, even if it has a history of doing so, and should only recognize the effect of these programs at the later of when the entity transfers the promised goods or services or makes a promise to pay the customer. Members of the TRG generally agreed¹⁴⁴ that if an entity has a history of providing this type of consideration to customers, the guidance on estimating variable consideration would require the entity to consider such amounts at the contract's inception when the transaction price is estimated, even if the entity has not yet provided or promised to provide this consideration to the customer. If the consideration paid or payable to a customer includes variable consideration in the form of a discount or refund for goods or services provided, an entity would use either the expected value method or most likely amount method to estimate the amount to which the entity expects to be entitled and apply the constraint to the estimate (see Section 5.2 for further discussion) to determine the effect on the transaction price of the discount or refund.

¹⁴³ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 37.

¹⁴⁴ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 44.

The standard includes the following example of consideration paid to a customer:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 32 – Consideration Payable to a Customer

606-10-55-252

An entity that manufactures consumer goods enters into a one-year contract to sell goods to a customer that is a large global chain of retail stores. The customer commits to buy at least \$15 million of products during the year. The contract also requires the entity to make a nonrefundable payment of \$1.5 million to the customer at the inception of the contract. The \$1.5 million payment will compensate the customer for the changes it needs to make to its shelving to accommodate the entity's products.

606-10-55-253

The entity considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-25 through 32-27 and concludes that the payment to the customer is not in exchange for a distinct good or service that transfers to the entity. This is because the entity does not obtain control of any rights to the customer's shelves. Consequently, the entity determines that, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-25, the \$1.5 million payment is a reduction of the transaction price.

606-10-55-254

The entity applies the guidance in paragraph 606-10-32-27 and concludes that the consideration payable is accounted for as a reduction in the transaction price when the entity recognizes revenue for the transfer of the goods. Consequently, as the entity transfers goods to the customer, the entity reduces the transaction price for each good by 10 percent ($\$1.5 \text{ million} \div \15 million). Therefore, in the first month in which the entity transfers goods to the customer, the entity recognizes revenue of \$1.8 million ($\$2.0 \text{ million invoiced amount} - \$0.2 \text{ million of consideration payable to the customer}$).

How we see it

TRG members' general agreement that entities will need to consider the guidance on variable consideration to determine the appropriate timing of recognition of consideration payable to a customer may result in a change in practice for some entities. TRG members generally agreed¹⁴⁵ that the "later of" guidance for consideration payable to a customer in the new standard would be applied in more limited circumstances than under legacy GAAP.

5.8 Nonrefundable up-front fees

In certain circumstances, entities may receive payments from customers before they provide the contracted service or deliver a good. Up-front fees generally relate to the initiation, activation or setup of a good to be used, or a service to be provided, in the future. Up-front fees also may be paid to grant access to, or to provide a right to use, a facility, product or service. In many cases, the up-front amounts paid by the customer are nonrefundable.

¹⁴⁵ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 44.

The standard provides the following guidance for nonrefundable up-front fees:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Nonrefundable Upfront Fees (and Some Related Costs)

606-10-55-50

In some **contracts**, an entity charges a **customer** a nonrefundable upfront fee at or near contract inception. Examples include joining fees in health club membership contracts, activation fees in telecommunication contracts, setup fees in some service contracts, and initial fees in some supply contracts.

606-10-55-51

To identify **performance obligations** in such contracts, an entity should assess whether the fee relates to the transfer of a promised good or service. In many cases, even though a nonrefundable upfront fee relates to an activity that the entity is required to undertake at or near contract inception to fulfill the contract, that activity does not result in the transfer of a promised good or service to the customer (see paragraph 606-10-25-17). Instead, the upfront fee is an advance payment for future goods or services and, therefore, would be recognized as **revenue** when those future goods or services are provided. The revenue recognition period would extend beyond the initial contractual period if the entity grants the customer the option to renew the contract and that option provides the customer with a material right as described in paragraph 606-10-55-42.

606-10-55-52

If the nonrefundable upfront fee relates to a good or service, the entity should evaluate whether to account for the good or service as a separate performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-22.

606-10-55-53

An entity may charge a nonrefundable fee in part as compensation for costs incurred in setting up a contract (or other administrative tasks as described in paragraph 606-10-25-17). If those setup activities do not satisfy a performance obligation, the entity should disregard those activities (and related costs) when measuring progress in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-21. That is because the costs of setup activities do not depict the transfer of services to the customer. The entity should assess whether costs incurred in setting up a contract have resulted in an asset that should be recognized in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-5.

Entities must evaluate whether nonrefundable up-front fees relate to the transfer of a good or service. In many situations, an up-front fee represents an advance payment for future goods or services. In addition, the existence of a nonrefundable up-front fee may indicate that the contract includes a renewal option for future goods and services at a reduced price (if the customer renews the agreement without the payment of an additional up-front fee), which an entity would need to assess to determine whether the option is a material right (i.e., another performance obligation in the contract) (see Section 4.6). If the entity concludes that the nonrefundable up-front fee does not provide a material right, the fee would be part of the consideration allocable to the goods or services in the contract and would be recognized as the good or service to which the consideration was allocated is transferred to the customer. If an entity concludes that the nonrefundable up-front fee provides a material right, the amount of the fee allocated to the material right would be recognized over the period of benefit of the fee, which may be the estimated customer life.

The following illustration depicts the allocation of a nonrefundable up-front fee determined to be a material right:

Illustration 5-2: Nonrefundable up-front fees

A customer signs a one-year contract with a health club and is required to pay both a nonrefundable initiation fee of \$150 and an annual membership fee in monthly installments of \$40. At the end of each year, the customer can renew the contract for an additional year without paying an additional initiation fee. The customer is then required to pay an annual membership fee in monthly installments of \$40 for each renewal period. The club's activity of registering the customer does not transfer any service to the customer and, therefore, is not a performance obligation. By not requiring the customer to pay the up-front membership fee again at renewal, the club is effectively providing a discounted renewal rate to the customer.

The club determines that the renewal option is a material right because it provides a renewal option at a lower price than the range of prices typically charged for new customers, and therefore, it is a separate performance obligation. Based on its experience, the club determines that its customers, on average, renew their annual memberships twice before terminating their relationship with the club. As a result, the club determines that the option provides the customer with the right to two annual renewals at a discounted price. In this scenario, the club would allocate the total transaction consideration of \$630 (\$150 up-front membership fee + \$480 (\$40 x 12 months)) to the identified performance obligations (monthly services for the one year contract and renewal option) based on the relative standalone selling price method. The amount allocated to the renewal option would be recognized as each of the two renewal periods is either exercised or forfeited.

Alternatively, the club could value the option by "looking through" to the optional goods and services using the practical alternative provided in ASC 606-10-55-45 (see Section 6.1.5). In that case, the club would determine that the total hypothetical transaction price (for purposes of allocating the transaction price to the option) is the sum of the up-front fee plus three years of service fees (i.e., \$150 + \$1,440) and would allocate that amount to all of the services expected to be delivered, or 36 months of membership (or \$44.17 per month). Therefore, the total consideration in the contract of \$630 would be allocated to the 12 months of service (\$530 (\$44.17 x 12 months)) with the remaining amount being allocated to the renewal option (\$100 (\$630 – 530)). The amount allocated to the renewal option (\$100) would be recognized as revenue over each renewal period. One acceptable approach would be to reduce the initial \$100 deferred revenue balance for the material right by \$4.17 each month (\$100 / 24 months remaining), assuming the estimated renewal period of two years remains unchanged.

See Sections 4.6 and 6.1.5 for a more detailed discussion of the treatment of options (including the practical alternative allowed under ASC 606-10-55-45) and Sections 6.1 and 6.2 for a discussion of estimating standalone selling prices and allocating consideration using the relative standalone selling price method.

Question 5-23

Over what period should an entity recognize a nonrefundable up-front fee (e.g., fees paid for membership to a health club or buying club, activation fees for phone, cable or internet services) that does not relate to the transfer of a good or service? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 32]

TRG members generally agreed that the period over which a nonrefundable up-front fee will be recognized depends on whether the fee provides the customer with a material right with respect to future contract renewals. For example, if an entity that charges a \$50 one-time activation fee to provide \$100 of services to a customer on a month-to-month basis concludes that the activation fee provides a material right, the fee would be recognized over the service period during which the customer is expected to benefit from not having to pay an activation fee upon renewal of service, which may be the estimated customer life in some situations. If the entity concludes that the activation fee does not provide a material right, the fee would be recognized over the contract term (i.e., one month).

5.9**Changes in the transaction price****Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification****Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Measurement**Changes in the Transaction Price***606-10-32-42**

After contract inception, the transaction price can change for various reasons, including the resolution of uncertain events or other changes in circumstances that change the amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for the promised goods or services.

Changes in the transaction price can occur for various reasons. See Section 6.5 for additional guidance on accounting for a change in transaction price.

6 Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations

Once the separate performance obligations are identified and the transaction price has been determined, the standard generally requires an entity to allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations in proportion to their standalone selling prices (i.e., on a relative standalone selling price basis). The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁴⁶ that an allocation based on standalone selling prices most often faithfully depicts the different margins that may apply to promised good or services. The standard includes the following allocation guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Allocating the Transaction Price to Performance Obligations

606-10-32-28

The objective when allocating the transaction price is for an entity to allocate the transaction price to each performance obligation (or distinct good or service) in an amount that depicts the amount of consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring the promised goods or services to the customer.

606-10-32-29

To meet the allocation objective, an entity shall allocate the transaction price to each performance obligation identified in the **contract** on a relative **standalone selling price** basis in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-31 through 32-35, except as specified in paragraphs 606-10-32-36 through 32-38 (for allocating discounts) and paragraphs 606-10-32-39 through 32-41 (for allocating consideration that includes variable amounts).

606-10-32-30

Paragraphs 606-10-32-31 through 32-41 do not apply if a contract has only one performance obligation. However, paragraphs 606-10-32-39 through 32-41 may apply if an entity promises to transfer a series of distinct goods or services identified as a single performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b) and the promised consideration includes variable amounts.

When allocating on a relative standalone selling price basis, any discount within the contract generally is allocated proportionately to all of the performance obligations in the contract. However, as discussed further below, there are some exceptions. For example, an entity could allocate variable consideration to a single performance obligation in some situations. The standard also contemplates the allocation of any discount in a contract to only certain performance obligations, if specified criteria are met. An entity would not apply the allocation guidance if the contract only has one performance obligation (that is not made up of a series of distinct goods and services and includes variable consideration).

¹⁴⁶ Paragraph BC266 of ASU 2014-09.

6.1 Determining standalone selling prices

To allocate the transaction price on a relative standalone selling price basis, an entity must first determine the standalone selling price of the distinct good or service underlying each performance obligation. Under the standard, this is the price at which an entity would sell a good or service on a standalone (or separate) basis at contract inception.

Under the model, the observable price of a good or service sold separately provides the best evidence of standalone selling price. However, in many situations, standalone selling prices will not be readily observable. In those cases, the entity must estimate the standalone selling price. The standard provides the following guidance on determining standalone selling prices, which may include estimation:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Allocation Based on Standalone Selling Prices

606-10-32-31

To allocate the transaction price to each performance obligation on a relative standalone selling price basis, an entity shall determine the standalone selling price at contract inception of the distinct good or service underlying each performance obligation in the contract and allocate the transaction price in proportion to those standalone selling prices.

606-10-32-32

The standalone selling price is the price at which an entity would sell a promised good or service separately to a customer. The best evidence of a standalone selling price is the observable price of a good or service when the entity sells that good or service separately in similar circumstances and to similar customers. A contractually stated price or a list price for a good or service may be (but shall not be presumed to be) the standalone selling price of that good or service.

606-10-32-33

If a standalone selling price is not directly observable, an entity shall estimate the standalone selling price at an amount that would result in the allocation of the transaction price meeting the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28. When estimating a standalone selling price, an entity shall consider all information (including market conditions, entity-specific factors, and information about the customer or class of customer) that is reasonably available to the entity. In doing so, an entity shall maximize the use of observable inputs and apply estimation methods consistently in similar circumstances.

606-10-32-34

Suitable methods for estimating the standalone selling price of a good or service include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Adjusted market assessment approach – An entity could evaluate the market in which it sells goods or services and estimate the price that a customer in that market would be willing to pay for those goods or services. That approach also might include referring to prices from the entity's competitors for similar goods or services and adjusting those prices as necessary to reflect the entity's costs and margins.
- b. Expected cost plus a margin approach – An entity could forecast its expected costs of satisfying a performance obligation and then add an appropriate margin for that good or service.

- c. Residual approach – An entity may estimate the standalone selling price by reference to the total transaction price less the sum of the observable standalone selling prices of other goods or services promised in the contract. However, an entity may use a residual approach to estimate, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-33, the standalone selling price of a good or service only if one of the following criteria is met:
1. The entity sells the same good or service to different customers (at or near the same time) for a broad range of amounts (that is, the selling price is highly variable because a representative standalone selling price is not discernible from past transactions or other observable evidence).
 2. The entity has not yet established a price for that good or service, and the good or service has not previously been sold on a standalone basis (that is, the selling price is uncertain).

606-10-32-35

A combination of methods may need to be used to estimate the standalone selling prices of the goods or services promised in the contract if two or more of those goods or services have highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices. For example, an entity may use a residual approach to estimate the aggregate standalone selling price for those promised goods or services with highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices and then use another method to estimate the standalone selling prices of the individual goods or services relative to that estimated aggregate standalone selling price determined by the residual approach. When an entity uses a combination of methods to estimate the standalone selling price of each promised good or service in the contract, the entity shall evaluate whether allocating the transaction price at those estimated standalone selling prices would be consistent with the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28 and the guidance on estimating standalone selling prices in paragraph 606-10-32-33.

Standalone selling prices are determined at contract inception and are not updated to reflect changes between contract inception and when performance is complete. For example, if an entity determines the standalone selling price for a promised good, and before it can finish manufacturing and deliver that good, the underlying cost of the materials doubles, the entity would not revise its standalone selling price for purposes of this contract. However, for future contracts involving the same good, the entity would need to determine whether the change in circumstances (i.e., the significant increase in the cost to produce the good) warrants a revision in the standalone selling price. If so, the entity would use that revised price for future allocations in future contracts (see Section 6.1.3).

Further, if the contract is modified, and the modification is treated as a termination of the existing contract and the creation of a new contract, the entity would update its estimates of standalone selling prices at the time of the modification. If the contract is modified, and the modification is treated as a separate contract, the accounting for the original contract would not be affected (and the standalone selling prices of the underlying goods and services would not be updated), but the standalone selling prices of the distinct goods or services of the new, separate contract would have to be determined at the time of the modification.

How we see it

The requirement to estimate a standalone selling price if a directly observable selling price is not available will not be a new concept for entities that have historically applied the multiple-element arrangements guidance in ASC 605-25. The new guidance on estimating a standalone selling price is generally consistent with ASC 605-25 except that it does not require an entity to consider a hierarchy of evidence to make this estimate.

Some entities have adopted the provisions of ASC 605-25 by developing estimates of selling prices for elements within an arrangement that may exhibit “highly variable” pricing as described in Section 6.1.2. The new standard may allow those entities to revert to a residual approach.

The requirement to estimate a standalone selling price may be a significant change for entities that have historically followed the software revenue recognition guidance in ASC 985-605. That literature has a different threshold for determining the standalone selling price, requiring observable evidence and not management estimates. Some of these entities may find it difficult to determine a standalone selling price, particularly for goods or services that are never sold separately (e.g., specified upgrade rights for software). In certain circumstances, an entity may be able to estimate the standalone selling price of a performance obligation using a residual approach (see Section 6.1.2). In these cases, the results would likely be similar to circumstances when legacy GAAP required a residual approach.

6.1.1 Factors to consider when estimating the standalone selling price

To estimate the standalone selling price (if not readily observable), an entity may consider the stated prices in the contract, but the standard says an entity cannot presume that a contractually stated price or a list price for a good or service is the standalone selling price. As stated in ASC 606-10-32-33 above, an “entity shall consider all information (including market conditions, entity-specific factors, and information about the customer or class of customer) that is reasonably available to the entity” to estimate a standalone selling price. An entity also will need to maximize the use of observable inputs in its estimate. This is a very broad requirement that will require an entity to consider a variety of data sources.

The following list, which is not all inclusive, provides examples of market conditions to consider:

- ▶ Potential limits on the selling price of the product
- ▶ Competitor pricing for a similar or identical product
- ▶ Market awareness of and perception of the product
- ▶ Current market trends that will likely affect the pricing
- ▶ The entity’s market share and position (e.g., the entity’s ability to dictate pricing)
- ▶ Effects of the geographic area on pricing
- ▶ Effects of customization on pricing
- ▶ Expected life of the product, including whether significant technological advances are expected in the market in the near future

Examples of entity-specific factors include:

- ▶ Profit objectives and internal cost structure
- ▶ Pricing practices and pricing objectives (including desired gross profit margin)
- ▶ Effects of customization on pricing
- ▶ Pricing practices used to establish pricing of bundled products
- ▶ Effects of a proposed transaction on pricing (e.g., the size of the deal, the characteristics of the targeted customer)
- ▶ Expected life of the product, including whether significant entity-specific technological advances are expected in the near future

To document its estimated standalone selling price, an entity should describe in detail what information it considered (e.g., the factors listed above), especially if there is limited observable data or none at all.

6.1.2 Possible estimation approaches

ASC 606-10-32-34 above discusses three estimation approaches: (1) the adjusted market assessment approach, (2) the expected cost plus a margin approach and (3) a residual approach, all of which are discussed further below. When applying the standard, an entity may need to use a different estimation approach for each of the distinct goods or services underlying the performance obligations in a contract. In addition, an entity may need to use a combination of approaches to estimate the standalone selling prices of goods or services promised in a contract if two or more of those goods and services have highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices. This may be applicable when an entity is using the residual approach to allocate consideration because there are two or more goods or services with highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices but at least one of the goods or services in the contract has an observable standalone selling price. For example, the Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁴⁷ (and discussed further below) that an entity in such a situation might apply the residual approach to estimate the aggregate of the standalone selling prices for all the promised goods or services with highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices and then use another approach to estimate the standalone selling prices of each of those promised goods or services.

Further, these are not the only estimation approaches permitted. The standard allows any reasonable estimation approach as long as it is consistent with the notion of a standalone selling price, maximizes the use of observable inputs and is applied on a consistent basis for similar goods and services and customers.

In some cases, an entity may have sufficient observable data to determine the standalone selling price. For example, an entity may have sufficient standalone sales of a particular good or service that give it persuasive evidence of the standalone selling price of a particular good or service. In such situations, no estimation would be necessary.

If an entity does not have sufficient standalone sales data to determine the standalone selling price based solely on those sales, it must maximize the use of whatever observable inputs it has available to make its estimate. In other words, an entity should not disregard any observable inputs when estimating the standalone selling price of a good or service. An entity should consider all factors contemplated in negotiating the contract with the customer and the entity's normal pricing practices factoring in the most objective and reliable information that is available. While many entities may have robust practices in place regarding the pricing of goods and services, some entities may need to improve their processes to develop estimates of standalone selling prices.

The standard includes the following estimation approaches:

Adjusted market assessment approach – This approach focuses on the amount that the entity believes the market in which it sells goods or services is willing to pay for a good or service. For example, an entity might refer to competitor prices for similar goods and services and adjust those prices as necessary to reflect the entity's costs and margins. When using the adjusted market assessment approach, an entity should consider market conditions, such as those listed in Section 6.1.1. Applying this approach will likely be easiest when an entity has sold the good or service for a period of time (so it has data about customer demand) or a competitor offers similar goods or services that the entity can use as a basis for its analysis. Applying this approach may be difficult when an entity is selling an entirely new good or service because it may be difficult to anticipate market demand. In these situations, entities may want to use the market assessment approach, with adjustments as necessary to reflect the entity's costs and margins, in combination with

¹⁴⁷ Paragraph BC272 of ASU 2014-09.

other approaches to maximize the use of observable inputs (e.g., using competitor pricing, adjusted based on the market assessment approach combined with an entity's planned internal pricing strategies if the performance obligation has never been sold separately).

Expected cost plus margin approach – This approach focuses more on internal factors (e.g., the entity's cost basis) but has an external component as well. That is, the margin included in this approach must reflect the margin the market would be willing to pay, not just the entity's desired margin. The margin may have to be adjusted for differences in products, geographies, customers and other factors. The expected cost plus margin approach may be useful in many situations, especially when the performance obligation has a determinable, direct fulfillment cost (e.g., a tangible product or an hourly service). However, this approach may be less helpful when there are no clearly identifiable direct fulfillment costs or the amount of those costs is unknown (e.g., a new software license or specified upgrade rights).

Residual approach – This approach allows an entity to estimate the standalone selling price of a promised good or service as the difference between the total transaction price and the observable (i.e., not estimated) standalone selling prices of other promised goods or services in the contract, provided one of two criteria are met. Because the standard indicates that this approach only can be applied to contracts with multiple promised goods or services when the selling price of one or more goods or services is unknown, either because the historical selling price is highly variable or because the goods or services have not yet been sold, we anticipate the use of this approach likely will be limited. However, allowing entities to use a residual technique will provide relief to entities that rarely or never sell goods or services on a standalone basis, such as entities that sell intellectual property only with physical goods or services.

An example would be an entity that frequently sells software, professional services and maintenance bundled together at prices that vary widely and also sells the professional services and maintenance individually at relatively stable prices. The FASB indicated that it may be appropriate to estimate the standalone selling price for the software as the difference between the total transaction price and the observable selling prices of the professional services and maintenance. See Example 34, Cases B and C, in Section 6.4 for examples of when the residual approach may or may not be appropriate.

As mentioned above, the Board clarified in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁴⁸ that an entity could also use the residual approach if there are two or more goods or services in the contract with highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices, provided at least one of the other promised goods or services in the contract has an observable standalone selling price. The Board observed that in such an instance, an entity may need to use a combination of techniques to estimate the standalone selling prices. For example, an entity may apply the residual approach to estimate the aggregate of the standalone selling prices for all of the promised goods or services with highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices, but then use another approach (e.g., adjusted market assessment, expected cost plus margin) to estimate the standalone selling prices of each of those promised goods or services with highly variable or uncertain standalone selling prices.

¹⁴⁸ Paragraph BC272 of ASU 2014-09.

The standard includes the following example in which two estimation approaches are used to estimate standalone selling prices of two different goods in a contract:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 33 – Allocation Methodology

606-10-55-256

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to sell Products A, B, and C in exchange for \$100. The entity will satisfy the performance obligations for each of the products at different points in time. The entity regularly sells Product A separately, and, therefore the standalone selling price is directly observable. The standalone selling prices of Products B and C are not directly observable.

606-10-55-257

Because the standalone selling prices for Products B and C are not directly observable, the entity must estimate them. To estimate the standalone selling prices, the entity uses the adjusted market assessment approach for Product B and the expected cost plus a margin approach for Product C. In making those estimates, the entity maximizes the use of observable inputs (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-33). The entity estimates the standalone selling prices as follows:

Product	Standalone selling price	Method
Product A	\$ 50	Directly observable (see paragraph 606-10-32-32)
Product B	25	Adjusted market assessment approach (see paragraph 606-10-32-34(a))
Product C	75	Expected cost plus a margin approach (see paragraph 606-10-32-34(b))
Total	<u>\$ 150</u>	

606-10-55-258

The customer receives a discount for purchasing the bundle of goods because the sum of the standalone selling prices (\$150) exceeds the promised consideration (\$100). The entity considers whether it has observable evidence about the performance obligation to which the entire discount belongs (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-37) and concludes that it does not. Consequently, in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-31 and 606-10-32-36, the discount is allocated proportionately across Products A, B, and C. The discount, and therefore the transaction price, is allocated as follows:

Product	Allocated transaction price	
Product A	\$ 33	$(\$50 \div \$150 \times \$100)$
Product B	17	$(\$25 \div \$150 \times \$100)$
Product C	50	$(\$25 \div \$150 \times \$100)$
Total	<u>\$ 100</u>	

Given the flexibility provided by the guidance, it is both appropriate and necessary for entities to tailor the approach(es) used to estimate standalone selling prices to their specific facts and circumstances. Regardless of whether an entity uses a single approach or a combination of approaches to estimate the standalone selling prices, the entity should evaluate whether the resulting allocation of the transaction price is consistent with the overall allocation objective of ASC 606-10-32-28 and the guidance on estimating standalone selling prices above.

In accordance with the standard, an entity must make a reasonable estimate of the standalone selling price for the distinct good or service underlying each performance obligation if an observable selling price is not readily available. In developing this requirement, the FASB believed that, even in instances in which limited information is available, entities should have sufficient information to develop a reasonable estimate.

How we see it

Estimating standalone selling price may require a change in practice. Entities will no longer follow the hierarchy in legacy ASC 605-25 guidance that requires them to consider VSOE, then third-party evidence and then best estimate of selling price. In addition, entities that follow legacy ASC 985-605 will no longer be required to establish VSOE of fair value based on a significant majority of their transactions. As a result, we expect that entities may use different approaches than under legacy GAAP to estimate standalone selling prices. However, because these estimates may have limited underlying observable data, it will be important for entities to have robust documentation to demonstrate the reasonableness of the calculations they make in estimating standalone selling prices. It isn't clear how much an entity's estimate of standalone selling price will change as a result of applying the new guidance.

6.1.3 Updating estimated standalone selling prices

The standard does not directly address how frequently estimated standalone selling prices must be updated. Instead, it indicates that an entity must make this estimate for each distinct good or service underlying each performance obligation in a contract with a customer (suggesting constant updating). In practice, we anticipate that entities will be able to consider their facts and circumstances in order to determine how frequently they will need to update their estimates. For example, if the information used to estimate the standalone selling price for similar transactions has not changed, an entity may determine that it is reasonable to use the previously determined standalone selling price. However, so that changes in circumstances are reflected in the estimate in a timely manner, we anticipate that an entity would formally update the estimate on a regular basis (e.g., quarterly, semiannually). The frequency of updates should be based on the facts and circumstances of the distinct good or service underlying each performance obligation for which the estimate is made. An entity should use current information each time it develops or updates its estimate, and the approach used to estimate standalone selling price should not change (i.e., an entity must use a consistent approach) unless facts and circumstances change.

6.1.4 Additional considerations for determining the standalone selling price

While this is not stated explicitly in the standard, we anticipate that a single good or service could have more than one standalone selling price. That is, the entity may be willing to sell goods or services at different prices to different customers. Further, an entity may use different prices in different geographies or in markets where it uses different methods to distribute its products (e.g., it may use a distributor or reseller rather than selling directly to the end customer) or for other reasons (e.g., different cost structures or strategies in different markets). Accordingly, an entity may need to stratify its analysis to determine its standalone selling price for each class of customer, geography and/or market, as applicable.

In addition, it may be appropriate, depending on the facts and circumstances, for an entity to develop a reasonable range for its estimated standalone selling price rather than a single estimate. See discussion in Question 6-3 below.

Question 6-1 **When estimating the standalone selling price, does an entity have to consider historical pricing for the sale of the good or service involved?**

Yes, we believe that an entity should consider historical pricing in all circumstances but it may not be determinative. Historical pricing is likely an important data point that reflects both market conditions and entity-specific factors and can provide supporting evidence about the reasonableness of management's estimate. For example, if management determines based on its pricing policies and competition in the market that the standalone selling price of its good or service is X, historical transactions within a reasonable range of X would provide supporting evidence for management's estimate. However, if historical pricing was only 50% of X, this may indicate that historical pricing is no longer relevant due to changes in the market, for example, or that management's estimate is flawed.

Depending on the facts and circumstances, an entity may conclude that other factors such as internal pricing policies are more relevant to its determination of standalone selling price. When historical pricing was established using the entity's normal pricing policies and procedures, it is more likely that this information will be relevant in the estimation.

If the entity has sold the product separately or has information on competitor pricing for a similar product, the entity likely would find historical data relevant to its estimate of standalone selling prices, among other factors. In addition, we believe it may be appropriate for entities to stratify standalone selling prices based on the type or size of customer, the amount of product or services purchased, the distribution channel, the geographic location or other factors.

Question 6-2 **When using an expected cost plus margin approach to estimate standalone selling price, how should an entity determine an appropriate margin?**

When an entity uses the expected cost plus margin approach, it is important for the entity to use an appropriate margin. Determining an appropriate margin will likely require the use of significant judgment and will involve the consideration of many market conditions and entity-specific factors discussed above. For example, it would not be appropriate to determine that the entity's estimate of standalone selling price is cost plus a 30% margin when a review of market conditions demonstrates that customers are only willing to pay the equivalent of cost plus a 12% margin for a comparable product. Similarly, it would be inappropriate to determine that cost plus a specified margin represents the standalone selling price if competitors are selling a comparable product at twice the determined estimate. Further, the determined margin will likely have to be adjusted for differences in products, geographic location, customers and other factors.

Question 6-3 **When estimating the standalone selling price of a good or service, can an entity estimate a range of prices or will it have to identify a point estimate?**

We believe it is reasonable for an entity to use a range of prices to estimate the standalone selling price of a good or service. That is, we do not believe that an entity would be required to determine a point estimate for each estimated standalone selling price if a range is a more practical means of estimating the standalone selling price for a good or service. While the standard doesn't address ranges of estimates, using a range of prices would not be inconsistent with the objective of the standard, which is to allocate the transaction price to each performance obligation in "an amount that depicts the amount of consideration for which the entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring the promised good or service to the customer." The only requirements in the standard are that an entity maximize its use of observable inputs and apply the estimation approaches consistently. The use of a range would be consistent with these principles as well.

Under legacy multiple element guidance, VSOE of selling price can be established when a large portion of the standalone sales fall within a narrow range (e.g., when the vendor can demonstrate that the pricing of 80% of the standalone sales fall within a range of plus or minus 15% from the midpoint of the range). We believe the use of a similar range would be acceptable for determining estimates of standalone selling prices under the standard because it is consistent with the standard's principle that an entity must maximize its use of observable inputs. If the entity has established a reasonable range for the estimated standalone selling prices and the stated contractual price fell within that range, it may be appropriate to use the stated contractual price as the standalone selling price. However, if the stated contractual price for the good or service was outside of the range, the standalone selling price would need to be adjusted to a point within the established range in order to allocate the transaction price on a relative standalone selling price basis. In these situations, the entity would need to determine which point in the range is most appropriate to use (e.g., the midpoint of the range or the outer limit nearest to the stated contractual price). We believe entities should establish a policy regarding the point in the range that will be used (e.g., low point, midpoint) and apply that policy consistently.

While the use of a range may be appropriate for estimating standalone selling price, we believe that some approaches to identifying this range do not meet the requirements of the guidance. For example, it wouldn't be appropriate for an entity to determine a range by estimating a single price point for standalone selling price and then adding an arbitrary range on either side of that point estimate or by taking the historical prices and expanding the range around the midpoint until a significant portion of the historical transactions fall within that band.

To illustrate, assume that an entity determines that 60% of its historical prices fall within +/-15% of \$100 (i.e., \$85 to \$115). However, the vendor determines that 80% of the historical prices fall within +/- 30% of \$100 and proposes a range for the standalone selling price estimate of \$70 to \$130. The wider the range necessary to capture a high proportion of historical transactions, the less relevant the range is in terms of providing a useful data point for estimating standalone selling prices.

Conversely, if management's analysis of market conditions and entity-specific factors resulted in management determining that the best estimate of the standalone selling price is \$85 to \$115, we believe the historical data showing that 60% of the transactions fall within that range, while likely not determinative, could be used as supporting evidence for management's conclusion because it is consistent with the standard's principle that an entity must maximize its use of observable inputs. In this case, management should analyze the transactions that fall outside the range to determine whether they have similar characteristics and should be evaluated as a separate class of transactions with a different estimated selling price.

6.1.5

Measurement of options that are separate performance obligations

An entity that determines that an option is a separate performance obligation (because the option provides the customer with a material right, as discussed further in Section 4.6) has to determine the standalone selling price of the option as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance

Customer Options for Additional Goods or Services

606-10-55-44

Paragraph 606-10-32-29 requires an entity to allocate the **transaction price** to performance obligations on a relative standalone selling price basis. If the standalone selling price for a customer's option to acquire additional goods or services is not directly observable, an entity should estimate it. That estimate should reflect the discount that the customer would obtain when exercising the option, adjusted for both of the following:

- a. Any discount that the customer could receive without exercising the option
- b. The likelihood that the option will be exercised.

606-10-55-45

If a customer has a material right to acquire future goods or services and those goods or services are similar to the original goods or services in the contract and are provided in accordance with the terms of the original contract, then an entity may, as a practical alternative to estimating the standalone selling price of the option, allocate the transaction price to the optional goods or services by reference to the goods or services expected to be provided and the corresponding expected consideration. Typically, those types of options are for contract renewals.

As stated above, if the option's standalone selling price is not directly observable, the entity will estimate it, taking into consideration the discount the customer would receive in a standalone transaction and the likelihood that the customer would exercise the option. Generally, option pricing models consider both the intrinsic value of the option (i.e., the value of the option if it were exercised today) and its time value (e.g., the option may be more or less valuable based on the amount of time until its expiration date and/or the volatility of the price of the underlying good or service). An entity is only required to measure the intrinsic value of the option under ASC 606-10-55-44 when estimating the standalone selling price of the option. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁴⁹ the FASB noted that the benefits of requiring entities to value the time value component of an option would not justify the cost of doing so. Example 49 in the standard (included in Section 4.6) illustrates the measurement of an option determined to be a material right under ASC 606-10-55-44.

ASC 606-10-55-45 provides an alternative to estimating the standalone selling price of an option. This practical alternative applies when the goods or services are both (1) similar to the original goods and services in the contract (i.e., the entity continues to provide what it was already providing¹⁵⁰) and (2) provided in accordance with the terms of the original contract. The standard indicates that this alternative generally will apply to options for contract renewals (i.e., the renewal option approach).

Under this alternative, a portion of the transaction price is allocated to the option (i.e., the material right that is a performance obligation) by reference to the total goods or services expected to be provided to the customer (including expected renewals) and the corresponding expected consideration. That is, the total amount of consideration expected to be received from the customer (including from expected renewals) is allocated to the total goods or services expected to be provided to the customer, including the expected contract renewals. The amount allocated to the goods or services that the entity is required to transfer to

¹⁴⁹ Paragraph BC390 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁵⁰ Paragraph BC394 of ASU 2014-09.

the customer under the contract (i.e., excluding the optional goods or services that will be transferred if the customer exercises the renewal option(s)) is then subtracted from the total amount of consideration received (or that will be received) for transferring those goods or services. The difference is the amount that is allocated to the option at contract inception. An entity using this alternative would need to apply the constraint on variable consideration (as discussed in Section 5.2.3) to the estimated consideration for the optional goods or services prior to performing the allocation. See Illustration 6-1, Scenario B below.

It is important to note that the calculation of total expected consideration (i.e., the hypothetical transaction price), including consideration related to expected renewals, is only performed for purposes of allocating a portion of the hypothetical transaction price to the option at contract inception. It does not change the enforceable rights or obligations in the contract, nor does it affect the actual transaction price for the goods or services that the entity is presently obligated to transfer to the customer (which would not include expected renewals). Accordingly, the entity would not include any remaining hypothetical transaction price in its disclosure of remaining performance obligations (see Section 10.4.1). In these respects, the renewal option approach is consistent with the conclusion in Question 4-13 (see Section 4.6) that even if an entity may think that a customer almost certainly will exercise an option to buy additional goods and services, an entity should not identify the additional goods and services underlying the option as promised goods or services (or performance obligations) unless there are substantive contractual penalties.

Subsequent to contract inception, if the actual number of contract renewals differs from an entity's initial expectations, the entity would update the hypothetical transaction price and allocation accordingly. However, as discussed in Section 6.1, the estimate of the standalone selling prices at contract inception would not be updated.

The following example illustrates the two possible approaches for measuring options included in a contract:

Illustration 6-1: Measuring an option

An aftermarket home warranty provider offers a promotion to new subscribers who pay full price for the first year of coverage that would grant them an option to renew their services for up to two years at a discount. The entity regularly sells warranty coverage for \$750 per year. With the promotion, the customer would be able to renew the one-year warranty at the end of the first and second years for \$600. The entity concludes that the ability to renew is a material right because the customer would receive a discount that exceeds any discount available to other customers. The entity also determines that no directly observable standalone selling price exists for the option to renew at a discount.

Scenario A – Estimating the standalone selling price of the option directly (ASC 606-10-55-44)

Because the entity has no directly observable evidence of the standalone selling price for the renewal option, the entity has to estimate the standalone selling price of an option for a \$150 discount on the renewal of service in years two and three. In developing its estimate, the entity would consider factors such as the likelihood that the option will be exercised and the price of comparable discounted offers. For example, the entity may consider the selling price of an offer for a discounted price of similar services found on a “deal of the day” website.

The option would then be included in the relative standalone selling price allocation. In this example, there would be two performance obligations, one year of warranty services and one option for discounted renewals. The contract consideration of \$750 would be allocated between those two performance obligations based on their relative standalone selling prices.

Example 49 in the standard (included in Section 4.6) illustrates the estimation of the standalone selling price of an option determined to be a material right under ASC 606-10-55-44.

Scenario B – Practical alternative to estimating the standalone selling price of the option using the renewal option approach (ASC 606-10-55-45)

If the entity chooses to use the renewal option approach, it would allocate the transaction price to the option for warranty services by reference to the warranty services expected to be provided (including expected renewals) and the corresponding expected consideration. Since there is a discount offered on renewal of the warranty service, this calculation will result in less revenue being allocated to the first year of the warranty service than the amount of consideration received. The difference between the consideration received (or that will be received) for the first year of warranty service and the revenue allocated for the first year of warranty service will represent the amount allocated to the option using the renewal option approach.

Assume the entity obtained 100 new subscribers under the promotion. Based on its experience, the entity anticipates approximately 50% attrition annually, after also giving consideration to the anticipated effect that the \$150 discount will have on attrition. The entity considers the constraint on variable consideration and concludes that it is probable that a significant revenue reversal will not occur. Therefore, the entity concludes that for this portfolio of contracts, it will ultimately sell 175 one-year warranty services (100 + 50 renewals after year one + 25 renewals after year two).

The total consideration the entity expects to receive is \$120,000 $[(100 \times \$750) + (50 \times \$600) + (25 \times \$600)]$ (i.e., the hypothetical transaction price). Assuming the standalone selling price for each warranty period is the same, the entity allocates \$685.71 $(\$120,000/175)$ to each warranty period.

During the first year, the entity will recognize revenue of \$68,571 (100 warranties sold times the allocated price of \$685.71 per warranty). Consequently, at contract inception, the entity would allocate \$6,429 to the option to renew $(\$75,000 \text{ cash received less } \$68,571 \text{ revenue to be recognized in the first year})$.

If the actual renewals in years two and three differ from its expectations, the entity would have to update the hypothetical transaction price and allocation accordingly. However, as discussed in Section 6.1, the estimate of the standalone selling prices at contract inception for the warranty service would not be updated.

For example, assume that the entity experiences less attrition than expected (e.g., 40% attrition annually instead of 50%). Therefore, the entity estimates that it will ultimately sell 196 one-year warranty services (100 + 60 renewals after year one + 36 renewals after year two). Accordingly, the total consideration the entity expects to receive is \$132,600 $[(100 \times \$750) + (60 \times \$600) + (36 \times \$600)]$ (i.e., the updated hypothetical transaction price). The entity would not update its estimates of the standalone selling prices (which were assumed to be the same for each warranty period). As such, the entity allocates \$676.53 $(\$132,600/196)$ to each warranty period. This would require the entity to reduce the amount of revenue it recorded in year 1 by \$918 $(\$68,571 - (100 \times 676.53))$ because the amount allocated to the option should have been higher at contract inception.

How we see it

The requirement to allocate contract consideration to an option (that has been determined to be a performance obligation) on a relative standalone selling price basis is consistent with legacy guidance in ASC 605-25. However, ASC 605-25 requires the entity to estimate the selling price of the option (unless other objective evidence of the selling price exists) and does not provide an alternative method (i.e., no renewal option approach) for measuring the option.

Question 6-4**Could the form of an option (e.g., a gift card versus a coupon) affect how an option's standalone selling price is estimated?**

We believe the form of an option should not affect how the standalone selling price is estimated. Consider, for example, a retailer that gives customers who spend more than \$100 during a specified period a \$15 discount on a future purchase in the form of a coupon or a gift card that expires two weeks from the sale date. If the retailer determines that this type of offer represents a material right (see Section 4.6), it will need to allocate a portion of the transaction price to the option on a relative standalone selling price basis.

As discussed above, the standard requires that an entity first look to any directly observable standalone selling price. That will require the retailer to consider the nature of the underlying transaction. In this example, while a customer can purchase a \$15 gift card for face value, that transaction is not the same in substance as a transaction in which the customer is given a \$15 gift card or coupon in connection with purchasing another good or service. As such, we believe the retailer could conclude that there is no directly observable standalone selling price for a "free" gift card or coupon obtained in connection with the purchase of another good or service. It would then have to estimate the standalone selling price in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-44.

The estimated standalone selling price of an option given in the form of a gift card or a coupon would be the same because both estimates would reflect the likelihood that the option will be exercised (see discussion of breakage in Section 7.9).

6.2**Applying the relative standalone selling price method**

Once an entity has determined the standalone selling price for the distinct goods and services in a contract, the entity allocates the transaction price to those performance obligations. The standard requires an entity to use the relative standalone selling price method to allocate the transaction price except in the two specific circumstances that are described in Sections 6.3 and 6.4.

Under the relative standalone selling price method, the transaction price is allocated to each performance obligation based on the proportion of the standalone selling price of each performance obligation to the sum of the standalone selling prices of all of the performance obligations in the contract, as described in the illustration below:

Illustration 6-2: Relative standalone selling price allocation

Manufacturing Co. enters into a contract with a customer to sell a machine for \$100,000. The total contract price includes installation of the machine and a two-year extended warranty. Assume Manufacturing Co. determines there are three performance obligations, and the standalone selling prices of those performance obligations are as follows: machine – \$75,000, installation services – \$14,000 and extended warranty – \$20,000.

The aggregate of the standalone selling prices (\$109,000) exceeds the total transaction price of \$100,000, indicating there is a discount inherent in the contract that must be allocated to each of the performance obligations based on their relative standalone selling prices. Therefore, the \$100,000 transaction price is allocated to each performance obligation as follows:

Machine – \$68,800 ($\$100,000 \times (\$75,000/\$109,000)$)
 Installation – \$12,850 ($\$100,000 \times (\$14,000/\$109,000)$)
 Warranty – \$18,350 ($\$100,000 \times (\$20,000/\$109,000)$)

The entity would recognize as revenue the amount allocated to each performance obligation when (or as) each performance obligation is satisfied.

How we see it

The standard's requirements don't differ significantly from legacy requirements to allocate consideration using a relative selling price allocation. As a result, we generally do not expect the allocation of the transaction price to change significantly for entities that already perform relative selling price allocations. However, that may not be the case for entities that apply one or both of the exceptions provided in the standard (described in Sections 6.3 and 6.4). The standard also likely will require a change in practice for entities that don't apply a relative selling price allocation under legacy GAAP (e.g., entities that have applied a residual approach).

6.3 Allocating variable consideration

The relative standalone selling price method is the default method for allocating the transaction price. However, the FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusion of ASU 2014-09¹⁵¹ that this method may not always result in a faithful depiction of the amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled from the customer. Therefore, the standard provides two exceptions to the relative standalone selling price method to allocate the transaction price.

The first relates to the allocation of variable consideration (see Section 6.4 for the second exception). This exception allows variable consideration to be allocated entirely to a specific part of a contract, such as one or more (but not all) performance obligations in the contract or one or more (but not all) distinct goods or services promised in a series of distinct goods or services that forms part of a single performance obligation (see Section 4.2.2).

Two criteria must be met to apply this exception, as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Allocation of Variable Consideration

606-10-32-39

Variable consideration that is promised in a **contract** may be attributable to the entire contract or to a specific part of the contract, such as either of the following:

- a. One or more, but not all, **performance obligations** in the contract (for example, a bonus may be contingent on an entity transferring a promised good or service within a specified period of time)
- b. One or more, but not all, distinct goods or services promised in a series of distinct goods or services that forms part of a single performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b) (for example, the consideration promised for the second year of a two-year cleaning service contract will increase on the basis of movements in a specified inflation index).

606-10-32-40

An entity shall allocate a variable amount (and subsequent changes to that amount) entirely to a performance obligation or to a distinct good or service that forms part of a single performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b) if both of the following criteria are met:

- a. The terms of a variable payment relate specifically to the entity's efforts to satisfy the performance obligation or transfer the distinct good or service (or to a specific outcome from satisfying the performance obligation or transferring the distinct good or service).

¹⁵¹ Paragraph BC280 of ASU 2014-09.

- b. Allocating the variable amount of consideration entirely to the performance obligation or the distinct good or service is consistent with the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28 when considering all of the performance obligations and payment terms in the contract.

606-10-32-41

The allocation requirements in paragraphs 606-10-32-28 through 32-38 shall be applied to allocate the remaining amount of the transaction price that does not meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40.

While the language in ASC 606-10-32-40 implies that this exception is limited to allocating variable consideration to a single performance obligation or a single distinct good or service within a series, ASC 606-10-32-39 indicates that the variable consideration can be allocated to “one or more, but not all” performance obligations or distinct goods or services within a series. We understand it was not the FASB’s intent to limit this exception to a single performance obligation or a single distinct good or service within a series, even though the standard uses a singular construction for the remainder of the discussion and does not repeat “one or more, but not all.”

The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁵² that this exception is necessary because allocating contingent amounts to all performance obligations in a contract may not reflect the economics of a transaction in all cases. Allocating variable consideration entirely to a distinct good or service may be appropriate when the amount allocated to that particular good or service is reasonable relative to all other performance obligations and payment terms in the contract. Subsequent changes in variable consideration should be allocated in a consistent manner.

Entities may need to exercise significant judgment to determine whether they meet the requirements to allocate variable consideration to specific performance obligations or distinct goods or services within a series. Entities will need to first determine whether they meet the first criterion in ASC 606-10-32-40, which requires that the terms of a variable payment specifically relate to an entity’s efforts to satisfy a performance obligation or transfer a distinct good or service that is part of a series. In performing this assessment, entities will need to consider the nature of the promise identified and whether the variable payment relates to that promise. For example, an entity may conclude that the nature of the promise to provide hotel management services (including management of the hotel employees, accounting services, training, procurement) is a series of distinct services (i.e., daily hotel management). For providing this service, the entity receives a variable fee (e.g., based on a percentage of occupancy rates and reimbursement of accounting services). An entity likely will determine it meets the first criterion because the uncertainty related to the consideration is resolved on a daily basis as the entity satisfies its obligation to perform daily hotel management services. This is because the variable payments specifically relate to transferring the distinct service that is part of a series of distinct goods or services (i.e., the daily management service). The fact that the payments do not directly correlate with each of the underlying activities performed each day does not affect this assessment. Refer to Chapter 4 for further discussion of identifying the nature of the goods and services promised in a contract, including whether they meet the series criteria.

Entities will then need to determine whether they meet the second criterion in ASC 606-10-32-40 and confirm that allocating the consideration in this manner is consistent with the overall allocation objective of the standard in ASC 606-10-32-28. That is, an entity should allocate to each performance obligation (or distinct good or service promised in a series) the portion of the transaction price that reflects the amount of consideration the entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring those goods or services to the customer.

¹⁵² Paragraph BC284 of ASU 2014-09.

The TRG discussed¹⁵³ four different types of contracts that may be accounted for as a series of distinct goods or services (see Section 4.2.2) and for which an entity may reasonably conclude that the allocation objective has been met (and the variable consideration could be allocated to each distinct period of service such as day, month or year) as follows:

- ▶ IT outsourcing contract in which the events that trigger the variable consideration are the same throughout the contract but the per unit price declines over the life of the contract – The allocation objective could be met if the pricing is based on market terms (e.g., if the contract contains a benchmarking clause) or the changes in price are substantive and linked to changes in an entity's cost to fulfill the obligation or value provided to the customer.
- ▶ Transaction processing contract with unknown quantity of transactions but fixed contractual rate per transaction – The allocation objective could be met if the fees are priced consistently throughout the contract, and the rates charged are consistent with the entity's standard pricing practices with similar customers.
- ▶ Hotel management contract in which monthly consideration is based on a percentage of monthly rental revenue, reimbursement of labor costs and an annual incentive payment – The allocation objective could be met for each payment stream as follows. The base monthly fees could meet the allocation objective if the consistent measure throughout the contract period (e.g., 1% of monthly rental revenue) reflects the value to the customer. The cost reimbursements could meet the allocation objective if they are commensurate with an entity's efforts to fulfill the promise each day. The annual incentive fee could also meet the allocation objective if it reflects the value delivered to the customer for the annual period and is reasonable compared with incentive fees that could be earned in other periods.
- ▶ Franchise agreement in which franchisor will receive a sales-based royalty of 5% in addition to a fixed fee – The allocation objective could be met if the consistent formula throughout the license term reasonably reflects the value to the customer of its access to the franchisor's intellectual property (e.g., reflected by the sales that access has generated for the customer).

It is important to note that allocating variable consideration to one or more, but not all, performance obligations or distinct goods or services in a series is a requirement, not a policy election. If the above criteria are met, the entity must allocate the variable consideration to the related performance obligation(s).

The standard provides the following example to illustrate when an entity may or may not be able to allocate variable consideration to a specific part of a contract (note that the example focuses on licenses of intellectual property, which are discussed in Chapter 8):

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 35 – Allocation of Variable Consideration

606-10-55-270

An entity enters into a contract with a customer for two intellectual property licenses (Licenses X and Y), which the entity determines to represent two performance obligations each satisfied at a point in time. The standalone selling prices of Licenses X and Y are \$800 and \$1,000, respectively.

¹⁵³ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 39.

Case A – Variable Consideration Allocated Entirely to One Performance Obligation**606-10-55-271**

The price stated in the contract for License X is a fixed amount of \$800, and for License Y the consideration is 3 percent of the customer's future sales of products that use License Y. For purposes of allocation, the entity estimates its sales-based royalties (that is, the variable consideration) to be \$1,000, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-8.

606-10-55-272

To allocate the transaction price, the entity considers the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 and concludes that the variable consideration (that is, the sales-based royalties) should be allocated entirely to License Y. The entity concludes that the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 are met for the following reasons:

- a. The variable payment relates specifically to an outcome from the performance obligation to transfer License Y (that is, the customer's subsequent sales of products that use License Y).
- b. Allocating the expected royalty amounts of \$1,000 entirely to License Y is consistent with the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28. This is because the entity's estimate of the amount of sales-based royalties (\$1,000) approximates the standalone selling price of License Y and the fixed amount of \$800 approximates the standalone selling price of License X. The entity allocates \$800 to License X in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-41. This is because, based on an assessment of the facts and circumstances relating to both licenses, allocating to License Y some of the fixed consideration in addition to all of the variable consideration would not meet the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28.

606-10-55-273

The entity transfers License Y at inception of the contract and transfers License X one month later. Upon the transfer of License Y, the entity does not recognize revenue because the consideration allocated to License Y is in the form of a sales-based royalty. Therefore, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-65, the entity recognizes revenue for the sales-based royalty when those subsequent sales occur.

606-10-55-274

When License X is transferred, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$800 allocated to License X.

Case B – Variable Consideration Allocated on the Basis of Standalone Selling Prices**606-10-55-275**

The price stated in the contract for License X is a fixed amount of \$300, and for License Y the consideration is 5 percent of the customer's future sales of products that use License Y. The entity's estimate of the sales-based royalties (that is, the variable consideration) is \$1,500 in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-8.

606-10-55-276

To allocate the transaction price, the entity applies the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 to determine whether to allocate the variable consideration (that is, the sales-based royalties) entirely to License Y. In applying the criteria, the entity concludes that even though the variable payments relate specifically to an outcome from the performance obligation to transfer License Y (that is, the customer's subsequent sales of products that use License Y), allocating the variable consideration entirely to License Y would be inconsistent with the principle for allocating the transaction price. Allocating \$300 to License X and \$1,500 to License Y does not reflect a reasonable allocation of the transaction price on the basis of the standalone selling prices of Licenses X and Y of \$800 and \$1,000, respectively. Consequently, the entity applies the general allocation requirements in paragraphs 606-10-32-31 through 32-35.

606-10-55-277

The entity allocates the transaction price of \$300 to Licenses X and Y on the basis of relative standalone selling prices of \$800 and \$1,000, respectively. The entity also allocates the consideration related to the sales-based royalty on a relative standalone selling price basis. However, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-65, when an entity licenses intellectual property in which the consideration is in the form of a sales-based royalty, the entity cannot recognize revenue until the later of the following events: the subsequent sales occur or the performance obligation is satisfied (or partially satisfied).

606-10-55-278

License Y is transferred to the customer at the inception of the contract, and License X is transferred three months later. When License Y is transferred, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$167 ($\$1,000 \div \$1,800 \times \300) allocated to License Y. When License X is transferred, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$133 ($\$800 \div \$1,800 \times \300) allocated to License X.

606-10-55-279

In the first month, the royalty due from the customer's first month of sales is \$200. Consequently, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-65, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$111 ($\$1,000 \div \$1,800 \times \200) allocated to License Y (which has been transferred to the customer and is therefore a satisfied performance obligation). The entity recognizes a contract liability for the \$89 ($\$800 \div \$1,800 \times \200) allocated to License X. This is because although the subsequent sale by the entity's customer has occurred, the performance obligation to which the royalty has been allocated has not been satisfied.

Question 6-5

In order to meet the criteria to allocate variable consideration entirely to a specific part of a contract, must the resulting allocation be consistent with a relative standalone selling price allocation?

[13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 39]

No. TRG members generally agreed that a relative standalone selling price allocation is not required to meet the allocation objective when it relates to the allocation of variable consideration to a specific part of a contract (e.g., a distinct good or service in a series). The Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁵⁴ notes that standalone selling price is the default method for meeting the allocation objective but other methods could be used in certain instances (e.g., in allocating variable consideration).

Stakeholders had questioned whether the variable consideration exception would have limited application to a series of distinct goods or services (see Section 4.2.2). That is, they wanted to know whether the guidance would require that each distinct service that is substantially the same be allocated the same amount (absolute value) of variable consideration. While the standard does not state what other allocation methods could be used beyond the relative standalone selling price basis, TRG members generally agreed that an entity should apply reasonable judgment to determine whether the allocation results in a reasonable outcome (and therefore, meets the standard's allocation objective), as discussed above in Section 6.3.

¹⁵⁴ Paragraph BC280 of ASU 2014-09.

6.4 Allocating a discount

The second exception to the relative standalone selling price allocation (see Section 6.3 for the first exception) relates to discounts inherent in contracts. When an entity sells a bundle of goods and services, the selling price of the bundle is often less than the sum of the standalone selling prices of the individual components. Under the relative standalone selling price method, this discount would be allocated proportionately to all of the separate performance obligations.

However, the standard says that if an entity determines that a discount is not related to all of the promised goods or services in the contract, the entity should allocate the contract's entire discount to only those goods or services to which it relates. An entity would make this determination when the price of certain goods or services is largely independent of other goods or services in the contract. In these situations, an entity would be able to effectively "carve off" an individual performance obligation, or some of the performance obligations in the contract, and allocate the contract's entire discount to that performance obligation or group of obligations. However, an entity could not use this exception to allocate only a portion of the discount to one or more, but not all, performance obligations in the contract.

The standard states the following:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Allocation of a Discount

606-10-32-36

A customer receives a discount for purchasing a bundle of goods or services if the sum of the standalone selling prices of those promised goods or services in the contract exceeds the promised consideration in a contract. Except when an entity has observable evidence in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-37 that the entire discount relates to only one or more, but not all, performance obligations in a contract, the entity shall allocate a discount proportionately to all performance obligations in the contract. The proportionate allocation of the discount in those circumstances is a consequence of the entity allocating the transaction price to each performance obligation on the basis of the relative standalone selling prices of the underlying distinct goods or services.

606-10-32-37

An entity shall allocate a discount entirely to one or more, but not all, performance obligations in the contract if all of the following criteria are met:

- a. The entity regularly sells each distinct good or service (or each bundle of distinct goods or services) in the contract on a standalone basis.
- b. The entity also regularly sells on a standalone basis a bundle (or bundles) of some of those distinct goods or services at a discount to the standalone selling prices of the goods or services in each bundle.
- c. The discount attributable to each bundle of goods or services described in (b) is substantially the same as the discount in the contract, and an analysis of the goods or services in each bundle provides observable evidence of the performance obligation (or performance obligations) to which the entire discount in the contract belongs.

606-10-32-38

If a discount is allocated entirely to one or more performance obligations in the contract in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-37, an entity shall allocate the discount before using the residual approach to estimate the standalone selling price of a good or service in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-34(c).

The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁵⁵ that it believes the guidance in ASC 606-10-32-37 generally will apply to contracts that include at least three performance obligations. While the standard contemplates that an entity can allocate the entire discount to as few as one performance obligation, the FASB further clarified that it believes such a situation would be rare. Instead, the FASB believes it is more likely that an entity will be able to demonstrate that a discount relates to two or more performance obligations because the entity would likely have observable information that the standalone selling price of a group of promised goods or services is lower than the price of those items when sold separately. It likely would be more difficult for an entity to have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that a discount is associated with a single performance obligation.

The standard includes the following example to illustrate this exception and when the use of the residual estimation approach may or may not be appropriate:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 34 – Allocating a Discount

606-10-55-259

An entity regularly sells Products A, B, and C individually, thereby establishing the following standalone selling prices:

Product	Standalone Selling Price
Product A	\$ 40
Product B	55
Product C	45
Total	\$ 140

606-10-55-260

In addition, the entity regularly sells Products B and C together for \$60.

Case A – Allocating a Discount to One or More Performance Obligations

606-10-55-261

The entity enters into a contract with a customer to sell Products A, B, and C in exchange for \$100. The entity will satisfy the performance obligations for each of the products at different points in time.

606-10-55-262

The contract includes a discount of \$40 on the overall transaction, which would be allocated proportionately to all 3 performance obligations when allocating the transaction price using the relative standalone selling price method (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-36). However, because the entity regularly sells Products B and C together for \$60 and Product A for \$40, it has evidence that the entire discount should be allocated to the promises to transfer Products B and C in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-37.

606-10-55-263

If the entity transfers control of Products B and C at the same point in time, then the entity could, as a practical matter, account for the transfer of those products as a single performance obligation. That is, the entity could allocate \$60 of the transaction price to the single performance obligation and recognize revenue of \$60 when Products B and C simultaneously transfer to the customer.

¹⁵⁵ Paragraph BC283 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-55-264

If the contract requires the entity to transfer control of Products B and C at different points in time, then the allocated amount of \$60 is individually allocated to the promises to transfer Product B (standalone selling price of \$55) and Product C (standalone selling price of \$45) as follows:

Product	Allocated transaction price	
Product B	\$ 33	(\$55 ÷ \$100 total standalone selling price x \$60)
Product C	<u>27</u>	(\$45 ÷ \$100 total standalone selling price x \$60)
Total	<u>\$ 60</u>	

Case B – Residual Approach Is Appropriate**606-10-55-265**

The entity enters into a contract with a customer to sell Products A, B, and C as described in Case A. The contract also includes a promise to transfer Product D. Total consideration in the contract is \$130. The standalone selling price for Product D is highly variable (see paragraph 606-10-32-34(c)(1)) because the entity sells Product D to different customers for a broad range of amounts (\$15 – \$45). Consequently, the entity decides to estimate the standalone selling price of Product D using the residual approach.

606-10-55-266

Before estimating the standalone selling price of Product D using the residual approach, the entity determines whether any discount should be allocated to the other performance obligations in the contract in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-37 through 32-38.

606-10-55-267

As in Case A, because the entity regularly sells Products B and C together for \$60 and Product A for \$40, it has observable evidence that \$100 should be allocated to those 3 products and a \$40 discount should be allocated to the promises to transfer Products B and C in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-37. Using the residual approach, the entity estimates the standalone selling price of Product D to be \$30 as follows:

Product	Standalone selling price	Method
Product A	\$ 40	Directly observable (see paragraph 606-10-32-32)
Product B and C	60	Directly observable with discount (see paragraphs 606-10-32-37)
Product D	<u>30</u>	Residual approach (see paragraph 606-10-32-34(c))
Total	<u>\$ 130</u>	

606-10-55-268

The entity observes that the resulting \$30 allocated to Product D is within the range of its observable selling prices (\$15 – \$45). Therefore, the resulting allocation (see above table) is consistent with the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28 and the guidance in paragraph 606-10-32-33.

Case C – Residual Approach Is Inappropriate**606-10-55-269**

The same facts as in Case B apply to Case C except the transaction price is \$105 instead of \$130. Consequently, the application of the residual approach would result in a standalone selling price of \$5 for Product D (\$105 transaction price less \$100 allocated to Products A, B, and C). The entity concludes that \$5 would not faithfully depict the amount of consideration to which the entity expects to

be entitled in exchange for satisfying its performance obligation to transfer Product D because \$5 does not approximate the standalone selling price of Product D, which ranges from \$15 – \$45. Consequently, the entity reviews its observable data, including sales and margin reports, to estimate the standalone selling price of Product D using another suitable method. The entity allocates the transaction price of \$105 to Products A, B, C, and D using the relative standalone selling prices of those products in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-28 through 32-35.

How we see it

Allocating a discount in a multiple-element arrangement to certain, but not all, performance obligations within the contract is a significant change from legacy practice. Under legacy GAAP, discounts inherent in contracts generally are allocated across all deliverables proportionately or allocated only to the first-delivered items. While this exception will likely be helpful in certain circumstances, the criteria that must be met to demonstrate that a discount should be associated with only some of the performance obligations in the contract likely will limit the number of transactions that will be eligible for this exception.

Question 6-6

If a discount also meets the definition of variable consideration because it is variable and/or contingent on a future event, which allocation exception should an entity apply? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 31]

TRG members generally agreed that an entity should first determine whether a variable discount meets the variable consideration exception discussed in Section 6.3. If it does not, the entity then will consider whether it meets the discount exception discussed in Section 6.4. In reaching that conclusion, the TRG agenda paper noted that ASC 606-10-32-41 establishes a hierarchy for allocating variable consideration that requires an entity to first identify variable consideration and determine whether it should allocate variable consideration to one or some, but not all, performance obligations (or distinct goods or services that comprise a single performance obligation) based on the exception for allocating variable consideration. The entity would consider the requirements for allocating a discount only if the discount is not variable consideration (i.e., the dollar amount is fixed and not contingent on future events) or the entity does not meet the criteria to allocate variable consideration to a specific part of the contract.

6.5

Changes in transaction price after contract inception

The standard provides the following guidance on accounting for changes in the transaction price after contract inception:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Measurement

Changes in the Transaction Price

606-10-32-42

After contract inception, the transaction price can change for various reasons, including the resolution of uncertain events or other changes in circumstances that change the amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for the promised goods or services.

606-10-32-43

An entity shall allocate to the performance obligations in the contract any subsequent changes in the transaction price on the same basis as at contract inception. Consequently, an entity shall not reallocate the transaction price to reflect changes in standalone selling prices after contract inception. Amounts allocated to a satisfied performance obligation shall be recognized as revenue, or as a reduction of revenue, in the period in which the transaction price changes.

606-10-32-44

An entity shall allocate a change in the transaction price entirely to one or more, but not all, performance obligations or distinct goods or services promised in a series that forms part of a single performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b) only if the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 on allocating variable consideration are met.

606-10-32-45

An entity shall account for a change in the transaction price that arises as a result of a contract modification in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-10 through 25-13. However, for a change in the transaction price that occurs after a contract modification, an entity shall apply paragraphs 606-10-32-42 through 32-44 to allocate the change in the transaction price in whichever of the following ways is applicable:

- a. An entity shall allocate the change in the transaction price to the performance obligations identified in the contract before the modification if, and to the extent that, the change in the transaction price is attributable to an amount of variable consideration promised before the modification and the modification is accounted for in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-13(a).
- b. In all other cases in which the modification was not accounted for as a separate contract in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-12, an entity shall allocate the change in the transaction price to the performance obligations in the modified contract (that is, the performance obligations that were unsatisfied or partially unsatisfied immediately after the modification).

As stated above, changes in the total transaction price generally are allocated to the separate performance obligations on the same basis as the initial allocation, whether they are allocated based on the relative standalone selling price (i.e., using the same proportionate share of the total) or to individual performance obligations under the variable consideration exception discussed in Section 6.3. As discussed in Section 6.1, standalone selling prices are not updated after contract inception, unless the contract has been modified.

If the change in the transaction price is due to a contract modification, the contract modification guidance in ASC 606-10-25-10 through 25-13 must be followed (see Section 3.4 for a discussion of contract modifications).

However, when contracts include variable consideration, it is possible that changes in the transaction price can arise after a modification, and such changes may or may not be related to performance obligations that existed before the modification. For changes in the transaction price arising after a contract modification that was not treated as a separate contract, an entity must apply one of the two approaches included in ASC 606-10-32-45 above.

6.6**Allocation of transaction price to elements outside the scope of the standard**

Revenue arrangements frequently contain multiple elements, including some elements that are not in the scope of the revenue literature. As discussed further in Section 2.4, the standard indicates that in such situations, an entity must first apply the other guidance if that guidance addresses separation and/or measurement.

For example, other guidance requires certain items, such as derivatives within the scope of ASC 815 and guarantees within the scope of ASC 460, to be accounted for at fair value. As a result, when a revenue arrangement includes that type of element, the fair value of that element must be separated from the total transaction price, and the remaining transaction price should be allocated to the remaining performance obligations.

The following example illustrates this concept:

Illustration 6-3: Arrangements with elements outside the scope of the standard

Company A, an auto manufacturer, sells vehicles to Company B, a fleet customer, under contracts that include guaranteed auction values (i.e., a guaranteed minimum resale value). Company B takes title to each vehicle at the time of sale, and title remains with Company B until resale to a third party. Upon resale by Company B, to the extent the resale price is below the guaranteed minimum resale value, Company A agrees to pay Company B the difference between the resale proceeds received and the guaranteed minimum resale value. The guaranteed minimum resale value is agreed to at the inception of the contract and is a fixed amount. The contract does not include a repurchase agreement (see Section 7.3) under the standard (i.e., title does not revert back to the manufacturer at any time).

Company A sells a vehicle to Company B for total consideration of \$50,000. The standalone selling price of the vehicle and the fair value of the guarantee are \$48,000 and \$4,000, respectively.

Analysis

The contract with a guaranteed minimum resale value contains a guarantee within the scope of ASC 460 (see further discussion in Section 7.3.3). In accordance with ASC 606-10-15-4, because ASC 460 provides measurement guidance (i.e., requires that guarantees in its scope be initially recorded at fair value), Company A will exclude from the transaction price the guarantee's fair value and allocate the remaining transaction price to the vehicle. The allocation of the total transaction price is as follows:

	Selling price and fair value	% Allocated discount	Allocated discount	Arrangement consideration allocation
Vehicle	\$ 48,000	100%	\$ 2,000	\$ 46,000
Guarantee	<u>4,000</u>	0%	<u>—</u>	<u>4,000</u>
	<u>\$ 52,000</u>		<u>\$ 2,000</u>	<u>\$ 50,000</u>

For elements that must be accounted for at fair value at inception, any remeasurement (i.e., the “day two” accounting) should be pursuant to other GAAP (e.g., ASC 815 on derivatives, ASC 460 on guarantees). That is, subsequent adjustments to the fair value of those elements have no effect on the amount of the transaction price previously allocated to any performance obligations included in the arrangement or on revenue recognized.

7 Satisfaction of performance obligations

Under the standard, an entity recognizes revenue only when it satisfies a performance obligation by transferring a promised good or service to a customer. A good or service is considered to be transferred when the customer obtains control. Recognizing revenue upon a transfer of control is a different approach from the “risks and rewards” model in legacy GAAP. The standard defines control as an entity’s ability to direct the use of and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits of an asset. The Board noted¹⁵⁶ that both goods and services are assets that a customer acquires (even if many services are not recognized as an asset because those services are simultaneously received and consumed by the customer). The FASB explained the key terms in the definition of control in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁵⁷ as follows:

- ▶ **Ability** – A customer must have the present right to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, an asset for an entity to recognize revenue. For example, in a contract that requires a manufacturer to produce an asset for a customer, it might be clear that the customer will ultimately have the right to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. However, the entity should not recognize revenue until the customer has actually obtained that right (which, depending on the contract, might occur during production or afterwards).
- ▶ **Direct the use of** – A customer’s ability to direct the use of an asset refers to the customer’s right to deploy or to allow another entity to deploy that asset in its activities or to restrict another entity from deploying that asset.
- ▶ **Obtain the benefits from** – The customer must have the ability to obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from an asset for the customer to obtain control of it. Conceptually, the benefits from a good or service are potential cash flows (either an increase in cash inflows or a decrease in cash outflows). A customer can obtain the benefits directly or indirectly in many ways, such as by using, consuming, disposing of, selling, exchanging, pledging or holding an asset.

The transfer of control to the customer represents the transfer of the rights with regard to the good or service. The customer’s ability to receive the benefit from the good or service is represented by its right to substantially all of the cash inflows, or the reduction of cash outflows, generated by the goods or services. Upon transfer of control, the customer has sole possession of the right to use the good or service for the remainder of its economic life or to consume the good or service in its own operations.

The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁵⁸ that control should be assessed primarily from the customer’s perspective. While a seller often surrenders control at the same time the customer obtains control, the Board required the assessment of control to be from the customer’s perspective to minimize the risk of an entity recognizing revenue from activities that do not coincide with the transfer of goods or services to the customer.

The standard states that an entity must determine at contract inception whether it will transfer control of a promised good or service over time. If an entity does not satisfy a performance obligation over time, the performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time. These concepts are explored further in the following sections.

¹⁵⁶ Paragraph BC118 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁵⁷ Paragraph BC120 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁵⁸ Paragraph BC121 of ASU 2014-09.

The standard provides the following overall guidance on satisfaction of performance obligations:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Satisfaction of Performance Obligations

606-10-25-23

An entity shall recognize revenue when (or as) the entity satisfies a performance obligation by transferring a promised good or service (that is, an asset) to a customer. An asset is transferred when (or as) the customer obtains control of that asset.

606-10-25-24

For each performance obligation identified in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-22, an entity shall determine at contract inception whether it satisfies the performance obligation over time (in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-27 through 25-29) or satisfies the performance obligation at a point in time (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-30). If an entity does not satisfy a performance obligation over time, the performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time.

606-10-25-25

Goods and services are assets, even if only momentarily, when they are received and used (as in the case of many services). Control of an asset refers to the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. Control includes the ability to prevent other entities from directing the use of, and obtaining the benefits from, an asset. The benefits of an asset are the potential cash flows (inflows or savings in outflows) that can be obtained directly or indirectly in many ways, such as by:

- a. Using the asset to produce goods or provide services (including public services)
- b. Using the asset to enhance the value of other assets
- c. Using the asset to settle liabilities or reduce expenses
- d. Selling or exchanging the asset
- e. Pledging the asset to secure a loan
- f. Holding the asset.

7.1 Performance obligations satisfied over time

Frequently, entities transfer promised goods and services to a customer over time. While the determination of whether goods or services are transferred over time is straightforward in some contracts (e.g., many service contracts), this determination is more difficult in other contracts. To help entities determine whether control transfers over time (rather than at a point in time), the FASB provided the following guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Performance Obligations Satisfied Over Time

606-10-25-27

An entity transfers control of a good or service over time and, therefore, satisfies a **performance obligation** and recognizes **revenue** over time, if one of the following criteria is met:

- a. The **customer** simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits provided by the entity's performance as the entity performs (see paragraphs 606-10-55-5 through 55-6).
- b. The entity's performance creates or enhances an asset (for example, work in process) that the customer controls as the asset is created or enhanced (see paragraph 606-10-55-7).
- c. The entity's performance does not create an asset with an alternative use to the entity (see paragraph 606-10-25-28), and the entity has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date (see paragraph 606-10-25-29).

Examples of each of the above criteria are included in the following sections. If an entity is unable to demonstrate that control transfers over time, the presumption is that control transfers at a point in time (see Section 7.2).

How we see it

For each performance obligation identified in the contract, an entity is required to consider at contract inception whether it satisfies the performance obligation over time (i.e., whether it meets one of the three criteria for over time recognition) or at a point in time. This evaluation will require many entities to perform new analyses or analyses that differ from what they do under legacy GAAP. For example, an entity with construction contracts is no longer required to evaluate whether the transactions are in the scope of legacy industry-specific guidance (i.e., ASC 605-35) but instead needs to determine whether its performance obligations are satisfied over time by evaluating the three criteria for over time recognition. If an entity does not satisfy a performance obligation over time, the performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time.

7.1.1 Customer simultaneously receives and consumes benefits as the entity performs

As the Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁵⁹ the entity's performance in many service contracts creates an asset only momentarily because that asset is simultaneously received and consumed by the customer. In these cases, the customer obtains control of the entity's output as it performs and, thus, the performance obligation is satisfied over time. Because there may be service contracts in which it is unclear whether the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefit of the entity's performance over time, the Board included the following implementation guidance in the standard:

¹⁵⁹ Paragraph BC125 of ASU 2014-09.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Simultaneous Receipt and Consumption of the Benefits of the Entity's Performance (paragraph 606-10-25-27(a))

606-10-55-5

For some types of **performance obligations**, the assessment of whether a **customer** receives the benefits of an entity's performance as the entity performs and simultaneously consumes those benefits as they are received will be straightforward. Examples include routine or recurring services (such as a cleaning service) in which the receipt and simultaneous consumption by the customer of the benefits of the entity's performance can be readily identified.

606-10-55-6

For other types of performance obligations, an entity may not be able to readily identify whether a customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits from the entity's performance as the entity performs. In those circumstances, a performance obligation is satisfied over time if an entity determines that another entity would not need to substantially reperform the work that the entity has completed to date if that other entity were to fulfill the remaining performance obligation to the customer. In determining whether another entity would not need to substantially reperform the work the entity has completed to date, an entity should make both of the following assumptions:

- a. Disregard potential contractual restrictions or practical limitations that otherwise would prevent the entity from transferring the remaining performance obligation to another entity
- b. Presume that another entity fulfilling the remainder of the performance obligation would not have the benefit of any asset that is presently controlled by the entity and that would remain controlled by the entity if the performance obligation were to transfer to another entity.

The Board added this implementation guidance because the notion of "benefit" can be subjective. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁶⁰ the Board provided an example of a freight logistics contract in which the entity has agreed to transport goods from Vancouver to New York City. Some stakeholders suggested that the customer receives no benefit from the entity's performance until the goods are delivered to New York City. However, the Board said the customer benefits as the entity performs because if the goods were only delivered part way (e.g., to Chicago), another entity would not need to substantially reperform the entity's performance to date. The Board observed that in these cases, the assessment of whether another entity would need to substantially reperform the entity's performance to date is an objective way to assess whether the customer receives benefit from the entity's performance as it occurs.

In assessing whether a customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits provided by an entity's performance, all relevant facts and circumstances should be considered, including the inherent characteristics of the good or service, the contract terms and information about how the good or service is transferred or delivered. However, as noted in ASC 606-10-55-6a, the Board decided that an entity should disregard any contractual or practical restrictions when it assesses this criterion. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁶¹ the FASB explained that the assessment of whether control of the goods or services has transferred to the customer should be performed by making a hypothetical assessment of

¹⁶⁰ Paragraph BC126 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁶¹ Paragraph BC127 of ASU 2014-09.

what another entity would need to do if it were to take over the remaining performance. Therefore, actual practical or contractual restrictions would have no bearing on the assessment of whether the entity had already transferred control of the goods or services provided to date.

The standard provides the following example showing a customer simultaneously receiving and consuming the benefits as the entity performs a series of distinct payroll processing services:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 13 – Customer Simultaneously Receives and Consumes the Benefits

606-10-55-159

An entity enters into a contract to provide monthly payroll processing services to a customer for one year.

606-10-55-160

The promised payroll processing services are accounted for as a single performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-14(b). The performance obligation is satisfied over time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27(a) because the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits of the entity's performance in processing each payroll transaction as and when each transaction is processed. The fact that another entity would not need to reperform payroll processing services for the service that the entity has provided to date also demonstrates that the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits of the entity's performance as the entity performs. (The entity disregards any practical limitations on transferring the remaining performance obligation, including setup activities that would need to be undertaken by another entity.) The entity recognizes revenue over time by measuring its progress toward complete satisfaction of that performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 and 606-10-55-16 through 55-21.

The FASB clarified in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁶² that an entity does not evaluate this criterion to determine whether a performance obligation is satisfied over time if the entity's performance creates an asset the customer does not consume immediately as the asset is received. Instead, an entity assesses that performance obligation using the criteria discussed in Sections 7.1.2 and 7.1.3.

For some service contracts, an entity will not satisfy its obligation over time because the customer does not consume the benefit of the entity's performance until the entity's performance is complete. Example 14 in the standard (excerpted in full in Section 7.1.3) depicts an entity providing consulting services that will take the form of a professional opinion upon the completion of the services. In this situation, an entity cannot conclude that the services are transferred over time based on this criterion. Instead, it must consider the other two criteria (see Sections 7.1.2 and 7.1.3 and Example 14 below).

7.1.2 Customer controls asset as it is created or enhanced

The second criterion for determining whether control of a good or service is transferred over time requires entities to evaluate whether the customer controls the asset as it is being created or enhanced. This criterion is described in the standard as follows:

¹⁶² Paragraph BC128 of ASU 2014-09.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Customer Controls the Asset As It Is Created or Enhanced (paragraph 606-10-25-27(b))

606-10-55-7

In determining whether a customer controls an asset as it is created or enhanced in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27(b), an entity should apply the guidance on control in paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-26 and 606-10-25-30. The asset that is being created or enhanced (for example, a work in process asset) could be either tangible or intangible.

For purposes of this determination, the definition of “control” is the same as previously discussed (i.e., the ability to direct the use of and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the asset). The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁶³ that this criterion addresses situations in which the customer controls any work in progress arising from the entity’s performance. For example, many construction contracts with the US federal government contain clauses indicating that the government owns any work-in-progress as the contracted item is being built and, as a result, the performance obligation would be satisfied over time. Further, the asset being created or enhanced can be intangible.

How we see it

The Board observed in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁶⁴ that the second over-time criterion (related to the customer’s control of the asset as it is being created or enhanced) is consistent with the rationale for the percentage-of-completion revenue recognition approach for construction contracts under ASC 605-35. Both approaches acknowledge that, in effect, the entity has agreed to sell its rights to the asset (i.e., work in progress) as the entity performs (i.e., a continuous sale).

7.1.3

Asset with no alternative use and right to payment

In some cases, it may be unclear whether the asset that an entity creates or enhances is controlled by the customer when considering the first two criteria for evaluating whether control transfers over time. Therefore, the Board added a third criterion, which requires revenue to be recognized over time if both of the following requirements are met:

- ▶ The entity’s performance does not create an asset with an alternative use to the entity.
- ▶ The entity has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date.

Each of these concepts is discussed further below.

Alternative use

The FASB said in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁶⁵ that it developed the notion of “alternative use” to prevent over time revenue recognition when the entity’s performance does not transfer control of the goods or services to the customer over time. When the entity’s performance creates an asset with an alternative use to the entity (e.g., standard inventory items), the entity can

¹⁶³ Paragraph BC129 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁶⁴ Paragraph BC130 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁶⁵ Paragraph BC134 of ASU 2014-09.

readily direct the asset to another customer. In those cases, the entity (not the customer) controls the asset as it is created because the customer does not have the ability to direct the use of the asset or restrict the entity from directing that asset to another customer. The standard includes the following guidance on alternative use:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Performance Obligations Satisfied Over Time

606-10-25-28

An asset created by an entity's performance does not have an alternative use to an entity if the entity is either restricted contractually from readily directing the asset for another use during the creation or enhancement of that asset or limited practically from readily directing the asset in its completed state to another use. The assessment of whether an asset has an alternative use to the entity is made at contract inception. After contract inception, an entity shall not update the assessment of the alternative use of an asset unless the parties to the **contract** approve a contract modification that substantively changes the performance obligation. Paragraphs 606-10-55-8 through 55-10 provide guidance for assessing whether an asset has an alternative use to an entity.

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Entity's Performance Does Not Create an Asset with an Alternative Use (paragraph 606-10-25-27(c))

606-10-55-8

In assessing whether an asset has an alternative use to an entity in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-28, an entity should consider the effects of contractual restrictions and practical limitations on the entity's ability to readily direct that asset for another use, such as selling it to a different **customer**. The possibility of the **contract** with the customer being terminated is not a relevant consideration in assessing whether the entity would be able to readily direct the asset for another use.

606-10-55-9

A contractual restriction on an entity's ability to direct an asset for another use must be substantive for the asset not to have an alternative use to the entity. A contractual restriction is substantive if a customer could enforce its rights to the promised asset if the entity sought to direct the asset for another use. In contrast, a contractual restriction is not substantive if, for example, an asset is largely interchangeable with other assets that the entity could transfer to another customer without breaching the contract and without incurring significant costs that otherwise would not have been incurred in relation to that contract.

606-10-55-10

A practical limitation on an entity's ability to direct an asset for another use exists if an entity would incur significant economic losses to direct the asset for another use. A significant economic loss could arise because the entity either would incur significant costs to rework the asset or would only be able to sell the asset at a significant loss. For example, an entity may be practically limited from redirecting assets that either have design specifications that are unique to a customer or are located in remote areas.

In making the assessment of whether a good or service has an alternative use, an entity must consider any substantive contractual restrictions. A contractual restriction is substantive if an entity expects the customer to enforce its rights to the promised asset if the entity sought to direct the asset for another use.

Contractual restrictions that are not substantive, such as protective rights for the customer, should not be considered. The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁶⁶ that a protective right typically gives an entity the practical ability to physically substitute or redirect the asset without the customer's knowledge or objection to the change. For example, a contract that states an entity cannot transfer a good to another customer because the customer has legal title to the good would not be substantive if the entity could physically substitute another good and redirect the original good to another customer for little cost. In this case, the contractual restriction is merely a protective right, and the entity concludes that control of the asset has not transferred to the customer.

An entity also will need to consider any practical limitations on directing the asset for another use. In making this determination, the Board clarified in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁶⁷ that an entity should consider the characteristics of the asset that ultimately will be transferred to the customer and assess whether the asset in its completed state could be redirected without a significant cost of rework. The Board provided an example of manufacturing contracts in which the basic design of the asset is the same across all contracts but substantial customization is made to the asset. As a result, redirecting the finished asset would require significant rework, and the asset would not have an alternative use because the entity would incur significant economic losses to direct the asset for another use.

Considering the level of customization of an asset may help entities assess whether an asset has an alternative use. The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁶⁸ that when an entity is creating an asset that is highly customized for a particular customer, it is less likely that the entity could use that asset for any other purpose. That is, the entity would likely need to incur significant rework costs to redirect the asset to another customer or sell the asset at a significantly reduced price. As a result, the asset would not have an alternative use to the entity, and the customer could be regarded as receiving the benefit of the entity's performance as the entity performs (i.e., having control of the asset) provided that the entity also has an enforceable right to payment (discussed below). However, the Board clarified¹⁶⁹ that the level of customization is a factor to consider, but it should not be a determinative factor. For example, in some real estate contracts, the asset may be standardized (i.e., not highly customized) but still may not have an alternative use to the entity because of substantive contractual restrictions that preclude the entity from readily directing the asset to another customer.

The standard provides the following example to illustrate an evaluation of practical limitations on directing an asset for another use:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 15 – Asset Has No Alternative Use to the Entity

606-10-55-165

An entity enters into a contract with a customer, a government agency, to build a specialized satellite. The entity builds satellites for various customers, such as governments and commercial entities. The design and construction of each satellite differ substantially, on the basis of each customer's needs and the type of technology that is incorporated into the satellite.

¹⁶⁶ Paragraph BC138 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁶⁷ Paragraph BC136 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁶⁸ Paragraph BC135 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁶⁹ Paragraph BC137 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-55-166

At contract inception, the entity assesses whether its performance obligation to build the satellite is a performance obligation satisfied over time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27.

606-10-55-167

As part of that assessment, the entity considers whether the satellite in its completed state will have an alternative use to the entity. Although the contract does not preclude the entity from directing the completed satellite to another customer, the entity would incur significant costs to rework the design and function of the satellite to direct that asset to another customer. Consequently, the asset has no alternative use to the entity (see paragraphs 606-10-25-27(c), 606-10-25-28, and 606-10-55-8 through 55-10) because the customer-specific design of the satellite limits the entity's practical ability to readily direct the satellite to another customer.

606-10-55-168

For the entity's performance obligation to be satisfied over time when building the satellite, paragraph 606-10-25-27(c) also requires the entity to have an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date. This condition is not illustrated in this Example.

Requiring an entity to assess contractual restrictions when evaluating this criterion may seem to contradict the requirements in ASC 606-10-55-6 to ignore contractual and practical restrictions when evaluating whether another entity would need to substantially reperform the work the entity has completed to date (see Section 7.1.1). The Board explained¹⁷⁰ that this difference is appropriate because each criterion provides a different method for assessing when control transfers, and the criteria were designed to apply to different situations.

After contract inception, an entity does not update its assessment of whether an asset has an alternative use for any subsequent changes in facts and circumstances, unless the parties approve a contract modification that substantively changes the performance obligation. The FASB also decided¹⁷¹ that an entity's lack of an alternative use for an asset does not, by itself, mean that the customer effectively controls the asset. The entity would also need to determine that it has an enforceable right to payment for performance to date, as discussed below.

Enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date

To evaluate whether it has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date, the entity is required to consider the terms of the contract and any laws or regulations that relate to it. The standard states that the right to payment for performance completed to date need not be for a fixed amount. However, at any time during the contract term, an entity must be entitled to an amount that at least compensates the entity for performance completed to date if the contract is terminated by the customer (or another party) for reasons other than the entity's failure to perform as promised. The FASB concluded¹⁷² that a customer's obligation to pay for the entity's performance is an indicator that the customer has obtained benefit from the entity's performance.

¹⁷⁰ Paragraph BC139 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁷¹ Paragraph BC141 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁷² Paragraph BC142 of ASU 2014-09.

The standard says the following about an entity's right to payment for performance completed to date:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Performance Obligations Satisfied Over Time

606-10-25-29

An entity shall consider the terms of the contract, as well as any laws that apply to the contract, when evaluating whether it has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27(c). The right to payment for performance completed to date does not need to be for a fixed amount. However, at all times throughout the duration of the contract, the entity must be entitled to an amount that at least compensates the entity for performance completed to date if the contract is terminated by the customer or another party for reasons other than the entity's failure to perform as promised. Paragraphs 606-10-55-11 through 55-15 provide guidance for assessing the existence and enforceability of a right to payment and whether an entity's right to payment would entitle the entity to be paid for its performance completed to date.

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date (paragraph 606-10-25-27(c))

606-10-55-11

In accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-29, an entity has a right to payment for performance completed to date if the entity would be entitled to an amount that at least compensates the entity for its performance completed to date in the event that the **customer** or another party terminates the **contract** for reasons other than the entity's failure to perform as promised. An amount that would compensate an entity for performance completed to date would be an amount that approximates the selling price of the goods or services transferred to date (for example, recovery of the costs incurred by an entity in satisfying the **performance obligation** plus a reasonable profit margin) rather than compensation for only the entity's potential loss of profit if the contract were to be terminated. Compensation for a reasonable profit margin need not equal the profit margin expected if the contract was fulfilled as promised, but an entity should be entitled to compensation for either of the following amounts:

- a. A proportion of the expected profit margin in the contract that reasonably reflects the extent of the entity's performance under the contract before termination by the customer (or another party)
- b. A reasonable return on the entity's cost of capital for similar contracts (or the entity's typical operating margin for similar contracts) if the contract-specific margin is higher than the return the entity usually generates from similar contracts.

606-10-55-12

An entity's right to payment for performance completed to date need not be a present unconditional right to payment. In many cases, an entity will have an unconditional right to payment only at an agreed-upon milestone or upon complete satisfaction of the performance obligation. In assessing whether it has a right to payment for performance completed to date, an entity should consider whether it would have an enforceable right to demand or retain payment for performance completed to date if the contract were to be terminated before completion for reasons other than the entity's failure to perform as promised.

606-10-55-13

In some contracts, a customer may have a right to terminate the contract only at specified times during the life of the contract or the customer might not have any right to terminate the contract. If a customer acts to terminate a contract without having the right to terminate the contract at that time

(including when a customer fails to perform its obligations as promised), the contract (or other laws) might entitle the entity to continue to transfer to the customer the goods or services promised in the contract and require the customer to pay the consideration promised in exchange for those goods or services. In those circumstances, an entity has a right to payment for performance completed to date because the entity has a right to continue to perform its obligations in accordance with the contract and to require the customer to perform its obligations (which include paying the promised consideration).

606-10-55-14

In assessing the existence and enforceability of a right to payment for performance completed to date, an entity should consider the contractual terms as well as any legislation or legal precedent that could supplement or override those contractual terms. This would include an assessment of whether:

- a. Legislation, administrative practice, or legal precedent confers upon the entity a right to payment for performance to date even though that right is not specified in the contract with the customer.
- b. Relevant legal precedent indicates that similar rights to payment for performance completed to date in similar contracts have no binding legal effect.
- c. An entity's customary business practices of choosing not to enforce a right to payment has resulted in the right being rendered unenforceable in that legal environment. However, notwithstanding that an entity may choose to waive its right to payment in similar contracts, an entity would continue to have a right to payment to date if, in the contract with the customer, its right to payment for performance to date remains enforceable.

606-10-55-15

The payment schedule specified in a contract does not necessarily indicate whether an entity has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date. Although the payment schedule in a contract specifies the timing and amount of consideration that is payable by a customer, the payment schedule might not necessarily provide evidence of the entity's right to payment for performance completed to date. This is because, for example, the contract could specify that the consideration received from the customer is refundable for reasons other than the entity failing to perform as promised in the contract.

The FASB described in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁷³ how the factors of "no alternative use" and the "right to payment" relate to the assessment of control. Because an entity is constructing an asset with no alternative use to the entity, the entity is effectively creating an asset at the direction of the customer. That asset would have little or no value to the entity if the customer terminated the contract. As a result, the entity will seek economic protection from the risk of customer termination by requiring the customer to pay for the entity's performance to date upon customer termination. The customer's obligation to pay for the entity's performance to date (or, the inability to avoid paying for that performance) suggests that the customer has obtained the benefits from the entity's performance.

The enforceable right to payment criterion has two components that an entity must assess: (1) what *amount* would the customer be required to pay and (2) what does it mean to have the *enforceable right* to payment. The Board provided additional guidance on how to evaluate each of these components.

First, the Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁷⁴ that the focus of the analysis should be on the amount to which the entity would be entitled upon termination. This amount is not the amount the entity would settle for in a negotiation, and it does not need to reflect the full contract margin

¹⁷³ Paragraph BC142 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁷⁴ Paragraph BC144 of ASU 2014-09.

the entity would earn if the contract were completed. The Board clarified in ASC 606-10-55-11 that a “reasonable profit margin” would either be a proportion of the entity’s expected profit margin that reasonably reflects the entity’s performance to date or a reasonable return on the entity’s cost of capital. In addition, the standard clarifies in ASC 606-10-55-15 that including a payment schedule in a contract does not, by itself, indicate that the entity has the right to payment for performance completed to date. The entity must examine information that may contradict the payment schedule and may represent the entity’s actual right to payment for performance completed to date. As highlighted in Example 16 below, payments from a customer must approximate the selling price of the goods or services transferred to date to be considered a right to payment for performance to date. A fixed payment schedule may not meet this requirement.

Second, the Board added guidance in ASC 606-10-55-14 to help an entity determine whether the right to payment is enforceable. Entities are required to consider any laws, legislation or legal precedent that could supplement or override the contractual terms. This may require entities to consult with legal counsel to establish their enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date. Further, the standard states that an entity can have an enforceable right to payment even when the customer does not have the right to terminate if the contract (or other laws) entitles the entity to continue to transfer the goods or services promised in the contract and require the customer to pay the consideration promised for those goods or services (often referred to as specific performance). The standard also states that even when an entity chooses to waive its right to payment in other similar contracts, an entity would continue to have a right to payment for the contract if, in the contract, its right to payment for performance to date remains enforceable.

The standard provides the following examples to illustrate the concepts described in Section 7.1.3. Example 14 depicts an entity providing consulting services that will take the form of a professional opinion upon the completion of the services as follows. In this example, the entity’s performance obligation meets the no alternative use and right to payment criterion of ASC 606-10-25-27(c) as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 14 – Assessing Alternative Use and Right to Payment

606-10-55-161

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to provide a consulting service that results in the entity providing a professional opinion to the customer. The professional opinion relates to facts and circumstances that are specific to the customer. If the customer were to terminate the consulting contract for reasons other than the entity’s failure to perform as promised, the contract requires the customer to compensate the entity for its costs incurred plus a 15 percent margin. The 15 percent margin approximates the profit margin that the entity earns from similar contracts.

606-10-55-162

The entity considers the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-27(a) and the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-55-5 through 55-6 to determine whether the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits of the entity’s performance. If the entity were to be unable to satisfy its obligation and the customer hired another consulting firm to provide the opinion, the other consulting firm would need to substantially reperform the work that the entity had completed to date because the other consulting firm would not have the benefit of any work in progress performed by the entity. The nature of the professional opinion is such that the customer will receive the benefits of the entity’s performance only when the customer receives the professional opinion. Consequently, the entity concludes that the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-27(a) is not met.

606-10-55-163

However, the entity's performance obligation meets the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-27(c) and is a performance obligation satisfied over time because of both of the following factors:

- a. In accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-28 and 606-10-55-8 through 55-10, the development of the professional opinion does not create an asset with alternative use to the entity because the professional opinion relates to facts and circumstances that are specific to the customer. Therefore, there is a practical limitation on the entity's ability to readily direct the asset to another customer.
- b. In accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-29 and 606-10-55-11 through 55-15, the entity has an enforceable right to payment for its performance completed to date for its costs plus a reasonable margin, which approximates the profit margin in other contracts.

606-10-55-164

Consequently, the entity recognizes revenue over time by measuring the progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 and 606-10-55-16 through 55-21.

Example 16 illustrates a contract in which the fixed payment schedule is not expected to correspond, at all times throughout the contract, to the amount that would be necessary to compensate the entity for performance completed to date. Accordingly, the entity concludes that it does not have an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Implementation Guidance and Illustrations***Example 16 – Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date****606-10-55-169**

An entity enters into a contract with a customer to build an item of equipment. The payment schedule in the contract specifies that the customer must make an advance payment at contract inception of 10 percent of the contract price, regular payments throughout the construction period (amounting to 50 percent of the contract price), and a final payment of 40 percent of the contract price after construction is completed and the equipment has passed the prescribed performance tests. The payments are nonrefundable unless the entity fails to perform as promised. If the customer terminates the contract, the entity is entitled only to retain any progress payments received from the customer. The entity has no further rights to compensation from the customer.

606-10-55-170

At contract inception, the entity assesses whether its performance obligation to build the equipment is a performance obligation satisfied over time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27.

606-10-55-171

As part of that assessment, the entity considers whether it has an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-27(c), 606-10-25-29, and 606-10-55-11 through 55-15 if the customer were to terminate the contract for reasons other than the entity's failure to perform as promised. Even though the payments made by the customer are nonrefundable, the cumulative amount of those payments is not expected, at all times throughout the contract, to at least correspond to the amount that would be necessary to compensate the entity for performance completed to date. This is because at various times during construction the cumulative amount of consideration paid by the customer might be less than the selling price of the partially completed item of equipment at that time. Consequently, the entity does not have a right to payment for performance completed to date.

606-10-55-172

Because the entity does not have a right to payment for performance completed to date, the entity's performance obligation is not satisfied over time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27(c). Accordingly, the entity does not need to assess whether the equipment would have an alternative use to the entity. The entity also concludes that it does not meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-27(a) or (b), and, thus, the entity accounts for the construction of the equipment as a performance obligation satisfied at a point in time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-30.

Example 17 contrasts similar situations and illustrates when revenue would be recognized over time (see Section 7.1) versus at a point in time (see Section 7.2). Specifically, this example illustrates the evaluation of the no alternative use and right to payment for performance to date concepts as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Implementation Guidance and Illustrations***Example 17 – Assessing Whether a Performance Obligation Is Satisfied at a Point in Time or Over Time****606-10-55-173**

An entity is developing a multi-unit residential complex. A customer enters into a binding sales contract with the entity for a specified unit that is under construction. Each unit has a similar floor plan and is of a similar size, but other attributes of the units are different (for example, the location of the unit within the complex).

Case A – Entity Does Not Have an Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date**606-10-55-174**

The customer pays a deposit upon entering into the contract, and the deposit is refundable only if the entity fails to complete construction of the unit in accordance with the contract. The remainder of the contract price is payable on completion of the contract when the customer obtains physical possession of the unit. If the customer defaults on the contract before completion of the unit, the entity only has the right to retain the deposit.

606-10-55-175

At contract inception, the entity applies paragraph 606-10-25-27(c) to determine whether its promise to construct and transfer the unit to the customer is a performance obligation satisfied over time. The entity determines that it does not have an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date because until construction of the unit is complete, the entity only has a right to the deposit paid by the customer. Because the entity does not have a right to payment for work completed to date, the entity's performance obligation is not a performance obligation satisfied over time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27(c). Instead, the entity accounts for the sale of the unit as a performance obligation satisfied at a point in time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-30.

Case B – Entity Has an Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date**606-10-55-176**

The customer pays a nonrefundable deposit upon entering into the contract and will make progress payments during construction of the unit. The contract has substantive terms that preclude the entity from being able to direct the unit to another customer. In addition, the customer does not have the right to terminate the contract unless the entity fails to perform as promised. If the customer defaults on its obligations by failing to make the promised progress payments as and when they are due, the entity would have a right to all of the consideration promised in the contract if it completes the construction of the unit. The courts have previously upheld similar rights that entitle developers to require the customer to perform, subject to the entity meeting its obligations under the contract.

606-10-55-177

At contract inception, the entity applies paragraph 606-10-25-27(c) to determine whether its promise to construct and transfer the unit to the customer is a performance obligation satisfied over time. The entity determines that the asset (unit) created by the entity's performance does not have an alternative use to the entity because the contract precludes the entity from transferring the specified unit to another customer. The entity does not consider the possibility of a contract termination in assessing whether the entity is able to direct the asset to another customer.

606-10-55-178

The entity also has a right to payment for performance completed to date in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-29 and 606-10-55-11 through 55-15. This is because if the customer were to default on its obligations, the entity would have an enforceable right to all of the consideration promised under the contract if it continues to perform as promised.

606-10-55-179

Therefore, the terms of the contract and the practices in the legal jurisdiction indicate that there is a right to payment for performance completed to date. Consequently, the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-27(c) are met, and the entity has a performance obligation that it satisfies over time. To recognize revenue for that performance obligation satisfied over time, the entity measures its progress toward complete satisfaction of its performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 and 606-10-55-16 through 55-21.

606-10-55-180

In the construction of a multi-unit residential complex, the entity may have many contracts with individual customers for the construction of individual units within the complex. The entity would account for each contract separately. However, depending on the nature of the construction, the entity's performance in undertaking the initial construction works (that is, the foundation and the basic structure), as well as the construction of common areas, may need to be reflected when measuring its progress toward complete satisfaction of its performance obligations in each contract.

Case C – Entity Has an Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date**606-10-55-181**

The same facts as in Case B apply to Case C, except that in the event of a default by the customer, either the entity can require the customer to perform as required under the contract or the entity can cancel the contract in exchange for the asset under construction and an entitlement to a penalty of a proportion of the contract price.

606-10-55-182

Notwithstanding that the entity could cancel the contract (in which case the customer's obligation to the entity would be limited to transferring control of the partially completed asset to the entity and paying the penalty prescribed), the entity has a right to payment for performance completed to date because the entity also could choose to enforce its rights to full payment under the contract. The fact that the entity may choose to cancel the contract in the event the customer defaults on its obligations would not affect that assessment (see paragraph 606-10-55-13), provided that the entity's rights to require the customer to continue to perform as required under the contract (that is, pay the promised consideration) are enforceable.

Question 7-1 In order to have an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date, does an entity need to have a present unconditional right to payment?

No. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁷⁵ the Board clarified that the contractual payment terms in a contract may not always align with an entity's enforceable rights to payment for performance completed to date. As a result, an entity does not need to have a present unconditional right to payment; instead, it must have an enforceable right to demand and/or retain payment for performance completed to date upon customer termination without cause. To illustrate this point, the Board included an example of a consulting contract that requires an entity to provide a report at the end of the project for a fixed amount due to the entity when it delivers the report. Assuming that the entity was performing under the contract and the contract or the law requires the customer to compensate the entity for its performance completed to date, the entity would have an enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date even though an unconditional right to the fixed amount only exists at the time the report is provided to the customer. This is because the entity has a right to demand and retain payment for performance completed to date.

Question 7-2 Does an entity have a right to payment for performance completed to date if the entity receives a nonrefundable up-front payment that represents the full transaction price?

Yes. The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁷⁶ that, because a full up-front payment would at least compensate an entity for work completed to date throughout the contract, such a payment would represent an entity's right to payment for performance completed to date provided that the entity's right to retain and not refund the payment is enforceable upon termination by the customer.

7.1.4 Measuring progress

When an entity has determined that a performance obligation is satisfied over time, the standard requires the entity to select a single revenue recognition method for the relevant performance obligation that faithfully depicts the entity's performance in transferring control of the goods or services. The standard provides the following guidance to meet this objective:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Measuring Progress toward Complete Satisfaction of a Performance Obligation

606-10-25-31

For each **performance obligation** satisfied over time in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-27 through 25-29, an entity shall recognize **revenue** over time by measuring the progress toward complete satisfaction of that performance obligation. The objective when measuring progress is to depict an entity's performance in transferring control of goods or services promised to a **customer** (that is, the satisfaction of an entity's performance obligation).

606-10-25-32

An entity shall apply a single method of measuring progress for each performance obligation satisfied over time, and the entity shall apply that method consistently to similar performance obligations and in similar circumstances. At the end of each reporting period, an entity shall remeasure its progress toward complete satisfaction of a performance obligation satisfied over time.

¹⁷⁵ Paragraph BC145 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁷⁶ Paragraph BC146 of ASU 2014-09.

Methods for Measuring Progress**606-10-25-33**

Appropriate methods of measuring progress include output methods and input methods. Paragraphs 606-10-55-16 through 55-21 provide guidance for using output methods and input methods to measure an entity's progress toward complete satisfaction of a performance obligation. In determining the appropriate method for measuring progress, an entity shall consider the nature of the good or service that the entity promised to transfer to the customer.

606-10-25-34

When applying a method for measuring progress, an entity shall exclude from the measure of progress any goods or services for which the entity does not transfer control to a customer. Conversely, an entity shall include in the measure of progress any goods or services for which the entity does transfer control to a customer when satisfying that performance obligation.

606-10-25-35

As circumstances change over time, an entity shall update its measure of progress to reflect any changes in the outcome of the performance obligation. Such changes to an entity's measure of progress shall be accounted for as a change in accounting estimate in accordance with Subtopic 250-10 on accounting changes and error corrections.

Reasonable Measures of Progress**606-10-25-36**

An entity shall recognize revenue for a performance obligation satisfied over time only if the entity can reasonably measure its progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation. An entity would not be able to reasonably measure its progress toward complete satisfaction of a performance obligation if it lacks reliable information that would be required to apply an appropriate method of measuring progress.

606-10-25-37

In some circumstances (for example, in the early stages of a contract), an entity may not be able to reasonably measure the outcome of a performance obligation, but the entity expects to recover the costs incurred in satisfying the performance obligation. In those circumstances, the entity shall recognize revenue only to the extent of the costs incurred until such time that it can reasonably measure the outcome of the performance obligation.

While the standard requires an entity to update its estimates related to the measure of progress selected, it does not allow a change in methods. That is, a performance obligation is accounted for under the method the entity selects (i.e., either the specific input or output method it has chosen) until the performance obligation has been fully satisfied. It would not be appropriate for an entity to start recognizing revenue based on an input measure, and then switch to an output measure (or to switch from one input method to a different input method). Further, the standard requires that the selected method be applied to similar contracts in similar circumstances and that a single method of measuring progress be used for each performance obligation. The Board noted¹⁷⁷ that applying more than one method to measure performance would effectively override the guidance on identifying performance obligations.

¹⁷⁷ Paragraph BC161 of ASU 2014-09.

If an entity does not have a reasonable basis to measure its progress, revenue should not be recognized until progress can be measured. An entity may be able to determine that a loss will not be incurred but may be unable to reasonably estimate the amount of profit. Until an entity is able to reasonably measure the outcome, the standard requires the entity to recognize revenue only up to the amount of the costs incurred. However, the FASB explained¹⁷⁸ that an entity should stop using this method once it is able to reasonably measure its progress toward satisfaction of the performance obligation. Finally, stakeholders had asked whether an entity's inability to measure progress would mean that costs also would be deferred. The Board clarified¹⁷⁹ that costs cannot be deferred in these situations unless they meet the criteria for capitalization under ASC 340-40-25-5 (see Section 9.3.2).

The standard provides two types of methods for recognizing revenue on contracts involving the transfer of goods and services over time – (1) input methods and (2) output methods. The standard says the following about those methods:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Methods for Measuring Progress toward Complete Satisfaction of a Performance Obligation

606-10-55-16

Methods that can be used to measure an entity's progress toward complete satisfaction of a **performance obligation** satisfied over time in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-27 through 25-29 include the following:

- a. Output methods (see paragraphs 606-10-55-17 through 55-19)
- b. Input methods (see paragraphs 606-10-55-20 through 55-21).

Output Methods

606-10-55-17

Output methods recognize **revenue** on the basis of direct measurements of the value to the **customer** of the goods or services transferred to date relative to the remaining goods or services promised under the **contract**. Output methods include methods such as surveys of performance completed to date, appraisals of results achieved, milestones reached, time elapsed, and units produced or units delivered. When an entity evaluates whether to apply an output method to measure its progress, the entity should consider whether the output selected would faithfully depict the entity's performance toward complete satisfaction of the **performance obligation**. An output method would not provide a faithful depiction of the entity's performance if the output selected would fail to measure some of the goods or services for which control has transferred to the customer. For example, output methods based on units produced or units delivered would not faithfully depict an entity's performance in satisfying a performance obligation if, at the end of the reporting period, the entity's performance has produced work in process or finished goods controlled by the customer that are not included in the measurement of the output.

¹⁷⁸ Paragraph BC180 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁷⁹ Paragraph BC179 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-55-18

As a practical expedient, if an entity has a right to consideration from a customer in an amount that corresponds directly with the value to the customer of the entity's performance completed to date (for example, a service contract in which an entity bills a fixed amount for each hour of service provided), the entity may recognize revenue in the amount to which the entity has a right to invoice.

606-10-55-19

The disadvantages of output methods are that the outputs used to measure progress may not be directly observable and the information required to apply them may not be available to an entity without undue cost. Therefore, an input method may be necessary.

Input Methods**606-10-55-20**

Input methods recognize **revenue** on the basis of the entity's efforts or inputs to the satisfaction of a **performance obligation** (for example, resources consumed, labor hours expended, costs incurred, time elapsed, or machine hours used) relative to the total expected inputs to the satisfaction of that performance obligation. If the entity's efforts or inputs are expended evenly throughout the performance period, it may be appropriate for the entity to recognize revenue on a straight-line basis.

In determining the method of measuring progress that faithfully depicts an entity's performance, the entity has to consider both the nature of the promised goods or services and the nature of the entity's performance. In other words, an entity's selection of the method used to measure its performance needs to be consistent with the nature of its promise to the customer and what the entity has agreed to transfer to the customer. To illustrate this concept, the Board included an example of a contract for health club services in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09.¹⁸⁰ Regardless of when or how frequently the customer uses the health club, the entity's obligation to stand ready for the contracted period of time does not change, and the customer is required to pay the fee regardless of whether the customer uses the health club. As a result, the entity would need to select a measure of progress based on its service of standing ready to make the health club available.

7.1.4.1**Output methods**

While there is no preferable measure of progress, the FASB states in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁸¹ that conceptually, an output measure is the most faithful depiction of an entity's performance because it directly measures the value of the goods and services transferred to the customer. However, the Board discussed¹⁸² two output methods, units of delivery and units of production, that may not always be appropriate.

¹⁸⁰ Paragraph BC160 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁸¹ Paragraph BC164 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁸² Paragraph BC165 of ASU 2014-09.

That is, units-of-delivery or units-of-production methods may not result in the best depiction of an entity's performance over time if there is material work-in-process at the reporting period end. In these cases, the FASB observed that using a units-of-delivery or units-of-production method would distort the entity's performance because it would not recognize revenue for the customer-controlled assets that are created before delivery or before construction is complete. This is because, when an entity determines control transfers to the customer over time, it has concluded that the customer controls any resulting asset as it is created. Therefore, the entity must recognize revenue related to those goods or services for which control has transferred. The FASB also stated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁸³ that a units-of-delivery or units-of-production method also may not be appropriate if the contract provides both design and production services because each item produced "may not transfer an equal amount of value to the customer." That is, the items produced earlier likely have a higher value than the ones produced later.

It is important to note that "value to the customer" in paragraph ASC 606-10-55-17 refers to an objective method of measuring the entity's performance in the contract (and is not intended to be assessed by reference to the market prices, standalone selling prices or the value a customer perceives to be embodied in the goods or services).¹⁸⁴ The FASB staff clarified in a TRG agenda paper¹⁸⁵ that this concept of value is different from the concept of value an entity uses to determine whether it can use the "right to invoice" practical expedient, as discussed below. When an entity determines whether items individually transfer an equal amount of value to the customer (i.e., when applying ASC 606-10-55-17), the FASB staff emphasized that the evaluation has to do with how much or what proportion of the goods or services (i.e., quantities) have been delivered (but not the price). For example, for purposes of applying ASC 606-10-55-17, an entity might consider the amount of goods or services transferred to date in proportion to the total expected goods or services to be transferred when measuring progress. However, if this measure of progress results in material work-in-progress at the reporting period end, it would not be appropriate, as discussed above. See the discussion below regarding the evaluation of "value to the customer" in the context of evaluating the "right to invoice" practical expedient in ASC 606-10-55-18.

Practical expedient for measuring progress toward satisfaction of a performance obligation

The FASB provided a practical expedient in ASC 606-10-55-18 for using an output method to measure progress toward completion of a performance obligation that is satisfied over time. If an entity demonstrates that the invoiced amount corresponds directly with the value to the customer of the entity's performance completed to date, the practical expedient allows an entity to recognize revenue in the amount for which it has the right to invoice (i.e., the "right to invoice" practical expedient). An entity might be able to use this practical expedient for a service contract in which it bills a fixed amount for each hour of service provided.

The FASB staff noted in a TRG agenda paper¹⁸⁶ that ASC 606-10-55-18 is intended as an expedient to some aspects of Steps 3, 4 and 5 in the standard. Because this practical expedient allows an entity to recognize revenue on the basis of invoicing, revenue is recognized by multiplying the price assigned to the goods or services delivered by the measure of progress (i.e., the quantities or units transferred). Therefore, an entity effectively bypasses the steps of determining the transaction price, allocating that transaction price to the performance obligations and determining when to recognize revenue. However, it does not permit an entity to bypass the requirements to determine the performance obligations in the contract and evaluate whether the performance obligation is satisfied over time, which is a requirement to use this expedient.

¹⁸³ Paragraph BC166 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁸⁴ Paragraph BC163 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁸⁵ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 40.

¹⁸⁶ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 40.

To apply the practical expedient, an entity must also be able to assert that the right to consideration from a customer corresponds directly with the value to the customer of the entity's performance to date. In determining whether the amount invoiced to the customer corresponds directly with the value to the customer of an entity's performance completed to date, the entity could evaluate the amount invoiced in comparison to market prices, standalone selling prices or another reasonable measure of value to the customer. See Question 7-7 in Section 7.1.4.3 for the TRG discussion on evaluating value to the customer in contracts with changing rates.

Further, TRG members also noted in their discussion of the TRG agenda paper¹⁸⁷ that an entity would have to evaluate all significant up-front payments or retroactive adjustments (e.g., accumulating rebates) to determine whether the amount the entity has a right to invoice for each good or service corresponds directly to the value to the customer of the entity's performance completed to date. That is, if an up-front payment or retroactive adjustment significantly shifts payment to the front- or back-end of a contract, it may be difficult for an entity to conclude that the amount invoiced corresponds directly with the value provided to the customer for goods or services.

The TRG agenda paper also stated that the presence of an agreed-upon customer payment schedule does not mean that the amount an entity has the right to invoice corresponds directly with the value to the customer of the entity's performance completed to date. In addition, the TRG agenda paper stated that the existence of specified contract minimums (or volume discounts) would not always preclude the application of the practical expedient, provided that these clauses are deemed non-substantive (e.g., the entity expects to receive amounts in excess of the specified minimums).

7.1.4.2

Input methods

Input methods recognize revenue based on an entity's efforts or inputs toward satisfying a performance obligation relative to the total expected efforts or inputs to satisfy the performance obligation. Examples of input methods mentioned in the standard include costs incurred, time elapsed, resources consumed or labor hours expended. An entity should select a single measure of progress for each performance obligation that depicts the entity's performance in transferring control of goods or services promised to a customer. If an entity's efforts or inputs are used evenly throughout the entity's performance period, a time-based measure that results in a straight line recognition of revenue may be appropriate. However, there may be a disconnect between an entity's inputs (e.g., cost of non-distinct goods included in a single performance obligation satisfied over time) and the depiction of an entity's performance to date. The standard includes specific guidance on adjustments to the measure of progress that may be necessary in those situations. See below for additional discussion.

Regardless of which method an entity selects, it excludes from its measure of progress any goods or services for which control has not transferred to the customer.

Adjustments to the measure of progress when based on an input method

If an entity applies an input method that uses costs incurred to measure its progress toward completion (e.g., cost to cost), the cost incurred may not always be proportionate to the entity's progress in satisfying the performance obligation. To address this shortcoming of input methods, the standard provides the following guidance:

¹⁸⁷ 13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 40.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Methods for Measuring Progress toward Complete Satisfaction of a Performance Obligation

Input Methods

606-10-55-21

A shortcoming of input methods is that there may not be a direct relationship between an entity's inputs and the transfer of control of goods or services to a **customer**. Therefore, an entity should exclude from an input method the effects of any inputs that, in accordance with the objective of measuring progress in paragraph 606-10-25-31, do not depict the entity's performance in transferring control of goods or services to the customer. For instance, when using a cost-based input method, an adjustment to the measure of progress may be required in the following circumstances:

- a. When a cost incurred does not contribute to an entity's progress in satisfying the performance obligation. For example, an entity would not recognize revenue on the basis of costs incurred that are attributable to significant inefficiencies in the entity's performance that were not reflected in the price of the contract (for example, the costs of unexpected amounts of wasted materials, labor, or other resources that were incurred to satisfy the performance obligation).
- b. When a cost incurred is not proportionate to the entity's progress in satisfying the performance obligation. In those circumstances, the best depiction of the entity's performance may be to adjust the input method to recognize revenue only to the extent of that cost incurred. For example, a faithful depiction of an entity's performance might be to recognize revenue at an amount equal to the cost of a good used to satisfy a performance obligation if the entity expects at contract inception that all of the following conditions would be met:
 1. The good is not distinct.
 2. The customer is expected to obtain control of the good significantly before receiving services related to the good.
 3. The cost of the transferred good is significant relative to the total expected costs to completely satisfy the performance obligation.
 4. The entity procures the good from a third party and is not significantly involved in designing and manufacturing the good (but the entity is acting as a principal in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-36 through 55-40).

In a combined performance obligation composed of non-distinct goods and services, the customer may obtain control of the some of the goods before the entity provides the services related to those goods. This could be the case when goods are delivered to a customer site, but the entity has not yet integrated the goods into the overall project (e.g., the materials are "uninstalled"). The FASB concluded¹⁸⁸ that using a measure of progress based on costs incurred for such a transaction may be inappropriately affected by the delivery of these goods and that a pure application of such a measure of progress would overstate revenue.

¹⁸⁸ Paragraph BC171 of ASU 2014-09.

The standard indicates that, in these situations (e.g., when control of the individual goods has transferred to the customer but the integration service has not yet occurred), the best depiction of the entity's performance may be to recognize revenue at an amount equal to the cost of the goods used to satisfy the performance obligation (i.e., a zero margin) because the cost incurred is not proportionate to an entity's progress in satisfying the performance obligation. The standard specifies in ASC 606-10-55-21 that it may be more appropriate to recognize revenue only to the extent of costs incurred in these situations. It is also important to note that determining when control of the individual goods that are part of a performance obligation has transferred to the customer will require judgment.

The Board noted¹⁸⁹ that the adjustment to the cost-to-cost measure of progress for uninstalled materials is generally intended to apply to a subset of construction-type goods that have a significant cost relative to the contract and for which the entity is effectively providing a simple procurement service to the customer. By applying the adjustment to recognize revenue at an amount equal to the cost of uninstalled materials, an entity is recognizing a margin similar to the one the entity would have recognized if the customer had supplied the materials. The FASB clarified¹⁹⁰ that this outcome of recognizing no margin for uninstalled materials is necessary to adjust the cost-to-cost calculation to faithfully depict an entity's performance.

In addition, situations may arise in which not all of the costs incurred contribute to the entity's progress in completing the performance obligation. ASC 606-10-55-21(a) requires that, under an input method, an entity would exclude these types of costs (e.g., costs related to significant inefficiencies, wasted materials, required re-work) from the measure of progress unless such costs were reflected in the price of the contract.

The standard includes the following example illustrating how uninstalled materials are considered in measuring progress toward complete satisfaction of a performance obligation:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 19 – Uninstalled Materials

606-10-55-187

In November 20X2, an entity contracts with a customer to refurbish a 3-story building and install new elevators for total consideration of \$5 million. The promised refurbishment service, including the installation of elevators, is a single performance obligation satisfied over time. Total expected costs are \$4 million, including \$1.5 million for the elevators. The entity determines that it acts as a principal in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-36 through 55-40 because it obtains control of the elevators before they are transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-188

A summary of the transaction price and expected costs is as follows:

Transaction price	\$ 5,000,000
Expected costs:	
Elevators	1,500,000
Other costs	<u>2,500,000</u>
Total expected costs	<u>\$ 4,000,000</u>

¹⁸⁹ Paragraph BC172 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁹⁰ Paragraph BC174 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-55-189

The entity uses an input method based on costs incurred to measure its progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation. The entity assesses whether the costs incurred to procure the elevators are proportionate to the entity's progress in satisfying the performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-21. The customer obtains control of the elevators when they are delivered to the site in December 20X2, although the elevators will not be installed until June 20X3. The costs to procure the elevators (\$1.5 million) are significant relative to the total expected costs to completely satisfy the performance obligation (\$4 million). The entity is not involved in designing or manufacturing the elevators.

606-10-55-190

The entity concludes that including the costs to procure the elevators in the measure of progress would overstate the extent of the entity's performance. Consequently, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-21, the entity adjusts its measure of progress to exclude the costs to procure the elevators from the measure of costs incurred and from the transaction price. The entity recognizes revenue for the transfer of the elevators in an amount equal to the costs to procure the elevators (that is, at a zero margin).

606-10-55-191

As of December 31, 20X2, the entity observes that:

- a. Other costs incurred (excluding elevators) are \$500,000.
- b. Performance is 20% complete (that is, $\$500,000 \div \$2,500,000$).

606-10-55-192

Consequently, at December 31, 20X2, the entity recognizes the following:

Revenue	\$ 2,200,000 ^(a)
Cost of goods sold	<u>2,000,000^(b)</u>
Profit	<u>\$ 200,000</u>

(a) Revenue recognized is calculated as $(20\% \times \$3,500,000) + \$1,500,000$. ($\$3,500,000$ million is $\$5,000,000$ transaction price – $\$1,500,000$ cost of elevator).

(b) Cost of goods sold is $\$500,000$ of costs incurred + $1,500,000$ costs of elevators

7.1.4.3**Examples**

The following example illustrates some of the factors an entity may consider when determining an appropriate measure of progress:

Illustration 7-1: Choosing the measure of progress

A shipbuilding entity enters into a contract to build 15 vessels for a customer over a three-year period. The contract includes both design and production services. The entity has not built a vessel of this type before, and it expects that the first vessels may take longer to produce than the last vessels because, as the entity gains experience building the vessels, it expects to be able to construct them more efficiently.

Assume that the entity has determined that the design and production services represent a single performance obligation. In this situation, the entity would likely not choose a "units of delivery" method as a measure of progress because that method would not accurately reflect its level of performance. That is, such a method would not reflect the entity's efforts during the design phase of the contract because no revenue would be recognized until a vessel was shipped. In this situation, the entity would likely determine that an input method, such as a percentage of completion method based on costs incurred approach, is more appropriate.

The standard also includes the following example on selecting an appropriate measure of progress toward satisfaction of a performance obligation:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 18 – Measuring Progress When Making Goods or Service Available

606-10-55-184

An entity, an owner and manager of health clubs, enters into a contract with a customer for one year of access to any of its health clubs. The customer has unlimited use of the health clubs and promises to pay \$100 per month.

606-10-55-185

The entity determines that its promise to the customer is to provide a service of making the health clubs available for the customer to use as and when the customer wishes. This is because the extent to which the customer uses the health clubs does not affect the amount of the remaining goods and services to which the customer is entitled. The entity concludes that the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits of the entity's performance as it performs by making the health clubs available. Consequently, the entity's performance obligation is satisfied over time in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-27(a).

606-10-55-186

The entity also determines that the customer benefits from the entity's service of making the health clubs available evenly throughout the year. (That is, the customer benefits from having the health clubs available, regardless of whether the customer uses it or not.) Consequently, the entity concludes that the best measure of progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation over time is a time-based measure, and it recognizes revenue on a straight-line basis throughout the year at \$100 per month.

Question 7-3

How should an entity measure progress toward satisfaction of a stand-ready obligation that is satisfied over time? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 16]

TRG members generally agreed that an entity should not default to a straight line revenue attribution model. However, they also generally agreed that if an entity expects the customer to receive and consume the benefits of its promise throughout the contract period, a time-based measure of progress (e.g., straight line) would be appropriate. The TRG agenda paper noted that this will generally be the case for unspecified upgrade rights, help desk support contracts and cable or satellite television contracts. TRG members generally agreed that ratable recognition may not be appropriate if the benefits are not spread evenly over the contract period (e.g., an annual snow removal contract that provides most benefits in winter).

Question 7-4 Can multiple measures of progress be used to depict an entity's performance in transferring a performance obligation comprised of two or more non-distinct goods and/or services (i.e., a combined performance obligation¹⁹¹) that is satisfied over time? [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 41]

TRG members agreed that when an entity has determined that a combined performance obligation is satisfied over time, the entity has to select a single measure of progress that faithfully depicts the entity's performance in transferring the goods or services. For example, using different measures of progress for different non-distinct goods or services in the combined performance obligation would be inappropriate because doing so ignores the unit of accounting that has been identified under the standard (i.e., the single combined performance obligation) and recognizes revenue in a way that overrides the separation and allocation guidance in the standard.

While TRG members didn't discuss this point, the TRG agenda paper noted that a single method of measuring progress should not be broadly interpreted to mean an entity may apply multiple measures of progress as long as all measures used are either output or input measures. TRG members also acknowledged that there is diversity in practice under legacy GAAP, and selecting a single measure of progress may represent a change for entities that have previously used a multiple attribution model when deliverables cannot be separated into separate units of accounting.

Question 7-5 How should an entity determine the appropriate single measure of progress for a combined performance obligation that is satisfied over time? [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 41]

TRG members acknowledged that it may be difficult to appropriately determine a single measure of progress when the entity will transfer goods or services that make up a combined performance obligation over different points of time and/or the entity would otherwise use a different measure of progress (e.g., a time-based method versus a labor-based input method) if each promise was a separate performance obligation. Such a determination will require significant judgment, but TRG members generally agreed that the measure of progress selected is not meant to be a "free choice," and that entities should consider the nature of the overall promise for the combined performance obligation in determining the measure of progress to use. For example, entities should not default to a "final deliverable" methodology such that all revenue would be recognized over the performance period of the last promised good or service. Rather, an entity is required to select the single measure of progress that most faithfully depicts the entity's performance in satisfying its combined performance obligation.

Some TRG members observed that an entity should consider the reasons why goods or services were bundled into a combined performance obligation in order to determine the appropriate pattern of revenue recognition. For example, if a good or service was combined with other goods or services because it was not capable of being distinct, that may indicate that it does not provide value or use to the customer on its own, and the entity should not contemplate the transfer of that good or service when determining the pattern of revenue recognition for the combined performance obligation.

TRG members also generally agreed that if an appropriately selected single measure of progress does not faithfully depict the economics of the arrangement, the entity should challenge whether the performance obligation was correctly combined (i.e., there might be more than one performance obligation).

¹⁹¹ Under Step 2 of the model, a single performance obligation may contain multiple non-distinct goods or services and/or distinct goods or services that were required to be combined with other non-distinct goods or services in order to identify a distinct bundle. This bundled performance obligation is referred to as a "combined performance obligation" for purposes of this discussion.

Question 7-6 **Can control of a good or service underlying a performance obligation satisfied over time be transferred at discrete points in time?** [18 April 2016 FASB TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 53]

FASB TRG members generally agreed that if a performance obligation meets the criteria for revenue to be recognized over time (rather than at a point in time), control of the underlying good or service is not transferred at discrete points in time. Because control transfers as an entity performs, an entity's performance (as reflected using an appropriate measure of progress) should not result in the creation of a material asset on the entity's books (e.g., work in progress).

Stakeholders had asked whether control of a good or service underlying a performance obligation that is satisfied over time can be transferred at discrete points in time because the standards highlight several output methods, including "milestones reached," as potentially acceptable methods for measuring progress toward satisfaction of an over-time performance obligation. FASB TRG members generally agreed that an entity could use an output method only if that measure of progress correlates to the entity's performance to date.

Question 7-7 **Can an entity use the "right to invoice" practical expedient for a contract that includes rates that change over the contractual term?** [13 July 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 40]

TRG members generally agreed that determining whether an entity can apply the "right to invoice" practical expedient will require judgment. They also generally agreed that it is possible for entities to meet the requirements for the practical expedient in contracts with changing rates, provided that the changing rates correspond directly to changes in value to the customer. That is, a contract does not need to have a fixed price per unit for the duration of a contract in order to qualify for the practical expedient. Examples of contracts that might qualify include an IT outsourcing arrangement with rates that decrease over the contract term as the level of effort to the customer decreases or a multi-year electricity contract that contemplates the forward market price of electricity. However, the SEC Observer also noted that entities will need to have strong evidence that variable prices reflect value to the customer in order to recognize variable amounts of revenue for similar goods or services.

Question 7-8 **If an entity begins activities on a specifically anticipated contract either (1) before it agrees to the contract with the customer or (2) before the arrangement meets the criteria to be considered a contract under the standard, how should revenue be recognized at the date a contract exists?** [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 33]

TRG members generally agreed that if the goods or services that ultimately will be transferred meet the criteria to be recognized over time, revenue should be recognized on a cumulative catch-up basis at the "contract establishment date," reflecting the performance obligation(s) that are partially or fully satisfied at that time. The TRG agenda paper noted that the cumulative catch-up method is considered to be consistent with the overall principle of the standard that revenue should be recognized when (or as) an entity transfers control of goods or services to a customer.

Question 7-9 **How should an entity account for fulfillment costs incurred prior to the contract establishment date that are outside the scope of another standard (e.g., outside of the scope of the inventory guidance in ASC 330)?** [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 33]

See response to Question 9-13 in Section 9.3.2.

7.2 Control transferred at a point in time

For all performance obligations for which control is not transferred over time, control is transferred at a point in time. In many situations, the determination of *when* that point in time occurs is relatively straightforward. However, in other circumstances, this determination is more complex.

To help entities determine the point in time when a customer obtains control of a particular good or service, the FASB provided the following guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Performance Obligations Satisfied at a Point in Time

606-10-25-30

If a **performance obligation** is not satisfied over time in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-27 through 25-29, an entity satisfies the performance obligation at a point in time. To determine the point in time at which a **customer** obtains control of a promised asset and the entity satisfies a performance obligation, the entity shall consider the guidance on control in paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-26. In addition, an entity shall consider indicators of the transfer of control, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. The entity has a present right to payment for the asset – If a customer presently is obliged to pay for an asset, then that may indicate that the customer has obtained the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset in exchange.
- b. The customer has legal title to the asset – Legal title may indicate which party to a **contract** has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, an asset or to restrict the access of other entities to those benefits. Therefore, the transfer of legal title of an asset may indicate that the customer has obtained control of the asset. If an entity retains legal title solely as protection against the customer's failure to pay, those rights of the entity would not preclude the customer from obtaining control of an asset.
- c. The entity has transferred physical possession of the asset – The customer's physical possession of an asset may indicate that the customer has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset or to restrict the access of other entities to those benefits. However, physical possession may not coincide with control of an asset. For example, in some repurchase agreements and in some consignment arrangements, a customer or consignee may have physical possession of an asset that the entity controls. Conversely, in some bill-and-hold arrangements, the entity may have physical possession of an asset that the customer controls. Paragraphs 606-10-55-66 through 55-78, 606-10-55-79 through 55-80, and 606-10-55-81 through 55-84 provide guidance on accounting for repurchase agreements, consignment arrangements, and bill-and-hold arrangements, respectively.
- d. The customer has the significant risks and rewards of ownership of the asset – The transfer of the significant risks and rewards of ownership of an asset to the customer may indicate that the customer has obtained the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. However, when evaluating the risks and rewards of ownership of a promised asset, an entity shall exclude any risks that give rise to a separate performance obligation in addition to the performance obligation to transfer the asset. For example, an entity may have transferred control of an asset to a customer but not yet satisfied an additional performance obligation to provide maintenance services related to the transferred asset.

- e. The customer has accepted the asset – The customer’s acceptance of an asset may indicate that it has obtained the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. To evaluate the effect of a contractual customer acceptance clause on when control of an asset is transferred, an entity shall consider the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-55-85 through 55-88.

None of the indicators above are meant to individually determine whether the customer has gained control of the good or service. For example, while shipping terms may provide information about when legal title to a good transfers to the customer, they are not determinative when evaluating the point in time at which the customer obtains control of the promised asset. An entity must consider all relevant facts and circumstances to determine whether control has transferred. The FASB also clarified¹⁹² that the indicators are not meant to be a checklist, and not all of them must be present for an entity to determine that the customer has gained control. Rather, the indicators are factors that are often present when a customer has obtained control of an asset, and the list is meant to help entities apply the principle of control.

Present right to payment for the asset

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,¹⁹³ the FASB considered but rejected specifying a right to payment as an overarching criterion for determining when revenue should be recognized. Therefore, while the date at which the entity has a right to payment for the asset may be an indicator of the date the customer obtained control of the asset, it does not always indicate that the customer has obtained control of the asset. For example, in some contracts, a customer is required to make a nonrefundable up-front payment but receives no goods or services in return at that time.

Legal title and physical possession

The term “title” is often associated with a legal definition denoting the ownership of an asset or legally recognized rights that preclude others’ claim to the asset. Accordingly, the transfer of title often indicates that control of an asset has been transferred. Determination of which party has title to an asset does not always depend on which party has physical possession of the asset, but without contract language to the contrary, title generally passes to the customer at the time of the physical transfer. For example, in a retail store transaction, there is no clear documentation of the title transfer. However, it is understood that product title is transferred at the time of purchase by the customer.

While the retail store transaction is relatively straightforward, determining when title has transferred may be more complicated in other arrangements. Transactions that involve the shipment of products may have varying shipment terms and often involve third-party shipping agents. In such cases, a clear understanding of the seller’s practices and the contractual terms of an arrangement is required in order to make an assessment of when title transfers. As indicated in ASC 606-10-25-30(b), legal title and/or physical possession may be an indicator of which party to a contract has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, an asset or to restrict the access of other entities to those benefits.

Risks and rewards of ownership

Although the Board included the risks and rewards of ownership as one factor to consider when evaluating whether control of an asset has transferred, it emphasized in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁹⁴ that this factor does not change the principle of determining the transfer of goods or

¹⁹² Paragraph BC155 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁹³ Paragraph BC148 of ASU 2014-09.

¹⁹⁴ Paragraph BC154 of ASU 2014-09.

services on the basis of control. The concept of the risks and rewards of ownership is based on how the seller and the customer share both the potential gain (the reward) and the potential loss (risk) associated with owning an asset. Rewards of ownership include the following:

- ▶ Rights to all appreciation in value of the asset
- ▶ Unrestricted usage of the asset
- ▶ Ability to modify the asset
- ▶ Ability to transfer or sell the asset
- ▶ Ability to grant a security interest in the asset

Conversely, the risks of ownership include the following:

- ▶ Absorbing all of the declines in market value
- ▶ Incurring losses due to theft or damage of the asset
- ▶ Incurring losses due to changes in the business environment (e.g., obsolescence, excess inventory, effect of retail pricing environment)

However, as noted in ASC 606-10-25-30(d), an entity should not consider risks that give rise to a separate performance obligation when evaluating whether the entity has the risks of ownership of an asset. For example, an entity does not consider warranty services that represent a separate performance obligation when evaluating whether it retains the risks of ownership of the asset sold to the customer.

7.2.1

Customer acceptance

When determining whether the customer has obtained control of the goods or services, an entity must consider any customer acceptance clauses that require the customer to approve the goods or services before it is obligated to pay for them. If a customer does not accept the goods or services, the entity may not be entitled to consideration, may be required to take remedial action or may be required to take back the delivered good.

The standard provides the following guidance on how customer acceptance provisions should be evaluated:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Customer Acceptance

606-10-55-85

In accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-30(e), a **customer's** acceptance of an asset may indicate that the customer has obtained control of the asset. Customer acceptance clauses allow a customer to cancel a **contract** or require an entity to take remedial action if a good or service does not meet agreed-upon specifications. An entity should consider such clauses when evaluating when a customer obtains control of a good or service.

606-10-55-86

If an entity can objectively determine that control of a good or service has been transferred to the customer in accordance with the agreed-upon specifications in the contract, then customer acceptance is a formality that would not affect the entity's determination of when the customer has obtained control of the good or service. For example, if the customer acceptance clause is based on meeting specified size and weight characteristics, an entity would be able to determine whether those

criteria have been met before receiving confirmation of the customer's acceptance. The entity's experience with contracts for similar goods or services may provide evidence that a good or service provided to the customer is in accordance with the agreed-upon specifications in the contract. If **revenue** is recognized before customer acceptance, the entity still must consider whether there are any remaining **performance obligations** (for example, installation of equipment) and evaluate whether to account for them separately.

606-10-55-87

However, if an entity cannot objectively determine that the good or service provided to the customer is in accordance with the agreed-upon specifications in the contract, then the entity would not be able to conclude that the customer has obtained control until the entity receives the customer's acceptance. That is because, in that circumstance the entity cannot determine that the customer has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the good or service.

606-10-55-88

If an entity delivers products to a customer for trial or evaluation purposes and the customer is not committed to pay any consideration until the trial period lapses, control of the product is not transferred to the customer until either the customer accepts the product or the trial period lapses.

Some acceptance provisions may be straightforward and may give a customer the ability to accept or reject delivered products based on standard objective criteria specified in the contract (e.g., the goods function at a specified speed). Other acceptance clauses may be subjective or may appear in parts of the contract that do not typically address acceptance matters, such as warranty provisions or indemnification clauses. Professional judgment may be required to determine the effect of the latter types of acceptance clauses on revenue recognition.

Acceptance criteria that an entity cannot objectively evaluate against the agreed-upon specifications in the contract will preclude an entity from concluding that a customer has obtained control of a good or service until formal customer sign-off is obtained, or the acceptance provisions lapse. Further, the entity should consider its experience with other contracts for similar goods or services because that experience may provide evidence that the entity is able to objectively determine that a good or service provided to the customer is in accordance with the agreed-upon specifications in the contract. We believe one or more of the following would represent circumstances in which the entity may not be able to objectively evaluate the acceptance criteria:

- ▶ The acceptance provisions are unusual, or "non-standard." Indicators of "non-standard" acceptance terms are:
 - ▶ The duration of the acceptance period is longer than in standard contracts
 - ▶ The majority of the vendor's contracts lack similar acceptance terms
 - ▶ The arrangement contains explicit customer-specified requirements that must be met prior to acceptance
- ▶ The arrangement contains a contractual requirement for explicit notification of acceptance versus deemed acceptance. Explicit notification requirements may indicate that the criteria the customer is assessing are not objective. Contracts may include provisions used to limit the time period the customer has to reject delivered products. Such clauses may require the customer to provide, in writing, the reasons for the rejection of the products by the end of a specified period. When such clauses exist, acceptance can be deemed to have occurred at the end of the specified time period if notification of rejection has not been received from the customer, as long as the customer has not indicated it will reject the products.

In determining whether the criteria for acceptance can be objectively assessed and acceptance is only a formality, the following criteria should be considered:

- ▶ Whether the acceptance terms are standard in arrangements entered into by the vendor
- ▶ Whether the acceptance is based on the delivered product performing to standard published specifications, and whether the vendor can demonstrate that it has an established history of objectively determining that the product functions in accordance with those specifications
- ▶ Whether the vendor is required to perform additional services for customer acceptance to occur

As discussed above, customer acceptance should not be deemed a formality if the acceptance terms are unusual or non-standard. If an arrangement contains acceptance provisions based on customer-specified criteria, it may be difficult for the entity to objectively assess the criteria, and the entity should not recognize revenue prior to obtaining written evidence of customer acceptance. However, determining that the acceptance criteria have been met (and thus acceptance is merely a formality) may be appropriate if the entity can demonstrate that its product meets all of the customer's acceptance specifications by replicating, before shipment, those conditions under which the customer intends to use the product.

However, if the product's performance, once it has been installed and is operating at the customer's facility, may reasonably be expected to be different from the performance as tested prior to shipment, this acceptance provision has not been met. The entity therefore would not be able to conclude that the customer has obtained control until customer acceptance occurs. Factors indicating that specifications cannot be tested effectively prior to shipment include:

- ▶ The customer has unique equipment, software or environmental conditions that can reasonably be expected to make performance in that customer's environment different from testing performed by the vendor. If the arrangement includes customer acceptance criteria or specifications that cannot be effectively tested before delivery or installation at the customer's site, revenue recognition should be deferred until it can be demonstrated that the criteria are met
- ▶ The products that are the subject of the arrangement are highly complex
- ▶ The vendor has a limited history of testing products prior to delivery to customers, or a limited history of having customers reject products that it has previously tested

Determining when a customer obtains control of an asset in an arrangement with customer-specified acceptance criteria requires the use of professional judgment and depends on the weight of the evidence in the particular circumstances. The conclusion could change based on a single variable such as the complexity of the equipment, the nature of the interface with the customer's environment, the extent of the seller's experience with this type of transaction or a particular clause in the agreement. An entity may need to discuss the situation with knowledgeable project managers or engineers in making such an assessment.

Additionally, each contract containing customer-specified acceptance criteria may require a separate assessment of whether the acceptance provisions have been met prior to confirmation of the customer's acceptance. That is, because different customers may specify different acceptance criteria, a vendor may not be able to make one assessment that applies to all contracts because of the variations in contractual terms and customer environments.

Even if an arrangement includes a standard acceptance clause, if the clause relates to a new product, or one that has only been sold on a limited basis previously, a vendor may be required to initially defer revenue recognition for the product until it establishes a history of successfully obtaining acceptance.

7.3

Repurchase agreements

Some agreements include repurchase provisions, either as a component of a sales contract or as a separate contract that relates to the goods in the original agreement or similar goods. These provisions affect how an entity applies the guidance on control to affected transactions.

The standard clarifies the types of arrangements that qualify as repurchase agreements:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Satisfaction of Performance Obligations

606-10-25-26

When evaluating whether a customer obtains control of an asset, an entity shall consider any agreement to repurchase the asset (see paragraphs 606-10-55-66 through 55-78).

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Repurchase Agreements

606-10-55-66

A repurchase agreement is a **contract** in which an entity sells an asset and also promises or has the option (either in the same contract or in another contract) to repurchase the asset. The repurchased asset may be the asset that was originally sold to the **customer**, an asset that is substantially the same as that asset, or another asset of which the asset that was originally sold is a component.

606-10-55-67

Repurchase agreements generally come in three forms:

- a. An entity's obligation to repurchase the asset (a forward)
- b. An entity's right to repurchase the asset (a call option)
- c. An entity's obligation to repurchase the asset at the customer's request (a put option).

In order for an obligation or right to purchase an asset to be accounted for as a repurchase agreement under the standard, it should exist at contract inception either as a part of the same contract or in another contract. The FASB clarified¹⁹⁵ that an entity's subsequent decision to repurchase an asset after transferring control of that asset to a customer without reference to any pre-existing contractual right should not be accounted for as a repurchase agreement under the standard. That is, because the customer is not obligated to resell that good to the entity as a result of the initial contract, any subsequent decision to repurchase the asset does not affect the customer's ability to control the asset upon initial transfer. However, in cases in which an entity decides to repurchase a good after transferring control of the good to a customer, the Board observed that the entity should carefully consider whether the customer obtained control in the initial transaction and may need to consider the guidance on principal versus agent considerations (see Section 4.4).

¹⁹⁵ Paragraph BC423 of ASU 2014-09.

7.3.1 Forward or call option held by the entity

When an entity has the obligation or right to repurchase an asset (i.e., a forward or call option), the standard indicates that the customer has not obtained control of the asset. Instead, the standard provides the following guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

A Forward or a Call Option

606-10-55-68

If an entity has an obligation or a right to repurchase the asset (a forward or a call option), a **customer** does not obtain control of the asset because the customer is limited in its ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset even though the customer may have physical possession of the asset. Consequently, the entity should account for the **contract** as either of the following:

- a. A lease in accordance with Topic 840 on leases, if the entity can or must repurchase the asset for an amount that is less than the original selling price of the asset unless the contract is part of a sale-leaseback transaction. If the contract is part of a sale-leaseback transaction, the entity should account for the contract as a financing arrangement and not as a sale-leaseback in accordance with Subtopic 840-40.
- b. A financing arrangement in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-70, if the entity can or must repurchase the asset for an amount that is equal to or more than the original selling price of the asset.

606-10-55-69

When comparing the repurchase price with the selling price, an entity should consider the time value of money.

606-10-55-70

If the repurchase agreement is a financing arrangement, the entity should continue to recognize the asset and also recognize a financial liability for any consideration received from the customer. The entity should recognize the difference between the amount of consideration received from the customer and the amount of consideration to be paid to the customer as interest and, if applicable, as processing or holding costs (for example, insurance).

606-10-55-71

If the option lapses unexercised, an entity should derecognize the liability and recognize **revenue**.

This guidance requires that an entity account for a transaction including a forward or a call option based on the relationship between the repurchase price and the original selling price. The standard indicates that if the entity has the right or obligation to repurchase the asset at a price less than the original sales price (taking into consideration the effects of the time value of money), the entity would account for the transaction as a lease in accordance with ASC 840 (or ASC 842 upon adoption of ASU 2016-02), unless the contract is part of a sale-leaseback transaction. If the entity has the right or obligation to repurchase the asset at a price equal to or greater than the original sales price (considering the effects of the time value of money) or if the contract is part of a sale-leaseback transaction, the entity would account for the contract as a financing arrangement in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-70.

The following graphic depicts this guidance for transactions that are not sale-leasebacks:

Forward or call option			
Repurchase price	<	Original selling price	= Lease
Repurchase price	≥	Original selling price	= Financing

Under the standard, *any* transaction with a seller option to repurchase the product must be treated as a lease or a financing arrangement (i.e., not a sale) because the customer does not have control of the product and is constrained in its ability to direct the use of and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the good. That is, entities cannot consider the likelihood that a call option will be exercised in determining the accounting for the repurchase provision. However, the Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁹⁶ that nonsubstantive call options should be ignored and would not affect when a customer obtains control of an asset.

If a transaction is considered a financing arrangement under the standard, in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-70, the selling entity will continue to recognize the asset and record a financial liability for the consideration received from the customer. The difference between the consideration received from the customer and the consideration subsequently paid to the customer (upon repurchasing the asset) will represent the interest and holding costs, as applicable, that will be recognized over the term of the financing arrangement. If the option lapses unexercised, the entity will derecognize the liability and recognize revenue at that time.

How we see it

Because the standard treats all forwards and call options the same way and does not consider their likelihood of exercise, some entities may experience a significant change in practice. In addition, given that the FASB has embedded lease guidance in the standard, it will be important for entities to understand the interaction between the lease and revenue guidance. Lastly, the standard does not differ significantly from legacy GAAP (i.e., ASC 470-40) on product financing arrangements for many transactions. However, entities that retain an option to repurchase a good from the customer as a part of a sales contract may see a change in practice.

The standard provides the following example of a call option:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 62 – Repurchase Agreements

606-10-55-401

An entity enters into a contract with a customer for the sale of a tangible asset on January 1, 20X7, for \$1 million.

¹⁹⁶ Paragraph BC427 of ASU 2014-09.

Case A – Call Option: Financing**606-10-55-402**

The contract includes a call option that gives the entity the right to repurchase the asset for \$1.1 million on or before December 31, 20X7.

606-10-55-403

Control of the asset does not transfer to the customer on December 31, 20X7, because the entity has a right to repurchase the asset and therefore the customer is limited in its ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. Consequently, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-68(b), the entity accounts for the transaction as a financing arrangement because the exercise price is more than the original selling price. In accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-70, the entity does not derecognize the asset and instead recognizes the cash received as a financial liability. The entity also recognizes interest expense for the difference between the exercise price (\$1.1 million) and the cash received (\$1 million), which increases the liability.

606-10-55-404

On December 31, 20X7, the option lapses unexercised; therefore, the entity derecognizes the liability and recognizes revenue of \$1.1 million.

7.3.2 Put option held by the customer

An entity's obligation to repurchase an asset at the customer's request is a put option that is held by the customer. The standard provides the following guidance for customer-held put options:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

A Put Option

606-10-55-72

If an entity has an obligation to repurchase the asset at the customer's request (a put option) at a price that is lower than the original selling price of the asset, the entity should consider at contract inception whether the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise that right. The customer's exercising of that right results in the customer effectively paying the entity consideration for the right to use a specified asset for a period of time. Therefore, if the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise that right, the entity should account for the agreement as a lease in accordance with Topic 840 on leases unless the contract is part of a sale-leaseback transaction. If the contract is part of a sale-leaseback transaction, the entity should account for the contract as a financing arrangement and not as a sale-leaseback in accordance with Subtopic 840-40.

606-10-55-73

To determine whether a customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise its right, an entity should consider various factors, including the relationship of the repurchase price to the expected market value of the asset at the date of the repurchase and the amount of time until the right expires. For example, if the repurchase price is expected to significantly exceed the market value of the asset, this may indicate that the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise the put option.

606-10-55-74

If the customer does not have a significant economic incentive to exercise its right at a price that is lower than the original selling price of the asset, the entity should account for the agreement as if it were the sale of a product with a right of return as described in paragraphs 606-10-55-22 through 55-29.

606-10-55-75

If the repurchase price of the asset is equal to or greater than the original selling price and is more than the expected market value of the asset, the contract is in effect a financing arrangement and, therefore, should be accounted for as described in paragraph 606-10-55-70.

606-10-55-76

If the repurchase price of the asset is equal to or greater than the original selling price and is less than or equal to the expected market value of the asset, and the customer does not have a significant economic incentive to exercise its right, then the entity should account for the agreement as if it were the sale of a product with a right of return as described in paragraphs 606-10-55-22 through 55-29.

606-10-55-77

When comparing the repurchase price with the selling price, an entity should consider the time value of money.

606-10-55-78

If the option lapses unexercised, an entity should derecognize the liability and recognize **revenue**.


The standard indicates that if the customer has the ability to require an entity to repurchase an asset (i.e., a put option) at a price lower than the original selling price, the entity should consider at contract inception whether the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise that right. That is, this determination influences whether the customer truly has control over the asset received and will determine whether the arrangement is treated as a lease or a sale with the right of return (see Section 5.4.1). An entity must consider many factors to determine whether a customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise its right, including the relationship of the repurchase price to the expected market value of the asset at the date of repurchase and the amount of time until the right expires. The standard notes that if the repurchase price is expected to significantly exceed the market value of the asset, the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise the put option.

If a customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise its right and, therefore, the customer is expected to ultimately return the asset, the entity should account for the agreement as a lease because the customer is effectively paying the entity for the right to use the asset for a period of time. An exception would be if the contract is part of a sale-leaseback, in which case the contract should be accounted for as a financing arrangement in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-70.

If a customer does not have a significant economic incentive to exercise its right, the entity should account for the agreement in a manner similar to a sale of a product with a right of return. A repurchase price of an asset that is equal to or greater than the original selling price but less than or equal to the expected market value of the asset should also be accounted for as a sale of a product with a right of return, if the customer does not have a significant economic incentive to exercise its right. See Section 5.4.1 for a discussion of sales with a right of return.

If the customer has the ability to require an entity to repurchase the asset at a price equal to or more than the original selling price and the repurchase price is more than the expected market value of the asset, the contract is in effect a financing arrangement.

The following graphic depicts this guidance:



How we see it

The guidance in the standard on put options is different from legacy GAAP because it requires an entity to determine whether the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise its right. Under legacy GAAP, when an arrangement includes a put option that is designed to compensate the customer for holding costs (including interest), the arrangement is accounted for as a financing arrangement, regardless of whether the customer is likely to exercise that option. However, the standard provides limited guidance on determining whether “a significant economic incentive” exists, and judgment may be required to make this determination.

The standard provides the following example of a put option:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 62 – Repurchase Agreements

606-10-55-401

An entity enters into a contract with a customer for the sale of a tangible asset on January 1, 20X7, for \$1 million.

Case B – Put Option: Lease

606-10-55-405

Instead of having a call option, the contract includes a put option that obliges the entity to repurchase the asset at the customer’s request for \$900,000 on or before December 31, 20X7. The market value is expected to be \$750,000 on December 31, 20X7.

606-10-55-406

At the inception of the contract, the entity assesses whether the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise the put option, to determine the accounting for the transfer of the asset (see paragraphs 606-10-55-72 through 55-78). The entity concludes that the customer has a significant

economic incentive to exercise the put option because the repurchase price significantly exceeds the expected market value of the asset at the date of repurchase. The entity determines there are no other relevant factors to consider when assessing whether the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise the put option. Consequently, the entity concludes that control of the asset does not transfer to the customer because the customer is limited in its ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset.

606-10-55-407

In accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-72 through 55-73, the entity accounts for the transaction as a lease in accordance with Topic 840 on leases.

Question 7-10

When an entity has a conditional call option to remove and replace expired products (e.g., out-of-date perishable goods, expired medicine), does the customer obtain control of the products (or is it akin to a right of return)?

The standard does not differentiate a conditional call or forward option from an unconditional one and states that a customer does not obtain control of the asset when the entity has a right to repurchase the asset. The presence of call or forward options indicates that control is not transferred because the customer is limited in its ability to direct the use of and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the asset.

However, in the case of perishable products, an entity's conditional right to remove and replace expired goods does not necessarily constrain the customer's ability to direct the use of and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the products. That is, the entity is not able to remove and replace the products until they expire, and the customer has control of the products over their entire useful life. Consequently, we believe it may be reasonable for an entity to conclude that control of the initial product does transfer to the customer in this situation and to consider this right to be a form of a right of return (see Section 5.4.1).

7.3.3

Sales with residual value guarantees

An entity that sells equipment may guarantee that the customer will receive a minimum resale amount when the customer resells the equipment (i.e., a residual value guarantee). The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09¹⁹⁷ that it considered whether such arrangements should be accounted for as a lease under the new standard, which would be consistent with the treatment under legacy GAAP. However, the FASB explained that while the economics of a repurchase agreement and a residual value guarantee may be similar, the customer's ability to control the asset in each case would be different. If the customer holds a put option that it has significant economic incentive to exercise, the customer is effectively restricted in its ability to consume, modify or sell the asset. In contrast, when the entity guarantees that the customer will receive a minimum amount of sales proceeds, the customer is not constrained in its ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the benefits from, the asset. Accordingly, the Board decided that it was not necessary to expand the guidance on repurchase agreements to consider guaranteed amounts of resale.

¹⁹⁷ Paragraph BC431 of ASU 2014-09.

Therefore, it will be important for an entity to review all its contracts and make sure that the residual value guarantee is not accomplished through a repurchase provision such as a put within the contract (e.g., the customer has the right to require the entity to repurchase equipment two years after the date of purchase at 85% of the original purchase price). If a put option is present, the entity would have to account for such a contract under the repurchase agreement guidance above and determine whether the existence of the put precludes the customer from obtaining control of the acquired item. In doing so, the entity would determine whether the customer has a significant economic incentive to exercise the put. If the entity concludes that there is no significant economic incentive, the transaction would be accounted for as a sale with a right of return as discussed in Section 7.3.2. Alternatively, if the entity concludes there is a significant economic incentive for the customer to exercise its right, the transaction would be accounted for as a lease.

If the transaction includes a residual value guarantee in which no put option is present and the entity will make the customer whole if, for example, the customer receives less than 85% of the initial sale price in a qualifying future sale to a third party, the repurchase agreement guidance in the standard would not apply because the entity is not repurchasing the asset from the customer. In those situations, the entity likely will need to account for the residual value guarantee under the guidance in ASC 460 (see Question 7-11 below) and the remainder of the transaction will be accounted for as a sale of the asset under the revenue guidance.

Question 7-11

Is a residual value guarantee, which is provided by an entity to a customer (that does not require the entity to reacquire the product sold), a financial guarantee in the scope of ASC 460?

Yes, we believe a residual value guarantee is a financial guarantee within the scope of ASC 460. To account for such arrangements, the entity should bifurcate the guarantee at fair value (and account for it under ASC 460) and account for the remaining amount of consideration under ASC 606.

Consider an auto manufacturer that sells vehicles to a fleet customer under a contract that includes a guaranteed auction value (i.e., a guaranteed minimum resale value). The fleet customer takes title to each vehicle at time of sale, and title remains with the fleet customer until resale. Upon resale by the fleet customer, to the extent the resale price is below the guaranteed minimum resale value, the auto manufacturer agrees to pay the fleet customer the difference between the resale proceeds received and the guaranteed minimum resale value. The guaranteed minimum resale value is agreed to at the inception of the contract and is a fixed amount.

The contract does not include a repurchase agreement as defined in ASC 606-10-55-56 because the title does not revert back to the auto manufacturer at any time. ASC 460-10-15-4(a) notes that contracts that contingently require a guarantor to make payments to a guaranteed party based on changes in an underlying are within the scope of ASC 460. The guarantee from the auto manufacturer to the fleet customer represents such a financial guarantee.

In addition, consequential amendments made to ASC 840-10-55-14A due to ASU 2014-09 state that “a sales incentive program in which an entity (for example, a manufacturer) contractually guarantees that it will pay a purchaser for the deficiency, if any, between the sales proceeds received for the equipment and the guaranteed minimum resale value should be accounted for in accordance with Topic 460 on guarantees and Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers.”

7.4 Consignment arrangements

Entities frequently deliver inventory on a consignment basis to other parties (e.g., distributor, dealer). By shipping on a consignment basis, consignors are able to better market products by moving them closer to the end user; however, they do so without selling the goods to the intermediary (consignee).

The standard provides the following guidance for determining whether an arrangement is a consignment arrangement:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Consignment Arrangements

606-10-55-79

When an entity delivers a product to another party (such as a dealer or a distributor) for sale to end **customers**, the entity should evaluate whether that other party has obtained control of the product at that point in time. A product that has been delivered to another party may be held in a consignment arrangement if that other party has not obtained control of the product. Accordingly, an entity should not recognize **revenue** upon delivery of a product to another party if the delivered product is held on consignment.

606-10-55-80

Indicators that an arrangement is a consignment arrangement include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. The product is controlled by the entity until a specified event occurs, such as the sale of the product to a customer of the dealer, or until a specified period expires.
- b. The entity is able to require the return of the product or transfer the product to a third party (such as another dealer).
- c. The dealer does not have an unconditional obligation to pay for the product (although it might be required to pay a deposit).

Entities entering into a consignment arrangement must determine the nature of the performance obligation (i.e., whether the obligation is to transfer the product/good to the consignee or to transfer the product to the end customer). This determination should be based on whether control of the product passes to the consignee upon delivery. Typically, a consignor will not relinquish control of the consigned product until the product is sold to the end consumer or, in some cases, when a specified period expires. Consignees commonly do not have any obligation to pay for the product other than to pay the consignor the agreed-upon portion of the sale price once the consignee sells the product to a third party. As a result, revenue generally would not be recognized for consignment arrangements when the products are delivered to the consignee because control has not transferred (i.e., the performance obligation to deliver goods to the end customer has not yet been satisfied).

7.5

Bill-and-hold arrangements

In some sales arrangements, an entity fulfills its obligations and bills the customer for the work performed but does not ship the goods until a later date. These arrangements, often called “bill-and-hold,” usually are designed this way at the request of the customer for a number of reasons, including a lack of storage capacity or its inability to use the goods until a later date.

The criteria for determining whether a bill-and-hold arrangement qualifies for revenue recognition under the standard are similar to, but somewhat less detailed than, the criteria in SAB Topic 13,¹⁹⁸ Securities Exchange Act Release 23507, Accounting and Auditing Enforcement Release No. 108 and SEC Release Nos. 33-8642, 34-52885 and IC-27178. For example, the requirement in SAB Topic 13 that the arrangement include a fixed delivery schedule is not a consideration under the standard.

The standard provides the following guidance with respect to these arrangements:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Bill-and-Hold Arrangements

606-10-55-81

A bill-and-hold arrangement is a **contract** under which an entity bills a **customer** for a product but the entity retains physical possession of the product until it is transferred to the customer at a point in time in the future. For example, a customer may request an entity to enter into such a contract because of the customer's lack of available space for the product or because of delays in the customer's production schedules.

606-10-55-82

An entity should determine when it has satisfied its performance obligation to transfer a product by evaluating when a customer obtains control of that product (see paragraph 606-10-25-30). For some contracts, control is transferred either when the product is delivered to the customer's site or when the product is shipped, depending on the terms of the contract (including delivery and shipping terms). However, for some contracts, a customer may obtain control of a product even though that product remains in an entity's physical possession. In that case, the customer has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the product even though it has decided not to exercise its right to take physical possession of that product. Consequently, the entity does not control the product. Instead, the entity provides custodial services to the customer over the customer's asset.

606-10-55-83

In addition to applying the guidance in paragraph 606-10-25-30, for a customer to have obtained control of a product in a bill-and-hold arrangement, all of the following criteria must be met:

- a. The reason for the bill-and-hold arrangement must be substantive (for example, the customer has requested the arrangement).
- b. The product must be identified separately as belonging to the customer.
- c. The product currently must be ready for physical transfer to the customer.
- d. The entity cannot have the ability to use the product or to direct it to another customer.

606-10-55-84

If an entity recognizes **revenue** for the sale of a product on a bill-and-hold basis, the entity should consider whether it has remaining performance obligations (for example, for custodial services) in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-22 to which the entity should allocate a portion of the **transaction price** in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-28 through 32-41.

¹⁹⁸ The SEC staff has been reviewing its revenue guidance in light of the new standard and has rescinded four SEC Staff Observer comments on narrow issues related to revenue effective upon adoption of the new standard. However, it hasn't yet addressed what will happen with SAB Topic 13.

The standard provides the following example to illustrate the bill-and-hold guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 63 – Bill-and-Hold Arrangement

606-10-55-409

An entity enters into a contract with a customer on January 1, 20X8, for the sale of a machine and spare parts. The manufacturing lead time for the machine and spare parts is two years.

606-10-55-410

Upon completion of manufacturing, the entity demonstrates that the machine and spare parts meet the agreed-upon specifications in the contract. The promises to transfer the machine and spare parts are distinct and result in two performance obligations that each will be satisfied at a point in time. On December 31, 20X9, the customer pays for the machine and spare parts but only takes physical possession of the machine. Although the customer inspects and accepts the spare parts, the customer requests that the spare parts be stored at the entity's warehouse because of its close proximity to the customer's factory. The customer has legal title to the spare parts, and the parts can be identified as belonging to the customer. Furthermore, the entity stores the spare parts in a separate section of its warehouse, and the parts are ready for immediate shipment at the customer's request. The entity expects to hold the spare parts for two to four years, and the entity does not have the ability to use the spare parts or direct them to another customer.

606-10-55-411

The entity identifies the promise to provide custodial services as a performance obligation because it is a service provided to the customer and it is distinct from the machine and spare parts. Consequently, the entity accounts for three performance obligations in the contract (the promises to provide the machine, the spare parts, and the custodial services). The transaction price is allocated to the three performance obligations and revenue is recognized when (or as) control transfers to the customer.

606-10-55-412

Control of the machine transfers to the customer on December 31, 20X9, when the customer takes physical possession. The entity assesses the indicators in paragraph 606-10-25-30 to determine the point in time at which control of the spare parts transfers to the customer, noting that the entity has received payment, the customer has legal title to the spare parts, and the customer has inspected and accepted the spare parts. In addition, the entity concludes that all of the criteria in paragraph 606-10-55-83 are met, which is necessary for the entity to recognize revenue in a bill-and-hold arrangement. The entity recognizes revenue for the spare parts on December 31, 20X9, when control transfers to the customer.

606-10-55-413

The performance obligation to provide custodial services is satisfied over time as the services are provided. The entity considers whether the payment terms include a significant financing component in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-15 through 32-20.

7.6 Recognizing revenue for licenses of intellectual property

The standard provides guidance on the recognition of revenue for licenses of intellectual property that differs from the recognition model for other promised goods and services. We discuss licensing in detail in Chapter 8.

7.7 Recognizing revenue when a right of return exists

As discussed in Section 4.7, a right of return does not represent a separate performance obligation. Instead, the existence of a right of return affects the transaction price, and the entity must determine whether the customer will return the transferred product.

Under the standard, as discussed in Chapter 5, an entity will estimate the transaction price and apply the constraint to the estimated transaction price. In doing so, it will consider the products expected to be returned to determine the amount to which the entity expects to be entitled (excluding consideration for the products expected to be returned). The entity will recognize revenue based on the amount to which it expects to be entitled through the end of the return period (considering expected product returns). An entity will not recognize the portion of the revenue subject to the constraint until the amount is no longer constrained, which could be at the end of the return period or earlier if the entity's expectations about the products expected to be returned changes prior to the end of the return period. The entity will recognize the amount received or receivable that is expected to be returned as a refund liability, representing its obligation to return the customer's consideration. An entity also will update its estimates at each financial reporting date. See Sections 4.7 and 5.4.1 for further discussion on rights of return.

7.8 Recognizing revenue for customer options for additional goods and services

As discussed in Section 4.6, when an entity grants a customer the option to acquire additional goods or services, that option is a separate performance obligation if it provides a material right to the customer that the customer would not receive without entering into the contract (e.g., a discount that exceeds the range of discounts typically given for those goods or services to that class of customer in that geographical area or market). If the option provides a material right to the customer, the customer in effect pays the entity in advance for future goods or services and the entity will be required to allocate a portion of the transaction price to the material right at contract inception (see Section 6.1.5). The revenue allocated to the material right will be recognized when (or as) the option is exercised (and the underlying future goods or services are transferred) or when the option expires.

In contrast, if a customer option is not deemed to be a material right and is instead a marketing offer, there is no accounting for the option and no accounting for the underlying goods or services until those subsequent purchases occur.

Question 7-12

How should an entity account for the exercise of a material right? That is, should it be accounted for as a contract modification, a continuation of the existing contract or as variable consideration? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 32]

See response to Question 4-16 in Section 4.6.

7.9 Breakage and prepayments for future goods or services

In certain industries, an entity will collect nonrefundable payments from its customers for goods or services that the customer has a right to receive in the future. However, a customer may ultimately leave that right unexercised (often referred to as breakage). For example, retailers frequently sell gift cards that are not completely redeemed, and airlines sometimes sell tickets to passengers who allow the tickets to expire unused.

The standard provides the following guidance on accounting for customers' unexercised rights:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance

Customers' Unexercised Rights

606-10-55-46

In accordance with paragraph 606-10-45-2, upon receipt of a prepayment from a **customer**, an entity should recognize a **contract liability** in the amount of the prepayment for its **performance obligation** to transfer, or to stand ready to transfer, goods or services in the future. An entity should derecognize that contract liability (and recognize **revenue**) when it transfers those goods or services and, therefore, satisfies its performance obligation.

606-10-55-47

A customer's nonrefundable prepayment to an entity gives the customer a right to receive a good or service in the future (and obliges the entity to stand ready to transfer a good or service). However, customers may not exercise all of their contractual rights. Those unexercised rights are often referred to as breakage.

606-10-55-48

If an entity expects to be entitled to a breakage amount in a contract liability, the entity should recognize the expected breakage amount as revenue in proportion to the pattern of rights exercised by the customer. If an entity does not expect to be entitled to a breakage amount, the entity should recognize the expected breakage amount as revenue when the likelihood of the customer exercising its remaining rights becomes remote. To determine whether an entity expects to be entitled to a breakage amount, the entity should consider the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration.

606-10-55-49

An entity should recognize a liability (and not revenue) for any consideration received that is attributable to a customer's unexercised rights for which the entity is required to remit to another party, for example, a government entity in accordance with applicable unclaimed property laws.

As stated above, when an entity receives consideration that is attributable to a customer's unexercised rights, the entity should recognize a contract liability equal to the amount prepaid by the customer for the performance obligation to transfer, or to stand ready to transfer, goods or services in the future. Revenue normally would be recognized when the entity satisfies its performance obligation.

Since entities will frequently not be required by customers to fully satisfy their performance obligations, the Board concluded¹⁹⁹ that an entity that expects to be entitled to a breakage amount should recognize breakage as revenue in proportion to the pattern of rights exercised by the customer. If an entity does not expect to be entitled to a breakage amount, it should not recognize any breakage amounts as revenue until the likelihood of the customer exercising its right becomes remote. In estimating any breakage amount, an entity has to consider the constraint on variable consideration, as discussed in Section 5.2.3. That is, if it is probable that a significant revenue reversal would occur for any estimated breakage amounts, an entity should not recognize those amounts until the breakage amounts are no longer constrained.

¹⁹⁹ Paragraph BC398 of ASU 2014-09.

As discussed above, the guidance on breakage requires that an entity establish a liability for the full amount of the prepayment and recognize breakage on that liability as revenue proportionate to the pattern of rights exercised by the customer. If the prepayment element (e.g., the sale of a gift card, loyalty points) is one of multiple performance obligations identified in a contract, an allocation of the transaction price will need to be made between the identified performance obligations so the amount deferred as a contract liability may differ from the amount of prepayment received for the unsatisfied performance obligations. The following example depicts the sale of goods with loyalty points. In this example, the amount allocated to the points (i.e., the “prepaid” element) is less than the standalone selling price of those points due to the allocation of the transaction price among the two performance obligation as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 52 – Customer Loyalty Program

606-10-55-353

An entity has a customer loyalty program that rewards a customer with 1 customer loyalty point for every \$10 of purchases. Each point is redeemable for a \$1 discount on any future purchases of the entity’s products. During a reporting period, customers purchase products for \$100,000 and earn 10,000 points that are redeemable for future purchases. The consideration is fixed, and the standalone selling price of the purchased products is \$100,000. The entity expects 9,500 points to be redeemed. The entity estimates a standalone selling price of \$0.95 per point (totalling \$9,500) on the basis of the likelihood of redemption in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-44.

606-10-55-354

The points provide a material right to customers that they would not receive without entering into a contract. Consequently, the entity concludes that the promise to provide points to the customer is a performance obligation. The entity allocates the transaction price (\$100,000) to the product and the points on a relative standalone selling price basis as follows:

Product	\$91,324 [$\$100,000 \times (\$100,000 \text{ standalone selling price} \div \$109,500)$]
Points	\$8,676 [$\$100,000 \times (\$9,500 \text{ standalone selling price} \div \$109,500)$]

606-10-55-355

At the end of the first reporting period, 4,500 points have been redeemed, and the entity continues to expect 9,500 points to be redeemed in total. The entity recognizes revenue for the loyalty points of \$4,110 [$(4,500 \text{ points} \div 9,500 \text{ points}) \times \$8,676$] and recognizes a contract liability of \$4,566 ($\$8,676 - \$4,110$) for the unredeemed points at the end of the first reporting period.

606-10-55-356

At the end of the second reporting period, 8,500 points have been redeemed cumulatively. The entity updates its estimate of the points that will be redeemed and now expects that 9,700 points will be redeemed. The entity recognizes revenue for the loyalty points of \$3,493 [$(8,500 \text{ total points redeemed} \div 9,700 \text{ total points expected to be redeemed}) \times \$8,676 \text{ initial allocation} - \$4,110 \text{ recognized in the first reporting period}$]. The contract liability balance is \$1,073 ($\$8,676 \text{ initial allocation} - \$7,603 \text{ of cumulative revenue recognized}$).

Question 7-13 **Are customers' unexercised rights (i.e., breakage) a form of variable consideration?**

Although the breakage guidance in ASC 606-10-55-48 specifically refers to the constraint on variable consideration, we do not believe breakage is a form of variable consideration (see Section 5.2) because it does not affect the transaction price. Breakage is a recognition concept (Step 5) that could affect the timing of revenue recognition and is not a measurement concept (Step 3). For example, the transaction price for a sale of a \$20 gift card is fixed at \$20 regardless of the expected breakage amount. The expected breakage, however, could affect the timing of revenue recognition because an entity is required under ASC 606-10-55-48 to "recognize the expected breakage amount as revenue in proportion to the pattern of rights exercised by the customer" if it expects to be entitled to a breakage amount.

8 Licenses of intellectual property

The standard provides guidance on the recognition of revenue for licenses of intellectual property that differs from the recognition model for other promised goods and services. Because licenses include a wide array of features and economic characteristics, the Board decided that an entity will need to evaluate the nature of its promise to grant a license of intellectual property in order to determine whether the promise is satisfied (and revenue is recognized) over time or at a point in time. A license will either provide:

- ▶ A right to access the entity's intellectual property throughout the license period, which results in revenue that is recognized over time
- ▶ A right to use the entity's intellectual property as it exists at the point in time in which the license is granted, which results in revenue that is recognized at a point in time

The standard provides the following examples of intellectual property that may be licensed to a customer:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

606-10-55-54

A license establishes a customer's rights to the intellectual property of an entity. Licenses of intellectual property may include, but are not limited to, licenses of any of the following:

- a. Software (other than software subject to a hosting arrangement that does not meet the criteria in paragraph 985-20-15-5) and technology
- b. Motion pictures, music, and other forms of media and entertainment
- c. Franchises
- d. Patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

The FASB emphasized in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²⁰⁰ that a contract must include a license of intellectual property in order for an entity to apply the licensing implementation guidance. This may be a straightforward assessment for many contracts. However, entities may have to more carefully evaluate the nature of the rights conveyed or promises included in a contract. For example, a software hosting contract will only include a license to intellectual property if the following criteria in ASC 985-20-15-5(a) are met: the customer (1) has the contractual right to take possession of the software at any time during the hosting period without significant penalty and (2) can feasibly either run the software on its own hardware or contract with another party unrelated to the vendor to host the software.

The Board also noted²⁰¹ that entities are required to identify the promised goods and services and determine whether those goods and services are distinct for all contracts, including those that contain a license of intellectual property. The FASB concluded that it is not necessary to provide additional

²⁰⁰ Paragraph BC37 of ASU 2016-10.

²⁰¹ Paragraphs BC41 and 42 of ASU 2016-10.

guidance on identifying performance obligations specifically tailored to licenses of intellectual property. Instead, entities should apply the requirements of Step 2 of the model discussed in detail in Chapter 4 and in Section 8.1.

8.1 Identifying performance obligations in a licensing arrangement

Contracts for licenses of intellectual property frequently include explicit or implicit promises for additional goods and services (e.g., equipment, when-and-if available upgrades, maintenance, installation). Consistent with Step 2 of the general model (see Chapter 4), entities will need to apply the guidance on identifying performance obligations in paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-22 when a contract with a customer includes a license of intellectual property and other promised goods or services in order to appropriately determine whether the license of intellectual property and the other promises are distinct (i.e., are separate performance obligations).

The standard provides the following guidance on identifying performance obligations in a licensing arrangement:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

606-10-55-55

In addition to a promise to grant a license (or licenses) to a **customer**, an entity may also promise to transfer other goods or services to the customer. Those promises may be explicitly stated in the **contract** or implied by an entity's customary business practices, published policies, or specific statements (see paragraph 606-10-25-16). As with other types of contracts, when a contract with a customer includes a promise to grant a license (or licenses) in addition to other promised goods or services, an entity applies paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-22 to identify each of the **performance obligations** in the contract.

As discussed in Section 4.2, the standard outlines a two-step process for determining whether a promised good or service (including a license of intellectual property) is distinct and, therefore, is a performance obligation: (1) consideration of the individual good or service (i.e., whether the good or service is capable of being distinct) and (2) consideration of whether the good or service is separately identifiable from other promises in the contract (i.e., whether the promise to transfer the good or service is distinct in the context of the contract).

To conclude that a good or service is distinct, an entity must determine that the good or service is both capable of being distinct and distinct in the context of the contract. These requirements must similarly be applied to determine whether a promise to grant a license of intellectual property is distinct from other promised goods or services in the contract. Therefore, entities are required to assess whether the customer can benefit from a license of intellectual property on its own or together with readily available resources (i.e., whether it is capable of being distinct) and whether the entity's promise to transfer a license of intellectual property is separately identifiable from other promises in the contract (i.e., whether it is distinct in the context of the contract). The assessment of whether a license of intellectual property is distinct will need to be based on the facts and circumstances of each contract.

8.1.1 Licenses of intellectual property that are distinct

Licenses frequently are capable of being distinct (i.e., the first criteria of a distinct good or service) as a customer often can obtain at least some benefit from the license of intellectual property on its own or with other readily available resources. Consider Example 11, Case A, from the standard (excerpted in full in Section 4.2.3), which includes a contract for a software license that is transferred along with installation services, technical support and software updates. The installation service is routinely performed by other entities and does not significantly modify the software. The software license is delivered before the other goods and services and remains functional without the updates and technical support. The entity concludes that the customer can benefit from each of the goods and services either on their own or together with other goods or services that are readily available. That is, each good or service, including the software license, is capable of being distinct under ASC 606-10-25-19(a).

If an entity determines that a license of intellectual property and other promised goods or services are capable of being distinct, the second step of the distinct evaluation is to determine whether they are distinct in the context of the contract. As part of this evaluation, an entity should consider the indicators for whether the goods or services are not separately identifiable including whether: (1) the entity provides a significant service of integrating the license and other goods or services into a combined output, (2) the license and other goods or services significantly modify or customize each other or (3) the license and other goods or services are highly interdependent or highly interrelated such that the entity would not be able to fulfill its promise to transfer the license independently of fulfilling its promise to transfer the other goods or services to the customer.

As part of their evaluation of the separately identifiable principle, entities also may need to consider the utility of the license of intellectual property and other promised goods or services in a contract (i.e., the ability of each good or service to provide benefit or value). As discussed in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,²⁰² an entity may be able to fulfill its promise to transfer each good or service in a contract independently of the other goods or services, but if each good or service significantly affects the other's utility to the customer, the promises would not be distinct in the context of the contract. This notion of utility is further discussed in Section 4.2.1.2 and in our discussion below on Example 10, Case C, in Section 8.1.2.

Continuing with Example 11, Case A, discussed above, the entity considers the separately identifiable principle and factors in ASC 606-10-25-21 and determines that the promise to transfer each good and service, including the software license, is separately identifiable. In reaching this determination, the entity considers that the installation services are routine and can be obtained from other providers. In addition, the software updates aren't necessary for the software to maintain a high level of utility to the customer during the license period. Therefore, neither the installation services nor the software updates significantly affect the customer's ability to use and benefit from the software license. The entity further observes that none of the promised goods or services significantly modify or customize one another and the entity is not providing a significant service of integrating the software and services into one combined output. Lastly, the software and the services are not deemed to be highly interdependent or highly interrelated because the entity would be able to fulfill its promise to transfer the initial software license independent from its promise to subsequently provide the installation service, software updates and the technical support.

²⁰² Paragraph BC33(b) of ASU 2016-10.

The following example from the standard also illustrates a contract for which a license of intellectual property is determined to be distinct from other promised goods or services:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 56 – Identifying a Distinct License

606-10-55-367

An entity, a pharmaceutical company, licenses to a customer its patent rights to an approved drug compound for 10 years and also promises to manufacture the drug for the customer for 5 years, while the customer develops its own manufacturing capability. The drug is a mature product; therefore, there is no expectation that the entity will undertake activities to change the drug (for example, to alter its chemical composition). There are no other promised goods or services in the contract.

Case B – License Is Distinct

606-10-55-371

In this case, the manufacturing process used to produce the drug is not unique or specialized, and several other entities also can also manufacture the drug for the customer.

606-10-55-372

The entity assesses the goods and services promised to the customer to determine which goods and services are distinct, and it concludes that the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-19 are met for each of the license and the manufacturing service. The entity concludes that the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(a) is met because the customer can benefit from the license together with readily available resources other than the entity's manufacturing service (that is, because there are other entities that can provide the manufacturing service) and can benefit from the manufacturing service together with the license transferred to the customer at the start of the contract.

606-10-55-372A

The entity also concludes that its promises to grant the license and to provide the manufacturing service are separately identifiable (that is, the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(b) is met). The entity concludes that the license and the manufacturing service are not inputs to a combined item in this contract on the basis of the principle and the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21. In reaching this conclusion, the entity considers that the customer could separately purchase the license without significantly affecting its ability to benefit from the license. Neither the license nor the manufacturing service is significantly modified or customized by the other, and the entity is not providing a significant service of integrating those items into a combined output. The entity further considers that the license and the manufacturing service are not highly interdependent or highly interrelated because the entity would be able to fulfill its promise to transfer the license independent of fulfilling its promise to subsequently manufacture the drug for the customer. Similarly, the entity would be able to manufacture the drug for the customer even if the customer had previously obtained the license and initially utilized a different manufacturer. Thus, although the manufacturing service necessarily depends on the license in this contract (that is, the entity would not contract for the manufacturing service without the customer having obtained the license), the license and the manufacturing service do not significantly affect each other. Consequently, the entity concludes that its promises to grant the license and to provide the manufacturing service are distinct and that there are two performance obligations:

- a. License of patent rights
- b. Manufacturing service.

606-10-55-373

The entity assesses the nature of its promise to grant the license. The entity concludes that the patented drug formula is functional intellectual property (that is, it has significant standalone functionality in the form of its ability to treat a disease or condition). There is no expectation that the entity will undertake activities to change the functionality of the drug formula during the license period. Because the intellectual property has significant standalone functionality, any other activities the entity might undertake (for example, promotional activities like advertising or activities to develop other drug products) would not significantly affect the utility of the licensed intellectual property. Consequently, the nature of the entity's promise in transferring the license is to provide a right to use the entity's functional intellectual property, and it accounts for the license as a performance obligation satisfied at a point in time. The entity recognizes revenue for the license performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-58B through 55-58C.

606-10-55-374

In its assessment of the nature of the license, the entity does not consider the manufacturing service because it is an additional promised service in the contract. The entity applies paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 to determine whether the manufacturing service is a performance obligation satisfied at a point in time or over time.

8.1.2**Licenses of intellectual property that are not distinct**

The licenses of intellectual property included in the examples above were determined to be distinct as they met the two criteria of ASC 606-10-55-19. In other situations, a license of intellectual property may not be distinct from other promised goods or services in a contract, either because it is not capable of being distinct and/or it is not separately identifiable.

ASC 606-10-55-56 requires that a license that is not distinct from other promised goods or services in a contract be combined into a single performance obligation. It also identifies two examples of licenses of intellectual property that are not distinct from other goods or services as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Implementation Guidance and Illustrations**Licensing***606-10-55-56**

If the promise to grant a license is not distinct from other promised goods or services in the contract in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-18 through 25-22, an entity should account for the promise to grant a license and those other promised goods or services together as a single performance obligation. Examples of licenses that are not distinct from other goods or services promised in the contract include the following:

- a. A license that forms a component of a tangible good and that is integral to the functionality of the good
- b. A license that the customer can benefit from only in conjunction with a related service (such as an online service provided by the entity that enables, by granting a license, the customer to access content).

In both examples, a customer only benefits from the combined output of the license of intellectual property and the related good or service and, therefore, the license is not distinct and would be combined with those other promised goods or services.

The standard includes other examples of non-distinct licenses of intellectual property that are combined with other promised goods or services because the customer can only benefit from the license in conjunction with a related service (as described in ASC 606-10-55-56(b)). For example, in Example 10, Case C (excerpted in full in Section 4.2.3), an entity grants a customer a license to antivirus software and promises to provide the customer with when-and-if available updates to that software during the three-year license period. The entity concludes that the license of intellectual property is capable of being distinct because the customer can obtain some limited benefit from the license without the updates. However, when evaluating whether the license is distinct in the context of the contract, the entity concludes that its promises to transfer the license and to provide the when-and-if available updates are not separately identifiable. This is because the license and the updates are effectively inputs to a combined item (i.e., antivirus protection) promised to the customer in the contract. The entity notes as part of its evaluation that the updates significantly modify the functionality of the software in that they permit the software to protect the customer from a significant number of additional viruses that the software did not protect against previously and are integral to maintaining the utility of the software license to the customer. That is, without the updates, the customer's ability to benefit from the software would decline significantly over the license period. Accordingly, the entity accounts for the software license and the when-and-if available updates as a single performance obligation.

This example from the standard (Example 10, Case C) illustrates how the notion of "utility" (discussed above) can affect the determination of whether a license is distinct from other promised goods or services in a contract. Example 55 and Example 56, Case A, from the standard also illustrate contracts that include licenses of intellectual property that are not distinct from other goods or services promised to the customer. Example 56, Case A is excerpted below in Section 8.2.4.

To the extent that an entity is required to bundle a license of intellectual property with other promised goods and services in a contract, it will need to consider the licenses guidance to help determine the nature of its promise to the customer. See Section 8.2.4 for further discussion.

8.1.3 Contractual restrictions



FASB amendments

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that clarified that entities will need to distinguish between contractual provisions that define the attributes of a single promised license (e.g., restrictions of time, geography or use) and contractual provisions that require them to transfer additional goods or services to customers (e.g., additional rights to use or access intellectual property).

The standard requires entities to distinguish between contractual provisions that define the attributes of a license of intellectual property (e.g., restrictions of time, geography or use) and other provisions in the contract that represent additional promised goods or services to the customer. Contractual provisions that are attributes of a promised license define the scope of a customer's rights to intellectual property and do not affect whether a performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time or over time or affect the number of performance obligations in the contract.

The following excerpt from the standard describes the requirement to evaluate restrictions on a license of intellectual property:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

606-10-55-64

Contractual provisions that explicitly or implicitly require an entity to transfer control of additional goods or services to a customer (for example, by requiring the entity to transfer control of additional rights to use or rights to access intellectual property that the customer does not already control) should be distinguished from contractual provisions that explicitly or implicitly define the attributes of a single promised license (for example, restrictions of time, geographical region, or use). Attributes of a promised license define the scope of a customer's right to use or right to access the entity's intellectual property and, therefore, do not define whether the entity satisfies its **performance obligation** at a point in time or over time and do not create an obligation for the entity to transfer any additional rights to use or access its intellectual property.

The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²⁰³ that judgment often is required to distinguish a single promised license with multiple attributes from a license that contains multiple promises to the customer. If an entity determines that a license contains multiple promises to a customer, it will need to evaluate whether the multiple promises represent multiple performance obligations. The guidance on contractual restrictions in ASC 606-10-55-64 does not replace the requirement to appropriately identify the goods or services promised to the customer in accordance with Step 2 of the model (see Chapter 4).

When analyzing contractual restrictions, an entity should consider whether a restriction requires it to grant additional rights to the customer at a future date in order to fulfill its promises under the contract. The presence of a requirement to grant additional rights to the customer indicates that there may be multiple promises that need to be accounted for under Step 2 of the model.

The standard includes several examples that illustrate the application of the guidance on contractual restrictions, including Example 59 (included in Section 8.4 below) and Example 61B below:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 61B – Distinguishing Multiple Licenses from Attributes of a Single License

606-10-55-399K

On December 15, 20X0, an entity enters into a contract with a customer that permits the customer to embed the entity's functional intellectual property in two classes of the customer's consumer products (Class 1 and Class 2) for five years beginning on January 1, 20X1. During the first year of the license period, the customer is permitted to embed the entity's intellectual property only in Class 1. Beginning in Year 2 (that is, beginning on January 1, 20X2), the customer is permitted to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 2. There is no expectation that the entity will undertake activities to change the functionality of the intellectual property during the license period. There are no other

²⁰³ Paragraph BC46 of ASU 2016-10.

promised goods or services in the contract. The entity provides (or otherwise makes available—for example, makes available for download) a copy of the intellectual property to the customer on December 20, 20X0.

606-10-55-399L

In identifying the goods and services promised to the customer in the contract (in accordance with guidance in paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-18), the entity considers whether the contract grants the customer a single promise, for which an attribute of the promised license is that during Year 1 of the contract the customer is restricted from embedding the intellectual property in the Class 2 consumer products), or two promises (that is, a license for a right to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 1 for a five-year period beginning on January 1, 20X1, and a right to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 2 for a four-year period beginning on January 1, 20X2).

606-10-55-399M

In making this assessment, the entity determines that the provision in the contract stipulating that the right for the customer to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 2 only commences one year after the right for the customer to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 1 means that after the customer can begin to use and benefit from its right to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 1 on January 1, 20X1, the entity must still fulfill a second promise to transfer an additional right to use the licensed intellectual property (that is, the entity must still fulfill its promise to grant the customer the right to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 2). The entity does not transfer control of the right to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 2 before the customer can begin to use and benefit from that right on January 1, 20X2.

606-10-55-399N

The entity then concludes that the first promise (the right to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 1) and the second promise (the right to embed the entity's intellectual property in Class 2) are distinct from each other. The customer can benefit from each right on its own and independently of the other. Therefore, each right is capable of being distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19(a). In addition, the entity concludes that the promise to transfer each license is separately identifiable (that is, each right meets the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(b)) on the basis of an evaluation of the principle and the factors in paragraph 606-10-25-21. The entity concludes that it is not providing any integration service with respect to the two rights (that is, the two rights are not inputs to a combined output with functionality that is different from the functionality provided by the licenses independently), neither right significantly modifies or customizes the other, and the entity can fulfill its promise to transfer each right to the customer independently of the other (that is, the entity could transfer either right to the customer without transferring the other). In addition, neither the Class 1 license nor the Class 2 license is integral to the customer's ability to use or benefit from the other.

606-10-55-399O

Because each right is distinct, they constitute separate performance obligations. On the basis of the nature of the licensed intellectual property and the fact that there is no expectation that the entity will undertake activities to change the functionality of the intellectual property during the license period, each promise to transfer one of the two licenses in this contract provides the customer with a right to use the entity's intellectual property and the entity's promise to transfer each license is, therefore, satisfied at a point in time. The entity determines at what point in time to recognize the revenue allocable to each performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-58B through 55-58C. Because a customer does not control a license until it can begin to use and benefit from the rights conveyed, the entity recognizes revenue allocated to the Class 1 license no earlier than January 1, 20X1, and the revenue on the Class 2 license no earlier than January 1, 20X2.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,²⁰⁴ the FASB noted that the license to the symphony recording in Example 59 includes multiple restrictions of time, geography and use (i.e., the license gives the customer the right to use the recording for two years, only in Country A and only in commercials). Those restrictions are attributes of a single promised license because once the customer controls the rights transferred by that license, there is no additional promise for the entity to fulfill (e.g., no promise to transfer control of additional rights to use the intellectual property).

In contrast, the contract in Example 61B provides the customer with the right to embed the licensed intellectual property in its Class 1 products during the first year of the contract but prohibits the customer from embedding the licensed intellectual property in its Class 2 products until the second year. That is, the entity must grant an additional right to the customer in year two to allow the licensed intellectual property to be embedded in the Class 2 products. Accordingly, the entity in this example determined that this provision is not solely an attribute of a single license. Rather, the provision demonstrates that the entity has a remaining promise to fulfill after transferring the initial right to embed the licensed intellectual property in the Class 1 consumer products. That is, because the customer does not control a license until it can begin to use and benefit from the rights transferred, the entity must still fulfill a second promise to transfer control of the right to embed the licensed intellectual property in the Class 2 consumer products (and would wait to recognize revenue for the right to embed the intellectual property in the Class 2 products until that point).

The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions²⁰⁵ that it evaluated a number of contractual provisions besides those included in the standard, including a common contractual provision in the media and entertainment industry called “broken windows.” This provision provides for substantial breaks between time periods or windows in a licensing contract during which a customer is able to use (or access) intellectual property. Media and entertainment entities had questioned whether the windows in such an arrangement represent separate licenses, even if the rights in each time period are the same. The Board explained that, while it didn’t include a broken windows example in the standard, its view is that a substantive break between the time periods for which a customer has the right to use intellectual property might suggest that the customer’s rights have been revoked for that period of time and that the entity has made an additional promise to transfer rights to use that same intellectual property again at a later date.

In many contracts, multiple, distinct rights may be transferred to a customer at the same point in time (e.g., licenses for multiple rights to use intellectual property) or over the same period of time (e.g., licenses for multiple rights to access intellectual property). The Board noted²⁰⁶ that an entity is not required to separately identify each set of distinct rights if those rights are transferred concurrently. For example, the licensor in Example 61B would not be precluded from accounting for the two sets of distinct rights as a single performance obligation if the facts were modified such that the customer was able to use and benefit from both sets of rights (i.e., Class 1 and Class 2) at the same time during the first year of the contract (rather than Class 1 starting in year one and Class 2 starting only in year two).

How we see it

We believe a critical part of the evaluation of contractual restrictions is whether a restriction requires an entity to *grant additional rights* to the customer at a future date in order to fulfill its promises under the contract. The presence of a requirement to grant additional rights to the customer indicates that there may be multiple performance obligations that need to be accounted for under Step 2 of the model.

An entity may need to apply significant judgment to distinguish between a single promised license with multiple attributes and a license that contains multiple promises to the customer that may be separate performance obligations.

²⁰⁴ Paragraph BC44 of ASU 2016-10.

²⁰⁵ Paragraph BC45 of ASU 2016-10.

²⁰⁶ Paragraph BC47 of ASU 2016-10.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 includes language on contractual restrictions that differs from the language on contractual provisions in ASC 606-10-55-64. However, the IASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments) that, consistent with the US GAAP standard, an entity should apply the requirements in Step 2 of the general model on identifying performance obligations when distinguishing between contractual provisions that create promises to transfer additional rights (and therefore may be separate performance obligations) from contractual provisions that are merely attributes of a license that establish when, where and how the right may be used. Under both IFRS 15 and ASC 606, significant judgment will be required to distinguish between a contract that contains a single license with multiple attributes and a contract that contains multiple licenses to the customer that represent separate performance obligations.

8.1.4

Guarantees to defend or maintain a patent

The standard states that a guarantee to defend or maintain a patent does not represent a promised good or service in a licensing contract. This type of guarantee also does not affect whether a license provides a right to access (i.e., symbolic intellectual property and functional intellectual property that meets the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62(a) and (b)) or a right to use (i.e., functional intellectual property that doesn't meet the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62(a) and (b)) an entity's intellectual property. This provision is similar to legacy guidance in SAB Topic 13. See Section 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 below for discussion on functional and symbolic licenses of intellectual property.

The guidance on the accounting for guarantees to defend or maintain a patent is included in the following excerpt from the standard:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

606-10-55-64A

Guarantees provided by the entity that it has a valid patent to intellectual property and that it will defend that patent from unauthorized use do not affect whether a license provides a right to access the entity's intellectual property or a right to use the entity's intellectual property. Similarly, a promise to defend a patent right is not a promised good or service because it provides assurance to the customer that the license transferred meets the specifications of the license promised in the contract.

Question 8-1

How should entities account for modifications to licenses of intellectual property?

A license provides a customer with rights to use or access the intellectual property of an entity. The terms of each license of intellectual property are defined by the contract, which establishes the customer's rights (e.g., period of time, area of use). We believe that when a contract for a license of intellectual property is modified, the additional and/or modified license of intellectual property is distinct from the original license because the new and/or modified rights will always differ from those conveyed by the original license.

The standard's contract modification guidance (see Section 3.4) requires that a modification in which the additional promised goods or services are distinct be accounted for on a prospective basis as follows:

- ▶ The modification will be accounted for as a separate contract if the additional consideration from the modification reflects the new license's standalone selling price in accordance with ASC 606-10-25-12.
- ▶ If the additional consideration does not reflect the standalone selling price of the new license, the modification would be accounted for in accordance with 606-10-25-13.

For a modification accounted for as a termination of the original contract and creation of a new contract in accordance with ASC 606-10-25-13(a), any revenue recognized to date under the original contract is not adjusted. At the modification date, the remaining unrecognized transaction price from the original contract (if any) plus the additional transaction price from the new contract is allocated to the remaining performance obligation(s) in the new contract. Any revenue allocated to a performance obligation created at the modification date for the renewal or extension of a license should not be recognized until the beginning of the renewal or extension period (see Section 8.4).

8.2 Determining the nature of the entity's promise in granting a license



FASB amendments

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that clarified how an entity will evaluate the nature of a promise to grant a license of intellectual property to determine whether the promise is satisfied (and revenue is recognized) over time or at a point in time. The amendments also require entities to classify intellectual property in one of two categories (i.e., functional or symbolic).

Entities will need to evaluate the nature of a promise to grant a license of intellectual property in order to determine whether the promise is satisfied (and revenue is recognized) over time or at a point in time. Because this evaluation can be difficult, the standard includes the following requirement for entities to classify intellectual property in one of two categories – functional or symbolic:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

Determining the Nature of the Entity's Promise

606-10-55-59

To determine whether the entity's promise to provide a right to access its intellectual property or a right to use its intellectual property, the entity should consider the nature of the intellectual property to which the customer will have rights. Intellectual property is either:

- a. Functional intellectual property. Intellectual property that has significant standalone functionality (for example, the ability to process a transaction, perform a function or task, or be played or aired). Functional intellectual property derives a substantial portion of its utility (that is, its ability to provide benefit or value) from its significant standalone functionality.
- b. Symbolic intellectual property. Intellectual property that is not functional intellectual property (that is, intellectual property that does not have significant standalone functionality). Because symbolic intellectual property does not have significant standalone functionality, substantially all of the utility of symbolic intellectual property is derived from its association with the entity's past or ongoing activities, including its ordinary business activities.

As explained in the Basis for Conclusion of ASU 2016-10,²⁰⁷ the licenses guidance is premised on the view that an entity's promise (explicit or implicit) to support or maintain intellectual property is inseparable from the entity's promise to grant the license when the activities to support or maintain the intellectual property *significantly* affect the "utility" of the intellectual property (i.e., its ability to provide benefit or value). Supporting or maintaining intellectual property generally includes undertaking activities (that do not transfer a good or service to the customer) that significantly affect the utility of the intellectual property. It could also include *not* undertaking activities or otherwise taking actions that would significantly degrade the utility of the intellectual property.

The FASB noted²⁰⁸ that whether an entity's promise to a customer includes supporting or maintaining intellectual property largely depends on whether the intellectual property has significant standalone functionality. Intellectual property that has significant standalone functionality is considered functional intellectual property. In contrast, intellectual property that does not have significant standalone functionality is considered symbolic intellectual property because it derives substantially all of its utility from the entity's past or ongoing activities (that do not transfer a good or service to the customer).



IASB differences

IFRS 15 does not require entities to classify licenses of intellectual property as either functional or symbolic. Under IFRS 15.B58, one of the three criteria to classify a license as a right to access (and therefore record revenue over time) is that "the contract requires, or the customer reasonably expects, that the entity will undertake activities that significantly affect the intellectual property to which the customer has rights."

The Boards agreed that their approaches generally will result in consistent answers, but there could be differences between US GAAP and IFRS when entities license brand names that no longer have any related ongoing activities (e.g., the license to the brand name of a defunct sports team such as the Brooklyn Dodgers). Under the FASB's approach, a license of a brand name would be classified as symbolic intellectual property, and revenue would be recognized over time, regardless of whether there are any related ongoing activities. Under the IASB's approach, revenue would be recognized at a point in time if there are no ongoing activities that significantly affect the intellectual property.

8.2.1 Functional intellectual property

Functional intellectual property has significant standalone functionality (e.g., the ability to process a transaction, perform a function or task, be played or aired). This type of intellectual property does not require the licensor to continue to support or maintain the intellectual property as part of the promise to the customer. The Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²⁰⁹ provides examples of functional intellectual property including software, biological compounds, drug formulas, completed media content (e.g., films, television shows, music) and patents underlying highly functional items (e.g., a patent to a specialized manufacturing process).

Licenses of functional intellectual property grant a right to use the entity's intellectual property and revenue generally will be recognized at the point in time when the intellectual property is made available for the customer's use and benefit (refer to Section 8.3 for further discussion on the timing of revenue recognition for licenses of intellectual property). This will be the case if the functionality is not expected to change substantially as a result of the licensor's ongoing activities that do not transfer another good

²⁰⁷ Paragraphs BC52 and BC55 of ASU 2016-10.

²⁰⁸ Paragraph BC56 of ASU 2016-10.

²⁰⁹ Paragraph BC56 of ASU 2016-10.

or service to the customer. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,²¹⁰ an entity's ongoing activities that do not substantively change the standalone functionality of functional intellectual property may affect the utility of the intellectual property but would not *significantly* affect it, so continuing to support or maintain the intellectual property is not part of the promise to a customer in transferring a license to functional intellectual property.

If the functionality of intellectual property is expected to substantively change as a result of activities that do not transfer a good or service to the customer, and the customer would be required or compelled to use the latest version of the intellectual property, the license would grant a right to access the entity's functional intellectual property, and revenue would be recognized over time. However, as discussed below, we expect licenses of functional intellectual property to meet the criteria to be recognized over time infrequently, if at all.

The standard includes the following guidance for determining whether a customer is provided with a right to use or right to access functional intellectual property:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

Determining the Nature of the Entity's Promise

606-10-55-62

A license to functional intellectual property grants a right to use the entity's intellectual property as it exists at the point in time at which the license is granted unless both of the following criteria are met:

- a. The functionality of the intellectual property to which the customer has rights is expected to substantively change during the license period as a result of activities of the entity that do not transfer a promised good or service to the customer (see paragraphs 606-10-25-16 through 25-18). Additional promised goods or services (for example, intellectual property upgrade rights or rights to use or access additional intellectual property) are not considered in assessing this criterion.
- b. The customer is contractually or practically required to use the updated intellectual property resulting from the activities in criterion (a).

If both of those criteria are met, then the license grants a right to access the entity's intellectual property.

606-10-55-63

Because functional intellectual property has significant standalone functionality, an entity's activities that do not substantively change that functionality do not significantly affect the utility of the intellectual property to which the customer has rights. Therefore, the entity's promise to the customer in granting a license to functional intellectual property does not include supporting or maintaining the intellectual property. Consequently, if a license to functional intellectual property is a separate **performance obligation** (see paragraph 606-10-55-55) and does not meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-55-62, it is satisfied at a point in time (see paragraphs 606-10-55-58B through 55-58C).

The following example from the standard illustrates an assessment of the nature of a license that is determined to represent functional intellectual property that will be recognized at a point in time (i.e., a right to use license):

²¹⁰ Paragraph BC56 of ASU 2016-10.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 54 – Right to Use Intellectual Property

606-10-55-362

Using the same facts as in Case A in Example 11 (see paragraphs 606-10-55-141 through 55-145), the entity identifies four performance obligations in a contract:

- a. The software license
- b. Installation services
- c. Software updates
- d. Technical support.

606-10-55-363

The entity assesses the nature of its promise to transfer the software license. The entity first concludes that the software to which the customer obtains rights as a result of the license is functional intellectual property. This is because the software has significant standalone functionality from which the customer can derive substantial benefit regardless of the entity's ongoing business activities.

606-10-55-363A

The entity further concludes that while the functionality of the underlying software is expected to change during the license period as a result of the entity's continued development efforts, the functionality of the software to which the customer has rights (that is, the customer's instance of the software) will change only as a result of the entity's promise to provide when-and-if available software updates. Because the entity's promise to provide software updates represents an additional promised service in the contract, the entity's activities to fulfill that promised service are not considered in evaluating the criteria in paragraph 606-10-55-62. The entity further notes that the customer has the right to install, or not install, software updates when they are provided such that the criterion in 606-10-55-62(b) would not be met even if the entity's activities to develop and provide software updates had met the criterion in paragraph 606-10-55-62(a).

606-10-55-363B

Therefore, the entity concludes that it has provided the customer with a right to use its software as it exists at the point in time the license is granted and the entity accounts for the software license performance obligation as a performance obligation satisfied at a point in time. The entity recognizes revenue on the software license performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-58B through 55-58C.

Generally, revenue for distinct licenses of functional intellectual property will be recognized at a point in time. However, if an entity meets the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62, revenue for a license of functional intellectual property will be recognized over time because that license would grant rights to access the entity's functional intellectual property. The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²¹¹ that it included the guidance in ASC 606-10-55-62 because it would be inconsistent with the principles of the licenses guidance to conclude that an entity's ongoing activities would not significantly affect the utility of functional intellectual property licensed to a customer if those ongoing activities: (1) substantively change the functionality of the intellectual property without transferring an additional good or service to

²¹¹ Paragraph BC58 of ASU 2016-10.

the customer and (2) directly affect the customer because the customer is subject to those changes in functionality. In this situation, the Board decided that an entity is only granting the customer the right to access its intellectual property in its present form, and the entity is required to continue to perform throughout the license period by making the changed intellectual property (e.g., changed code, content, or design) available to the customer.

Although the FASB included the guidance in ASC 606-10-55-62 for its conceptual merits, it noted²¹² that it expects entities will meet the criteria to recognize licenses of functional intellectual property over time *infrequently, if at all*. This is because when an entity performs activities to support or update functional intellectual property, the provision of those activities are typically an additional promised service to the customer and will therefore not meet the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62(a). This is depicted in Example 54 above, in which the entity's activities to develop or provide software updates do not meet the criterion in ASC 606-10-55-62(a) because the updates are determined to be an additional promised service to the customer.

That said, a license to functional intellectual property may end up being recognized over time because it is required to be combined with another good or service in Step 2 of the model, and the appropriate pattern of recognition for the combined performance obligation is over time. In this situation, if an entity determines the combined performance obligation should be recognized over time, that conclusion is based on the characteristics of the license of intellectual property and other goods/services underlying the combined performance obligation, not because the functional intellectual property underlying the license meets the criteria to be recognized over time under the licenses guidance. This concept of assessing a combined performance obligation that includes a license of intellectual property to determine the appropriate pattern of revenue recognition is discussed below in Section 8.2.4.

How we see it

It is important for entities that provide licenses of functional intellectual property to their customers to appropriately identify the promised goods or services in their contracts as part of Step 2 of the model because those conclusions may directly affect their evaluation of the criterion in ASC 606-10-55-62(a). Because functional intellectual property, by definition, has standalone functionality (e.g., the ability to process a transaction, perform a function or task, be played or aired), we would expect an entity that upon initial evaluation believes it meets the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62 to reaffirm that the promised goods or services identified in its Step 2 analysis is appropriate. Like the FASB, we expect distinct licenses of functional intellectual property to be recognized over time infrequently, if at all.

8.2.2 Symbolic intellectual property

Symbolic intellectual property is any intellectual property that is not functional intellectual property. In other words, symbolic intellectual property does not have significant standalone functionality. The utility of symbolic intellectual property is largely derived from a licensor's ongoing or past support that does not transfer a promised good or service to a customer (e.g., activities that support the value of character images licensed from an animated film). The Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²¹³ provides examples of symbolic intellectual property including brands, team or trade names, logos and franchise rights.

²¹² Paragraph BC58 of ASU 2016-10.

²¹³ Paragraph BC57 of ASU 2016-10.

Licenses of symbolic intellectual property grant a right to access an entity's intellectual property for which revenue will be recognized over time as the performance obligation is satisfied (e.g., over the license period). This is described in the standard as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Determining the Nature of the Entity's Promise

606-10-55-60

A customer's ability to derive benefit from a license to symbolic intellectual property depends on the entity continuing to support or maintain the intellectual property. Therefore, a license to symbolic intellectual property grants the customer a right to access the entity's intellectual property, which is satisfied over time (see paragraphs 606-10-55-58A and 606-10-55-58C) as the entity fulfills its promise to both:

- a. Grant the customer rights to use and benefit from the entity's intellectual property
- b. Support or maintain the intellectual property. An entity generally supports or maintains symbolic intellectual property by continuing to undertake those activities from which the utility of the intellectual property is derived and/or refraining from activities or other actions that would significantly degrade the utility of the intellectual property.

The Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²¹⁴ explains that the absence of significant standalone functionality for symbolic intellectual property means that the utility of the intellectual property depends on the entity supporting or maintaining it. For example, a license to a sports team's name and logo typically will have limited residual value if the team stops playing games. Therefore, in granting a license of symbolic intellectual property, the entity's promise to a customer is both to: (1) grant the customer rights to use and benefit from the intellectual property, which includes making a copy of the underlying intellectual property available for the customer's use and (2) support or maintain the intellectual property for a period of time.

When determining the period of time over which a performance obligation to grant a license of symbolic intellectual property is satisfied, the entity's obligation to support or maintain the intellectual property exists for the duration of the license period, unless the license period is longer than the remaining economic life of the intellectual property. The FASB noted²¹⁵ that it is reasonable to assume that an entity will not support or maintain intellectual property past the end of the intellectual property's economic life.

The standard includes the following example to illustrate an assessment of the nature of a license that is determined to represent symbolic intellectual property:

²¹⁴ Paragraph BC57 of ASU 2016-10.

²¹⁵ Paragraph BC57 of ASU 2016-10.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 58 – Access to Intellectual Property

606-10-55-383

An entity, a creator of comic strips, licenses the use of the images and names of its comic strip characters in three of its comic strips to a customer for a four-year term. There are main characters involved in each of the comic strips. However, newly created characters appear and disappear regularly and the images of the characters evolve over time. The customer, an operator of cruise ships, can use the entity's characters in various ways, such as in shows or parades, within reasonable guidelines.

606-10-55-384

In exchange for granting the license, the entity receives a fixed payment of \$1 million in each year of the 4-year term.

606-10-55-385

The entity concludes that it has made no other promises to the customer other than the promise to grant a license. That is, the additional activities associated with the license do not directly transfer a good or service to the customer. Therefore, the entity concludes that its only performance obligation is to transfer the license.

606-10-55-386

The entity assesses the nature of its promise to transfer the license and concludes that the nature of its promise is to grant the customer the right to access the entity's symbolic intellectual property. The entity determines that the licensed intellectual property (that is, the character names and images) is symbolic because it has no standalone functionality (the names and images cannot process a transaction, perform a function or task, or be played or aired separate from significant additional production that would, for example, use the images to create a movie or a show) and the utility of those names and images is derived from the entity's past and ongoing activities such as producing the weekly comic strip that includes the characters.

606-10-55-387

Because the nature of the entity's promise in granting the license is to provide the customer with a right to access the entity's intellectual property, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-58A, the entity accounts for the promised license as a performance obligation satisfied over time.

606-10-55-388

The entity recognizes the fixed consideration allocable to the license performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-58A and 606-10-55-58C. The entity considers paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 in identifying the method that best depicts its performance in the license. Because the contract provides the customer with unlimited use of the licensed characters for a fixed term, the entity determines that a time-based method would be the most appropriate measure of progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation.

Question 8-2

Can revenue for a license of symbolic intellectual property be recognized at a point in time if the licensor does not expect to perform or provide any activities to support or maintain the intellectual property?

No. Licenses for symbolic intellectual property will always represent a right to access an entity's intellectual property and, therefore, revenue for these types of licenses will be recognized over time.

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,²¹⁶ the FASB discussed but decided not to include an override to the guidance that all licenses of symbolic intellectual property are satisfied over time. In making this decision, the Board noted that (1) the number of licensing arrangements for which symbolic intellectual property would have been recognized at a point in time is small because most licensors continue to be involved with their symbolic intellectual property throughout its economic life and (2) requiring over-time recognition of revenue for licenses of symbolic intellectual property improves the operability and understandability of the licenses guidance. Further, the Board concluded that the clarity and simplicity of this requirement outweighed the conceptual rationale for an override for licenses of symbolic intellectual property.


8.2.3**Evaluating functional versus symbolic intellectual property**

The standard includes a flowchart to assist an entity with determining the nature of its promise in granting a license of intellectual property:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Implementation Guidance and Illustrations**Determining the Nature of the Entity's Promise***606-10-55-63A**

The following flowchart depicts the decision process for evaluating whether the nature of an entity's promise in granting a license is to provide the customer with a right to access the entity's intellectual property or a right to use the entity's intellectual property. The flowchart does not include all of the guidance on determining the nature of an entity's promise in granting a license of intellectual property in this Subtopic and is not intended as a substitute for the guidance in this Subtopic.

²¹⁶ Paragraphs BC63 and BC65 of ASU 2016-10.



8.2.4 Applying the licenses guidance to a bundled performance obligation that includes a license of intellectual property



FASB amendments

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that clarified that an entity will need to consider the licenses guidance for a bundled performance obligation that is comprised of a license of intellectual property and other goods or services to help determine the nature of its promise and how it will recognize revenue for the combined performance obligation.

To the extent that an entity is required to bundle a license of intellectual property with other promised goods and services in a contract, it will need to consider the licenses guidance to help determine the nature of its promise to the customer as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

606-10-55-57

When a single performance obligation includes a license (or licenses) of intellectual property and one or more other goods or services, the entity considers the nature of the combined good or service for which the customer has contracted (including whether the license that is part of the single performance obligation provides the customer with a right to use or a right to access intellectual property in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-59 through 55-60 and 606-10-55-62 through 55-64A) in determining whether that combined good or service is satisfied over time or at a point in time in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 and, if over time, in selecting an appropriate method for measuring progress in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37.

As stated above in the standard, entities will need to consider the licenses guidance when (1) determining whether the overall promise is satisfied over time or at a point in time and (2) selecting an appropriate method for measuring progress of that performance obligation if it is satisfied over time. Considering the nature of an entity's promise in granting a license that is part of a combined performance obligation is not a separate step or evaluation in the revenue model. Rather, it is part of the overall requirement in Step 5 to determine the nature of a combined performance obligation in order to determine whether that performance obligation is satisfied over time or at a point in time and measure progress toward the satisfaction of the combined performance obligation if it is satisfied over time.

The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²¹⁷ that, in some instances, not considering the nature of the entity's promise in granting a license that is bundled with other promised goods or services in the contract would result in accounting that does not best reflect the entity's performance. For example, it would be inappropriate for an entity that grants a 10-year license to access the entity's intellectual property that is not distinct from a promise to provide a one-year service to conclude that the bundled performance obligation is satisfied over the one-year service period. This is because the promise to grant the license would have been satisfied over the 10-year license term if it had been a separate performance obligation.

²¹⁷ Paragraph BC66 of ASU 2016-10.

The standard includes a number of examples that illustrate how an entity applies the licenses guidance to help determine the nature of a combined performance obligation that includes a license of intellectual property and other promised goods or services.

In Example 56, Case A (excerpted below), an entity licenses the patent rights for an approved drug compound to its customer and also promises to manufacture the drug for the customer. The entity considers that no other entity can perform the manufacturing service because of the highly specialized nature of the manufacturing process. Therefore, the license cannot be purchased separately from the manufacturing service, and the customer cannot benefit from the license on its own or with other readily available resources (i.e., the license and the manufacturing service are not capable of being distinct). Accordingly, the entity's promises to grant the license and to manufacture the drug are accounted for as a single performance obligation satisfied over time as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 56 – Identifying a Distinct License

606-10-55-367

An entity, a pharmaceutical company, licenses to a customer its patent rights to an approved drug compound for 10 years and also promises to manufacture the drug for the customer for 5 years, while the customer develops its own manufacturing capability. The drug is a mature product; therefore, there is no expectation that the entity will undertake activities to change the drug (for example, to alter its chemical composition). There are no other promised goods or services in the contract.

Case A – License is Not Distinct

606-10-55-368

In this case, no other entity can manufacture this drug while the customer learns the manufacturing process and builds its own manufacturing capability because of the highly specialized nature of the manufacturing process. As a result, the license cannot be purchased separately from the manufacturing service.

606-10-55-369

The entity assesses the goods and services promised to the customer to determine which goods and services are distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19. The entity determines that the customer cannot benefit from the license without the manufacturing service; therefore, the criterion in paragraph 606-10-25-19(a) is not met. Consequently, the license and the manufacturing service are not distinct, and the entity accounts for the license and the manufacturing service as a single performance obligation.

606-10-55-370

The nature of the combined good or service for which the customer contracted is a sole sourced supply of the drug for the first five years; the customer benefits from the license only as a result of having access to a supply of the drug. After the first five years, the customer retains solely the right to use the entity's functional intellectual property (see Case B, paragraph 606-10-55-373), and no further performance is required of the entity during Years 6-10. The entity applies paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30 to determine whether the single performance obligation (that is, the bundle of the license and the manufacturing service) is a performance obligation satisfied at a point in time or over time. Regardless of the determination reached in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-30, the entity's performance under the contract will be complete at the end of Year 5.

This example (Example 56, Case A) illustrates the importance of applying the licenses guidance when determining the nature of an entity's promise in granting a license that is combined into a single performance obligation with other promised goods or services. That is because the conclusion of whether a non-distinct license provides the customer with a right to use intellectual property or a right to access intellectual property may have a significant effect on the timing of revenue recognition for a combined performance obligation. The FASB explains in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²¹⁸ that in this example, the entity needs to determine the nature of its promise in granting the license within the single license/manufacturing service performance obligation to appropriately apply the general principle of recognizing revenue when (or as) it satisfies its performance obligation to the customer. Because the license in this example provides a right to use the entity's intellectual property (i.e., the drug patent is functional intellectual property) that on its own would be recognized at the point in time in which control of the license is transferred to the customer, the combined performance obligation is fully satisfied at the end of the fifth year when the manufacturing service is complete. In contrast, if the license provided a right to access the entity's intellectual property, the combined performance obligation would not be fully satisfied until the end of the 10-year license period, which would likely extend the period of revenue recognition beyond the date when the manufacturing service is complete.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 does not explicitly state that an entity will need to consider the nature of its promise in granting a license when applying the general revenue recognition model to all combined performance obligations that include a license and other goods or services. However, the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 says that an entity considers the nature of its promise in granting the license if the license is the primary or dominant component (i.e., the predominant item) of a single performance obligation. Accordingly, when the license is not the predominant item of a single performance obligation, this may result in US GAAP entities considering the nature of their promises in granting a license more frequently than IFRS entities.

8.3

Transfer of control of licensed intellectual property

When determining whether a license of intellectual property transfers to a customer (and revenue is recognized) over time or at a point in time, the standard states that an entity provides a customer with either:

- ▶ A right to access the entity's intellectual property throughout the license period (i.e., symbolic intellectual property and functional intellectual property that meets the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62(a) and (b)) for which revenue is recognized over the license period
- ▶ A right to use the entity's intellectual property as it exists at the point in time the license is granted (i.e., functional intellectual property that doesn't meet the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62(a) and (b)) for which revenue is recognized at the point in time the customer can first use and benefit from the licensed intellectual property

²¹⁸ Paragraph BC68(b) of ASU 2016-10.

The standard provides the following guidance on the timing of revenue recognition for right-to-access and right-to-use licenses:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

606-10-55-58

In evaluating whether a license transfers to a customer at a point in time or over time, an entity should consider whether the nature of the entity's promise in granting the license to a customer is to provide the customer with either:

- a. A right to access the entity's intellectual property throughout the license period (or its remaining economic life, if shorter)
- b. A right to use the entity's intellectual property as it exists at the point in time at which the license is granted.

606-10-55-58A

An entity should account for a promise to provide a customer with a right to access the entity's intellectual property as a performance obligation satisfied over time because the customer will simultaneously receive and consume the benefit from the entity's performance of providing access to its intellectual property as the performance occurs (see paragraph 606-10-25-27(a)). An entity should apply paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 to select an appropriate method to measure its progress toward complete satisfaction of that performance obligation to provide access to its intellectual property.

606-10-55-58B

An entity's promise to provide a customer with the right to use its intellectual property is satisfied at a point in time. The entity should apply paragraph 606-10-25-30 to determine the point in time at which the license transfers to the customer.

606-10-55-58C

Notwithstanding paragraphs 606-10-55-58A through 55-58B, revenue cannot be recognized from a license of intellectual property before both:

- a. An entity provides (or otherwise makes available) a copy of the intellectual property to the customer.
- b. The beginning of the period during which the customer is able to use and benefit from its right to access or its right to use the intellectual property. That is, an entity would not recognize revenue before the beginning of the license period even if the entity provides (or otherwise makes available) a copy of the intellectual property before the start of the license period or the customer has a copy of the intellectual property from another transaction. For example, an entity would recognize revenue from a license renewal no earlier than the beginning of the renewal period.

8.3.1

Right to access

The Board concluded that a license that provides an entity with the right to access intellectual property is satisfied over time because the customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefit from the entity's performance of providing access and the related activities undertaken by the entity. This conclusion is based on the determination that when a license of intellectual property is subject to change,

and the customer is exposed to the positive or negative effects of that change, the customer is not able to fully gain control over the license of intellectual property at any given point in time and instead gains control over the license period. Symbolic intellectual property and functional intellectual property that meet the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62(a) and (b) both provide a customer with a right-to-access license that is satisfied over time. Entities will need to apply the general guidance in ASC 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 to determine the appropriate method to measure progress (see Section 7.1.4).

Step 2 of the model requires an entity to identify the performance obligations in a contract. This includes identifying whether multiple distinct goods or services should be accounted for as a single performance obligation under the series provision (see Section 4.2.2). The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²¹⁹ that many licenses that provide a right to access intellectual property may include a series of distinct goods or services that are substantially the same and have the same pattern of transfer to the customer (e.g., a series of distinct periods of access to intellectual property such as monthly access or quarterly access). If a license meets the criteria to be accounted for as a series of distinct goods or services, an entity will need to consider whether any variable consideration in the contract (e.g., royalties, milestone payments) should be allocated to the distinct periods of access if certain allocation criteria are met. See Section 6.3 for a discussion of the variable consideration allocation criteria and Section 8.5 for a discussion of the accounting for sales- or usage-based royalties.

8.3.2 Right to use

The Board concluded that for a license that represents a right to use the intellectual property as it exists at a specific point in time, the customer gains control over that intellectual property at the beginning of the period for which it has the right to use the intellectual property. Functional intellectual property that doesn't meet the criteria in ASC 606-10-55-62(a) and (b) provides a customer with a right to use license that is satisfied at a point in time.

8.3.3 Use and benefit requirement

ASC 606-10-55-58C states that revenue from a license of intellectual property may not be recognized before the customer has (1) access to the intellectual property and (2) the right to use and benefit from the intellectual property. The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²²⁰ that control of a license cannot transfer before the beginning of the period that the customer can use and benefit from the licensed property. As explained in ASC 606-10-55-58C(b), an entity would not recognize revenue before the beginning of the license period, even if it previously provides (or otherwise makes available) a copy of the intellectual property or the customer has a copy of the intellectual property from another transaction. Therefore, if an entity executes a contract and makes the intellectual property available to a customer prior to the start of the license period, it would have to wait to recognize revenue until it completes performance by granting to the customer the right to use and benefit from the license on the start date of the license period.

Consider an example where an entity provides a customer with a right to use intellectual property but indicates that the right to use does not start until 30 days after the agreement is finalized. In this example, the entity likely would conclude that control of the license does not transfer until 30 days after the agreement is finalized because that is when the customer has both access and the right to use and benefit from the intellectual property.

²¹⁹ Paragraph BC72 of ASU 2016-10.

²²⁰ Paragraph BC414 of ASU 2014-09.

8.4

License renewals

**FASB amendments**

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that clarified that revenue related to license renewals should not be recognized earlier than the beginning of the renewal period.

In accordance with ASC 606-10-55-58C, revenue related to the renewal of a license of intellectual property may not be recognized prior to the beginning of the renewal period. The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²²¹ that when two parties enter into a contract to renew (or extend the term of) a license, the renewal contract should not be combined with the original license contract unless the criteria in ASC 606-10-25-9 for combining contracts are met. Therefore, the additional right granted by a renewal (e.g., the right to use the intellectual property for three additional years) should be evaluated in the same manner as any other additional rights that are granted to the customer after the initial contract. That is, the Board determined that a renewal license is subject to the same revenue recognition requirements as any other license that grants rights to the customer, and an entity should not recognize revenue from the transfer of a license before the customer can begin to use and benefit from it. A customer typically can begin to use and benefit from a renewed license only at the beginning of the license renewal period. This is true even if the entity provides a copy of the intellectual property in advance of the renewal period or the customer has a copy of the intellectual property from another transaction.

Example 59 in the standard illustrates when to recognize revenue for a right to use license of functional intellectual property and a subsequent renewal of the license:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 59 – Right to Use Intellectual Property

Case A – Initial License

606-10-55-389

An entity, a music record label, licenses to a customer a recording of a classical symphony by a noted orchestra. The customer, a consumer products company, has the right to use the recorded symphony in all commercials, including television, radio, and online advertisements for two years in Country A starting on January 1, 20X1. In exchange for providing the license, the entity receives fixed consideration of \$10,000 per month. The contract does not include any other goods or services to be provided by the entity. The contract is noncancellable.

606-10-55-390

The entity assesses the goods and services promised to the customer to determine which goods and services are distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19. The entity concludes that its only performance obligation is to grant the license. The term of the license (two years), the geographical scope of the license (that is, the customer's right to use the symphony only in Country A), and the defined permitted uses for the recording (that is, use in commercials) are all attributes of the promised license in this contract.

²²¹ Paragraph BC50(a) of ASU 2016-10.

606-10-55-391

In determining that the promised license provides the customer with a right to use its intellectual property as it exists at the point in time at which the license is granted, the entity considers the following:

- a. The classical symphony recording has significant standalone functionality because the recording can be played in its present, completed form without the entity's further involvement. The customer can derive substantial benefit from that functionality regardless of the entity's further activities or actions. Therefore, the nature of the licensed intellectual property is functional.
- b. The contract does not require, and the customer does not reasonably expect, that the entity will undertake activities to change the licensed recording.

Therefore, the criteria in paragraph 606-10-55-62 are not met.

606-10-55-392

In accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-58B, the promised license, which provides the customer with a right to use the entity's intellectual property, is a performance obligation satisfied at a point in time. The entity recognizes revenue from the satisfaction of that performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-58B through 55-58C. Additionally, because of the length of time between the entity's performance (at the beginning of the period) and the customer's monthly payments over two years (which are noncancellable), the entity considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-15 through 32-20 to determine whether a significant financing component exists.

Case B – Renewal of the License**606-10-55-392A**

At the end of the first year of the license period, on December 31, 20X1, the entity and the customer agree to renew the license to the recorded symphony for two additional years, subject to the same terms and conditions as the original license. The entity will continue to receive fixed consideration of \$10,000 per month during the 2-year renewal period.

606-10-55-392B

The entity considers the contract combination guidance in paragraph 606-10-25-9 and assesses that the renewal was not entered into at or near the same time as the original license and, therefore, is not combined with the initial contract. The entity evaluates whether the renewal should be treated as a new license or the modification of an existing license. Assume that in this scenario, the renewal is distinct. If the price for the renewal reflects its standalone selling price, the entity will, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-12, account for the renewal as a separate contract with the customer. Alternatively, if the price for the renewal does not reflect the standalone selling price of the renewal, the entity will account for the renewal as a modification of the original license contract.

606-10-55-392C

In determining when to recognize revenue attributable to the license renewal, the entity considers the guidance in paragraph 606-10-55-58C and determines that the customer cannot use and benefit from the license before the beginning of the two-year renewal period on January 1, 20X3. Therefore, revenue for the renewal cannot be recognized before that date.

606-10-55-392D

Consistent with Case A, because the customer's additional monthly payments for the modification to the license will be made over two years from the date the customer obtains control of the second license, the entity considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-15 through 32-20 to determine whether a significant financing component exists.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 does not state that an entity cannot recognize revenue relating to a license renewal until the beginning of the license renewal period. Accordingly, the IASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions on IFRS 15 (included in its April 2016 amendments) that it is possible that IFRS entities will recognize revenue for contract renewals or extensions earlier than US GAAP entities.

8.5 Sales- or usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property



FASB amendments

In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10 that clarified that the sales- and usage-based royalty exception (i.e., the royalty recognition constraint) must be applied to the overall royalty stream when the sole or predominant item to which the royalty relates is a license of intellectual property. It also clarified that the sales- or usage-based royalty in these types of contracts will be either entirely in the scope of royalty recognition constraint guidance or entirely in the scope of the general variable consideration constraint guidance.

The standard provides the following guidance on the recognition of revenue for sales- or usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property that differs from the guidance that applies to other revenue from licenses:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Licensing

Sales-Based or Usage-Based Royalties

606-10-55-65

Notwithstanding the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-14, an entity should recognize **revenue** for a sales-based or usage-based royalty promised in exchange for a license of intellectual property only when (or as) the later of the following events occurs:

- a. The subsequent sale or usage occurs.
- b. The **performance obligation** to which some or all of the sales-based or usage-based royalty has been allocated has been satisfied (or partially satisfied).

606-10-55-65A

The guidance for a sales-based or usage-based royalty in paragraph 606-10-55-65 applies when the royalty relates only to a license of intellectual property or when a license of intellectual property is the predominant item to which the royalty relates (for example, the license of intellectual property may be the predominant item to which the royalty relates when the entity has a reasonable expectation that the customer would ascribe significantly more value to the license than to the other goods or services to which the royalty relates).

606-10-55-65B

When the guidance in paragraph 606-10-55-65A is met, revenue from a sales-based or usage-based royalty should be recognized wholly in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 606-10-55-65. When the guidance in paragraph 606-10-55-65A is not met, the guidance on variable consideration in paragraphs 606-10-32-5 through 32-14 applies to the sales-based or usage-based royalty.

ASC 606-10-55-65 says that royalties received in exchange for licenses of intellectual property are recognized at the later of when (1) the subsequent sale or usage occurs or (2) the performance obligation to which some or all of the sales- or usage-based royalty has been allocated is satisfied (in whole or in part). That is, an entity recognizes the royalties as revenue when (or as) the customer's subsequent sales or usage occurs, unless that recognition pattern accelerates revenue recognition ahead of the entity's satisfaction of the performance obligation to which the royalty solely or partially relates based on an appropriate measure of progress (see Section 7.1.4).

The Board explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²²² that for a license of intellectual property for which the consideration is based on the customer's subsequent sales or usage, an entity should not recognize any revenue for the variable amounts until the uncertainty is resolved (i.e., when a customer's subsequent sales or usage occurs).

The FASB also explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²²³ that the guidance in ASC 606-10-55-65 through 55-65B addresses the *recognition* of sales-based or usage-based royalties received in exchange for a license of intellectual property, rather than when such amounts are included in the transaction price of the contract. As a result, this exception is a recognition constraint, and the constraint on variable consideration (see Section 5.2.3) does not apply.

The Board said²²⁴ it added the royalty recognition constraint because both users and preparers of financial statements indicated that it would not be useful for entities to recognize a constrained amount of revenue for sales- or usage-based royalties received in exchange for licenses of intellectual property (following the guidance in the general model on estimating the transaction price) because those revenue amounts would be subject to frequent adjustments throughout the life of the contract as a result of changes in circumstances that are not related to the entity's performance. The Board observed that this would not result in relevant information, especially for contracts in which the sales- or usage-based royalties are paid over a long period of time.

ASC 606-10-55-65A requires that the royalty recognition constraint be applied to the overall royalty stream when the sole or predominant item to which the royalty relates is a license of intellectual property (including when no single license is the predominant item to which the royalty relates, but the royalty predominantly relates to two or more licenses in the contract²²⁵). The standard does not provide a bright line for determining the "predominant" item in a contract that includes a license of intellectual property. The Board acknowledged in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²²⁶ that significant judgment may be required to determine when a license is the predominant item to which a royalty relates. However, it said that applying the general variable consideration guidance to such contracts would likely be more complex and require more judgment than determining whether a license is the predominant item.

It is important to note that this guidance applies only to licenses of intellectual property for which some or all of the consideration is in the form of a sales- or usage-based royalty. Entities cannot analogize to it for other situations. For example, if consideration in a contract is in the form of a sales- or usage-based royalty but there is no license of intellectual property, this guidance would not apply. In such cases, an entity would follow the guidance in the general model on estimating variable consideration and applying the constraint on variable consideration (see Section 5.2).

²²² Paragraph BC70 of ASU 2016-10.

²²³ Paragraph BC71 of ASU 2016-10.

²²⁴ Paragraph BC73 of ASU 2016-10.

²²⁵ Paragraph BC75(b) of ASU 2016-10.

²²⁶ Paragraph BC77 of ASU 2016-10.

The standard provides the following example of a contract that includes two performance obligations, including a license of symbolic intellectual property, and consideration in the form of sales-based royalties. In the example, the license is determined to be the predominant item to which the royalty relates:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 60 – Sales-Based Royalty Promised in Exchange for a License of Intellectual Property and Other Goods and Services

606-10-55-393

An entity, a movie distribution company, licenses Movie XYZ to a customer. The customer, an operator of cinemas, has the right to show the movie in its cinemas for six weeks. Additionally, the entity has agreed to provide memorabilia from the filming to the customer for display at the customer's cinemas before the beginning of the six-week airing period and to sponsor radio advertisements for Movie XYZ on popular radio stations in the customer's geographical area throughout the six-week airing period. In exchange for providing the license and the additional promotional goods and services, the entity will receive a portion of the operator's ticket sales for Movie XYZ (that is, variable consideration in the form of a sales-based royalty).

606-10-55-394

The entity concludes that the license to show Movie XYZ is the predominant item to which the sales-based royalty relates because the entity has a reasonable expectation that the customer would ascribe significantly more value to the license than to the related promotional goods or services. The entity will recognize revenue from the sales-based royalty, the only fees to which the entity is entitled under the contract, wholly in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-65. If the license, the memorabilia, and the advertising activities were separate performance obligations, the entity would allocate the sales-based royalties to each performance obligation.

As illustrated in this example, ASC 606-10-55-65B requires that when the royalty recognition constraint is applied, the royalty stream should be accounted for either entirely under the royalty constraint guidance or entirely under the general variable consideration constraint guidance (see Section 5.2.3). That is, an entity should not split a single royalty and apply the royalty recognition constraint to a portion of it and the general variable consideration constraint to the other portion. The Board concluded in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²²⁷ that accounting for a single royalty in accordance with two different constraint models (i.e., splitting a royalty) would have been more complex for preparers while not providing more useful information for financial statement users. This is because using an approach that accounts for a single royalty using two different constraint models would result in amounts being recognized at contract inception that do not reflect the amount to which the entity expects to be entitled to for its performance or amounts that the entity has become legally entitled to during the period.

Regardless of whether an entity applies the royalty recognition constraint or the general constraint on variable consideration, it is still required to allocate sales- or usage-based royalties to separate performance obligations in a contract (as noted in Example 60 above). The following example from the standard also illustrates the allocation of the transaction price (including sales- or usage-based royalties) to the performance obligations in the contract:

²²⁷ Paragraph BC76 of ASU 2016-10.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 35 – Allocation of Variable Consideration

606-10-55-270

An entity enters into a contract with a customer for two intellectual property licenses (Licenses X and Y), which the entity determines to represent two performance obligations each satisfied at a point in time. The standalone selling prices of Licenses X and Y are \$800 and \$1,000, respectively.

Case A – Variable Consideration Allocated Entirely to One Performance Obligation

606-10-55-271

The price stated in the contract for License X is a fixed amount of \$800, and for License Y the consideration is 3 percent of the customer's future sales of products that use License Y. For purposes of allocation, the entity estimates its sales-based royalties (that is, the variable consideration) to be \$1,000, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-8.

606-10-55-272

To allocate the transaction price, the entity considers the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 and concludes that the variable consideration (that is, the sales-based royalties) should be allocated entirely to License Y. The entity concludes that the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 are met for the following reasons:

- a. The variable payment relates specifically to an outcome from the performance obligation to transfer License Y (that is, the customer's subsequent sales of products that use License Y).
- b. Allocating the expected royalty amounts of \$1,000 entirely to License Y is consistent with the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28. This is because the entity's estimate of the amount of sales-based royalties (\$1,000) approximates the standalone selling price of License Y and the fixed amount of \$800 approximates the standalone selling price of License X. The entity allocates \$800 to License X in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-41. This is because, based on an assessment of the facts and circumstances relating to both licenses, allocating to License Y some of the fixed consideration in addition to all of the variable consideration would not meet the allocation objective in paragraph 606-10-32-28.

606-10-55-273

The entity transfers License Y at inception of the contract and transfers License X one month later. Upon the transfer of License Y, the entity does not recognize revenue because the consideration allocated to License Y is in the form of a sales-based royalty. Therefore, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-65, the entity recognizes revenue for the sales-based royalty when those subsequent sales occur.

606-10-55-274

When License X is transferred, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$800 allocated to License X.

Case B – Variable Consideration Allocated On the Basis of Standalone Selling Prices

606-10-55-275

The price stated in the contract for License X is a fixed amount of \$300, and for License Y the consideration is 5 percent of the customer's future sales of products that use License Y. The entity's estimate of the sales-based royalties (that is, the variable consideration) is \$1,500 in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-8.

606-10-55-276

To allocate the transaction price, the entity applies the criteria in paragraph 606-10-32-40 to determine whether to allocate the variable consideration (that is, the sales-based royalties) entirely to License Y. In applying the criteria, the entity concludes that even though the variable payments relate specifically to an outcome from the performance obligation to transfer License Y (that is, the customer's subsequent sales of products that use License Y), allocating the variable consideration entirely to License Y would be inconsistent with the principle for allocating the transaction price. Allocating \$300 to License X and \$1,500 to License Y does not reflect a reasonable allocation of the transaction price on the basis of the standalone selling prices of Licenses X and Y of \$800 and \$1,000, respectively. Consequently, the entity applies the general allocation requirements in paragraphs 606-10-32-31 through 32-35.

606-10-55-277

The entity allocates the transaction price of \$300 to Licenses X and Y on the basis of relative standalone selling prices of \$800 and \$1,000, respectively. The entity also allocates the consideration related to the sales-based royalty on a relative standalone selling price basis. However, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-65, when an entity licenses intellectual property in which the consideration is in the form of a sales-based royalty, the entity cannot recognize revenue until the later of the following events: the subsequent sales occur or the performance obligation is satisfied (or partially satisfied).

606-10-55-278

License Y is transferred to the customer at the inception of the contract, and License X is transferred three months later. When License Y is transferred, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$167 ($\$1,000 \div \$1,800 \times \300) allocated to License Y. When License X is transferred, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$133 ($\$800 \div \$1,800 \times \300) allocated to License X.

606-10-55-279

In the first month, the royalty due from the customer's first month of sales is \$200. Consequently, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-65, the entity recognizes as revenue the \$111 ($\$1,000 \div \$1,800 \times \200) allocated to License Y (which has been transferred to the customer and is therefore a satisfied performance obligation). The entity recognizes a contract liability for the \$89 ($\$800 \div \$1,800 \times \200) allocated to License X. This is because although the subsequent sale by the entity's customer has occurred, the performance obligation to which the royalty has been allocated has not been satisfied.

Recognition of royalties for a license that provides a right to access intellectual property

The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10²²⁸ that the royalty recognition constraint is intended to align the recognition of the royalties with the standard's key principle that revenue should be recognized only when (or as) an entity satisfies a performance obligation. As discussed above, ASC 606-10-55-65 says that sales- or usage-based royalties received in exchange for licenses of intellectual property are recognized at the later of when (a) the subsequent sale or usage occurs or (b) the performance obligation to which some or all of the sales- or usage-based royalty has been allocated is satisfied (in whole or in part). That is, an entity recognizes revenue for such arrangements when (or as) the customer's subsequent sales or usage occurs, unless that recognition pattern accelerates revenue recognition ahead of the entity's satisfaction of the performance obligation to which the royalty solely or partially relates based on an appropriate measure of progress (see Section 7.1.4).

²²⁸ Paragraph BC71 of ASU 2016-10.

The Board provided the following example²²⁹ of when revenue recognition may be inappropriately accelerated ahead of an entity's performance if revenue was recognized under ASC 606-10-55-65(a) for a right-to-access license:

Example of a licensing contract with a declining royalty rate

A contract provides a customer with the right to access an entity's intellectual property, and the entity receives royalties of 8% on total sales up to \$1 million, 4% on the next \$3 million in sales and 2% on all sales above \$4 million. The declining royalty rate does not reflect changing value to the customer.

In this example, the FASB noted that recognizing royalties as they are due (i.e., according to the contractual formula) would not be aligned with the principle of recognizing revenue only when (or as) an entity satisfies a performance obligation because the right to access the intellectual property is provided evenly over the license term while the declining royalty rate does not reflect the value to the customer. However, the FASB stated that the existence of a declining royalty rate in a contract does not always mean that recognizing revenue for sales- or usage-based royalties as the customer's underlying sales or usage occurs is inappropriate. In fact, it would be appropriate if the declining royalty rate reflects the changing value to the customer.

The above example notwithstanding, for many contracts with licenses that provide a right to access an entity's intellectual property, applying the royalty recognition constraint guidance will result in an entity recognizing revenue from sales- or usage-based royalties as the customer's underlying sales or usage occurs in accordance with ASC 606-10-55-65(a). As described in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,²³⁰ this is because an output-based measure of progress that is the same as, or similar to, the application of the practical expedient in ASC 606-10-55-18 (that is, when the right to consideration corresponds directly with the value to the customer of the entity's performance to date) will be appropriate because the entity's right to consideration (i.e., the sales- or usage-based royalties earned) will often correspond directly with the value to the customer of the entity's performance completed to date. The practical expedient in ASC 606-10-55-18 is discussed further in Section 7.1.4.

An example of a contract for which an entity may be able to apply the practical expedient in ASC 606-10-55-18 is one in which it earns \$1 in royalties for each \$10 in revenue that the customer generates from using the licensed intellectual property.

In addition, the Board explained²³¹ that an output-based measure could also be appropriate for a license that provides a right to access intellectual property in which the consideration is in the form of a fixed fee and royalties. The following example from the standard illustrates this:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 61 – Access to Intellectual Property

606-10-55-395

An entity, a well-known sports team, licenses the use of its name and logo to a customer. The customer, an apparel designer, has the right to use the sports team's name and logo on items including t-shirts, caps, mugs, and towels for one year. In exchange for providing the license, the entity will receive fixed consideration of \$2 million and a royalty of 5 percent of the sales price of any items using the team name or logo. The customer expects that the entity will continue to play games and provide a competitive team.

²²⁹ Paragraph BC71 of ASU 2016-10.

²³⁰ Paragraph BC72 of ASU 2016-10.

²³¹ Paragraph BC72 of ASU 2016-10.

606-10-55-396

The entity assesses the goods and services promised to the customer to determine which goods and services are distinct in accordance with paragraph 606-10-25-19. The entity concludes that the only good or service promised to the customer in the contract is the license. The additional activities associated with the license (that is, continuing to play games and provide a competitive team) do not directly transfer a good or service to the customer. Therefore, there is one performance obligation in the contract.

606-10-55-397

To determine whether the entity's promise in granting the license provides the customer with a right to access the entity's intellectual property or a right to use the entity's intellectual property, the entity assesses the nature of the intellectual property to which the customer obtains rights. The entity concludes that the intellectual property to which the customer obtains rights is symbolic intellectual property. The utility of the team name and logo to the customer is derived from the entity's past and ongoing activities of playing games and providing a competitive team (that is, those activities effectively give value to the intellectual property). Absent those activities, the team name and logo would have little or no utility to the customer because they have no standalone functionality (that is, no ability to perform or fulfill a task separate from their role as symbols of the entity's past and ongoing activities).

606-10-55-398

Consequently, the entity's promise in granting the license provides the customer with the right to access the entity's intellectual property throughout the license period and, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-58A, the entity accounts for the promised license as a performance obligation satisfied over time.

606-10-55-399

The entity recognizes the fixed consideration allocable to the license performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-58A and 606-10-55-58C. This includes applying paragraphs 606-10-25-31 through 25-37 to identify the method that best depicts the entity's performance in satisfying the license. For the consideration that is in the form of a sales-based royalty, paragraph 606-10-55-65 applies because the sales-based royalty relates solely to the license that is the only performance obligation in the contract. The entity concludes that recognizing revenue from the sales-based royalty when the customer's subsequent sales of items using the team name or logo occur is consistent with the guidance in paragraph 606-10-55-65(b). That is, the entity concludes that ratable recognition of the fixed consideration of \$2 million plus recognition of the royalty fees as the customer's subsequent sales occur reasonably depict the entity's progress toward complete satisfaction of the license performance obligation.

In Example 61 above, the fixed consideration of \$2 million is an explicit term in the contract with the customer. In some contracts, fixed consideration may be implied, such as when a guaranteed minimum amount of royalties is part of the transaction price.

In addition, as discussed in Section 8.3.1, the FASB noted²³² that many licenses that provide a right to access intellectual property may constitute a series of distinct goods or services that are substantially the same and have the same pattern of transfer to the customer (e.g., a series of distinct periods of access to intellectual property such as monthly access or quarterly access). In cases where the criteria for a performance obligation to be accounted for as a series of distinct goods or services have been met, an entity will need to consider whether any variable consideration in the contract (e.g., sales- or usage-

²³² Paragraph BC72 of ASU 2016-10.

based royalties) should be allocated directly to the distinct periods of access if certain allocation criteria are met. The FASB also noted that the allocation of sales- or usage-based royalties in this manner generally will result in the recognition of royalties as revenue when (or as) the customer's underlying sales or usage occurs.

An entity may need to apply significant judgment to determine the appropriate pattern of revenue recognition for royalties received for a license that provides a right to access intellectual property.

Question 8-3 Can the recognition constraint for sales- or usage-based royalties be applied to royalties that are paid in consideration for *sales* of intellectual property (rather than just licenses of intellectual property)?

No. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2016-10,²³³ the Board discussed but decided not to expand the scope of the royalty recognition constraint to include sales of intellectual property.

The Board also concluded that entities should not attempt to determine whether a license of intellectual property is “in-substance” a sale of intellectual property (i.e., a promise that is in the form of a license but in substance has the characteristics of a sale) when determining whether the royalty recognition constraint applies. The Board noted that there can be legal differences between a contract for a license and a sale of intellectual property that may not be appropriate or feasible to ignore or attempt to override from an accounting perspective. Therefore, entities should follow the legal form of a license of intellectual property for purposes of applying the royalty recognition constraint.

Question 8-4 If a contract for a license of intellectual property includes payments with fixed dollar amounts (e.g., milestone payments) that are determined by reference to sales- or usage-based thresholds, should the royalty recognition constraint be applied?

Yes, we generally believe the royalty recognition constraint should be applied to fixed dollar amounts of variable consideration (i.e., fixed amounts of consideration that are contingent on the occurrence of a future event), such as milestone payments, provided the amounts are determined by reference to sales- or usage-based thresholds. This is the case even if those payments are not referred to as “royalties” under the terms of the contract. However, entities will need to apply judgment and carefully evaluate the facts and circumstances of their contracts for licenses of intellectual property to determine whether these types of payments should be accounted for using the royalty recognition constraint.

Consider the following example:

Illustration 8-1: Application of the royalty recognition constraint to a milestone payment

A vendor enters into a contract to license functional intellectual property to a customer. The contract contains payment terms that include a \$10 million milestone payment that is payable to the vendor once the customer has reached \$100 million of sales.

The vendor determines that the milestone payment is based on the customer's subsequent sales and represents variable consideration because it is contingent on the customer's sales reaching \$100 million. It accounts for the \$10 million milestone payment in accordance with the royalty recognition constraint and only recognizes revenue for the milestone payment once the customer's sales reach \$100 million.

²³³ Paragraph BC78(b) of ASU 2016-10.

Question 8-5 Can an entity recognize revenue for sales- or usage-based royalties for licenses of intellectual property on a lag if actual sales or usage data is not available at the end of a reporting period?

The standard states that sales- or usage-based royalties promised in exchange for licenses of intellectual property should be recognized as revenue at the later of when the (1) subsequent sales or usage occurs or (2) the performance obligation to which the sales- or usage-based royalties relates has been satisfied (or partially satisfied). Therefore, after the conditions in the royalty constraint guidance have been met (i.e., the underlying sales or usage has occurred and the performance obligation to which the royalties relate has been satisfied (or partially satisfied)), we believe that licensors without actual sales or usage data from the licensee will need to make an estimate of royalties earned in the current reporting period in accordance with the general model in Step 3, which would include consideration of the general constraint on variable consideration.

The Deputy Chief Accountant of the SEC's Office of the Chief Accountant noted in a speech²³⁴ that because the FASB did not provide "a lagged reporting exception" in the new standard, the reporting of sales- and usage-based royalties may require estimation in some circumstances. This may result in a change in practice for entities that have previously recorded revenue from royalties on a lag (i.e., in a reporting period subsequent to when the underlying sales or usage occurs).

²³⁴ Speech by Wesley R. Bricker, 9 June 2016. Refer to SEC website at <https://www.sec.gov/news/speech/bricker-remarks-35th-financial-reporting-institute-conference.html>.

9 Other measurement and recognition topics

9.1 Warranties

Warranties are commonly included in arrangements to sell goods or services. They can be explicitly stated or implied based on an entity's customary business practices. The standard includes the following guidance on warranties:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Warranties

606-10-55-30

It is common for an entity to provide (in accordance with the contract, the law, or the entity's customary business practices) a warranty in connection with the sale of a product (whether a good or service). The nature of a warranty can vary significantly across industries and contracts. Some warranties provide a customer with assurance that the related product will function as the parties intended because it complies with agreed-upon specifications. Other warranties provide the customer with a service in addition to the assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications.

The price of a warranty may be included in the overall purchase price or listed separately as an optional product. The standard identifies two types of warranties:

- ▶ Warranties that promise the customer that the delivered product is as specified in the contract (called "assurance-type warranties")
- ▶ Warranties that provide a service to the customer in addition to assurance that the delivered product is as specified in the contract (called "service-type warranties")

9.1.1 Determining whether a warranty is a service- or assurance-type warranty

The standard provides the following guidance on determining whether a warranty is a service- or assurance-type warranty:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Warranties

606-10-55-31

If a customer has the option to purchase a warranty separately (for example, because the warranty is priced or negotiated separately), the warranty is a distinct service because the entity promises to provide the service to the customer in addition to the product that has the functionality described in the contract. In those circumstances, an entity should account for the promised warranty as a performance

obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-14 through 25-22 and allocate a portion of the transaction price to that performance obligation in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-28 through 32-41.

606-10-55-32

If a customer does not have the option to purchase a warranty separately, an entity should account for the warranty in accordance with the guidance on product warranties in Subtopic 460-10 on guarantees, unless the promised warranty, or a part of the promised warranty, provides the customer with a service in addition to the assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications.

If the customer has the option to purchase the warranty separately or if the warranty provides a service to the customer beyond fixing defects that existed at the time of sale, the entity is providing a service-type warranty. Otherwise, it is an assurance-type warranty, which provides the customer with assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications. In some cases, it may be difficult to determine whether a warranty provides a customer with a service in addition to the assurance that the delivered product is as specified in the contract. To help entities make that assessment, the standard provides the following guidance:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Warranties

606-10-55-33

In assessing whether a warranty provides a customer with a service in addition to the assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications, an entity should consider factors such as:

- a. Whether the warranty is required by law – If the entity is required by law to provide a warranty, the existence of that law indicates that the promised warranty is not a performance obligation because such requirements typically exist to protect customers from the risk of purchasing defective products.
- b. The length of the warranty coverage period – The longer the coverage period, the more likely it is that the promised warranty is a performance obligation because it is more likely to provide a service in addition to the assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications.
- c. The nature of the tasks that the entity promises to perform – If it is necessary for an entity to perform specified tasks to provide the assurance that a product complies with agreed-upon specifications (for example, a return shipping service for a defective product), then those tasks likely do not give rise to a performance obligation.

606-10-55-35

A law that requires an entity to pay compensation if its products cause harm or damage does not give rise to a performance obligation. For example, a manufacturer might sell products in a jurisdiction in which the law holds the manufacturer liable for any damages (for example, to personal property) that might be caused by a consumer using a product for its intended purpose. Similarly, an entity's promise to indemnify the customer for liabilities and damages arising from claims of patent, copyright, trademark, or other infringement by the entity's products does not give rise to a performance obligation. The entity should account for such obligations in accordance with the guidance on loss contingencies in Subtopic 450-20 on contingencies.

How we see it

Entities may need to exercise significant judgment when determining whether a warranty is an assurance-type or service-type warranty. An entity's evaluation may be affected by several factors, including common warranty practices within its industry and the entity's business practices related to warranties. For example, consider an automotive manufacturer that provides a five-year warranty on a luxury vehicle and a three-year warranty on a standard vehicle. The manufacturer may conclude that the longer warranty period is not an additional service because it believes the materials used to construct the luxury vehicle are of a higher quality, and latent defects would take longer to appear. In contrast, the manufacturer might consider the length of the warranty period and the nature of the services provided under the warranty and conclude that the five-year warranty period, or some portion of it, is an additional service that should be accounted for as a service-type warranty.

Question 9-1

How should an entity evaluate whether a product warranty is a service-type warranty (i.e., a performance obligation) when it is not separately priced? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 29]

TRG members generally agreed that the evaluation of whether a warranty provides a service in addition to the assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications will require judgment and depend on the facts and circumstances. There is no bright line in the standard on what constitutes a service-type warranty beyond it being separately priced.

However, the standard includes three factors that should be considered in each evaluation (i.e., whether the warranty is required by law, the length of the warranty coverage and the nature of the tasks that the entity promises to perform, as stated in ASC 606-10-55-33).

Consider the following example from the TRG agenda paper: A luggage company provides a lifetime warranty to repair broken or damaged baggage free of charge. The luggage company evaluates the three factors and determines that they indicate the warranty is a performance obligation in addition to the assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications because (1) there is no law that requires the luggage company to make a promise for the lifetime of the product, (2) the length of the warranty is for the life of the baggage and (3) the tasks include both repairs to baggage that does not meet the promised specifications and repairs for broken or damaged baggage.

Further, the TRG agenda paper emphasized that entities should not assume that legacy accounting will remain unchanged under the new standard. Entities will need to evaluate each type of warranty offered to determine the appropriate accounting.

Question 9-2

Should repairs provided outside the warranty period be accounted for as a service-type warranty?

We believe entities will need to carefully consider the factors in ASC 606-10-55-33 (e.g., the nature of the services provided, the length of the implied warranty period) to determine whether services provided outside the warranty period represent a service-type warranty. Sometimes, entities provide these services as part of their customary business practices, in addition to providing assurance-type warranties for specified periods of time. For example, an equipment manufacturer gives its customers a standard product warranty that provides assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications for one year from the date of purchase. However, the entity provides an implied warranty by frequently repairing products for free after the one-year standard warranty period has ended. See Section 4.1 for a discussion of implied performance obligations.

If the entity determines that the repairs made during the implied warranty period generally involve defects that existed when the product was sold and the repairs occur shortly after the assurance warranty period, the entity may conclude that the repairs are covered by an assurance-type warranty. That is, the term of the assurance-type warranty may be longer than that stated in the contract. However, all facts need to be considered to reach a conclusion.

Question 9-3 **Should an entity account for a customer’s return of a defective item in exchange for compensation (i.e., not for a replacement item) as a right of return or an assurance-type warranty?**

We believe that an entity should account for the right to return a defective item for cash (instead of a replacement item) under the right of return guidance in ASC 606-10-55-22 through 55-29 rather than as an assurance-type warranty. The Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-19²³⁵ states that “... the Boards decided that an entity should recognize an assurance-type warranty as a separate liability to replace or repair a defective product.” This description of an assurance-type warranty does not include defective products that are returned for a refund; it only contemplates defective products that are replaced or repaired. See Section 5.4.1 for a discussion of rights of return.

However, there may be limited circumstances in which cash paid to a customer for a defective item should be accounted for in accordance with the warranty guidance instead of the variable consideration guidance. For example, an entity may pay cash to a customer as reimbursement for third-party costs incurred to repair a defective item. In this case, the cash payment to the customer was incurred to fulfill the entity’s warranty obligation. This assessment will require judgment and depend on the facts and circumstances.

Question 9-4 **Should liquidated damages, penalties or compensation from other similar clauses be accounted for as variable consideration or warranty provisions under the standard?**

See response to Question 5-3 in Section 5.2.1.

9.1.2 Service-type warranties

The Board determined²³⁶ that a service-type warranty represents a distinct service and is a separate performance obligation. Therefore, an entity allocates a portion of the transaction price to the service-type warranty based on the estimated standalone selling price of the service-type warranty. The entity then recognizes revenue allocated to the service-type warranty over the period the warranty service is provided because the customer will likely receive and consume the benefits of the warranty as the entity performs (i.e., the warranty performance obligation is likely satisfied over time in accordance with ASC 606-10-25-27(a), see Section 7.1.1).

Judgment may be required to determine the appropriate pattern of revenue recognition associated with service-type warranties. For example, an entity may determine that it provides the warranty service continuously over the warranty period (i.e., the performance obligation is an obligation to “stand ready to perform” during the stated warranty period). An entity that makes this determination will likely recognize revenue ratably over the warranty period. An entity also may conclude that a different pattern of recognition is appropriate based on data it has collected about when it provides services. For example, an entity might recognize little or no revenue in the first year of a three-year service-type warranty if its historical data indicates that it provides warranty services only in the second and third years of the warranty period. Section 7.1.4 describes considerations for determining the appropriate pattern of revenue recognition, including for stand-ready obligations. If payment for the service-type warranty is received upfront, an entity should also evaluate whether a significant financing component exists (see Section 5.5).

²³⁵ Paragraph BC376 of ASU 2014-09.

²³⁶ Paragraph BC371 of ASU 2014-09.

Changes in the estimate of the costs to satisfy service-type warranty performance obligations do not result in a revision to the original relative standalone selling price allocation (or the resulting allocated amount of the transaction price that will be recognized as revenue for the service-type warranty performance obligation). For example, an entity may discover two months after a product is shipped that the cost of a part acquired from a third-party manufacturer has tripled and that it will cost the entity significantly more to replace that part if a warranty claim is made. This change will not affect the amount of transaction price that the entity allocated to the service-type warranty because the estimate of standalone selling prices is performed at contract inception and is not updated to reflect changes between contract inception and when performance is complete. Therefore, the service-type warranty cost recognition does not affect the revenue recognition. However, for future contracts involving the same warranty, the entity would need to determine whether to revise the standalone selling price because of the significant increase in the costs to satisfy the warranty and, if so, use that revised price for future allocations (see Section 6.1.3).

9.1.3 Assurance-type warranties

The Board concluded²³⁷ that assurance-type warranties do not provide an additional good or service to the customer (i.e., they are not separate performance obligations). By providing this type of warranty, the selling entity has effectively provided a guarantee of quality. Under the standard, these types of warranties are accounted for as warranty obligations, and the estimated cost of satisfying them is accrued in accordance with the guidance in ASC 460-10 on guarantees. Once recorded, the warranty liability should be assessed on an ongoing basis also in accordance with ASC 460-10.

ASC 460-10-25-6 indicates that if the costs of satisfying future warranty obligations cannot be reasonably estimated at the transaction date, a reserve for warranty obligations cannot be accrued, and if the range of possible loss is wide, may raise a question about whether revenue should be recorded until a reasonable estimate can be made or the warranty period expires.

9.1.4 Contracts that contain both assurance- and service-type warranties

Some contracts may include both an assurance-type warranty and a service-type warranty. The standard provides the following guidance for these situations:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Warranties

606-10-55-34

If a warranty, or a part of a warranty, provides a customer with a service in addition to the assurance that the product complies with agreed-upon specifications, the promised service is a performance obligation. Therefore, an entity should allocate the transaction price to the product and the service. If an entity promises both an assurance-type warranty and a service-type warranty but cannot reasonably account for them separately, the entity should account for both of the warranties together as a single performance obligation.

²³⁷ Paragraph BC376 of ASU 2014-09.

When an assurance-type warranty and a service-type warranty can be accounted for separately, an entity is required to accrue for the expected costs associated with the assurance-type warranty and defer the revenue for the service-type warranty as illustrated below:

Illustration 9-1: Service-type and assurance-type warranties

An entity manufactures and sells computers that include an assurance-type warranty for the first 90 days. The entity offers an optional “extended coverage” plan under which it will repair or replace any defective part for three years from the expiration of the assurance-type warranty. Because the optional “extended coverage” plan is sold separately, the entity determines that the three years of extended coverage represent a separate performance obligation (i.e., a service-type warranty).

The total transaction price for the sale of a computer and the extended warranty is \$3,600. The entity determines that the standalone selling prices of the computer and the extended warranty are \$3,200 and \$400, respectively. The inventory value of the computer is \$1,440. Further, the entity estimates that, based on its experience, it will incur \$200 in costs to repair defects that arise within the 90-day coverage period for the assurance-type warranty. As a result, the entity will record the following entries:

Dr. Cash/receivables	3,600	
Dr. Warranty expense	200	
Cr. Accrued warranty costs (assurance-type warranty)		200
Cr. Contract liability (service-type warranty)		400
Cr. Revenue		3,200

To record revenue and contract liabilities related to warranties.

Dr. Cost of sales	1,440	
Cr. Inventory		1,440

To relieve inventory and recognize cost of sales.

The entity derecognizes the accrued warranty liability associated with the assurance-type warranty as actual warranty costs are incurred during the first 90 days after the customer receives the computer. The entity recognizes the contract liability associated with the service-type warranty as revenue during the contract warranty period and recognizes the costs associated with providing the service-type warranty as they are incurred. The entity would need to be able to determine whether repair costs incurred should be applied against the warranty reserve it already established for claims that occur during the first 90 days or recognized as an expense in the period incurred.

Accounting for both assurance-type warranties and service-type warranties in the same transaction may be complex. Entities may need to develop processes to match individual warranty claims with the specific warranty plans so claims can be analyzed for appropriate accounting treatment. This individual assessment of warranty claims is necessary because the assurance-type warranty costs will have been accrued previously, while the service-type warranty costs are expenses that need to be recognized in the period in which they are incurred as illustrated below:

Illustration 9-2: Service-type and assurance-type warranty costs

Assume the same facts as in Illustration 9-1, but assume the entity sold 500 computers during the year. In January of the following year, \$10,000 of warranty claims are submitted by customers. The entity analyzes each claim and identifies the specific computer sale to which the claim is related. The entity needs to do this in order to determine eligibility and the appropriate accounting treatment under the warranty plans.

The entity determines that a portion of the claims, totaling \$2,500 for repair and replacement parts, are covered by the assurance-type warranty plan. As shown above in Illustration 9-1, the expected cost of each assurance-type warranty was accrued at the time of the sale. The entity records the following entry to derecognize a portion of the warranty liability:

Dr. Accrued warranty costs (assurance-type warranty)	2,500	
Cr. Cash		2,500

To derecognize the assurance-type warranty liability as the costs are incurred.

The entity also determines that a portion of the claims, totaling \$7,000 for repair and replacement parts, are eligible under the "extended coverage" plan (i.e., the service-type warranty). The entity records the following entry to recognize the costs associated with the service-type warranty:

Dr. Warranty expense	7,000	
Cr. Cash		7,000

To record the costs of the service-type warranty as the costs are incurred.

The entity also determines that \$500 of the claims are not eligible under either warranty plan because the claims relate to incidents that occurred after the 90-day coverage period for the assurance-type warranty, and the customers in those transactions did not purchase the extended warranty coverage (i.e., the service-type warranty). The entity rejects these customer claims.

How we see it

The guidance for assurance-type warranties is essentially the same as legacy practice. The guidance for service-type warranties is similar to legacy GAAP, except for the amount of transaction consideration that is allocated to the warranty performance obligation. Under legacy GAAP, entities that provide separately priced extended warranties defer an amount equal to the stated price of the warranty and record that amount as revenue over the warranty period. The new standard requires an entity to defer an allocated amount based on a relative standalone selling price allocation, so an entity may need to enhance its processes and controls to allocate the transaction price between performance obligations in the contract.

9.2

Loss contracts

The Board decided²³⁸ to retain existing guidance for situations in which an entity is expected to incur a loss on a contract (with certain consequential amendments to reflect the terminology of, and cross-references to, the new revenue guidance, where appropriate). While guidance exists for some industries or for certain types of transactions, there is no general authoritative guidance on when to recognize losses on onerous contracts and, if a loss is to be recognized, how to measure the loss. Accordingly, diversity in practice exists when such contracts are not within the scope of specific authoritative literature.

Legacy GAAP that requires accrual of expected losses on contracts includes the following:

- ▶ A firm purchase commitment for goods or inventory subject to ASC 440-10-25-4
- ▶ Contracts within the scope of ASC 605-35
- ▶ An operating lease that is subleased subject to ASC 840 or ASC 420
- ▶ Certain other executory contracts subject to ASC 420

²³⁸ Paragraph BC296 of ASU 2014-09.

- ▶ An insurance contract with a premium deficiency subject to ASC 944
- ▶ Losses on prepaid health care services subject to ASC 954-450
- ▶ Certain derivative contracts within the scope of ASC 815
- ▶ Losses on arrangements accounted for pursuant to ASC 985-605

Entities will continue to be required to follow legacy guidance for onerous contracts.²³⁹ For example, entities that fall within the scope of the legacy accounting guidance in ASC 605-35 and are required to account for expected losses on contracts would continue to follow that guidance after adoption of ASU 2014-09 (assuming they continue to meet the scope criteria in ASC 605-35, as amended by ASU 2014-09). However, as noted above, there were consequential amendments to some of the legacy cost guidance. For example, the guidance in ASC 605-35 has been updated to require entities to use the principles in ASC 606 when determining the transaction price (except for the guidance on constraining estimates of variable consideration) for purposes of estimating the expected loss on the contract. Entities should consider the updated guidance and terminology when applying the retained legacy cost guidance.

UPDATE: In May 2016, the FASB proposed clarifying that the provision for losses under ASC 605-35 be determined at least at the contract level. However, the proposed amendments would allow an entity to determine the provision for losses at the performance obligation level as an accounting policy election. Comments were due 2 July 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.



IASB differences

Under IFRS, the accounting for onerous contracts under IAS 37 applies to all contracts in the scope of the revenue standard and requires entities to recognize and measure liabilities for onerous contracts. The liability amount is the lower of the cost to exit (i.e., any compensation or penalties arising from failure to fulfill the contract) or to fulfill the remaining obligations under a contract.

9.3

Contract costs

ASU 2014-09 also added ASC 340-40 to codify the guidance on other assets and deferred costs relating to contracts with customers. This guidance specifies the accounting for costs an entity incurs to obtain and fulfill a contract to provide goods and services to customers as described below:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Scope

Transactions

606-10-15-5

Subtopic 340-40 on other assets and deferred costs from contracts with customers includes guidance on accounting for the incremental costs of obtaining a contract with a customer and for the costs incurred to fulfill a contract with a customer if those costs are not within the scope of another Topic (see Subtopic 340-40). An entity shall apply that guidance only to the costs incurred that relate to a contract with a customer (or part of that contract) that is within the scope of the guidance in this Topic.

²³⁹ Paragraph BC296 of ASU 2014-09.

Question 9-5

Can entities apply the portfolio approach practical expedient for the evaluation of and/or accounting for contracts costs under ASC 340-40?

ASC 606 includes a practical expedient, as described in ASC 606-10-10-4, that allows for the use of a portfolio approach if the entity reasonably expects that the effects on the financial statements would not materially differ from applying the revenue guidance to individual contracts (see Section 3.3.1). While a similar practical expedient was not codified in ASC 340-40, we believe the portfolio approach can be applied to the evaluation of contract costs accounted for in accordance with the guidance in ASC 340-40 (e.g., for amortizing costs to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer).

The FASB and the IASB developed the guidance on accounting for contracts with customers (including both revenues and costs) as part of one joint project. When the new guidance was finalized for US GAAP, the FASB split the revenue and costs guidance into ASC 606 and ASC 340-40, due to the structure and format of accounting topics within the Codification. Under IFRS, the converged guidance on revenue and costs are both in IFRS 15. Therefore, under IFRS 15, the guidance developed by the IASB on the use of the portfolio approach can be applied to both contract revenues and costs. We believe that the Boards did not intend for there to be a difference in how the portfolio approach could be applied under US GAAP and IFRS.

This view was also expressed in TRG agenda paper no. 23, which stated, “[p]er paragraph 606-10-10-4 ..., an entity might take advantage of the practical expedient to account for the incremental costs of obtaining a contract at a portfolio level (for example, in determining an amortization period). An entity’s specific facts and circumstances will dictate whether it can apply the guidance at a portfolio level.”

9.3.1**Costs to obtain a contract**

Under ASC 340-40, the incremental costs of obtaining a contract with a customer are recognized as an asset if the entity expects to recover them as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers***Scope and Scope Exceptions**Incremental Costs of Obtaining a Contract with a Customer***340-40-15-2**

The guidance in this Subtopic applies to the incremental costs of obtaining a contract with a customer within the scope of Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers (excluding any consideration payable to a customer, see paragraphs 606-10-32-25 through 32-27).

*Recognition**Incremental Costs of Obtaining a Contract***340-40-25-1**

An entity shall recognize as an asset the incremental costs of obtaining a contract with a customer if the entity expects to recover those costs.

340-40-25-2

The incremental costs of obtaining a contract are those costs that an entity incurs to obtain a contract with a customer that it would not have incurred if the contract had not been obtained (for example, a sales commission).

340-40-25-3

Costs to obtain a contract that would have been incurred regardless of whether the contract was obtained shall be recognized as an expense when incurred, unless those costs are explicitly chargeable to the customer regardless of whether the contract is obtained.

340-40-25-4

As a practical expedient, an entity may recognize the incremental costs of obtaining a contract as an expense when incurred if the amortization period of the asset that the entity otherwise would have recognized is one year or less.

Before applying the cost guidance, entities will need to consider the scoping provisions of the guidance. Specifically, an entity will need to first consider whether the guidance on consideration payable to a customer under ASC 606 (see Section 5.7 for a discussion on accounting for consideration paid or payable to a customer) applies to the costs.

To qualify for capitalization, contract acquisition costs must be incremental, and the entity must expect to recover them. Incremental costs are those that an entity would not have incurred if the contract had not been obtained. For example, salaries and benefits of sales employees that are incurred (i.e., paid to the employee) regardless of whether a contract was obtained are not incremental costs. An entity can expect to recover contract acquisition costs through direct recovery (i.e., reimbursement under the contract) or indirect recovery (i.e., through the margin inherent in the contract).

The standard cites sales commissions as a type of an incremental cost that may require capitalization under the standard. For example, commissions that are related to sales from contracts signed during the period may represent incremental costs that would require capitalization. The standard does not explicitly address considerations for different types of commission programs, so entities will have to exercise judgment to determine whether sales commissions are incremental costs and if so, the point in time when the costs should be capitalized. For example, variable commissions, commissions paid for contract renewals or modifications, commissions paid to supervisors and commissions not directly linked to any single contract (e.g., commissions based on reaching a specified level of sales overall) may require additional analysis.

TRG members²⁴⁰ discussed the underlying principle for capitalizing costs under the standard and generally agreed that neither ASC 340-40 nor ASC 606 amended US GAAP liability guidance. Therefore, entities should first refer to the applicable liability standard to determine when they are required to accrue for certain costs. Entities would then use the guidance in ASC 340-40 to determine whether the related costs need to be capitalized. TRG members acknowledged that certain aspects of the cost guidance will require entities to apply significant judgment to analyze the facts and circumstances and to determine the appropriate accounting.

In addition, the TRG agenda paper²⁴¹ observed that incremental costs of obtaining a contract are not limited to initial incremental costs. Commissions recognized subsequent to contract inception (e.g., commissions paid on modifications, commissions subject to contingent events or clawback) because they did not meet the liability recognition criteria at contract inception should still be considered for capitalization as costs to obtain the contract when the liability is recognized. This would include contract renewals because, as the TRG agenda paper said, a renewal contract *is* a contract and there isn't anything in the guidance on costs to obtain a contract to suggest a different treatment for contracts that are renewals of existing contracts. That is, the only difference between the two costs would be the timing of recognition based on when a liability has been incurred.

²⁴⁰ 26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 23.

²⁴¹ 26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 23.

The following example illustrates how these principles may be applied to a fact pattern with sales commissions paid to a supervisor and sales commissions paid for renewals:

Illustration 9-3: Sales commissions

Entity X has a commission plan whereby each salesperson is paid \$1,000 for each new contract entered into with a customer as a result of the salesperson's efforts. The salesperson is also paid \$200 every time that customer renews its contract with the company. The Vice President (VP) of sales also receives a \$50 commission every time an initial contract or renewal is signed, which is not contingent on other performance metrics. The margin inherent in each new contract is sufficient to recover the commissions for each new contract and renewal.

Entity X would record a liability of \$1,050 (the commission for the salesperson and the VP of sales) at contract inception, as that is the point in time when the commissions are probable and estimable under ASC 710. The entity would separately evaluate the commissions paid to the salesperson and to the VP of sales to determine whether it would have incurred those commissions if it had not obtained the contract and whether it will recover them. If Entity X determines these criteria are met for both commissions, it would capitalize \$1,050 when the liability is recognized.

Entity X would likewise record a liability of \$250 when each renewal is signed because that is the point in time when the renewal commissions are probable and estimable and would evaluate whether the commissions would not have been incurred if the renewal contract had not been obtained and are recoverable. Even if the renewal was anticipated at contract inception, the estimated commission would not be accrued or capitalized at that time because a liability has not been incurred for the renewal at contract inception.

Unlike many commissions, some incentive payments such as bonuses and other compensation that are based on quantitative or qualitative metrics not related to contracts obtained (e.g., profitability, EPS, performance evaluations) likely do not meet the criteria for capitalization because they are not incremental costs of obtaining a contract. However, a legal contingency cost may be an incremental cost of obtaining a contract if a lawyer agrees to receive payment only upon the successful completion of a negotiation. Determining which costs must be capitalized under the standard may require judgment.

ASC 340-40 provides the following example regarding incremental costs of obtaining a contract:

Excerpt from the Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Implementation and Guidance Illustrations

Example 1 – Incremental Costs of Obtaining a Contract

340-40-55-2

An entity, a provider of consulting services, wins a competitive bid to provide consulting services to a new customer. The entity incurred the following costs to obtain the contract:

External legal fees for due diligence	\$ 15,000
Travel costs to deliver proposal	25,000
Commissions to sales employees	<u>10,000</u>
Total costs incurred	<u>\$ 50,000</u>

340-40-55-3

In accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1, the entity recognizes an asset for the \$10,000 incremental costs of obtaining the contract arising from the commissions to sales employees because the entity expects to recover those costs through future fees for the consulting services. The entity also pays discretionary annual bonuses to sales supervisors based on annual sales targets, overall profitability of the entity, and individual performance evaluations. In accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1, the entity does not recognize an asset for the bonuses paid to sales supervisors because the bonuses are not incremental to obtaining a contract. The amounts are discretionary and are based on other factors, including the profitability of the entity and the individuals' performance. The bonuses are not directly attributable to identifiable contracts.

340-40-55-4

The entity observes that the external legal fees and travel costs would have been incurred regardless of whether the contract was obtained. Therefore, in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-3, those costs are recognized as expenses when incurred, unless they are within the scope of another Topic, in which case, the guidance in that Topic applies.

How we see it

The new guidance will require a significant change in practice for entities that historically have expensed the costs of obtaining a contract and now will be required to capitalize them. In addition, this may be a significant change for entities that have previously capitalized costs to obtain a contract, such as salaries and benefits for salespeople, by analogizing to the guidance in ASC 310-20. Because such amounts are not incremental, they would not be eligible for capitalization under the new standard unless they are explicitly chargeable to the customer regardless of whether the contract is obtained.

As a practical expedient, the standard permits an entity to immediately expense contract acquisition costs when the asset that would have resulted from capitalizing these costs would have been amortized in one year or less. While this is not explicitly stated in the standard, we believe entities should apply this approach consistently to all short-term acquisition costs.

Question 9-6

Should an entity capitalize commissions paid on contract modifications? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 23]

Yes, if they are incremental (i.e., they would not have been incurred if there hadn't been a modification) and recoverable. Contract modifications are accounted for in one of three ways: (1) as a separate contract, (2) as a termination of the existing contract and the creation of a new contract or (3) as part of the existing contract (see Section 3.4 for further guidance on contract modifications). In all three cases, commissions paid on contract modifications are incremental costs of obtaining a contract and should be capitalized if they are recoverable. In the first two cases, a new contract is created so the costs of obtaining that contract would be incremental. The TRG agenda paper said that commissions paid on the modification of a contract that is accounted for as part of the existing contract are incremental costs even though they are not *initial* incremental costs.

Question 9-7 Should fringe benefits (e.g., employer portion of payroll taxes, pension/401-K matches) on commission payments be included in the capitalized amounts? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 23]

Fringe benefits should be capitalized as part of the incremental cost of obtaining a contract if the additional costs are based on the amount of commissions paid and the commissions qualify as costs to obtain a contract. However, if the costs of fringe benefits would have been incurred regardless of whether the contract had been obtained (e.g., health insurance premiums), the fringe benefits should not be capitalized. That is, an entity cannot allocate to the commission and therefore capitalize a portion of the costs of benefits it would provide regardless of whether the commission was paid.

Question 9-8 Must an entity apply the practical expedient to expense contract acquisition costs to all of its qualifying contracts across the entity or can it apply the practical expedient to individual contracts?

We believe the practical expedient to expense contract acquisition costs that would be amortized over a period of one year or less should be applied consistently to contracts with similar characteristics and in similar circumstances. Therefore, we believe an entity generally should apply the practical expedient to expense contract acquisition costs to all of its qualifying contracts at the entity-wide level.

Question 9-9 How should an entity account for capitalized commissions upon a modification of the contract that is treated as the termination of an existing contract and the creation of a new contract?

We believe an asset recognized for incremental costs to obtain a contract that exists when the related contract is modified should be carried forward into the new contract if the modification is treated as the termination of an existing contract and the creation of a new contract and the goods and services to which the original contract cost asset relates are part of the new contract. That is because the contract cost asset relates to goods and services that have not been transferred and the accounting for the modification is prospective. This conclusion is similar to the one reached by FASB TRG members in relation to the accounting for contract assets upon a contract modification, as discussed in Question 10-5 in Section 10.1. The contract cost asset that remains on the entity's balance sheet at the date of modification would continue to be evaluated for impairment in accordance with ASC 340-40 (see Section 9.3.4). In addition, an entity should determine an appropriate amortization period for the contract cost asset (see Section 9.3.3).

9.3.2 Costs to fulfill a contract

ASC 340-40 divides contract fulfillment costs into two categories: (1) those that give rise to an asset and (2) those that are expensed as incurred. When determining the appropriate accounting treatment for these costs, the guidance states that any other applicable literature should be considered first as follows:

Excerpt from the Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Scope and Scope Exceptions

Costs Incurred in Fulfilling a Contract with a Customer

340-40-15-3

The guidance in this Subtopic applies to the costs incurred in fulfilling a contract with a customer within the scope of Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers, unless the costs are within the scope of another Topic or Subtopic, including, but not limited to, any of the following:

- a. Topic 330 on inventory
- b. Paragraphs 340-10-25-1 through 25-4 on preproduction costs related to long-term supply arrangements

- c. Subtopic 350-40 on internal-use software
- d. Topic 360 on property, plant, and equipment
- e. Subtopic 985-20 on costs of software to be sold, leased, or otherwise marketed.

Recognition

Costs to Fulfill a Contract

340-40-25-5

An entity shall recognize an asset from the costs incurred to fulfill a contract only if those costs meet all of the following criteria:

- a. The costs relate directly to a contract or to an anticipated contract that the entity can specifically identify (for example, costs relating to services to be provided under renewal of an existing contract or costs of designing an asset to be transferred under a specific contract that has not yet been approved).
- b. The costs generate or enhance resources of the entity that will be used in satisfying (or in continuing to satisfy) performance obligations in the future.
- c. The costs are expected to be recovered.

340-40-25-6

For costs incurred in fulfilling a contract with a **customer** that are within the scope of another Topic (for example, Topic 330 on inventory; paragraphs 340-10-25-1 through 25-4 on preproduction costs related to long-term supply arrangements; Subtopic 350-40 on internal-use software; Topic 360 on property, plant, and equipment; or Subtopic 985-20 on costs of software to be sold, leased, or otherwise marketed), an entity shall account for those costs in accordance with those other Topics or Subtopics.

If other accounting guidance precludes the recognition of an asset for a particular cost, an asset cannot be recognized under ASC 340-40.

When determining whether costs meet the criteria for capitalization, an entity must consider its specific facts and circumstances. The standard says that costs can be capitalized even if the revenue contract with the customer is not finalized. However, rather than allowing costs to be related to any potential future contract, the standard requires that the costs be associated with a specific anticipated contract.

The standard discusses and provides examples of costs that may meet the first criterion for capitalization listed above (i.e., costs that relate directly to the contract) as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Recognition

Costs to Fulfill a Contract

340-40-25-7

Costs that relate directly to a contract (or a specific anticipated contract) include any of the following:

- a. Direct labor (for example, salaries and wages of employees who provide the promised services directly to the customer)
- b. Direct materials (for example, supplies used in providing the promised services to a customer)

- c. Allocations of costs that relate directly to the contract or to contract activities (for example, costs of contract management and supervision, insurance, and depreciation of tools and equipment used in fulfilling the contract)
- d. Costs that are explicitly chargeable to the customer under the contract
- e. Other costs that are incurred only because an entity entered into the contract (for example, payments to subcontractors).

Significant judgment may be required to determine whether costs generate or enhance resources of the entity that will be used in satisfying performance obligations in the future. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁴² the FASB explained that the standard results in the capitalization of only costs that meet the definition of an asset and precludes an entity from deferring costs merely to normalize profit margins throughout a contract by allocating revenue and costs evenly over the contract term.

For costs to meet the “expected to be recovered” criterion, the costs need to be either explicitly reimbursable under the contract or reflected through the pricing on the contract and recoverable through margin.

If the costs incurred in fulfilling a contract do not give rise to an asset based on the criteria above, the guidance requires them to be expensed as incurred. The standard provides some common examples of costs that should be expensed as incurred as follows:

Excerpt from the Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Recognition

Costs to Fulfill a Contract

340-40-25-8

An entity shall recognize the following costs as expenses when incurred:

- a. General and administrative costs (unless those costs are explicitly chargeable to the customer under the contract, in which case an entity shall evaluate those costs in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-7)
- b. Costs of wasted materials, labor, or other resources to fulfill the contract that were not reflected in the price of the contract
- c. Costs that relate to satisfied performance obligations (or partially satisfied performance obligations) in the contract (that is, costs that relate to past performance)
- d. Costs for which an entity cannot distinguish whether the costs relate to unsatisfied performance obligations or to satisfied performance obligations (or partially satisfied performance obligations).

If a performance obligation (or a portion of a performance obligation that is satisfied over time) has been satisfied, fulfillment costs related to that performance obligation (or portion thereof) can no longer be capitalized. Once an entity has begun satisfying a performance obligation that is satisfied over time, it should only capitalize costs that relate to future performance. If an entity is unable to determine whether certain costs relate to past or future performance, and the costs are not eligible for capitalization under other US GAAP guidance, the costs are expensed as incurred.

²⁴² Paragraph BC308 of ASU 2014-09.

The standard provides the following example that illustrates costs that are capitalized under other US GAAP, costs that meet the capitalization criteria and costs that don't:

Excerpt from the Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 2 – Costs that Give Rise to an Asset

340-40-55-5

An entity enters into a service contract to manage a customer's information technology data center for five years. The contract is renewable for subsequent one-year periods. The average customer term is seven years. The entity pays an employee a \$10,000 sales commission upon the customer signing the contract. Before providing the services, the entity designs and builds a technology platform for the entity's internal use that interfaces with the customer's systems. That platform is not transferred to the customer but will be used to deliver services to the customer.

Incremental Costs of Obtaining a Contract

340-40-55-6

In accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1, the entity recognizes an asset for the \$10,000 incremental costs of obtaining the contract for the sales commission because the entity expects to recover those costs through future fees for the services to be provided. The entity amortizes the asset over seven years in accordance with paragraph 340-40-35-1 because the asset relates to the services transferred to the customer during the contract term of five years and the entity anticipates that the contract will be renewed for two subsequent one-year periods.

Costs to Fulfill a Contract

340-40-55-7

The initial costs incurred to set up the technology platform are as follows:

Design services	\$ 40,000
Hardware	120,000
Software	90,000
Migration and testing of data center	<u>100,000</u>
Total costs	<u>\$ 350,000</u>

340-40-55-8

The initial setup costs relate primarily to activities to fulfill the contract but do not transfer goods or services to the customer. The entity accounts for the initial setup costs as follows:

- a. Hardware costs – accounted for in accordance with Topic 360 on property, plant, and equipment
- b. Software costs – accounted for in accordance with Subtopic 350-40 on internal-use software
- c. Costs of the design, migration, and testing of the data center – assessed in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-5 to determine whether an asset can be recognized for the costs to fulfill the contract. Any resulting asset would be amortized on a systematic basis over the seven-year period (that is, the five-year contract term and two anticipated one-year renewal periods) that the entity expects to provide services related to the data center.

340-40-55-9

In addition to the initial costs to set up the technology platform, the entity also assigns two employees who are primarily responsible for providing the service to the customer. Although the costs for these two employees are incurred as part of providing the service to the customer, the entity concludes that the costs do not generate or enhance resources of the entity (see paragraph 340-40-25-5(b)). Therefore, the costs do not meet the criteria in paragraph 340-40-25-5 and cannot be recognized as an asset using this Topic. In accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-8, the entity recognizes the payroll expense for these two employees when incurred.

Question 9-10 How should an entity account for pre-production costs related to long-term supply arrangements that are accounted for under ASC 340-10 prior to the adoption of ASU 2014-09? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 46]

ASU 2014-09 did not amend the guidance in ASC 340-10 on pre-production costs related to long-term supply arrangements. FASB TRG members generally agreed that an entity that was appropriately following the guidance in ASC 340-10 before the adoption of ASU 2014-09 would continue to do so after implementation of ASU 2014-09. However, several FASB TRG members questioned whether the guidance in ASC 340-10 should be rescinded because it appears to be unnecessary and is potentially inconsistent with the revenue and cost guidance in ASU 2014-09.

UPDATE: In May 2016, the FASB proposed superseding the guidance in ASC 340-10. Under this proposal, an entity would apply ASC 340-40 to determine whether pre-production costs should be capitalized as long as those costs are not in the scope of other authoritative accounting literature (e.g., ASC 720-15, ASC 730). Comments were due 2 July 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

Question 9-11 Will pre-production costs for construction-type and production-type contracts that were previously in the scope of ASC 605-35 be in the scope of the cost guidance in ASC 340-10 or ASC 340-40? [9 November 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 46]

The contract cost guidance in ASC 605-35 will be superseded by ASU 2014-09. FASB TRG members generally agreed that an entity that is appropriately accounting for contract costs under ASC 605-35 prior to the adoption of ASU 2014-09 would account for those contract costs under ASC 340-40 after adopting ASU 2014-09.

Question 9-12 Can an entity defer costs of a transferred good or service that would otherwise generate an up-front loss because variable consideration is fully or partially constrained?

An entity should not defer the costs of a transferred good or service when the application of the constraint on variable consideration results in an up-front loss even if the entity ultimately expects to recognize a profit on that good or service, unless other specific guidance requires a deferral of those costs. The criteria in ASC 340-40 must be met to capitalize costs to fulfill a contract, including the criterion that the costs must generate or enhance resources of the entity that will be used in satisfying performance obligations in the future. An entity recognizes costs of sales when control of a good or service transfers to the customer, so the cost of those sales would not generate or enhance resources used to satisfy future performance obligations. Consider the following example:

An entity sells goods with a cost of \$500,000 for consideration of \$600,000. The goods have a high risk of obsolescence, which may require the entity to provide price concessions in the future, resulting in variable consideration (see Section 5.2.1.1). The entity constrains the transaction price and concludes that it is probable that \$470,000 will not result in a significant revenue reversal even though the vendor reasonably expects the contract to be ultimately profitable. When control transfers, the entity recognizes revenue of \$470,000 and costs of \$500,000 and would not capitalize the loss of \$30,000 because the loss does not generate or enhance resources of the entity that will be used in satisfying performance obligations in the future.

Question 9-13

How should an entity account for fulfillment costs incurred prior to the contract establishment date that are outside the scope of another standard (e.g., outside of the scope of the inventory guidance in ASC 330)? [30 March 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 33]

Entities may begin activities on a specific anticipated contract before the contract establishment date (e.g., before agreeing to the contract with the customer, before the contract satisfies the criteria to be accounted for under the standard). TRG members generally agreed that costs relating to pre-contract establishment date activities that relate to a good or service that will transfer to the customer at or after the contract establishment date may be capitalized as costs to fulfill a specific anticipated contract. However, TRG members noted such costs would still need to meet the other criteria in the standard to be capitalized (e.g., they are expected to be recovered under the anticipated contract).

Capitalized costs that relate to goods or services that are transferred to the customer at the contract establishment date should be expensed immediately. Any remaining capitalized costs would be amortized over the period that the related goods or services are transferred to the customer.

For guidance on recognizing revenue for a performance obligation satisfied over time when activities are completed before the contract establishment date, see Question 7-8 in Section 7.1.4.3.

9.3.3

Amortization of capitalized costs

Any capitalized contract costs are amortized, with the expense recognized as an entity transfers the related goods or services to the customer as follows:

Excerpt from the Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Subsequent Measurement

Amortization and Impairment

340-40-35-1

An asset recognized in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5 shall be amortized on a systematic basis that is consistent with the transfer to the customer of the goods or services to which the asset relates. The asset may relate to goods or services to be transferred under a specific anticipated contract (as described in paragraph 340-40-25-5(a)).

340-40-35-2

An entity shall update the amortization to reflect a significant change in the entity's expected timing of transfer to the customer of the goods or services to which the asset relates. Such a change shall be accounted for as a change in accounting estimate in accordance with Subtopic 250-10 on accounting changes and error corrections.

It is important to note that certain capitalized costs will relate to multiple goods and services (e.g., design costs to manufacture multiple distinct goods when design services are not a separate performance obligation) in a single contract, so the amortization period could be the entire contract term. The amortization period could also extend beyond a single contract if the capitalized costs relate to goods or services being transferred under multiple contracts, or to a specific anticipated contract, such as when the customer is expected to renew its current services contract for another term. In these situations, the capitalized costs should be amortized over the expected period of benefit. The expected period of benefit may be the expected customer relationship period. To determine the appropriate amortization period, an entity will need to evaluate the type of capitalized costs, what the costs relate to and the specific facts and circumstances of the arrangement.

When evaluating whether the amortization period for a sales commission extends beyond the contract period, an entity should also evaluate whether an additional commission is paid for subsequent renewals. In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁴³ the FASB explained that amortizing the asset over a longer period than the initial contract would not be appropriate if an entity pays a commission on a contract renewal that is commensurate with the commission paid on the initial contract. In that case, the costs of obtaining the initial contract do not relate to the subsequent contract. Judgment will be required to determine whether a renewal commission is commensurate with the commission paid on the initial contract.

An entity should update the amortization period when there is a significant change in the entity's expected timing of transfer to the customer of the goods or services to which the asset relates, as illustrated in the following example:

Illustration 9-4: Amortization period

Entity A enters into a three-year contract with a new customer for transaction processing services. To fulfill the contract, Entity A incurred setup costs of \$60,000, which it capitalized in accordance with ASC 340-40-25-5 through 25-8 and will amortize over the term of the contract.

At the beginning of the third year, the customer renews the contract for an additional two years. Because Entity A will benefit from the setup costs during the additional two-year period, it would change the remaining amortization period from one to three years and adjust the amortization expense in the period of the change and future periods in accordance with the guidance in ASC 250 on changes in estimates. The disclosure requirements of ASC 250 related to changes in estimates also are applicable.

However, under the standard, if Entity A had been in the position to anticipate the contract renewal at contract inception, Entity A would have amortized the setup costs over the anticipated term of the contract, including the expected renewal (i.e., five years).

²⁴³ Paragraph BC309 of ASU 2014-09.

Question 9-14 **Can an entity attribute the capitalized contract costs to the individual performance obligations in the contract to determine the appropriate amortization period?**

Yes, we believe an entity can attribute the capitalized contract costs to the individual performance obligations in the contract to determine the appropriate amortization period, but it is not required to do so. ASC 340-40-35-1 states that the asset recognized should be amortized on a systematic basis “that is consistent with the transfer to the customer of the goods or services to which the asset relates.” An entity may meet this objective by allocating the capitalized costs to performance obligations on a relative basis (i.e., in proportion to the transaction price allocated to each performance obligation) to determine the period of amortization.²⁴⁴ An entity may also meet the objective by allocating specific capitalized costs to individual performance obligations when the costs relate specifically to certain goods or services. An entity should have objective evidence to support a conclusion that a specified amount of the costs relates to a specific performance obligation.

In addition, as discussed above, an entity that attributes capitalized contract costs to individual performance obligations will need to consider whether the amortization period for some or all of the performance obligations should extend beyond the original contract.

Question 9-15 **Over what period should an entity amortize a sales commission that is paid only once a threshold is met that is determined to be an incremental cost to obtain a contract? [26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 23]**

The TRG agenda paper said two of the alternatives discussed would meet the objective of amortizing the costs on a systematic basis that is consistent with the transfer to the customer of the goods or services to which the asset relates, but either alternative should be applied consistently to similar circumstances. In one alternative, an entity allocated the capitalized costs to all of the contracts that cumulatively resulted in the threshold being met and amortized the costs over the expected customer relationship period of each of those contracts. In the other alternative, an entity allocated the capitalized costs to the contract that resulted in the threshold being met and amortized the costs over the expected customer relationship period of that contract. The TRG agenda paper noted that the second alternative may result in a counterintuitive answer if the commission paid upon obtaining the contract that resulted in the threshold being met was large in relation to the transaction price for only that contract. The TRG agenda paper did not contemplate all possible alternatives.

9.3.4 **Impairment of capitalized costs**

Because costs that give rise to an asset must continue to be recoverable throughout the contract period (or period of benefit, if longer) to meet the criteria for capitalization, any asset recorded by the entity is subject to an impairment assessment at the end of each reporting period as follows:

²⁴⁴ 26 January 2015 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 23.

Excerpt from the Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Subsequent Measurement

Amortization and Impairment

340-40-35-3

An entity shall recognize an impairment loss in profit or loss to the extent that the carrying amount of an asset recognized in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5 exceeds:

- a. The remaining amount of consideration that the entity expects to receive in exchange for the goods or services to which the asset relates, less
- b. The costs that relate directly to providing those goods or services and that have not been recognized as expenses (see paragraph 340-40-25-7).

340-40-35-4

For the purposes of applying paragraph 340-40-35-3 to determine the amount of consideration that an entity expects to receive, an entity shall use the principles for determining the transaction price (except for the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13 on constraining estimates of variable consideration) and adjust that amount to reflect the effects of the customer's credit risk.

340-40-35-5

Before an entity recognizes an impairment loss for an asset recognized in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5, the entity shall recognize any impairment loss for assets related to the contract that are recognized in accordance with another Topic (for example, Topic 330 on inventory; Subtopic 985-20 on costs of software to be sold, leased, or otherwise marketed; Topic 360 on property, plant, and equipment; and Topic 350 on goodwill and other intangibles). After applying the impairment test in paragraph 340-40-35-3, an entity shall include the resulting carrying amount of the asset recognized in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5 in the carrying amount of the asset group or reporting unit to which it belongs for the purpose of applying the guidance in Topics 360 and 350 to that asset group or reporting unit.

340-40-35-6

An entity shall not recognize a reversal of an impairment loss previously recognized.

An impairment exists if the carrying amount of any asset(s) exceeds the amount of consideration the entity has received that has not been recognized as revenue and consideration it expects to receive in exchange for providing those goods and services, less the remaining costs that relate directly to providing those goods and services.

TRG members²⁴⁵ generally agreed that an entity should include future cash flows associated with contract renewal or extension periods when it determines the amount it expects to receive for purposes of the impairment test if the period of benefit of the costs under assessment is expected to extend beyond the present contract. In other words, an entity should consider the total period over which it expects to receive economic benefits relating to the asset both for purposes of determining the amortization period and estimating cash flows for impairment purposes. Some constituents had asked the TRG to clarify whether including renewals or extension periods would be appropriate because of an inconsistency between ASC 340-40 and ASC 606. Specifically, the cost guidance indicates that costs capitalized could relate to goods or services to be transferred under "a specific anticipated contract"

²⁴⁵ 18 July 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 4.

(e.g., goods or services to be provided under contract renewals and/or extensions) and that entities should follow the principles of ASC 606 for determining the transaction price. The guidance in ASC 606 (ASC 606-10-32-4) states that an entity should not anticipate that the contract will be “cancelled, renewed or modified” when determining the transaction price. In some instances, excluding renewals or extensions would have triggered an immediate impairment of a contract asset because the consideration an entity expects to receive would have not included anticipated cash flows from contract extension or renewal periods, but the entity would have capitalized contract costs on the basis that they would be recovered over the contract extension or renewal periods.

Note that when an entity determines the amount it expects to receive, the guidance on constraining estimates of variable consideration is also not considered. That is, if an entity were required to reduce the estimated transaction price because of the constraint on variable consideration, it would use the unconstrained transaction price for the impairment test. While unconstrained, this amount must be reduced to reflect the customer’s credit risk before it is used in the impairment test.

However, subject to the finalization of the FASB’s May 2016 proposal, before recognizing an impairment loss on capitalized costs incurred to obtain or fulfill a contract, the entity will need to consider impairment losses recognized in accordance with another topic (e.g., ASC 330, ASC 985-20). After applying the impairment test to the capitalized costs in the scope of other topics and those in the scope of ASC 340-40, an entity includes the resulting carrying amounts in the carrying amount of the asset group or reporting unit for purposes of applying the guidance in ASC 360 or ASC 350.

Consistent with impairment guidance in other standards (e.g., ASC 360), entities following US GAAP will not be permitted to reverse impairment losses previously recognized.

UPDATE: In May 2016, the FASB proposed clarifying the inconsistency between ASC 340-40 and ASC 606 as discussed by the TRG (noted above) to make clear that when performing impairment testing an entity should consider expected contract renewals and extensions and include both the amount of consideration it already has received but has not recognized as revenue and the amount the entity expects to receive in the future. The FASB also proposed clarifying the interaction of the impairment testing in ASC 340-40 with other ASC topics (e.g., ASC 360). The proposal would clarify that the order of impairment testing is as discussed above. Comments were due 2 July 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 permits the reversal of some or all of previous impairment losses if the estimates used to determine the asset’s recoverable amount have changed.

10 Presentation and disclosure

The standard provides guidance on presentation and disclosure that applies to both public and nonpublic entities and provides some relief on disclosure requirements for nonpublic entities. As discussed in Section 1.2.1, the standard defines a public entity as one of the following:

- ▶ A PBE
- ▶ A not-for-profit entity that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market
- ▶ An employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with the SEC

An entity that does not meet any of the criteria above is considered a nonpublic entity for purposes of this standard. The presentation and disclosure requirements for nonpublic entities are discussed separately below.



IASB differences

IFRS 15 does not differentiate between public and nonpublic entities.

10.1

Presentation requirements for contract assets and contract liabilities

The revenue model is based on the notion that a contract asset or contract liability is generated when either party to a contract performs, depending on the relationship between the entity's performance and the customer's payment. The guidance requires that an entity present these contract assets or contract liabilities in the statement of financial position (balance sheet) and is excerpted below:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Other Presentation Matters

606-10-45-1

When either party to a contract has performed, an entity shall present the contract in the statement of financial position as a contract asset or a contract liability, depending on the relationship between the entity's performance and the customer's payment. An entity shall present any unconditional rights to consideration separately as a receivable.

606-10-45-2

If a customer pays consideration, or an entity has a right to an amount of consideration that is unconditional (that is, a receivable), before the entity transfers a good or service to the customer, the entity shall present the contract as a contract liability when the payment is made or the payment is due (whichever is earlier). A contract liability is an entity's obligation to transfer goods or services to a customer for which the entity has received consideration (or an amount of consideration is due) from the customer.

606-10-45-3

If an entity performs by transferring goods or services to a customer before the customer pays consideration or before payment is due, the entity shall present the contract as a **contract asset**, excluding any amounts presented as a receivable. A contract asset is an entity's right to consideration in exchange for goods or services that the entity has transferred to a customer. An entity shall assess a contract asset for impairment in accordance with Topic 310 on receivables. An impairment of a contract asset shall be measured, presented, and disclosed in accordance with Topic 310 (see also paragraph 606-10-50-4(b)).

606-10-45-4

A receivable is an entity's right to consideration that is unconditional. A right to consideration is unconditional if only the passage of time is required before payment of that consideration is due. For example, an entity would recognize a receivable if it has a present right to payment even though that amount may be subject to refund in the future. An entity shall account for a receivable in accordance with Topic 310. Upon initial recognition of a receivable from a contract with a customer, any difference between the measurement of the receivable in accordance with Topic 310 and the corresponding amount of **revenue** recognized shall be presented as an expense (for example, as an impairment loss).

606-10-45-5

This guidance uses the terms *contract asset* and *contract liability* but does not prohibit an entity from using alternative descriptions in the statement of financial position for those items. If an entity uses an alternative description for a contract asset, the entity shall provide sufficient information for a user of the financial statements to distinguish between receivables and contract assets.

When an entity satisfies a performance obligation by transferring a promised good or service, the entity has earned a right to consideration from the customer and, therefore, has a contract asset. When the customer performs first (e.g., by prepaying its promised consideration), the entity has a contract liability.

Contract assets may represent conditional or unconditional rights to consideration. The right would be conditional, for example, when an entity first must satisfy another performance obligation in the contract before it is entitled to payment from the customer. If an entity has an unconditional right to receive consideration from the customer, the contract asset is accounted for as a receivable and presented separately from contract assets.²⁴⁶ A right is unconditional if nothing other than the passage of time is required before payment of that consideration is due.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁴⁷ the Board explains that in many cases an unconditional right to consideration (i.e., a receivable) arises when an entity satisfies a performance obligation, which could be before it invoices the customer (e.g., an unbilled receivable) if only the passage of time is required before payment of that consideration is due. It is also possible for an entity to have an unconditional right to consideration before it satisfies a performance obligation. In some industries, it is common for an entity to invoice its customers in advance of performance (and satisfaction of the performance obligation). For example, an entity that enters into a noncancellable contract requiring payment a month before the entity provides the goods or services would record a receivable and an offsetting contract liability on the date when payment is due.²⁴⁸ In this situation, revenue is not recognized until goods or services are transferred to the customer.

²⁴⁶ Paragraphs BC323 and BC324 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁴⁷ Paragraph BC325 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁴⁸ This conclusion (i.e., that a receivable is recorded when payment is due) is based on ASC 606-10-55-286 in Example 38 Case B (excerpted below), which is subject to a potential technical correction. See update box below.

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁴⁹ the Board noted that making the distinction between a contract asset and a receivable is important because doing so provides users of financial statements with relevant information about the risks associated with the entity's rights in a contract. Although both would be subject to credit risk, a contract asset also is subject to other risks (e.g., performance risk).

Under the standard, entities are not required to use the terms "contract asset" or "contract liability," but they must disclose sufficient information so that users of the financial statements can clearly distinguish between unconditional rights to consideration (receivables) and conditional rights to receive consideration (contract assets). Additionally, entities with a classified balance sheet should consider the guidance in ASC 210 on classification of current assets and liabilities when determining whether their contract assets and contract liabilities should be presented as current or noncurrent.

The standard provides the following example of presentation of contract balances:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 38 – Contract Liability and Receivable

Case A – Cancellable Contract

606-10-55-284

On January 1, 20X9, an entity enters into a cancellable contract to transfer a product to a customer on March 31, 20X9. The contract requires the customer to pay consideration of \$1,000 in advance on January 31, 20X9. The customer pays the consideration on March 1, 20X9. The entity transfers the product on March 31, 20X9. The following journal entries illustrate how the entity accounts for the contract:

- a. The entity receives cash of \$1,000 on March 1, 20X9 (cash is received in advance of performance).

Cash	\$	1,000	
Contract Liability			\$ 1,000

- b. The entity satisfies the performance obligation on March 31, 20X9.

Contract Liability	\$	1,000	
Revenue			\$ 1,000

Case B – Noncancellable Contract

606-10-55-285

The same facts as in Case A apply to Case B except that the contract is noncancellable. The following journal entries illustrate how the entity accounts for the contract:

- a. The amount of consideration is due on January 31, 20X9 (which is when the entity recognizes a receivable because it has an unconditional right to consideration).

Receivable	\$	1,000	
Contract Liability			\$ 1,000

²⁴⁹ Paragraph BC323 of ASU 2014-09.

- b. The entity receives the cash on March 1, 20X9.

Cash	\$	1,000	
Receivable			\$ 1,000

- c. The entity satisfies the performance obligation on March 31, 20X9.

Contract liability	\$	1,000	
Revenue			\$ 1,000

606-10-55-286

If the entity issued the invoice before January 31, 20X9 (the due date of the consideration), the entity would not present the receivable and the contract liability on a gross basis in the statement of financial position because the entity does not yet have a right to consideration that is unconditional.

UPDATE: At the April 2016 FASB TRG meeting, the FASB staff provided an update on a question it had received from a stakeholder regarding Case B of Example 38. This example indicates that an entity could not record a receivable until the date the consideration for a noncancellable contract was due. However, the staff believes that ASC 606 requires any unconditional right to payment, such as when only the passage of time is required for payment, to be presented separately as a receivable. As such, the staff indicated it would likely recommend to the Board that it issue a technical correction for this example.

The standard includes another example of presentation of contract balances that illustrates when an entity has satisfied a performance obligation but does not have an unconditional right to payment and therefore recognizes a contract asset:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 39 – Contract Asset Recognized for the Entity's Performance

606-10-55-287

On January 1, 20X8, an entity enters into a contract to transfer Products A and B to a customer in exchange for \$1,000. The contract requires Product A to be delivered first and states that payment for the delivery of Product A is conditional on the delivery of Product B. In other words, the consideration of \$1,000 is due only after the entity has transferred both Products A and B to the customer. Consequently, the entity does not have a right to consideration that is unconditional (a receivable) until both Products A and B are transferred to the customer.

606-10-55-288

The entity identifies the promises to transfer Products A and B as performance obligations and allocates \$400 to the performance obligation to transfer Product A and \$600 to the performance obligation to transfer Product B on the basis of their relative standalone selling prices. The entity recognizes revenue for each respective performance obligation when control of the product transfers to the customer.

606-10-55-289

The entity satisfies the performance obligation to transfer Product A.

Contract asset	\$	400	
Revenue			\$ 400

606-10-55-290

The entity satisfies the performance obligation to transfer Product B and to recognize the unconditional right to consideration.

Receivable	\$	1,000	
Contract asset			\$ 400
Revenue			\$ 600

After initial recognition, receivables and contract assets are subject to impairment assessments in accordance with ASC 310. In addition, if there is a difference between the initial measurement of the receivable under ASC 310 and the corresponding amount of revenue, that difference will be presented as an expense (i.e., as an impairment loss). This will be the case when the difference is attributable to customer credit risk rather than an implied price concession. Implied price concessions are deducted from the contract price to derive the transaction price, which is the amount recognized as revenue. Distinguishing between implied price concessions and expense due to customer credit risk will require judgment (see Section 5.2.1.1). Impairment losses resulting from contracts with customers are presented separately from losses on other contracts.

An entity could also have recorded other assets related to contracts with a customer (e.g., the incremental costs of obtaining the contract, other costs incurred that meet the criteria for capitalization). The guidance requires that any such assets be presented separately from contract assets and contract liabilities in the statement of financial position (assuming they are material). These amounts are also assessed for impairment separately.

Question 10-1

How should an entity determine the presentation of contract assets and liabilities for contracts that contain multiple performance obligations? [31 October 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 7]

Members of the TRG generally agreed that contract assets and liabilities should be determined at the contract level and not at the performance obligation level. That is, an entity would not separately recognize an asset or liability for each performance obligation within a contract but would aggregate them into a single contract asset or liability.

This question arose in part because, under the standard, the amount and timing of revenue recognition is determined based on progress toward complete satisfaction of *each* performance obligation. Therefore, some constituents questioned whether an entity could have a contract asset and a contract liability for a single contract when, for example, the entity has satisfied (or partially satisfied) one performance obligation in a contract for which consideration is not yet due but has received a prepayment for another unsatisfied performance obligation in the contract. Members of the TRG generally agreed that the discussion in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁵⁰ was clear that contract asset or contract liability positions are determined for each contract on a net basis. This is because the rights and obligations in a contract with a customer are interdependent – the right to receive consideration from a

²⁵⁰ Paragraph BC317 of ASU 2014-09.

customer depends on the entity's performance and similarly, the entity performs only as long as the customer continues to pay. The Board decided that those interdependencies are best reflected by accounting and presenting contract assets or liabilities on a net basis.

Question 10-2 **How should an entity determine the presentation of two or more contracts that have been required to be combined under the standard?** [31 October 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 7]

TRG members generally agreed that the contract asset or liability would be combined (i.e., presented net) for different contracts with the same customer (or a related party of the customer) if an entity is otherwise required to combine those contracts under the standard (see Section 3.3 for discussion of the criteria for combining contracts). When two or more contracts are required to be combined under the standard, the rights and obligations in the individual contracts are interdependent. Therefore, as discussed in Question 10-1, this interdependency is best reflected by combining the individual contracts as if they were a single contract. TRG members acknowledged that this analysis may be operationally difficult for some entities because their systems may capture data at the performance obligation level to comply with the recognition and measurement aspects of the standard.

Question 10-3 **When should an entity offset contract assets and liabilities against other balance sheet items?** [31 October 2014 TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 7]

TRG members generally agreed that because the standards do not provide offsetting guidance, entities will need to look to other guidance outside the revenue standard to determine whether offsetting is appropriate (e.g., the balance sheet offsetting guidance in ASC 210-20). For example, if an entity has a contract asset (or a receivable) and a contract liability from separate contracts with the same customer (that are not required to be combined under the standard), the entity will need to look to other guidance outside the revenue standard to determine whether offsetting is appropriate.

Question 10-4 **Is a refund liability a contract liability (and thus subject to the presentation and disclosure requirements of a contract liability)?**

We believe that a refund liability will not typically meet the definition of a contract liability. When an entity makes the conclusion that a refund liability is not a contract liability, it should present the refund liability separate from any contract liability (or asset) and it would not be subject to the disclosure requirements of ASC 606-10-50-8 and 50-10 discussed in Section 10.4.1 below.

When a customer pays consideration (or consideration is unconditionally due) and the entity has an obligation to transfer *goods or services* to the customer, the entity records a contract liability. When the entity expects to refund some or all of the *consideration* received (or receivable) from the customer, it records a refund liability. A refund liability generally does not represent an obligation to transfer goods or services in the future. Similar to receivables (which are considered a subset of contract assets), refund liabilities could be considered a subset of contract liabilities. We believe refund liabilities are also similar to receivables in that they should be extracted from the net contract position and presented separately (if material). This conclusion is consistent with the standard's specific requirement to present the corresponding asset for expected returns separately.

If an entity were to conclude, based on its specific facts and circumstances, that a refund liability did represent an obligation to transfer goods or services in the future, it would be a contract liability subject to the disclosure requirements in ASC 606-10-50-8 and 50-10. Additionally, in that situation, the entity would present a single net contract liability or asset (i.e., including the refund liability) determined at the contract level as discussed in Question 10-1.

Question 10-5 **How should an entity account for a contract asset that exists when a contract is modified if the modification is treated as the termination of an existing contract and the creation of a new contract?**
[18 April 2016 FASB TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 51]

FASB TRG members generally agreed that a contract asset that exists when a contract is modified should be carried forward into the new contract if the modification is treated as the termination of an existing contract and the creation of a new contract.

Some stakeholders questioned the appropriate accounting for contract assets when this type of modification occurs because the termination of the old contract could indicate that any remaining balances associated with the old contract should be written off.

FASB TRG members generally agreed that it is appropriate to carry forward the related contract asset in such modifications because the asset relates to a right to consideration for goods and services that have already been transferred and are distinct from those to be transferred in the future. As such, the revenue recognized to date should not be reversed and the contract asset should continue to be realized as amounts become due from the customer and are presented as a receivable. The contract asset that remains on the entity's balance sheet at the date of modification would continue to be subject to evaluation for impairment in accordance with ASC 310.

While the FASB TRG members did not discuss this point, we believe a similar conclusion would be appropriate when accounting for an asset created under ASC 340-40, such as capitalized commissions, which exists immediately before a contract modification that is treated as if it were a termination of the existing contract and creation of a new contract. Refer to Question 9-9 in Section 9.3.1 for further discussion.

Question 10-6 **When should an entity record a receivable if it has not transferred a good or service but has an unconditional right to payment?**

ASC 606-10-45-4 states that a receivable is an entity's right to consideration that is unconditional. We believe it may be difficult to assert that the entity has an unconditional right to payment when it has not transferred a good or service.

An entity may enter into noncancellable contracts that provide unconditional rights to payment from the customer for services that the entity has not yet completed providing or services it will provide in the near future (e.g., advance billings related to a service or maintenance arrangement). When determining whether it is acceptable (or required) for an entity to record accounts receivable and contract liability, the contract terms and specific facts and circumstances supporting the existence of an unconditional right to payment should be evaluated. Factors to consider include:

- ▶ Does the vendor have a contractual (or legal) right to bill and receive payment from the customer for services being provided currently (and not yet completed) or being provided in the near future (e.g., advance billings related to a service or maintenance arrangement)?
- ▶ Is the advance billing consistent with the vendor's normal billing terms?
- ▶ Will the vendor commence performance within a relatively short timeframe of the invoice date?
- ▶ Is there more than one year between the advance billing and performance?

10.2 Other presentation considerations

The standard also changes the presentation requirements for products expected to be returned and for contracts that contain a significant financing component. Refer to Sections 5.4.1 and 5.5.2 for presentation considerations related to rights of return and significant financing components, respectively.

10.3 Annual disclosure requirements

In response to criticism that legacy revenue recognition disclosures are inadequate, the Board sought to create a comprehensive and coherent set of disclosures. It also described the overall objective of the disclosures, as it has done in other recent standards as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

606-10-50-1

The objective of the disclosure requirements in this Topic is for an entity to disclose sufficient information to enable users of financial statements to understand the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows arising from contracts with customers. To achieve that objective, an entity shall disclose qualitative and quantitative information about all of the following:

- a. Its contracts with customers (see paragraphs 606-10-50-4 through 50-16)
- b. The significant judgments, and changes in the judgments, made in applying the guidance in this Topic to those contracts (see paragraphs 606-10-50-17 through 50-21)
- c. Any assets recognized from the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5 (see paragraphs 340-40-50-1 through 50-6).

606-10-50-2

An entity shall consider the level of detail necessary to satisfy the disclosure objective and how much emphasis to place on each of the various requirements. An entity shall aggregate or disaggregate disclosures so that useful information is not obscured by either the inclusion of a large amount of insignificant detail or the aggregation of items that have substantially different characteristics.

Each of the disclosure topics in the above excerpt is discussed further below. Because the disclosure requirements differ for public and nonpublic entities, these topics are discussed in Section 10.4 for public entities and Section 10.5 for nonpublic entities. To assist entities in determining the required disclosures, Appendices D and E include excerpts of a US GAAP Disclosure Checklist for public and nonpublic entities, respectively.

As explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁵¹ many preparers raised concerns when the Board was developing the standard that they would need to provide voluminous disclosures at a cost that might outweigh any potential benefits. In the final standard, the FASB clarified its disclosure objective and said the disclosures described in the guidance are not meant to be a checklist of minimum requirements. That is, entities do not have to include disclosures that are not relevant or not material to them. In addition, the FASB decided to require qualitative disclosures instead of tabular reconciliations for certain information.

²⁵¹ Paragraphs BC327 and BC331 of ASU 2014-09.

How we see it

Entities should review their disclosures to determine whether they have met the standard's objective to enable users to understand the nature, amount, timing and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows arising from contracts with customers. For example, some entities may make large payments to customers that do not represent payment for a distinct good or service and therefore reduce the transaction price and affect the amount and timing of revenue recognized. Although there are no specific requirements in the standard to disclose balances related to consideration paid to a customer, an entity may need to disclose qualitative and/or quantitative information about those arrangements to meet the objective of the disclosure requirements in the standard if the amounts are material.

10.4

Disclosures for public entities

Under the standard, all applicable disclosures are required for and as of each reporting period for which a statement of comprehensive income and a statement of financial position are presented as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

606-10-50-3

Amounts disclosed are for each reporting period for which a statement of comprehensive income (statement of activities) is presented and as of each reporting period for which a statement of financial position is presented. An entity need not disclose information in accordance with the guidance in this Topic if it has provided the information in accordance with another Topic.

10.4.1

Contracts with customers

The majority of the standard's disclosure requirements relate to an entity's contracts with customers. These disclosures include disaggregation of revenue, information about contract asset and liability balances, and information about an entity's performance obligations. To provide context for the disclosures, the Board decided²⁵² to require entities to disclose the following amounts related to contracts with customers:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Contracts with Customers

606-10-50-4

An entity shall disclose all of the following amounts for the reporting period unless those amounts are presented separately in the statement of comprehensive income (statement of activities) in accordance with other Topics:

- a. **Revenue** recognized from **contracts with customers**, which the entity shall disclose separately from its other sources of revenue

²⁵² Paragraph BC332 of ASU 2014-09.

- b. Any impairment losses recognized (in accordance with Topic 310 on receivables) on any receivables or **contract assets** arising from an entity's contracts with customers, which the entity shall disclose separately from impairment losses from other contracts.

ASC 606-10-5-4(a) requires an entity to disclose (or present in the statement of comprehensive income) the amount of revenue recognized from contracts with customers separately from other sources of revenue. For example, a large equipment manufacturer that both sells and leases its equipment should present (or disclose) amounts from these transactions separately.

ASC 606-10-5-4(b) also requires an entity to disclose impairment losses from contracts with customers separately from other impairment losses if they are not presented in the statement of comprehensive income separately. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁵³ the Board felt that separately disclosing the impairment losses on contracts with customers will provide the most relevant information to users of financial statements.

Disaggregation of revenue

Entities will be required to disclose disaggregated revenue information to illustrate how the nature, amount, timing and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors. Entities are not required to disaggregate losses for uncollectible amounts. While the standard does not specify how revenue should be disaggregated, the implementation guidance suggests categories for entities to consider.

The implementation guidance indicates that the most appropriate categories for a particular entity will depend on its facts and circumstances, but an entity should consider how it disaggregates revenue in other communications (e.g., press releases, other public filings) when determining which categories are most relevant and useful.

The standard includes the following guidance on the required disaggregation of revenue disclosures:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Disaggregation of Revenue

606-10-50-5

An entity shall disaggregate **revenue** recognized from **contracts** with **customers** into categories that depict how the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors. An entity shall apply the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-55-89 through 55-91 when selecting the categories to use to disaggregate revenue.

606-10-50-6

In addition, an entity shall disclose sufficient information to enable users of financial statements to understand the relationship between the disclosure of disaggregated revenue (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-5) and revenue information that is disclosed for each reportable segment, if the entity applies Topic 280 on segment reporting.

²⁵³ Paragraph BC334 of ASU 2014-09.

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Disclosure of Disaggregated Revenue

606-10-55-89

Paragraph 606-10-50-5 requires an entity to disaggregate **revenue** from **contracts with customers** into categories that depict how the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors. Consequently, the extent to which an entity's revenue is disaggregated for the purposes of this disclosure depends on the facts and circumstances that pertain to the entity's contracts with customers. Some entities may need to use more than one type of category to meet the objective in paragraph 606-10-50-5 for disaggregating revenue. Other entities may meet the objective by using only one type of category to disaggregate revenue.

606-10-55-90

When selecting the type of category (or categories) to use to disaggregate revenue, an entity should consider how information about the entity's revenue has been presented for other purposes, including all of the following:

- a. Disclosures presented outside the financial statements (for example, in earnings releases, annual reports, or investor presentations)
- b. Information regularly reviewed by the chief operating decision maker for evaluating the financial performance of operating segments
- c. Other information that is similar to the types of information identified in (a) and (b) and that is used by the entity or users of the entity's financial statements to evaluate the entity's financial performance or make resource allocation decisions.

606-10-55-91

Examples of categories that might be appropriate include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

- a. Type of good or service (for example, major product lines)
- b. Geographical region (for example, country or region)
- c. Market or type of customer (for example, government and nongovernment customers)
- d. Type of contract (for example, fixed-price and time-and-materials contracts)
- e. Contract duration (for example, short-term and long-term contracts)
- f. Timing of transfer of goods or services (for example, revenue from goods or services transferred to customers at a point in time and revenue from goods or services transferred over time)
- g. Sales channels (for example, goods sold directly to consumers and goods sold through intermediaries).

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁵⁴ the Board decided not to prescribe a specific characteristic of revenue as the basis for disaggregation because it intended for entities to make this determination based on entity- and/or industry-specific factors that would be most meaningful for their businesses. The Board acknowledged that an entity may need to use more than one type of category to disaggregate its revenue.

²⁵⁴ Paragraph BC336 of ASU 2014-09.

ASC 606-10-50-3 clarifies that an entity does not have to duplicate disclosures required by another standard. For example, an entity that provides disaggregated revenue disclosures as part of its segment disclosures does not have to separately provide disaggregated revenue disclosures if the segment-related disclosures are sufficient to illustrate how the nature, amount, timing and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows from contracts with customers are affected by economic factors and are presented on a basis consistent with US GAAP.

However, segment-related disclosures may not be sufficiently disaggregated to achieve the disclosure objectives of the revenue standard. The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁵⁵ that segment revenue disclosures may not always provide users of financial statements with enough information to help them understand the composition of revenue recognized in the period. If an entity provides disaggregated revenue disclosures in addition to segment disclosures, the standard requires an entity to explain the relationship between the disclosures. Users of the financial statements said this information is critical to their ability to understand not only the composition of revenue but also how revenue relates to other information provided in the segment disclosures. Entities can provide this information in a tabular or a narrative form.

The Board provided an example of disaggregation of revenue disclosures as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 41 – Disaggregation of Revenue – Quantitative Disclosure

606-10-55-296

An entity reports the following segments: consumer products, transportation, and energy, in accordance with Topic 280 on segment reporting. When the entity prepares its investor presentations, it disaggregates revenue into primary geographical markets, major product lines, and timing of revenue recognition (that is, goods transferred at a point in time or services transferred over time).

606-10-55-297

The entity determines that the categories used in the investor presentations can be used to meet the objective of the disaggregation disclosure requirement in paragraph 606-10-50-5, which is to disaggregate revenue from contracts with customers into categories that depict how the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors. The following table illustrates the disaggregation disclosure by primary geographical market, major product line, and timing of revenue recognition, including a reconciliation of how the disaggregated revenue ties in with the consumer products, transportation, and energy segments in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-50-6.

Segments	Consumer Products	Transportation	Energy	Total
Primary Geographical Markets				
North America	\$ 990	\$ 2,250	\$ 5,250	\$ 8,490
Europe	300	750	1,000	2,050
Asia	700	260	-	960
	<u>\$ 1,990</u>	<u>\$ 3,260</u>	<u>\$ 6,250</u>	<u>\$ 11,500</u>

²⁵⁵ Paragraph BC340 of ASU 2014-09.

Major Goods/Service Lines				
Office Supplies	\$ 600	-	-	600
Appliances	990	-	-	990
Clothing	400	-	-	400
Motorcycles	-	500	-	500
Automobiles	-	2,760	-	2,760
Solar panels	-	-	1,000	1,000
Power plant	-	-	5,250	5,250
	<u>\$ 1,990</u>	<u>\$ 3,260</u>	<u>\$ 6,250</u>	<u>\$ 11,500</u>
Timing of Revenue Recognition				
Goods transferred at a point in time	\$ 1,990	\$ 3,260	\$ 1,000	\$ 6,250
Services transferred over time	-	-	5,250	5,250
	<u>\$ 1,990</u>	<u>\$ 3,260</u>	<u>\$ 6,250</u>	<u>\$ 11,500</u>

Contract balances

The Board noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁵⁶ that users of the financial statements need to understand the relationship between the revenue recognized and changes in the overall balances of an entity's total contract assets and liabilities during a particular reporting period. As a result, the Board included the following disclosure requirements for an entity's contract balances and changes in the balances:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Contract Balances

606-10-50-8

An entity shall disclose all of the following:

- The opening and closing balances of receivables, **contract assets**, and **contract liabilities** from **contracts with customers**, if not otherwise separately presented or disclosed
- Revenue** recognized in the reporting period that was included in the contract liability balance at the beginning of the period
- Revenue recognized in the reporting period from **performance obligations** satisfied (or partially satisfied) in previous periods (for example, changes in **transaction price**).

606-10-50-9

An entity shall explain how the timing of satisfaction of its performance obligations (see paragraph 606-10-50-12(a)) relates to the typical timing of payment (see paragraph 606-10-50-12(b)) and the effect that those factors have on the contract asset and the contract liability balances. The explanation provided may use qualitative information.

²⁵⁶ Paragraph BC341 of ASU 2014-09.

606-10-50-10

An entity shall provide an explanation of the significant changes in the contract asset and the contract liability balances during the reporting period. The explanation shall include qualitative and quantitative information. Examples of changes in the entity's balances of contract assets and contract liabilities include any of the following:

- a. Changes due to business combinations
- b. Cumulative catch-up adjustments to revenue that affect the corresponding contract asset or contract liability, including adjustments arising from a change in the measure of progress, a change in an estimate of the transaction price (including any changes in the assessment of whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained), or a contract modification
- c. Impairment of a contract asset
- d. A change in the time frame for a right to consideration to become unconditional (that is, for a contract asset to be reclassified to a receivable)
- e. A change in the time frame for a performance obligation to be satisfied (that is, for the recognition of revenue arising from a contract liability).

Entities are permitted to disclose information about contract balances and changes therein as they deem to be most appropriate, which could include a combination of tabular and narrative information. The FASB explained in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁵⁷ that these disclosures are intended provide financial statement users with requested information on when contract assets are typically transferred to accounts receivable or collected as cash and when contract liabilities are recognized as revenue.

In addition to the disclosures on contract balances and changes, the standard requires entities to disclose the amount of revenue recognized in the period that relates to amounts allocated to performance obligations that were satisfied (or partially satisfied) in previous periods (e.g., due to a change in transaction price or in estimates related to the constraint on revenue recognized). As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁵⁸ the Board said this information is not required elsewhere in the financial statements and will provide relevant information about the timing of revenue recognized that was not a result of performance in the current period.

The illustration below is an example of how an entity may fulfill these requirements:

Illustration 10-1: Contract asset and liability disclosures

Company A discloses trade receivables separately in the statement of financial position. To comply with the other disclosure requirements for contract assets and liabilities, Company A includes the following information in the notes to the financial statements:

	20X9	20X8	20X7
Contract asset	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,250	\$ 1,800
Contract liability	(200)	(850)	(500)
Revenue recognized in the period from:			
Amounts included in contract liability at the beginning of the period	\$ 650	\$ 200	\$ 100
Performance obligations satisfied in previous periods	\$ 200	\$ 125	\$ 200

²⁵⁷ Paragraph BC346 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁵⁸ Paragraph BC347 of ASU 2014-09.

We receive payments from customers based on a billing schedule as established in our contracts. Contract asset relates to our right to consideration for our completed performance under the contract. Accounts receivable are recorded when the right to consideration becomes unconditional. Contract liability relates to payments received in advance of performance under the contract. Contract liabilities are recognized as revenue as (or when) we perform under the contract. In addition, contract asset decreased in 20X9 due to a contract asset impairment of \$400 relating to the early cancellation of a contract with a customer.

How we see it

Disclosing contract assets and liabilities and the revenue recognized from changes in contract liabilities and performance obligations satisfied in previous periods will likely be a change in practice for most entities. They will need to make sure they have appropriate systems, policies and procedures and internal controls in place to collect and disclose the required information. For example, a sales- or usage-based royalty received by the entity in reporting periods after it delivers functional intellectual property represents revenue that the entity receives in subsequent periods that relates to a previously satisfied performance obligation and should be disclosed in accordance with ASC 606-10-50-8(c).

Performance obligations

To help users of financial statements analyze the nature, amount, timing and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows arising from contracts with customers, the Board decided to require disclosures about an entity's performance obligations. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁵⁹ legacy GAAP requires entities to disclose their accounting policies for recognizing revenue, but users of financial statements have said that many entities provide a "boilerplate" description that doesn't explain how the policy relates to the contracts they enter into with customers. To address this criticism, the standard requires an entity to provide more descriptive information about its performance obligations.

A public entity is also required to disclose information about remaining performance obligations and the amount of the transaction price allocated to such obligations, including an explanation of when it expects to recognize the amount(s) in its interim and annual financial statements.

Both quantitative and qualitative information are required as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Performance Obligations

606-10-50-12

An entity shall disclose information about its **performance obligations** in **contracts with customers**, including a description of all of the following:

- a. When the entity typically satisfies its performance obligations (for example, upon shipment, upon delivery, as services are rendered, or upon completion of service) including when performance obligations are satisfied in a bill-and-hold arrangement

²⁵⁹ Paragraph BC354 of ASU 2014-09.

- b. The significant payment terms (for example, when payment typically is due, whether the contract has a significant financing component, whether the consideration amount is variable, and whether the estimate of variable consideration is typically constrained in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13)
- c. The nature of the goods or services that the entity has promised to transfer, highlighting any performance obligations to arrange for another party to transfer goods or services (that is, if the entity is acting as an agent)
- d. Obligations for returns, refunds, and other similar obligations
- e. Types of warranties and related obligations.

Transaction Price Allocated to the Remaining Performance Obligations

606-10-50-13

An entity shall disclose the following information about its remaining **performance obligations**:

- a. The aggregate amount of the transaction price allocated to the performance obligations that are unsatisfied (or partially unsatisfied) as of the end of the reporting period
- b. An explanation of when the entity expects to recognize as **revenue** the amount disclosed in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-13(a), which the entity shall disclose in either of the following ways:
 - 1. On a quantitative basis using the time bands that would be most appropriate for the duration of the remaining performance obligations
 - 2. By using qualitative information.

606-10-50-14

As a practical expedient, an entity need not disclose the information in paragraph 606-10-50-13 for a performance obligation if either of the following conditions is met:

- a. The performance obligation is part of a **contract** that has an original expected duration of one year or less.
- b. The entity recognizes revenue from the satisfaction of the performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-18.

606-10-50-15

An entity shall explain qualitatively whether it is applying the practical expedient in paragraph 606-10-50-14 and whether any consideration from contracts with **customers** is not included in the transaction price and, therefore, not included in the information disclosed in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-13. For example, an estimate of the transaction price would not include any estimated amounts of variable consideration that are constrained (see paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13).

In the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁶⁰ the Board noted that many financial statement users commented that information about the amount and timing of revenue that an entity expects to recognize from its existing contracts would be useful in their analyses of revenue, especially for long-term contracts with significant unrecognized revenue. The Board also observed that a number of entities often

²⁶⁰ Paragraphs BC438 and BC349 of ASU 2014-09.

voluntarily disclose “backlog” information. However, this information typically is presented outside the financial statements and may not be comparable with what other entities disclose because there is no common definition of backlog.

As summarized in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁶¹ the Board’s goal in including the disclosure requirements in ASC 606-10-50-13 is to provide users of an entity’s financial statements with additional information about the following:

- ▶ The amount and expected timing of revenue to be recognized from the remaining performance obligations in existing contracts
- ▶ Trends relating to the amount and expected timing of revenue to be recognized from the remaining performance obligations in existing contracts
- ▶ Risks associated with expected future revenue (e.g., some observe that revenue is more uncertain if an entity does not expect to satisfy a performance obligation until a much later date)
- ▶ The effect of changes in judgments or circumstances on an entity’s revenue

This disclosure can be provided on either a quantitative basis (e.g., amounts to be recognized in given time bands, such as between one and two years and between two and three years) or by disclosing a mix of quantitative and qualitative information. In addition, this disclosure should only include amounts related to performance obligations in the current contract. For example, expected contract renewals that have not been executed and are not material rights are not performance obligations, so entities would not disclose amounts related to these renewals. However, if an entity concluded that expected contract renewals represented a material right to acquire goods or services in the future (and therefore is a separate performance obligation – see Section 4.6), the entity would include in its disclosure the consideration attributable to the material right for the options that have not yet been exercised (i.e., the unsatisfied performance obligation(s)).

The disclosure of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations does not include consideration that has been excluded from the transaction price. However, the standard requires entities to disclose qualitatively whether any consideration is not included in the transaction price and therefore not included in the disclosure of the remaining performance obligations (e.g., amounts of variable consideration that are constrained and excluded from the transaction price).

The FASB also provided a practical expedient under which an entity can decide to not disclose the amount of the remaining performance obligations for contracts with an original expected duration of less than one year or those for which the entity applies the “right to invoice” practical expedient in ASC 606-10-55-18. As explained in Section 7.1.4, the right to invoice practical expedient permits an entity that is recognizing revenue over time to recognize revenue as invoiced if the entity’s right to payment is in an amount that corresponds directly with the value to the customer of the entity’s performance to date. For example, an entity may not be required to make the disclosure for a three-year service contract under which it has a right to invoice the customer a fixed amount for each hour of service provided, provided that fixed amount reflects the value to the customer. An entity that uses this disclosure practical expedient will be required to disclose that fact.

²⁶¹ Paragraph BC350 of ASU 2014-09.

UPDATE: The FASB proposed another practical expedient that would allow an entity not to disclose variable consideration allocated to performance obligations related to either: (1) sales- or usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property or (2) variable consideration allocated entirely to a wholly unsatisfied performance obligation or to a wholly unsatisfied promise to transfer a distinct good or service that forms part of a single performance obligation when certain criteria are met. Comments were due 2 July 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

The standard provides the following examples of various scenarios for these required disclosures:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 42 – Disclosure of the Transaction Price Allocated to the Remaining Performance Obligations

606-10-55-298

On June 30, 20X7, an entity enters into three contracts (Contracts A, B, and C) with separate customers to provide services. Each contract has a two-year noncancellable term. The entity considers the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-50-13 through 50-15 in determining the information in each contract to be included in the disclosure of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations at December 31, 20X7.

Contract A

606-10-55-299

Cleaning services are to be provided over the next two years typically at least once per month. For services provided, the customer pays an hourly rate of \$25.

606-10-55-300

Because the entity bills a fixed amount for each hour of service provided, the entity has a right to invoice the customer in the amount that corresponds directly with the value of the entity's performance completed to date in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-18. Consequently, no disclosure is necessary if the entity elects to apply the practical expedient in paragraph 606-10-50-14(b).

Contract B

606-10-55-301

Cleaning services and lawn maintenance services are to be provided as and when needed with a maximum of four visits per month over the next two years. The customer pays a fixed price of \$400 per month for both services. The entity measures its progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation using a time-based measure.

606-10-55-302

The entity discloses the amount of the transaction price that has not yet been recognized as revenue in a table with quantitative time bands that illustrates when the entity expects to recognize the amount as revenue. The information for Contract B included in the overall disclosure is as follows.

	<u>20X8</u>	<u>20X9</u>	<u>Total</u>
Revenue expected to be recognized on this contract as of December 31, 20X7	\$4,800 ^(a)	\$2,400 ^(b)	\$7,200

^(a) \$4,800 = \$400 x 12 months

^(b) \$2,400 = \$400 x 6 months

Contract C**606-10-55-303**

Cleaning services are to be provided as and when needed over the next two years. The customer pays fixed consideration of \$100 per month plus a one-time variable consideration payment ranging from \$0 – \$1,000 corresponding to a one-time regulatory review and certification of the customer's facility (that is, a performance bonus). The entity estimates that it will be entitled to \$750 of the variable consideration. On the basis of the entity's assessment of the factors in paragraph 606-10-32-12, the entity includes its estimate of \$750 of variable consideration in the transaction price because it is probable that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized will not occur. The entity measures its progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligation using a time-based measure.

606-10-55-304

The entity discloses the amount of the transaction price that has not yet been recognized as revenue in a table with quantitative time bands that illustrates when the entity expects to recognize the amount as revenue. The entity also includes a qualitative discussion about any significant variable consideration that is not included in the disclosure. The information for Contract C included in the overall disclosure is as follows.

Example disclosure:

	<u>20X8</u>	<u>20X9</u>	<u>Total</u>
Revenue expected to be recognized on this contract as of December 31, 20X7	\$1,575 ^(a)	\$788 ^(b)	\$2,363

^(a) Transaction price = \$3,150 (\$100 x 24 months + \$750 variable consideration) recognized evenly over 24 months at \$1,575 per year

^(b) \$1,575 ÷ 2 = \$788 (that is, for 6 months of the year)

606-10-55-305

In addition, in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-15, the entity discloses qualitatively that part of the performance bonus has been excluded from the disclosure because it was not included in the transaction price. That part of the performance bonus was excluded from the transaction price in accordance with the guidance on constraining estimates of variable consideration.

The standard also provides an example of how an entity would make the disclosure required by ASC 606-10-50-13(b) using qualitative information (as opposed to quantitatively using time bands) as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall****Implementation Guidance and Illustrations****Example 43 – Disclosure of the Transaction Price Allocated to the Remaining Performance Obligations – Qualitative Disclosure****606-10-55-306**

On January 1, 20X2, an entity enters into a contract with a customer to construct a commercial building for fixed consideration of \$10 million. The construction of the building is a single performance obligation that the entity satisfies over time. As of December 31, 20X2, the entity has recognized \$3.2 million of revenue. The entity estimates that construction will be completed in 20X3 but it is possible that the project will be completed in the first half of 20X4.

606-10-55-307

At December 31, 20X2, the entity discloses the amount of the transaction price that has not yet been recognized as revenue in its disclosure of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations. The entity also discloses an explanation of when the entity expects to recognize that amount as revenue. The explanation can be disclosed either on a quantitative basis using time bands that are most appropriate for the duration of the remaining performance obligation or by providing a qualitative explanation. Because the entity is uncertain about the timing of revenue recognition, the entity discloses this information qualitatively as follows:

As of December 31, 20X2, the aggregate amount of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligation is \$6.8 million, and the entity will recognize this revenue as the building is completed, which is expected to occur over the next 12-18 months.

10.4.2**Significant judgments**

The guidance requires disclosure of significant accounting estimates and judgments made in determining the transaction price, allocating the transaction price to performance obligations and determining when performance obligations are satisfied, as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Disclosure**Significant Judgments in the Application of the Guidance in this Topic***606-10-50-17**

An entity shall disclose the judgments, and changes in the judgments, made in applying the guidance in this Topic that significantly affect the determination of the amount and timing of **revenue** from **contracts with customers**. In particular, an entity shall explain the judgments, and changes in the judgments, used in determining both of the following:

- a. The timing of satisfaction of **performance obligations** (see paragraphs 606-10-50-18 through 50-19)
- b. The **transaction price** and the amounts allocated to performance obligations (see paragraph 606-10-50-20).

Legacy GAAP has general guidance requiring disclosures about significant accounting estimates and judgments made by an entity. Because of the importance placed on revenue by users of financial statements, as noted in the Basis for Conclusion of ASU 2014-09,²⁶² the Board decided to require specific disclosures about the estimates used and the judgments made in determining the amount and timing of revenue recognition. These requirements exceed the requirements in legacy GAAP on significant accounting estimates and are discussed in more detail below.

Determining the timing of satisfaction of performance obligations

The guidance requires entities to provide disclosures about the significant judgments made in determining the timing of satisfaction of performance obligations. The disclosure requirements for performance obligations that are satisfied over time differ from those satisfied at a point in time, but the objective is similar – to disclose the judgments made in determining the timing of revenue recognition. Public entities must disclose the following information:

²⁶² Paragraph BC355 of ASU 2014-09.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Determining the Timing of Satisfaction of Performance Obligations

606-10-50-18

For **performance obligations** that an entity satisfies over time, an entity shall disclose both of the following:

- a. The methods used to recognize **revenue** (for example, a description of the output methods or input methods used and how those methods are applied)
- b. An explanation of why the methods used provide a faithful depiction of the transfer of goods or services.

606-10-50-19

For performance obligations satisfied at a point in time, an entity shall disclose the significant judgments made in evaluating when a **customer** obtains control of promised goods or services.

When an entity has determined that a performance obligation is satisfied over time, the standard requires the entity to select a single revenue recognition method for each performance obligation that depicts the entity's performance in transferring the goods or services. Entities must disclose the method used to recognize revenue.

For example, assume an entity enters into a contract to refurbish a multilevel building for a customer, and the work is expected to take two years. The entity has concluded the promised refurbishment service is a single performance obligation satisfied over time, and it decides to measure progress based on costs it incurs. The entity discloses the method used, how it is applied to the contract and why the method selected provides a faithful depiction of the transfer of goods or services.

When an entity has determined that a performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time, the standard requires the entity to disclose the significant judgments made in evaluating when the customer obtains control of the promised goods or services. For example, an entity will consider the indicators of the transfer of control included in ASC 606-10-25-30 to determine when control transfers and disclose significant judgments made in reaching that conclusion.

Determining the transaction price and the amounts allocated to performance obligations

Entities often exercise significant judgment when estimating the transaction prices of their contracts, especially when those estimates involve variable consideration.

Further, significant judgment may be required when allocating the transaction price, including estimating standalone selling prices. For example, FASB TRG²⁶³ members generally agreed that entities will have to exercise significant judgment to determine whether a customer option gives rise to a material right (see Section 4.6) and estimating the standalone selling price for those material rights. Because of the importance placed on revenue by financial statement users, the Board concluded²⁶⁴ that it was important to require public entities to disclose qualitative information in their annual financial statements about the methods, inputs and assumptions used in making these judgments, as follows:

²⁶³ 18 April 2016 FASB TRG meeting; agenda paper no. 54.

²⁶⁴ Paragraph BC355 of ASU 2014-09.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Determining the Transaction Price and the Amounts Allocated to Performance Obligations

606-10-50-20

An entity shall disclose information about the methods, inputs, and assumptions used for all of the following:

- a. Determining the **transaction price**, which includes, but is not limited to, estimating variable consideration, adjusting the consideration for the effects of the time value of money, and measuring noncash consideration
- b. Assessing whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained
- c. Allocating the transaction price, including estimating **standalone selling prices** of promised goods or services and allocating discounts and variable consideration to a specific part of the **contract** (if applicable)
- d. Measuring obligations for returns, refunds, and other similar obligations.

How we see it

Disclosing information about the methods, inputs and assumptions they use to determine and allocate the transaction price will be a change in practice for some entities. Entities with diverse contracts will need to make sure they have the processes and procedures in place to capture all of the different methods, inputs and assumptions used.

10.4.3

Assets recognized for the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract

In addition to the guidance in ASC 606, the FASB added ASC 340-40 to codify the guidance on other assets and deferred costs relating to contracts with customers. As discussed in Section 9.3, this guidance specifies the accounting for costs an entity incurs to obtain and fulfill a contract to provide goods and services to customers. The guidance requires entities to disclose information about the assets recognized to help users understand the types of costs recognized as assets and how those assets are subsequently amortized or impaired. These disclosures are:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Disclosure

Assets Recognized from the Costs to Obtain or Fulfill a Contract with a Customer

340-40-50-1

Consistent with the overall disclosure objective in paragraph 606-10-50-1 and the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-50-2 through 50-3, an entity shall provide the following disclosures of assets recognized from the costs to obtain or fulfill a **contract** with a **customer** in accordance with paragraphs 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5.

340-40-50-2

An entity shall describe both of the following:

- a. The judgments made in determining the amount of the costs incurred to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer (in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5)

- b. The method it uses to determine the amortization for each reporting period.

340-40-50-3

An entity shall describe both of the following:

- a. The closing balances of assets recognized from the costs incurred to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer (in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5), by main category of asset (for example, costs to obtain contracts with customers, precontract costs, and setup costs)
- b. The amount of amortization and any impairment losses recognized in the reporting period.

Entities will be required to disclose the judgments made in determining the amount of costs that were incurred to obtain or fulfill contracts with customers that meet the criteria for capitalization as well as the method the entity uses to amortize the assets recognized. For example, for costs to obtain a contract, an entity that capitalizes commission costs upon the signing of each contract will need to describe the judgments used to determine the commission costs that qualified as costs incurred to obtain a contract with a customer as well as the determination of the amortization period.

10.4.4

Practical expedients

The standard allows entities to use several practical expedients. The standard requires public entities to disclose their use of two practical expedients – the practical expedient associated with the determination of whether a significant financing component exists (see Section 5.5) and the expedient for recording an immediate expense for certain incremental costs of obtaining a contract with a customer (see Section 9.3.1) – as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Practical Expedients

606-10-50-22

If an entity elects to use the practical expedient in either paragraph 606-10-32-18 (about the existence of a significant financing component) or paragraph 340-40-25-4 (about the incremental costs of obtaining a **contract**), the entity shall disclose that fact.

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Disclosure

Assets Recognized from the Costs to Obtain or Fulfill a Contract with a Customer

340-40-50-5

If an entity elects to use the practical expedient in paragraph 340-40-25-4 on the incremental costs of obtaining a contract, the entity shall disclose that fact.

10.5 Disclosures for nonpublic entities

Under the standard, nonpublic entities can choose to provide all of the disclosures required for public entities or to provide reduced disclosures. As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁶⁵ the FASB decided that some of the disclosure requirements should differ for nonpublic entities, primarily because the costs of providing them outweigh the benefits. The FASB also noted that users of nonpublic entity financial statements often have access to supplemental revenue information directly from management. The following is a discussion highlighting the reduced disclosure requirements for nonpublic entities that select this option.

10.5.1 Contracts with customers

Disclosures related to an entity's contracts with customers will likely make up a significant portion of the required disclosures under the standard. These disclosures include disaggregation of revenue, contract asset and liability balances, and information about an entity's performance obligations. To provide context for the disclosures, the Board decided²⁶⁶ to require entities to disclose the following amounts related to contracts with customers:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Contracts with Customers

606-10-50-4

An entity shall disclose all of the following amounts for the reporting period unless those amounts are presented separately in the statement of comprehensive income (statement of activities) in accordance with other Topics:

- a. **Revenue** recognized from **contracts with customers**, which the entity shall disclose separately from its other sources of revenue
- b. Any impairment losses recognized (in accordance with Topic 310 on receivables) on any receivables or **contract assets** arising from an entity's contracts with customers, which the entity shall disclose separately from impairment losses from other contracts.

Disaggregation of revenue

Nonpublic entities are required to provide, at a minimum, quantitative disclosures about revenue, disaggregated based on the timing of transfer of goods or services (e.g., revenue recognized at a point in time and revenue recognized over time) in their interim and annual financial statements, as applicable. Nonpublic entities may include the additional information described in ASC 606-10-50-5 through 50-6, but this information is not required. However, if a nonpublic entity decides not to provide that information, the FASB decided the entity should at a minimum disclose qualitative information to address how economic factors (e.g., type of customer, geographical location of customers, type of contract) affect revenue and cash flows as specified in ASC 606-10-50-7 below:

²⁶⁵ Paragraph BC506 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁶⁶ Paragraph BC332 of ASU 2014-09.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Disaggregation of Revenue

606-10-50-5

An entity shall disaggregate **revenue** recognized from **contracts** with **customers** into categories that depict how the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors. An entity shall apply the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-55-89 through 55-91 when selecting the categories to use to disaggregate revenue.

606-10-50-6

In addition, an entity shall disclose sufficient information to enable users of financial statements to understand the relationship between the disclosure of disaggregated revenue (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-5) and revenue information that is disclosed for each reportable segment, if the entity applies Topic 280 on segment reporting.

606-10-50-7

An entity, except for a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), may elect not to apply the quantitative disaggregation disclosure guidance in paragraphs 606-10-50-5 through 50-6 and 606-10-55-89 through 55-91. If an entity elects not to provide those disclosures, the entity shall disclose, at a minimum, revenue disaggregated according to the timing of transfer of goods or services (for example, revenue from goods or services transferred to customers at a point in time and revenue from goods or services transferred to customers over time) and qualitative information about how economic factors (such as type of customer, geographical location of customers, and type of contract) affect the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows.

Contract balances

The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁶⁷ that it believes users of the financial statements need to understand the relationship between revenue recognized and changes in the overall balances of an entity's total contract assets and liabilities during a particular reporting period. The FASB also noted²⁶⁸ that nonpublic entities could make these disclosures without incurring significant costs because they would have to calculate those balances to apply the revenue guidance. As a result, the standard requires nonpublic entities to disclose the opening and closing balances of contract assets, contract liabilities and receivables from contracts with customers (ASC 606-10-50-8(a)) if not otherwise separately presented or disclosed. This requirement likely will result in new disclosures for most nonpublic entities. The other contract balance disclosures described below are permitted but not required for nonpublic entities:

²⁶⁷ Paragraph BC341 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁶⁸ Paragraph BC512 of ASU-2014-09.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Contract Balances

606-10-50-8

An entity shall disclose all of the following:

- a. The opening and closing balances of receivables, **contract assets**, and **contract liabilities** from **contracts with customers**, if not otherwise separately presented or disclosed
- b. **Revenue** recognized in the reporting period that was included in the contract liability balance at the beginning of the period
- c. Revenue recognized in the reporting period from **performance obligations** satisfied (or partially satisfied) in previous periods (for example, changes in **transaction price**).

606-10-50-9

An entity shall explain how the timing of satisfaction of its performance obligations (see paragraph 606-10-50-12(a)) relates to the typical timing of payment (see paragraph 606-10-50-12(b)) and the effect that those factors have on the contract asset and the contract liability balances. The explanation provided may use qualitative information.

606-10-50-10

An entity shall provide an explanation of the significant changes in the contract asset and the contract liability balances during the reporting period. The explanation shall include qualitative and quantitative information. Examples of changes in the entity's balances of contract assets and contract liabilities include any of the following:

- a. Changes due to business combinations
- b. Cumulative catch-up adjustments to revenue that affect the corresponding contract asset or contract liability, including adjustments arising from a change in the measure of progress, a change in an estimate of the transaction price (including any changes in the assessment of whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained), or a contract modification
- c. Impairment of a contract asset
- d. A change in the time frame for a right to consideration to become unconditional (that is, for a contract asset to be reclassified to a receivable)
- e. A change in the time frame for a performance obligation to be satisfied (that is, for the recognition of revenue arising from a contract liability).

606-10-50-11

An entity, except for a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the SEC, may elect not to provide any or all of the disclosures in paragraphs 606-10-50-8 through 50-10. However, if an entity elects not to provide the disclosures in paragraphs 606-10-50-8 through 50-10, the entity shall provide the disclosure in paragraph 606-10-50-8(a), which requires the disclosure of the opening and closing balances of receivables, contract assets, and contract liabilities from contracts with customers, if not otherwise separately presented or disclosed.

Performance obligations

To help users of financial statements analyze the nature, amount, timing and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows arising from contracts with customers, the Board decided to require disclosures about an entity's performance obligations. Nonpublic entities are required to disclose when they typically satisfy their performance obligations, the significant payment terms, the nature of the goods or services the entity has promised to transfer, any obligations for returns, refunds and any warranty provisions, as detailed in ASC 606-10-50-12. Nonpublic entities may decide to provide the disclosures for the transaction price allocated to remaining performance obligations detailed below in ASC 606-10-50-13 through 50-15, but these disclosures are not required:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Performance Obligations

606-10-50-12

An entity shall disclose information about its **performance obligations** in **contracts with customers**, including a description of all of the following:

- a. When the entity typically satisfies its performance obligations (for example, upon shipment, upon delivery, as services are rendered, or upon completion of service) including when performance obligations are satisfied in a bill-and-hold arrangement
- b. The significant payment terms (for example, when payment typically is due, whether the contract has a significant financing component, whether the consideration amount is variable, and whether the estimate of variable consideration is typically constrained in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13)
- c. The nature of the goods or services that the entity has promised to transfer, highlighting any performance obligations to arrange for another party to transfer goods or services (that is, if the entity is acting as an agent)
- d. Obligations for returns, refunds, and other similar obligations
- e. Types of warranties and related obligations.

Transaction Price Allocated to the Remaining Performance Obligations

606-10-50-13

An entity shall disclose the following information about its remaining **performance obligations**:

- a. The aggregate amount of the **transaction price** allocated to the performance obligations that are unsatisfied (or partially unsatisfied) as of the end of the reporting period
- b. An explanation of when the entity expects to recognize as **revenue** the amount disclosed in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-13(a), which the entity shall disclose in either of the following ways:
 1. On a quantitative basis using the time bands that would be most appropriate for the duration of the remaining performance obligations
 2. By using qualitative information.

606-10-50-14

As a practical expedient, an entity need not disclose the information in paragraph 606-10-50-13 for a performance obligation if either of the following conditions is met:

- a. The performance obligation is part of a **contract** that has an original expected duration of one year or less.
- b. The entity recognizes revenue from the satisfaction of the performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-18.

606-10-50-15

An entity shall explain qualitatively whether it is applying the practical expedient in paragraph 606-10-50-14 and whether any consideration from contracts with **customers** is not included in the transaction price and, therefore, not included in the information disclosed in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-13. For example, an estimate of the transaction price would not include any estimated amounts of variable consideration that are constrained (see paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13).

606-10-50-16

An entity, except for a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the SEC, may elect not to provide the disclosures in paragraphs 606-10-50-13 through 50-15.

10.5.2**Significant judgments**

The guidance also requires the disclosure of significant accounting estimates and judgments made in determining the transaction price, allocating the transaction price to performance obligations and determining the timing of satisfaction of performance obligations. These disclosure requirements exceed the requirements in the general guidance on significant accounting estimates required under legacy GAAP and are as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall***Disclosure**Significant Judgments in the Application of the Guidance in this Topic***606-10-50-17**

An entity shall disclose the judgments, and changes in the judgments, made in applying the guidance in this Topic that significantly affect the determination of the amount and timing of **revenue** from **contracts** with **customers**. In particular, an entity shall explain the judgments, and changes in the judgments, used in determining both of the following:

- a. The timing of satisfaction of **performance obligations** (see paragraphs 606-10-50-18 through 50-19)
- b. The **transaction price** and the amounts allocated to performance obligations (see paragraph 606-10-50-20).

Determining the timing of satisfaction of performance obligations

The guidance requires nonpublic entities to provide disclosures about the significant judgments made in determining the timing of satisfaction of performance obligations. For performance obligations that are satisfied over time, nonpublic entities must disclose the methods used to recognize revenue (e.g., a description of the output method, a description of the input method, how those methods are applied

(ASC 606-10-50-18(a))). A nonpublic entity may also provide an explanation of why the method used to recognize revenue over time provides a faithful depiction of the transfer of goods or services and the significant judgments made in evaluating when control transfers at a point in time, but those disclosures, as follow, are not required:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Determining the Timing of Satisfaction of Performance Obligations

606-10-50-18

For **performance obligations** that an entity satisfies over time, an entity shall disclose both of the following:

- a. The methods used to recognize **revenue** (for example, a description of the output methods or input methods used and how those methods are applied)
- b. An explanation of why the methods used provide a faithful depiction of the transfer of goods or services.

606-10-50-19

For performance obligations satisfied at a point in time, an entity shall disclose the significant judgments made in evaluating when a **customer** obtains control of promised goods or services.

Determining the transaction price and the amounts allocated to performance obligations

The standard requires nonpublic entities to disclose qualitative information about the methods, inputs and assumptions used for assessing whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained (ASC 606-10-50-20(b)).

In addition to the required disclosures, nonpublic entities may provide any or all of the following disclosures about determining the transaction price and the amounts allocated to performance obligations:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Determining the Transaction Price and the Amounts Allocated to Performance Obligations

606-10-50-20

An entity shall disclose information about the methods, inputs, and assumptions used for all of the following:

- a. Determining the **transaction price**, which includes, but is not limited to, estimating variable consideration, adjusting the consideration for the effects of the time value of money, and measuring noncash consideration
- b. Assessing whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained
- c. Allocating the transaction price, including estimating **standalone selling prices** of promised goods or services and allocating discounts and variable consideration to a specific part of the **contract** (if applicable)
- d. Measuring obligations for returns, refunds, and other similar obligations.

606-10-50-21

An entity except for a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the SEC, may elect not to provide any or all of the following disclosures:

- a. Paragraph 606-10-50-18(b), which states that an entity shall disclose, for **performance obligations** satisfied over time, an explanation of why the methods used to recognize **revenue** provide a faithful depiction of the transfer of goods or services to a **customer**
- b. Paragraph 606-10-50-19, which states that an entity shall disclose, for performance obligations satisfied at a point in time, the significant judgments made in evaluating when a customer obtains control of promised goods or services
- c. Paragraph 606-10-50-20, which states that an entity shall disclose the methods, inputs, and assumptions used to determine the transaction price and to allocate the transaction price. However, if an entity elects not to provide the disclosures in paragraph 606-10-50-20, the entity shall provide the disclosure in paragraph 606-10-50-20(b), which states that an entity shall disclose the methods, inputs, and assumptions used to assess whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained.

10.5.3**Assets recognized for the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract**

Nonpublic entities may disclose information about assets recognized from the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract, but this information is not required. The information is intended to help users understand the types of costs recognized as assets and how those assets are subsequently amortized or impaired. Refer to Section 10.4.3 above for a discussion of the requirements for public entities. The exception for nonpublic entities is detailed below:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification**Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers***Disclosure**Assets Recognized from the Costs to Obtain or Fulfill a Contract with a Customer***340-40-50-4**

An entity, except for a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the Securities and Exchange Commission, may elect not to provide the disclosures in paragraphs 340-40-50-2 through 50-3.

10.5.4**Practical expedients**

The standard allows entities to use several practical expedients and specifically requires disclosure of a public entity's use of two of those expedients (see Section 10.4.4). However, a nonpublic entity is not required to do so as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Disclosure

Practical Expedients

606-10-50-23

An entity, except for a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the SEC, may elect not to provide the disclosures in paragraph 606-10-50-22.

Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers

Disclosure

Practical Expedients

340-40-50-6

An entity, except for a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the Securities and Exchange Commission, may elect not to provide the disclosure in paragraph 340-40-50-5.

As noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09,²⁶⁹ the FASB decided that a nonpublic entity may decide not to disclose that it is using these practical expedients in part because the public entity disclosure requirements are generally consistent with the requirements under ASC 235 (e.g., an entity should disclose its selections from acceptable accounting alternatives), which a nonpublic entity will follow and determine if the information should be disclosed.

10.6

Interim disclosure requirements

ASU 2014-09 (through consequential amendments to ASC 270) expands the disclosure requirements for interim financial statements as described below:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Interim Reporting

Disclosure

Disclosure of Summarized Interim Financial Data by Publicly Traded Companies

270-10-50-1A

Consistent with paragraph 270-10-50-1, a **public business entity**, a **not-for-profit entity** that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market, or an employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with or to the Securities and Exchange Commission, shall disclose all of the following information about **revenue from contracts with customers** consistent with the guidance in Topic 606:

- a. A disaggregation of revenue for the period, see paragraphs 606-10-50-5 through 50-6 and paragraphs 606-10-55-89 through 55-91.

²⁶⁹ Paragraph BC516 of ASU 2014-09.

- b. The opening and closing balances of receivables, **contract assets**, and **contract liabilities** from contracts with customers (if not otherwise separately presented or disclosed), see paragraph 606-10-50-8(a).
- c. Revenue recognized in the reporting period that was included in the contract liability balance at the beginning of the period, see paragraph 606-10-50-8(b).
- d. Revenue recognized in the reporting period from **performance obligations** satisfied (or partially satisfied) in previous periods (for example, changes in **transaction price**), see paragraph 606-10-50-8(c).
- e. Information about the entity's remaining performance obligations as of the end of the reporting period, see paragraphs 606-10-50-13 through 50-15.

The FASB amended ASC 270 to require the same quantitative disclosures about revenue in interim financial statements as in the annual financial statements. While ASC 270 already required entities to disclose information about changes in financial position and performance since the last annual reporting period, the FASB decided that specifying the revenue-related disclosures required in entities' interim financial statements would reduce the risk that entities might reach different conclusions about what represents a significant change and how information about that change should be presented in interim financial statements. In reaching this conclusion, the FASB indicated in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁷⁰ that an entity has much of the information required for the disclosures on an interim basis readily available, and disclosing that information may not raise costs significantly.



IASB differences

The interim disclosure requirements for US GAAP reporting entities differ from the requirements for IFRS reporting entities. While the IASB amended its interim reporting standard, IAS 34, to require disaggregated revenue information, it decided not to require IFRS preparers to make any of the other annual disclosures under IFRS 15 on an interim basis that the FASB requires for US GAAP preparers.

10.7

Transition disclosure requirements

The revenue standard requires retrospective application. However, the Board decided to allow either full retrospective adoption in which the standard is applied to all of the periods presented or a modified retrospective adoption. The transition disclosure requirements will differ for entities depending on the transition method selected. Refer to Section 1.3 for additional discussion on transition, including the disclosure requirements.

²⁷⁰ Paragraph BC361 of ASU 2014-09.

11 Gains and losses from the derecognition of nonfinancial assets

ASU 2014-09 created ASC 610-20 to account for any gain or loss resulting from the sale of nonfinancial assets within the scope of ASC 350 or ASC 360 that are not an output of an entity's ordinary activities. This includes the sale of intangible assets and property, plant and equipment, including real estate.

ASC 610-20 does not contain guidance that goes beyond ASC 606. Instead, it instructs entities to apply certain recognition and measurement principles of ASC 606. Thus, the accounting for contracts that include the sale of a nonfinancial asset to a noncustomer and to a customer generally will be consistent, except for financial statement presentation and disclosure (i.e., entities that sell nonfinancial assets to noncustomers will follow the guidance in ASC 360-10 for presenting a gain or loss). The FASB noted in the Basis for Conclusions of ASU 2014-09²⁷¹ that there is economically little difference between the sale of real estate that is, or is not, an output of an entity's ordinary activities. Therefore, the Board determined that the only difference in the treatment of these transactions should be the presentation in the statement of comprehensive income (i.e., revenue and expense when the sale is to a customer and net gain or loss when the sale is to a noncustomer).

ASC 610-20 also requires entities to apply certain recognition and measurement principles in ASC 606 to the transfer of a subsidiary (or a group of assets) that is, in substance, a nonfinancial asset within the scope of ASC 350 or ASC 360. However, the transfer of a subsidiary (or a group of assets) that is a business and does not also qualify as an in substance nonfinancial asset will continue to be accounted for in accordance with legacy derecognition guidance.²⁷²

UPDATE: In June 2016, the FASB proposed making ASC 610-20 the default recognition guidance for nonfinancial assets, not just those in the scope of ASC 350 or ASC 360, when no other guidance applies. Comments were due 5 August 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

11.1 Scope of ASC 610-20

An entity must determine whether a sale of nonfinancial assets is within the scope of ASC 606, ASC 610-20 or ASC 810.²⁷³ As described below, ASC 610-20 applies to gains or losses on sales to noncustomers of nonfinancial assets or in substance nonfinancial assets that are within the scope of ASC 350 or ASC 360, with certain limited exceptions:

²⁷¹ Paragraph BC497 of ASU 2014-09.

²⁷² Generally, such transactions are within the scope of ASC 810. However, certain types of transactions (e.g., spinoffs, split-offs, conveyances of oil and gas mineral rights) are excluded from the scope of ASC 810, as stated in ASC 810-10-40-3A and ASC 810-10-40-5, because they are addressed by other guidance.

²⁷³ As noted in the previous footnote, other guidance may also apply for certain types of transactions.

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Other Income – Gains and Losses from the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets

Overview and Background

610-20-05-1

This Subtopic provides guidance on a gain or loss recognized upon the derecognition of a nonfinancial asset within the scope of Topic 350 on intangibles and Topic 360 on property, plant, and equipment (including in substance nonfinancial assets) if those assets are not in a contract with a customer within the scope of Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers.

Scope and Scope Exceptions

610-20-15-1

The guidance in this Subtopic applies to all entities.

610-20-15-2

The guidance in this Subtopic applies to the following events and transactions:

- a. The gain or loss recognized upon the derecognition of a nonfinancial asset within the scope of Topic 350 on intangibles or Topic 360 on property, plant, and equipment, unless the entity sells or transfers the nonfinancial asset in a contract with a customer.
- b. The gain or loss recognized upon the transfer of financial assets that are in substance nonfinancial assets within the scope of Topic 350 or Topic 360 (for example, the sale of a subsidiary that only consists of an asset [for example, a machine or piece of equipment]).

610-20-15-3

The guidance in this Subtopic does not apply to the following:

- a. The derecognition of a nonfinancial asset, including an in substance nonfinancial asset, in a contract with a customer, see Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers
- b. The derecognition of a subsidiary or group of assets that constitutes a business or nonprofit activity (excluding an in substance nonfinancial asset), see Section 810-10-40 on consolidation
- c. Real estate sale-leaseback transactions, see Subtopics 360-20 and 840-40 on leases
- d. A conveyance of oil and gas mineral rights, see Subtopic 932-360 on extractive activities
- e. A transfer of a nonfinancial asset to another entity in exchange for a noncontrolling ownership interest in that entity, see the guidance on exchanges of a nonfinancial asset for a noncontrolling ownership interest in Section 845-10-30.

The FASB amended the derecognition guidance for sales or transfers of intangibles and property, plant and equipment within the scope of ASC 350-10 and ASC 360-10, respectively. This amended guidance states that sales of nonfinancial assets, including in substance nonfinancial assets, should be accounted for using the guidance in ASC 610-20, unless the contract is with a customer (i.e., a party that has contracted with an entity to obtain goods or services that are an output of the entity's ordinary activities in exchange for consideration). If the contract is with a customer, ASC 606 will apply.

In certain circumstances, neither ASC 606 nor ASC 610-20 will be applied when derecognizing a nonfinancial asset. Instead, the sale of nonfinancial assets in a subsidiary or group of assets that meets all of the following requirements will be accounted for in accordance with the derecognition guidance in ASC 810:²⁷⁴

- ▶ The nonfinancial assets are not being sold to a customer (i.e., they are not outputs of the entity's ordinary activities)
- ▶ The nonfinancial assets in a subsidiary or group of assets meet the definition of a business
- ▶ The nonfinancial assets in a subsidiary or group of assets are not in substance nonfinancial assets (e.g., because the group of assets or subsidiary also contains significant financial assets)
- ▶ No other scope exceptions in ASC 810-10 apply

The following table summarizes the appropriate derecognition guidance to apply for common transactions:

ASC topic	When applied?	Possible transactions
ASC 606, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers</i>	Sales to customers of nonfinancial assets or in substance nonfinancial assets, regardless of whether they also meet the definition of a business	Sales of heavy equipment by the manufacturer
ASC 610-20, <i>Other Income – Gains and Losses from the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets</i>	Sales or transfers to noncustomers of nonfinancial assets or in substance nonfinancial assets, regardless of whether they also meet the definition of a business	Sales of commercial properties (e.g., office buildings, hotels, manufacturing facilities) by non-real estate entities
ASC 810-10, <i>Consolidation – Overall</i>	Sales or transfers to noncustomers of businesses that also are not in substance nonfinancial assets. In addition, ASC 810-10 is applied to the sale or transfer of a subsidiary if no other GAAP applies.	Sales of a portfolio of hotels, including significant value related to existing receivables, leases to retail tenants and the hotels' brand name (i.e., nonfinancial assets and financial assets that together meet the definition of a business)

UPDATE: In June 2016, the FASB proposed excluding all businesses from the scope of ASC 610-20. Under the proposal, an entity would not need to evaluate whether a business is an in substance nonfinancial asset. This proposal is part of the second phase of the FASB's definition of a business project. Comments were due 5 August 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU. In the first phase of the project, the FASB proposed limiting the type of transactions that would qualify as a business, so many in substance nonfinancial assets would not meet the definition of a business.

11.1.1

Definition of a customer

ASC 610-20 and ASC 606 define a customer as "a party that has contracted with an entity to obtain goods or services that are an output of the entity's ordinary activities in exchange for consideration." The standard does not define the term "ordinary activities" because it was derived from legacy guidance. CON 6 refers to ordinary activities as an entity's "ongoing major or central operations."

For example, a heavy equipment manufacturer sells equipment as an output of its ordinary activities. The sale of a home by a homebuilder is also an ordinary activity. In contrast, an entity that sells equipment it previously used in its manufacturing operations to another entity likely would conclude that its decision to dispose of an operating asset is not an output of its ordinary activities and, therefore, does not represent a contract with a customer.

²⁷⁴ ASC 810-10-45-21A.

If an entity sells a nonfinancial asset to a party that is a customer in other transactions (i.e., the party is purchasing goods or services from the entity that are the output of the entity's ordinary activities), we believe the purchasing party will be considered a customer for the transactions involving the goods or services but not for the sale of the nonfinancial asset.

11.1.2 In substance nonfinancial assets

The term "in substance nonfinancial asset" is a new concept used in ASC 610-20-15-2(b) that is not defined in the standard or elsewhere in US GAAP. In that paragraph, the example of an in substance nonfinancial asset is a legal entity that holds only nonfinancial assets. The owner that holds shares (i.e., a financial asset) in the entity would consider the interest an "in substance" nonfinancial asset because the legal entity owns only nonfinancial assets (e.g., real estate). Because the economics of a sale by the owner of its interest or the underlying nonfinancial assets would be similar, the FASB decided that these ownership interests should be accounted for as nonfinancial assets.

Entities may find it easy to identify an in substance nonfinancial asset if, for example, a single nonfinancial asset is held by a legal entity. However, this assessment may be more difficult and may require significant judgment if the legal entity holds both financial and nonfinancial assets or nonfinancial assets that are outside the scope of ASC 350 or ASC 360 (i.e., nonfinancial assets that are not intangibles or property, plant and equipment, such as inventory). The fact that an entity is a business does not mean it is not an in substance nonfinancial asset.

UPDATE: In June 2016, the FASB proposed clarifying that assets within a group of assets or a subsidiary that is not a business are in substance nonfinancial assets if substantially all of the fair value of the assets is concentrated in nonfinancial assets. When comparing the fair value of the nonfinancial assets to total assets, cash and cash equivalents should be excluded from total assets. The Board also proposed that the transfer of a subsidiary (that is not a business or an in substance nonfinancial asset) for which the substance of the transaction is not subject to other GAAP (e.g., ASC 860 on financial assets) would continue to be accounted for under ASC 810. For example, a subsidiary may hold a significant amount of financial assets (e.g., securities) and nonfinancial assets (e.g., a building and equipment) but not meet the definition of a business or an in substance nonfinancial asset (because of the significance of the financial assets). In this case, the transfer of the subsidiary would be accounted for under ASC 810 if it was not subject to other GAAP. Comments were due 5 August 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

11.1.3 Real estate sale-leaseback transactions

The guidance on sales of real estate that are part of a sale-leaseback transaction within the scope of ASC 840-40 was retained in ASC 360-20. Therefore, these transactions will be accounted for under ASC 360-20 and not under ASC 610-20. A number of amendments were made to narrow the scope of ASC 360-20, and the FASB stated²⁷⁵ that entities should not analogize to the retained guidance when evaluating any transaction that is not a sale-leaseback.

Sales of non-real estate that are part of a sale-leaseback transaction are not specifically scoped out of ASC 610-20 until an entity adopts the new leases standard, as described below. As a result, they will be accounted for under ASC 610-20.

²⁷⁵ Paragraph 63 of the *Conforming Amendments Related to Revenue from Contracts with Customers: Amendments to the Accounting Standards Codification*.

The FASB issued ASU 2016-02 (largely codified in ASC 842) in February 2016, which provides new guidance for sale-leaseback transactions (referred to as sale and leaseback transactions in ASC 842) that will replace the guidance in ASC 360-20 and ASC 840-40. Upon adoption of ASC 842, an entity will not apply ASC 610-20 to sale-leaseback transactions. In many cases, applying ASC 842 will not result in a different outcome from ASC 610-20 because ASC 842 requires entities to apply certain guidance in ASC 606 (e.g., existence of a contract, determining when an entity satisfies a performance obligation by transferring control of an asset). However, ASC 842 provides additional guidance on whether a sale occurs, so some differences may result. The guidance in ASU 2016-02 is effective for public entities for annual periods beginning after 15 December 2018 but can be early adopted. Nonpublic entities will have an additional year to adopt ASU 2016-02.

11.1.4 Nonmonetary exchanges involving a noncontrolling ownership interest in an entity

ASC 606 (and ASC 610-20 by reference to ASC 606) provides guidance for contracts with customers involving the exchange of noncash consideration. As a result, the FASB excluded contracts that fall within the guidance of ASC 606 and ASC 610-20 from the scope of ASC 845 on nonmonetary transactions.

However, the FASB clarified in ASC 610-20-15-3(e) that the exchange of a nonfinancial asset (including an in substance nonfinancial asset) for a noncontrolling ownership interest in the receiving entity is within the scope of ASC 845. The guidance in ASC 845 states that if an exchange of a nonmonetary asset for a noncontrolling ownership interest in the receiving entity is accounted for at fair value, full or partial gain recognition is required if the fair value of the asset given up is greater than its carrying value. A loss is recognized if the carrying value of the asset given up exceeds its fair value.

UPDATE: In June 2016, the FASB proposed requiring exchanges of a nonfinancial asset for a noncontrolling ownership interest in the receiving entity to be accounted for under ASC 610-20, not ASC 845. Comments were due 5 August 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

11.2 Derecognition of the nonfinancial asset

ASC 610-20 provides the following guidance on when to derecognize a nonfinancial asset:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Other Income – Gains and Losses from the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets

Initial Recognition

610-20-25-1

An entity shall recognize a gain or loss in accordance with the derecognition guidance in Section 610 20-40.

Derecognition

610-20-40-1

To determine when a nonfinancial asset shall be derecognized, an entity shall apply the following paragraphs in Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers:

- a. Paragraphs 606-10-25-1 through 25-8 on the existence of a contract
- b. Paragraph 606-10-25-30 on when an entity satisfies a performance obligation by transferring control of an asset.

610-20-40-2

When the guidance in paragraph 610-20-40-1 is met, an entity shall derecognize the nonfinancial asset and recognize as a gain or loss the difference between the amount of consideration measured in accordance with paragraph 610-20-32-1 and the carrying amount of the nonfinancial asset. When the guidance in paragraph 610-20-40-1 is not met, an entity shall apply the guidance in paragraphs 350-10-40-3 to intangible assets and 360-10-40-3C to property, plant, and equipment.

11.2.1**Existence of a contract**

Before derecognizing a nonfinancial asset, an entity must first identify the contract, or contracts, to sell such assets. See Section 3.3 for guidance on when two or more contracts should be combined. These contracts may be written, oral or implied by the entity's customary business practices but must be legally enforceable and meet specified criteria, as outlined in ASC 606-10-25-1 (see Section 3.1 for a detailed discussion of those criteria). These criteria are assessed at the inception of the arrangement. If the criteria are met at that time, an entity does not reassess the criteria unless there is an indication of a significant change in facts and circumstances.

An entity must carefully evaluate whether a contract (particularly an oral or implied contract) is legally enforceable. In many cases in the US, a contract to sell or transfer nonfinancial assets must be written to be legally enforceable (e.g., many real estate transactions). Entities commonly execute these transactions using a signed, written contract that specifies the asset to be transferred and the amount to be paid. This generally will result in a straightforward assessment of most of the contract criteria. The assessment may be different when evaluating transactions that occur in countries outside of the US.

An entity also must conclude that it is probable that it will collect the transaction price, as discussed in Section 3.1.5. When evaluating whether collectibility of the transaction price is probable, an entity should consider the buyer's intent and ability to pay the amount of consideration when it is due. In some cases, an entity may conclude that it has offered or is willing to accept a price concession or other discount, as discussed in Section 5.2.1.1, that is a form of variable consideration and does not affect the collectibility assessment. In other cases, an entity may decide to transfer the asset even if it has doubts about the buyer's intent or ability to pay the transaction price for the asset. All facts and circumstances should be considered when making this determination.

How we see it

Entities will need to carefully evaluate whether each of their contracts should be accounted for under ASC 606 because not all legal contracts will meet the requirements of a contract under ASC 606-10-25-1.

Entities may find applying the collectibility criterion challenging. Significant judgment will be required to determine whether an expected partial payment from the counterparty indicates that (1) there is an implied price concession in the contract, (2) there is an impairment loss or (3) the arrangement lacks sufficient substance to be considered a contract within the scope of the guidance.

11.2.2**Accounting for consideration received when the contract criteria are not met**

As noted in ASC 610-20-40-2, both ASC 350-10-40-3 and ASC 360-10-40-3C provide guidance for when an entity concludes that it is not probable that it will collect the transaction price or when any of the other criteria in ASC 606-10-25-1 are not met. This guidance requires an entity to continue to report the nonfinancial asset in its financial statements, recognize amortization or depreciation expense and evaluate the asset for impairment. Any consideration received from the buyer is initially accounted for as a liability that is measured at the amount of consideration received from the buyer. This approach is similar to the deposit method prescribed in ASC 360-20 (prior to amendments in ASU 2014-09) for sales of real estate.

The liability for any consideration received should continue to be recognized until the contract criteria in ASC 606-10-25-1 are met or until one of the events described in ASC 606-10-25-7 occurs. The events listed in ASC 606-10-25-7 are discussed in detail in Section 3.5.

11.2.3 Transferring control of the asset

If an entity determines that an arrangement meets the criteria to be accounted for as a contract as described in Section 11.2.1, it should derecognize the asset and recognize a gain or loss on the transaction when control of the underlying asset transfers to the buyer. As discussed in Section 7.2, ASC 606 defines control as “the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset” and also includes the ability to prevent others from directing the use of the asset and obtaining the benefits from it. The guidance in ASC 610-20 refers to indicators of the transfer of control in ASC 606-10-25-30 to determine when control of the underlying asset has transferred to the buyer. Those indicators include:

- ▶ The entity has a present right to payment for the asset.
- ▶ The buyer has legal title to the asset.
- ▶ The entity has transferred physical possession of the asset.
- ▶ The buyer has the significant risks and rewards of ownership of the asset.
- ▶ The buyer has accepted the asset.

ASC 606 provides guidance on how to apply these indicators, including how they relate to the definition of control and how the other implementation guidance in ASC 606 may affect the assessment of control (e.g., accounting for repurchase agreements), as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Recognition

Performance Obligations Satisfied at a Point in Time

606-10-25-30

If a **performance obligation** is not satisfied over time in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-25-27 through 25-29, an entity satisfies the performance obligation at a point in time. To determine the point in time at which a **customer** obtains control of a promised asset and the entity satisfies a performance obligation, the entity shall consider the guidance on control in paragraphs 606-10-25-23 through 25-26. In addition, an entity shall consider indicators of the transfer of control, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. The entity has a present right to payment for the asset – If a customer presently is obliged to pay for an asset, then that may indicate that the customer has obtained the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset in exchange.
- b. The customer has legal title to the asset – Legal title may indicate which party to a **contract** has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, an asset or to restrict the access of other entities to those benefits. Therefore, the transfer of legal title of an asset may indicate that the customer has obtained control of the asset. If an entity retains legal title solely as protection against the customer’s failure to pay, those rights of the entity would not preclude the customer from obtaining control of an asset.

- c. The entity has transferred physical possession of the asset – The customer’s physical possession of an asset may indicate that the customer has the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset or to restrict the access of other entities to those benefits. However, physical possession may not coincide with control of an asset. For example, in some repurchase agreements and in some consignment arrangements, a customer or consignee may have physical possession of an asset that the entity controls. Conversely, in some bill-and-hold arrangements, the entity may have physical possession of an asset that the customer controls. Paragraphs 606-10-55-66 through 55-78, 606-10-55-79 through 55-80, and 606-10-55-81 through 55-84 provide guidance on accounting for repurchase agreements, consignment arrangements, and bill-and-hold arrangements, respectively.
- d. The customer has the significant risks and rewards of ownership of the asset – The transfer of the significant risks and rewards of ownership of an asset to the customer may indicate that the customer has obtained the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. However, when evaluating the risks and rewards of ownership of a promised asset, an entity shall exclude any risks that give rise to a separate performance obligation in addition to the performance obligation to transfer the asset. For example, an entity may have transferred control of an asset to a customer but not yet satisfied an additional performance obligation to provide maintenance services related to the transferred asset.
- e. The customer has accepted the asset – The customer’s acceptance of an asset may indicate that it has obtained the ability to direct the use of, and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from, the asset. To evaluate the effect of a contractual customer acceptance clause on when control of an asset is transferred, an entity shall consider the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-55-85 through 55-88.

None of the indicators above are meant to be individually determinative. The Board also clarified²⁷⁶ that the indicators are not meant to be a checklist and not all of them must be present to determine that the other party has gained control. Rather, the indicators are factors that are often present when a buyer has obtained control of an asset, and the list is meant to help entities apply the principle of control. An entity must consider all relevant facts and circumstances to determine whether control has transferred. For example, the fact that a buyer has physical possession of an asset but can’t use it until a certain date may indicate that the selling entity still controls the asset, even though the buyer has physical possession. The indicators are discussed in further detail in Section 7.2.

How we see it

The guidance in ASC 610-20 differs significantly from legacy prescriptive requirements for gain or loss recognition on real estate sales. For example, under legacy GAAP, a sale or transfer of real estate and any profit on it is recognized only if the transaction is consummated, the buyer meets certain initial and continuing investment conditions, any receivable is not subject to future subordination and the seller doesn’t have certain forms of continuing involvement in the real estate (i.e., a sale is based on the transfer of the risks and rewards of ownership).

In addition, the derecognition guidance will be new for entities that sell other types of nonfinancial assets (e.g., ships, planes, patents). The guidance also will be a change for entities that have applied ASC 810 to sales of subsidiaries (i.e., subsidiaries that are not in substance real estate) that are in substance nonfinancial assets.

²⁷⁶ Paragraph BC155 of ASU 2014-09.

Under the new model, assuming that control of the asset has been transferred, a gain may be recognized if the transaction price of the sale (based on the guidance on measuring the gain or loss described below) exceeds the carrying amount of the real estate sold, even though the transaction may not have qualified as a sale under legacy real estate guidance.

11.3 Measuring the gain or loss

ASC 610-20 requires an entity to apply the measurement principles in ASC 606 to measure the consideration to be included in the calculation of the gain or loss recognized upon derecognition of a nonfinancial asset as follows:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Other Income – Gains and Losses from the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets

Measurement

610-20-32-1

To determine the amount of consideration to be included in the calculation of a gain or loss recognized upon the derecognition of a nonfinancial asset, an entity shall apply the following paragraphs in Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers:

- a. Paragraphs 606-10-32-2 through 32-27 on determining the transaction price, including all of the following:
 1. Estimating variable consideration
 2. Constraining estimates of variable consideration
 3. The existence of a significant financing component
 4. Noncash consideration
 5. Consideration payable to a customer.
- b. Paragraphs 606-10-32-42 through 32-45 on accounting for changes in the transaction price.

The consideration promised in a contract may include fixed and/or variable amounts. When determining the transaction price, entities must estimate the variable consideration expected to be received. The transaction price also will include the fair value of any noncash consideration (see Section 5.6), the effect of a significant financing component (i.e., the time value of money) (see Section 5.5) and the effect of any consideration payable to a customer²⁷⁷ (see Section 5.7).

11.3.1 Variable consideration and the constraint

The transaction price may vary in amount and timing as a result of price concessions, incentives or bonuses. In addition, consideration may be contingent on the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a future event or earned as a percentage of an underlying measure (e.g., sales/revenues, EBITDA, operating performance).

²⁷⁷ The term "consideration payable to a customer" is used in ASC 606. ASC 610-20 does not apply to contracts with customers but does refer to the consideration payable guidance in ASC 606. This chapter of our publication uses the term as it is used in ASC 606 to describe any consideration payable to a buyer in a transaction in the scope of ASC 610-20.

For contracts in which the promised consideration is variable, an entity will need to estimate the amount of consideration to which it expects to be entitled, as discussed in Section 5.2.2, using either an expected value method (sum of probability-weighted amounts) or a most likely amount method. An entity is required to use the method that best predicts the consideration to which it will be entitled, considering all information (historical, current and forecast) that is reasonably available.

The amount of variable consideration an entity can include in the transaction price is limited to the amount for which it is probable that a significant reversal will not occur when the uncertainties related to the variability are resolved, as discussed in Section 5.2.3. An entity should update both its estimate of the variable consideration and its evaluation of the likelihood of a significant reversal at each reporting date. Significant judgment will be required, and all facts and circumstances will need to be considered when determining whether it is probable that a significant reversal will not occur.

The following example from ASC 610-20 illustrates applying the constraint to variable consideration:

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Other Income – Gains and Losses from the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets

Implementation Guidance and Illustrations

Example 1 – Sale of a Nonfinancial Asset for Variable Consideration

610-20-55-2

An entity sells the rights to in-process research and development that it recently acquired in a business combination and measured at fair value of \$50 million in accordance with Topic 805 on business combinations. The buyer of the in-process research and development agrees to pay a nonrefundable amount of \$5 million at inception plus 2 percent of sales of any products derived from the in-process research and development over the next 20 years. The entity concludes that the sale of in-process research and development is not a good or service that is an output of the entity's ordinary activities.

610-20-55-3

Topic 350 on goodwill and other intangibles requires the entity to apply the guidance on existence of a contract, control, and measurement in Topic 606 on revenue from contracts with customers to determine the amount and timing of income to be recognized as follows:

- a. The entity concludes that the criteria for identifying a contract in paragraph 606-10-25-1 are met.
- b. The entity also concludes that on the basis of the guidance in paragraph 606-10-25-30, it has transferred control of the in-process research and development asset to the buyer as of contract inception. This is because as of contract inception the buyer can use the in-process research and development's records, patents, and supporting documentation to develop potential products and the entity has relinquished all substantive rights to the in-process research and development asset.
- c. In estimating the consideration received, the entity applies the guidance in Topic 606 on determining the transaction price, including estimating and constraining variable consideration. The entity estimates that the amount of consideration that it will receive from the sales-based royalty is \$100 million over the 20-year royalty period. However, the entity cannot assert that it is probable that recognizing all of the estimated variable consideration in other income would not result in a significant reversal of that consideration. The entity reaches this conclusion on the basis of its assessment of factors in paragraph 606-10-32-12. In particular, the entity is aware that the variable consideration is highly susceptible to the actions and judgments of third parties, because it is based on the buyer completing the in-process research and development asset, obtaining regulatory approval for the output of the in-process research and development asset, and marketing and selling the output. For the same reasons, the entity also concludes that it

could not include any amount, even a minimum amount, in the estimate of the consideration. Consequently, the entity concludes that the estimate of the consideration to be used in the calculation of the gain or loss upon the derecognition of the in-process research and development asset is limited to the \$5 million fixed upfront payment.

610-20-55-4

At inception of the contract, the entity recognizes a net loss of \$45 million (\$5 million of consideration, less the in-process research and development asset of \$50 million). The entity reassesses the transaction price at each reporting period to determine whether it is probable that a significant reversal would not occur from recognizing the estimate as other income and, if so, recognizes that amount as other income in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-14 and 606-10-32-42 through 32-45.

How we see it

Some entities may see significant changes in how they account for sales of nonfinancial assets in the scope of ASC 610-20 due to the measurement principles for variable consideration. For example, some entities may not have historically estimated consideration that was contingent on future events (i.e., variable consideration) because they recognized these amounts when they were received. Other entities may have recognized contingent consideration at its fair value or applied a loss recovery approach.

Entities may see another significant change if the transaction price includes variable consideration that is constrained at contract inception. In these instances, an entity may be required to recognize a loss upon derecognition of a nonfinancial asset even though the entity expects to ultimately recognize a gain on the sale when the uncertainty related to the transaction price is resolved.

11.4

Other aspects of ASC 606

ASC 610-20 refers to only certain aspects of ASC 606 and does not contain guidance for other situations that may affect sales of nonfinancial assets. For example, ASC 610-20 does not contain guidance on identifying performance obligations (i.e., units of accounting) or on allocating the transaction price to more than one nonfinancial asset that may be included in a contract, while ASC 606 provides specific guidance on both topics. In the absence of specific guidance in ASC 610-20 or other existing literature, we believe it would be reasonable for an entity to refer to the guidance in ASC 606.

UPDATE: In June 2016, the FASB proposed specifying that an entity should apply the guidance in ASC 606 on identifying performance obligations and allocating the transaction price to each performance obligation for nonfinancial assets in the scope of ASC 610-20. Comments were due 5 August 2016. To finalize this change, the FASB will need to issue a final ASU.

A Summary of important changes

We have made significant changes to this FRD since the August 2015 edition, primarily to address amendments the FASB has made to the standard and TRG implementation discussions, as well as to expand our discussions of certain topics. In addition, the FRD now includes FAQs and all ASC 606 and ASC 340-40 Codification guidance (but not all of the examples included in the Codification – see Appendix F). The previous version included only select Codification references. The list below summarizes the most significant new or revised content in this edition of our FRD.

Chapter 1 **Overview, effective date and transition**

- ▶ Updated Section 1.3 for transition amendments in ASU 2016-12
- ▶ Updated Section 1.3.4 for new Topic 11 of the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance's Financial Reporting Manual, *Reporting Issues Related to Adoption of New Revenue Recognition Standard*

Chapter 2 **Scope**

- ▶ Added seven FAQs in Section 2.4 on scoping

Chapter 3 **Identify the contract with the customer**

- ▶ Updated Section 3.1.5 for amendments to the collectibility guidance in ASU 2016-12
- ▶ Added Section 3.2 on contract enforceability and termination clauses
- ▶ Added flowchart in Section 3.4 on the contract modifications guidance
- ▶ Updated Section 3.5 for amendments to the guidance on recognition of nonrefundable consideration received for arrangements that to do meet the definition of a contract in ASU 2016-12

Chapter 4 **Identify the performance obligations in the contract**

- ▶ Updated Sections 4.1 and 4.2 for amendments on identifying performance obligations in ASU 2016-10
- ▶ Updated Section 4.4 for amendments on principal versus agent considerations in ASU 2016-08
- ▶ Added eight FAQs in Section 4.6 on customer options

Chapter 5 **Determine the transaction price**

- ▶ Added Section 5.1 on amendments on the presentation of sales (and other similar taxes) in ASU 2016-12
- ▶ Added eight FAQs in Section 5.2 on variable consideration
- ▶ Removed Illustration 5-1 from Section 5.2.3 (formerly Section 5.1.3) and replaced it with an example from TRG agenda paper no. 38 on estimating variable consideration using the expected value method
- ▶ Added Section 5.3 on refund liabilities
- ▶ Added seven FAQs in Section 5.5 on significant financing components
- ▶ Updated Section 5.6 for amendments on noncash consideration in ASU 2016-12 and added Illustration 5-1 on noncash consideration with variability due to both form and other reasons
- ▶ Expanded Section 5.7 on consideration paid or payable to a customer and added several subsections
- ▶ Added Section 5.9 on changes in the transaction price

- Chapter 6** **Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations**
- ▶ Added three FAQs in Section 6.1.4 on determining the standalone selling price
 - ▶ Expanded Section 6.3 on the variable consideration allocation exception
 - ▶ Revised Illustration 6-3 in Section 6.6 to illustrate an arrangement with elements in the scope of ASC 460 and ASC 606
- Chapter 7** **Satisfaction of performance obligations**
- ▶ Expanded the discussion in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 on applying the notion of control to performance obligations satisfied over time and at a point in time
 - ▶ Added nine FAQs in Section 7.1 on performance obligations satisfied over time
- Chapter 8** **Licenses of intellectual property**
- ▶ New chapter on licenses of intellectual property (some of the content was formerly included in Section 8.4)
 - ▶ Updated for ASU 2016-10
- Chapter 9** **Other measurement and recognition topics**
- ▶ Added four FAQs in Section 9.1 on warranties
 - ▶ Added four FAQs in Section 9.3.1 on costs to obtain a contract and added Illustration 9-3 on sales commissions
 - ▶ Added four FAQs in Section 9.3.2 on costs to fulfill a contract
 - ▶ Added two FAQs in Section 9.3.3 on amortization of capitalized costs
 - ▶ Added new Section 9.3.4 on impairment of capitalized costs, including discussion of proposed technical corrections to this guidance
- Chapter 10** **Presentation and disclosure**
- ▶ Added six FAQs in Section 10.1 on presentation considerations
 - ▶ Added Section 10.6 on interim disclosure requirements
 - ▶ Added Section 10.7 on transition disclosure requirements
- Chapter 11** **Gains and losses from the derecognition of nonfinancial assets**
- ▶ Added chapter to discuss guidance in ASC 610-20 that requires entities to apply certain principles of the revenue standard (including estimating variable consideration) to sales of certain nonfinancial assets (e.g., real estate; intangible assets; property, plant and equipment)

B Index of ASC references used in this publication

ASC Reference	Section	
250-10-50-1 through 50-2	1.3.1	Full retrospective adoption
270-10-50-1A	10.6	Interim disclosure requirements
340-40-15-2	9.3.1	Costs to obtain a contract
340-40-15-3	9.3.2	Costs to fulfill a contract
340-40-25-1 through 25-4	9.3.1	Costs to obtain a contract
340-40-25-5 through 25-8	9.3.2	Costs to fulfill a contract
340-40-35-1 through 35-2	9.3.3	Amortization of capitalized costs
340-40-35-3 through 35-6	9.3.4	Impairment of capitalized costs
340-40-50-1 through 3	10.4.3	Disclosures for public entities – Assets recognized for the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract
340-40-50-4	10.5.3	Disclosures for nonpublic entities – Assets recognized for the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract
340-40-50-5	10.4.4	Disclosures for public entities – Practical expedients
340-40-50-6	10.5.4	Disclosures for nonpublic entities – Practical expedients
606-10-10-1 through 10-3	1.1.1	Core principle of the standard
606-10-10-4	3.3.1	Portfolio approach practical expedient
606-10-15-1 through 15-3	2	Scope
606-10-15-4	2.4	Interaction with other guidance
606-10-15-5	9.3	Contract costs
606-10-25-1	3.1	Attributes of a contract
606-10-25-2	3	Identify the contract with the customer
606-10-25-3 through 25-4	3.2	Contract enforceability and termination clauses
606-10-25-5	3.1	Attributes of a contract
606-10-25-6 through 25-8	3.5	Arrangements that do not meet the definition of a contract under the standard
606-10-25-9	3.3	Combining contracts
606-10-25-10 through 10-13	3.4	Contract modifications
606-10-25-10	6.5	Changes in transaction price after contract inception
606-10-25-14 through 25-15	4	Identifying the performance obligations in the contract
606-10-25-16 through 25-18	4.1	Identifying the promised goods and services in the contract
606-10-25-18A through 25-18B	4.1.2	Shipping and handling activities
606-10-25-19	4.2.1	Determination of distinct
606-10-25-20	4.2.1.1	Capable of being distinct
606-10-25-21	4.2.1.2	Distinct within the context of the contract
606-10-25-22	4.3	Promised goods and services that are not distinct
606-10-25-23 through 25-25	7	Satisfaction of performance obligations
606-10-25-25	4.4.2	Control of the specified good or service

ASC Reference	Section	
606-10-25-26	7.3	Repurchase agreements
606-10-25-27	7.1	Performance obligations satisfied over time
606-10-25-28 through 25-29	7.1.3	Asset with no alternative use and right to payment
606-10-25-30	7.2	Control transferred at a point in time
606-10-25-30	11.2.3	Transferring control of the asset
606-10-25-31 through 25-37	7.1.4	Measuring progress
606-10-32-1 through 32-4	5	Determine the transaction price
606-10-32-5 through 32-7	5.2	Variable consideration
606-10-32-8 through 32-9	5.2.2	Estimating variable consideration
606-10-32-10	5.3	Refund liabilities
606-10-32-11 through 32-13	5.2.3	Constraining estimates of variable consideration
606-10-32-14	5.2.4	Reassessment of variable consideration
606-10-32-15 through 32-19	5.5	Significant financing component
606-10-32-20	5.5.2	Financial statement presentation of financing component
606-10-32-21 through 32-24	5.6	Noncash consideration
606-10-32-25 through 32-27	5.7	Consideration paid or payable to a customer
606-10-32-28 through 32-30	6	Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations
606-10-32-31 through 32-35	6.1	Determining standalone selling prices
606-10-32-36 through 32-38	6.4	Allocating a discount
606-10-32-39 through 32-41	6.3	Allocating variable consideration
606-10-32-42	5.9	Changes in the transaction price
606-10-32-42 through 32-45	6.5	Changes in transaction price after contract inception
606-10-45-1 through 45-5	10.1	Presentation requirements for contract assets and contract liabilities
606-10-50-1 through 50-2	10.3	Annual disclosure requirements
606-10-50-3	10.4	Disclosures for public entities
606-10-50-4 through 50-6	10.4.1	Disclosures for public entities – Contracts with customers
606-10-50-8 through 50-10	10.4.1	Disclosures for public entities – Contracts with customers
606-10-50-12 through 50-15	10.4.1	Disclosures for public entities – Contracts with customers
606-10-50-17 through 20	10.4.2	Disclosures for public entities – Significant judgments
606-10-50-22	10.4.4	Disclosures for public entities – Practical expedients
606-10-50-8 through 10-16	10.5.1	Disclosures for nonpublic entities – Contracts with customers
606-10-50-17 through 21	10.5.2	Disclosures for nonpublic entities – Significant judgments
606-10-50-23	10.5.4	Disclosures for nonpublic entities – Practical expedients
606-10-55-3A through 55-3C	3.1.5	Collectibility
606-10-55-5 through 55-6	7.1.1	Customer simultaneously receives and consumes benefits as the entity performs
606-10-55-7	7.1.2	Customer controls asset as it is created or enhanced
606-10-55-8 through 55-15	7.1.3	Asset with no alternative use and right to payment
606-10-55-16 through 55-20	7.1.4	Measuring progress
606-10-55-21	7.1.4.2	Input methods
606-10-55-22 through 55-29	5.4.1	Rights of return
606-10-55-30	9.1	Warranties

ASC Reference	Section	
606-10-55-31 through 55-33	9.1.1	Determining whether a warranty is an assurance- or service-type warranty
606-10-55-34	9.1.4	Contracts that contain both assurance- and service-type warranties
606-10-55-35	9.1.1	Determining whether a warranty is an assurance- or service-type warranty
606-10-55-36 through 55-37	4.4	Principal versus agent considerations
606-10-55-37A	4.4.2	Control of the specified good or service
606-10-55-37B through 55-38	4.4.3	Recognizing revenue as a principal or agent
606-10-55-39 through 55-39A	4.4.2.1	Principal indicators
606-10-55-40	4.4.3	Recognizing revenue as a principal or agent
606-10-55-41 through 55-43	4.6	Customer options for additional goods or services
606-10-55-44 through 55-45	6.1.5	Measurement of options that are separate performance obligations
606-10-55-46 through 55-49	7.9	Breakage and prepayments for future goods or services
606-10-55-50 through 55-53	5.8	Nonrefundable up-front fees
606-10-55-54	8	Licenses of intellectual property
606-10-55-55	8.1	Identifying performance obligations in a licensing arrangement
606-10-55-56	8.1.2	Licenses of intellectual property that are not distinct
606-10-55-57	8.2.4	Applying the licenses guidance to a bundled performance obligation that includes a license of intellectual property
606-10-55-58 through 55-58C	8.3	Transfer of control of licensed intellectual property
606-10-55-59	8.2	Determining the nature of the entity's promise in granting a license
606-10-55-60	8.2.2	Symbolic intellectual property
606-10-55-62 through 55-63	8.2.1	Functional intellectual property
606-10-55-63A	8.2.3	Evaluating functional versus symbolic intellectual property
606-10-55-64	8.1.3	Contractual restrictions
606-10-55-64A	8.1.4	Guarantees to defend or maintain a patent
606-10-55-65 through 55-65B	8.5	Sales- or usage-based royalties on licenses of intellectual property
606-10-55-66 through 55-67	7.3	Repurchase agreements
606-10-55-68 through 55-71	7.3.1	Forward or call option held by the entity
606-10-55-72 through 55-78	7.3.2	Put option held by the customer
606-10-55-79 through 55-80	7.4	Consignment arrangements
606-10-55-81 through 55-84	7.5	Bill-and-hold arrangements
606-10-55-85 through 55-88	7.2.1	Customer acceptance
606-10-55-89 through 55-91	10.4.1	Disclosures for public entities – Contracts with customers
606-10-65-1	1.2	Effective date
606-10-65-1	1.3	Transition method
610-20-05-1	11.1	Scope of ASC 610-20
610-20-15-1 through 15-3	11.1	Scope of ASC 610-20
610-20-25-1	11.2	Derecognition of the nonfinancial asset
610-20-32-1	11.3	Measuring the gain or loss
610-20-40-1 through 40-2	11.2	Derecognition of the nonfinancial asset

C Guidance abbreviations used in this publication

Abbreviation	Full title of guidance reference
ASC 210-20	FASB ASC Topic 210-20, <i>Balance Sheet – Offsetting</i>
ASC 235	FASB ASC Topic 235, <i>Notes to Financial Statements</i>
ASC 250	FASB ASC Topic 250, <i>Accounting Changes and Error Corrections</i>
ASC 270	FASB ASC Topic 270, <i>Interim Reporting</i>
ASC 280	FASB ASC Topic 280, <i>Segment Reporting</i>
ASC 310	FASB ASC Topic 310, <i>Receivables</i>
ASC 320	FASB ASC Topic 320, <i>Investments – Debt and Equity Securities</i>
ASC 330	FASB ASC Topic 330, <i>Inventory</i>
ASC 340	FASB ASC Topic 340, <i>Other Assets and Deferred Costs</i>
ASC 340-40	FASB ASC Topic 340, <i>Other Assets and Deferred Costs – Contracts with Customers</i>
ASC 350	FASB ASC Topic 350, <i>Intangibles – Goodwill and Other</i>
ASC 360	FASB ASC Topic 360, <i>Property, Plant, and Equipment</i>
ASC 360-20	FASB ASC Topic 360-20, <i>Property, Plant, and Equipment – Real Estate Sales</i>
ASC 405	FASB ASC Topic 405, <i>Liabilities</i>
ASC 420	FASB ASC Topic 420, <i>Exit or Disposal Cost Obligations</i>
ASC 440	FASB ASC Topic 440, <i>Commitments</i>
ASC 460	FASB ASC Topic 460, <i>Guarantees</i>
ASC 470-40	FASB ASC Topic 470-40, <i>Product Financing Arrangements</i>
ASC 605	FASB ASC Topic 605, <i>Revenue Recognition</i>
ASC 605-20	FASB ASC Topic 605-20, <i>Revenue Recognition – Services</i>
ASC 605-25	FASB ASC Topic 605-25, <i>Revenue Recognition – Multiple-Element Arrangements</i>
ASC 605-35	FASB ASC Topic 605-35, <i>Revenue Recognition – Construction-Type and Production-Type Contracts</i>
ASC 605-45	FASB ASC Topic 605-45, <i>Revenue Recognition – Principal Agent Considerations</i>
ASC 605-50	FASB ASC Topic 605-50, <i>Customer Payments and Incentives</i>
ASC 606	FASB ASC Topic 606, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers</i>
ASC 610-20	FASB ASC Topic 610-20, <i>Other Income – Gains and Losses from the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets</i>
ASC 710	FASB ASC Topic 710, <i>Compensation</i>
ASC 720-15	FASB ASC Topic 720-15, <i>Other Expenses – Start-up Costs</i>
ASC 730	FASB ASC Topic 730, <i>Research and Development</i>
ASC 808	FASB ASC Topic 808, <i>Collaborative Arrangements</i>
ASC 810	FASB ASC Topic 810, <i>Consolidation</i>
ASC 815	FASB ASC Topic 815, <i>Derivatives and Hedging</i>
ASC 820	FASB ASC Topic 820, <i>Fair Value Measurement</i>
ASC 830-20	FASB ASC Topic 830-20, <i>Foreign Currency Transactions</i>
ASC 835	FASB ASC Topic 835, <i>Interest</i>
ASC 840	FASB ASC Topic 840, <i>Leases</i>

Abbreviation	Full title of guidance reference
ASC 840-40	FASB ASC Topic 840, <i>Leases – Sale-Leaseback Transactions</i>
ASC 842	FASB ASC Topic 842, <i>Leases</i>
ASC 845	FASB ASC Topic 845, <i>Nonmonetary Transactions</i>
ASC 860	FASB ASC Topic 860, <i>Transfers and Servicing</i>
ASC 924-605	FASB ASC Topic 924, FASB ASC Topic 924-605, <i>Entertainment – Casinos – Revenue Recognition</i>
ASC 944	FASB ASC Topic 944, <i>Financial Services – Insurance</i>
ASC 954-450	FASB ASC Topic 954-450, <i>Healthcare Entities – Contingencies</i>
ASC 958-605	FASB ASC Topic 958-605, <i>Not-for-Profit Entities – Revenue Recognition</i>
ASC 985-20	FASB ASC Topic 958-605, <i>Costs of Software to Be Sold, Leased, or Marketed</i>
ASC 985-605	FASB ASC Topic 985-605, <i>Software – Revenue Recognition</i>
ASU 2013-12	Accounting Standards Update No. 2013-12, <i>Definition of a Public Business Entity</i>
ASU 2014-09	Accounting Standards Update No. 2014-09, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)</i>
ASU 2015-14	Accounting Standards Update No. 2015-14, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Deferral of the Effective Date</i>
ASU 2016-02	Accounting Standards Update No. 2016-02, <i>Leases (Topic 842)</i>
ASU 2016-08	Accounting Standards Update No. 2016-08, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Principal versus Agent Considerations (Reporting Revenue Gross versus Net)</i>
ASU 2016-10	Accounting Standards Update No. 2016-10, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Identifying Performance Obligations and Licensing</i>
ASU 2016-12	Accounting Standards Update No. 2016-12, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Narrow-Scope Improvements and Practical Expedients</i>
CON 6	FASB Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 6, <i>Elements of Financial Statements</i>
EITF D-96	Emerging Issues Task Force Issue No. D-96, <i>Accounting for Management Fees Based on a Formula</i>
IAS 11	International Accounting Standard 11 <i>Construction Contracts</i>
IAS 18	International Accounting Standard 18 <i>Revenue</i>
IAS 21	International Accounting Standard 21 <i>The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates</i>
IAS 34	International Accounting 34 <i>Interim Financial Reporting</i>
IAS 37	International Accounting 37 <i>Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets</i>
IAS 39	International Accounting Standard 39 <i>Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement</i>
IFRS 2	International Financial Reporting Standard 2 <i>Share-based Payment</i>
IFRS 9	International Financial Reporting Standard 9 <i>Financial Instruments</i>
IFRS 15	International Financial Reporting Standard 15 <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers</i>
SAB Topic 1.M	Codified SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin, Topic 1.M, <i>Materiality</i>
SAB Topic 11.M	Codified SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin, Topic 11.M, <i>Disclosure of the Impact that Recently Issued Accounting Standards Will have on the Financial Statements of the Registrant when Adopted in a Future Period</i>
SAB Topic 13	Codified SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin, Topic 13, <i>Revenue Recognition</i>
SOP 97-2	Statement of Position 97-2, <i>Software Revenue Recognition</i>

D Disclosure checklist – Public entities

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
<p>Note: In May 2014, the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update (ASU) 2014-09, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)</i> that will supersede virtually all recognition guidance in US GAAP. For public entities, the guidance is effective for annual and interim periods beginning after 15 December 2017. For nonpublic entities, it is effective for annual periods beginning after 15 December 2018, and interim periods beginning after 15 December 2019. Early adoption is permitted for all entities for annual and interim periods beginning after 15 December 2016.</p> <p>The FASB issued the following ASUs to amend the new guidance:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>ASU 2015-14, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Deferral of the Effective Date</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>ASU 2016-08, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Principal versus Agent Considerations (Reporting Revenue Gross versus Net)</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>ASU 2016-10, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Identifying Performance Obligations and Licensing</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>ASU 2016-12, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Narrow-Scope Improvements and Practical Expedients</i></p> <p>The standard defines a public entity as one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A public business entity ▶ A not-for-profit entity that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market ▶ An employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) <p>ASU 2013-12, <i>Definition of a Public Business Entity</i>, states that a business entity is a public business entity if it meets any of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ “(a) It is required by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to file or furnish financial statements, or does file or furnish financial statements (including voluntary filers), with the SEC (including other entities whose financial statements or financial information are required to be or are included in a filing). ▶ (b) It is required by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the Act), as amended, or rules or regulations promulgated under the Act, to file or furnish financial statements with a regulatory agency other than the SEC. ▶ (c) It is required to file or furnish financial statements with a foreign or domestic regulatory agency in preparation for the sale of or for purposes of issuing securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer. ▶ (d) It has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market. ▶ (e) It has one or more securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer, and it is required by law, contract, or regulation to prepare U.S. GAAP financial statements (including footnotes) and make them publicly available on a periodic basis (for example, interim or annual periods). An entity must meet both of these conditions to meet this criterion.” 				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
An entity that does not meet any of the above is considered a nonpublic entity for purposes of this standard.				
<i>Contracts with customers</i>				
1. An entity shall disclose all of the following amounts for the reporting period unless those amounts are presented separately in the statement of comprehensive income (statement of activities) in accordance with other disclosure requirements: (606-10-50-4)				
a. Revenue recognized from contracts with customers, which the entity shall disclose separately from its other sources of revenue				
b. Any impairment losses recognized (in accordance with ASC 310 on receivables) on any receivables or contract assets arising from an entity's contracts with customers, which the entity shall disclose separately from impairment losses on other contracts				
<i>Disaggregation of revenue</i>				
2. An entity shall disclose the following related to disaggregated revenue:				
a. An entity shall disclose disaggregated revenue from contracts with customers into categories that depict how the nature, amount, timing, and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors. An entity shall apply the guidance in paragraphs 606-10-55-89 through 55-91 when selecting the categories to use to disaggregate revenue. (606-10-50-5) Note: Paragraph 606-10-50-5 requires an entity to disaggregate revenue from contracts with customers into categories that depict how the nature, amount, timing and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows are affected by economic factors. Consequently, the extent to which an entity's revenue is disaggregated for the purposes of this disclosure depends on the facts and circumstances that pertain to the entity's contracts with customers. Some entities may need to use more than one type of category to meet the objective in paragraph 606-10-50-5 for disaggregating revenue. Other entities may meet the objective by using only one type of category to disaggregate revenue. (606-10-55-89)				
b. When selecting the type of category (or categories) to use to disaggregate revenue, an entity should consider how information about the entity's revenue has been presented for other purposes, including all of the following: (606-10-55-90)				
i. Disclosures presented outside the financial statements (for example, in earnings releases, annual reports or investor presentations)				
ii. Information regularly reviewed by the chief operating decision maker for evaluating the financial performance of operating segments				
iii. Other information that is similar to the types of information identified in (i) and (ii) and that is used by the entity or users of the entity's financial statements to evaluate the entity's financial performance or make resource allocation decisions				
Note: Examples of categories that might be appropriate include, but are not limited to, all of the following: (606-10-55-91) (a) Type of good or service (for example, major product lines) (b) Geographical region (for example, country or region) (c) Market or type of customer (for example, government and nongovernment customers)				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
(d) Type of contract (for example, fixed-price and time-and-materials contracts) (e) Contract duration (for example, short-term and long-term contracts) (f) Timing of transfer of goods or services (for example, revenue from goods or services transferred to customers at a point in time and revenue from goods or services transferred over time) (g) Sales channels (for example, goods sold directly to consumers and goods sold through intermediaries)				
c. An entity shall disclose sufficient information to enable users of financial statements to understand the relationship between the disclosure of disaggregated revenue (in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-5) and revenue information that is disclosed for each reportable segment, if the entity applies ASC 280 on segment reporting. (606-10-50-6)				
<i>Contract balances</i>				
3. An entity shall disclose all of the following: (606-10-50-8)				
a. The opening and closing balances of receivables, contract assets and contract liabilities from contracts with customers, if not otherwise separately presented or disclosed				
b. Revenue recognized in the reporting period that was included in the contract liability balance at the beginning of the period				
c. Revenue recognized in the reporting period from performance obligations satisfied (or partially satisfied) in previous reporting periods (for example, changes in transaction price)				
4. An entity shall explain how the timing of satisfaction of its performance obligations (see paragraph 606-10-50-12(a)) relates to the typical timing of payment (see paragraph 606-10-50-12(b)) and the effect that those factors have on the contract asset and contract liability balances. The explanation provided may use qualitative information. (606-10-50-9)				
5. An entity shall provide an explanation of the significant changes in the contract asset and contract liability balances during the reporting period. The explanation should include qualitative and quantitative information. Examples of significant changes include any of the following: (606-10-50-10)				
a. Changes due to business combinations				
b. Cumulative catch-up adjustments to revenue that affect the corresponding contract asset or contract liability, including adjustments arising from a change in the measure of progress, the estimate of the transaction price (including any constrained amounts) or a contract modification				
c. Impairment of a contract asset				
d. A change in the timeframe for a right to consideration to become unconditional (i.e., a contract asset reclassified to a receivable)				
e. A change in the timeframe for a performance obligation to be satisfied (i.e., the recognition of revenue arising from a contract liability)				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
<i>Performance obligations</i>				
6. An entity shall disclose information about its performance obligations in contracts with customers, including a description of all of the following: (606-10-15-12)				
a. When the entity typically satisfies its performance obligations (e.g., upon shipment, upon delivery, as a bill and hold arrangement, as services are rendered, upon completion of service)				
b. The significant payment terms (e.g., when payment typically is due, whether the contract has a significant financing component, whether the consideration amount is variable, whether such estimate is constrained in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13)				
c. The nature of the goods or services that the entity has promised to transfer, highlighting any performance obligations to arrange for another party to transfer goods or services (i.e., if the entity is acting as an agent)				
d. Obligations for returns, refunds and other similar obligations				
e. Types of warranties and related obligations				
7. An entity shall disclose the aggregate amount of the transaction price allocated to remaining performance obligations as of the end of the current reporting period. (606-10-50-13(a))				
8. An entity shall explain when the entity expects to recognize the amount disclosed in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-13(a) either on a quantitative basis using the time bands that would be most appropriate for the duration of the remaining performance obligations or by using qualitative information. (606-10-50-13(b))				
9. As a practical expedient, an entity need not disclose the information in paragraphs 606-10-50-13(a) and 50-13(b) for a performance obligation if either of the following conditions are met: (606-10-50-14)				
a. The performance obligation is part of a contract that has an original expected duration of less than one year				
b. The entity recognizes revenue from the satisfaction of the performance obligation in accordance with paragraph 606-10-55-18				
10. An entity shall explain qualitatively whether it is applying the practical expedient in paragraph 606-10-50-14 and whether any consideration from contracts with customers is not included in the transaction price and, therefore, not included in the information disclosed in accordance with paragraph 606-10-50-13. For example, an estimate of the transaction price would not include any estimated amounts of variable consideration that are constrained (see paragraphs 606-10-32-11 through 32-13). (606-10-50-15)				
<i>Significant judgments in the application of the guidance in ASC 606</i>				
11. An entity shall disclose the judgments, and changes in the judgments, made in applying the guidance in ASC 606 that significantly affect the determination of the amount and timing of revenue from contracts with customers. In particular, an entity shall explain the judgments, and changes in the judgments, used in determining both of the following: (606-10-50-17)				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
a. The timing of satisfaction of performance obligations (see paragraphs 606-10-50-18 through 50-19)				
b. The transaction price and the amounts allocated to performance obligations (see paragraph 606-10-50-20)				
12. For performance obligations that an entity satisfies over time, an entity shall disclose both of the following: (606-10-50-18)				
a. The methods used to recognize revenue (e.g., a description of the output methods or input methods used and how these methods are applied)				
b. An explanation of why the methods used are a faithful depiction of the transfer of goods or services				
13. For performance obligations satisfied at a point in time, an entity shall disclose the significant judgments made in evaluating when the customer obtains control of promised goods or services. (606-10-50-19)				
14. An entity shall disclose information about the methods, inputs and assumptions used for all of the following: (606-10-50-20)				
a. Determining the transaction price, which includes, but is not limited to, estimating variable consideration, adjusting the consideration for the effects of the time value of money and measuring noncash consideration				
b. Assessing whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained				
c. Allocating the transaction price, including estimating standalone selling prices of promised goods or services and allocating discounts and variable consideration to a specific part of the contract (if applicable)				
d. Measuring obligations for returns, refunds and other similar obligations				
<i>Costs to obtain or fulfill a contract</i>				
15. An entity shall describe both of the following: (340-40-50-2)				
a. The judgments made in determining the amount of the costs incurred to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer (in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5)				
b. The method it uses to determine the amortization for each reporting period				
16. An entity shall disclose all of the following: (340-40-50-3)				
a. The closing balances of assets recognized from the costs incurred to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer (in accordance with paragraph 340-40-25-1 or 340-40-25-5) by main category of asset (for example, costs to obtain contracts with customers, pre-contract costs, setup costs)				
b. The amount of amortization and any impairment losses recognized in the reporting period				
<i>Practical expedients</i>				
17. If an entity uses either the practical expedient in paragraph 606-10-32-18 (about the existence of a significant financing component) or paragraph 340-40-25-4 (about the incremental costs of obtaining a contract), the entity shall disclose that fact. (606-10-50-22 and 340-40-50-5)				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
<i>Accounting policies</i>				
18. An entity may make an accounting policy election to exclude from the measurement of the transaction price all taxes assessed by a governmental authority that are both imposed on and concurrent with a specific revenue-producing transaction and collected by the entity from a customer (e.g., sales, use, value added, some excise taxes). An entity that makes this election shall comply with the disclosure requirements in paragraphs 235-10-50-1 through 50-6. (606-10-32-2A)				
19. If shipping and handling activities are performed after a customer obtains control of the good, then the entity may elect to account for shipping and handling as activities to fulfill the promise to transfer the good. An entity that makes this election shall comply with the disclosure requirements in paragraphs 235-10-50-1 through 50-6. (606-10-25-18B)				
<i>Effective date and transition disclosures</i>				
20. An entity that applies the standard retrospectively to each prior reporting period (i.e., using the full retrospective approach) is required to make the disclosures required by paragraphs 250-10-50-1 through 50-2 in the fiscal period in which the standard is adopted: (Note: An entity need not disclose the effect of the changes on the current period, which otherwise would be required by paragraph 250-10-50-1(b)(2)). (606-10-65-1(e))				
a. The nature of and reason for the change in accounting principle, including an explanation of why the newly adopted accounting principle is preferable				
b. The method of applying the change, and:				
i. A description of the prior-period information that has been retrospectively adjusted, if any				
ii. The effect of the change on income from continuing operations, net income (or other appropriate captions of changes in the applicable net assets or performance indicator), any other affected financial statement line item, and any affected per-share amounts for the current period and any prior periods retrospectively adjusted. Presentation of the effect on financial statement subtotals and totals other than income from continuing operations and net income (or other appropriate captions of changes in the applicable net assets or performance indicator) is not required. (Note: An entity need not disclose the effect of the changes on the current period, which otherwise would be required by this paragraph in ASC 250).				
iii. The cumulative effect of the change on retained earnings or other components of equity or net assets in the statement of financial position as of the beginning of the earliest period presented				
iv. If retrospective application to all prior periods is impracticable, disclose the reasons and a description of the alternative method used to report the change (see paragraphs 250-10-45-5 through 45-7).				
c. If indirect effects of a change in accounting principle are recognized:				
i. A description of the indirect effects of a change in accounting principle, including the amounts that have been recognized in the current period, and the related per-share amounts, if applicable				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
ii. Unless impracticable, the amount of the total recognized indirect effects of the accounting change and the related per-share amounts, if applicable, that are attributable to each prior period presented				
d. If a change in accounting principle has no material effect in the period of change but is reasonably certain to have a material effect in later periods, the disclosures specified in item 20.a. above shall be provided whenever the financial statements of the period of change are presented. (250-10-50-1)				
e. The SEC staff has stated that while labeling financial statement columns “as adjusted” for a change in accounting principle is not explicitly required, it is considered a best practice to facilitate as much transparency as possible. (SP – AICPA/SEC Regulations Committee, Current Practice Issues, dated 9/26/06, Discussion Document D)				
f. The transition practical expedients that have been used: (606-10-65-1(g)(1))				
i. Disclose that the entity has not restated completed contracts that begin and end in the same annual reporting period. (606-10-65-1(f)(1))				
ii. Disclose the entity’s use of the transaction price at the date the contract was completed rather than estimating variable consideration amounts in the comparative reporting periods. (606-10-65-1(f)(2))				
iii. Disclose that the entity has not disclosed the amount of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations and an explanation of when the entity expects to recognize that amount as revenue for the reporting periods presented prior to the initial date of application. (606-10-65-1(f)(3))				
iv. For contracts that were modified before the beginning of the earliest reporting period presented in accordance with the standard, disclose that the entity has not retrospectively restated the contract for those modifications in accordance with the contract modification guidance in paragraphs 606-10-25-12 and 25-13. Disclose that the entity instead reflected the aggregate effect of all modifications when identifying the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations, determining the transaction price and allocating the transaction price. (606-10-65-1(f)(4))				
g. To the extent reasonably possible, a qualitative assessment of the estimated effect of applying each of the expedients listed in item 20.f. (606-10-65-1(g)(2))				
21. An entity that applies the standard retrospectively with the cumulative effect recognized at the date of initial application (i.e., using a modified retrospective approach) is required to disclose the following in the fiscal period in which the standard is adopted: (606-10-65-1(h))				
a. Whether the entity has applied the standard to all contracts or only to contracts that are not completed at the date of initial application.				
b. The transition practical expedients that have been used: (606-10-65-1(g)(1))				
i. For contracts that were modified before the beginning of the earliest reporting period presented in accordance with the standard disclose that the entity has not retrospectively restated the contract for those modifications in accordance with the contract modification guidance in paragraphs 606-10-25-12 and 25-13. Disclose that the entity instead reflected the aggregate effect of all modifications when identifying the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations, determining the transaction price and allocating the transaction price. (606-10-65-1(h), 606-10-65-1(f)(4))				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
c. To the extent reasonably possible, a qualitative assessment of the estimated effect of applying the expedients listed in item 21.b. (606-10-65-1(h), 606-10-65-1(g)(2))				
d. The amount by which each financial statement line item is affected in the current reporting period by the standard as compared with the guidance that was in effect before the change (606-10-65-1(i)(1))				
e. An explanation of the reasons for significant changes identified in item 21.d. (606-10-65-1(i)(2))				

E Disclosure checklist – Nonpublic entities

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
<p>Note: In May 2014, the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update (ASU) 2014-09, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)</i> that will supersede virtually all recognition guidance in US GAAP. For nonpublic entities, it is effective for annual periods beginning after 15 December 2018, and interim periods beginning after 15 December 2019. Early adoption is permitted for all entities for annual and interim periods beginning after 15 December 2016.</p> <p>The FASB issued the following ASUs to amend the new guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASU 2015-14, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606), Deferral of the Effective Date</i> ASU 2016-08, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606), Principal versus Agent Considerations (Reporting Revenue Gross versus Net)</i> ASU 2016-10, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606), Identifying Performance Obligations and Licensing</i> ASU 2016-12, <i>Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606), Narrow-Scope Improvements and Practical Expedients</i> <p>The standard defines a public entity as one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A public business entity ▶ A not-for-profit entity that has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market ▶ An employee benefit plan that files or furnishes financial statements with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) <p>ASU 2013-12, <i>Definition of a Public Business Entity</i>, states that a business entity is a public business entity if it meets any of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ “(a) It is required by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to file or furnish financial statements, or does file or furnish financial statements (including voluntary filers), with the SEC (including other entities whose financial statements or financial information are required to be or are included in a filing). ▶ (b) It is required by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the Act), as amended, or rules or regulations promulgated under the Act, to file or furnish financial statements with a regulatory agency other than the SEC. ▶ (c) It is required to file or furnish financial statements with a foreign or domestic regulatory agency in preparation for the sale of or for purposes of issuing securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer. ▶ (d) It has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market. ▶ (e) It has one or more securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer, and it is required by law, contract, or regulation to prepare U.S. GAAP financial statements (including footnotes) and make them publicly available on a periodic basis (for example, interim or annual periods). An entity must meet both of these conditions to meet this criterion.” 				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
An entity that does not meet any of the above is considered a nonpublic entity for purposes of this standard.				
<i>Contracts with customers</i>				
1. An entity shall disclose all of the following amounts for the reporting period unless those amounts are presented separately in the statement of comprehensive income (statement of activities) in accordance with other disclosure requirements: (606-10-50-4)				
a. Revenue recognized from contracts with customers, which the entity shall disclose separately from its other sources of revenue				
b. Any impairment losses recognized (in accordance with ASC 310 on receivables) on any receivables or contract assets arising from an entity's contracts with customers, which the entity shall disclose separately from impairment losses on other contracts				
<i>Disaggregation of revenue</i>				
2. An entity shall disclose, at a minimum, the following related to disaggregated revenue: (660-10-50-7)				
a. Revenue disaggregated according to the timing of transfer of goods or services (e.g., revenue from goods or services transferred to customers at a point in time and revenue from goods or services transferred to customers over time)				
b. Qualitative information about how economic factors (e.g., type of customer, geographical information of customers, types of contract) affect the nature, amount, timing and uncertainty of revenue and cash flows				
<i>Contract balances</i>				
3. An entity shall disclose, at a minimum, the opening and closing balances of receivables, contract assets and contract liabilities from contracts with customers, if not otherwise separately presented or disclosed. (606-10-50-11)				
<i>Performance obligations</i>				
4. An entity shall disclose information about its performance obligations in contracts with customers, including a description of all of the following: (606-10-50-12)				
a. When the entity typically satisfies its performance obligations (e.g., upon shipment, upon delivery, as a bill and hold arrangement, as services are rendered, upon completion of service)				
b. The significant payment terms (e.g., when payment typically is due, whether the contract has a significant financing component, whether the consideration amount is variable, whether such estimate is constrained in accordance with paragraph 606-10-32-11 through 32-13)				
c. The nature of the goods or services that the entity has promised to transfer, highlighting any performance obligations to arrange for another party to transfer goods or services (i.e., if the entity is acting as an agent)				
d. Obligations for returns, refunds and other similar obligations				
e. Types of warranties and related obligations				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
<i>Significant judgments in the application of the guidance in ASC 606</i>				
5. An entity shall disclose the judgments, and changes in the judgments, made in applying the guidance in ASC 606 that significantly affect the determination of the amount and timing of revenue from contracts with customers. In particular, a nonpublic entity shall, at a minimum, disclose the following: (606-10-50-17)				
a. For performance obligations that an entity satisfies over time, the methods used to recognize revenue (e.g., a description of the output methods or input methods used and how these methods are applied) (606-10-50-18a)				
b. Information about the methods, inputs and assumptions used for assessing whether an estimate of variable consideration is constrained (606-10-50-20(b))				
<i>Accounting policies</i>				
6. An entity may make an accounting policy election to exclude from the measurement of the transaction price all taxes assessed by a governmental authority that are both imposed on and concurrent with a specific revenue-producing transaction and collected by the entity from a customer (for example, sales, use, value added and some excise taxes). An entity that makes this election shall comply with the disclosure requirements in paragraphs 235-10-50-1 through 50-6. (606-10-32-2A)				
7. If shipping and handling activities are performed after a customer obtains control of the good, then the entity may elect to account for shipping and handling as activities to fulfill the promise to transfer the good. An entity that makes this election shall comply with the disclosure requirements in paragraphs 235-10-50-1 through 50-6. (606-10-25-18B)				
<i>Effective date and transition disclosures</i>				
8. An entity that applies the standard retrospectively to each prior reporting period (i.e., using the full retrospective approach), is required to make the disclosures required by paragraphs 250-10-50-1 through 50-2 in the fiscal period in which the standard is adopted: (Note: An entity need not disclose the effect of the changes on the current period, which otherwise would be required by paragraph 250-10-50-1(b)(2)). (606 10-65-1(e))				
a. The nature of and reason for the change in accounting principle, including an explanation of why the newly adopted accounting principle is preferable				
b. The method of applying the change, and:				
i. A description of the prior-period information that has been retrospectively adjusted, if any				
ii. The effect of the change on income from continuing operations, net income (or other appropriate captions of changes in the applicable net assets or performance indicator), any other affected financial statement line item, and any affected per-share amounts for the current period and any prior periods retrospectively adjusted. Presentation of the effect on financial statement subtotals and totals other than income from continuing operations and net income (or other appropriate captions of changes in the applicable net assets or performance indicator) is not required. (Note: An entity need not disclose the effect of the changes on the current period, which otherwise would be required by this paragraph.)				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
iii. The cumulative effect of the change on retained earnings or other components of equity or net assets in the statement of financial position as of the beginning of the earliest period presented				
iv. If retrospective application to all prior periods is impracticable, disclose the reasons and a description of the alternative method used to report the change (see paragraphs 250-10-45-5 through 45-7).				
c. If indirect effects of a change in accounting principle are recognized:				
i. A description of the indirect effects of a change in accounting principle, including the amounts that have been recognized in the current period, and the related per-share amounts, if applicable				
ii. Unless impracticable, the amount of the total recognized indirect effects of the accounting change and the related per-share amounts, if applicable, that are attributable to each prior period presented				
d. If a change in accounting principle has no material effect in the period of change but is reasonably certain to have a material effect in later periods, the disclosures specified in item 8.a. above shall be provided whenever the financial statements of the period of change are presented. (250-10-50-1)				
e. The SEC staff has stated that while labeling financial statement columns “as adjusted” for a change in accounting principle is not explicitly required, it is considered a best practice to facilitate as much transparency as possible. (SP – AICPA/SEC Regulations Committee, Current Practice Issues, dated 9/26/06, Discussion Document D)				
f. The transition practical expedients that have been used: (606-10-65-1(g)(1))				
i. Disclose that the entity has not restated completed contracts that begin and end in the same annual reporting period. (606-10-65-1(f)(1))				
ii. Disclose the entity’s use of the transaction price at the date the contract was completed rather than estimating variable consideration amounts in the comparative reporting periods. (606-10-65-1(f)(2))				
iii. Disclose that the entity has not disclosed the amount of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations and an explanation of when the entity expects to recognize that amount as revenue for the reporting periods presented prior to the initial date of application. (606-10-65-1(f)(3))				
iv. For contracts that were modified before the beginning of the earliest reporting period presented in accordance with the standard, disclose that the entity has not retrospectively restated the contract for those modifications in accordance with the contract modification guidance in paragraphs 606-10-25-12 and 25-13. Disclose that the entity instead reflected the aggregate effect of all modifications when identifying the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations, determining the transaction price, and allocating the transaction price. (606-10-65-1(f)(4))				
g. To the extent reasonably possible, a qualitative assessment of the estimated effect of applying each of the transition practical expedients listed in item 8.f. (606-10-65-1(g)(2))				

	Yes	No	N/A	Reference/explanation
9. An entity that applies the standard retrospectively with the cumulative effect recognized at the date of initial application (i.e., using a modified retrospective approach), is required to disclose the following in the fiscal period in which the standard is adopted: (606-10-65-1(h))				
a. Whether the entity has applied the standard to all contracts or only to contracts that are not completed at the date of initial application.				
b. The transition practical expedients that have been used:				
i. For contracts that were modified before the beginning of the earliest reporting period presented in accordance with the standard disclose that the entity has not retrospectively restated the contract for those modifications in accordance with the contract modification guidance in paragraphs 606-10-25-12 and 25-13. Disclose that the entity instead reflected the aggregate effect of all modifications when identifying the satisfied and unsatisfied performance obligations, determining the transaction price, and allocating the transaction price (606-10-65-1(h), 606-10-65-1(f)(4))				
c. To the extent reasonably possible, a qualitative assessment of the estimated effect of applying the expedients listed in item 9.b. (606-10-65-1(h), 606-10-65-1(g)(2))				
d. The amount by which each financial statement line item is affected in the current reporting period by the standard as compared with the guidance that was in effect before the change (606-10-65-1(i)(1))				
e. An explanation of the reasons for significant changes identified in item 9.d. (606-10-65-1(i)(2))				

F List of examples included in ASC 606 and references in this publication

<i>Identifying the Contract</i>		
Example 1	Collectibility of the Consideration	
	Case A – Collectibility Is Not Probable	Not included
	Case B – Credit Risk Is Mitigated	Section 3.1.5
	Case C – Credit Risk Is Not Mitigated	Section 3.1.5
	Case D – Advance Payment	Not included
Example 2	Consideration Is Not the Stated Price – Implicit Price Concession	Section 5.2.1.1
Example 3	Implicit Price Concession	Not included
Example 4	Reassessing the Criteria for Identifying a Contract	Not included
<i>Contract Modifications</i>		
Example 5	Modification of a Contract for Goods	
	Case A – Additional Products for a Price That Reflects the Standalone Selling Price	Section 3.4.1
	Case B – Additional Products for a Price That Does Not Reflect the Standalone Selling Price	Section 3.4.2
Example 6	Change in the Transaction Price after a Contract Modification	Not included
Example 7	Modification of a Services Contract	Not included
Example 8	Modification Resulting in a Cumulative Catch-Up Adjustment to Revenue	Section 3.4.2
Example 9	Unapproved Change in Scope and Price	Section 3.4
<i>Identifying Performance Obligations</i>		
Example 10	Goods and Services Are Not Distinct	
	Case A – Significant Integration Service	Section 4.2.3
	Case B – Significant Integration Service	Section 4.2.3
	Case C – Combined Item	Section 4.2.3
Example 11	Determining Whether Goods or Services Are Distinct	
	Case A – Distinct Goods or Services	Section 4.2.3
	Case B – Significant Customization	Section 4.2.3
	Case C – Promises Are Separately Identifiable (Installation)	Section 4.2.3
	Case D – Promises Are Separately Identifiable (Contractual Restrictions)	Section 4.2.3
	Case E – Promises Are Separately Identifiable (Consumables)	Section 4.2.3
Example 12	Explicit and Implicit Promises in a Contract	
	Case A – Explicit Promise of Service	Section 4.1
	Case B – Implicit Promise of Service	Section 4.1
	Case C – Services are Not a Promised Service	Section 4.1
Example 12A	Series of Distinct Goods or Services	Section 4.2.3
<i>Performance Obligations Satisfied Over Time</i>		
Example 13	Customer Simultaneously Receives and Consumes the Benefits	Section 7.1.1
Example 14	Assessing Alternative Use and Right to Payment	Section 7.1.3

Example 15	Asset Has No Alternative Use to the Entity	Section 7.1.3
Example 16	Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date	Section 7.1.3
Example 17	Assessing Whether a Performance Obligation Is Satisfied at a Point in Time or Over Time	
	Case A – Entity Does Not Have an Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date	Section 7.1.3
	Case B – Entity Has an Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date	Section 7.1.3
	Case C – Entity Has an Enforceable Right to Payment for Performance Completed to Date	Section 7.1.3
<i>Measuring Progress toward Complete Satisfaction of a Performance Obligation</i>		
Example 18	Measuring Progress When Making Goods or Services Available	Section 7.1.4.3
Example 19	Uninstalled Materials	Section 7.1.4.2
<i>Variable Consideration</i>		
Example 20	Penalty Gives Rise to Variable Consideration	Not included
Example 21	Estimating Variable Consideration	Not included
<i>Constraining Estimates of Variable Consideration</i>		
Example 22	Right of Return	Section 5.4.1
Example 23	Price Concessions	
	Case A – Estimate of Variable Consideration Is Not Constrained	Section 5.2.3
	Case B – Estimate of Variable Consideration Is Constrained	Section 5.2.3
Example 24	Volume Discount Incentive	Section 5.2.1
Example 25	Management Fees Subject to the Constraint	Section 5.2.3
<i>The Existence of a Significant Financing Component in the Contract</i>		
Example 26	Significant Financing Component and Right of Return	Section 5.5.1
Example 27	Withheld Payments on a Long-Term Contract	Section 5.5.1
Example 28	Determining the Discount Rate	
	Case A – Contractual Discount Rate Reflects the Rate in a Separate Financing Transaction	Section 5.5.1
	Case B – Contractual Discount Rate Does Not Reflect the Rate in a Separate Financing Transaction	Section 5.5.1
Example 29	Advance Payment and Assessment of Discount Rate	Section 5.5.1
Example 30	Advance Payment	Section 5.5.1
<i>Noncash Consideration</i>		
Example 31	Entitlement to Noncash Consideration	Section 5.6
<i>Consideration Payable to a Customer</i>		
Example 32	Consideration Payable to a Customer	Section 5.7.3
<i>Allocating the Transaction Price to Performance Obligations</i>		
Example 33	Allocation Methodology	Section 6.1.2
Example 34	Allocating a Discount	
	Case A – Allocating a Discount to One or More Performance Obligations	Section 6.4
	Case B – Residual Approach Is Appropriate	Section 6.4
	Case C – Residual Approach Is Inappropriate	Section 6.4
Example 35	Allocation of Variable Consideration	
	Case A – Variable Consideration Allocated Entirely to One Performance Obligation	Sections 6.3 & 8.5
	Case B – Variable Consideration Allocated On the Basis of Standalone Selling Prices	Sections 6.3 & 8.5
<i>Contract Costs</i>		
Example 36	Incremental Costs of Obtaining a Contract (refers to ASC 340-40 Example 1)	Section 9.3.1
Example 37	Costs That Give Rise to an Asset (refers to ASC 340-40 Example 2)	Section 9.3.2

<i>Presentation</i>		
Example 38	Contract Liability and Receivable	
	Case A – Cancellable Contract	Section 10.1
	Case B – Noncancellable Contract	Section 10.1
Example 39	Contract Asset Recognized for the Entity's Performance	Section 10.1
Example 40	Receivable Recognized for the Entity's Performance	Not included
<i>Disclosure</i>		
Example 41	Disaggregation of Revenue – Quantitative Disclosure	Section 10.4.1
Example 42	Disclosure of the Transaction Price Allocated to the Remaining Performance Obligations	Section 10.4.1
Example 43	Disclosure of the Transaction Price Allocated to the Remaining Performance Obligations – Qualitative Disclosure	Section 10.4.1
<i>Warranties</i>		
Example 44	Warranties	Not included
<i>Principal versus Agent Considerations</i>		
Example 45	Arranging for the Provision of Goods or Services (Entity is an Agent)	Not included
Example 46	Promise to Provide Goods or Services (Entity is a Principal)	Not included
Example 46A	Promise to Provide Goods or Services (Entity Is a Principal)	Section 4.4.4
Example 47	Promise to Provide Goods or Services (Entity is a Principal)	Section 4.4.4
Example 48	Arranging for the Provision of Goods or Services (Entity is an Agent)	Section 4.4.4
Example 48A	Entity Is a Principal and an Agent in the Same Contract	Section 4.4.4
<i>Customer Options for Additional Goods or Services</i>		
Example 49	Option That Provides the Customer with a Material Right (Discount Voucher)	Section 4.6
Example 50	Option That Does Not Provide the Customer with a Material Right (Additional Goods or Services)	Not included
Example 51	Option that Provides the Customer with a Material Right (Renewal Option)	Not included
Example 52	Customer Loyalty Program	Section 7.9
<i>Nonrefundable Upfront Fees</i>		
Example 53	Nonrefundable Upfront Fee	Not included
<i>Licensing</i>		
Example 54	Right to Use Intellectual Property	Section 8.2.1
Example 55	License of Intellectual Property	Not included
Example 56	Identifying a Distinct License	
	Case A – License is Not Distinct	Section 8.2.4
	Case B – License is Distinct	Section 8.1.1
Example 57	Franchise Rights	Not included
Example 58	Access to Intellectual Property	Section 8.2.2
Example 59	Right to Use Intellectual Property	
	Case A – Initial License	Section 8.4
	Case B – Renewal of the License	Section 8.4
Example 60	Sales-based Royalty Promised in Exchange for a License of Intellectual Property and Other Goods and Services	Section 8.5
Example 61	Access to Intellectual Property	Section 8.5
Example 61A	Right to Use Intellectual Property	
	Case A – License Is the Only Promise in the Contract	Not included
	Case B – Contract Includes Two Promises	Not included
Example 61B	Distinguishing Multiple Licenses from Attributes of a Single License	Section 8.1.3

<i>Repurchase Arrangements</i>		
Example 62	Repurchase Agreements	
	Case A – Call Option: Financing	Section 7.3.1
	Case B – Put Option: Lease	Section 7.3.2
<i>Bill-and-Hold Arrangements</i>		
Example 63	Bill-and-Hold Arrangement	Section 7.5

G TRG discussions and references in this publication

Date of TRG Meeting	Agenda Paper No.	Topic Discussed	FRD Section
18 July 2014	1	Gross versus Net Revenue	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Section 4.4
	2	Gross versus Net Revenue: Amounts Billed to Customers	Section 4.4.4
	3	Sales-Based and Usage-Based Royalties in Contracts with Licenses and Goods or Services Other than Licenses	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Section 8.5
	4	Impairment Testing of Capitalized Contract Costs	TRG discussions led to proposed FASB technical correction discussed in Section 9.3.4
31 October 2014	5	July 2014 Meeting – Summary of Issues Discussed and Next Steps	Not applicable
	6	Customer Options for Additional Goods and Services and Nonrefundable Upfront Fees	Section 4.6
	7	Presentation of a Contract as a Contract Asset or a Contract Liability	Section 10.1
	8	Determining the Nature of a License of Intellectual Property	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Chapter 8
	9	Distinct in the Context of the Contract	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Section 4.2.1.2
	10	Contract Enforceability and Termination Clauses	Section 3.2
26 January 2015	11	October 2014 Meeting – Summary of Issues Discussed and Next Steps	Not applicable
	12	Identifying Promised Goods or Services	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Section 4.1
	13	Collectibility	Section 3.1.5
	14	Variable Consideration	Section 5.2.3
	15	Noncash Consideration	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Section 5.6
	16	Stand-Ready Obligations	Sections 4.1.1 & 7.1.4.3
	17	Islamic Finance Transactions	Not included
	18	Material Right	Questions in this paper were brought forward to agenda paper no. 37 for TRG discussion
	19	Consideration Payable to a Customer	Questions in this paper were brought forward to agenda paper no. 28 for TRG discussion

Date of TRG Meeting	Agenda Paper No.	Topic Discussed	FRD Section
	20	Significant Financing Component	Questions in this paper were brought forward to agenda paper no. 30 for TRG discussion
	21	Licenses Research Update	No TRG discussion – update only
	22	Performance Obligations Research Update	No TRG discussion – update only
	23	Costs to Obtain a Contract	Sections 9.3 & 9.3.1 & 9.3.3
	24	Contract Modifications	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Section 1.3
30 March 2015	25	January 2015 Meeting – Summary of Issues Discussed and Next Steps	Not applicable
	26	Contributions	Section 2.4
	27	Series of Distinct Goods or Services	Section 4.2.2
	28	Consideration Payable to a Customer	Sections 5.7 & 5.7.2
	29	Warranties	Section 9.1.1
	30	Significant Financing Component	Section 5.5.1
	31	Variable Discounts	Section 6.4
	32	Exercise of Material Right	Sections 4.6 & 5.8
13 July 2015	33	Partially Satisfied Performance Obligations	Sections 7.1.4.3 & 9.3.2
	34	March 2015 Meeting – Summary of Issues Discussed and Next Steps	Not applicable
	35	Accounting for Restocking Fees and Related Costs	Section 5.4.1
	36	Credit Cards	Section 2.4
	37	Consideration Payable to a Customer	Sections 5.7 & 5.7.2 & 5.7.3
	38	Portfolio Practical Expedient and Application of Variable Consideration Constraint	Sections 5.2.2 & 5.2.3 & 5.4.1
	39	Application of the Series Provision and Allocation of Variable Consideration	Sections 4.2.2 & 5.2.1 & 6.3
	40	Practical Expedient for Measuring Progress toward Complete Satisfaction of a Performance Obligation	Section 7.1.4.1 & 7.1.4.3
	41	Measuring Progress when Multiple Goods or Services are Included in a Single Performance Obligation	Section 7.1.4.3
	42	Completed Contracts at Transition	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Section 1.3
	43	Determining When Control of a Commodity Transfers	Not included

Date of TRG Meeting	Agenda Paper No.	Topic Discussed	FRD Section
9 November 2015	44	July 2015 Meeting – Summary of Issues Discussed and Next Steps	Section 5.7.3
	45	Licenses – Specific Application Issues About Restrictions and Renewals	TRG discussions led to amended FASB guidance discussed in Sections 8.1.3 & 8.4
	46	Pre-Production Activities	Sections 4.1.1 & 9.3.2
	47	Whether Fixed Odds Wagering Contracts are Included or Excluded from the Scope of Topic 606	Section 2.4
	48	Customer Options for Additional Goods and Services	Sections 3.2 & 4.1.1 & 4.6
	49	November 2015 Meeting – Summary of Issues Discussed and Next Steps	Not applicable
18 April 2016	50	Scoping Considerations for Incentive-based Capital Allocations	Not included
	51	Contract Asset Treatment in Contract Modifications	Section 10.1
	52	Scoping Considerations for Financial Institutions	Section 2.4
	53	Evaluating How Control Transfers Over Time	Section 7.1.4.3
	54	Class of Customer	Section 4.6 & 10.4.2

H Summary of differences from IFRS

The following comparison of the US GAAP and IFRS standards was issued by the FASB and included as an appendix to ASU 2016-12. It is reproduced below in its entirety.

Comparison of Topic 606 and IFRS 15

- A1. Topic 606, together with the IASB's IFRS 15, is a joint effort by the FASB and the IASB to improve financial reporting by creating common revenue recognition guidance for GAAP and IFRS that can be applied consistently across various transactions, industries, and capital markets. In Topic 606 and IFRS 15, the Boards achieved their goal of reaching the same conclusions on requirements for the accounting for revenue from contracts with customers. However, there are some minor differences, as follows:
- a. Collectibility threshold – The Boards included an explicit collectibility threshold as one of the criteria that a contract must meet before an entity can recognize revenue. For a contract to meet that criterion, an entity must conclude that it is probable that it will collect the consideration to which it will be entitled in exchange for the goods or services that will be transferred to the customer. In setting the threshold, the Boards acknowledged that the term *probable* has different meanings in GAAP and IFRS. However, the Boards decided to set the threshold at a level that is consistent with previous revenue recognition practices and requirements in GAAP and IFRS (see paragraphs BC42-BC46 of Update 2014-09).
 - b. Interim disclosure requirements – The Boards noted that the general guidance in their respective interim reporting guidance (Topic 270, Interim Reporting, and IAS 34, *Interim Financial Reporting*) would apply to revenue from contracts with customers. However, the IASB decided to also amend IAS 34 to specifically require the disclosure of disaggregated information of revenue from contracts with customers in interim financial statements. The FASB similarly decided to amend Topic 270 to require a public entity to disclose disaggregated revenue information in interim financial statements. The FASB also decided to require that information about both contract balances and remaining performance obligations be disclosed on an interim basis (see paragraphs BC358-BC361 of Update 2014-09).
 - c. Early application and effective date – The effective date for IFRS 15 is for annual reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2018; whereas, Topic 606 has an effective date for public entities for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2017. Early application is permitted for IFRS 15. Topic 606 also permits early application, but only as of annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2016.
 - d. Impairment loss reversal – Consistent with other areas of GAAP, Topic 340 does not allow an entity to reverse an impairment on an asset that is recognized in accordance with the guidance on costs to obtain or fulfill a contract. In contrast, IFRS 15 requires an entity to reverse an impairment, which is consistent with the requirements on the impairment of assets within the scope of IAS 36, *Impairment of Assets* (see paragraphs BC309-BC311 of Update 2014-09).
 - e. Nonpublic entity requirements – Topic 606 applies to nonpublic entities and includes some specific relief for nonpublic entities relating to disclosure, transition, and effective date. No such guidance is included in IFRS 15. IFRS for small- and medium- sized entities is available for entities that do not have public accountability (see paragraphs BC504-BC521 of Update 2014-09).

- f. Determining the nature of an entity's promise in granting a license of intellectual property – Topic 606 and IFRS 15 require an entity to assess whether the nature of its promise in granting a license is a right to use or a right to access the entity's intellectual property, which results in point in time or over time revenue recognition, respectively. Under Topic 606, an entity makes this determination by classifying the intellectual property underlying the license as functional or symbolic on the basis of whether the intellectual property has significant standalone functionality. A license to functional intellectual property is considered a right to use, while a license to symbolic intellectual property is considered a right to access the underlying intellectual property. Under IFRS 15, determining whether the nature of an entity's promise in granting a license is a right to use or a right to access the entity's intellectual property is based on whether the customer can direct the use of and obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from a license at the point in time the license is granted, which occurs if the underlying intellectual property is not significantly affected by the entity's ongoing activities. Although most licenses to symbolic intellectual property would be recognized over time under IFRS 15, revenue may be recognized at a point in time in those cases in which the entity will undertake no activities that significantly affect the ability of the customer to obtain benefit from the intellectual property during the license period. Under Topic 606, revenue for all licenses to symbolic intellectual property is recognized over time (over the license period or the remaining economic life of the intellectual property, if shorter) (see paragraphs BC51-BC65 of Update 2016-10.)
- g. Renewals of licenses of intellectual property – Topic 606 specifies that a renewal or extension of a license is subject to the use and benefit guidance in paragraph 606-10-55-58C, which generally will result in revenue recognition at the beginning of the renewal period. Under IFRS 15, the use and benefit guidance (paragraph B61) does not explicitly refer to renewals. Consequently, in some cases, this may result in the recognition of revenue with respect to the renewal or extension at a later date under Topic 606 than under IFRS 15 (see paragraphs BC48-BC50 in Update 2016-10).
- h. Shipping and handling activities – Topic 606 provides an accounting policy election that permits an entity to account for shipping and handling activities that occur after the customer has obtained control of a good as an activity to fulfill the promise to transfer the good. IFRS 15 does not contain a similar policy election (see paragraphs BC19-BC25 of Update 2016-10).
- i. Noncash consideration – Topic 606 specifies that noncash consideration should be measured at estimated fair value at contract inception and that the variable consideration guidance applies only to variability resulting from reasons other than the form of the noncash consideration. IFRS 15 does not prescribe the measurement date and whether the variable consideration guidance applies only to variability resulting from reasons other than the form of the noncash consideration (see paragraphs BC36-BC43 of this Update).
- j. Presentation of sales (and other similar) taxes – Topic 606 provides an accounting policy election that permits an entity to exclude all sales (and other similar) taxes from the measurement of the transaction price. IFRS 15 does not contain a similar policy election (see paragraphs BC29-BC35 of this Update).
- k. Date of application of the contract modifications practical expedient (modified retrospective transition) – For an entity applying Topic 606 in accordance with paragraph 606-10-65-1(d)(2) (equivalent to paragraph C3(b) of IFRS 15), an entity should apply the practical expedient at the date of initial application. However, an entity applying IFRS 15 in accordance with paragraph C3(b) may apply the practical expedient either (1) at the beginning of the earliest period presented or (2) at the date of initial application (see paragraphs BC44-BC48 of this Update).

- I. Completed contracts at transition – Topic 606 defines *completed contract* as a contract for which all (or substantially all) of the revenue has been recognized under legacy GAAP before the date of initial application. IFRS 15 defines *completed contract* as one for which an entity has transferred all goods or services identified in accordance with existing IFRS. Furthermore, the IASB added a practical expedient to allow an entity applying the full retrospective method of transition (paragraph C3[a] of IFRS 15) not to restate contracts that are completed contracts at the beginning of the earliest period presented. Topic 606 does not contain this practical expedient (see paragraphs BC49-BC53 of this Update).
- A2. Topic 606 and IFRS 15 include different articulations of the guidance in the following areas:
- a. Collectibility criterion – The guidance in Topic 606 explains that the objective of the collectibility threshold is to determine if there is a substantive transaction based on whether the customer has the ability and intention to pay the promised consideration in exchange for goods or services that will be transferred to the customer (rather than assessing collectibility of the consideration promised in the contract for all of the promised goods or services). Additional guidance (including examples) on the application of the collectibility threshold is included in the implementation guidance in Topic 606. This guidance is not included in IFRS 15 (see paragraphs BC9-BC20 of this Update).
 - b. Revenue recognition for contracts with customers that do not meet the criteria for Step 1 – Topic 606 includes an additional criterion for revenue recognition compared with IFRS 15 when a contract does not meet the criteria in paragraph 606-10-25-1. The additional criterion allows an entity to recognize revenue in the amount of consideration received when the entity has transferred control of the goods or services, the entity has stopped transferring goods or services (if applicable) and has no obligation under the contract to transfer additional goods or services, and the consideration received from the customer is nonrefundable (see paragraphs BC21-BC28 of this Update).
 - c. Promised goods or services – The guidance in Topic 606 states that items that are immaterial in the context of the contract are not required to be assessed as promised goods or services for purposes of identifying performance obligations. IFRS 15 does not include a similar provision. Entities applying IFRS should consider the overall objective of IFRS 15 and materiality considerations in assessing promised goods or services and identifying performance obligations (see paragraphs BC8-BC18 of Update 2016-10).
 - d. When to consider the nature of an entity's promise in granting a license – Topic 606 explicitly states that when a single performance obligation includes a license of intellectual property and one or more other goods or services, the entity considers the nature of the combined good or service (including whether the license that is part of the single performance obligation provides the customer with a right to use or a right to access intellectual property in accordance with paragraphs 606-10-55-59 through 55-60 and 606-10-55-62 through 55-64A) in determining whether that combined good or service is satisfied over time or at a point in time and in selecting an appropriate method for measuring progress. Under IFRS 15, the requirement to specifically consider the nature of a license included in a single performance obligation that contains one or more other goods or services is less explicit (see paragraphs BC66-BC69 of Update 2016-10).
 - e. Contractual restrictions in a license and identifying performance obligations – Topic 606 explicitly states that contractual provisions that, explicitly or implicitly, require the entity to transfer control of additional goods or services to the customer (for example, by requiring the entity to transfer control of additional rights of use or rights of access that the customer does not already control) should be distinguished from contractual provisions that, explicitly or implicitly, define the attributes of a single promised license (for example,

restrictions of time, geographical region, or use). Attributes of a promised license define the scope of a customer's right to use or right to access the entity's intellectual property and, therefore, do not define whether the entity satisfies its performance obligation at a point in time or over time. While this guidance is not included in IFRS 15, the basis for conclusions in IFRS 15 explains that the licensing implementation guidance does not override the revenue recognition model, and an entity is expected to apply the general requirements for identifying performance obligations to identify whether a contract includes one or multiple licenses (see paragraphs BC41-BC47 of Update 2016-10).

- A3. Topic 606 and IFRS 15 were structured to be consistent with the style of the Codification and other standards in IFRS, respectively. As a result, the paragraph numbers of Topic 606 and IFRS 15 are not the same. The wording in most of the paragraphs is consistent because Topic 606 and IFRS 15 were issued as common revenue guidance for GAAP and IFRS. However, as noted in paragraphs A1 and A2, the wording in some paragraphs differs. The following table illustrates how the paragraphs of IFRS 15 and Topic 606, and the related illustrative examples, correspond. Paragraphs for which the wording differs are indicated with an asterisk (*):

Main features	Overview and background
N/A	606-10-05-1
IN7	606-10-05-2
IN8	606-10-05-3
IN8	606-10-05-4
IN9	606-10-05-5
N/A	606-10-05-6
Objectives	
1	606-10-10-1
> Meeting the objective	
2	606-10-10-2
3	606-10-10-3
4	606-10-10-4
Scope and scope exceptions	
> Entities	
N/A	606-10-15-1
> Transactions	
5	606-10-15-2
6	606-10-15-3
7	606-10-15-4
8	606-10-15-5
Recognition	
> Identifying the contract	
9	606-10-25-1*
10	606-10-25-2
11	606-10-25-3*
12	606-10-25-4
13	606-10-25-5
14	606-10-25-6
15	606-10-25-7*
16	606-10-25-8
> Combination of contracts	
17	606-10-25-9

> Contract modifications	
18	606-10-25-10
19	606-10-25-11
20	606-10-25-12
21	606-10-25-13
> Identifying performance obligations	
22	606-10-25-14
23	606-10-25-15
>> Promises in contracts with customers	
24	606-10-25-16*
N/A	606-10-25-16A
N/A	606-10-25-16B
25	606-10-25-17*
>> Distinct goods or services	
26	606-10-25-18
N/A	606-10-25-18A
N/A	606-10-25-18B
27	606-10-25-19
28	606-10-25-20
29	606-10-25-21
30	606-10-25-22
> Satisfaction of performance obligations	
31	606-10-25-23
32	606-10-25-24
33	606-10-25-25
34	606-10-25-26
>> Performance obligations satisfied over time	
35	606-10-25-27
36	606-10-25-28
37	606-10-25-29
>> Performance obligations satisfied at a point in time	
38	606-10-25-30
>> Measuring progress toward complete satisfaction of a performance obligation	
39	606-10-25-31
40	606-10-25-32
>>> Methods for measuring progress	
41	606-10-25-33
42	606-10-25-34
43	606-10-25-35
>>> Reasonable measures of progress	
44	606-10-25-36
45	606-10-25-37
Measurement	
46	606-10-32-1
> Determining the transaction price	
47	606-10-32-2
N/A	606-10-32-2A
48	606-10-32-3
49	606-10-32-4

>> Variable consideration	
50	606-10-32-5
51	606-10-32-6
52	606-10-32-7
53	606-10-32-8
54	606-10-32-9
>>> Refund liabilities	
55	606-10-32-10
>>> Constraining estimates of variable consideration	
56	606-10-32-11
57	606-10-32-12
58	606-10-32-13
>>> Reassessment of variable consideration	
59	606-10-32-14
>> The existence of a significant financing component in the contract	
60	606-10-32-15
61	606-10-32-16
62	606-10-32-17
63	606-10-32-18
64	606-10-32-19
65	606-10-32-20
>> Noncash consideration	
66	606-10-32-21*
67	606-10-32-22
68	606-10-32-23*
69	606-10-32-24
>> Consideration payable to a customer	
70	606-10-32-25
71	606-10-32-26
72	606-10-32-27
> Allocating the transaction price to performance obligations	
73	606-10-32-28
74	606-10-32-29
75	606-10-32-30
>> Allocation based on standalone selling prices	
76	606-10-32-31
77	606-10-32-32
78	606-10-32-33
79	606-10-32-34
80	606-10-32-35
>> Allocation of a discount	
81	606-10-32-36
82	606-10-32-37
83	606-10-32-38
>> Allocation of variable consideration	
84	606-10-32-39
85	606-10-32-40
86	606-10-32-41

> Changes in the transaction price	
87	606-10-32-42
88	606-10-32-43
89	606-10-32-44
90	606-10-32-45
Contract costs	
> Overview and background	
N/A	340-40-05-1
N/A	340-40-05-2
> Scope and scope exceptions	
N/A	340-40-15-1
N/A	340-40-15-2
N/A	340-40-15-3
>> Incremental costs of obtaining a contract	
91	340-40-25-1
92	340-40-25-2
93	340-40-25-3
94	340-40-25-4
>> Costs to fulfill a contract	
95	340-40-25-5
96	340-40-25-6
97	340-40-25-7
98	340-40-25-8
>> Amortization and impairment	
99	340-40-35-1
100	340-40-35-2
101	340-40-35-3
102	340-40-35-4
103	340-40-35-5
104	340-40-35-6
Other presentation matters	
105	606-10-45-1
106	606-10-45-2
107	606-10-45-3
108	606-10-45-4
109	606-10-45-5
Disclosure	
110	606-10-50-1
111	606-10-50-2
112	606-10-50-3
> Contracts with customers	
113	606-10-50-4
>> Disaggregation of revenue	
114	606-10-50-5
115	606-10-50-6
N/A	606-10-50-7
>> Contract balances	
116	606-10-50-8
117	606-10-50-9

118	606-10-50-10
N/A	606-10-50-11
>> Performance obligations	
119	606-10-50-12
>> Transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations	
120	606-10-50-13
121	606-10-50-14
122	606-10-50-15
N/A	606-10-50-16
> Significant judgments in the application of the guidance	
123	606-10-50-17
>> Determining the timing of satisfaction of performance obligations	
124	606-10-50-18
125	606-10-50-19
>> Determining the transaction price and the amounts allocated to performance obligations	
126	606-10-50-20
N/A	606-10-50-21
> Assets recognized from the costs to obtain or fulfill a contract with a customer	
N/A	340-40-50-1
127	340-40-50-2
128	340-40-50-3
N/A	340-40-50-4
129	340-40-50-5
N/A	340-40-50-6
> Practical expedients	
129	606-10-50-22
N/A	606-10-50-23
Transition and effective date	
Appendix C	606-10-65-1*
Implementation guidance	
B1	606-10-55-3*
N/A	606-10-55-3A
N/A	606-10-55-3B
>> Performance obligations satisfied over time	
B2	606-10-55-4
>>> Simultaneous receipt and consumption of the benefits of the entity's performance	
B3	606-10-55-5
B4	606-10-55-6
>>> Customer controls the asset as it is created or enhanced	
B5	606-10-55-7
>>> Entity's performance does not create an asset with an alternative use	
B6	606-10-55-8
B7	606-10-55-9
B8	606-10-55-10
>>> Right to payment for performance completed to date	
B9	606-10-55-11
B10	606-10-55-12
B11	606-10-55-13
B12	606-10-55-14

B13	606-10-55-15
> > Methods for measuring progress toward complete satisfaction of a performance obligation	
B14	606-10-55-16
> > > Output methods	
B15	606-10-55-17
B16	606-10-55-18
B17	606-10-55-19
> > > Input methods	
B18	606-10-55-20
B19	606-10-55-21
> > Sale with a right of return	
B20	606-10-55-22
B21	606-10-55-23
B22	606-10-55-24
B23	606-10-55-25
B24	606-10-55-26
B25	606-10-55-27
B26	606-10-55-28
B27	606-10-55-29
> > Warranties	
B28	606-10-55-30
B29	606-10-55-31
B30	606-10-55-32
B31	606-10-55-33
B32	606-10-55-34
B33	606-10-55-35
> > Principal versus agent considerations	
B34	606-10-55-36
B34A	606-10-55-36A
B35	606-10-55-37
B35A	606-10-55-37A
B35B	606-10-55-37B
B36	606-10-55-38
B37	606-10-55-39
B37A	606-10-55-39A
B38	606-10-55-40
> > Customer options for additional goods or services	
B39	606-10-55-41
B40	606-10-55-42
B41	606-10-55-43
B42	606-10-55-44
B43	606-10-55-45
> > Customers' unexercised rights	
B44	606-10-55-46
B45	606-10-55-47
B46	606-10-55-48
B47	606-10-55-49
> > Nonrefundable upfront fees (and some related costs)	
B48	606-10-55-50

B49	606-10-55-51
B50	606-10-55-52
B51	606-10-55-53
>> Licensing	
B52	606-10-55-54*
B53	606-10-55-55
B54	606-10-55-56
B55	606-10-55-57*
B56	606-10-55-58*
B60	606-10-55-58A*
B61	606-10-55-58B*
B61	606-10-55-58C*
>>> Determining the nature of the entity's promise	
N/A	606-10-55-59
B58	606-10-55-60*
B59	N/A
B59A	N/A
N/A	606-10-55-62
N/A	606-10-55-63
N/A	606-10-55-63A
B62	606-10-55-64*
B62	606-10-55-64A*
>>> Sales-based or usage-based royalties	
B63	606-10-55-65
B63A	606-10-55-65A
B63B	606-10-55-65B
>> Repurchase agreements	
B64	606-10-55-66
B65	606-10-55-67
>>> A forward or a call option	
B66	606-10-55-68
B67	606-10-55-69
B68	606-10-55-70
B69	606-10-55-71
>>> A put option	
B70	606-10-55-72
B71	606-10-55-73
B72	606-10-55-74
B73	606-10-55-75
B74	606-10-55-76
B75	606-10-55-77
B76	606-10-55-78
>> Consignment arrangements	
B77	606-10-55-79
B78	606-10-55-80
>> Bill-and-hold arrangements	
B79	606-10-55-81
B80	606-10-55-82
B81	606-10-55-83

B82	606-10-55-84
> > Customer acceptance	
B83	606-10-55-85
B84	606-10-55-86
B85	606-10-55-87
B86	606-10-55-88
> > Disclosure of Disaggregated Revenue	
B87	606-10-55-89
B88	606-10-55-90
B89	606-10-55-91
Illustrations	
IE1	606-10-55-92
N/A	606-10-55-93
Identifying the contract	
IE2	606-10-55-94*
Example 1 – Collectibility of the consideration	
IE3	606-10-55-95
IE4	606-10-55-96*
IE5	606-10-55-97*
IE6	606-10-55-98*
N/A	606-10-55-98A
N/A	606-10-55-98B
N/A	606-10-55-98C
N/A	606-10-55-98D
N/A	606-10-55-98E
N/A	606-10-55-98F
N/A	606-10-55-98G
N/A	606-10-55-98H
N/A	606-10-55-98I
N/A	606-10-55-98J
N/A	606-10-55-98K
N/A	606-10-55-98L
Example 2 – Consideration is not the stated price – implicit price concession	
IE7	606-10-55-99
IE8	606-10-55-100
IE9	606-10-55-101
Example 3 – Implicit price concession	
IE10	606-10-55-102
IE11	606-10-55-103
IE12	606-10-55-104
IE13	606-10-55-105
Example 4 – Reassessing the criteria for identifying a contract	
IE14	606-10-55-106
IE15	606-10-55-107
IE16	606-10-55-108
IE17	606-10-55-109
Contract Modifications	
IE18	606-10-55-110

Example 5 – Modification of a contract for goods	
IE19	606-10-55-111
IE20	606-10-55-112
IE21	606-10-55-113
IE22	606-10-55-114
IE23	606-10-55-115
IE24	606-10-55-116
Example 6 – Change in the transaction price after a contract modification	
IE25	606-10-55-117
IE26	606-10-55-118
IE27	606-10-55-119
IE28	606-10-55-120
IE29	606-10-55-121
IE30	606-10-55-122
IE31	606-10-55-123
IE32	606-10-55-124
Example 7 – Modification of a services contract	
IE33	606-10-55-125
IE34	606-10-55-126
IE35	606-10-55-127
IE36	606-10-55-128
Example 8 – Modification resulting in a cumulative catch-up adjustment to revenue	
IE37	606-10-55-129
IE38	606-10-55-130
IE39	606-10-55-131
IE40	606-10-55-132
IE41	606-10-55-133
Example 9 – Unapproved change in scope and price	
IE42	606-10-55-134
IE43	606-10-55-135
Identifying performance obligations	
IE44	606-10-55-136*
Example 10 – Goods and services are not distinct	
IE45	606-10-55-137
IE46	606-10-55-138
IE47	606-10-55-139
IE48	606-10-55-140
IE48A	606-10-55-140A
IE48B	606-10-55-140B
IE48C	606-10-55-140C
N/A	606-10-55-140D
N/A	606-10-55-140E
N/A	606-10-55-140F
Example 11 – Determining whether goods or services are distinct	
IE49	606-10-55-141
IE50	606-10-55-142
IE51	606-10-55-143*
IE52	606-10-55-144
IE53	606-10-55-145

IE54	606-10-55-146
IE55	606-10-55-147
IE56	606-10-55-148
IE57	606-10-55-149
IE58	606-10-55-150*
IE58A	606-10-55-150A
IE58B	606-10-55-150B
IE58C	606-10-55-150C
IE58D	606-10-55-150D
IE58E	606-10-55-150E
IE58F	606-10-55-150F
IE58G	606-10-55-150G
IE58H	606-10-55-150H
IE58I	606-10-55-150I
IE58J	606-10-55-150J
IE58K	606-10-55-150K
Example 12 – Explicit and implicit promises in a contract	
IE59	606-10-55-151
IE60	606-10-55-152
IE61	606-10-55-153
IE61A	606-10-55-153A
IE62	606-10-55-154
IE63	606-10-55-155*
IE65	606-10-55-157
IE65A	606-10-55-157A
Example 12A – Series of distinct goods or services	
N/A	606-10-55-157B
N/A	606-10-55-157C
N/A	606-10-55-157D
N/A	606-10-55-157E
Performance obligations satisfied over time	
IE66	606-10-55-158
Example 13 – Customer simultaneously receives and consumes the benefits	
IE67	606-10-55-159
IE68	606-10-55-160
Example 14 – Assessing alternative use and right to payment	
IE69	606-10-55-161
IE70	606-10-55-162
IE71	606-10-55-163
IE72	606-10-55-164
Example 15 – Asset has no alternative use to the entity	
IE73	606-10-55-165
IE74	606-10-55-166
IE75	606-10-55-167
IE76	606-10-55-168
Example 16 – Enforceable right to payment for performance completed to date	
IE77	606-10-55-169
IE78	606-10-55-170
IE79	606-10-55-171

IE80	606-10-55-172
Example 17 – Assessing whether a performance obligation is satisfied at a point in time or over time	
IE81	606-10-55-173
IE82	606-10-55-174
IE83	606-10-55-175
IE84	606-10-55-176
IE85	606-10-55-177
IE86	606-10-55-178
IE87	606-10-55-179
IE88	606-10-55-180
IE89	606-10-55-181
IE90	606-10-55-182
Measuring progress toward complete satisfaction of a performance obligation	
IE91	606-10-55-183
Example 18 – Measuring progress when making goods or services available	
IE92	606-10-55-184
IE93	606-10-55-185
IE94	606-10-55-186
Example 19 – Uninstalled materials	
IE95	606-10-55-187
IE96	606-10-55-188
IE97	606-10-55-189
IE98	606-10-55-190
IE99	606-10-55-191
IE100	606-10-55-192
Variable consideration	
IE101	606-10-55-193
Example 20 – Penalty gives rise to variable consideration	
IE102	606-10-55-194
IE103	606-10-55-195
IE104	606-10-55-196
Example 21 – Estimating variable consideration	
IE105	606-10-55-197
IE106	606-10-55-198
IE107	606-10-55-199
IE108	606-10-55-200
Constraining estimates of variable consideration	
IE109	606-10-55-201
Example 22 – Right of return	
IE110	606-10-55-202
IE111	606-10-55-203
IE112	606-10-55-204
IE113	606-10-55-205
IE114	606-10-55-206
IE115	606-10-55-207
Example 23 – Price concessions	
IE116	606-10-55-208
IE117	606-10-55-209
IE118	606-10-55-210

IE119	606-10-55-211
IE120	606-10-55-212
IE121	606-10-55-213
IE122	606-10-55-214
IE123	606-10-55-215
Example 24 – Volume discount incentive	
IE124	606-10-55-216
IE125	606-10-55-217
IE126	606-10-55-218
IE127	606-10-55-219
IE128	606-10-55-220
Example 25 – Management fees subject to constraint	
IE129	606-10-55-221
IE130	606-10-55-222
IE131	606-10-55-223
IE132	606-10-55-224
IE133	606-10-55-225
The existence of a significant financing component in the contract	
IE134	606-10-55-226
Example 26 – Significant financing component and right of return	
IE135	606-10-55-227
IE136	606-10-55-228
IE137	606-10-55-229
IE138	606-10-55-230
IE139	606-10-55-231
IE140	606-10-55-232
Example 27 – Withheld payments on a long-term contract	
IE141	606-10-55-233
IE142	606-10-55-234
Example 28 – Determining the discount rate	
IE143	606-10-55-235
IE144	606-10-55-236
IE145	606-10-55-237
IE146	606-10-55-238
IE147	606-10-55-239
Example 29 – Advance payment and assessment of discount rate	
IE148	606-10-55-240
IE149	606-10-55-241
IE150	606-10-55-242
IE151	606-10-55-243
Example 30 – Advance payment	
IE152	606-10-55-244
IE153	606-10-55-245
IE154	606-10-55-246
Noncash consideration	
IE155	606-10-55-247
Example 31 – Entitlement to noncash consideration	
IE156	606-10-55-248
IE157	606-10-55-249

IE158	606-10-55-250*
Consideration payable to a customer	
IE159	606-10-55-251
Example 32 – Consideration payable to a customer	
IE160	606-10-55-252
IE161	606-10-55-253
IE162	606-10-55-254
Allocating the transaction price to performance obligations	
IE163	606-10-55-255
Example 33 – Allocation methodology	
IE164	606-10-55-256
IE165	606-10-55-257
IE166	606-10-55-258
Example 34 – Allocating a discount	
IE167	606-10-55-259
IE168	606-10-55-260
IE169	606-10-55-261
IE170	606-10-55-262
IE171	606-10-55-263
IE172	606-10-55-264
IE173	606-10-55-265
IE174	606-10-55-266
IE175	606-10-55-267
IE176	606-10-55-268
IE177	606-10-55-269
Example 35 – Allocation of variable consideration	
IE178	606-10-55-270
IE179	606-10-55-271
IE180	606-10-55-272
IE181	606-10-55-273
IE182	606-10-55-274
IE183	606-10-55-275
IE184	606-10-55-276
IE185	606-10-55-277
IE186	606-10-55-278
IE187	606-10-55-279
Contract costs	
IE188	340-40-55-1
Example 36 – Incremental costs of obtaining a contract	
IE189	340-40-55-2
IE190	340-40-55-3
IE191	340-40-55-4
Example 37 – Costs that give rise to an asset	
IE192	340-40-55-5
IE193	340-40-55-6
IE194	340-40-55-7
IE195	340-40-55-8
IE196	340-40-55-9
Presentation	

IE197	606-10-55-283
Example 38 – Contract liability and receivable	
IE198	606-10-55-284
IE199	606-10-55-285
IE200	606-10-55-286
Example 39 – Contract asset recognized for the entity's performance	
IE201	606-10-55-287
IE202	606-10-55-288
IE203	606-10-55-289
IE204	606-10-55-290
Example 40 – Receivable recognized for the entity's performance	
IE205	606-10-55-291
IE206	606-10-55-292
IE207	606-10-55-293
IE208	606-10-55-294
Disclosure	
IE209	606-10-55-295
Example 41 – Disaggregation of revenue – quantitative disclosure	
IE210	606-10-55-296
IE211	606-10-55-297
Example 42 – Disclosure of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations	
IE212	606-10-55-298
IE213	606-10-55-299
IE214	606-10-55-300
IE215	606-10-55-301
IE216	606-10-55-302
IE217	606-10-55-303
IE218	606-10-55-304
IE219	606-10-55-305
Example 43 – Disclosure of the transaction price allocated to the remaining performance obligations – qualitative disclosure	
IE220	606-10-55-306
IE221	606-10-55-307
Warranties	
IE222	606-10-55-308
Example 44 – Warranties	
IE223	606-10-55-309*
IE224	606-10-55-310
IE225	606-10-55-311
IE226	606-10-55-312
IE227	606-10-55-313
IE228	606-10-55-314
IE229	606-10-55-315
Principal versus agent considerations	
IE230	606-10-55-316
Example 45 – Arranging for the provision of goods or services (entity is an agent)	
IE231	606-10-55-317
IE232	606-10-55-318
IE232A	606-10-55-318A

IE232B	606-10-55-318B
IE232C	606-10-55-318C
IE233	606-10-55-319
Example 46 – Promise to provide goods or services (entity is a principal)	
IE234	606-10-55-320
IE235	606-10-55-321
IE236	606-10-55-322
IE237	606-10-55-323
IE237A	606-10-55-323A
IE237B	606-10-55-323B
IE238	606-10-55-324
Example 46A – Promise to provide goods or services (entity is a principal)	
IE238A	606-10-55-324A
IE238B	606-10-55-324B
IE238C	606-10-55-324C
IE238D	606-10-55-324D
IE238E	606-10-55-324E
IE238F	606-10-55-324F
IE238G	606-10-55-324G
Example 47 – Promise to provide goods or services (entity is a principal)	
IE239	606-10-55-325
IE240	606-10-55-326
IE241	606-10-55-327
IE242	606-10-55-328
IE242A	606-10-55-328A
IE242B	606-10-55-328B
IE242C	606-10-55-328C
IE243	606-10-55-329
Example 48 – Arranging for the provision of goods or services (entity is an agent)	
IE244	606-10-55-330
IE245	606-10-55-331
IE246	606-10-55-332
IE247	606-10-55-333
IE247A	606-10-55-333A
IE247B	606-10-55-333B
IE248	606-10-55-334
Example 48A – Entity is a principal and an agent in the same contract	
IE248A	606-10-55-334A
IE248B	606-10-55-334B
IE248C	606-10-55-334C
IE248D	606-10-55-334D
IE248E	606-10-55-334E
IE248F	606-10-55-334F
Customer options for additional goods or services	
IE249	606-10-55-335
Example 49 – Option that provides the customer with a material right (discount voucher)	
IE250	606-10-55-336
IE251	606-10-55-337
IE252	606-10-55-338
IE253	606-10-55-339

Example 50 – Option that does not provide the customer with a material right (additional goods or services)	
IE254	606-10-55-340
IE255	606-10-55-341
IE256	606-10-55-342
Example 51 – Option that provides the customer with a material right (renewal option)	
IE257	606-10-55-343
IE258	606-10-55-344
IE259	606-10-55-345
IE260	606-10-55-346
IE261	606-10-55-347
IE262	606-10-55-348
IE263	606-10-55-349
IE264	606-10-55-350
IE265	606-10-55-351
IE266	606-10-55-352
Example 52 – Customer loyalty program	
IE267	606-10-55-353
IE268	606-10-55-354
IE269	606-10-55-355
IE270	606-10-55-356
Nonrefundable upfront fees	
IE271	606-10-55-357
Example 53 – Nonrefundable upfront fee	
IE272	606-10-55-358
IE273	606-10-55-359
IE274	606-10-55-360
Licensing	
IE275	606-10-55-361*
Example 54 – Right to use intellectual property	
IE276	606-10-55-362
IE277	606-10-55-363*
N/A	606-10-55-363A
N/A	606-10-55-363B
Example 55 – License of intellectual property	
IE278	606-10-55-364
IE279	606-10-55-365
IE279A	606-10-55-365A
IE280	606-10-55-366*
Example 56 – Identifying a distinct license	
IE281	606-10-55-367*
IE282	606-10-55-368*
IE283	606-10-55-369
IE284	606-10-55-370*
IE285	606-10-55-371
IE286	606-10-55-372
IE286A	606-10-55-372A
IE287	606-10-55-373*
IE288	606-10-55-374*

Example 57 – Franchise rights	
IE289	606-10-55-375*
IE290	606-10-55-376*
IE291	606-10-55-377
IE292	606-10-55-378*
IE293	606-10-55-379*
IE294	606-10-55-380*
IE295	606-10-55-381*
IE296	606-10-55-382*
Example 58 – Access to intellectual property	
IE297	606-10-55-383*
IE298	606-10-55-384
IE299	606-10-55-385*
IE300	606-10-55-386*
IE301	606-10-55-387*
IE302	606-10-55-388*
Example 59 – Right to use intellectual property	
IE303	606-10-55-389
IE304	606-10-55-390
IE305	606-10-55-391*
IE306	606-10-55-392*
N/A	606-10-55-392A
N/A	606-10-55-392B
N/A	606-10-55-392C
N/A	606-10-55-392D
Example 60 – Sales-based royalty promised in exchange for a license of intellectual property and other goods or services	
IE307	606-10-55-393
IE308	606-10-55-394
Example 61 – Access to intellectual property	
IE309	606-10-55-395
IE310	606-10-55-396*
IE311	606-10-55-397*
IE312	606-10-55-398*
IE313	606-10-55-399*
Example 61A – Right to use intellectual property	
N/A	606-10-55-399A
N/A	606-10-55-399B
N/A	606-10-55-399C
N/A	606-10-55-399D
N/A	606-10-55-399E
N/A	606-10-55-399F
N/A	606-10-55-399G
N/A	606-10-55-399H
N/A	606-10-55-399I
N/A	606-10-55-399J
Example 61B – Distinguishing multiple licenses from attributes of a single license	
N/A	606-10-55-399K
N/A	606-10-55-399L

N/A	606-10-55-399M
N/A	606-10-55-399N
N/A	606-10-55-399O
Repurchase agreements	
IE314	606-10-55-400
Example 62 – Repurchase agreements	
IE315	606-10-55-401
IE316	606-10-55-402
IE317	606-10-55-403
IE318	606-10-55-404
IE319	606-10-55-405
IE320	606-10-55-406
IE321	606-10-55-407
Bill-and-hold arrangements	
IE322	606-10-55-408
Example 63 – Bill-and-hold arrangement	
IE323	606-10-55-409
IE324	606-10-55-410
IE325	606-10-55-411
IE326	606-10-55-412
IE327	606-10-55-413

Glossary

Excerpt from Accounting Standards Codification

Revenue from Contracts with Customers – Overall

Glossary

606-10-20

Contract

An agreement between two or more parties that creates enforceable rights and obligations.

Contract Asset

An entity's right to consideration in exchange for goods or services that the entity has transferred to a customer when that right is conditioned on something other than the passage of time (for example, the entity's future performance).

Contract Liability

An entity's obligation to transfer goods or services to a customer for which the entity has received consideration (or the amount is due) from the customer.

Customer

A party that has contracted with an entity to obtain goods or services that are an output of the entity's ordinary activities in exchange for consideration.

Lease

A contract, or part of a contract, that conveys the right to control the use of identified property, plant, or equipment (an identified asset) for a period of time in exchange for consideration.

Not-for-Profit Entity

An entity that possesses the following characteristics, in varying degrees, that distinguish it from a business entity:

- a. Contributions of significant amounts of resources from resource providers who do not expect commensurate or proportionate pecuniary return
- b. Operating purposes other than to provide goods or services at a profit
- c. Absence of ownership interests like those of business entities.

Entities that clearly fall outside this definition include the following:

- a. All investor-owned entities
- b. Entities that provide dividends, lower costs, or other economic benefits directly and proportionately to their owners, members, or participants, such as mutual insurance entities, credit unions, farm and rural electric cooperatives, and employee benefit plans.

Performance Obligation

A promise in a contract with a customer to transfer to the customer either:

- a. A good or service (or a bundle of goods or services) that is distinct
- b. A series of distinct goods or services that are substantially the same and that have the same pattern of transfer to the customer.

Probable (second definition)

The future event or events are likely to occur.

Public Business Entity

A public business entity is a business entity meeting any one of the criteria below. Neither a not-for-profit entity nor an employee benefit plan is a business entity.

- a. It is required by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to file or furnish financial statements, or does file or furnish financial statements (including voluntary filers), with the SEC (including other entities whose financial statements or financial information are required to be or are included in a filing).
- b. It is required by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the Act), as amended, or rules or regulations promulgated under the Act, to file or furnish financial statements with a regulatory agency other than the SEC.
- c. It is required to file or furnish financial statements with a foreign or domestic regulatory agency in preparation for the sale of or for purposes of issuing securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer.
- d. It has issued, or is a conduit bond obligor for, securities that are traded, listed, or quoted on an exchange or an over-the-counter market.
- e. It has one or more securities that are not subject to contractual restrictions on transfer, and it is required by law, contract, or regulation to prepare U.S. GAAP financial statements (including footnotes) and make them publicly available on a periodic basis (for example, interim or annual periods). An entity must meet both of these conditions to meet this criterion. An entity may meet the definition of a public business entity solely because its financial statements or financial information is included in another entity's filing with the SEC. In that case, the entity is only a public business entity for purposes of financial statements that are filed or furnished with the SEC.

Revenue

Inflows or other enhancements of assets of an entity or settlements of its liabilities (or a combination of both) from delivering or producing goods, rendering services, or other activities that constitute the entity's ongoing major or central operations.

Standalone Selling Price

The price at which an entity would sell a promised good or service separately to a customer.

Transaction Price

The amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring promised goods or services to a customer, excluding amounts collected on behalf of third parties.

EY | Assurance | Tax | Transactions | Advisory

About EY

EY is a global leader in assurance, tax, transaction and advisory services. The insights and quality services we deliver help build trust and confidence in the capital markets and in economies the world over. We develop outstanding leaders who team to deliver on our promises to all of our stakeholders. In so doing, we play a critical role in building a better working world for our people, for our clients and for our communities.

EY refers to the global organization, and may refer to one or more, of the member firms of Ernst & Young Global Limited, each of which is a separate legal entity. Ernst & Young Global Limited, a UK company limited by guarantee, does not provide services to clients. For more information about our organization, please visit ey.com.

Ernst & Young LLP is a client-serving member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited operating in the US.

© 2016 Ernst & Young LLP.
All Rights Reserved.

SCORE no. BB3043
(Revised August 2016)

This and many of the publications produced by our US Professional Practice Group, are available free on AccountingLink at www.ey.com/us/accountinglink.

This material has been prepared for general informational purposes only and is not intended to be relied upon as accounting, tax, or other professional advice. Please refer to your advisors for specific advice.