

Pregunta	Brasil	Uruguay	México	Colombia
<p>Question 1: The IASB proposes to clarify that accounting for the effects of vesting and non-vesting conditions on the measurement of a cash-settled share-based payment should follow the approach used for measuring equity-settled share-based payments in paragraphs 19–21A of IFRS 2. Do you agree? Why or why not?</p>	<p>We agree that is necessary to clarify that accounting for the effects of vesting and non-vesting conditions on the measurement of a cash-settled share-based payment, because, until now, as a result of the lack of guide in IFRS 2 for this type of share-based payments, there was diversity in the practice of measurement of the liability. So, we agree that the approach would be the same used for measuring equity-settled share-based payments in paragraphs 19–21A of IFRS 2.</p>	<p>Si bien consideramos que la especificidad del caso requiere un análisis y normas que levanten las flaquezas de las normas IFRS 2, la operación en cuestión es bien diferente al pago en acciones, se refiere a liquidar en efectivo con referencias a valor de las acciones, pero en ningún caso está previsto que el proveedor o el prestador de servicios sea en el futuro accionista de la empresa. Los accionistas pueden tener otros intereses(mayorías en asambleas o respaldos en directorios) que los imples proveedores o prestadores. Por lo tanto consideramos que debe tener un tratamiento diferente al pago que se liquida con partes de patrimonio. 19 a 21 A NiIF 2</p>	<p>We agree that the cash-settled share-based payments should follow the approach used for measuring equity-settled share-based payments. The same accounting should apply for measuring performance conditions and for determining the number of equity instruments that will vest.</p>	<p>Las modificaciones propuestas por el IASB para la NIIF 2, permiten aclarar la forma en que se contabilizaran aquellos pagos basados en acciones que se liquidan en efectivo cuando existen condiciones para la irrevocabilidad de la concesión. Adicionalmente, la propuesta de agregar los párrafos 33A y 33B suministran mayor información sobre la mediciones y los efectos que tienen en el precio de la acción.</p>
<p>Question 2: The IASB proposes to specify that a share-based payment transaction in which the entity settles the share-based payment arrangement net by withholding a specified portion of the equity instruments to meet the statutory tax withholding obligation should be classified as equity-settled in its entirety. This is required if the entire share-based payment transaction would otherwise have been classified as an equity-settled share-based payment transaction if it had not included the net settlement feature. Do you agree? Why or why not?</p>	<p>In Brazil is common to find a share-based payment transaction in which the entity settles the share-based payment arrangement net by withholding a specified portion of the equity instruments to meet the statutory tax withholding obligation. Thus, there was a doubt whether the portion of the equity instruments hold by the entity should be classified as cash-settled share-based payment or as equity-settled share-based payment. So, we support the proposed requirement.</p>	<p>No estamos de acuerdo, las obligaciones fiscales son independientes de la operación, la operación por lo demás puede afectar tanto a la empresa como al futuro accionista (en caso que se liquide como parte de capital). En el caso puro que se plantea donde el precio de las acciones es una referencia de precio, la parte fiscal no tiene efectos diferentes a los demás pasivos contratados.</p>	<p>We believe that the amount of tax to be withheld upon settling the share-based payment arrangement by withholding a specified portion of the equity instruments to meet the statutory tax withholding should be recognized as a liability and not as equity. This is because the amount of shares that will be issued will be less than the total share-based payment and, therefore, in the periods in which the employee is working to obtain the right to receive the share-based payment, an amount that will be paid to the tax authorities will be shown as equity, and such amount will not flow to the paid-in capital upon vesting. We believe that, in accordance with the IFRS Conceptual Framework, paragraph 4.4(b) the amount to be withheld and paid to the tax authorities is a liability, as it is "...a present obligation of the entity arising from past events and the settlement of</p>	<p>Es pertinente la inclusión del párrafo 33D en la NIIF 2, como lo propone el IASB, puesto que se aclara el tratamiento de los pagos basados en acciones a los que se les debe practicar retención para la autoridad fiscal, el cual propone clasificar todo el monto como instrumento de patrimonio, puesto que anteriormente podía entenderse (aunque no era lo correcto) que este tipo de transacciones incluían una parte liquidada en efectivo (las retenciones a pagar a la autoridad fiscal) y la otra parte en instrumentos de patrimonio (la que se le debía entregar al empleado).</p>

Pregunta	Brasil	Uruguay	México	Colombia
			<p>which is expected to result in an outflow from the entity of resources embodying economic benefits".</p> <p>We understand that determining the amount of the liability might be difficult, due to changes in the tax laws, including changes in the tax rate, and that for practical purposes it would be less complex to reclassify from equity to a liability the amount of tax due, when the share-based payment vests. We also understand that recognizing the entire share-based transaction as equity settled converges with USGAAP; however, in many cases USGAAP follows rules, not principles. Therefore, we would prefer that the tax liability be recognized since the beginning of the transaction. If not, we suggest that:</p> <p>a) a disclosure of the approximate amount of tax that will be withheld be required; and</p> <p>b) the end of paragraph 33D indicate that a "...the share-based payment that includes a net settlement feature shall be accounted for, in its entirety, in accordance with the requirements that apply to equity-settled share-based payment transactions in paragraphs 10-29." This is to avoid any misunderstanding.</p>	
<p>Question 3: The IASB proposes to specify the accounting for modifications to the terms and conditions of a cash-settled share-based payment transaction that results in a change in its classification from cash-settled to equity-settled. The IASB proposes that these transactions should be accounted for in the following manner: (a) the share-based payment transaction is measured by reference to the modification-date fair value of the equity</p>	<p>We agree with the proposed criteria and requirements to the accounting for modifications to the terms and conditions of a cash-settled share-based payment transaction that results in a change in its classification from cash-settled to equity-settled.</p>	<p>Estamos de acuerdo con este criterio, que además demuestra claramente que la operación es bien diferente si es " pagar con acciones o partes de patrimonio" o pagar en efectivo a un valor ajustado al valor de las acciones o partes de capital como tratamos de explicar en las dos respuestas anteriores.</p>	<p>We agree, since the effects of the modification must be recognized on the modification date.</p>	<p>Compartimos la incorporación de los párrafos B41A y B41B, ya que precisan la contabilización cuando se modifican las condiciones que se puedan presentar en las condiciones del pago basado en acciones. Sin estas aclaraciones, queda al arbitrio de cada entidad la fecha en la cual se registran este tipo de modificaciones.</p>

Pregunta	Brasil	Uruguay	México	Colombia
<p>instruments granted as a result of the modification;</p> <p>(b) the liability recognised in respect of the original cash-settled share-based payment is derecognised upon the modification, and the equity-settled share-based payment is recognised to the extent that the services have been rendered up to the modification date; and</p> <p>(c) the difference between the carrying amount of the liability as at the modification date and the amount recognised in equity at the same date is recorded in profit or loss immediately.</p> <p>Do you agree? Why or why not?</p>				
<p>Question 4: The IASB proposes prospective application of these amendments, but also proposes to permit the entity to apply the amendments retrospectively if it has the information needed to do so and this information is available without the use of hindsight. Do you agree? Why or why not?</p>	<p>We agree with the proposed prospective application of these amendments and the permission to the entity to apply the amendments retrospectively if it has the information needed to do so and this information is available without the use of hindsight.</p>	<p>Estamos de acuerdo con este criterio, que posibilita ajustar adecuadamente el valor patrimonial de la empresa, la única condición es que el valor de las acciones que no coticen en bolsa, se tome al valor de cierre del ejercicio económico último cerrado</p>	<p>We believe the first two proposed modifications of IFRS 2 should be applied retrospectively, to present comparative information on the same basis. However, we understand that for practical purposes it would be difficult to do so without hindsight, and therefore we agree with prospective application of the modifications. and to permit retrospective application if the information is available and can be prepared without hindsight.</p>	<p>Compartimos la propuesta del IASB de aplicar las modificaciones a esta norma de forma prospectiva, por cuanto les permite a los preparadores de la información contar con un tiempo razonable para realizar los ajustes y adecuaciones necesarios a fin de dar aplicación a las modificaciones que tendrá el estándar.</p> <p>De otra parte estamos de acuerdo con permitir la aplicación anticipada, cuando se cuente con la información necesaria para poderlo hacer.</p>
<p>Question 5: Do you have any other comments on the proposals?.</p>	<p>We not have any other comments on the proposals.</p>	<p>No tenemos otros comentarios, agradecemos la posibilidad de esta participación</p>	<p>We have no additional comments.</p>	<p>En el caso colombiano, no es muy frecuente que se den transacciones con pagos basados en acciones. Lo cual se vió reflejando en la poca participación que se generó en el proceso de discusión pública.</p> <p>De otra parte, recomendamos que se elabore una Guía de Aplicación que permita un mejor entendimiento del estándar.</p>