

AASB16 – recommended change

This standard only applies to out printer/photocopier leases within our organization and is an administrative burden with an immaterial affect on the financials.

A threshold for the application of this standard per 'lease' would be beneficial.



3 September 2025

Dr K Kendall
Chair
Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins St West Victoria 8007
AUSTRALIA

Dear Dr Kendall

AASB Invitation to Comment ITC 55 *Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases*

The Australasian Council of Auditors-General (ACAG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on AASB Invitation to Comment ITC 55 *Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases*. The views expressed in this submission represent those of all Australian members of ACAG, unless specifically identified.

The attachment to this letter addresses the AASB's specific matters for comment outlined in the ITC. Also attached is ACAG's response to the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) Request for Information *Post-implementation Review of IFRS 16 Leases*.

Overarching feedback

ACAG found that the implementation of AASB 16 in public sector agencies has presented numerous audit challenges, particularly regarding the completeness and accuracy of lease data, documentation of accounting judgments, and quality assurance processes. Additionally, certain elements of the standard are not well understood by public sector entities, making it difficult for them to apply in practice.

The submission notes various areas where additional guidance or examples could be provided to provide more clarity to preparers and auditors and drive greater consistency in application of AASB 16 in the public sector.

The ongoing costs of auditing operating leases for lessees under AASB 16 are generally higher than under AASB 117, particularly for entities with a significant number of leases. While including leases on balance sheet does provide more transparent information on leases and helps comparability between entities, it is unclear whether the benefits have been fully realised by users of the public sector's financial statements.

Notwithstanding the issues raised above, the costs of implementing any proposed changes to the framework should be considered when making decisions about any amendments to AASB 16. Further, the majority of ACAG jurisdictions support keeping the accounting policy choice for concessionary leases. One jurisdiction that supports the FV approach for concessionary ROU assets has shared their rationale in Topic 5 of the attachment.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this post-implementation review. I hope you will find ACAG's comments, helpful when assessing whether the effects of applying the requirements are as intended.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rachel Vagg', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Rachel Vagg
Chair
ACAG Financial Reporting and Accounting Committee

SECTION 1 – AASB GENERAL MATTERS FOR COMMENT

General Matter for comment 1

Are there any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 *Leases*?

The application of AASB 16 creates convergence differences with the Australian Government Finance Statistics (GFS) Manual, as GFS continues to distinguish between operating and finance leases for lessees and does not recognise operating leases in the Statement of Financial Position.

ACAG is not aware of any other regulatory or other issues in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16.

General Matter for comment 2

Does the application of the requirements in AASB 16 result in major auditing or assurance challenges?

Implementation of AASB 16 in public sector agencies has presented numerous audit challenges, particularly regarding the completeness and accuracy of lease data, documentation of accounting judgments, and quality assurance processes. Additionally, certain elements of the standard are not well understood by public sector entities, making it difficult for them to apply in practice.

Key issues identified by ACAG in the implementation of AASB 16 include:

- **Completeness and accuracy of lease calculations:** auditors faced challenges in verifying the accuracy and completeness of lease calculations as agencies:
 - struggled to identify contracts that may contain leases
 - were parties to arrangements that were undocumented
 - did not formally document, approve, or maintain key lease accounting interpretations and assessments for individual lease contracts. This often made it difficult to determine whether the asset in a long-term contract was subject to a lease and should be recognised as a right-of-use asset (ROU) asset or as property, plant and equipment (PPE). For example, in certain jurisdictions, some government departments have historically leased land to government agencies without documentation. These agencies use the land and constructed significant public sector assets on it. The issue is whether the land should be recognised as an ROU asset or PPE, and if it is a lease what the lease term should be
 - had incomplete and/or inaccurate lease data held centrally (e.g. future market rent reviews, fixed rate increases, and lease incentives) which resulted in material adjustments to lease calculations
 - did not have information from lessors regarding the value of non-lease components
 - applied the standard incorrectly e.g. omission of fixed rent and/or market rent review increases, application of lease incentives and non-lease components
 - inconsistently applied the impairment requirements for ROU assets measured at cost subsequent to initial recognition.

These issues were more prevalent when the standard was first introduced and have reduced since this time. However, the following areas still require significant judgement each time a new lease is entered, to calculate the lease liability to be recognised:

- consideration of what constitutes a non-lease component versus a lease component or an 'amount payable by the lessee for activities and costs that do not transfer a good or service to the lessee'
- estimation of stand-alone selling prices for non-lease components
- allocation of 'amounts payable by the lessee for activities and costs that do not transfer a good or service to the lessee.'

While this separation is not mandatory it is in most entity's interests to separate the lease components to reduce the liability, and the ongoing depreciation expense associated with the right-of-use asset.

- **Judgment and complexity in lease accounting:** ACAG found the standard inherently difficult to audit given the extensive judgment required in determining enforceability of leases, particularly intra-government leases, lease terms, including 'reasonably certain to extend' and 'no more than an insignificant penalty'.

There are often practical challenges for determining whether a lease exists. One of the criteria is whether the lessee receives the substantial economic benefits. In the public sector, for leases between departments and agencies, as both entered into the arrangements with the aim of providing services to the public it is difficult to assess who received substantially all of the benefits. For example, in social housing both parties enter into these arrangements with the aim of providing social housing. It is difficult to assess which party receives substantially all the benefits from the arrangement.

These areas continue to cause interpretation challenges.

The main audit challenge for subsequent measurement of leases is the accounting for lease modifications. ACAG found that these requirements are not well understood or applied by public sector agencies due to the complex concepts in the standard. The specific challenges we have noted are set out in our response to question 5.

General Matter for comment 3

Are the requirements in the best interests of the Australian economy?

ACAG is unable to comment on whether the proposals are in the best interests of the Australian Economy.

SECTION 2 – NFP AND PUBLIC SECTOR TOPICS FOR COMMENT

Topic 1 – Application of AASB 16 by NFP and public sector entities

1. In respect of NFP and public sector entities:
 - (a) are the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application significantly greater than expected?
 - (b) are the benefits to users significantly lower than expected?
 - (c) overall, do you have any comments about whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous Standard AASB 117 *Leases*?

Please explain the reasons for your views on the above matters. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

- 1(a) ACAG has found the costs of auditing operating leases for lessees under AASB 16 are generally higher than under AASB 117, especially for agencies with a significant number of leases. This is because AASB 16 introduces more complex ongoing accounting and auditing requirements for leases compared to AASB 117. These include the review and accounting of:
 - changes to the lease term
 - changes to ROU assets and lease liabilities resulting from changes in lease payments due to an index or rate
 - changes to leases as a lease modification or as a separate lease (including impacts from changes in the discount rate)

- annual impairment assessments (for jurisdictions opting for the cost model subsequent to initial recognition) or undertaking revaluations (for jurisdictions opting for revaluation model) of non-concessionary ROU assets. The one ACAG Office that supports the revaluation model for valuing ROU assets arising out of non-concessionary leases, are of the view that fair value is necessary to meet the market value concept under AASB 1049. This is despite the AASB staff's position (as outlined in [Agenda paper 14.1 \(M172\)](#)) which states that adoption of fair value of ROU asset would not resolve the divergence between the GFS and reporting framework under Australian Accounting Standards. Therefore, this jurisdiction believes a clarification in this regard will be helpful.

The exceptions for low-value and short-term leases have been effective in managing some of these costs.

We have found agencies often struggle with the requirements of the standard, particularly lease modifications, leading to increased audit costs for entities with material leases.

- 1(b) AASB 16 (based on IFRS 16) was designed for the private sector, with the changes from AASB 117 primarily focused on the information needs of investors. In the public sector, the users and their information needs differ from those in the private sector, as they focus on decisions related to providing resources to the entity rather than returns on investments. Our understanding is that public sector users did not specifically request these changes. While the new requirements may provide some additional transparency, it is unclear whether the benefits of recording operating leases on the balance sheet have been fully realised by users of the public sector's financial statements.

ACAG has found that while the users understand the concept of lease liability, they often struggle to understand the concept of ROU asset and the classification of lease payments in the statement of cash flows.

ACAG recommends the AASB consult with both preparers and users to determine whether the information on operating leases in individual agencies' financial statements is used or relied upon by users.

- 1(c) Refer to the response for question 1(b).

Topic 2 – Determining the lease term

Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about:

2. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?
3. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?
4. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for determining the lease term are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

2. ACAG has identified the following issues in the application of the lease term.

Interpretation of 'insignificant penalty'

In its agenda decision from November 2019, the IFRS Interpretations Committee noted that when applying paragraph B34 of IFRS 16 to determine the enforceable period of a lease, an entity must consider the wider economics of the contract (and not only termination payments as stated in the contract), and whether each of the parties has the right to terminate the lease without the other party's permission with no more than an insignificant penalty.

Determining whether a penalty for terminating a lease is 'insignificant' involves a high level of judgment and can be challenging to apply in practice to the specific terms and conditions of lease agreements. Due to this level of judgment, there are variations in how this is applied in practice. For example, one jurisdiction is encountering diverse views when interpreting 'insignificant penalty' for buildings with options to terminate at 'market value.' Some interpret the penalty as contractual payments and other lost assets (per the IFRIC Agenda Decision), while others consider the penalty on a wider economic basis, looking at wider economic gains and losses.

This jurisdiction is also currently facing challenges interpreting 'insignificant penalty' in the context of social housing with options to terminate at 'market value'. For example, a government department provided a government grant to an operator to construct a building that is then used (by that operator under the direction of the government department / lessee) for government purposes, with a termination clause. Under the termination clause, the operator can terminate the agreement at any time if there is a repayment of the initial government funding and the government's share of the fair value increase in property. This interpretation is crucial in determining the non-cancellable period. If the repayment of the government grant is considered an 'insignificant penalty' because the provider is repaying funding, then the lease term would be considered nil.

The IFRIC Agenda decision was developed for private sector entities. It is unclear in a NFP context whether 'insignificant penalty' extends beyond financial penalties and economic incentives to include the impact on an agency's service objectives.

Determining whether there is a lease and related lease term

Assessing whether a NFP public sector entity is reasonably certain to exercise an option can be challenging. Beyond uncertainties in funding, which are subject to government budgetary approval process, there are other specific factors and circumstances within the public sector that contribute to this challenge. Government policy directions or objectives may affect an entity's operations, such as where an entity should locate its operations, and how it should conduct them. Since government directions can often be released and take immediate effect, this can create challenges for preparers of financial statements to conclude that the entity will reasonably exercise the extension options until the time for exercising the options approaches.

Therefore, ACAG suggests the AASB provides additional guidance on how to interpret 'insignificant penalty' and 'reasonable' certainty over lease extension options including their application in the NFP public sector context.

In one jurisdiction, some departments have historically leased land to other government agencies without supporting documentation or with lease agreements for a fixed period. In the latter case, at the end of the term the lessee has the option to continue to occupy the premises on a monthly basis with the approval of the landlord. The agencies use the land and constructed significant public sector assets on it. The issues that arise are:

- whether the land should be recognised as an ROU asset or PPE for the agency
- if it is a lease, what is the lease term as the lease term cannot be indefinite.

The departments have historically rolled forward the lease agreements when they expire, indicating their intention to continue the lease for a foreseeable period. Should the lease term be equal to the lease term mentioned in the agreement or should it be the useful life of the asset constructed, as the termination will result in more than an insignificant penalty as the lessee has constructed significant structures on the leased land and it may disrupt public services?

3. ACAG is unable to comment on whether there are application differences between the NFP public and NFP private sectors.
4. Refer to the response for question 2.

Topic 3 – Lease modifications

Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about:

5. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?
6. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?
7. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for lease modification are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

5. ACAG has found that the lease modification requirements are not well understood or applied by public sector agencies due to the complex concepts in the standard. ACAG has noted specific challenges in determining whether arrangements contain new leases or are a lease modification. Some issues ACAG has encountered, where we believe that additional guidance is needed, include:

- **Master / umbrella agreement that cover the lease of many individual items with one monthly payment** – when new assets were included in the master / umbrella agreement, the agency interpreted that the lease modification provisions (including using an updated discount rate) applied as the payment changed, without understanding that these changes relate to a new item / lease and should not affect the existing ROU asset and lease liability. While initial AASB 16 training often discussed modifications and lease to lease agreements, the above situation (more common in the public sector, for example under public, private partnership arrangements) was not directly covered.
- **Intra-government lease contracts that contain a continuous supply of assets (i.e. assets that are planned to be upgraded or constructed in future years)** – agencies interpreted that the lease calculations should be updated each year for the new assets constructed and made available for use. However, since the new assets are not available at the lease commencement, their payments should be accounted for as a separate lease and excluded from the existing lease liability and ROU asset.

While not necessarily unclear within the standard, due to the general complexity of accounting for lease modifications or other adjustments we have also noted differences in accounting for the following scenarios:

- **'New' contracts signed** – agencies accounting for these as a separate lease rather than as a lease modification (extension of lease term), despite being for the same asset. In this regard, often before the old lease ends, the lessee and the lessor enter into a new lease agreement for the same premises which begin post the balance sheet date. The question that arises at the balance sheet date is whether this new contract should be accounted for as a modification of the old lease (with the ROU asset and the lease liability updated for the term of the new lease agreement) or accounted for as a separate lease. This often brings into question whether the lease term determined at inception was correct or has not taken into consideration the nature of the asset, the entity's dependency on that asset and application of paragraph B34 of AASB 16.
 - **Changes in rental payments under variable payments** – agencies interpreting that the lease modification provisions (including using an updated discount rate) applied, without understanding that the variable lease payments should be accounted for under the remeasurement provisions. Initial AASB 16 training often did provide specific details on this issue, or make it clear what to do when the next year's lease rental increased.
 - **Adjustments for lease modifications** – agencies putting adjustments through profit or loss rather than adjusting the ROU asset when required.
6. ACAG is unable to comment on whether there are application differences between the NFP public and NFP private sectors.

7. ACAG believes it would be beneficial to include additional guidance and examples on lease modifications, taking into account some of the challenges and examples noted above.

Topic 4 – Measurement of lease liabilities – determining an incremental borrowing rate

Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate, do you have any comments about:

8. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP private sector entities, including how these entities are currently determining the incremental borrowing rate in practice?
9. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP private sector?
10. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for the measurement of lease liabilities are sufficient for NFP private sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

8. ACAG is unable to comment on the practices of NFP private sector entities.
9. ACAG is unable to comment on the practices of NFP private sector entities.
10. ACAG is unable to comment.

Topic 5 – NFP public sector concessionary leases

Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about:

11. whether there are any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice to measure initially concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value?
12. whether the temporary accounting policy choice for NFP public sector entities should be made permanent?
13. whether the disclosures prepared in accordance with paragraphs Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 of AASB 16 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users regarding concessionary leases when the ROU assets are measured at cost?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

11. The majority of ACAG jurisdictions have not identified any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice as it is functioning effectively and the factors supporting its adoption remain present.

The choice allows central regulatory bodies to decide whether they provide public sector agencies with a choice or mandate the measurement base. In practice, treasuries have mandated concessionary leases be measured at cost both on initial recognition and subsequent measurement.

The accounting policy choices means that NFP public sector can avoid the complexities of fair valuing leased assets such as:

- identifying market participants (private sector or public sector) or how much they are willing to pay
- specialised assets and those with restrictions
- dealing with variable and contingent rentals, early termination provisions etc.

ACAG does not believe that the concessionary leases component of the IPSASB's Leases project adequately addresses the issues raised above. ACAG raised concerns on the IPSASB's proposals to account for concessionary leases in IPSASB Exposure Draft ED 84 'Concessionary Leases and Right-of-Use Assets In-Kind' (Amendments to IPSAS 43 and IPSAS 23) and IPSASB Exposure Draft ED 88 'Arrangements Conveying Rights over Assets (Amendments to IPSAS 47 and IPSAS 48)'.

However, while acknowledging there may be costs associated with fair valuing complex ROU assets including challenges to fair value these in a non-revaluation year, one jurisdiction supports fair value approach as:

- in their view fair value (CRC) is conceptually about current cost accounting i.e. showing the current cost of service delivery not the historic cost, so that asset users can set fees and charges accordingly. To lose this information would remove this price signal and potentially increase the financial burden on future generations
 - the value of resources received by a public sector organisation is important for users' understanding and informed decision making, whether that user be the government, Parliament, public sector or community. This aligns with the expectations of AASB 1058 as it relates to assets provided free of charge
 - there are other examples, such as volunteer services or complex intangible assets that are transferred whose fair value may be difficult to determine, but there is no similar exception for those types of assets, so a narrower exception for concessionary leases does not seem justified
 - if fair value is not adopted for concessionary leases, then it could give rise to an anomaly where the lessor grants a concessionary finance sublease (therefore derecognising the asset) and the lessee chooses the cost option and recognises the asset at a nominal consideration. Therefore, the fair value of the asset is not shown in the agencies' financial statements. This has the potential of omitting useful information for the users
 - the cost versus benefit argument may not be justifiable as determining fair value for a number of non-financial physical assets is equally complex
 - the bigger challenge currently faced is capability. Some preparers perceive the fair value approach is the fair value of the underlying asset, not the right to use the asset through the lease arrangement. Greater clarity and guidance is required by standard-setters on this
 - providing an option on a permanent basis does not align with the IPSASB's approach.
12. The majority of ACAG jurisdictions recommend making the temporary accounting policy choice permanent, with one jurisdiction supporting the fair value approach for the reasons outlined in question 11.
13. Disclosures on concessionary leases measured at cost are important for financial statement users to understand the impact of these arrangements. ACAG is not aware of any issues raised by preparers on the sufficiency of these disclosures.

Topic 6 – Sale and leaseback arrangements

Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements, do you have any comments about:

14. the application of the requirements in practice by public sector entities?
15. whether differences in application exist in practice in the public sector?
16. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for sale and leaseback arrangements are sufficient for public sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

14. One jurisdiction has encountered arrangements where the 'leaseback' period is rent-free under the 'lease' contract. These arrangements are often bundled into one or more contracts that include the sale price. This jurisdiction found the standard is unclear about whether any of the total proceeds should be considered 'lease payments' in these circumstances or how to differentiate the components of the sale price. Additionally, paragraph 101 of AASB 16 is unclear about whether it applies to the buyer-lessor, the seller-lessee or both. This has led to different interpretations by the agency and the audit team. This jurisdiction believes additional guidance is required when there is nil or nominal consideration for the 'leaseback', as the current guidance is insufficient.

The other jurisdictions have either not encountered sale and leaseback arrangements or have not encountered related issues in applying the requirements.

15. ACAG is not aware of any difference in application. The majority of ACAG jurisdictions have not encountered any major sale and leasebacks since the new standard was introduced.
16. Refer to the response in question 14.

Topic 7 – Other matters

17. Are there any other NFP and public sector matters that should be brought to the attention of the AASB as it undertakes a PIR of AASB 16?

If so, please provide your views on those matters, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

The following issues have been encountered by some jurisdictions.

Lessor accounting – Inclusion of non-cash consideration in the net investment in a lease

AASB 16 does not explicitly set out whether lease payments include forms of non-cash consideration, while other standards such as AASB 15 and AASB 1058 (AASB 15.66 and AASB 1058.BC61) require entities to measure any non-cash consideration at fair value in determining the transaction price in respect of a contract.

In the NFP public sector non-cash consideration, such as works-in-kind may be paid under agreements that contain a lease. This is common in at least one jurisdiction where the public sector offer 99-year leases of land, along with rights to develop the land. Some of the challenges include:

- distinguishing whether non-cash consideration is directly related to granting the right to use an underlying asset or whether it is a developer contribution (e.g. upgrading infrastructure within or outside of the lease boundary). This could also apply to certain levies (cash consideration) to be made under the arrangement
- whether non-cash consideration is considered a fixed payment included in the 'gross investment in a finance lease'. Determining the value of non-cash consideration that will be delivered at inception requires an estimate. The value of what is delivered will often differ to the amount estimated at inception, creating a 'true-up' entry. In contrast, if the non-cash consideration was considered a 'variable lease payment' it would be excluded from the 'gross investment in the lease' as it does not depend on an index or rate.

ACAG believes it would be beneficial if the AASB considers issuing additional guidance on how non-cash consideration should be accounted for by lessors and lessees at the point of initial recognition and measurement of lease liability and lease payments included in the net investment in the lease (paragraphs 27 and 70 of AASB 16).

Accounting for development arrangements on leased land

Another challenge in accounting for these development arrangements is determining the timing of lease commencement. The private sector will be granted differing levels of access to the underlying asset (land) in situations where there is a long-term land lease and the developer is constructing an asset on the land. For instance, construction licenses are often issued, granting the developer rights to begin building on the land, but a formal lease is not issued until the development is complete.

We've noted differing judgements being applied in these circumstances and believe additional guidance or examples may help in determining when lease commencement has occurred in complex scenarios such as detailed above.

Lessor accounting – accounting for variable lease payments in a finance lease

The lessee requirements in AASB 16 contain specific requirements for subsequently adjusting the lease liability due to changes in an index or a rate (paragraph 16.42b, with additional details in paragraphs BC188-190). While AASB 16 provides guidance for lessors on how to treat variable lease payments that depend on an index or rate at initial recognition (paragraph 70(b)), it does not address how to account for these payments in subsequent years when the cash flows change due to variations in the index or rate. Although the lessor requirements in AASB 16 remain largely unchanged from AASB 117, the removal of minimum lease payment and contingent rent concepts in AASB 16 now mean it is unclear whether lessors need to remeasure their lease income when the cash flows change due to index or rate variations in the same way as a lessee or recognise the income in the period it occurs (similar to approach for recognising contingent rent under AASB 117) or account for the variable receipts as an embedded derivative.

ACAG has seen this applied differently in practice and believe it would be helpful to provide guidance on how these changes should be accounted for.

Perpetual leases / In-substance purchases (finance leases)

The public sector has numerous land grants (e.g. Deeds of Grant in Trust (DOGIT) and reserve land) between the state government, public sector entities and local government.

Occasionally, issues arise regarding whether the land should be accounted for under AASB 116 or AASB 16. These issues mainly pertain to the technical difference between freehold land and leasehold land – even if in-substance the leasehold land is economically the same as freehold land aside from some valuation differences because of their different legal nature.

Generally, these assets are accounted for under AASB 116, using the various valuation options for subsequent measurement, and the various options under AASB 16 for initial measurement (i.e. fair value or cost such as peppercorn).

We note the IASB decided not to provide guidance distinguishing a lease from a sale or purchase of an asset.

3 September 2025

Columbus Building
7 Westferry Circus
Canary Wharf
London E14 4HD
United Kingdom

By email: commentletters@ifrs.org

IASB Request for Information *Post-implementation Review of IFRS 16 Leases*

The Australasian Council of Auditors-General (ACAG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on IASB Request for Information *Post-implementation Review of IFRS 16 Leases*. The views expressed in this submission represent those of all Australian members of ACAG, unless specifically identified.

The attachment to this letter addresses the AASB's specific matters for comment outlined in the Request for Information.

Overarching feedback

The Australian public sector applies AASB 16 'Leases' which incorporates IFRS 16 'Leases' as issued by the IASB. ACAG found IFRS 16 has generally met its objective of requiring lessees to recognise leases on the balance sheet, with clear core principles and effective exemptions for low-value and short-term leases. The transition provisions also worked well, providing significant cost relief for entities implementing the standard.

The submission notes areas where additional guidance or examples could be provided to provide more clarity to preparers and auditors and drive greater consistency in the application of IFRS 16.

The ongoing costs of auditing operating leases for lessees under IFRS 16 are generally higher than under IAS 17, particularly for entities with a significant number of leases.

While including leases on balance sheet does provide more transparent information on leases and helps comparability between entities, it is unclear whether the benefits have been realised by users of the public sector's financial statements.

Notwithstanding the issues raised above, the costs of implementing any proposed changes should be considered when making decisions about any amendments to AASB 16.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this post-implementation review. I hope you will find ACAG's comments, helpful when assessing whether the effects of applying the requirements are as intended.

Yours sincerely



Rachel Vagg
Chair
ACAG Financial Reporting and Accounting Committee

IASB SPECIFIC MATTERS FOR COMMENT

Question 1 – Overall assessment of IFRS 16

- (a) In your view, is IFRS 16 meeting its objective (see page 9) and are its core principles clear? If not, please explain why not.
- (b) In your view, are the overall improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.⁸
- (c) In your view, are the overall ongoing costs of applying the requirements and auditing and enforcing their application largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, how you would propose the IASB reduce these costs and how your proposals would affect the benefits of IFRS 16.

The [Effects Analysis on IFRS 16](#) describes the expected likely effects of the Standard, including benefits and implementation and ongoing costs.

- 1(a) IFRS 16 is meeting its objectives of lessees recognising leases on balance sheet. ACAG has generally found that the core principles are clear and are being applied.

The exemption for low value and short-term leases is working well in practice and helps to reduce costs. The transition provisions also worked well, providing significant cost relief for entities implementing the standard.

- 1(b) IFRS 16 was designed for the private sector, with the changes from IAS 17 primarily focused on the information needs of investors. In the public sector, the users and their information needs differ from those in the private sector, as they focus on decisions related to providing resources to the entity rather than returns on investments.

While the new requirements may provide some additional transparency, it is unclear whether the benefits of recording operating leases on the balance sheet have been fully realised by users of the public sector's financial statements. ACAG has found that while the users understand the concept of lease liability, they often struggle to understand the concept of right-of-use (ROU) asset and the classification of lease payments in the statement of cash flows.

ACAG has found the costs of auditing operating leases under IFRS 16 are generally higher than under IAS 17, especially for entities with a significant number of leases. The exceptions for low-value and short-term leases have been effective in managing some of these costs.

While the IASB expected there will be marginal costs, these expectations were from a private sector perspective, rather than the public sector. ACAG is therefore not clear if these costs were greater than expected. ACAG found:

- a significant number of public sector entities did not have sophisticated systems in place to manage and track leases, with some having large lease portfolios (some across vast geographic locations) with relatively small finance teams
- entities often struggle with the requirements of the standard, particularly lease modifications, leading to increased audit costs for entities with material leases.

The above issues resulted in numerous audit challenges, particularly regarding the completeness and accuracy of lease data, documentation of accounting judgments, and quality assurance processes. Additionally, certain elements of the standard are not well understood by public sector entities, making it difficult for them to apply in practice.

Key issues identified by ACAG during implementation include:

- **Completeness and accuracy of lease calculations:** auditors faced challenges in verifying the accuracy and completeness of lease calculations as entities:
 - struggled to identify contracts that may contain leases
 - were parties to arrangements that were undocumented
 - did not formally document, approve, or maintain key lease accounting interpretations and assessments for individual lease contracts. This often made it difficult for long-term contracts to determine whether the asset was subject to a lease and should be recognised as a ROU asset or as property, plant and equipment (PPE)
 - had incomplete and/or inaccurate lease data held centrally (e.g. future market rent reviews, fixed rate increases, and lease incentives) which resulted in material adjustments to lease calculations
 - did not have information from lessors regarding the value of non-lease components
 - applied the standard incorrectly e.g. omission of fixed rent and/or market rent review increases, application of lease incentives and non-lease components
 - inconsistently applied the impairment requirements for ROU assets measured at cost subsequent to initial recognition.

These issues were more prevalent when the standard was first introduced and have reduced since this time. However, the following areas still require significant judgement each time a new lease is entered, to calculate the lease liability to be recognised:

- consideration of what constitutes a non-lease component versus a lease component or an 'amount payable by the lessee for activities and costs that do not transfer a good or service to the lessee'
- estimation of stand-alone selling prices for non-lease components
- allocation of 'amounts payable by the lessee for activities and costs that do not transfer a good or service to the lessee.'

While this separation is not mandatory it is in most entity's interests to separate the lease components to reduce the liability, and the ongoing depreciation expense associated with the right-of-use asset.

- **Judgment and complexity in lease accounting:** ACAG found the standard inherently difficult to audit given the extensive judgment required in determining enforceability of leases, particularly intra-government leases, lease terms, including 'reasonably certain to extend' and 'no more than an insignificant penalty'.

These areas continue to cause interpretation challenges.

The main audit challenge for subsequent measurement of leases is the accounting for lease modifications. ACAG found that these requirements are not well understood or applied by entities due to the complex concepts in the standard. The specific challenges we have noted are set out in our response to question 2(b).

Question 2 – Usefulness of information resulting from lessees' application of judgement

- (a) Do you agree that the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that lessees' application of judgement has a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information, please explain why.¹³
- (b) Do you agree that the requirements in IFRS 16 provide a clear and sufficient basis for entities to make appropriate judgements and that the requirements can be applied consistently? If not, please explain why not.

- (c) If your view is that the IASB should improve the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement, please explain:
- (i) what amendments you propose the IASB make to the requirements (and how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs); or
 - (ii) what additional information about lessees' application of judgement you propose the IASB require entities to disclose (and how the benefits would outweigh the costs).

The [Effects Analysis on IFRS 16](#) describes the expected likely effects of the Standard, including benefits and implementation and ongoing costs.

2(a) ACAG expects that there is likely to be diversity in accounting by lessees as:

- the terms 'reasonably certain' and 'no more than an insignificant penalty' are subject to a significant amount of judgement and can often be difficult to apply in practice to the individual terms and conditions of lease agreements resulting in diverse accounting treatments
- lease modifications, are quite complex and often difficult to understand. As a result, we have found entities have interpreted these requirements incorrectly requiring adjustments to their financial statements.

Whether this diversity impacts the usefulness of the information is best answered by preparers and users of the financial statements.

2(b) As stated in question 2(a), ACAG has identified issues with the consistent application of lease modifications and the terms 'reasonably certain' and 'no more than an insignificant penalty'.

Lease modifications

ACAG has found the lease modification requirements are not well understood or applied by entities due to the complex concepts in the standard, leading to inconsistent interpretations and material adjustments to financial statements. ACAG has noted specific challenges in determining whether arrangements contain new leases or are a lease modification. Some issues ACAG has encountered, where we believe that additional guidance is needed, include:

- **Master / umbrella agreement that cover the lease of many individual items with one monthly payment** – when new assets were included in the master / umbrella agreement, the entity interpreted that the lease modification provisions (including using an updated discount rate) applied as the payment changed, without understanding that these changes relate to a new item / lease and should not affect the existing ROU asset and lease liability. While initial IFRS 16 training often discussed modifications and lease to lease agreements, the above situation (more common in the public sector, for example under public, private partnership arrangements) was not directly covered.
- **Intra-government lease contracts that contain a continuous supply of assets (i.e. assets that are planned to be upgraded or constructed in future years)** – entities interpreted that the lease calculations should be updated each year for the new assets constructed and made available for use. However, since the new assets are not available at the lease commencement, their payments should be accounted for as a separate lease and excluded from the existing lease liability and ROU asset.

While not necessarily unclear within the standard, due to the general complexity of accounting for lease modifications or other adjustments we have also noted differences in accounting for the following scenarios:

- **'New' contracts signed** – agencies accounting for these as a separate lease rather than as a lease modification (extension of lease term), despite being for the same asset. In this regard, often before the old lease ends, the lessee and the lessor enter into a new lease agreement for the same premises which begin post the balance sheet date. The question that arises at the balance sheet date is whether this new contract should be accounted for as a modification of the old lease (with the ROU asset and the lease liability updated for the term of the new lease agreement) or accounted for as a separate

lease. This often brings into question whether the lease term determined at inception was correct or not taking into consideration the nature of the asset and the dependency of the entity on that asset and application of paragraph B34 of IFRS 16.

- **Changes in rental payments under variable payments** – entities interpreting that the lease modification provisions (including using an updated discount rate) applied, without understanding that the variable lease payments should be accounted for under the remeasurement provisions. Initial IFRS 16 training often did provide specific details on this issue, or make it clear what to do when the next year's lease rental increased.
- **Adjustments for lease modifications** – entities putting adjustments through profit or loss rather than adjusting the ROU asset when required.

Insignificant penalties

Determining whether a penalty for terminating a lease is 'insignificant' involves a high level of judgment and can be challenging to apply in practice to the specific terms and conditions of lease agreements. Due to this level of judgment, there are variations in how this is applied in practice. For example, ACAG has seen diverse views when interpreting 'insignificant penalty' for buildings with options to terminate at 'market value.' Some interpret the penalty as contractual payments and other lost assets (per the IFRIC Agenda Decision), while others consider the penalty on a wider economic basis, such as repayment of a government grant not being an insignificant penalty, and looking at wider economic gains and losses.

Reasonable certainty over lease extension options

Assessing whether an entity is reasonably certain to exercise an option can be challenging due to the significant judgement involved as some entities are interpreting reasonably certain at a higher threshold than others for similar circumstances. This could have a material effect on ROU asset and lease liabilities.

- 2(c) ACAG believes it would be beneficial for the IASB to provide additional guidance and practical examples on lease modifications and the terms 'reasonably certain' and 'no more than an insignificant penalty', taking into account some of the challenges and examples noted above. This would help entities apply these concepts to the individual terms and conditions of lease agreements, potentially reducing diversity and improving consistency in their key judgments.

Question 3 – Usefulness of information about lessees' lease-related cash flows

Do you agree that the improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows that lessees present and disclose are *largely* as the IASB expected? If your view is that the improvements are *significantly lower* than expected, please explain why.

ACAG does not have any specific comments on lease-related cash flows (whether presented as operating or financing) as the primary focus for public sector entities is on their operating activities. Additionally, presenting the interest portion of the lease payments as a financing activity is not relevant for most NFP public sector entities as they do not generally borrow funds for service delivery.

Question 4 – Ongoing costs for lessees of applying the measurement requirements

- (a) Do you agree that the ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements in IFRS 16 are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, considering how any entity-specific facts and circumstances (such as IT solutions) add to these costs.
- (b) If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain how you propose the IASB reduce these costs without a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information about leases.

4(a) ACAG has found the costs of auditing operating leases for lessees under IFRS 16 are generally higher than under IAS 17, especially for entities with a significant number of leases. This is because IFRS 16 introduces more complex ongoing accounting and auditing requirements for leases compared to IFRS 17. These include the review and accounting of:

- changes to the lease term
- changes to ROU assets and lease liabilities resulting from changes in lease payments due to an index or rate
- changes to leases as a lease modification or as a separate lease (including impacts from changes in the discount rate)
- annual impairment assessments of ROU assets.

The exceptions for low-value and short-term leases have been effective in managing some of these costs.

The accounting for the above changes can be complex and the standards are unclear in some areas, such as indexation and market rent review combinations. This is made more difficult as many entities do not have leasing software and rely on spreadsheets. This requires ongoing review and monitoring to ensure the models are robust.

ACAG has also found that the lease modification requirements are not well understood or applied by entities due to the complex concepts in the standard, leading to inconsistent interpretations and material adjustments to financial statements. Question 2(b) contains details on the issues ACAG has identified.

4(b) ACAG does not have any specific suggestions. As all the requirements work together, any changes may impose costs from introducing a change to the framework.

Question 5 – Potential improvements to future transition requirements

Based on your experience with the transition to IFRS 16, would you recommend the IASB does anything differently when developing transition requirements in future standard-setting projects? If so, please explain how your idea would ensure:

- (a) users have enough information to allow them to understand the effect of any new requirements on entities' financial performance, financial position and cash flows; and
- (b) preparers can appropriately reduce their transition costs when implementing new requirements for the first time.

ACAG believes that the transitional provisions and exemptions in IFRS 16 have been effective. The inclusion of the modified retrospective approach, along with various simplifications and practical expedients, has provided significant cost relief for entities implementing the standard without the loss of information for users. Additionally, the extended lead time before the standard's implementation was beneficial.

ACAG recommends evaluating the option to use the modified retrospective approach and the decision not to mandate comparatives on a case-by-case basis for each new standard.

Question 6.1 – Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 9 to rent concessions

- (a) How often have you observed the type of rent concession described in Spotlight 6.1?
- (b) Have you observed diversity in how lessees account for rent concessions that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?
- (c) If your view is that the IASB should act to improve the clarity of the requirements, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

6.1(a) ACAG has not frequently observed this type of rent concession in the public sector.

6.1(b) ACAG is not aware of any rent concession issues.

6.1(c) Not applicable.

Question 6.2 – Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 when assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale

- (a) How often have you observed difficulties in assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale?
- (b) Have you observed diversity in seller–lessees’ assessments of the transfer of control that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?
- (c) If your view is that the IASB should act to help seller–lessees determine whether the transfer of an asset is a sale, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

6.2(a) ACAG has not seen many major sale and leasebacks in the public sector and is not aware of any issues in practice.

6.2(b) ACAG has not seen many major sale and leasebacks in the public sector and is not aware of any issues in practice.

6.2(c) Not applicable.

Question 6.3 – Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 to gain or loss recognition in a sale and leaseback transaction

- (a) Do you agree that restricting the amount of gain (or loss) an entity recognises in a sale and leaseback transaction results in useful information?
- (b) What new evidence or arguments have you identified since the IASB issued IFRS 16 that would indicate that the costs of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, and the usefulness of the resulting information, differ significantly from those expected?
- (c) If your view is that the IASB should improve the cost–benefit balance of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, please describe your proposed solution.

6.3(a) ACAG has no specific comments.

6.3(b) ACAG has no specific comments.

6.3(c) Not applicable.

Question 6.4 – Other matters relevant to the assessment of the effects of IFRS 16

Are there any further matters the IASB should examine as part of the post- implementation review of IFRS 16? If so, please explain why, considering the objective of a post-implementation review as set out on page 5.

ACAG has identified the following matters that the IASB should example as part of the post-implementation review.

Lease incentives

In November 2019, as part of the Annual Improvements to IFRS Standards 2018-2020, the IASB deferred addressing the complexities and diverse views on lease incentives. ACAG recommends the IASB prioritise resolving these issues.

The underlying principle can be difficult to apply in practice given the various ways in which lessors may structure lease arrangements, and what they commonly refer to as lease incentives.

While most jurisdictions now have their own guidance and entities have established their accounting policies as to how to account for lease incentives (including where internal government 'leases' fail to meet the definition of a lease), issues faced on implementation included:

- confusion due to what the leasing profession would refer to as a lease incentive not actually resulting in a reduction to the ROU asset (for example rent-free periods or rent reductions because these are already effectively taken into account in determining the lease liability)
- how to account for fit-out, including whether the lessee or lessor control the fit-out, and difficulties determining whether the lease payments inherently include an amount to compensate for this, and should therefore result in adjustments to the ultimate lease related expenses recognised.

The standards as they currently stand continue to lack clarity about what comprises a lease incentive, and how to account for lease incentives at the point they are received. This lack of clarity is likely to result in inconsistent accounting treatments.

Lessor accounting – Inclusion of non-cash consideration in the net investment in a lease

IFRS 16 does not explicitly set out whether lease payments include forms of non-cash consideration, while other standards such as IFRS 15 (IFRS 15.66) requires entities to measure any non-cash consideration at fair value in determining the transaction price in respect of a contract.

ACAG has identified instances where non-cash consideration such as works-in-kind may be paid under agreements that contain a lease. This is common in at least one jurisdiction where the public sector offer 99-year leases of land, along with rights to develop the land. Some of the challenges include:

- distinguishing whether non-cash consideration is directly related to granting the right to use an underlying asset or whether it is a developer contribution (e.g. upgrading infrastructure within or outside of the lease boundary). This could also apply to certain levies (cash consideration) to be made under the arrangement
- whether non-cash consideration is considered a fixed payment included in the 'gross investment in a finance lease'. Determining the value of non-cash consideration that will be delivered at inception requires an estimate. The value of what is delivered will often differ to the amount estimated at inception, creating a 'true-up' entry. In contrast, if the non-cash consideration was considered a 'variable lease payment' it would be excluded from the 'gross investment in the lease' as it does not depend on an index or rate.

ACAG believes it would be beneficial if the IASB considers issuing additional guidance on how non-cash consideration should be accounted for by lessors and lessees at the point of initial recognition and measurement of lease liability and lease payments included in the net investment in the lease (paragraphs 27 and 70 of IFRS 16).

Accounting for development arrangements on leased land

Another challenge in accounting for these development arrangements is determining the timing of lease commencement. The private sector will be granted differing levels of access to the underlying asset (land) in situations where there is a long-term land lease, and the developer is constructing an asset on the land. For instance, construction licenses are often issued, granting the developer rights to begin building on the land, but a formal lease is not issued until the development is complete.

ACAG has noted differing judgements being applied in these circumstances and believe additional guidance or examples may help in determining when lease commencement has occurred in complex scenarios such as detailed above.

Lessor accounting – accounting for variable lease payments in a finance lease

The lessee requirements in IFRS 16 contain specific requirements for subsequently adjusting the lease liability due to changes in an index or a rate (paragraph 16.42b, with additional details in paragraphs BC188-190). While IFRS 16 provides guidance for lessors on how to treat variable lease payments that depend on an index or rate at initial recognition (paragraph 70(b)), it does not address how to account for these payments in subsequent years when the cash flows change due to variations in the index or rate. Although the lessor requirements in IFRS 16 remain largely unchanged from IAS 17, the removal of minimum lease payment and contingent rent concepts in IFRS 16 now mean it is unclear whether lessors need to remeasure their lease income when the cash flows change due to index or rate variations in the same way as a lessee, or recognise the income in the period it occurs (similar to approach for recognising contingent rent under IAS 17) or, account for the variable receipts as an embedded derivative.

ACAG has seen this applied differently in practice and believe it would be helpful to provide guidance on how these changes should be accounted for.

Submission to the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB)

To whom it may concern,

We at LGiQ are a firm of local government specialists dedicated to empowering local government organisations with targeted mentoring and innovative accounting support. Our work is primarily with regional and rural councils whose experiences underpin much of our feedback.

In preparing this submission, we have also consulted with the South Australian Local Government Financial Management Group (SALGFMG) which represents finance professionals across the sector by providing resources, support and ongoing professional development.

This submission responds to the AASB request for feedback on:

1. The ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application; and
2. Whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful for decision makers than financial statements prepared under the previous Standard AASB 117 Leases?

1. Ongoing Costs of Compliance with AASB 16

Under section 127 of the *Local Government Act 1999* South Australian councils must prepare financial statements and notes in accordance with the standards prescribed by the regulations and other statements or documentation relating to the financial affairs of the council. Regulation 13 requires compliance with the **Model Financial Statements (MFS)**. The MFS prescribes guidance and recommended formats for all South Australian councils including flow diagrams, examples and guidance on accounting interpretations to assist councils when preparing their financial statements. Despite this comprehensive framework, the application of AASB 16 remains extremely challenging for councils. We find most finance professionals struggle with the calculations given the number of assumptions required to be made in the absence of readily accessible and available information on leases, especially when they have agreements that have not been structured as a lease. This issue is even more problematic in the regional and rural sector who struggle to find skilled finance staff and who have difficulty in meeting deadlines for statutory financial reporting with increasing workloads. They are required to make determinations on whether a lease exists, the lease term, interest rate implicit in the lease all of which takes time for calculations which ironically despite all their effort results in information the users of financial statements find difficult to understand.

Gathering contracts for analysis can require considerable effort and often require collaboration with other functional areas such as finance, procurement, property and IT. Some of the contracts can be very lengthy and hence the analysis may require considerable time to evaluate and digest. In Local Government this particularly occurs in arrangements where there were difficult judgements in the past or those which were not legally structured as a lease but involve "substantial" use of a single asset. This extends to waste contracts, power agreements, access to stormwater systems and property contracts all of which are often complex. Councils therefore often have to seek outside expertise from accounting firms to help them with the calculations and determination as to whether a lease exists or not. Very often these accounting firms have been known to charge per lease which can be very costly especially for a council with a larger portfolio of leases. There is also the need for the reassessment of leases on a yearly basis and the requirement to determine revised discount rates when remeasuring lease liabilities. Accounting for remeasurements

involves a lot of resources and often manual work that cannot be automated. This all comes at a cost and when you are a small regional council who is struggling financially and with staff resources to complete end of year statements the budget to fund this work often comes at the expense of funding services to the community and/or other competing work priorities.

A particularly significant challenge lies in determining the correct lease term under AASB 16. The length of the lease affects not only the size of the right-of-use asset and lease liability but also whether the short-term lease exemption can be applied. Finally, AASB16 contains additional application guidance on how to deal with periods covered by options to extend or terminate a lease. While this detailed guidance can be helpful, it also means there is more to consider when determining the lease term. There can be considerable judgement in determining whether it is 'reasonably certain' that an entity would exercise its extension option or not exercise its termination option. Unfortunately to influence disclosure requirements councils may decide to either not include any lease extensions or show all lease extensions resulting in an inconsistent and uneven approach by the sector which reduces comparability. This is exactly at odds with what AASB16 was designed to address. In determining the amount of lease liability councils will need to discount future lease payments using either (a) the interest rate implicit in the lease (if it can be readily determined) or (b) the lessee's incremental borrowing rate. In many cases, the interest rate implicit in the lease will not be readily determinable nor is there the required data to calculate it and therefore Councils often will need to come up with an appropriate incremental borrowing rate.

The more judgment required and greater need for manual entries to support adherence to the standard the greater the cost to implement for a council and the even greater risk of potential misstatement.

We have instances of calculations for council organisations and subsidiaries that have been reviewed by external auditors or external providers for lease calculations which subsequently have been found to be incorrect and the AASB16 calculations have materially misstated the operating results. In some instances this has required a reinstatement of prior year financial statements.

Calculations are often done manually, and Excel spreadsheets are used due to system limitations, which also comes with its own risk, as the proper tools for lease calculations are difficult and costly to obtain. Therefore for South Australian local councils, implementing AASB 16 has introduced several challenges, both technical and operational. Below is a summary of these major challenges, all of which come at a significant cost for compliance.

Identifying all lease arrangements - Local councils often have numerous, decentralized departments or business units that enter into lease or lease-like arrangements

Challenges :

- Difficulty identifying informal or embedded leases as employees managing lease registers are not specialised in the finance and accounting area.
- Incomplete lease registers across departments.
- Long-standing arrangements not formally documented.
- Lack of understanding and awareness of the financial implications by decentralised departments when committing the council to a contract that potentially may have an embedded lease
- Lack of guidance on what is determined to be a low-value asset (for example, various external audit firms have a different approach to what is considered "low value" and this creates inconsistency across the sector for comparability.

Determining the lease term - AASB 16 requires entities to determine the reasonably certain lease term, including options to extend or terminate

Challenges:

- Councils often enter into leases with rolling or short-term arrangements that are renewed informally.
- Judgement is required to assess lease extension options, particularly for Crown land or community buildings.

Discount rate determination - Under AASB 16, the lessee must apply the incremental borrowing rate (IBR) if the interest rate implicit in the lease cannot be readily determined

Challenges :

- Councils may not have a readily determinable IBR and more problematic as there is often no interest rate implicit in the lease especially with “old” documentation and very long term contracts.
- Often there is a need to estimate or model an appropriate rate, which can be complex and subjective.
- Council employees were given some industry guidance in 2025 for first time on options to use for incremental borrowing rates due to a lack of external borrowing options and benchmarks but there is still confusion by accounting staff.


Valuation of Right of Use (ROU) assets - Councils must recognise a right-of-use asset and corresponding lease liability for most leases.

Challenges :

- Determining appropriate asset values for long-term land leases or peppercorn (low-cost) leases, noting there is a temporary exemption currently for peppercorn leases
- Difficulty in applying fair value assessments where consideration is nominal (common with intergovernmental agreements or community use leases).

Subsequent measurement

Challenges :

- Determining if there was a lease modification (*a change in the scope of a lease, or the consideration for a lease, that was not part of the original terms and conditions of the lease*)
 - Incorrectly recognising a lease modification when there has only been a CPI increase in lease payments
 - Challenges of the subsequent measurements of ROUA
 - Lack of derecognition of ROUA and lease liabilities
- 

System and Data management

Challenges :

- Legacy systems not designed for lease accounting.
- Manual tracking increases risk of error.
- Need for new software or significant spreadsheet-based workarounds.

Training and resourcing

AASB 16 is technical and significantly different from previous lease accounting standards.

Challenges:

Lack of internal accounting expertise on lease accounting.

- Resource constraints in smaller councils
- Different interpretation by Audit firms when providing advice given judgements required
- Ongoing training needed for finance and operational staff.

Audit and Compliance

Local councils are subject to external audit, compliant with the Model Financial statements and accounting standards and which is mandated in Local Government Act 1999.

Challenges:

- Auditors require consistent application and detailed supporting evidence and each external auditing firm can be inconsistent in how it assesses the information provided by a council.
- Risk of qualified audit opinions if lease data is incomplete or inconsistent.
- Increased disclosure requirements in financial statements.

2. Are financial statements more useful to users of local government statutory reporting as a result of AASB16?

Financial reporting by councils provides users with information to assist their decision-making and demonstrates effective stewardship and accountability. Councils are normally accountable to those who provide them with resources and to those who depend on them for the services or goods they provide. In addition, and like other tiers of government, councils are also subject to a high level of community interest and accountability. The financial reporting by councils provides information on how they have discharged their accountability obligations for the management of the public monies and assets entrusted to them and the delivery of services or goods to stakeholders in compliance with relevant legislation.

Councils control significant physical assets, the majority of which have no market value. Many of these assets are long-life assets that are subject to significant changes in value over the period the council holds

them. As a result, and to ensure financial information is relevant to users of the financial statements, physical assets, such as infrastructure (roads, water, sewerage, storm water drains, bridges) and buildings are measured and presented at their fair value. Under this approach, assets are re-measured periodically to reflect changes in their current value, with the resulting change generally being reflected in an asset revaluation reserve. The result is a balance sheet that better reflects the current replacement cost of assets and the operating statement measures more accurately the consumption of those assets via depreciation.

Financial sustainability in South Australian local government involves councils maintaining long-term financial health to deliver services and manage infrastructure without excessive rate increases or service cuts. This requires sound asset management, responsible debt management, and effective financial planning. Long-term financial plans that forecast future revenue, expenses, and infrastructure needs help councils evaluate their financial sustainability using several key financial ratios.

These ratios are industry specific. They let users know that each generation is paying for the consumption of resources, that community assets are being renewed and replaced compared with what is need to cost effectively maintain service levels and that the level of indebtedness is manageable and can be funded without compromising the councils ability to deliver services.

Decision makers and users of financial statements therefore primarily want financial information that helps them to understand the financial sustainability of the council's operation and have confidence that the systems and processes in place are working effectively to ensure that the tax collected, namely rates is being used effectively and efficiently to deliver council services.

Regarding leases, this makes the actual lease payments in the annual operating budget the most useful numbers for understanding the real costs of the council and for practical purposes like setting rates, managing services, and budgeting. It is these costs that decision makers and users of financial information and in particular council members, are interested in and understand.

Councillors, elected by their communities are often not sophisticated in their understanding of finance. They often lack basic financial skills and acumen and therefore overly complex financial statements information especially on items like leases which create significant distortions in the statements are difficult for them to understand. AASB16 introduces a level of complexity and subjectivity that does not add value to their decision making.

Intergenerational equity is a key principle especially in ensuring rates increases are relatively 'stable' over time. Therefore front-loaded expenses created as a result of lease accounting entries are seen as confusing and potentially distorting reported financial results which makes it harder for users to understand. This is why finance staff in their management and financial reporting over the year often do not complete the calculation for right of use assets until the end of year process and all reporting throughout the year and against budget is based on the actual lease payments. The accounting entries for AASB16 effectively have become a year end adjustment to meet compliance for accounting standards as opposed to information useful for decision making.

In an ideal world although AASB 16 Leases could be considered generally helpful to local government users of statutory financial reporting its usefulness comes with some caveats depending on the specific context, the financial literacy of the user base which is often low , and the way the information is communicated which is arguably challenging with a sector facing significant challenges in attracting and retaining skilled professionals.


An additional issue is that bringing lease liabilities onto the balance sheet can create the perception of increased debt. This often leads to misconceptions about a council’s financial sustainability and may trigger political or public concern, even though there is no actual change in the underlying economic substance. Councils often meet the technical definition of control on paper when determining if a lease and ROU asset is recognised, but economic control is weaker than with owned assets — they can’t sell, modify, or sublease many leased assets without restrictions.

So councils "control" it enough for accounting purposes, but it’s not the same as owning it as for other assets on our balance sheet.

These issues faced by local government are illustrated with the following example from a regional council. The entries created by recognising a right of use asset due to its arrangement for the purchase of power via a power purchase agreement distort the operating results of the council and the level of indebtedness due to this long term agreement.



With the introduction of AASB16 the distortion on the income statement over time shows a higher impact on the operating position over the initial 10 years as opposed to the later years. This, for a council looking for “rate stability” over time does not help users of financial statements. Councils prepare long-term financial plans in compliance with legislation over a 10 year period. Users of financial information and in particular councillors now see the council with higher operating deficits due to the introduction of ASB16.


Technically, as a council seeks to report an operating surplus this would translate to increases in rates to ensure ratepayers are “paying for the consumption of resources” from each generation. Contrastingly in a subsequent long-term financial plan and in later years of the contract the impact on the operating position improves and that generation effectively will be required to pay less. Prior to AASB16 changes each generation was effectively contributing the same amount annually.



The same can be said of the net impact on the balance sheet. This “distortion” impacts the perceived level of indebtedness of the council over time and the interpretation by users of the financial statements regarding a level of increased debt. There were already concerns over this council’s financial sustainability but the recognition of the right of use asset in compliance with AASB16 triggered greater concerns and reputational risk. This has resulted in the council reporting its financial position excluding the ROU asset treatment and compliance with the AASB16 accounting standard is done merely for compliance with accounting standards and the MFS as opposed to providing meaningful information for users

Lease Liability vs ROUA





We strongly believe despite its intent, AASB16 leases for the local government sector is not providing more meaningful information to users of financial statements to enhance decision making, We believe compliance has become costly and introduced a level of complexity given the significant judgments required. AASB16 usefulness to decision makers appears to be industry-specific and more tailored to users of financial statements looking to make investment decisions. For the local government sector our experience and feedback from finance professionals shows it does not add value or provide its users with better information to assess the council's financial sustainability and accountability over resource provision. To address that the standard as a minimum would need to minimise distortions created to the operating statement and balance sheet especially for longer leases. The requirement for judgement and subjectivity in determining whether there indeed is an imbedded lease, to decisions regarding the interest rate if it is not readily determined from the agreement and to the lease term also need to be simplified. Any changes to the standard need have regard to industry specific impacts of AASB16 accounting entries and how the typical user of financial information interprets this information for decision making.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss any aspect of our submission and supportive of the AASB endeavours to address AASB16 and its application.

Kind Regards,

Annette Martin (Sep 3, 2025 10:43:58 GMT+9.5)
Annette Martin
Financial Consultant

Michele Bennetts
Managing Director



Level 38, International Towers Three
300 Barangaroo Avenue
Sydney NSW 2000

P O Box H67 Australia Square
Sydney NSW 1213
Australia

ABN: 51 194 660 183
Telephone: +61 2 9335 7621
Facsimile: +61 2 9335 7001
DX: 1056 Sydney
www.kpmg.com.au

Dr Keith Kendall
Chair
Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins Street West VIC 9007

via email: standard@asb.gov.au

5 September 2025

Dear Dr Kendall,

KPMG response: ITC 55 Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases

KPMG Australia (KPMG) is pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the AASB's ITC 55 *Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases* (ITC). We note that a separate response representing KPMG's views globally will be submitted to the IASB in response to Request for Information *Post-implementation Review of IFRS 16 Leases*. Our responses to ITC 55 are therefore confined to the feedback sought in Section 2: Not-for-profit (NFP) and public sector topics for comment (Section 2).

In general, we have found that AASB 16 *Leases* has been applied as intended in the NFP and public sector. Nevertheless, we routinely encounter two key challenges in its application.

Firstly, challenges arise when determining the lease term, particularly in assessing what constitutes an "insignificant penalty" in lease agreements that include "holdover" clauses. AASB 16 focuses on financial penalties, which may not always be directly relevant to NFP entities.

Secondly, there are challenges for NFP entities in applying lease modification accounting, as lease contracts in the sector do not always reflect commercial substance.

We have set out our detailed comments to select questions in Section 2 in the Appendix to this letter. Where we have no response to specific questions they have not been included in the Appendix.



We would be pleased to discuss our comments with members of the AASB or its staff. If you wish to do so, please contact Julie Locke on (02) 6248 1190, or myself on (02) 9455 9120.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kim Heng', written in a cursive style.

Kim Heng
Partner, Audit & Assurance
KPMG Australia

Appendix

Section 2 Topic 1: Application of AASB 16 by NFP and public sector entities

1. In respect of NFP and public sector entities:
 - (a) are the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application significantly greater than expected?
 - (b) are the benefits to users significantly lower than expected?
 - (c) overall, do you have any comments about whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous Standard AASB 117 Leases?
- Please explain the reasons for your views on the above matters. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

It is our understanding, particularly within the NFP public sector, that the intended benefits of improving comparability between financial statements of entities that lease assets and those that borrow to buy assets may not be applicable. This is because NFPs, especially NFP public sector entities typically do not borrow to purchase assets.

Further, we have observed that for NFP public sector entities, there is a disconnect between government reporting and statutory reporting, requiring entities to make AASB 16 adjustments purely for statutory reporting purposes. This process could arguably be interpreted as the application of AASB 16 not necessarily providing useful and relevant information to meet the needs of the users of financial statements.

Additionally, we understand that there are relatively high ongoing costs associated with maintaining the data required for AASB 16 lease calculations for NFP public sector entities.

Section 2 Topic 2: Determining the lease term

- Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about:
2. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?
 3. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?
 4. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for determining the lease term are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?
- If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

In our experience, challenges arise for NFP entities, particularly in the public sector, when applying AASB 16.B34 to determine the lease term from a lessee perspective. Some lease arrangements include holdover clauses, which allow for the continued use of leased assets beyond the contractual lease period. When assessing the enforceable period of a lease, AASB 16.B34 requires evaluating whether the lessor can terminate the lease with no more than an insignificant penalty. However, in the context of NFP entities, the concept of “insignificant penalty” extends beyond monetary considerations to include non-monetary factors. These considerations often involve significant judgement, increasing the complexity of determining the enforceable lease term under such arrangements.

Section 2 Topic 3: Lease modifications

Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about:

5. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?
6. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?
7. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for lease modification are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

In our experience, NFP public sector entities face some complexities in applying lease modification accounting. For example, challenges often arise when assessing AASB 16.44 and 45 to determine whether a lease modification constitutes a separate lease.

Lease contracts in the NFP sector frequently do not reflect commercial substance. For instance, when there is an increase in scope, such as adding the right to use one or more underlying assets, assessing whether the consideration increases by an amount commensurate with the stand-alone price for the increase in scope may not always be straightforward.

Section 2 Topic 5: NFP public sector concessionary leases

Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about:

11. whether there are any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice to measure initially concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value?
12. whether the temporary accounting policy choice for NFP public sector entities should be made permanent?
13. whether the disclosures prepared in accordance with paragraphs Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 of AASB 16 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users regarding concessionary leases when the ROU assets are measured at cost?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

We are aware from our work with clients that the accounting policy choice under AASB 16.Aus.25.1, which allows a class of concessionary right-of-use assets to be initially measured at cost or fair value, significantly reduces the complexity for NFP entities in assessing the fair value of these assets. However, we are aware that concerns persist that this accounting policy choice may not be permanent. While the AASB clarified in the Basis for Conclusions of AASB 2022-3 that the accounting policy choice is ongoing for private sector NFPs, this clarity has not been extended to public sector entities. The absence of such clarification remains despite the finalisation of amendments to AASB 13 *Fair Value Measurement for public sector NFPs*. Additionally, the placement of the relevant Basis for Conclusions in AASB 15 *Revenue from Contracts with Customers*, rather than AASB 16, has contributed to further uncertainty on this matter.



5 September 2025

Dr Keith Kendall
Chair
Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins Street West
VICTORIA 8007

Submitted via email: standard@asb.gov.au

Dear Dr Kendall

Invitation to Comment (ITC) 55 Post-Implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases

The Institute of Public Accountants (IPA) welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the above ITC.

General Comment

Overall, IPA is of the view that the costs and benefits of the leases Standard are largely as the IASB expected. That is, the Standard has met its objective and its core principles are clear and improve the quality and comparability of financial information about leases, while the initial implementation cost was higher compared to the on-going costs of applying the requirements.

IPA notes the costs are disproportionately higher for SMEs and NFP entities, which have less resources to invest in understanding the requirements, make the necessary judgements (for which there are many) and developing the necessary IT systems to account for the leases. We also think the ongoing costs of applying the requirements disproportionately affect SMEs and NFP entities compared to the larger and better resourced entities.

Despite the above, IPA is of the view that the benefits of improved quality of financial information for leases outweigh the initial and on-going costs of applying the Standard. That is, the Standard requires a lessee to initially recognise all leases (operating and financial leases) on the balance sheet, and subsequently account for them through the profit and loss and balance sheet. This essentially accounts for the substance of a lease as an entity's financial obligation that is associated with the lease assets and liabilities. Such information is useful to users in assessing an entity's assets and liabilities and how management finances and manages its assets in delivering the entity's objectives. The Standard, therefore, increases the transparency and quality of financial information on leases.

To reduce the disproportionate cost to SMEs and NFP entities in applying the requirements, IPA recommends that the IASB and AASB provide guidance in areas where these entities find challenging when applying judgment. For examples, determining the lease term, Incremental borrowing rates, discount rates and interest rates implicit in a lease and variable lease payments, including those that are linked to Consumer Price Index.

Further details of our comments on the above are contained in the related questions in Attachment 1.

SPECIFIC COMMENT

Our responses to the specific questions in the ITC are in Attachment 1.

For any questions relating to this submission, please contact Vicki Stylianou, Group Executive Advocacy and Professional Standards, Institute of Public Accountants at vicki.stylianou@publicaccountants.org.au.

Yours sincerely



Vicki Stylianou
Group Executive, Advocacy & Professional Standards
Institute of Public Accountants

Attachment 1 – IPA’s responses to ITC 55 specific questions

SECTION 1: AASB GENERAL MATTERS FOR COMMENT

Q1. Are there any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 Leases?

IPA is not aware of any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 .

Q2. Does the application of the requirements in AASB 16 result in major auditing or assurance challenges?

As stated in IPA’s comment to Question 1 of “Section 3: IASB Request for Information”, the cost of implementing the leases Standard was high as an entity needed to:

- Apply the new accounting model to many contracts
- Apply significant judgment to determine the discount rates and lease terms and
- Implement IT solutions to capture the data and perform the necessary calculations for the lease accounting.

These implementation costs were disproportionately higher for SMEs and NFP entities, which have less resources to invest in understanding the requirements, experience in make the necessary judgements (for which there are many) and developing the necessary IT systems to account for the leases.

IPA’s observations are that the larger and well-resourced entities were better able to apply the requirements of AASB 16, and therefore better able to address any auditing or assurance challenges that arise. In contrast, SMEs and NFP entities were likely to have more auditing or assurance challenges, particularly in evidencing that the data and IT systems that capture the data and perform the necessary calculations for the lease accounting are accurate and consistent.

Q3. Are the requirements in the best interests of the Australian economy

IPA is of the view that overall, AASB 16 improves financial reporting by requiring a lessee to initially recognise all leases (operating and finance leases) on the balance sheet, and subsequently account for them through the profit and loss and balance sheet. This essentially accounts for the substance of a lease as an entity’s financial obligation associated with the lease asset and liabilities. Such information is useful to users in assessing an entity’s assets and liabilities and how management finances and manages its assets in delivering the entity’s objectives. The standard, therefore, increases the transparency and quality of financial information on leases.

SECTION 2: NFP AND PUBLIC SECTOR TOPICS FOR COMMENT

Topic 1: Application of AASB 16 by NFP and public sector entities

Q1. In respect of NFP and public sector entities:

(a) are the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application significantly greater than expected?

(b) are the benefits to users significantly lower than expected?

(c) overall, do you have any comments about whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous Standard AASB 117

Leases?

The correct initial recognition and subsequent accounting of leases under AASB 16 requires the collection and input of accurate data for the necessary calculations. This data capture, calculation and associated disclosures are greater under the current AASB 16 than the previous AASB 117. Consequently, there would still be ongoing costs in applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its applications. Given in general, the resources of NFP and smaller entities are less compared to larger private sector entities, these costs would have a disproportionately greater impact on NFP and smaller entities. However, these costs would be considerably less compared with the costs in the initial application of AASB 16. However, IPA is of the view that the accounting requirements for leases under AASB 16 result in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous AASB 117. Therefore, the ongoing costs would justify their accounting treatment.

Topic 2: Determining the lease term

Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about:

Q2. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

Q3. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

Q4. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for determining the lease term are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Determining the lease term requires an understanding and application of the generally accepted accounting principles of what constitutes “significant” for determining “insignificant penalty” and “reasonable” certainty to exercise an option to extend a lease.

As per IPA’s comment to Questions 1(c) and 2 of “Section 3: IASB Request for Information”, SMEs and NFP entities are likely to have less resources and experience in understanding and applying the requirements, compared to the larger entities. Consequently, a lessee’s application of judgment by SMEs and NFP entities may find it challenging in determining the lease term. Consequently, IPA recommends that the AASB develop further guidance in their area. We also commend the AASB in its simplification of lease accounting for the proposed Tier 3 reporting entities.

Topic 3: Lease modifications

Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about:

Q5. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

Q6. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

Q7. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for lease modification are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

As per IPA's comment to Question 4 of "Section 3: IASB Request for Information".

Topic 4: Measurement of lease liabilities – determining an incremental borrowing rate

Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate, do you have any comments about:

Q8. the application of the requirements in practice by NFP private sector entities, including how these entities are currently determining the incremental borrowing rate in practice?

Q9. whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP private sector?

Q10. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for the measurement of lease liabilities are sufficient for NFP private sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

As per IPA's comment to Question 2 of "Section 1: AASB General Matters for Comment", SMEs and NFP entities are likely to have less resources to invest in understanding the requirements and experience in making the necessary judgements in accounting for the leases. This extends to determining the incremental borrowing rate. Given these challenges, it is likely there would be differences in applying the requirements in the NFP private sector.

Topic 5: NFP public sector concessionary leases

Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about:

Q11. whether there are any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice to measure initially concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value?

Q12. whether the temporary accounting policy choice for NFP public sector entities should be made permanent?

Q13. whether the disclosures prepared in accordance with paragraphs Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 of AASB 16 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users regarding concessionary leases when the ROU assets are measured at cost?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

IPA have no comments on this topic.

Topic 6: Sale and leaseback arrangements

Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements, do you have any comments about:

Q14. the application of the requirements in practice by public sector entities?

Q15. whether differences in application exist in practice in the public sector?

Q16. whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for sale and leaseback arrangements are sufficient for public sector entities?

If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

IPA have no comments on this topic.

Topic 7: Other matters

Q17. Are there any other NFP and public sector matters that should be brought to the attention of the AASB as it undertakes a PIR of AASB 16?

If so, please provide your views on those matters, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

IPA has no further comments.

SECTION 3: IASB REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Question 1—Overall assessment of IFRS 16

- (a) In your view, is IFRS 16 meeting its objective and are its core principles clear? If not, please explain why not.
- (b) In your view, are the overall improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.
- (c) In your view, are the overall ongoing costs of applying the requirements and auditing and enforcing their application largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, how you would propose the IASB reduce these costs and how your proposals would affect the benefits of IFRS 16.

IPA is of the view that:

- (a) The core principles in the leases standard are sufficiently clear and the Standard has achieved its objective of ensuring that lessees and lessors provide relevant leases information that faithfully represents those transactions. This is because, the Standard requires lessees to:
- Recognise all lease assets (as right-of-use assets) and lease liabilities in the statement of financial position, irrespective of whether it is an operating or financial lease
 - Recognise the depreciation of leased assets and interest on lease liabilities over the lease term in the statement of profit or loss and
 - Classify the cash payments in the statements of cashflows.
- (b) The overall improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases are largely as the IASB expected in that it reduced the need for investors and analysts to adjust amounts reported by lessees. While this is important, it is less relevant to IPA members who are small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs) and not-for-profit (NFP) entities. Instead, the leases Standard improves financial reporting for IPA members by requiring a lessee to initially recognise all leases (operating and financial leases) on the balance sheet, and subsequently account for them through the profit and loss and balance sheet. This essentially accounts for the substance of a lease as an entity's financial obligation that is associated with the lease assets and liabilities. Such information is useful to users in assessing an entity's assets and liabilities and how management finances and manages its assets in delivering the entity's objectives. The Standard, therefore, increases the transparency and quality of financial information on leases.
- (c) However, the cost of implementing the leases Standard was high (as expected), as an entity needed to:
- Apply the new accounting model to many contracts
 - Apply significant judgment to determine the discount rates, lease terms and other inputs for the calculation of the necessary lease information to be reported and
 - Implement IT solutions to capture the data and perform the necessary calculations for the lease accounting.

While these costs are high for many entities, they are disproportionately higher for SMEs and NFP entities, which have less resources to invest in understanding the requirements, make the necessary judgements (for which there are many) and developing the necessary IT systems to account for the leases. We also think the ongoing costs of applying the requirements disproportionately affect SMEs and NFP entities compared to the larger and better resourced

entities. This is despite our agreement that the overall ongoing costs of applying the requirements and auditing and enforcing their application are largely as the IASB expected.

On balance, IPA is of the view that the benefits of improved quality of financial information for leases outweigh the initial and on-going costs of applying the Standard. It is for this reason that IPA supports the simplified lease accounting by the standard-setters. In particular, the Australian Accounting Standards Board's (AASB) proposed simplified reporting for smaller (Tier 3) entities, which encompasses the simplified accounting and disclosures for leases.

Question 2—Usefulness of information resulting from lessees' application of judgement

- (a) Do you agree that the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that lessees' application of judgement has a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information, please explain why.
- (b) Do you agree that the requirements in IFRS 16 provide a clear and sufficient basis for entities to make appropriate judgements and that the requirements can be applied consistently? If not, please explain why not.
- (c) If your view is that the IASB should improve the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement, please explain:
 - (i) what amendments you propose the IASB make to the requirements (and how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs); or
 - (ii) what additional information about lessees' application of judgement you propose the IASB require entities to disclose (and how the benefits would outweigh the costs).

IPA is of the view that:

- (a) The usefulness of financial information from a lessee's application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected. However, this usefulness is predicated on an entity being able to understand the requirements so that judgement can be applied correctly and consistently across the entity's leases. Consistent with our response to Q1, SMEs and NFP entities are likely to have less resources and capacity to do so compared to the larger entities. Consequently, a lessee's application of judgment by SMEs and NFP entities may result in a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information where the entity does not have the necessary resources to comply with the requirements.
- (b) Overall, the requirements in leases Standard do provide a clear and sufficient basis for entities to make appropriate judgements and that the requirements can be applied consistently for entities that have experience in accounting for finance leases. However, where entities that traditionally have only operating leases, in particular SMEs and NPE entities, there is a considerable learning of the requirements to be applied correctly and accurately. This is because every input for the leased asset and leased liability calculations require judgement. For examples, judgements are required for determining the:
 - Lease term – in particular where the lease includes clauses relating to penalties and an option to extend a lease
 - Incremental borrowing rates, discount rates and interest rates implicit in a lease and
 - Variable lease payments, including those that are linked to Consumer Price Index.The incorrect application of judgement in any of the above may change the amount of leased assets and leased liabilities recognised initially and their subsequent accounting.

- (c) To improve the usefulness of financial information, the IASB could provide more guidance, especially for SMEs, on the key matters and/principles to consider when applying judgement in the example areas outlined in (b). IPA notes that it is not within the remit of the IASB to set standards for the NFP sector. However, we think that the guidance sought for SMEs could be written in a manner that would allow the NFP sector to apply.

Question 3—Usefulness of information about lessees' lease-related cash flows

Do you agree that the improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows that lessees present and disclose are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.

Overall, IPA is of the view that the required classification and presentation in the statement of cash flows are useful and the improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows that lessees present and disclose are largely as the IASB expected. However, preparers and users, especially the SMEs and NFP entities, may find the required classification and presentation in the statement of cash flows complex and difficult on the initial implementation of the leases Standard.

Question 4—Ongoing costs for lessees of applying the measurement requirements

- (a) Do you agree that the ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements in IFRS 16 are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, considering how any entity-specific facts and circumstances (such as IT solutions) add to these costs.
- (b) If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain how you propose the IASB reduce these costs without a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information about leases.

IPA is of the view that the ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements in IFRS 16 are largely as the IASB expected for the larger entities. However, for SMEs and NFP entities, the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, especially in remeasuring the carrying amount of the lease liability to reflect any reassessment or lease modification, unless a lease modification is accounted for as a separate lease. The complexity involved in a reassessment or lease modification has resulted in some SMEs and NFPs adopting business practices, where there is a modification to an existing lease, the entity enters into a new lease for the modified terms and accounts for it as a new lease. The practice thereby eliminates the need for the entity to remeasure the carrying amount of lease liability to reflect any reassessment or lease modification. Additionally, many of the SMEs and NFP entities would not have IT solutions that cater for a reassessment or lease modification. These entities, instead, would need to capture the data in another IT application, such as a spreadsheet and then manually reconcile the two IT systems.

Consistent with our comments in Q1 above, we think that there is merit in retaining the reassessment or lease modification requirements. However, IPA supports the simplified lease accounting by the standard-setters. In particular, the AASB's proposed simplified reporting for smaller (Tier 3) entities, which encompasses the simplified accounting and disclosures for leases.

Question 5—Potential improvements to future transition requirements

Based on your experience with the transition to IFRS 16, would you recommend the IASB does anything differently when developing transition requirements in future standard-setting projects? If so, please explain how your idea would ensure:

- (a) users have enough information to allow them to understand the effect of any new requirements on entities' financial performance, financial position and cash flows; and
- (b) preparers can appropriately reduce their transition costs when implementing new requirements for the first time.

IPA is of the view that the transition requirements provided sufficient flexibility to allow an entity to select the transition provisions that are appropriate to their circumstance. That is, the Standard permits a lessee to elect to apply the Standard either “fully” retrospectively or retrospectively (without stating comparative financial information). The Standard also includes simplifications and practical expedients to provide cost relief for entities implementing the Standard.

Question 6.1—Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 9 to rent concessions

- (a) How often have you observed the type of rent concession described in Spotlight 6.1?
- (b) Have you observed diversity in how lessees account for rent concessions that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?
- (c) If your view is that the IASB should act to improve the clarity of the requirements, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

Rent concessions occur more often for NPF entities than they do for SMEs. IPA notes that a lessee can account for a rent concession in which the only change to the lease contract is the lessor's forgiveness of lease payments due from the lessee under that contract resulting in partial extinguishment of the lessee's liability under either:

- IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* to the extinguished part of the lease liability or
- Lease modification requirements under IFRS 16

Both methods are difficult to navigate and apply for SMEs and NFP entities. We therefore recommend the IFRS Interpretations Committee consider undertaking a narrow-scope standard-setting project to clarify how a lessee distinguishes a lease modification under IFRS 16 or an extinguishment under IFRS 19.

Question 6.2—Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 when assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale

- (a) How often have you observed difficulties in assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale?
- (b) Have you observed diversity in seller–lessees’ assessments of the transfer of control that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?
- (c) If your view is that the IASB should act to help seller–lessees determine whether the transfer of an asset is a sale, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

IPA supports the requirement that the gain or loss a seller-lessee recognises on a completed sale in a sale and leaseback transaction should reflect the amount of the gain or loss that relates to the rights transferred to the buyer or lessor. We also agree with the IASB’s rationale for this accounting, so as to restrict the amount of the gain recognised on the sale of the asset in a sale and thereby reduce the incentive to structure such a transaction to achieve a preferred accounting outcome.

However, some SMEs and NFP entities that enter into a sales and leaseback find the calculations complex and the accounting challenging. This is particularly when there is a partial gain or loss in a sale and leaseback transaction, where the accounting is inconsistent under the requirements of IFRS 15 *Revenue from Contracts with Customers* and IFRS 16. Additionally, some NFP entities found it challenging to account for when an asset is sold or transferred for nominal consideration.

Question 6.3—Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 to gain or loss recognition in a sale and leaseback transaction

- (a) Do you agree that restricting the amount of gain (or loss) an entity recognises in a sale and leaseback transaction results in useful information?
- (b) What new evidence or arguments have you identified since the IASB issued IFRS 16 that would indicate that the costs of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, and the usefulness of the resulting information, differ significantly from those expected?
- (c) If your view is that the IASB should improve the cost–benefit balance of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, please describe your proposed solution.

Refer to IPA’s comments for Question 6.2.

Question 6.4—Other matters relevant to the assessment of the effects of IFRS 16

Are there any further matters the IASB should examine as part of the post- implementation review of IFRS 16? If so, please explain why, considering the objective of a post-implementation review as set out on page 5.

IPA has no further comments.

29 August 2025

Dr Keith Kendall
Chair
Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins Street West
VIC 8007 Australia

Dear Dr Kendall,

ITC 55: Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases

The Heads of Treasuries Accounting and Reporting Advisory Committee (HoTARAC) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Invitation to Comment ITC 55 *Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases* (ITC 55). HoTARAC is an intergovernmental committee that advises Australian Heads of Treasuries on accounting and reporting issues. The Committee comprises senior accounting policy representatives from all Australian states and territories and the Australian Government.

At the outset, HoTARAC would like to thank the Board and its staff for your considerable effort in consulting the public sector to understand the key public sector challenges and perspectives on the implementation of AASB 16.

Overall, HoTARAC has had no major issues in the transition to AASB 16 and has found the guidance provided by the AASB to be sufficient in most areas. We are particularly grateful for the board's understanding of the unique implementation challenges faced by the Not-for-Profit (NFP) public sector and the introduction of the policy choice to measure concessionary leases at cost or fair value to help minimise the burden on the sector.

HoTARAC notes that currently all Australian jurisdictions hold and report concessionary assets at cost due to the complexities and challenges in fair valuing concessionary leases, and the associated substantial costs. HoTARAC strongly supports making the accounting policy choice permanent for the public sector consistent with the AASB's decision for the private NFP sector. This would crystallise and embed consistent reporting across the public and private NFP sectors.

In HoTARAC's view, the costs for entities to measure concessionary leases at fair value substantially outweigh any additional benefits for users of financial statements. Measuring concessionary leases at fair value is complex and costly for entities and will likely often require external valuation experts. Entities that measure concessionary leases at cost provide robust disclosures within the notes to the financial statements to provide sufficient information to users. The current approach has served well over the last six years since its introduction in 2019 and we believe it should continue permanently.

Attached is HoTARAC's response to the general and NFP and public sector specific topics for comment. If you have any queries regarding HoTARAC's comments, please contact Steve Mitsas from the Department of Treasury and Finance in Victoria via email to steve.mitsas@dtf.vic.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,



Andy Hobbs

Chair
Heads of Treasuries Accounting and Reporting Advisory Committee
Executive Director, Financial Stewardship and Public Reporting
NSW Treasury

ENCLOSED:

HoTARAC Comments to the AASB on ITC 55 Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 *Leases*

ITC 55: Post Implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases

Section 1: AASB general matters for comment

- 1 Are there any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 Leases?

Government Finance Statistics (GFS) treat leases differently to AASB 16. GFS is aligned to the concepts of financing and operating leases in AASB 117. This means there is a convergence difference that is not measured by governments.

- 2 Does the application of the requirements in AASB 16 result in major auditing or assurance challenges?

No comment.

- 3 Are the requirements in the best interests of the Australian economy?

No comment.

Section 2: NFP and public sector topics for comment

Topic 1: Application of AASB 16 by NFP and public sector entities

- 1 In respect of NFP and public sector entities:
 - a are the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application significantly greater than expected?

HoTARAC has noted significant ongoing costs for entities in accounting for leases under AASB 16 compared to the previous requirements under AASB 117.

The cost can be particularly significant for relatively smaller not-for-profit public sector entities that often lack the required technical expertise and/or the resources, and entities that maintain larger and more complex lease portfolios.

AASB 16 lease accounting is similar to maintaining a register for PP&E assets, but arguably more complicated, as accounting for lease renewals or modifications is more complex than asset replacements. In some instances, investment in software has been required.

Other additional costs/challenges include:

- Staffing costs;
- Auditing costs;
- Ongoing effort required for lease remeasurements due to CPI adjustments etc;
- Forecasting and budgeting;
- Cost to perform regular ROU asset impairment assessments;
- Intra-sector leases create consolidation challenges, where one entity records the same asset under PPE and another as ROU, which then requires adjustments on consolidation; and
- Subleasing arrangements create additional accounting effort, if a sublease is a finance lease.

b are the benefits to users significantly lower than expected?

Given the dynamics of the public sector, including centralised funding arrangements and primary user focus on service delivery rather than lease financing, it is difficult to comment on the extent of benefits arising from applying AASB 16 accounting in the public sector context.

The information provided by AASB 16 may not be as useful to the users of public sector entities' financial statements as to those of private sector entities. The recognition of the right-of-use assets and the corresponding liability provides more transparent information about the "debt-like" arrangement and has increased comparability between entities. However, credit rating agencies have previously considered the impact using the lease information disclosed under AASB 117.

Overall, do you have any comments about whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous Standard AASB 117 Leases?

While acknowledging the greater transparency of lease-related assets and liabilities through the on balance sheet presentation, HoTARAC has not received any significant user feedback indicating 'AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous standard AASB 117 Leases'.

Topic 2: Determining the lease term

Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about:

2 the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

HoTARAC have identified the following key areas of concern:

2.1 Enforceable period

The concept of lease term has been complex to apply at times given the nature of government operations and the less 'legalistic' approach that might be taken in ensuring arrangements are set out in 'enforcement' terms.

Relatively informal or undocumented lease arrangements are common between entities within the public sector. For example, an entity may utilise land and/or buildings of another entity on a largely undocumented basis (often for below market or no consideration).

Lease agreements which are effectively open ended (no or nominal contractual termination penalties for both lessee and lessor) are also common in the public sector. In some cases, even though contractual termination penalties are only nominal, significant economic penalties may still apply if the lease is terminated.

Determining the lease term for such arrangements can be particularly challenging, in light of the requirements in AASB 16.B34 around 'enforceable period' and the meaning 'insignificant economic penalty' in the context of the broader economics of the arrangement.

2.2 Termination or renewal

Termination or renewal of leases in the government sector often has more dependence on political or social factors than financial consideration. This requires more judgment when lessee entities assess the certainty of exercising renewal or termination options. The AASB 16.20 requirement for reassessments of lease extension or termination options only for events or changes in circumstances ‘within the control of the lessee’ is also unclear. This may cause the differences between lessee and lessor entities when they assess the lease term.

2.3 Extension options

Many government entities hold long-term leases, with some including non-cancellable lease terms of up to 40 years. Often, determining the likelihood of an extension option being exercised by the entity at the inception of a long-term lease can be challenging and requires significant judgement.

Also, entities may have multiple lease extension options, but the certainty of those extensions may be unclear where there are frequent changes in the Government’s operational requirements (e.g. administrative restructures).

There is the added complexity when determining the lease term where an entity may be the lessee from an external party and then sub-lease to another entity, so the other entity's intentions also need to be considered when determining if the option to extend is reasonably certain to be exercised.

3 whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

Refer to our comment above.

4 whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for determining the lease term are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

Refer to comment above. Despite the high levels of judgement often involved in determining lease term in the public sector context, HoTARAC considers that the requirements of AASB 16 have generally served well.

Some additional guidance on the term ‘penalty’ (AASB 16.B34) in the not-for-profit public sector context, particularly non-financial penalties, and what determines if extension options are reasonably certain, may be beneficial for users. It would also be useful to have public sector specific illustrative examples that replicate various real-life scenarios which involve some complexity. For example, Agency A is the lessee and enters a 20 year lease with an option to extend for a further 5 years with an external party. Agency A then subleases to Agency B. In this situation, not only is the term of the lease longer which makes applying judgement as to whether the option will be exercised difficult, but consideration needs to also be given to the other entity and their demand for the leased asset at that point in time.

Topic 3: Lease modification

Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about:

5 the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

Overall, HoTARAC members have not experienced significant issues in the application of the lease modification requirements under AASB 16. However additional application guidance and illustrative examples could be beneficial.

6 whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

Not to our knowledge.

7 whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for lease modification are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

HoTARAC considers that the current requirements and guidance on lease modifications are sufficient. However additional application guidance and illustrative examples could be beneficial.

Topic 4: Measurement of lease liabilities – determining the incremental borrowing rate

Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate, do you have any comments about:

8 the application of the requirements in practice by NFP private sector entities, including how these entities are currently determining the incremental borrowing rate in practice?

9 whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP private sector?

10 whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for the measurement of lease liabilities are sufficient for NFP private sector entities?

No comment on Topic 4 questions as these questions are targeted at the NFP private sector.

Topic 5: NFP public sector concessionary leases

Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about:

11 whether there are any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice to measure initially concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value?

HoTARAC notes that all Australian jurisdictions currently elect to hold concessionary assets at cost due to the complexities and challenges in fair valuing concessionary leases and the substantial associated costs. The disclosure approach has served well in meeting any user's information needs over the last six years since its introduction in 2019. In HoTARAC's view, fair valuing below market leases is highly problematic and is not justifiable on cost/benefit grounds.

Consistent with the ongoing policy choice allowed for the private sector NFP entities, HoTARAC strongly believes the current policy choice should continue an ongoing policy choice for the public sector. We see no conceptual justification for a different treatment between NFP private sector and NFP public sector in this area.

12 whether the temporary accounting policy choice for NFP public sector entities should be made permanent?

HoTARAC strongly supports making the accounting policy choice for NFP public sector to measure concessionary assets at cost or fair value a permanent choice, consistent with the AASB's decision for the private NFP sector.

In HoTARAC's view, the costs for entities to measure concessionary leases at fair value substantially outweighs any additional benefits for users of financial statements. Measuring concessionary leases at fair value is highly complex and costly for entities and will likely often require external valuation experts. Additionally, entities that measure concessionary leases at cost provide robust disclosures within the notes to the financial statements to provide sufficient information to users and these disclosures have served well since their introduction in 2019. Accordingly, HoTARAC believes it is appropriate that this accounting policy choice is made permanent to provide certainty to the sector.

13 whether the disclosures prepared in accordance with paragraphs Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 of AASB 16 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users regarding concessionary leases when the ROU assets are measured at cost?

HoTARAC believes that the disclosures provided in accordance with Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users. We are not aware of any user feedback indicating otherwise in the last six years that these requirements have been in operation.

Topic 6: Sale and leaseback arrangements

Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements, do you have any comments about:

14 the application of the requirements in practice by public sector entities?

HoTARAC has not experienced any major challenges in accounting for sale-leaseback arrangements.

However, we note that BC262 of IFRS 16 may seem to indicate that most sale and lease back transactions should be considered as a sale: "...a lease is different from the purchase or sale of the underlying asset, in that a lease does not transfer control of the underlying asset to the lessee; instead, it transfers the right to control the use of the underlying asset for the period of the lease. Consequently, if there are no features in a sale and leaseback transaction that prevent sale accounting, the buyer-lessor is considered to obtain control of the underlying asset, and immediately transfer the right to control the use of that asset to the seller-lessee for the lease term..."

Given IFRS 16 requires sale and leaseback arrangements to be treated as financing arrangements in certain circumstances, it would be helpful to add some explanation or example about when a transaction is not a sale in a sale and lease back transaction (i.e. features that prevent sale accounting).

15 whether differences in application exist in practice in the public sector?

Not to our knowledge.

16 whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for sale and leaseback arrangements are sufficient for public sector entities?

HoTARAC considers that the current requirements and guidance on accounting for sale-leaseback arrangements are sufficient.

Topic 7: Other matters

17 Are there any other NFP and public sector matters that should be brought to the attention of the AASB as it undertakes a PIR of AASB 16?

HoTARAC notes the assessment of impairment of RoU assets in a public sector context can sometimes be challenging. For example, although change in interest rates is possibly an impairment trigger, in isolation a change in interest rate may not comprise impairment in a public sector environment as the recoverable amount is unchanged in substance.

Also, the requirements in AASB 16.42 may lead to timing differences in recognition of impairment of a RoU asset and a reduction of the corresponding RoU liability. When there is a downturn in market rents, an impairment of the right-of-use asset may need to be made in the period the downturn occurs. However, the corresponding lease liability cannot be adjusted until the actual market rent review takes place. This is due to AASB 16.42(b), which states that the lessee shall remeasure the lease liability to reflect those revised lease payments only when there is a change in the cash flows (i.e. when the adjustment to the lease payments takes effect). As a result, an entity may incur an impairment expense in an earlier year and income from reduction of lease liability in a later year.

ITC 55 asks the following questions under three broad sections heading as shown below. There is a list of questions under each Section heading as shown below.

Section 1: General Matters (All Stakeholders). This section includes three questions as outlined below relevant to all entities applying AASB 16.

- **Question 1: Are there any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 Leases?**
- **Question 2: Does the application of the requirements in AASB 16 result in major auditing or assurance challenges?**
- **Question 3: Are the requirements in the best interests of the Australian economy?**

Section 2: NFP and Public Sector Focus: This section seeks feedback from NFP and public sector stakeholders on sector-specific application issues identified by the AASB during the planning phase of this PIR. In undertaking the planning phase of this PIR, the AASB understands that some NFP and public sector stakeholders are experiencing challenges applying AASB 16. This section asks a list of questions as outlined below.

Question 4: In respect of NFP and public sector entities please respond to following questions:

Question 4.1: Are the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application significantly greater than expected?

The introduction and application of AASB 16 has resulted in additional costs to the ABS and its GFS data providers due to the divergence between economic (GFS) and accounting standards. As GFS standards still recognise a distinction between operating and finance leases, particularly around who bears the economic risks and rewards and where finance v operating leases are recorded in the financial statements, the ABS requires additional data from providers to maintain that distinction in the GFS accounts.

Question 4.2: Are the benefits to users significantly lower than expected?

Question 4.3: Overall, do you have any comments about whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the

previous Standard AASB 117 Leases? Please explain the reasons for your views on the above matters. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Financial statements prepared under AASB 16 differ from those prepared under GFS standards due to the divergent treatment of operating and finance leases. This requires extra work from both the ABS and GFS data providers to compile lease data in accordance with GFS standards.

Question 5: Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about:

Question 5.1: The application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

Question 5.2: Whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

Question 5.3: Whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for determining the lease term are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities? If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Question 6: Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about:

Question 6.1: The application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

Question 6.2: Whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

Question 6.3: Whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for lease modification are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities? If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Question 7: Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate do you have any comments about:

Question 7.1: The application of the requirements in practice by NFP private sector entities, including how these entities are currently determining the incremental borrowing rate in practice?

Question 7.2: Whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP private sector?

Question 7.3: Whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for the measurement of lease liabilities are sufficient for NFP private sector entities? If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their

significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Question 8 Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about:

Question 8.1: whether there are any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice to measure initially concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value?

The ABS is not supportive of any movement away from fair value, as that is the valuation basis most consistent with the GFS principle of market valuation and this is expected to be continued through the current review of the IMF's GFS Manual.

Under GFS conceptual principles, all assets and liabilities should ideally be valued at their current market value. However, the ABS understands that market valuation can sometimes be challenging. As such the ABS accepts a market value equivalent which to date has been fair value.

The risk for the ABS is that any change from measuring assets at fair value means that the ABS is receiving data that is not consistent with GFS principles. ABS still maintains a requirement for GFS data providers to provide valuations in line with current practices and standards.

Question 8.2: whether the temporary accounting policy choice for NFP public sector entities should be made permanent?

As stated above, the ABS is not supportive of any movement away from fair value, as this is the valuation basis most consistent with the GFS principle of market valuation.

Question 8.3: whether the disclosures prepared in accordance with paragraphs Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 of AASB 16 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users regarding concessionary leases when the ROU assets are measured at cost? If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances, and their significance. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Question 9: Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements do you have any comments about:

Question 9.1: The application of the requirements in practice by public sector entities?

Question 9.2: Whether differences in application exist in practice in the public sector?

Question 9.3: whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for sale and leaseback arrangements are sufficient for public sector entities? If so, please provide your views on those requirements, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Question 10: Are there any other NFP and public sector matters that should be brought to the attention of the AASB as it undertakes a PIR of AASB 16? If so, please provide your views on

those matters, relevant circumstances and their significance, and areas where you believe changes or additional guidance are needed. Examples to illustrate your responses are also most helpful.

Section 3: IASB Request for Information (RFI) Primarily For-Profit Sector. This section contains the IASB's Request for information RFI on IFRS 16- Leases in full. This Request for Information includes a list of questions under following six sub-sections:

- information on stakeholders' experience relating to IFRS 16 and their overall views on the Standard.
- Usefulness of information resulting from lessees' application of judgement
- Usefulness of information about lessees' lease-related cash flows
- Ongoing costs for lessees of applying the measurement requirements
- Potential improvements to future transition requirements
- Other matters relevant to the assessment of the effects of IFRS 16

A series of questions is associated with each subsection as outlined below

Question 11: In relation to Overall assessment of IFRS 16 please provide the following:

Question 11.1: In your view, is IFRS 16 meeting its objective (see page 9) and are its core principles clear? If not, please explain why not.

Question 11.2: In your view, are the overall improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.

Question 11.3: In your view, are the overall ongoing costs of applying the requirements and auditing and enforcing their application largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, how you would propose the IASB reduce these costs and how your proposals would affect the benefits of IFRS 16

Question 12: in relation to the Usefulness of information resulting from lessees' application of judgement please respond to following questions:

Question 12.1: Do you agree that the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that lessees' application of judgement has a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information, please explain why.

Question 12.2: Do you agree that the requirements in IFRS 16 provide a clear and sufficient basis for entities to make appropriate judgements and that the requirements can be applied consistently? If not, please explain why not.

Question 12.3: If your view is that the IASB should improve the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement, please explain:

- What amendments you propose the IASB make to the requirements (and how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs); or

- What additional information about lessees' application of judgement you propose the IASB requires entities to disclose (and how the benefits would outweigh the costs).

Question 13: In relation to Usefulness of information about lessees' lease-related

cash flows Do you agree that the improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows that lessees present and disclose are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.

Question 14: in relation to on Ongoing costs for lessees of applying the measurement requirements, respond to following questions:

Question 14.1: Do you agree that the ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements in IFRS 16 are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, considering how any entity-specific facts and circumstances (such as IT solutions) add to these costs.

Question 14.2: If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain how you propose the IASB reduce these costs without a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information about leases.

Question 15: In relation to Potential improvements to future transition requirements based on your experience with the transition to IFRS 16, would you recommend the IASB does anything different when developing transition requirements in future standard-setting projects? If so, please explain how your idea would ensure:

- users have enough information to allow them to understand the effect of any new requirements on entities' financial performance, financial position and cash flows; and
- preparers can appropriately reduce their transition costs when implementing new requirements for the first time.

Question 16: In relation to other matters relevant to the assessment of the effects of IFRS 16 i.e. Accounting for Rent Concessions: IFRS 16 and IFRS 9 please respond to the following questions:

Question 16.1: How often have you observed the type of rent concession described in Accounting for Rent Concessions: IFRS 16 and IFRS 9?

Question 16.2: Have you observed diversity in how lessees account for rent concessions that have had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

Question 16.3: If your view is that the IASB should act to improve the clarity of the requirements, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution outweigh the costs.

Question 17: In relation to other matters relevant to the assessment of the effects of IFRS 16 i.e. Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 when assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale please respond to the following questions:

Question 17.1: How often have you observed difficulties in assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale?

Question 17.2: Have you observed diversity in seller–lessees’ assessments of the transfer of control that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

Question 17.3 If your view is that the IASB should act to help seller–lessees determine whether the transfer of an asset is a sale, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

Question 18: In relation to applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 to gain or loss recognition in a sale and leaseback transaction, please respond to following questions:

Question 18.1: Do you agree that restricting the amount of gain (or loss) an entity recognises in a sale and leaseback transaction results in useful information? (

Question 18.2: What new evidence or arguments have you identified since the IASB issued IFRS 16 that would indicate that the costs of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, and the usefulness of the resulting information, differ significantly from those expected?

Question 18.3 If your view is that the IASB should improve the cost–benefit balance of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, please describe your proposed solution.

Question 19: In relation to other matters relevant to the assessment of the effects of IFRS 16, are there any further matters the IASB should examine as part of the post implementation review of IFRS 16? If so, please explain why, considering the objective of a post-implementation review.

As stated above, the ABS is not supportive of any movement away from fair value, as this is the valuation basis most consistent with the GFS principle of market valuation.



Property Council of Australia ABN 13 00847 4422
A Level 7, 50 Carrington Street, Sydney NSW 2000
T +61 2 9033 1900
E info@propertycouncil.com.au
W propertycouncil.com.au
in Property Council of Australia

5 September 2025

Office of the Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins St West
VIC 8007

By email only: standard@asb.gov.au

To Whom It May Concern

ITC 55 – Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases

The Property Council of Australia (the Property Council) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Australian Accounting Standards Board's (the AASB's) invitation to comment (ITC) on the post-implementation review of AASB 16 *Leases*.

The Property Council is the peak body for owners and investors in Australia's \$670 billion property industry. We represent owners, fund managers, superannuation trusts, developers, and investors across all four quadrants of property investments: debt, equity, public and private.

The property industry is the country's second largest employer, providing over 1.4 million jobs to Australians, representing a direct gross domestic product (GDP) contribution of \$232 billion, or 10.6 per cent of total GDP, as well as 18.2 percent of total tax revenues totalling \$129.6 billion.

The operation of AASB 16 *Leases* has a direct and ongoing impact on the property industry's resources. CBRE has estimated that an average of 20,000 commercial leases are entered into each year, with about 50 per cent made up of new leases, and the compliance burden associated with the recognition, measurement and disclosure requirements is significant and material.

Whilst AASB 16 is broadly meeting its objectives, some aspects of the standard (particularly as they interact with AASB 15 *Contracts with Customers*) are burdensome and represent little value for users of financial statements.

These requirements draw on limited industry resources and divert them from core operational and strategic activities. Whilst the Australian Government is prioritising the reduction of red tape and regulatory friction on industry, the AASB should use this opportunity to advocate for a streamlined standard that can both meet its broader objectives and reduce the regulatory impact on preparers of financial statements.

For the property industry, many participants are required to prepare their financial statements in line with the requirements of AASB 16. However, in other shareholder communications (such as in directors' reports or investor presentations) alternative performance measures (APMs) are presented that reverse the impact of AASB 16 lease accounting for lessors and reflect instead the

cash receipts from leases to better present how these businesses are run in practice and understood by investors.

The AASB has already acknowledged the feedback from the not-for-profit and public sector, and the constraints that compliance is having on community housing providers (for example).

The Property Council is aware of the broader sectoral impacts of the standard and would support the simplification of requirements on the not-for-profit sector in order to support alignment with government housing policy.

As part of this post-implementation review the AASB must assess whether the benefits of increased granularity required under the standards justify the scale of resource commitment required to comply.

Ultimately, the standard has increased visibility of rental obligations at a high compliance cost. The Property Council prefers stability in the broader standard over wholesale change, supporting international alignment while calling for targeted refinements.

Splitting of lease income, trade receivables and other income between AASB 15 and AASB 16

The Property Council has previously responded to the International Accounting Standards Board's (IASB) post-implementation review of IFRS 15 *Revenue from Contracts with Customers*, which outlined two disclosures which are providing little or no value to users of financial statements. These disclosures are:

- The splitting of lease income and other revenue from contracts with customers (generally the outgoings component)(as required by paragraph 113(a) of IFRS 15)
- The splitting of trade receivables between those relating to leases and those relating to contracts with customers (as required by paragraph 116(a) of IFRS 15)

The split of leasing income was as a result of an interpretation by the major accounting firms that outgoings-related charges (amounts paid by lessees for building costs such as cleaning, security, statutory rates and taxes etc.) to the landlord as part of the lease were not lease revenue under IFRS 16 *Leases*, but rather revenue from contracts with customers under IFRS 15.

Prior to the release of these two standards, this income (together with other immaterial income streams associated with a lease) were grouped with leasing income for reporting purposes.

Broadly, there are two main types of lease agreements:

- Net leases - where the tenant will pay a base rent component and also pay a separate portion of the building operating costs (i.e. outgoings)
- Gross leases - where the tenant will pay a single base rent amount.

There are other variations on these lease types, such as semi-gross leases (where tenants pay a separate amount for a selection of building operating costs), or leases where the tenant will directly pay the full operating costs of a building (usually in a single-tenant building).

As a result of this interpretation by the major accounting firms (and to align with the requirements of IFRS 15 and 16), preparers of financial statements had to determine the split by calculating:

1. What is **lease income** (to be disclosed under IFRS 16), and
2. What is **outgoings/other revenue** from contracts with customers (under IFRS 15), including determining an apportionment for gross leases where the tenant only receives a single charge.

This determination is arbitrary and despite the significant work involved in calculating provides little or no useful information to users of financial statements who are otherwise focused on the total revenue from leases.

In addition, IFRS 15 paragraph 116(a) requires the opening and closing balance of receivables relating to contract assets to be disclosed. In the same manner, this balance is often arbitrarily split between IFRS 15 and IFRS 16.

Furthermore, as amounts paid by tenants often do not specifically relate to any particular charge, customer receivables cannot be meaningfully split between balances relating to leasing income and balances relating to outgoings and other charges.

The Property Council supports reducing the regulatory burden on preparers of financial statements by allowing outgoings and other income incidental to a lease to be treated as variable lease income under IFRS 16.

Recommendation 1: amend IFRS/AASB 16 *Leases* to allow outgoings and other income incidental to a lease to be treated as variable lease income.

Embedded fit outs in investment property leases

As part of its engagement with industry, the Property Council has other matters which require review by the AASB to ensure the standard is working as intended. This issue is also closely connected to the interaction between lease accounting and sustainability standards (S1 and S2), particularly in how lease-related assets and activities are brought into an entity's reporting boundary.

Whilst AASB 16 has removed the separate classification for operating leases for lessees, the distinction remains for lessors between operating and finance leases, with property leases classified as operating leases if they do not transfer the significant risks and rewards of ownership to the lessee.

However, this classification has unintended consequences when considered along the Greenhouse Gas Protocol (GHG Protocol). Lessor entities (such as fund managers) must include emissions from operating leases within their emissions boundary.

This creates a situation where tenant-selected but landlord-funded fit outs are otherwise interpreted as being within the lessor's emissions boundary. This interpretation leads to significant complexity in attributing emissions, for example when:

- The landlord's fit out is connected to the tenant's electrical distribution board and powers tenant-owned equipment,
- The tenant funds the electricity consumption, yet the equipment is deemed to be part of the lessor's boundary, or

- The fit out is jointly funded, resulting in ambiguity over which party is responsible for the emissions generated.

This complexity introduces material regulatory burden on preparers of financial statements, particularly in cases where audit firms interpret embedded fit outs as part of the lessor's boundary.

The commercial reality is that these fit outs often function as finance leases embedded within operating leases, with the cost of the fit out recovered through base rent charges that include an implicit interest component.

The Property Council seeks clarity and further guidance from the AASB on the treatment of fit outs in the context of both IFRS 16 and emerging sustainability reporting requirements. Greater certainty in this area would assist preparers, avoid inconsistent audit interpretations, and otherwise reduce compliance costs.

Divergence between the Australian and international standard

The Property Council supports further investigation and consideration of the feedback provided in this submission; however it wishes to express its strong view that any response by the IASB should not consider divergence from the IFRS framework.

Australia's continued alignment with IFRS is critical to maintaining global consistency, comparability, and investor confidence. Divergence would not only reduce the usefulness of financial statements for global capital providers but would also impose greater administrative complexity and burden on Australian preparers, particularly those operating across multiple jurisdictions.

The Property Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss this submission in more detail. Please contact Dan Rubenach, Policy Manager at drubenach@propertycouncil.com.au

Yours sincerely



Matthew Kandelaars
Group Executive, Policy and Advocacy

GAAP International Pty Ltd trading as **Stevenson McGregor Rugers**

ABN 16 088 971 091

Sean Rugers PO Box 216 Park Orchards Victoria 3114 Australia

 +61(0)421 057 493  seanrugers@stevensonmcgregor.com

Dr Keith Kendall
Chair - Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO BOX 204 Collins Street West
Victoria 8007

Dear Keith

Re: ITC 55 – Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases ('AASB 16')

Stevenson McGregor Rugers ('SMR') is pleased to provide comments on the AASB's Invitation to Comment on the Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases ('PIR'). Our detailed responses are set out in Appendix A to this cover letter.

We have a deep interest in the development of AASB 16 for both public and private sector reporting. We are very supportive of the IASB's and AASB's activities in undertaking this Post-implementation Review as a critical element of the standard setting process.

Overall, we agree that the introduction of AASB 16 has resulted in improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases. However, there are several areas of AASB 16 that are unnecessarily complex and as such, we believe there are opportunities to make some adjustments to the requirements without diminishing the benefits of AASB 16.

If you have any questions concerning our comments please contact Warren McGregor at +61 417 340 664 or Sean Rugers at +61 421 057 493.

Signed on behalf of Warren and Sean

Yours sincerely



Sean Rugers
Director

6 September 2025



Appendix A – Responses to AASB questions

Section 1: AASB General Matters for Comment

Q1. Are there any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 Leases?

1. We aren't aware of any ongoing regulatory issues that impact adversely on the application of AASB 16. There was some initial focus on how best to deal with the consequences of lease contracts becoming a capital activity rather than an operating activity wherever the statutory numbers were being used to drive a calculation that required that distinction. This was largely internal management reporting, like budget funding requests, but at times it impacted on regulatory measures. Our understanding is that these matters are largely settled in the private sector.

Q2. Does the application of the requirements in AASB 16 result in major auditing or assurance challenges?

2. We have not observed major auditing or assurance challenges although it should be noted that there are several areas of complexity when applying the standard, that present a risk to individual audit teams if there isn't a clear understanding of the requirements of the standard. These areas are summarised as follows:
 - 2.1. Calculation complexity – complexity can create an overreliance on system outputs, as it can be hard to replicate calculations accurately in a spreadsheet environment.
 - 2.2. Testing of portfolio decisions depends heavily on how comprehensive the documentation is of how the requirements have been applied.

Q3. Are the requirements in the best interests of the Australian economy?

3. Yes, for the following reasons:
 - 3.1. While not all user groups are utilising the enhanced information about leases, there are sufficient benefits to capturing lease contracts on the balance sheet and enhancing disclosures about material lease contract arrangements.
 - 3.2. Companies of all sizes typically realise benefits from managing leases using a system. While the lease accounting calculations are inherently complex, capturing the underlying lease information in a system will allow management to more effectively manage the contractual requirements of each lease contract.



3.3. For public sector entities, AASB 16 results in a more consistent presentation with AASB 1059 Service Concession Arrangements (AASB 1059). Control through ownership, regulation and right of use are all presented on balance sheet in a reasonably consistent manner.



Section 2: NFP and Public Sector topics for comment

Topic 1: Application of AASB 16 by NFP and public sector entities

Q1. In respect of NFP and public sector entities:

Q1(a) Are the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application significantly greater than expected?

4. Yes, the higher costs than expected result from the fact that leases are generally non-standard and are therefore inherently complex. The level of judgement required is not easy to capture sufficiently in a system and therefore in many cases, judgement decisions on individual leases are captured outside of the system. This is partly because the judgement involved is not limited to the application of a policy position by the finance function – it involves input from property teams, asset managers and treasury functions which may not understand the accounting requirements that can be different to the natural commercial decision making processes that they may otherwise adopt.

Q1(b) Are the benefits to users significantly lower than expected?

5. Overall no, although it would be important to note that the P&L presentation of depreciation and interest is less relevant in a NFP context, particularly with regard to property leases. There may be opportunities within IFRS 18 to address this though with the development of better ways for finance teams to communicate to users the nature of lease costs and how they are managed by the business.

Q1 (c) Overall, do you have any comments about whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous Standard AASB 117 Leases?

6. Yes, presenting lease contracts on the balance sheet is just as important for NFP and public entities as it is for private sector entities. Lease contracts are complex and represent an indebtedness of a business that should be captured by the accounting process to ensure there is a full measurement of an entity's contractual obligations on their balance sheet.



Topic 2: Determining the lease term

Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about:

Q2. The application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

7. No specific comments to add

Q3. Whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

8. Yes, there are differences in application but there is sufficient guidance available to cover most of the issues that develop in practice. The challenges that arise particularly in the public sector, have more to do with being able to specifically define the relationship between different public sector participants, rather than the specific application of the provisions in the leasing standard.

9. A good example of this has been the accounting for leased commercial office space across the State Government sector. In many States, there is a central co-ordinating agency that enters a head lease with a non-Government lessor. There are differing commercial arrangements that may apply as to whether the central co-ordinating agency is doing that on behalf of another agency or is then entering into a formal sub-lease arrangement with the other agency. This has led to at least 3 different accounting treatments for similar types of arrangements (noting there are genuinely different commercial arrangements that exist and could justifiably result in different outcomes).

Q4. Whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for determining the lease term are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

10. Yes, particularly considering that relevant public sector agencies will also supplement the published AAS guidance with their own policies and practice notes to deal with particular issues that arise in practice.



Topic 3: Lease modifications

Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about:

Q5. The application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

11. No comments to add

Q6. Whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

12. No differences in application noted

Q7. Whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for lease modification are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

13. No comments to add



Topic 4: Measurement of lease liabilities – determining an incremental borrowing rate

Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate, do you have any comments about:

Q8. The application of the requirements in practice by NFP private sector entities, including how these entities are currently determining the incremental borrowing rate in practice?

14. We don't have direct experience with assisting NFP private sector entities with determining the incremental borrowing rate, although given our broader experience working with private sector entities, we would expect that it would be a difficult exercise to establish an incremental borrowing rate for an entity that does not have any borrowings.

Q9. Whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP private sector?

15. No comments to add.

Q10. Whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for the measurement of lease liabilities are sufficient for NFP private sector entities?

16. No comments to add



Topic 5: NFP public sector concessionary leases

Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about:

Q11. Whether there are any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice to measure initially concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value?

17. While it is an accepted rationale that fair value accounting will generally give rise to more relevant and reliable information, it is often very difficult to determine a commercial market rental in order undertake the measurement of a lease, particularly for unique or specialised buildings. Therefore, there may be more limited circumstances under which a Fair Value accounting policy choice is feasible, although this is not in itself a reason to remove the policy choice from being available.

18. In addition, while it is valid to require that any “grant” component of a below market lease should be accounted for, it can be difficult to isolate whether a below market lease is only a grant element, or if it incorporates other things. For example, if a below market lease is provided to a NFP such that the recipient is better able to deliver services to the lessor, the entity is furthering its’ objectives, but there is also a co-incidence of purpose affecting this transaction that should be considered and should not always result in income being recorded by the NFP entity.

Q12. Whether the temporary accounting policy choice for NFP public sector entities should be made permanent?

19. Yes, unless there is any substantive work planned to further investigate this issue, making the policy choice permanent would give preparers more certainty of the requirements that will apply to these arrangements.

Q13. Whether the disclosures prepared in accordance with paragraphs Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 of AASB 16 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users regarding concessionary leases when the ROU assets are measured at cost?

20. Yes



Topic 6: Sale and leaseback arrangements

Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements, do you have any comments about:

Q14. The application of the requirements in practice by public sector entities?

21. We have not had any direct experience with the use of sale and leaseback transactions by public sector entities.

Q15. Whether differences in application exist in practice in the public sector?

22. None noted.

Q16. Whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for sale and leaseback arrangements are sufficient for public sector entities?

23. No comments to add.



Topic 7: Other matters

Q17. Are there any other NFP and public sector matters that should be brought to the attention of the AASB as it undertakes a PIR of AASB 16?

24. One matter that does regularly arise for public sector entities is the overlap in scope between AASB 1059 and AASB 16. We note in AASB1059.IG12-IG13 there are two tables presented which set out different types of arrangements for private sector participation in the provision of public sector services. We think this does a reasonable job of identifying the types of commercial arrangements and features that govern these types of contracts. While it is clearly stated that accounting outcomes will depend on the specific terms and conditions of any arrangement, we do find that in practice it can be challenging to determine which standard should apply and is often determined by assessing which parts of a commercial arrangement are considered to be the “provision of a public service” and which entity is responsible for delivering/managing the delivery of those services.
25. As a general statement, it seems like an appropriate outcome that contracts of a relatively short nature (8 – 15 years) would more likely be lease arrangements, with service concessions being more medium term (20 – 30 years). In practice, the length of the arrangement isn’t directly relevant and so is not determinative of the outcome.
26. Therefore, we think it would be beneficial for the Board to consider certain types of arrangements (for example, bus contract arrangements) and assess whether the existing accounting policy application is resulting in optimal outcomes.
27. We would also make the observation that while there are some differences in measurement, in broad terms, each of AASB 1059 and AASB 16 should result in similar accounting treatment. In cases where it is clear that control of the asset exists, there can be a significant amount of effort in determining which standard is more appropriate to apply when the measurement differences may not be material.



Appendix B – Responses to IASB Request for information

Q1 – Overall assessment of IFRS 16

Q1(a). In your view, is IFRS 16 meeting its objective (see page 9) and are its core principles clear? If not, please explain why not.

28. Overall yes. IFRS 16 is meeting its objectives and the core principles are clear.

Q1(b). In your view, are the *overall* improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases *largely* as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall improvements are *significantly lower* than expected, please explain why.

29. Yes, in our view the overall improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases are largely as the IASB expected.

Q1(c). In your view, are the *overall* ongoing costs of applying the requirements and auditing and enforcing their application *largely* as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall ongoing costs are *significantly higher* than expected, please explain why, how you would propose the IASB reduce these costs and how your proposals would affect the benefits of IFRS 16.

30. In our view, the overall ongoing costs of applying the requirements are largely as the IASB expected. However, we have some concern that the reason for this is due to selective application of the requirements of the standard due to the complexity involved in applying them. We believe it is possible that some of this complexity may not necessarily lead to more relevant and reliable financial information for users. We note that if preparers are being selective in how the requirements are applied, the financial reporting outcomes may be less reliable than if the requirements were less complex and were applied more comprehensively by preparers.

31. Specifically in relation to systems – the overall requirement for companies to adopt systems is appropriate as it necessarily results in better record keeping. We have found in practice that to be effective, systems need to comprise both the collection and management of key lease contract information and the calculation methodology required for applying accounting judgements. Where costs are incurred that focus on managing complex lease contract information, this typically



leads to more accurate and consistent accounting application and flow on benefits to the business. If systems do not have the sophistication required to perform all of the necessary measurement adjustments, then adjustments are necessarily happening outside of the system, therefore mitigating the benefits.

32. For accounting judgements – there are several circumstances where there are combinations of strict requirements (ie not including variable payments like CPI and Market Rent Reviews) and judgement calls (on which a range of applications can be applied) resulting in a comingled outcome where there is insufficient transparency and comparability. Commercial terms that are negotiated in the market (particularly for real estate leases) shouldn't result in significant differences in the lease calculations unless there is a genuine principle about trying to capture the financial effect of market risk transfer between the parties.
33. As set out below in the response to Q2, we think that costs could be reduced if there was a focus on removing rigid measurement requirements that may counteract any benefit from applying accounting judgements, or that don't appropriately reflect the reality of how lease agreements may be negotiated in practice.



Q2 – Usefulness of information resulting from lessees’ application of judgement

Q2(a). Do you agree that the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees’ application of judgement is *largely* as the IASB expected? If your view is that lessees’ application of judgement has a *significant* negative effect on the usefulness of financial information, please explain why.

34. Our view is that there are a number of requirements in the standard that when taken together can be counterproductive to the objective of the usefulness of financial information. The simplest example of this is with regard to the exclusion from the lease liability measurement of variable payments arising from an index or rate (ie CPI linked leases or Market Rent Reviews (MRR)). While there are several lease contract features that may require the careful application of accounting judgement, the requirement to exclude variable lease payments arising from index or rate can have the effect of undermining the application and effect of those accounting judgements.
35. While CPI-linked price increases and MRR features are legitimate features of lease contract negotiation, the accounting requirements create a disproportionate impact on the overall measurement of the lease. Arguably, the measurement differences resulting from the differing treatment of these contract features creates more significant measurement differences than the application of judgement/estimates, which then limits the effectiveness of disclosures, and makes it harder for users to compare the leasing arrangements of similar companies.
36. In terms of the discount rate that is applied, for property leases it is almost always infeasible to apply the rate implicit in the lease due to the lack of sufficient information about the leased asset (which is most often a "partial asset"). IFRS16.BC161 states that it is likely that the Implicit Rate in the Lease and the Incremental Borrowing Rate is similar in many cases. However, the elements used to determine the incremental borrowing rate do not typically take into account differences in the lease payment profile. The lease term is adjusted for, but where payments relating to an index or rate are excluded, these are not typically adjusted for in the incremental borrowing rate determination.
37. The determination of the incremental borrowing rate could be amended to more accurately match which lease components are being excluded from the measurement calculation to mitigate the effect of their exclusion. This would better



align with the IASB's stated objective in IFRS16.BC160 that the discount rate reflects how the contract is priced.

38. Consider the following example calculations (note – the inception measurement values have been derived using the NPV excel formula using a 5% pa discount rate and annual cashflows):

Determining ROU Asset/lease liability measurement at inception of lease contract											
Discount rate for all scenarios - 5%											
Scenario 1 - 3% fixed increase each year of lease term											
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	
Cashflows used at lease inception	\$ 100	\$ 103	\$ 106	\$ 109	\$ 113	\$ 116	\$ 119	\$ 123	\$ 127	\$ 130	
ROU Asset & Lease Liability @ inception	\$874.76										
Scenario 2 - CPI increases throughout lease term											
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	
Cashflows used at lease inception	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	
ROU Asset & Lease Liability @ inception	\$772.17										
Scenario 3 - 3% fixed increase with a Market Rent Review in year 6, fixed increase (3%) for remainder of term											
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	
Cashflows used at lease inception	\$ 100	\$ 103	\$ 106	\$ 109	\$ 113	\$ 100	\$ 103	\$ 106	\$ 109	\$ 113	
ROU Asset & Lease Liability @ inception	\$817.55										
Scenario 4 - 3% fixed increase with a Market Rent Review in year 6 (with a floor being the prior period rent), fixed increase (3%) for remainder of term											
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	
Cashflows used at lease inception	\$ 100	\$ 103	\$ 106	\$ 109	\$ 113	\$ 113	\$ 116	\$ 119	\$ 123	\$ 127	
ROU Asset & Lease Liability @ inception	\$862.63										

39. Clearly it is difficult to draw conclusions from a small set of examples, but the question that these examples pose is whether small adjustments in the commercial arrangements should result in relatively material differences in the measurement calculation. It should be noted that the effect of such variances could be evened out across large portfolios of lease contracts, but where entities have a small number of very material lease agreements, this effect can be amplified.

40. It is also acknowledged that over the course of each lease, the remeasurement requirements will narrow these differences but the question remains whether the initial measurement differences affect the comparability of lease information between similar companies.

41. Arguably an adjustment factor in the discount rate could be used to reflect that expected variable increases in lease payments have not been captured in the initial measurement.



Q2(b). Do you agree that the requirements in IFRS 16 provide a clear and sufficient basis for entities to make appropriate judgements and that the requirements can be applied consistently? If not, please explain why not.

42. Yes, in particular we would note the provisions in the standard that allow for the use of a portfolio approach. As a general statement, we have observed less application of portfolio groups than expected which we suspect diminishes the effective application of appropriate judgements.

Q2(c). If your view is that the IASB should improve the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement, please explain:

- (i) What amendments you propose the IASB make to the requirements (and how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs); or**
- (ii) What additional information about lessees' application of judgement you propose the IASB require entities to disclose (and how the benefits would outweigh the costs).**

43. Our view is that the IASB could improve the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement. This is best achieved by reconsidering the methodology for determining the lessee's incremental borrowing rate. We think it could be beneficial to introduce adjustment factors to the incremental borrowing rate that reflect lease or portfolio specific attributes of the contracts that are requiring definitive measurement adjustments (ie the exclusion of payments linked to an index or rate). Adding in such adjustment factors may serve to better mitigate the outsized impact such measurement adjustments ultimately have on the lease accounting.

44. Any such adjustments should of course be carefully balanced if there are also changes to the measurement requirements themselves. The objective of the incremental borrowing rate should be more directly aligned with the intention of the rate implicit in the lease (which is often not able to be determined) such that it is more capable of resulting in a similar outcome.



Q3 - Usefulness of information about lessees' lease-related cashflows

Q3. Do you agree that the improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows that lessees present and disclose are *largely* as the IASB expected? If your view is that the improvements are *significantly lower* than expected, please explain why.

45. Yes the improvements in the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows are largely as the IASB expected.



Q4 Ongoing costs for lessees of applying the measurement requirements

Q4(a) Do you agree that the ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements in IFRS 16 are *largely* as the IASB expected? If your view is that the ongoing costs are *significantly higher* than expected, please explain why, considering how any entity-specific facts and circumstances (such as IT solutions) add to these costs.

46. The ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements is directly related to the sophistication of the lease accounting system that is used by an entity to prepare the lease calculations. In many cases, particularly with regard to a MRR, systems are not accurately incorporating the requirements into the calculations which then requires entities to perform certain measurement adjustments outside of the system, increasing both cost and risk of error as a result.
47. The principal reason for excluding the variable component of payments that depend on an index or rate is due to the costs involved in applying a forecasting technique or other forward looking information in the calculation. We would agree that the costs involved in applying any increase in future payments exceed any benefits from doing so.
48. However, in the case of CPI-linked increases and MRR provisions with no “floor” have the impact of using below market lease rental rates in the liability measurement, particularly for long dated lease contracts. Mechanics that are used to adjust the lease payments over the contract term (whether they are determined by fixed or variable means) are generally seen to be a mechanism to act as a proxy for the market rents that would otherwise apply, and are a practical way of adjusting the rent and without incurring costs associated with resetting to a market rate on a more regular basis. As a result, it would seem that the selected proxy for market that is negotiated by the participants in the lease agreement could be used in the determination of the lease payments as a more accurate measure of the way the lease contract should be measured.

Q4(b) If your view is that the ongoing costs are *significantly higher* than expected, please explain how you propose the IASB reduce these costs without a *significant* negative effect on the usefulness of financial information about leases.

49. We believe that making some adjustments to the way in which variable payments based on an index or rate are required to be excluded from the calculation could reduce some of the complexity of the measurement requirements and result in



payments that more accurately reflect the underlying commercial arrangement that has been negotiated by the parties. This would result in a reduction of costs and an improvement of the usefulness of financial information about leases.

50. As noted in the response to Question 2(c) above, any changes should be carefully balanced with other changes that may be considered with regard to the application of judgement to ensure that they work together to improve the benefits of the lease calculation.



Q5 – Potential improvements to future transition requirements

Based on your experience with the transition to IFRS 16, would you recommend the IASB does anything differently when developing transition requirements in future standard-setting projects? If so, please explain how your idea would ensure:

Q5(a) users have enough information to allow them to understand the effect of any new requirements on entities' financial performance, financial position and cash flows; and

51. No comments

Q5(b) preparers can appropriately reduce their transition costs when implementing new requirements for the first time.

52. No comments



Q6 – Other matters relevant to the assessment of the effects of IFRS 16

Q6.1 Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 9 to rent concessions

Q6.1(a) How often have you observed the type of rent concession described in Spotlight 6.1?

53. No

Q6.1(b) Have you observed diversity in how lessees account for rent concessions that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

54. No

Q6.1(c) If your view is that the IASB should act to improve the clarity of the requirements, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

55. No comment

Q6.2 Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 when assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale

Q6.2(a) How often have you observed difficulties in assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale?

56. Yes, there can often be significant difficulty due to the fact that fair value of a property is ultimately based on the market value of rent that can be obtained for that property. This means that an inherent part of the test that is being used to determine if a sale has occurred is a circular calculation.

Q6.2(b) Have you observed diversity in seller-lessees' assessments of the transfer of control that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

57. No not in relation to the transfer of control, although more guidance in relation to control over the residual rights of an asset, particularly when it relates to decisions to invest capital to refurbish or replace the asset that has been sold would be useful.

Q6.2(c) If your view is that the IASB should act to help seller-lessees determine whether the transfer of an asset is a sale, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

58. No comments



Q6.3 – Applying IFRS 16 with IFRS 15 to gain or loss recognition in a sale and leaseback transaction

Q6.3(a) Do you agree that restricting the amount of gain (or loss) an entity recognises in a sale and leaseback transaction results in useful information?

59. Yes, there is an important anti-abuse principle that requires specific guidance in this case.

Q6.3(b) What new evidence or arguments have you identified since the IASB issued IFRS 16 that would indicate that the costs of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, and the usefulness of the resulting information, differ significantly from those expected?

60. None noted

Q6.3(c) If your view is that the IASB should improve the cost-benefit balance of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, please describe your proposed solution.

61. Yes, in relation to sale and lease back transactions an assessment is required of whether there are any above or below market features that would indicate a separate financing component. An above or below market element is identified by referencing either lease payments that are above market, or the fair value of the asset being above market. However, lease payments are integral to determining the market value of an asset so it seems illogical to conclude that there is an above/below market component by reference to the contracted lease payments since such payments are the basis for determining what a market participant will pay to acquire that asset.

Q6.4 – Are there any further matters the IASB should examine as part of the post-implementation review of IFRS 16? If so, please explain why, considering the objective of a post-implementation review as set out on page 5.

62. A matter the IASB should examine is the exemptions provided by paragraph 5 of the standard. For both short-term and low-value leases, these exemptions are superfluous because of the materiality concept (bearing in mind that like items that are individually immaterial may be material in the aggregate). Their inclusion in the standard is disingenuous because they can result in material information about lease assets and liabilities being omitted from the financial statements, thereby impairing the quality of the financial information about leases that is provided to users of the financial statements. Such matters are better dealt with by entities



considering the specific attributes of the lease arrangements that they have rather than a blanket exclusion which affects entities in different ways relative to their own materiality thresholds and contractual arrangements.

CPA Australia Ltd
 ABN 64 008 392 452
 Level 20, 28 Freshwater Place
 Southbank VIC 3006 Australia
 GPO Box 2820 Melbourne
 VIC 3001 Australia
 T 1300 737 373
Outside Aust +613 9606 9677
cpaaustralia.com.au

10 September 2025

Dr Keith Kendall FCPA
 Chair
 Australian Accounting Standards Board
 PO Box 204, Collins Street West, Victoria 8007

Via online submission: www.aasb.gov.au

Invitation to comment 55 - Post-implementation review of AASB 16 Leases

Dear Keith

As one of the largest professional accounting bodies in the world, CPA Australia represents the diverse interests of more than 175,000 members working in over 100 jurisdictions and regions around the world, working in diverse roles across public practice, commerce, industry, government and academia throughout Australia, New Zealand and internationally. We welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the above Invitation to comment 55 - Post-implementation review of AASB 16 Leases ([ITC 55](#)). We make this submission on behalf of our members and in the public interest.

In preparing our response to these questions, CPA Australia has undertaken extensive outreach to gather feedback across a wide spectrum of stakeholders. This has included:

- Joint research with the University of Melbourne, including
 - A benchmark analysis of a sample of Australian listed companies ([Attachment B](#))
 - A Chief Financial Officers (CFO) roundtable held in Canberra ([Attachment C](#))

The research project is currently ongoing, and we will share further outputs including the final research report (expect in first half of 2026) as they become available

- Engagement with members of CPA Australia including the CPA Australia Reporting and Assurance Centre of Excellence
- 3 co-hosted roundtables with the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB), the New Zealand External Reporting Board (XRB) and Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (CA ANZ).

In addition, our analysis draws on topics and concerns identified through our previous submissions, ensuring continuity and a robust evidence base. Taken together, this approach has allowed us to capture a comprehensive set of perspectives that reflect the practical challenges and implications of applying AASB 16 in the Australian environment.

CPA Australia has received diverse and contrasting views on the questions raised in ITC 55, that vary depending on the sector. Set out below are the high-level comments based on the feedback we have received:

- **Australian listed companies:** AASB 16 is generally considered to be working well overall. However, stakeholders have highlighted some areas of complexity that require simplification and additional guidance, including lease-term assessments, the distinction between reassessment and modification, lease definition issues (such as substantial substantive rights), sale-and-leaseback arrangements, cash flow disclosures, low-value leased assets, the use of implicit versus incremental borrowing rates, and lease incentives.

While the information arising from AASB 16 as part of financial statements is valued, its use in non-GAAP reporting has been inconsistent, and some considerations should be given to this also as part of the post-implementation review (PIR).

- **Non-listed for-profit entities:** We received mixed views from stakeholders representing this sector. Some indicated that the requirements work adequately, while others observed that the standard was complex, with disproportionate costs relative to the benefits.

In particular, we noted the divergence between the IFRS for SMEs standard (third edition), which retains a simpler recognition and measurement model, and the equivalent requirements in AASB 1060 *General Purpose Financial Statements – Simplified Disclosures for For-Profit and Not-for-Profit Tier 2 Entities* (AASB 1060), based on the full recognition and measurement requirements of AASB 16, that are applicable to Tier 2 entities in Australia. This divergence in recognition and measurement requirements between the IASB-issued IFRS for SMEs standard and its Australian equivalent (AASB 1060) should be considered further as part of this PIR.

- **Public sector NFP entities:** The feedback we received from stakeholders representing this sector was largely negative. Stakeholders reported that the requirements do not meet user needs, are costly to implement, and involve complex judgements and systems challenges. Applying the standard requires dedicated resources, placing a burden on taxpayers without delivering meaningful benefits. The main positive outcome noted was improved transparency over lease portfolios.
- **Private sector NFP entities:** Stakeholders representing this sector noted similar concerns to those raised by stakeholders representing public sector NFP entities. Stakeholders advised that the requirements do not meet user needs, are costly to apply, and create additional administrative and system burdens. As with the NFP public sector, the one significant benefit observed was greater transparency and clarity over lease portfolios.

Given the mixed views received from stakeholders, it is difficult to form a conclusive position on whether the requirements of AASB 16 are in the best interests of the Australian economy. While the standard has been viewed in a positive light by stakeholders representing the listed-entities sector and is also considered to provide some benefits in terms of lease transparency by other sectors, the feedback highlights significant challenges and costs, particularly for non-listed for-profit and NFP entities. The evidence points to areas where simplifications, clearer guidance, or sector-specific adjustments may be necessary to ensure the requirements remain proportionate and effective.

To address the concerns raised above, we make the following recommendations:

- **Establish a dedicated project to explore simplification of lease accounting requirements:** We recommend that the AASB establish a dedicated project to explore simplification of lease accounting requirements in challenging areas, for NFP private and public sector entities.
- **Consider Tier 2 entities as part of the AASB 1060 post implementation review:** We recommend that the AASB considers the implications of AASB 16 for Tier 2 NFP private and public sector entities as part of its post-implementation review of AASB 1060.

Attachment A sets out CPA Australia's detailed responses to the questions in [ITC 55](#). We have also included CPA Australia Research Report 1 (**Attachment B**) and a summary of the discussions from the CPA Australia Public Sector CFO Roundtable (**Attachment C**) to support the comments provided in this submission. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss further, please contact Ram Subramanian, Financial Reporting Lead at ram.subramanian@cpaaustralia.com.au.

Yours sincerely

Elinor Kasapidis
Chief of Policy, Standards and External Affairs
CPA Australia



Attachment A: CPA Australia's Response to ITC 55

SECTION 1: AASB GENERAL MATTERS FOR COMMENT

(1) Are there any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 Leases?

(2) Does the application of the requirements in AASB 16 result in major auditing or assurance challenges?

(3) Are the requirements in the best interests of the Australian economy?

As noted in our above cover letter, CPA Australia has obtained diverse and contrasting views from different sectors on the impact of AASB 16 on Australian financial reporting. Based on both our commissioned research and outreach activities, whilst the standard is considered to be working as intended by the Australian listed-entity sector, the views have been less positive from the NFP private sector and the NFP public sector. Limited feedback we have received from the for-profit public sector and non-listed private sector also indicate some concerns with the usefulness of the information from AASB 16, when compared against the costs associated with compliance with the standard.

Feedback indicates that the burden of AASB 16 falls disproportionately on small and medium-sized entities (SMEs) and non-listed for-profits. Larger entities typically have the systems, expertise, and resources to manage compliance, whereas SMEs face significantly higher relative costs due to less sophisticated systems, greater reliance on manual processes, and limited capacity to absorb ongoing remeasurement requirements.

Currently, SMEs preparing general purpose financial statements are required, through AASB 1060 *General Purpose Financial Statements - Simplified Disclosures for For-Profit and Not-for-Profit Tier 2 Entities* (AASB 1060), to apply the recognition and measurement requirements of AASB 16 in full, with some disclosure relief. We have heard that SMEs face relatively high implementation and ongoing costs in complying with AASB 16 and are seeking a more proportionate and simplified approach. In contrast to the recognition and measurement requirements of AASB 1060, the latest third edition of the IFRS for SMEs standard adopts a simplified model for lease accounting by retaining the operating versus finance lease distinction, thereby avoiding the complexities associated with recognising right-of-use assets and lease liabilities. This follows the IASB's conclusion that the information-value associated with IFRS 16 is not relevant to SMEs. We recommend that the AASB considers this divergence from the approach taken by the IASB for SME lease accounting as part of its upcoming post-implementation review of AASB 1060.

Our responses to questions included in Section 3 of [ITC 55](#) provide our views on the impact of AASB 16 on financial reporting by Australian listed entities. Overall, the impact of AASB 16 is seen positively by preparers, users and auditors involved with financial reporting by Australian listed entities. However, some challenges have been identified that indicate there is scope for improving and simplifying the standard and developing and providing additional guidance.

When we consider feedback from stakeholders representing non-listed for-profit entities and the NFP private and public sector entities, the views diverge dramatically from those noted in the previous paragraph. The feedback we have obtained in relation to NFP private and public sector entities is set out in detail in our responses to the questions to Section 2 of [ITC 55](#).

Given the mixed views we have received as noted above, it is difficult to form a view on whether the requirements are in the best interests of the Australian economy. Some significant concerns have been raised by NFP private and public sector stakeholders about the adverse costs/benefits balance of the standard, and recommendations have ranged from a full withdrawal of the standard to significant simplifications to the accounting for lease term, discount rate, lease definition, lease modification etc. We appreciate that the AASB adopts a transaction-neutral approach to standard-setting and in the absence of a suitable alternative, it may be necessary to consider significant simplifications to the standard to address the concerns raised by NFP private and public sector stakeholders.

SECTION 2: NFP AND PUBLIC SECTOR TOPICS FOR COMMENT

Topic 1: Application of AASB 16 by NFP and public sector entities

As noted in our above cover letter, CPA Australia has undertaken extensive outreach in gathering feedback from NFP entities in the public and private sectors. This has included a physical roundtable held in Canberra as part of the ongoing research we are undertaking in collaboration with the University of Melbourne, the three co-hosted roundtables (with the AASB, the XRB and CA ANZ) and other ad-hoc feedback as well.

Although the consultation refers to "NFP and public sector entities", we have gathered feedback and provided responses for private and public sector NFP entities, largely excluding public sector for-profit entities. Some respondents have indicated that public sector for-profit entities (e.g., AusPost) should be viewed similarly to private sector for-profit entities for the purposes of this consultation.

Based on the feedback received, AASB 16 has imposed significantly higher costs on NFP private and public sector entities than expected, while delivering lower benefits to users. Although AASB16 Leases has improved lease visibility in principle, in practice it has introduced high administrative burdens, requirements that rely heavily on professional judgement, and outcomes that often lack relevance for NFP private and public sector entities. Stakeholders consistently reported reduced readability of financial statements, distortions in reported results, and limited decision-usefulness, suggesting that AASB 16 has not made the financial reporting of lease information by lessees more useful than under the previous standard AASB 117 Leases.

This overarching concern is closely connected to other specific topics discussed below (e.g. lease terms, lease modification, incremental borrowing rates (IBR) etc.), where many of the detailed feedback points ultimately reflected the same underlying theme, i.e. that the costs of compliance often outweigh the benefits for NFP and public sector entities. We appreciate that overall, the principles behind the lease accounting requirements of AASB 16 are sound. Given the AASB's transaction-neutral approach to standard-setting and in the absence of other viable alternatives, we are unable to offer any suitable recommendations that would result in replacing AASB 16 in its entirety.

To address the concerns raised by NFP private and public sector stakeholders, we make two recommendations for consideration by the AASB:

- **Establish a dedicated project to explore simplification of lease accounting requirements:** We appreciate that the AASB adopts a transaction-neutral approach to standard-setting and in the absence of a suitable alternative, it may be necessary to consider significant simplifications to the standard to address the concerns raised by NFP private and public sector stakeholders. We recommend that the AASB establish a dedicated project to explore simplification of lease accounting requirements in challenging areas, for NFP private and public sector entities. Such an approach could help reduce compliance costs and administrative effort while enhancing the relevance and understandability of financial information for users. This is consistent with the principle that reporting requirements should remain proportionate to the needs of preparers and users in these sectors.
- **Consider Tier 2 entities as part of the AASB 1060 post implementation review:** Some SMEs have expressed similar concerns about the high cost of applying AASB 16 in full. We note that the third edition of the IFRS for SMEs standard does not include the lease accounting requirements of AASB 16 (IFRS 16). We recommend that the AASB considers the implications of AASB 16 for Tier 2 NFP private and public sector entities as part of its AASB 1060 post implementation review.

For smaller private sector NFPs, we note the AASB is currently developing a simplified reporting standard that does not propose to require lease accounting that is based on the requirements in AASB 16. We believe this approach is appropriate and will alleviate some of the concerns that have been raised by private sector NFP stakeholders. We provide further details in our responses to the Topic 1 questions below.

1a) In respect of NFP and public sector entities, are the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 and auditing and regulating its application significantly greater than expected?

Based on the feedback received, the ongoing costs of applying AASB 16 in the NFP public and private sectors are significantly greater than expected, which is consistent with the feedback noted in [ITC 55](#). While the standard has improved visibility of an entity's lease portfolio in some cases, stakeholders consistently highlighted that compliance requires substantial resources, creates unnecessary administrative effort, and often provides limited benefit to users of financial statements. There is a concern that the additional costs incurred for lease accounting by public sector NFP entities have to ultimately be borne by the Australian taxpayer. Some further detail around what we have received as feedback is provided below:

- **High resource burden and administrative cost:** Public sector participants at the Canberra roundtable highlighted that adopting AASB 16 has involved high implementation and ongoing costs, including reliance on multiple staff dedicated to lease accounting, manual tracking due to lack of funding for system upgrades, and resources allocated to dealing with additional queries from auditors (e.g. ANAO). Many described this as an administrative or bureaucratic burden, with costs disproportionate to the usefulness of the information. As an example, in the education sector, adoption of AASB 16 has required bespoke internal systems and simplified guidance for approximately 1,500 schools, but challenges remain due to high training costs and staff turnover.
- **Systems immaturity and reliance on manual processes:** The public sector participants further emphasised that applying AASB 16 without appropriate systems has led to inconsistent practices, error risks, and high reliance on consultants. Many continue to depend on manual Excel-based models, which heightens inefficiency and reduces comparability.
- **Unnecessary effort on assessments with limited value:** Local councils noted that they spent considerable time assessing embedded leases (e.g. waste management contracts) even when none were ultimately identified. Despite knowing the likely outcome, they were still required to complete the assessments, leading to wasted resources with little benefit for decision-making.

1b) In respect of NFP and public sector entities, are the benefits to users significantly lower than expected?

The benefits of AASB 16 for NFP private and public sector entities are seen as significantly lower than expected. While some stakeholders acknowledged that regulators of NFP public sector entities noted that lease disclosures can improve transparency and accountability by better identification of lease portfolios, stakeholders more broadly observed that the information value derived from AASB 16 did not justify the costs and complexities associated with applying the standard.

- **Some transparency and financial management benefits:** Some stakeholders identified benefits from AASB 16 for NFP private and public sector entities include better transparency and knowledge of leases held by entities and some discipline being brought to the management of leases through such transparency.
- **Limited user benefit:** It is generally considered that the costs associated with lease accounting under AASB 16 outweigh the benefits arising from it. Public sector NFP entities in general do not rely on debt financing but rather rely on budget appropriations and other income sources to fund their activities. Accordingly, the concept of acquiring a right-of-use (ROU) asset by debt financing through a lease contract does not align with the way in which many public sector NFP entities operate. We also understand that in many cases, the lease information on balance sheets is reversed out when presenting information for internal management purposes.

In the NFP private sector (e.g. credit unions), lease liabilities were typically less than 1% of equity, yet entities faced significant complexity in undertaking present-value calculations and reconciliations. Local government stakeholders have also provided feedback that AASB 16 added complexity to financial statements without delivering meaningful benefits, as both preparers and users often struggled to understand and interpret the results.

- **Limited usefulness at whole-of-government and agency levels:** Government agencies observed that recognising office accommodation on departmental/agency balance sheets often provides little value when the same assets and liabilities are already captured in whole-of-government consolidated financial statements. For example, office accommodation in some States is centrally managed, and agencies can be moved between office locations at the discretion of the central body. Because of this substitution right, many of these

arrangements do not meet the definition of a lease under AASB 16, making the recognition exercise at the departmental/agency level redundant and unhelpful to users.

- **Distorted results and ratios in local government:** Some council representatives noted that the financial information from AASB 16 often does not align with the economic reality of their lease arrangements. For instance, for long-term property leases, the lease accounting model often results in high interest and depreciation expenses at the start of the lease, exceeding the actual rental payments, leading to reported results appearing worse than the council's true operating cash position. This could also have an adverse impact on rate calculations based on annual expenditure, which can impact the rates a council sets for the year. Furthermore, lease liabilities inflate financial ratios such as the net financial liabilities ratio, which could suggest a council is in a weaker financial position than it actually is, undermining comparability across councils and potentially misleading stakeholders about financial capacity.
- **Complex and judgement-heavy requirements with limited user value:** For NFP private and public sector entities, the usefulness of financial statements under AASB 16 is diminished by requirements that are highly judgemental and resource-intensive, demanding significant effort without delivering equivalent benefits to users. These challenges are particularly significant because the operations of NFP private and public sector are different from the for-profit private sector, where lease accounting concepts such as debt financing and discount rates have more relevance. Some public sector respondents observed that determining lease terms requires a case-by-case analysis (e.g. contracts include break or extension options). Others highlighted difficulties in distinguishing between lease modifications and extensions, with different interpretations producing inconsistent outcomes. Inter-agency leases were also cited as problematic, as both the lessee and lessor agency are required to record the same arrangement, effectively duplicating effort without adding informational value. In addition, calculating IBR was viewed as particularly burdensome in the public sector, since many agencies do not borrow funds and the discount rates generated are less meaningful for decision-making purposes.

1c) In respect of NFP and public sector entities, overall, do you have any comments about whether AASB 16 results in financial statements that are more useful than financial statements prepared under the previous Standard AASB 117 Leases?

Stakeholders generally considered that AASB 16 has not resulted in financial statements that are more useful than those prepared under AASB 117 for NFP private and public sector entities. While the standard has improved lease visibility in principle, its application in these sectors has created more confusion than clarity. Respondents highlighted reduced readability, limited relevance of lease recognition, knowledge gaps leading to inconsistent application, distortions from the financing effect, and budgeting mismatches. Collectively, these issues suggest that the benefits for users have been significantly lower than expected.

- **Reduced readability and clarity, obscuring useful information for users:** AASB 16 was widely described as adding complexity without enhancing reporting quality in the NFP private and public sector entities. Users of public sector financial statements are primarily interested in operating expenditure, yet the lease accounting model obscures actual spending patterns and makes financial statements harder to interpret. In some cases, this has reduced the visibility of useful information rather than improving it.
- **Lease recognition often lacks relevance and limited decision-usefulness in practice:** Most leases in the NFP private and public sectors involve office accommodation or community facilities, where recognising a lease liability and a ROU asset was seen as disconnected from operational realities. In some cases, the majority of an entity's reported assets and liabilities were dominated by lease balances, overstating the significance of a single long-term arrangement and masking the entity's underlying financial position. Similarly, feedback from the credit union sector highlighted that lease liabilities are typically immaterial (often less than 1% of equity), yet the standard requires disproportionate effort. These organisations continue to base decisions on cash flow expenses, reflecting the limited decision-usefulness of AASB 16 outcomes.

- **Knowledge gaps, inconsistent application, and user confusion on lease cash flow presentation:** Local governments highlighted that staff often have limited understanding of AASB 16, leading to mechanical application and inconsistent interpretations both within departments and across agencies. Senior management also reported difficulty interpreting the presentation of lease cash flows, where actual payments differed from reported outflows because a part of the outflow was classified as finance costs. This principal-interest split was viewed as confusing, requiring additional explanation and administrative effort, which in turn increases compliance costs.
- **Financing effect distorts results:** This concern was also raised in our response to Question 1(b) above, where stakeholders noted that such outcomes reduce the representational faithfulness of reported results.
- **Identifying a lease - substantive substitution rights:** We understand that there is inconsistent application of whether a contract constitutes a lease agreement, in the context of substantive substitution rights. For example, when a local council leases garbage removal trucks from a third party, affixes their logo on the trucks and uses them as part of their refuse removal process, there is some inconsistency in how these contracts are treated. There may be some confusion around whether the trucks are under leasing arrangements or not, as the trucks can be substituted for different routes etc. There may also be instances where contracts are written to ensure substantive substitution rights are present, so the contracts are considered not to be lease contracts.

Topic 2: Determining the lease term

Summary and recommendation

The feedback received highlights that determining lease term under AASB 16 is one of the more challenging areas for NFP private and public sector entities. The requirements are viewed as overly complex, requiring significant professional judgement, often requiring case-by-case assessments that place a significant administrative burden on agencies with large or diverse lease portfolios. Inconsistent practices have emerged across entities, driven by both manual processes and the unique types of leases common in the public sector, such as community assets and entity-to-entity arrangements. Current requirements and guidance are seen as insufficient, exacerbating inconsistency and confusion. As a result, the usefulness of the outputs is limited, with stakeholders calling for greater clarity, practical examples, and simplified approaches that are better suited to the NFP private and public sector context.

As noted in our recommendation in Section 2 Topic 1 above, we support simplifying the standard to better align costs with benefits (for further details, please refer to that topic). In addition, given that a significant portion of feedback related to leases of land and buildings, we recommend that the AASB consider developing further guidance or practical expedients specifically for determining lease terms for such arrangements.

We provide further details in our responses to the Topic 2 questions below.

2) Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about: the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

3) Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about: whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

4) Regarding determining the lease term, do you have any comments about: whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for determining the lease term are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

Determining lease term is challenging for NFP and public sector entities, with requirements often seen as overly complex, requiring significant professional judgement, with insufficient guidance to support the requirements.

- **Application in practice:** Government agencies reported that assessing lease term requires significant professional judgement, especially where contracts include multiple break or extension options. For large lease portfolios, entities often need to invest significant effort and resources to review each lease individually and establish detailed accounting policies for different lease types. For example, an agency managing over 1,000 leases globally explained that this process is resource-intensive as the analysis and accounting have

to be undertaken manually due to system constraints (as explained in our response to Section 2 Question 1(a) above), creating ongoing cost and resourcing challenges.

- **Differences in application:** Inconsistent practices were observed across entities. Some councils and government agencies adopt very conservative approaches, applying all possible lease-term extensions (which significantly inflates lease liabilities), while others justify minimal lease-term extensions that result in smaller balance sheet numbers. These differences partly arise because many agencies rely on manual processes due to immature data collection systems and limited funding for upgrades (as explained in our response to Section 2 Question 1(a) above), making consistent judgments difficult. They also reflect the unique types of leases commonly found in the public sector, such as community assets or government-to-government arrangements, which often lack private sector comparators. Together, these factors highlight the difficulties of applying private-sector concepts in the public sector context.
- **Adequacy of current requirements and guidance:** Stakeholders consistently felt that the current guidance is insufficient. Many referred to the lack of clarity on how to deal with “until further notice” arrangements, or how to distinguish between breaking a lease and exercising an extension. Reliance on requirements from different standards (e.g., AASB 15, AASB 9) and International Financial Reporting Interpretations Committee (IFRIC) agenda decisions adds to the complexity and increases the risk of inconsistent application. Feedback suggested that more practical examples, simplified requirements, and clearer wording would help reduce the burden and ensure more consistent application in the NFP and public sector context.

Topic 3: Lease modifications

5) Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about: the application of the requirements in practice by NFP and public sector entities?

6) Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about: whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP and public sector?

7) Regarding the accounting for lease modifications, do you have any comments about: whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for lease modification are sufficient for NFP and public sector entities?

Feedback indicates that lease modifications are a complex area for NFP private and public sector entities, requiring significant judgement, frequent remeasurement, and reliance on costly, resource-intensive and inconsistent processes. The requirements and guidance around determining whether a contract provision leads to lease modifications or lease remeasurements are widely viewed as unclear. This has led to calls for simplification and clearer guidance to reduce unnecessary recurrent costs and inconsistent outcomes.

- **Application in practice:** Government agencies reported difficulty distinguishing between lease modifications and extensions of options, often requiring professional judgement and consultation with central authorities to reach a conclusion. Entities also reported confusion when rental payments changed under variable payment terms: some staff mistakenly treated these as lease modifications (including updating discount rates) instead of treating as a remeasurement under the standard. Similarly, under master or umbrella agreements covering multiple items, changes in payment due to adding new items were sometimes treated as modifications when recognising these as new leases may have been more appropriate. Moreover, annual CPI-driven remeasurements add recurring burden, often calculated manually or through expensive outsourced solutions.
- **Differences in application:** Inconsistent practices were observed across entities. Some finance teams recalculate leases as modifications but sometimes fail to derecognise the existing lease, resulting in overstated ROU assets and liabilities. Others adopt different treatments depending on internal policies or auditor advice, leading to divergent outcomes even for similar fact patterns. These inconsistencies are worsened by reliance on spreadsheets, multiple calculation methods, and costly outsourcing (often charged per lease), with staff turnover further reducing consistency in application.

- **Adequacy of current requirements and guidance:** Stakeholders viewed the current guidance as insufficient. The terminology around modifications versus extensions was described as adding unnecessary workload without providing commensurate user benefit. More practical examples, (e.g. carparks, variable payments, or umbrella agreements) were requested to reduce ambiguity and improve consistency. Some also suggested simplifying CPI-driven remeasurements by allowing forecast index movements to be incorporated upfront, with remeasurement only required if outcomes differ materially. The COVID-19 rent concession expedient was cited as an example of how targeted relief can make compliance more practical without undermining transparency.

Topic 4: Measurement of lease liabilities - determining an incremental borrowing rate

8) Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate, do you have any comments about: the application of the requirements in practice by NFP private sector entities, including how these entities are currently determining the incremental borrowing rate in practice?

9) Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate, do you have any comments about: whether differences in application exist in practice in the NFP private sector?

10) Regarding the measurement of lease liabilities and determining an incremental borrowing rate, do you have any comments about: whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for the measurement of lease liabilities are sufficient for NFP private sector entities?

We note that Topic 4 Questions 8-10 focus only NFP private sector entities. However, most of the feedback we have received relates to NFP public sector entities and our below comments reflect this.

Feedback indicates that the measurement of lease liabilities and the determination of IBR are problematic for NFP private and public sector entities. Stakeholders noted that the requirements add significant complexity without delivering meaningful value for users, and current guidance is insufficient to ensure consistent or efficient application.

- **Application in practice:** Public sector agencies explained that calculating an IBR adds little value for decision-making, since many agencies do not borrow and future cash flow concepts tied to IBR are not relevant in their context. In practice, entities almost always default to IBR because the information needed to calculate the lessor's implicit rate (e.g. asset fair values or residual values) is rarely available. However, because many agencies do not have their own borrowing rate, they typically substitute proxies such as government financing authority rates, which are accessible but not necessarily reflective of the entity's risk profile.
- **Differences in application:** Inconsistencies are widespread across entities. Some agencies apply prescribed IBR parameters incorrectly, while others rely on bespoke consultant models or internal spreadsheets, producing divergent outcomes. In group situations, subsidiaries without credit ratings are often required to determine their own discount rates, which was viewed as artificial and unreflective of actual risk. Stakeholders suggested that a practical expedient should allow subsidiaries to use the group's rate in consolidated groups to improve consistency and reduce unnecessary effort.
- **Adequacy of current requirements and guidance:** Stakeholders generally felt that the requirements are too complex and not fit-for-purpose in the NFP private and public sectors. Errors such as incorrect indexations and unrecorded asset classes were reported, largely due to immature systems and reliance on error-prone spreadsheets. Heavy dependence on consultants further increases costs without necessarily improving outcomes. Feedback suggested that simplification is needed, for example, providing standardised discount rates or practical expedients. Some argued the public sector might have been better exempted from many of the IBR requirements altogether.

Topic 5: NFP public sector concessionary leases

11) Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about: whether there are any reasons to remove the current accounting policy choice to measure initially concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value

12) Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about: whether the temporary accounting policy choice for NFP public sector entities should be made permanent?

13) Regarding NFP public sector concessionary leases, do you have any comments about: whether the disclosures prepared in accordance with paragraphs Aus59.1 and Aus59.2 of AASB 16 are sufficient in providing useful information to financial statement users regarding concessionary leases when the ROU assets are measured at cost?

CPA Australia reiterates its previous recommendation made in our [submission](#) in response to ED 286 to make the exemption permanent. Feedback from stakeholders in response to the current consultation is also strongly supportive of retaining and making the exemption permanent. We understand many entities in the NFP public sector do not apply fair value to their concessionary leases. For the few that do currently opt to fair value their concessionary leases, the option should be made available on a permanent basis to continue doing so.

- **Application in practice:** Entities reported that the ability to choose between cost and fair value has been effective in practice. For example, perpetual land leases or in-substance land grants are sometimes recognised at fair value, but in other cases at cost, particularly where ongoing obligations exist to maintain the land. The option to use cost allows NFPs to avoid unnecessary complexities such as valuing assets with no active market, variable or contingent rentals, or early termination provisions.
- **Differences in application:** While some entities apply fair value for certain land arrangements, many rely on the cost model, particularly for peppercorn and concessionary leases. This reflects the fact that the public sector context is different from the private sector, where market-based valuations may be more meaningful. In practice, differences in application are driven less by inconsistency and more by the flexibility needed to address the unique nature of concessionary arrangements in the public sector.
- **Adequacy of current requirements and guidance:** Stakeholders strongly supported making the concessionary lease exemption permanent. They highlighted that applying fair value would impose very high costs, require specialised valuation expertise, and add an unnecessary administrative burden with little corresponding user benefit. Preparers also reported difficulties in measuring lease liabilities for peppercorn leases, as minimal or no payments leave them uncertain about how to recognise related assets and liabilities. Retaining and clarifying the exemption is therefore seen as essential to ensuring the standard remains fit-for-purpose in the NFP public sector context.

Topic 6: Sale and leaseback arrangements

14) Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements, do you have any comments about: the application of the requirements in practice by public sector entities?

15) Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements, do you have any comments about: whether differences in application exist in practice in the public sector?

16) Regarding sale and leaseback arrangements, do you have any comments about: whether the current requirements and guidance in AASB 16 for sale and leaseback arrangements are sufficient for public sector entities?

We received limited but important feedback on sale-and-leaseback arrangements, with stakeholders noting this is an emerging area of complexity as governments increasingly pursue alternative financing structures. In practice, these transactions often involve service components or embedded leases, making it difficult to determine whether a genuine sale has occurred and how the leaseback should be accounted for.

Additional concerns were raised about failed sale-and-leaseback arrangements, particularly the difficulty of disconnecting the financial liability from the underlying asset. Situations such as changes in useful life, asset replacement, or lease terms extending beyond the asset's life create uncertainty about whether reassessment is required and how to measure or derecognise the liability. Termination rights by either lessor or lessee raise similar questions about when a failed sale should be reclassified as a true sale and how related balances should be treated. Whilst feedback on this topic has been limited, the feedback we did receive noted that current requirements and guidance on sale and leaseback arrangements are insufficient, and further clarification and illustrative examples would be valuable to promote consistent application in the public sector.

Topic 7: Other matters

17) Are there any other NFP and public sector matters that should be brought to the attention of the AASB as it undertakes a PIR of AASB 16?

Stakeholders highlighted several additional matters that may be relevant for the AASB to consider as part of its post-implementation review of AASB 16 for the NFP private and public sectors:

- **Perpetual leases and in-substance purchases:** Public sector entities frequently deal with land arrangements, such as grants and reserves, that are economically like freehold ownership but legally structured as leases. These raise questions about whether such assets should fall under AASB 116 or AASB 16. While most are currently accounted for under AASB 116, clearer guidance would help avoid inconsistent treatment of these arrangements.
- **Materiality and exemptions:** Stakeholders noted that materiality remains an unresolved issue for public sector NFPs, with current exemption thresholds (low value leases and short-term leases) set too low to be meaningful. In practice, these thresholds often capture only minor items such as personal computers, while most lease value is concentrated in a small number of significant contracts (e.g. 20 leases covering around 90% of value of all leases held by the entity). As a result, entities still need to apply lease accounting to numerous low-value items, creating unnecessary burden. Stakeholders suggested clearer principles that explicitly allow immaterial leases to be disregarded while ensuring materially significant assets (such as land) are recognised.
- **Data collection challenges and maturity:** While some expected that processes and systems would gradually improve over time, the feedback received suggests that, in practice, systems and processes for data collection in the public sector remains immature. Initial implementation was hampered by poor-quality data, particularly for smaller leases such as fleet and IT equipment that were managed outside finance teams. Many agencies continue to face difficulties consolidating this information, often resorting to manual workarounds due to system and funding constraints. As a result, the anticipated benefits of improved governance and visibility have not been fully realised, and stakeholders stressed that data quality remains a significant barrier to effective application of AASB 16.
- **Education, guidance, and systems:** Agencies reported continued reliance on professional bodies for training, and highlighted the need for clearer guidance on exercising professional judgement. System limitations also remain, with many agencies lacking funding for upgrades. Current systems tend to handle property leases adequately but require manual workarounds for other types of leases, increasing cost and effort.
- **Stakeholder needs and future direction:** Participants questioned whether financial reporting for public sector entities is heading in the right direction, suggesting greater focus on service performance information rather than balance sheet-based financial information. Some suggested a stronger focus on reporting future commitments, rather than theoretical cash flow models, to provide more relevant and meaningful information to users.

SECTION 3: IASB REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

We note that the IASB has issued a Request for Information as part of its PIR of IFRS 16, with comments due by 15 October 2025. We are in the process of preparing a separate submission to the IASB, A draft of this submission is below.

We will provide a copy to the AASB once the final version has been submitted to the IASB.

DRAFT

CPA Australia's Response to IFRS16 PIR (Draft)

Question 1(a)

In your view, is IFRS 16 meeting its objective (see page 9) and are its core principles clear? If not, please explain why not

Yes, in relation to Australian listed entities, CPA Australia is of the view that IFRS 16 meets its objectives, and its core principles are clear. Feedback received from the outreach and research activities we have undertaken supports our view. As you will be aware, IFRS Accounting Standards form the basis for financial reporting by all sectors in Australia. Whilst feedback from our commissioned research and outreach has indicated that the objective of IFRS 16 is being met for financial reporting by Australian listed entities, significant concerns have been raised about its suitability for other sectors including the Australian not-for-profit private and public sectors. Given the focus of the IASB is standard-setting for the global capital markets, we have restricted our views in this submission to that segment.

As noted in our cover letter, our above views are underpinned by ongoing commissioned research in collaboration with the University of Melbourne. Research report 1 (**Attachment B**) provides insights into some aspects of the impacts of IFRS 16 on Australian listed entities. We have also gathered additional feedback through our outreach activities as noted in our cover letter.

The standard has also achieved its intended objective of enhancing the usefulness of information for users. However, perceptions of usefulness remain diverse across different stakeholder groups, while some embrace the standard in terms of recognising lease commitments on balance sheets, some stakeholders such as banks and financial analysts seeing it as irrelevant and perform reversing adjustments for their specific decision-making purposes. Further consideration could be given to whether the accounting requirements more closely align with information needs of diverse user groups.

Question 1(b)

In your view, are the overall improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.

Overall, the evidence indicates that IFRS 16 has delivered on its objective of bringing many leases onto the balance sheet and improving quality and comparability. However, concerns remain regarding operational comparability in complex situations and the practical relevance of reported information for key users. We recommend that these issues be considered and addressed following the PIR to further enhance the usefulness of the standard.

CPA Australia commissioned research (**Attachment B**) indicates that IFRS 16 has largely achieved the IASB's objective of improving the quality and comparability of lease information.

Evidence from research:

Analysis of Australian firms from 2019-2024 (**Attachment B**) shows that the principle of lease capitalisation is both widely understood and consistently applied. Adoption rates rose sharply at transition, with 92% of firms recognising lease liabilities in 2020 compared with 42% in 2019. By 2024, 84% of firms continued to recognise lease liabilities across all sizes and industries. Lease liabilities are also economically significant, with the median firm reporting leases equal to 45% of total debt. Recognition levels have remained stable since adoption, suggesting that compliance costs have not deterred ongoing application. Taken together, these findings indicate that IFRS 16 has materially changed reporting practices, enhanced transparency, and strengthened comparability across firms and industries.

Concerns raised in feedback:

While the overall improvements are evident, in our outreach activities, stakeholders identified areas where challenges remain:

- **Comparability challenges:** Many lease accounting systems cannot fully address complexities such as lease modifications, variable payments, subleases, and sale-and-leasebacks. This often results in manual adjustments outside the system, increasing inconsistencies. Differences in system design (lease contract asset management vs. lease accounting) also lead to divergent outcomes, reducing comparability across the market.
- **Relevance for key stakeholders:** Some Australian banks routinely exclude IFRS 16 adjustments when monitoring debt covenant compliance, preferring to focus on future lease commitments. Similarly, many organisations reverse IFRS 16 adjustments in external market communications – for example, reporting EBITDA and cash flows on a pre-IFRS 16 basis for consistency with peers, competitors, and US-GAAP practice. This suggests that while the standard has improved statutory comparability, its decision-usefulness for key stakeholders is reduced in practice, as both preparers and users treat leases as ordinary operating costs rather than financing.

Question 1(c)

In your view, are the overall ongoing costs of applying the requirements and auditing and enforcing their application largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, how you would propose the IASB reduce these costs and how your proposals would affect the benefits of IFRS 16.

In the context of Australian listed entities, CPA Australia commissioned research (**Attachment B**) indicates that the auditing of lease-related requirements under IFRS 16 is not generally associated with unexpectedly high costs. As noted in the sample-based analysis in Research Report 1 of Key Audit Matters (KAM) (refer also to our response to Question 1(a)), leases were identified as a KAM in only 4% of audit reports across Australian listed companies. This suggests that lease accounting is not typically regarded as a significant source of audit complexity or cost. Where lease-related KAMs did arise, they were concentrated in consumer sectors with high exposure to retail premises and primarily related to economic significance or the exercise of professional judgment around matters such as discount rates. Importantly, the review did not reveal unforeseen areas of estimation uncertainty or judgement. These findings support the view that the auditing of financial information arising from IFRS 16 results in satisfactory outcomes overall and the standard is operating as intended and without undue burden.

Whilst the overall feedback has been positive, some concerns and areas for improvement have also been identified, particularly for smaller listed entities. The main concerns raised can be summarised as follows:

- **Contradictions in requirements:** Stakeholders noted that the standard demands highly precise calculations in some areas (e.g., discount rates) while allowing broad judgment in others (e.g., portfolio application). This inconsistency increases ongoing cost without necessarily improving the usefulness of the information.
- **Limited relevance to some users:** Feedback suggested that measurement outputs are often ignored or excluded by banks and internal management, who prefer to focus on future lease commitments or cash flows. Many of the responses we received focused on property leases, questioning whether the complexity and cost of maintaining compliance is justified by the decision-usefulness of the information, particularly for common office leases or multiple small landlord arrangements.
- **Higher relative cost on smaller listed entities:** Larger organisations are generally able to absorb IFRS 16 requirements with access to better systems and resources, while smaller entities face disproportionately high costs. Lease calculations relating to remeasurement are not as reliable with less sophisticated software solutions, forcing more manual intervention, and compliance costs represent a significant proportion of resources relative to firm size.
- **Complexity versus substance:** Some stakeholders have expressed a view that IFRS 16 transforms what are, in practice, straightforward rent payments into a complex series of accounting entries (right-of-use assets, liabilities, interest expenses, and amortisation costs). They view this as detached from the commercial substance of leases, particularly for smaller entities. Moreover, as noted above, banks and internal management often reverse or ignore the adjustments, focusing instead on cash flows. This raises some concern that the ongoing costs of complying with IFRS 16 are higher than anticipated, with some estimating compliance with IFRS 16 drives around 20% of audit fees.

- **Lack of a clear benchmark for costs:** Stakeholders noted that while most preparers agree compliance costs are higher than anticipated, it is difficult to assess whether these costs are truly “excessive” in the absence of a clear benchmark of what ongoing costs were expected to be. This lack of a reference point makes evaluation inconsistent and subjective.

In summary, our commissioned research suggests that from an audit perspective, IFRS 16 has not created greater-than-expected burdens. Nonetheless, stakeholder feedback through our outreach activities highlights genuine concerns about the uneven distribution of costs across different company sizes, the perceived disconnect between accounting complexity and economic reality, and the absence of clear cost benchmarks. We recommend that the IASB consider these issues in the PIR, particularly by:

- evaluating whether additional simplifications or reliefs are warranted for listed SMEs
- assessing whether the accounting requirements could be better aligned with the economic substance of leases in practice
- clarifying expectations about the appropriate level of costs to support consistent evaluation in future reviews.

Question 2(a)

Do you agree that the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees’ application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that lessees’ application of judgement has a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information, please explain why.

We agree that, overall, the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected. The exercise of judgement that results in IFRS 16-based lease accounting information has increased transparency and provided users with a clearer view of financial obligations relating to leases. Our commissioned research also indicates that recognition levels have remained high and stable, suggesting that preparers are exercising judgement consistently, resulting in information that is relevant and faithfully representative.

However, feedback received highlights that perceptions of usefulness vary considerably between different user groups:

- **Divergent stakeholder perspectives:** Some preparers and auditors view the information as burdensome or less relevant to decision-making, whereas others—such as credit rating agencies—value it highly, as it aligns with their long-standing practice of capitalising lease commitments. This suggests that usefulness depends on the stakeholder’s perspective and objectives.
- **Banks and internal management:** As noted in our response to Question 1(b), some banks and internal management teams routinely exclude IFRS 16 information, focusing instead on cash flows and future lease commitments. This practice indicates that for certain key users, the usefulness of IFRS 16 arising from information may not be as high as expected.
- **Analysts and transaction-focused users:** Feedback also indicated that analysts often find the information more difficult to reconcile for comparability and valuation purposes, particularly in merger and acquisition scenarios. This adds complexity to their work and may reduce the perceived usefulness of the information.

Question 2(b)

Do you agree that the requirements in IFRS 16 provide a clear and sufficient basis for entities to make appropriate judgements and that the requirements can be applied consistently? If not, please explain why not.

We agree that, in general, IFRS 16 provides a clear and sufficient basis for entities to exercise appropriate judgement and apply the requirements consistently. Our commissioned research indicates that the principle of lease capitalisation is widely understood and consistently applied across firms, suggesting that the core framework is sound and workable in practice.

Some stakeholder feedback received however highlights that challenges remain in more complex areas of application as set out below:

- **Determination of lease term:** To assist with lease-term determination, stakeholders noted that the relevant IFRIC agenda decision has been relied upon to resolve ambiguities, such as how to define lease term when contracts lack explicit extensions. However, these clarifications are not always easily accessible, being included as separate literature on the IASB website.

In practice, this has resulted in inconsistent application across entities. For example, there is diversity in the application of lease-term thresholds when assessing whether lease extensions are “reasonably certain.” These differences can materially affect reported lease liabilities and ratios such as return on assets, undermining comparability.

We also understand diversity exists in how retailers assess “reasonably certain” extension options, particularly for long retail leases. Different interpretations can materially affect reported assets, liabilities, and performance ratios, suggesting a need for clearer guidance.

In short, while IFRS 16 provides a framework for determining lease term, its application remains highly judgemental and resource-intensive. Concerns remain in terms of inconsistent outcomes and limited comparability in practice, particularly for smaller entities. Feedback strongly supports the need for clearer, more integrated guidance and practical examples, particularly for land and building leases, to reduce complexity and ensure the requirements deliver meaningful and useful information.

- **Fragmentation of Guidance and Role of Agenda Decisions:** We note that IFRIC has already issued six separate agenda decisions relating to IFRS 16 since its introduction:
 - i. Lease Term and Useful Life of Leasehold Improvements (Nov 2019)
 - ii. Definition of a Lease (Dec 2019)
 - iii. Sale and Leaseback with Variable Payments (Jun 2020)
 - iv. Non-refundable VAT on Lease Payments (Apr 2021)
 - v. Lessor Forgiveness of Lease Payments (Oct 2022)
 - vi. Definition of a Lease—Substitution Rights (Apr 2023)

The volume and breadth of these decisions indicate that preparers and auditors frequently encounter interpretative challenges in applying the standard. Relying on agenda decisions as the primary mechanism for clarification risks fragmenting the guidance, creating accessibility issues, and leading to inconsistent application. We therefore recommend that the IASB considers formally incorporating the substance of these agenda decisions into IFRS 16, either as practical expedients or integrated guidance, to improve clarity, consistency, and accessibility.

- **Lease modifications:** Preparers often confuse modifications with remeasurements, particularly for CPI-driven rent resets or umbrella agreements covering multiple assets. For example, some preparers incorrectly apply modification provisions and update discount rates when variable lease payments change, even though these should be treated as remeasurements. This lack of understanding adds unnecessary cost and inconsistency, highlighting the need for clearer guidance and practical examples.

From an auditing perspective, modification versus remeasurement is also a recurring source of difficulty. This often leads to disagreements between preparers and auditors, giving rise to time and cost pressures. Regulatory issues in the Australian environment further compound the problem. Local legal practice often involves extending leases by amending the original contract rather than creating a new one, with resets every few years. This structure does not align neatly with the accounting requirements of IFRS 16, creating ambiguity in distinguishing between new leases and modifications. Such mismatches increase compliance costs and uncertainty, particularly for mid-sized entities.

In short, stakeholders viewed the current lease modification requirements as complex and judgement-heavy, creating recurring compliance costs. They emphasised the need for simplification and clearer practical guidance to reduce burden while maintaining transparency.

- **Lease incentives:** We previously raised this matter in our 2019 **submission** to the IASB, highlighting concerns around the accounting for lease incentives under IFRS 16, particularly in relation to:
 1. whether lease incentives should be excluded from both the right-of-use asset and lease liability, or whether a separate lease incentive liability should be recognised (Issue 1 in our submission), and
 2. whether reimbursements for leasehold improvements should fall within the scope of the definition of lease incentives (Issue 2 in our submission).

These uncertainties created the potential for inconsistent practices and undermined comparability, as evidenced by divergent interpretations amongst preparers and auditors. In response, the *IASB's 2020 Annual Improvements* amended Illustrative Example 13 by deleting the reference to leasehold improvements, primarily to avoid confusion. While this action removed a source of inconsistency in the example, it did not substantively address the underlying interpretative questions raised by stakeholders. Accordingly, the treatment of lease incentives continues to lack clarity, and diversity in practice may persist, warranting further consideration as part of the post-implementation review.

- **Low value leases:** Stakeholders noted that materiality remains an unresolved issue, with current exemption thresholds (USD\$5,000 noted in the Basis for Conclusions for low value assets) set too low to be meaningful. In practice, these thresholds often capture only minor items such as personal computers, while most lease value is concentrated in a small number of significant contracts (e.g. 20 leases covering around 90% of value of all leases held by the entity). As a result, entities still need to apply lease accounting to numerous low-value items, creating unnecessary burden. Stakeholders suggested clearer principles that explicitly allow immaterial leases to be disregarded while ensuring materially significant assets are recognised.
- **Variable lease payments:** Current requirements prohibit the estimation of variable lease payments linked to consumer price index (CPI) or market rent reviews unless a floor exists. This can exclude substantial obligations from lease liabilities, reducing consistency and making like-for-like comparisons difficult.

Overall, we believe IFRS 16 sets out a sufficiently clear and consistent framework for judgement. However, complex areas, particularly around areas noted above, would benefit from more integrated and transparent guidance incorporated directly within the standard. This would help reduce reliance on a number of Agenda Decisions and promote more consistent application across all entities, including smaller and resource-constrained entities.

Question 2(c)

If your view is that the IASB should improve the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement, please explain: (i) what amendments you propose the IASB make to the requirements (and how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs); or (ii) what additional information about lessees' application of judgement you propose the IASB require entities to disclose (and how the benefits would outweigh the costs)

See our response to Question 2(b) above.

Question 3

Do you agree that the improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows that lessees present and disclose are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.

We acknowledge that overall, IFRS 16 has improved the quality and comparability of lease-related cash flows by requiring greater disclosure.

However, some stakeholders have raised concerns that some of the cash flow-related characteristics of certain leases. In particular, we understand there is inconsistency in how lease payments are classified in the cash flow statement, and the separation of cash flows into operating and financing categories results in useful information for decision-making purposes.

Some stakeholders have also observed that there is no clear distinction of cash flows now between assets that are essentially purchased through debt-financing (finance leases under IAS 17) and assets that are 'rented' for operational requirements (operating leases under IAS 17). From a user perspective, this treatment overcomplicates what is essentially a straightforward cost of doing business.

The IASB may wish to consider developing requirements that provide further clarity around cash flows relating to leases in its project on Cash Flows and Related Matters.

Question 4(a)

Do you agree that the ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements in IFRS 16 are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, considering how any entity-specific facts and circumstances (such as IT solutions) add to these costs.

See our response to Question 1(c) above.

Question 4(b)

If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain how you propose the IASB reduce these costs without a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information about leases.

See our response to Question 1(c) above.

Question 5

Based on your experience with the transition to IFRS 16, would you recommend the IASB does anything differently when developing transition requirements in future standard-setting projects? If so, please explain how your idea would ensure: (a) users have enough information to allow them to understand the effect of any new requirements on entities' financial performance, financial position and cash flows; and (b) preparers can appropriately reduce their transition costs when implementing new requirements for the first time.

Overall, feedback we have received indicates that the transition approach adopted for IFRS 16 worked well and provided an effective and appropriate balance between providing useful information for users and cost relief for preparers.

- **Transition choices:** The availability of both full retrospective and modified retrospective approaches was also seen as a positive. This allowed flexibility for entities, with most opting for the modified retrospective method, while those seeking greater comparability were still able to apply full retrospective transition.
- **Contextual challenges:** Some stakeholders noted that the onset of COVID-19 coincided with adoption, which diverted resources and meant there were competing and sometimes more important priorities for preparers, which may have led to some treating initial application of the standard as a compliance exercise. The real challenges only emerged later once entities had more capacity to engage with the requirements. It is therefore difficult to isolate whether any transition issues were due to the design of the transition provisions or the unusual circumstances of implementation.

- **Grandfathered contracts:** Additional feedback suggested that issues have since emerged where grandfathered contracts unexpectedly trigger reapplication of IFRS 16 due to subsequent modifications or renegotiations. Even minor changes in long-term contracts can cause material balance sheet impacts, adding significant judgement and complexity when historical data was not captured at transition. Stakeholders recommended that grandfathered contracts remain exempt from reapplication, or that immaterial modifications should not trigger full reassessment, to avoid disproportionate costs.

At this stage, we have not identified any additional suggestions other than the observations above, to assist the IASB in establishing transition provisions for future standards.

Question 6.1(a)

How often have you observed the type of rent concession described in Spotlight 6.1?

Question 6.1(b)

Have you observed diversity in how lessees account for rent concessions that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

Question 6.1(c)

If your view is that the IASB should act to improve the clarity of the requirements, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

No further comments.

Question 6.2(a)

How often have you observed difficulties in assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale?

Question 6.2(b)

Have you observed diversity in seller-lessees' assessments of the transfer of control that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

Question 6.2(c)

If your view is that the IASB should act to help seller-lessees determine whether the transfer of an asset is a sale, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

We have received limited feedback that indicates that sale-and-leaseback transactions are one of the more complex and judgement-heavy areas of IFRS 16, with difficulties in assessing whether transfers qualify as true sales, with diversity in practice leading to inconsistent recognition of gains, losses, and lease liabilities. These inconsistencies, arising in hybrid or partial asset transfers, undermine comparability and reduce the usefulness of reported information. Stakeholders recommended clearer, dedicated guidance within IFRS 16 itself, including criteria for assessing sales, treatment of subsequent modifications, and illustrative examples to improve consistency. Some of the specific concerns raised include:

- **Whether transfer constitutes a sale:** Stakeholders observed they encountered difficulties frequently in assessing whether a transfer constitutes a true sale, noting IFRS 16 provides limited guidance on this point, leaving them reliant on the 'transfer of control' framework enshrined in IFRS 15. This has created uncertainty,

particularly in hybrid or complex transactions (for example, where only part of a building or infrastructure asset is transferred).

- **Diversity in practice and impact:** Some entities conclude transactions are sales, while others treat them as failed sales (transactions that do not qualified as a 'sale' under IFRS 15), leading to inconsistent recognition of gains/losses and ROU assets/lease liabilities. Inconsistent approaches also arise from reassessments where “unit of account” questions are handled differently (e.g., entire asset vs. physically distinct components). This divergence undermines comparability and reduces the usefulness of reported information.

Stakeholders have recommended that the IASB develop clearer, dedicated guidance for sale-and-leaseback accounting, rather than relying on references to IFRS 15 and IFRS 9. Key areas for improvement include:

- Clarifying the criteria for assessing whether a transfer is a true sale or a failed sale, possibly by embedding principles similar to those used in IFRS 3 for valuing asset acquisitions as part of business combinations, which separate different transaction components.
- Providing guidance on how to treat subsequent events or modifications – i.e., whether and when reassessment or modification is required.
- Addressing conceptual inconsistencies between IFRS 15, IFRS 9 and IFRS 16, so preparers are not left unclear on which path to follow for specific fact patterns.
- Developing and providing further illustrative examples, including for partial asset transfers and hybrid arrangements (e.g., one floor of a building), to improve comparability in practice.

Question 6.3(a)

Do you agree that restricting the amount of gain (or loss) an entity recognises in a sale and leaseback transaction results in useful information?

Question 6.3(b)

What new evidence or arguments have you identified since the IASB issued IFRS 16 that would indicate that the costs of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, and the usefulness of the resulting information, differ significantly from those expected?

Question 6.3(c)

If your view is that the IASB should improve the cost-benefit balance of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, please describe your proposed solution.

We have no further comments other than those provided in our response to Question 6.2 above.

Question 6.4

Are there any further matters the IASB should examine as part of the post-implementation review of IFRS 16? If so, please explain why, considering the objective of a post-implementation review as set out on page 5

Based on feedback and observations, we suggest the IASB examine the following matters as part of the PIR of IFRS 16. These are some of the areas identified by our stakeholders as more challenging to apply as part of the IFRS 16 requirements:

- **Use of lease liabilities in performance metrics:** As noted in our commissioned research (Attachment B), among Australia’s largest lease-intensive firms, most include lease liabilities in Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) calculations. However, a notable minority exclude them, which may lead to inconsistent or potentially misleading performance measures. Whilst we appreciate this would be considered 'non-IFRS' information, the inconsistent approaches taken to presenting IFRS 16-based information as part of financial ratios could have an impact on information presented as management performance measures under IFRS 18.
- **Interest rate implicit in the lease vs incremental borrowing rate (IBR):** Our research indicates that auditing the Standard is not generally associated with high costs (see our response to Question 1(c)). Leases were

identified as a Key Audit Matter (KAM) in only 4% of audit reports for Australian listed companies, concentrated mainly in retail sectors where lease exposures are significant. This suggests that, overall, the auditing of IFRS 16 is functioning as intended and does not impose an undue burden. The primary area where challenges arise is in the determination of discount rates (particularly IBR) which requires significant judgement and is often the focus of audit attention.

Beyond our research findings, stakeholders consistently noted that determining the IBR represents one of the more judgement-intensive aspects of applying the Standard, given that the implicit rate is rarely observable for property leases. Entities therefore default to using the IBR, which requires assumptions about credit risk, lease terms, and financing conditions. While workable, this approach creates variation across entities, as methodologies and inputs differ. Stakeholders also noted that although a portfolio-based approach to discount rates (e.g., using standardised rates for 3-, 7- or 15-year leases) could improve consistency, most systems are not equipped to support this, forcing companies into manual workarounds and increasing inconsistency in practice.

In short, while the Standard has not created widespread auditing challenges, the area of discount rate determination, particularly reliance on the IBR in the absence of practical implicit rates, remains one of the more complex and judgement-heavy aspect of assurance under the standard.

DRAFT

Attachment B

CPA Australia Leases Research Report 1

IFRS 16 *Leases*: A review of
implementation and
effectiveness

Index Page

Executive summary	4
Lease recognition	4
Key audit matters.....	4
Management commentary	4
Background	5
Introduction.....	5
Section 1: Frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition	6
Section 2: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters	10
Section 3: Computation of ROIC reported in management commentary	11
Conclusions and policy recommendations	13
Appendix A	
TABLE SUMMARY	14
Appendix B	
ILLUSTRATIVE AUDIT REPORT WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KAM.....	18
Appendix C	
EXTRACTS FROM THE “WHY SIGNIFICANT” SECTION OF AUDIT REPORTS, WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KEY AUDIT MATTER.....	19
Appendix D	
SAMPLE CONSTRUCTION FOR DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS IN REGARD TO FREQUENCY AND MAGNITUDE OF LEASE LIABILITES	25
Appendix E	
METHODOLOGY FOR CLASSIFICATION OF KEY AUDIT MATTER SUBJECT MATTER.....	26

Contributors

Research team

University of Melbourne

Prof. Matthew Pinnuck
Prof. Michael Davern FCPA
Nikole Gyles FCPA

CPA Australia

Ram Subramanian FCPA
Vincent Lok CPA

Copyright notice

© CPA Australia Ltd (ABN 64 008 392 452) ('CPA Australia'), 2025. All rights reserved. This document is protected by copyright. Other than for the purposes of and in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth) and Copyright Act 1994 (NZ), this document may only be reproduced, published, stored in a retrieval system or communicated in whole or in part provided that it is not amended or adapted without express prior written permission and the ownership of copyright by CPA Australia ABN 64 008 392 452 is attributed at all times.

Disclaimer

CPA Australia and its contributors do not warrant or make representations as to the accuracy, completeness, suitability or fitness for purpose of the Materials and accepts no responsibility for any acts or omissions made in reliance of the Materials. The Materials have been produced for reference purposes only and are not intended, in part or full, to constitute legal or professional advice or to be relied upon for any purpose whatsoever. You shall not rely on the Materials and instead, shall rely on your own enquiries. If appropriate, you shall obtain your own independent legal, regulatory, tax, business, investment, financial or other professional advice in relation to the issues to which the Materials relate, the contents of the Materials and all matters arising from or relating to or in any way connected with the Materials or their contents. To the extent permitted by the applicable laws in your jurisdiction, CPA Australia, its employees, agents and consultants shall have no liability for any loss, damage, claim, proceeding and or expense including but not limited to legal costs, indirect special or consequential loss or damage, arising from acts or omissions made in reliance on the Materials or as a result of receiving the Materials. Where any law prohibits the exclusion of such liability, CPA Australia limits its liability to the resupply of the relevant information, if appropriate.

Executive summary

This report provides an overview of the impact of adopting IFRS 16 Leases (IFRS 16) in Australia. The Australian version of IFRS 16 is AASB 16 Leases (AASB 16). The objective of this report is to assess whether IFRS 16 is achieving its intended goals, when applied by Australian listed companies. The report focusses on three key areas of IFRS 16 implementation in Australia:

- a. Lease recognition: The frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition following the adoption of IFRS 16;
- b. Key Audit Matters: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters (KAMs) disclosed in 2024 audit reports; and
- c. Management commentary: Whether firms include lease liabilities in the denominator (invested capital) when voluntarily reporting Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) in the management commentary section of annual reports.

Lease recognition

The data show a sharp increase in recognition, with the proportion of firms reporting lease liabilities, rising from 42% prior to IFRS 16 to approximately 90% post-adoption. This widespread recognition and economic materiality suggest that preparers have engaged with and operationalised the principles of IFRS 16. Moreover, the results indicate continued high level of compliance with the standard between 2021 and 2024, providing strong evidence that the standard's ongoing implementation costs are sustainable and in line with expectations.

Key audit matters

In relation to KAMs, leases were identified as a KAM in only four per cent of audit reports across the sample. The small proportion suggests that lease accounting under IFRS 16 is not a significant source of audit complexity or cost.

Management commentary

Finally, in relation to the reporting of ROIC, among the ten largest lease-intensive firms in Australia, 70% included lease liabilities in the ROIC denominator, consistent with the intention of IFRS 16 that leases are a source of funding and financial capital. This signals that many firms consider lease liabilities to be relevant and decision-useful for assessing financial performance, aligning with the objectives of IFRS 16. However, a notable minority (30%) excluded lease liabilities from the ROIC calculation. This practice has the potential to be misleading in relation to performance metrics.

Conclusion

Overall, the evidence presented in this report supports the conclusion that IFRS 16 is achieving its intended objectives. The only area highlighted where further refinement is warranted relates to the treatment of lease liabilities in voluntary performance metrics such as ROIC. Given that ROIC is a key performance indicator used widely by analysts and investors, we recommend that the IASB address this issue through further guidance or educational material in relation to management commentary, or in IFRS 18 and related standards.

Addressing this issue would help ensure that the benefits of IFRS 16 in the primary financial statements are not undermined by selective reporting practices in management commentary.

Background

There are two primary reasons for the University of Melbourne to undertake this current research project with the support of CPA Australia. Firstly, the research seeks to update previous research undertaken to understand impacts of the standard when it was issued. This initial research culminated in two research reports:

- [Implementing AASB 16 Leases: are preparers ready?](#)
- [AASB 16 Leases: investor perspectives](#)

Secondly, the current research project seeks to gather and present suitable empirical evidence to assist with the post implementation review of IFRS/AASB 16 being undertaken by the IASB/AASB.

This research report sets out findings from a benchmark analysis of listed companies that explores some potential disclosure impacts arising from the standard as described above. In addition to the findings from the benchmark analysis showcased in this report, the research project will also be informed by a series of roundtables to be conducted with various sector-based stakeholders to obtain further evidence of the impacts of the standard and opportunities for improvement. The aim of the research project is to make available further information to the standard-setters and other stakeholders as it becomes available, with a further report to be published in the first half of 2026.

Introduction

The adoption of IFRS 16 *Leases* (IFRS 16) marked a pivotal shift in lease accounting, with the central aim of bringing greater transparency and comparability to financial statements by requiring lessees to recognise almost all leases on the balance sheet. The current International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) post-implementation review (PIR) evaluates the extent to which the standard is meeting these objectives, particularly in relation to its core principles, the informational value it provides to users of financial statements, and the costs incurred in its application, audit, and enforcement.

This report draws on data from Australian listed entities following mandatory adoption of IFRS 16 (AASB 16) and analyses the following focus areas:

- Lease recognition: The frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition following the adoption of IFRS 16;
- Key Audit Matters: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters (KAMs) disclosed in 2024 audit reports; and
- Management commentary: Whether firms include lease liabilities in the denominator (invested capital) when voluntarily reporting Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) in the management commentary section of annual reports.

In analysing these areas, we aim to address the following three components of Question 1 in the IASB's Request for Information:

- a. Whether the core principles of IFRS 16 are clear and are being met in practice;
- b. Whether the information provided about leases meets the needs of users; and
- c. Whether the costs of applying, auditing, and enforcing the standard are as expected.

These and other findings are expanded on in the remainder of this report which is structured as follows. Section 1 documents the frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition under IFRS 16 for Australian listed companies. Section 2 documents the frequency and nature of the designation of leases

as a Key Audit Matter in the audit reports of Australian listed companies in 2024. Section 3 examines if management, for the purpose of reporting ROIC in the management commentary section of the annual report, include lease liabilities in the calculation of invested capital (i.e., the denominator of ROIC).

Section 1: Frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition

The core principle of IFRS 16 is that lessees should recognise assets and liabilities arising from leases unless the lease is of low value or short-term. This approach represented a shift from the previous distinction between operating and finance leases under IAS 17 *Leases* (IAS 17), which allowed many lease obligations to remain off-balance sheet. IAS 17 drew a distinction between finance and operating leases, and only required recognition of assets and liabilities arising from finance leases.


To address whether the core principles of IFRS 16 are clear and are being met in practice we analysed the frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition under IFRS 16 across the period from the year of adoption in 2020 to 2024 for a sample of Australian firms¹ across the following:

- the frequency² and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised under IFRS 16 in 2024; and
- yearly time-series of the frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities since the adoption of IFRS 16 in 2020.

Frequency and magnitude of leases liabilities – 2024 results

The following charts present the summary statistics for the sample as at 2024. The data these charts are based on are derived from Table 1 included in Appendix A to this report.

Chart 1 - Frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australia listed companies - full sample



¹ See Appendix D for the sample construction.

² The frequency of recognition is simply measured as the number of firms that have recognised a lease liability as a percentage of the total sample of firms. The two metrics we use to assess magnitude are: (1) the value of lease liabilities as a percentage of total debt. Where total debt is the sum of borrowings and lease liabilities. The descriptive statistics for this metric are based on the sample of firms that have debt > 0 and thus is bounded between 0 and 100%, and (2) the value of lease liabilities as percentage of total funding where total funding is total debt plus total shareholder equity.

Chart 2 - Frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australia listed companies - by entity size³





Chart 3 - frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australia listed companies - by sector



³ Firm size categories, based on total assets, are defined as follows: Micro – less than \$23 million; Small – \$23 million to less than \$102 million; Medium – \$102 million to less than \$593 million; Large – greater than \$593 million.

Our findings strongly suggest that the core principle of IFRS 16, capitalisation of leases, is both widely understood and implemented in practice. By 2024, 84% of firms in our sample recognised lease liabilities (Chart 1 above). Importantly, lease recognition rates were consistent across firm size categories. Even among micro-cap firms, 77% recognised lease liabilities in 2024, and among small to large entities, this figure was 86% (Chart 2 above). All sectors have a high level of lease recognition with the lowest being in the mining (75%) and energy sectors (60%)⁴ (Chart 3 above). This widespread application indicates that the principle of capitalisation is understood and applied not only by large entities with sophisticated accounting functions, but also by smaller entities where accounting resources may be more limited.


Moreover, the reported lease liabilities were economically material, as demonstrated by the magnitude of lease liabilities as a percentage of total debt for the median firm being 45%⁵ (Chart 1 above).

Taken together, these findings support the conclusion that the core principle of lease capitalisation is not only clear but also being broadly applied consistently in practice. IFRS 16 is achieving its objective of bringing leases onto the balance sheet and improving the quality of financial statements.

Changes across time in the frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities

To provide insight into the impact of IFRS 16, we also undertook a time-series analysis of lease liabilities from 2016 to 2024.⁶ The results are presented in Table 2 (see Appendix A), and graphically in Figures 1 and 2 below.


Figure 1 – % Lease Liability Recognition



⁴ The sector with the greatest level of lease liabilities is the retail sector, where, in Australia, prime locations in shopping centres are typically held by property investors and must be leased rather than purchased.

⁵ The *variation* in the magnitude of leases as a % of debt financing is substantial. As reported in Table 1 panel A the 25th (75th percentile) is 14% (97%). This implies that for 25% of firms, leases are the primary or only source of debt financing (>97% of debt financing is from leases) and for another 25% of firms' leases are a very low source of debt financing (<14% of debt financing is from leases).

⁶ The analysis is restricted to firms that existed in all years of the sample period. This restriction ensures that observed changes are attributable to the adoption and application of IFRS 16, rather than to firms entering or leaving the listed population due to new listings or delistings. The data are reported by calendar year, based on the financial year-end of each firm. IFRS 16 became mandatory for financial years beginning on or after 1 January 2019. As a result, the calendar year 2020, which includes both 30 June and 31 December year-ends, represents the first full year of adoption for most Australian firms.

Figure 2 – Lease Liability/Total debt

A clear pattern emerges when comparing the year of adoption, 2020, to the preceding year, 2019. The proportion of firms recognising lease liabilities increased significantly from 42% in 2019 to 92% in 2020. In addition to this increase in frequency, there was a material change in the magnitude of reported lease obligations. The average ratio of lease liabilities to total debt rose from 18% in 2019 to 51% in 2020. This shift demonstrates that for the average firm, the capitalisation of leases had a substantial effect on reported leverage. These findings suggest that IFRS 16 impacted a broad cross-section of firms and materially changed the presentation of financial obligations. As such, they provide support for the view that the standard improves both the transparency and comparability of financial information.

Looking at the years following initial adoption, from 2021 through 2024, the percentage of firms recognising lease liabilities remained stable. Similarly, the average ratio of lease liabilities to total debt did not exhibit any material decline. This ongoing consistency suggests that firms have continued to comply with the requirements of IFRS 16 without withdrawing from recognition over time. The absence of any reduction in recognition implies that the costs of applying and complying with IFRS 16 have not deterred firms from ongoing compliance with the Standard nor led firms to alter financing arrangements significantly.

Implications for standard-setting

These findings provide evidence that the ongoing costs of applying IFRS 16 are reasonable and appropriate; broadly consistent with the IASB's expectations. Two factors support this interpretation:

- First, compliance with IFRS 16 does not appear to deter the use of leases by either micro firms or firms for which lease liabilities represent only a small proportion of total debt. This suggests that even firms with limited resources or minimal lease exposure are able to comply with the standard without undue cost or burden.
- Second, the near-universal recognition of lease liabilities implies the presence of substantial scale economies. The widespread use of leases across firms likely facilitates the sharing or adoption of common systems, software, and accounting processes for lease recognition, thereby reducing the per-unit cost of compliance, particularly for property and buildings leases.

In addition, the consistently high level of lease liability recognition, along with the economically significant magnitude of lease liabilities for the typical firm, provides evidence that the information produced under IFRS 16 is materially relevant. This supports the view that the standard meets its objective of improving

the faithful representation of financial position and performance by bringing lease obligations onto the balance sheet.

Finally, the significant variation in the extent to which firms use leases as a source of debt financing indicates that IFRS 16 contributes meaningfully to improving the comparability of financial information. By requiring the recognition of lease liabilities, IFRS 16 enables users to better assess and compare the total level of financial leverage and associated risk across different firms and industries.

Section 2: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters

The shift to on-balance sheet lease accounting was expected to improve the ability of users, especially investors, analysts, and creditors, to assess leverage, capital efficiency, and cash flow commitments. In this section of the report, we examine the frequency and nature of the designation of leases as a Key Audit Matter (KAM) in the audit reports of Australian listed companies.⁷

Audit reports offer a unique lens through which to observe the relative complexity and judgement involved in applying IFRS 16. Auditor's reports of listed entities in Australia are required to provide information about key audit matters (KAM). KAM are "those matters that, in the auditor's professional judgement, were of most significance in the audit of the financial statements of the current period".⁸ The audit report is required to include a description of each key audit matter that addresses why the matter was considered to be one of most significance in the audit and therefore determined to be a key audit matter. This is the "Why Significant" section of the audit report.⁹

As KAMs are relative, if the costs and complexities of accounting for and auditing leases are larger than expected we should find an abnormal frequency of leases identified as a KAM. Furthermore, if the costs are larger than expected, the designated reasons for the KAM in the "Why Significant" section of the audit report should be for underlying reasons of judgment and uncertainty that were not expected.

Out of the full sample, only 4% of firms (17 companies) had an audit report in which leases were identified as a KAM subject matter. These firms are listed in Table 3 included in Appendix A. Across all firms, there were 955 individual KAMs reported in total; of these, only 17, or 2%, had leases as the subject matter. This makes lease-related KAMs relatively rare. The full list of KAM subject matters and their frequency is reported in Table 3 in Appendix A.

The results also showed a concentration for KAMs in certain sectors. Fifteen of the 17 firms with lease-related KAMs were in the consumer staples or consumer discretionary sectors. This may reflect the

⁷ We sampled the full population of Australian listed entities (excluding mining, real estate and banking firms) with reporting periods ending in 2024. We categorised and classified the KAMs into subject matters based on the primary financial statement account that it related to (e.g., revenue, inventory, provisions, intangibles, leases). The details of the sample selection and methodology for classification of the KAMs is discussed in Appendix E. Overall, we have a final sample of 529 firms. We have classified 29 distinct KAM subject matters. As each audit report may have more than one KAM we have a total of 955 KAMs.

⁸ ASA 701.8 *Communicating Key Audit Matters in the Independent Auditor's Report*. For audits of financial statements for periods ending on or after 15 December 2016, auditor's reports of all listed entities in Australia have been required to provide information about key audit matters.

⁹ ASA 701.13. A full extract of an audit report with a lease as KAM is provided for illustrative purposes in Appendix B.

higher prevalence of leased assets in retail and franchise-heavy industries, where physical premises and equipment are commonly leased.

Taken together, these findings suggest that leases are not frequently regarded as a high-risk area requiring special audit focus. As such, there is no evidence from audit frequency that the cost and complexity of auditing lease-related disclosures under IFRS 16 has been greater than expected.

Additional analysis

To explore the audit rationale for identifying leases as a KAM, we reviewed the “Why Significant” sections of the audit reports for all 17 firms. (See extracts in Appendix C). The rationale provided by auditors typically centred on two factors: the economic significance of lease liabilities, both in volume and value, and the requirement for management to make key judgments and estimates. Among the 17 firms, the most commonly cited area of audit judgment was the determination of the incremental borrowing rate used to discount future lease payments. Other areas, though less frequently mentioned, included the accounting treatment of backdated rent variations, the assessment of renewal options contained within leases, and the handling of sub-lease arrangements, particularly in franchise models.

Overall, the review of audit report disclosures did not identify any unexpected sources of estimation uncertainty or judgment that would suggest IFRS 16 presents unforeseen challenges in practice. The findings provide further support for the conclusion that the auditing of IFRS 16 lease obligations is operating as intended and without undue burden.

Section 3: Computation of ROIC reported in management commentary

This section examines how companies treat lease liabilities when calculating Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) in the management commentary section of their annual reports. ROIC is widely regarded as a key performance measure for assessing the efficiency of capital use and value creation. The analysis focuses on whether lease liabilities recognised under IFRS 16 are incorporated into the denominator of ROIC, which reflects the total invested capital.

ROIC is a voluntary reported metric and, therefore, reflects the demand and needs of users. ROIC as following examples illustrate, is the most widely used metric to measure performance and productivity and thus the amount of value a company creates.¹⁰

“Underlying return on capital employed is an indicator of the Group’s capital efficiency” (BHP, 2024, p18.)

“ROC has been adopted as the principal measure of performance for the divisions. ROC focuses the divisions on increasing earnings and/or increasing capital productivity by managing existing assets efficiently” (Wesfarmers 2024 Annual Report, p.16)

¹⁰ At a conceptual level the definition of ROIC is:

$$ROIC = \frac{\text{Profit}}{\text{Invested Capital}}$$

“Underlying ROCE measures how efficiently we generate profits from investment in our portfolio of assets” (RIO Tinto, 2024, p.12)

We examine if firms include or exclude lease liabilities in their definition of Debt for purposes of computing *Invested Capital* and *ROIC*. It is expected that lease liabilities would be included in the calculation as the objective of ROIC is to measure the returns on all capital invested in the business.

As outlined in the below Table4, the findings indicate that a significant majority, 70% of the sampled companies, include lease liabilities in the denominator of ROIC. This finding suggests that most firms consider lease liabilities to represent a meaningful component of financial capital. Their inclusion in invested capital supports a more accurate and reliable assessment of financial performance and capital efficiency, in line with the broader objectives of IFRS 16.

Table 4 – Australian companies examined to determine if leases included in computation of ROIC¹¹

Company	Total Assets (\$m)	Leases Liabilities (\$m)	Lease liabilities / Total Funds	Lease included in ROIC?
Woolworths Group Limited	33,936	12,144	54.48%	Yes
Coles Group Limited	19,870	8,417	61.50%	Yes
Wesfarmers Limited	27,309	6,522	32.83%	No
Ramsay Health Care Limited	20,894	5,854	35.55%	No
Endeavour Group Limited	11,783	3,913	39.76%	Yes
BHP Group Limited*	102,362	3,116	4.46%	Yes
TPG Telecom Limited	19,094	2,205	12.62%	Yes
Woodside Energy Group Ltd	61,264	1,623	3.40%	Yes
Qantas Airways Limited	20,564	1,556	22.60%	Yes
Sonic Healthcare Limited	14,826	1,527	12.13%	No

*Numbers quoted are in US Dollars

However, a notable minority, 30% of the sample, exclude lease liabilities from their ROIC calculations. This practice raises concerns regarding the comparability and reliability of ROIC as a performance metric across firms. When lease liabilities are excluded, ROIC figures may be overstated, potentially presenting a distorted view of how efficiently a company uses its capital.

This inconsistency suggests that, while IFRS 16 has significantly improved the quality of financial statements, the effectiveness of lease information in management commentary and voluntary

¹¹ The information in Table 4 has been extracted from the publicly available 2024 Annual Reports

performance metrics remains uneven. The divergence points to a possible gap in guidance under IFRS 18 and IFRS Practice Statement 1. In particular, paragraph 121 of IFRS 18 requires management performance measures to faithfully represent financial performance, which may not be achieved when lease liabilities are selectively excluded from capital-based metrics.

To address this issue, we suggest that the IASB explore available educational avenues, such as through IFRS Practice Statement 1 *Management Commentary* (revised), or other educational material to provide clearer guidance on the appropriate treatment of lease liabilities in performance metrics disclosed in management commentary.

The issue is not limited to the consideration of IFRS 16, however. It also intersects directly with the reporting of management-defined performance measures and disclosures related to capital, as outlined in IFRS 18 *Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements* which becomes effective in Australia for annual reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2027.¹² Arguably, the exclusion of lease liabilities from invested capital in ROIC calculations may conflict with the objectives of IFRS 18. Specifically, such reporting may not provide users with an unbiased, representative, and faithfully presented view of a firm's financial performance.

Given the significance of ROIC to financial analysis and investor decision-making, we recommend that the IASB consider this issue as part of the post-implementation review of IFRS 18, if not addressed earlier.

We conclude that IFRS 16 is fulfilling its intended objective of improving information quality in the primary financial statements. Nonetheless, there is room for improvement in ensuring that this enhanced transparency is carried through to performance reporting in management commentary.

Conclusions and policy recommendations

The evidence presented in this report supports the conclusion that IFRS 16 has largely achieved its objectives. The requirement to recognise leases on the balance sheet has led to greater transparency and comparability in financial statements and has proven to be well-understood and applicable across a diverse range of entities. Auditors and preparers appear to be managing the judgements and estimates inherent in the standard without undue difficulty.

At the same time, our findings point to opportunities for improvement, particularly in the alignment of voluntary performance metrics with the principles of IFRS 16. Inconsistencies in the treatment of lease liabilities in metrics such as ROIC, despite their materiality, may undermine the comparability and reliability of management commentary. This is an area where further guidance or educational material in relation to management commentary, or in IFRS 18 and related standards would be beneficial.

Overall, we recommend that the IASB maintain the current scope and core principles of IFRS 16, which are being effectively applied in practice and provide additional guidance or examples to encourage the faithful representation of leases in management-defined metrics.

These measures would help ensure the full benefits of IFRS 16, going beyond the balance sheet to improve transparency, consistency and usefulness of financial reporting.

¹² See paragraphs 117–123 and 126–129.

Appendix A

TABLE SUMMARY

Table 1 – Frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australian Listed Companies in 2024

Panel A Full Sample

	Observations	P25	Mean	Median	P75
% Lease Liabilities	622		83.76%		
Lease/ Total Debt	562	13.51%	50.13%	44.97%	96.66%
Lease/ Total Funding	622	1.06%	12.67%	5.16%	14.94%

Panel B By Firm size

Size Category	Observations	Lease Recognition (%)	Lease/ Total Debt			Lease/ Total Funding		
			P25	Median	P75	P25	Median	P75
Micro	150	77.33%	11.70%	52.66%	100.00%	0.26%	3.56%	12.85%
Small	158	86.08%	19.58%	77.37%	100.00%	1.01%	4.91%	16.93%
Medium	158	84.81%	17.37%	46.73%	97.14%	1.25%	5.72%	14.77%
Large	156	86.54%	10.46%	24.07%	53.10%	2.14%	6.65%	15.55%

Panel C By Sector

GICS Sector	Lease Recognition (%)	Lease/ Total Debt			Lease/ Total Funding		
		P25	Median	P75	P25	Median	P75
Mining	74.65%	3.80%	19.59%	89.78%	0.02%	0.77%	4.06%
Energy	59.18%	0.00%	11.52%	35.52%	0.00%	0.45%	2.35%
Materials	100.00%	14.75%	48.42%	73.94%	4.47%	8.50%	13.98%
Industrials	97.41%	15.43%	38.42%	84.89%	3.57%	8.54%	16.95%
Consumer Discretionary	97.78%	36.83%	73.60%	98.29%	5.88%	15.71%	39.31%
Consumer Staples	95.56%	14.59%	44.79%	72.62%	2.14%	8.57%	21.31%
Health Care	88.30%	19.31%	75.00%	100.00%	1.30%	3.63%	12.83%
Information Technology	93.75%	16.45%	48.51%	100.00%	1.93%	4.77%	10.70%
Communication Services	81.82%	12.48%	31.26%	84.36%	1.49%	5.98%	14.99%
Utilities	81.82%	0.96%	11.13%	62.10%	0.36%	3.03%	8.25%
Mining	74.65%	3.80%	19.59%	89.78%	0.02%	0.77%	4.06%

%Lease Recognition is the % of the total sample of firms that recognize lease liabilities

Total Debt is Borrowings plus Lease Liabilities

Total Funding is Shareholders Equity plus Total Debt

P25 and P75 are the observations at the 25th and 75th percentile of the distribution. They imply that 25% of the sampled firms lie below (above) the 25th (75th) percentile observation respectively.

The sample is all Australian listed companies in 2024 excluding companies in the mining, finance and real-estate sectors.

Table 2 – Lease liability recognition across time

Year	Lease Recognition (%)	Lease/ Total Debt	
		Mean	Median
2015	34.52%	8.86%	0.00%
2016	33.98%	11.33%	0.00%
2017	32.42%	10.87%	0.00%
2018	35.69%	13.73%	0.00%
2019	42.09%	18.01%	0.10%
2020	91.60%	51.49%	49.87%
2021	90.89%	53.37%	50.40%
2022	89.95%	51.26%	45.72%
2023	90.21%	52.54%	46.55%
2024	90.36%	50.26%	44.88%

% Lease Recognition is the % of the total sample of firms that recognize lease liabilities
The sample is Australian listed companies that existed for the years from 2019 to 2024.

Table 3 – Frequency of KAMS by subject matter for Australian companies in 2024

KAM Subject Matter	Lease Recognition (%)	Median
Impairment	261	27.33%
Revenue	229	23.98%
Inventory	67	7.02%
Business Combinations	59	6.18%
Financial Instruments	48	5.03%
Intangibles	43	4.50%
Share Based Payment	38	3.98%
Going Concern	33	3.46%
Taxation	32	3.35%
Provisions	22	2.30%
PPE	19	1.99%
Leases	17	1.78%
Discontinued Operation	15	1.57%
Deferred Tax Asset	12	1.26%
Account Receivable	9	0.94%
Information Technology	8	0.84%
Equity Method	6	0.63%
Exploration Assets	6	0.63%
Biological Assets	5	0.52%
Contingent Liabilities	5	0.52%
Investment Property	5	0.52%
Expenses	4	0.42%
Related Party Transactions	4	0.42%
Cash	2	0.21%
R&D	2	0.21%
Grant	1	0.10%
Joint Venture	1	0.10%
Management Fee	1	0.10%
Trade Payables	1	0.10%
Total	955	100.00%

Appendix B

ILLUSTRATIVE AUDIT REPORT WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KAM

Independent Auditor's Report to the members of JB Hi-Fi Limited¹³

[...]

Key Audit Matters

Key audit matters are those matters that, in our professional judgment, were of most significance in our audit of the financial report for the current period. These matters were addressed in the context of our audit of the financial report as a whole, and in forming our opinion thereon, and we do not provide a separate opinion on these matters.

[...]

Key Audit Matter	How the scope of our audit responded to the Key Audit Matter
<p>Lease accounting</p> <p>Refer to Note 16 of Right of use assets and lease liabilities</p> <p>The Group holds right of use assets of \$568.3 million and lease liabilities of \$642.4 million. These balances are significant in the context of the Group's balance sheet as at 30 June 2024.</p> <p>In applying AASB 16 Leases, the Group is required to make a number of judgments and estimates as disclosed in Note 16, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measuring the lease term (including judgements associated with lease renewal options and the accounting for leases in hold over). Determining an appropriate incremental borrowing rate to be applied in the measurement of right of use assets and lease liabilities upon initial recognition of a lease and for certain lease modifications. 	<p>Our audit procedures included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the Group's processes and key controls related to the accounting for leases. Testing on a sample basis, movements in the right of use assets and lease liabilities and recalculating the interest and depreciation recognised in profit or loss. Evaluating the judgements applied by management, including the probability of exercising renewal options. Assessing the incremental borrowing rates adopted by management, by preparing an independent expectation of the incremental borrowing rates. Evaluating the adequacy of the disclosures included in Note 16 to the financial statements.

¹³ As extracted in the independent auditor's report of JB HI-FI Annual Report 2024

Appendix C

EXTRACTS FROM THE “WHY SIGNIFICANT” SECTION OF AUDIT REPORTS, WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KEY AUDIT MATTER

XREALITY GROUP LIMITED

Right of use asset and lease liability

The group performed a reassessment of the calculations for the right-of-use asset and lease liabilities due to the flow on effect of higher sustained inflation and the impact on future rent increases. The right-of-use assets and lease liability calculations involves a degree of complexity and judgement around potential rent increases based on inflation. We considered in the persistent inflationary environment reviewing the right-of-use asset and lease calculations are a key audit matter due to the significant uncertainty around the current period of economic volatility. The value of the right-of use assets also forms part of our impairment assessment described above

JB HI-FI LIMITED

Lease accounting

The Group holds right of use assets of \$568.3 million and lease liabilities of \$642.4 million. These balances are significant in the context of the Group’s balance sheet as at 30 June 2024. In applying AASB 16 Leases, the Group is required to make a number of judgments and estimates as disclosed in Note 16, including:

Measuring the lease term (including judgements associated with lease renewal options and the accounting for leases in hold over).

Determining an appropriate incremental borrowing rate to be applied in the measurement of right of use assets and lease liabilities upon initial recognition of a lease and for certain lease modifications.

SILK LOGISTICS HOLDINGS LIMITED

Assessment of Lease term and incremental borrowing rate under AASB 16 Leases

As at 30 June 2024 the Group has reported right of use assets of \$283.7 million (\$142.8 million at 25 June 2023) relating to property related leases. The estimated lease term of these properties and the incremental borrowing rate forms part of the assessment for determining the right of use asset and associated lease liability at the time of initial recognition. The accounting policy and the significant estimates and judgements in relation to determining the lease term are disclosed in Notes 2 and 3. In reassessing the lease term, the Group is required to determine whether there are significant events under their control which result in renewal options being required to be incorporated into the assessment. Where lease terms have been reassessed, the Group is required to determine an appropriate incremental borrowing rate to be applied in the calculation of right of use assets and lease liabilities.

GUZMAN Y GOMEZ LIMITED

Lease

The Group has a significant lease portfolio which includes leases for restaurant sites as well as office and other leases. As set out in Notes 15, 17 & 21 to the financial statements, at 30 June 2024 the Group has recognised lease liabilities of \$239.5m, finance lease receivables of \$126.4m and right-of-use assets of \$93.8m. There were additions of \$65.5m to lease liabilities, \$24.3m to finance lease receivables and \$36.9m to right-of-use assets during the year. Included in the lease portfolio are leases which are entered into for franchise restaurants with the Group as the head lessee, and sub-leases entered into with the franchisees under the same terms as the head lease. Where the sub-lease transfers substantially all of the risks and rewards of the underlying right-of-use asset, the sub-lease is classified as a finance lease and is recognised as a finance lease receivable. Alternatively, other sub-leases are classified as operating leases and recognised as right-of-use assets. For lease additions and modifications during the year, the Group applied significant judgement in determining the incremental borrowing rate {IBR}, including the calculation method, appropriate data utilised, and the determination of the lease term with extension options.

PREMIER INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Accounting for leases

The Group holds a significant volume of leases by number and value over retail sites as a lessee. The recognition and measurement of new and remeasured lease agreements executed during the year in accordance with AASB 16 Leases (“AASB 16”) are dependent on a number of key judgements and estimates. These include:

The calculation of incremental borrowing rates;

The treatment of the option to extend the lease term under holdover; and

The impact of backdated rent variations.

Accordingly, given the significant judgements and estimates involved we considered this a key audit matter.

VIVA LEISURE LIMITED

Right Of Use Assets and Lease Liabilities

At 30 June 2024, the group recognized \$255,307,160 in Right of Use Asset and \$290,225,494 in lease liabilities. The group has numerous lease arrangements in place which requires certain judgments to be made at point of recognition and measurement. We focused on this area as a key audit matter given the significance of the balance and there is risk that the leases may not be accounted for in accordance with the requirements of AASB 16 Leases.

CARLY HOLDINGS LIMITED

Lease accounting

As at 30 June 2023, the Group has recognised a current lease liability of \$346,770 and a non-current lease liability of \$640,550 in relation to an office lease and vehicle leases. We determined lease accounting to be a key audit matter as it is material, important to the users' understanding of the financial statements and involved the most audit effort and communication with management.

RETAIL FOOD GROUP LIMITED

Lease accounting - estimate of lease arrears and assessment of recoverability of lease receivables (\$61.7m)

The Group has a significant lease portfolio that includes sub-lease arrangements with franchisees where the Group has entered into the head lease agreement with the landlord. Where the franchise store sub-lease is assessed by the Group as a finance lease using AASB 16 Leases, the Group recognise a finance lease receivable. Following this, the impairment requirements of AASB 9 Financial Instruments apply to the net investment in these leases. The Group determined their expected loss provisioning amounts using a forward-looking expected credit loss impairment model. This involves significant judgement as the expected credit loss reflects information about past, current and future conditions. Overall, the relative size of balances has a significant financial impact on the Group's financial position and performance. We involved our senior audit team members in assessing this key audit matter

CHRYSOS CORPORATION LIMITED

PhotonAssay operating lease income

PhotonAssay operating lease income was a key audit matter due to:

The quantum of operating lease income earned during the year, which comprised 92% of total revenue and other income.

The judgement required in applying revenue recognition and lease accounting standards to the PhotonAssay leases.

To classify each lease the Group applies judgement to assess whether the agreements transfer substantially all the risks and rewards of ownership of the underlying PhotonAssay assets. If this is the case, then the lease is a finance lease; if not, then it is an operating lease. Significant judgement is required to determine the lease term. Consideration is given to the non-cancellable periods and early cancellation penalties contained in the leasing arrangements. In assessing this key audit matter, we involved senior audit team members who understand the Group's business and industry.

INGHAMS GROUP LIMITED

Accounting for AASB 16 Leases – (right of use assets and lease liabilities amounting to \$1,031.7 million and \$1,138.4 million respectively)

AASB 16 Leases (“AASB 16”) is complex with specific lease-features driving different accounting outcomes, increasing the need for interpretation and judgement. AASB 16 Leases is a key audit matter due to the:

Relative materiality of the right of use assets and lease liabilities to the financial report.

Number of leases in the Group, including the individual nature of the lease agreements used to estimate the lease liability and right-of-use asset.

A focus for us was the accuracy of multiple and varied inputs which may drive different accounting outcomes, including key dates, fixed and variable rent payments, renewal options and incentives. The key areas of judgement we focussed on was in assessing the Group’s:

Renewal options contained within leases. Assessing the Group’s determination of whether it is reasonably certain renewal options will be exercised impacts the measurement of the lease, therefore is critical to the accuracy of the accounting.

Grower contractual arrangements and the features of the underlying grower contracts against the definition of a lease under the accounting standards.

Incremental borrowing rates determined by the Group. These are meant to reflect the Group’s entity specific credit risk and vary based on each lease term. We involved our senior audit team members in assessing these areas

SONIC HEALTHCARE LIMITED

Lease accounting

Lease accounting was a key audit matter due to the:

financial significance of lease liabilities and right-of-use assets to the consolidated balance sheet; and

significant judgements required by the Group such as determining the lease term and the incremental borrowing rate

UNIVERSAL STORE HOLDINGS LIMITED

Accounting for leases

Accounting for leases was a key audit matter due to the size of right-of-use assets and lease liability balances included in the financial report and the judgement involved in determining the balances, including the incremental borrowing rate used for discounting, accounting for leases in holdover and treatment of lease incentives and modifications.

BAPCOR LIMITED

Accounting for leases

At 30 June 2024, the Group recorded right of use assets of \$249.9 million and a lease liability of \$288.6 million. Accounting for leases was a key audit matter due to the financial significance of right-of-use assets and lease liability balances and the judgement involved in determining these balances, including the incremental borrowing rate and option renewals.

BIOXYNE LIMITED

Accounting for leases

The Group has significant lease arrangements. AASB 16 Leases, has introduced new complexities in lease accounting, requiring significant management judgment and estimation. This includes determining the lease term, discount rates, and the classification of leases as either operating or finance leases. Given the material impact on the financial statements and the complexity involved, accounting for leases was identified as a key audit matter

ALTERRA LIMITED

Leases

The Group has continued to recognise right-of-use assets and lease liabilities in relation to its lease arrangements over office premises and Carpenters plantation site. The majority of the right-of-use asset and lease liability recorded relates to the long-term Carpenters lease. Accounting for leases is a key audit matter as the balances recorded are material and there are significant judgements involved in determining the appropriate lease payments necessary to be used in the calculation of the lease liability and right-of-use asset

OOH MEDIA LIMITED

Lease Accounting

The accounting requirements of MSB 16 Leases are inherently complex, where specific and individualised lease-features drive different accounting outcomes, increasing the need for interpretation and judgement. This increases our audit effort and is a key audit matter. We focused on:

High volume of leases - the Group has a high volume of individualised lease agreements required to be assessed in determining the lease liability and right-of-use asset. A focus for us was the completeness of the lease population and the accuracy of multiple and varied inputs which may drive different accounting outcomes, including key terms of the lease agreements, such as key dates, fixed rent payments, renewal options and incentives.

Complex modelling process - the Group developed a lease calculation model, which is largely manual and complex, and therefore is at greater risk for potential error and inconsistent application.

Relative magnitude - the size of balances has a significant financial impact on the Group's financial position and performance.

The most significant areas of judgement we focused on were in assessing the Group's:

Incremental borrowing rates used - these reflect the Group's entity specific credit risk and vary based on each lease term. The Group periodically engages an external expert to assist with determining each of the Group's incremental borrowing rates.

Lease terms where leases have renewal options - assessing the Group's judgement of whether it is reasonably certain renewal options will be exercised impacts the measurement of the lease, therefore is important to the accuracy of the accounting. We involved our senior audit team members in assessing these areas

COLLINS FOODS LIMITED

Accounting for Leases

The Group applies Australian Accounting Standard AASB 16 Leases in accounting for the Group's portfolio of restaurant leases. As a result, Right-of-use assets and Lease liabilities are recognised in the balance sheet. We considered this a key audit matter given the financial significance of the related balances in the Group's balance sheet and the critical judgements used in determining the lease term assumptions in the lease calculations, as well as the significant amount of audit effort in auditing the balances.

Appendix D

SAMPLE CONSTRUCTION FOR DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS IN REGARD TO FREQUENCY AND MAGNITUDE OF LEASE LIABILITES

The starting population is all Australian listed entities over the period from 2016 to 2024. We removed entities missing data on total assets, total revenue, shareholders' equity, net statutory income, or a GICS sector. We also removed entities in the GICS Sectors: financials (GICS #40), real estate (GICS #60) and mining (GICS Industry 151040). Finally, we removed entities with totals assets less than \$5 million.

The finance and real estate sectors were removed both because of their fundamental different business models to the typical firm (e.g. REITS and exchange traded funds) and the nature of the accounting is different. The mining sector was removed because of the predominance of Metals and Mining entities in the Australian economy

The size cutoffs in total assets are as follows. Micro (< \$m23); Small (>\$m23 and < \$m101); Medium (>\$101m and < \$593m) and Large (> \$m593).

Appendix E

METHODOLOGY FOR CLASSIFICATION OF KEY AUDIT MATTER SUBJECT MATTER

We classified the KAMs into subject matters based on the following three broad decision rules:

- First, if the subject matter was not an impairment and related to a specific primary financial statement account (e.g., revenue, receivables, inventory, provisions, leases) then that account was the category.
- Second, we had categories for any subject matter that related to impairments, and business combinations. The impairment category includes impairments regarding all assets.
- Finally, we had a range of subject matters that were relevant to the audit that may not directly affect a specific financial statement account (e.g., information technology, due to implementation of enterprise resource systems).

Introduction

This report provides a summary of the CPA Australia Chief Financial Officers (CFO) roundtable held in Canberra on the implementation and impact of AASB 16 *Leases* across the Australian public sector. The roundtable brought together senior finance executives, CFOs from Commonwealth agencies and technical accounting experts to discuss the implementation of AASB 16 *Leases* in the context of the current [ITC 55](#) released by the AASB. For consistency, the discussion in this report is structured under the topic headings identified in ITC 55 (Topics 1–7). Not all topics were discussed at the roundtable; accordingly, this report does not include sections for Topics 3 and 6 that were not discussed at the roundtable.

Topic 1: Application of AASB 16 by NFP and public sector entities

Key points

- **Misalignment with public sector operations and accountabilities:** AASB 16 is primarily designed for private sector use and does not align with the budget-driven accountability and operational realities of government agencies.
- **Lack of stakeholder interest:** Detailed lease disclosures and balance sheet recognition have not increased engagement from Ministers, parliamentary committees, or the public.
- **High complexity and cost:** Implementation and ongoing compliance are resource-intensive, requiring significant staffing, niche expertise, contract reviews and often external advisors.
- **Data and system challenges:** Many agencies and departments apply fragmented systems with reliance on spreadsheets and external workarounds.

Misalignment with Public Sector Operations and Accountabilities

Participants expressed significant concerns that AASB 16 has created a misalignment between the standard's objectives and the operational realities of public sector entities. The core principle of recognising lease assets on the balance sheet, while relevant to the private sector, was seen as much less relevant in the public sector.

Fundamentally, participants noted that public sector accountability is budget-driven, rather than balance-sheet-driven. Oversight bodies do not focus on the balance sheet, but on

accountability for the spending of taxpayer funds: whether agencies spend within appropriations, achieve value for money and deliver services as intended. Many participants noted that AASB 16 forces recognition of assets and liabilities irrelevant to this accountability framework, creating a parallel set of numbers that need to be reconciled back to the budgetary view. Within agencies, executives rely on internal management reports that translate financial information back into budget terms, effectively undoing the adjustments required by AASB 16.

Participants noted that, because the funding of government agencies is primarily determined by government budget allocations, policy decisions and legislative frameworks, balance sheet measures have little influence on operational continuity or financing. In the public sector, the concept of “going concern” was described as a matter of political and policy decisions rather than financial viability.

Lack of Stakeholder Interest

Participants consistently expressed the view that the expanded lease disclosures and balance sheet recognition have not led to increased engagement or inquiries from their primary stakeholders, including parliamentary committees, ministers or the general public. Participants noted that the lack of user interest raises fundamental questions about the cost-benefit balance of implementing such a complex standard in the public sector context. Many participants noted that they had never been questioned about lease-related balance sheet items in high-level forums such as Senate estimates hearings.

The prevailing view of participants was that the complex accounting treatments required under AASB 16 were adding little value to the understanding of government spending. Concerns were expressed that the AASB 16 lease accounting model may be obscuring rather than clarifying the financial impact of leases for non-expert users of financial statements. Participants suggested that it has become more difficult for ‘lay users’ to understand the actual annual spending on leases, as the information is now spread across various parts of the financial statements, and requires significant accounting expertise to interpret. Many participants highlighted that the financial statements are already underutilised in government, suggesting that AASB 16 risks making financial reports even less accessible to non-specialists.

Some participants commented that balance sheet adjustments can misrepresent an agency’s financial position, suggesting leverage or indebtedness where none exists. Obfuscation at a whole-of-government level also arises because of substantial inter-agency lease arrangements.

There was some acknowledgement that cataloguing leases provided agencies with a clearer view of commitments. Examples were provided of improvements to the scope of department and agency office and housing lease portfolios, as well as improvements to data quality. However, participants agreed this outcome could have been achieved more simply through enhanced disclosure of commitments, without adopting complex recognition rules.

High Complexity and Cost

Implementing and maintaining compliance with AASB 16 was identified as costing millions across agencies and departments (e.g., one department cited \$3m+). It was noted by some participants that these costs were not anticipated in their appropriation and therefore required reallocation from service delivery. Challenges included the niche expertise required, extensive contract reviews to identify embedded leases and ongoing staffing for compliance. Several large agencies now employ multiple staff solely for lease accounting and reconciliation, and some agencies and departments rely on external advisors annually. Many participants noted that the standard has created permanent compliance costs with minimal practical utility.

There was a strong feeling that the focus on technical compliance with complex standards is distracting from more meaningful financial management and reporting activities that could better serve the public interest. A broader concern was also raised that this focus on technical compliance more generally could reduce the attractiveness of public sector accounting as a career path, potentially leading to a skills gap in the future.

Data And System Challenges

The roundtable discussion revealed significant challenges related to data management, systems integration and information flow in the implementation of AASB 16 for public sector entities. Most participants reported that their lease accounting solutions were not fully integrated with their Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems. Agencies frequently resorted to using spreadsheets or standalone models, especially for non-property leases. This fragmentation of systems was reported to create duplication of effort and inefficiencies in data management and reporting processes.

Data quality was identified as a recurring problem, with property teams and business units often unaware of the accounting implications of their actions. Participants noted that operational teams frequently enter leases without appreciating the accounting requirements, leading to incomplete or inaccurate data being passed to finance. A key issue identified was the lack of understanding among those entering lease data about the model calculations that would be performed, leading to potential data quality issues. To address this, some agencies have moved towards a centralised model, with dedicated staff in central offices responsible for data entry to ensure quality. However, participants expressed frustration at having to invest resources in managing a reporting requirement rather than addressing more pressing operational risks, viewing it as a compliance exercise rather than a value-adding activity.

Topic 2: Determining The Lease Term

Key points

- **Judgement and subjectivity:** The requirement to exercise judgement in determining whether it is "reasonably certain" that lease extension options introduced a high degree of subjectivity.
- **Application of "Until Further Notice" agreements:** Difficulties are encountered in determining appropriate lease terms for arrangements that do not have a fixed end date, such as ongoing agreements with other government entities.
- **Need for additional guidance:** Public sector specific guidance on the determination of lease terms was seen as an area for improvement.

Judgement and Subjectivity

A primary concern expressed by participants was the high degree of judgement and subjectivity required in determining lease terms under AASB 16. The standard requires entities to consider all relevant facts and circumstances that create an economic incentive to exercise (or not exercise) extension options. The subjectivity has introduced challenges regarding consistency and added to audit costs as disagreements and inconsistencies across agencies are addressed.

Application of “Until Further Notice” Agreements

A particular challenge highlighted by several participants was the treatment of “until further notice” arrangements, which are common in inter-departmental and other public sector leasing scenarios. It was noted that although these forms of leases are common in government operations, as they allow flexibility and continuity of service; however, they are not specifically contemplated by the AASB 16 model, which leaves preparers with uncertainty in application. Similarly, the 12-month short-term lease exemption often fails in practice due to extension options and was not considered useful.

Need for additional guidance

Participants highlighted lease terms as one of the most challenging and problematic areas of the standard, with far-reaching implications for financial reporting, audit relationships and operational decision-making. There were calls for clearer, more prescriptive guidance on lease term determination in the public sector context. Participants suggested that illustrative examples specific to common public sector scenarios would help promote consistency and reduce audit disputes.

Topic 4: Incremental Borrowing Rate

Potential Simplification to Reduce Complexity

Participants expressed that the incremental borrowing rate (IBR) is an element that adds complexity to lease calculations without necessarily adding value in the public sector context. Although participants noted that the Department of Finance provides rates quarterly for agencies to use, which simplifies the process to some extent, the calculations remain complicated. Some participants viewed the IBR as arbitrary in the public sector context, suggesting the use of the government bond rate as a simpler alternative.

Topic 5: NFP Public Sector Concessionary Leases

Key points

- **Exemptions:** The current exemption from fair valuing concessionary leases should be made permanent.
- **Cost of Fair Value Assessments:** The sector already incurs a high cost to conduct fair value assessments across government.

Exemptions

There was strong support to retain the concessionary lease exemption on a permanent basis. Participants warned that requiring fair value would add cost and complexity without benefit to stakeholders. Participants highlighted the practical difficulties with fair valuing concessionary

leases, particularly for unique or heritage properties. The lack of observable market data for many concessionary leases was seen as a major obstacle to reliable valuation. Notably, participants reported little to no stakeholder interest in detailed information about concessionary leases. The view was that current disclosures are sufficient for accountability purposes.

Cost of Fair Value Assessments

Participants noted the high costs associated with making fair value assessments in the public sector context. This prompted the questioning of whether fair value accounting generally adds value in the public sector. For example, valuing specialised assets was described as a hugely expensive exercise with no practical outcome. Extending fair value requirements to concessionary leases was expected to exacerbate this problem.

Topic 7: Other Matters

The need for guidance

Throughout the roundtable discussion, a recurring theme emerged regarding the need for more guidance on implementing AASB 16 in the public sector context. Participants consistently highlighted the challenges they faced in interpreting and applying the standard, which was primarily designed with private sector entities in mind. This lack of sector-specific guidance has led to inconsistencies in application, increased audit tensions, and a general sense of frustration among public sector finance professionals. Participants were keen to see more illustrative examples that reflect common public sector scenarios, covering areas such as embedded leases in service arrangements, modifications to complex government contracts and the treatment of subleases between government entities.

Materiality

Guidance on applying materiality concepts in the context of AASB 16 for public sector entities would be highly beneficial. Many participants noted that they were hesitant to apply materiality judgements due to potential audit disputes. Clear guidelines on how materiality should be considered in relation to lease accounting, particularly for entities with large volumes of relatively small leases, would help streamline the implementation process and focus efforts on significant items. Problematically, the practical expedient of the US\$5,000 “low-value lease” exemption was seen as not useful. Disturbingly, in some cases, this threshold was being treated as a “ceiling” rather than a “floor” for materiality purposes.

CPA Australia Ltd
ABN 64 008 392 452
Level 20, 28 Freshwater Place
Southbank VIC 3006 Australia
GPO Box 2820 Melbourne
VIC 3001 Australia
T 1300 737 373
Outside Aust +613 9606 9677
cpaaustralia.com.au

15 October 2025

Andreas Barckow
Chair, International Accounting Standards Board
IFRS Foundation
Columbus Building
7 Westferry Circus, Canary Wharf
London E14 4HD, UK

Via online submission: <https://www.ifrs.org/projects/work-plan/post-implementation-review-of-ifrs-16-leases/pir-ifrs-16-rfi-cls/>

Request for Information: Post-implementation Review of IFRS 16 Leases

Dear Andreas

As one of the largest professional accounting bodies in the world, CPA Australia represents the diverse interests of more than 175,000 members working in over 100 jurisdictions and regions around the world, working in diverse roles across public practice, commerce, industry, government and academia throughout Australia, New Zealand and internationally. We welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the above Request for Information and comment letters: Post-implementation Review of IFRS 16 *Leases* (the [PIR](#)). We make this submission on behalf of our members and in the public interest.

In preparing our response to these questions, CPA Australia has undertaken extensive outreach to gather feedback across a wide spectrum of stakeholders. This has included:

- Joint research with the University of Melbourne, including a benchmark analysis of a sample of Australian listed companies (Research Report 1 included as **Attachment B**)
- Engagement with members of CPA Australia including the CPA Australia Reporting and Assurance Centre of Excellence
- 3 co-hosted roundtables with the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB), the New Zealand External Reporting Board (XRB) and Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (CA ANZ)

In addition, our analysis draws on topics and concerns identified through our previous submissions, ensuring continuity and a robust evidence base. Taken together, this approach has allowed us to capture a comprehensive set of perspectives that reflect the overall impact, practical challenges and implications of applying the IFRS 16 *Leases* (IFRS 16).

We set out below our high-level comments and recommendations based on the feedback received:

- **Overall, IFRS 16 is meeting its objective:** the standard is meeting its objective and is providing overall improvement to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases.
- **Explore simplifications and reliefs:** whilst the standard is meeting its objective there is scope for some simplification and reliefs to be developed and provided, particularly in areas such as discount rate determination, long-term property leases and low-value leases, where costs and complexity remain disproportionate to benefits derived.
- **Clearer, sector-specific guidance:** there is a need for more practical examples to reduce inconsistency in applying requirements on lease definition (e.g., substantial substantive rights), lease-term assessment, lease reassessment vs. modifications, lease incentives, and sale-and-leaseback transactions, as well as improving disclosure practices (e.g. cash flow classification) to better reflect how users assess lease information.

Attachment A sets out CPA Australia’s detailed responses to the questions in the [PIR](#). We have also included CPA Australia Research Report 1 (**Attachment B**) to support the comments provided in this submission. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss further, please contact Ram Subramanian, Financial Reporting Lead at ram.subramanian@cpaaustralia.com.au.

Yours sincerely

Elinor Kasapidis
Chief of Policy, Standards and External Affairs
CPA Australia

Attachment A: CPA Australia's Response

Question 1(a)

In your view, is IFRS 16 meeting its objective (see page 9) and are its core principles clear? If not, please explain why not

Yes, CPA Australia is of the view that IFRS 16 meets its objectives, and its core principles are clear. Feedback received from the outreach and research activities we have undertaken supports our view, however some concerns have been raised in areas of complexity and where judgement is required. We have addressed these concerns in our comments here and in our responses to the questions below.

As noted in our cover letter, our above views are underpinned by ongoing commissioned research in collaboration with the University of Melbourne. Research report 1 (**Attachment B**) provides insights into some aspects of the impacts of IFRS 16 on Australian listed entities. We have also gathered additional feedback through our outreach activities as noted in our cover letter.

The standard has also achieved its intended objective of enhancing the usefulness of information for users. However, our ongoing research points to some divergent views in respect of how lease information is presented as part of management performance measures. In particular, the research notes that when presenting Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) many entities include lease liabilities as part of debt for the purposes of computing ROIC whilst some do not.

We have also received feedback that perceptions of usefulness remain diverse across different stakeholder groups. While some value the information arising from recognising leases on balance sheets, other stakeholders including some banks and financial analysts see it as irrelevant and perform reversing adjustments for their specific decision-making purposes. Further consideration should be given to whether the accounting requirements more closely align with information needs of diverse user groups.

Question 1(b)

In your view, are the overall improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about leases largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.

Overall, feedback we have received indicates that IFRS 16 has delivered on its objective of bringing most leases onto the balance sheet, thereby improving quality and comparability of lease-related information. However, concerns remain regarding operational comparability in some situations and the practical relevance of reported information for key users. We recommend that these issues be considered and addressed following the [PIR](#) to further enhance the usefulness of the standard.

CPA Australia commissioned research (Research Report 1 in **Attachment B**) indicates that IFRS 16 has largely achieved the IASB's objective of improving the quality and comparability of lease information.

Evidence from research:

Analysis of Australian listed entities from 2019–2024 shows that the principle of lease capitalisation is both widely understood and consistently applied. Adoption rates rose sharply at transition, with 92% of firms recognising lease liabilities in 2020 compared with 42% in 2019. By 2024, 84% of firms continued to recognise lease liabilities across all sizes and industries. Lease liabilities are also economically significant, with the median firm reporting leases equal to 45% of total debt. Recognition levels have remained stable since adoption, suggesting that compliance costs have not significantly impacted ongoing application of IFRS 16 requirements or the use of leased assets for business operations. Taken together, these findings indicate that IFRS 16 has materially changed reporting practices, enhanced transparency, and strengthened comparability across firms and industries.

Concerns raised in feedback:

While the overall improvements are evident, in our outreach activities, stakeholders identified areas where challenges remain:

- **Comparability challenges:** Many lease accounting systems cannot adequately address complexities such as lease modifications, variable payments, subleases, and sale-and-leasebacks. This often results in manual adjustments outside

the system, increasing inconsistencies. Differences in software or system design (lease contract asset management software/systems vs. lease accounting software/systems) also lead to divergent outcomes, reducing comparability across the market.

Whilst we appreciate this highlights an issue with lease accounting systems and software that is not necessarily something the IASB can specifically address, it does highlight the complexities associated with some aspects of the standard that may warrant consideration for simplification.

- **Relevance for key stakeholders:** Some Australian banks routinely exclude IFRS 16 adjustments when monitoring debt covenant compliance, preferring to focus on future lease commitments. Similarly, many organisations reverse IFRS 16 adjustments in external market communications — for example, reporting EBITDA and cash flows on a pre-IFRS 16 basis for consistency with peers, competitors, and US-GAAP practice. This suggests that while the standard has improved statutory comparability, its decision-usefulness for key stakeholders is reduced in practice, as both preparers and users treat leases as ordinary operating costs rather than debt financing of leased assets.

Question 1(c)

In your view, are the overall ongoing costs of applying the requirements and auditing and enforcing their application largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the overall ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, how you would propose the IASB reduce these costs and how your proposals would affect the benefits of IFRS 16.

CPA Australia commissioned research (Research Report 1 in **Attachment B**) indicates that the auditing of lease-related requirements under IFRS 16 is not generally associated with significant complexity or cost. As noted in the sample-based analysis in Research Report 1 of Key Audit Matters (KAM) (refer also to our response to Question 1(a)), leases were identified as a KAM in only 4% of audit reports across Australian listed companies. This suggests that lease accounting is not typically regarded as leading to significant auditing complexity, and therefore higher overall ongoing costs. Where lease-related KAMs did arise, they were concentrated in the consumer goods sector with high exposure to retail premises and primarily related to the economic significance of lease liabilities, both in volume and value, and the requirement for management to exercise professional judgment around matters such as discount rates.

Importantly, the research did not reveal unforeseen areas of estimation uncertainty or judgement. These findings support the view that the auditing of financial information arising from IFRS 16 results in satisfactory outcomes overall and the standard is operating as intended.

Whilst the overall feedback has been positive, including the research findings noted above, some concerns and areas for improvement have also been identified by stakeholders. The main concerns raised can be summarised as follows:

- **Limited relevance to some users:** Lease-related information based on IFRS 16 is sometimes ignored or excluded by banks and internal management, who prefer to focus on future lease commitments or cash flows. Many of the responses we received in this regard focused on property leases, questioning whether the complexity and cost of maintaining compliance is justified by the decision-usefulness of the information, particularly for common office leases or multiple small landlord arrangements. In these cases, stakeholders viewed leases as more akin to operating expenditure and not as debt financing of leased assets.
- **Higher relative cost on smaller listed entities:** Larger organisations are generally able to absorb IFRS 16 requirements with access to better systems and resources, while smaller entities face disproportionately high costs. Lease calculations relating to remeasurement are not as reliable with less sophisticated software solutions, forcing more manual intervention, and compliance costs represent a significant proportion of resources relative to entity size.
- **Complexity versus substance:** Some stakeholders have expressed a view that IFRS 16 transforms what are, in practice, straightforward rent payments into a complex series of accounting entries (right-of-use assets, liabilities, interest expenses, and amortisation costs). They view this as detached from the commercial substance of leases, particularly for smaller entities. Moreover, as noted above, banks and internal management often reverse or ignore the adjustments, focusing instead on cash flows. This raises some concern that the ongoing costs of complying with IFRS 16 are higher than anticipated.
- **Contradictions in requirements:** Stakeholders noted that IFRS 16 demands highly precise calculations in some areas (e.g., discount rates) while allowing broad judgment in others (e.g., portfolio application). This inconsistency increases ongoing costs without necessarily improving the usefulness of the information.

- **Lack of a clear benchmark for costs:** Stakeholders noted that while most preparers agree compliance costs are higher than anticipated, it is difficult to assess whether these costs are truly “excessive” in the absence of a clear benchmark of what ongoing costs were expected to be. This lack of a reference point makes evaluation somewhat subjective.

In summary, our commissioned research suggests that from an audit perspective, IFRS 16 has not created greater-than-expected burdens. Nonetheless, stakeholder feedback through our outreach activities highlights genuine concerns about the uneven distribution of costs across different company sizes, the perceived disconnect between accounting complexity and economic reality, and the absence of clear cost benchmarks. We recommend that the IASB consider these issues in the PIR, particularly by:

- evaluating whether additional simplifications or reliefs are warranted, to assist smaller sized listed entities
- assessing whether the accounting requirements could be better aligned with the perceived economic substance of leases in practice
- clarifying expectations about the appropriate level of costs to support consistent evaluation in future reviews.

Question 2(a)

Do you agree that the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees’ application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that lessees’ application of judgement has a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information, please explain why.

We agree that, overall, the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees' application of judgement is largely as the IASB expected. The exercise of judgement that results in IFRS 16-based lease accounting information has increased transparency and provided users with a clearer view of financial obligations relating to leases. Our commissioned research also indicates that recognition levels have remained high and stable, suggesting that preparers are exercising judgement consistently, resulting in information that is relevant and faithfully representative.

However, feedback received highlights that perceptions of usefulness vary considerably between different user groups:

- **Divergent stakeholder perspectives:** Some preparers and auditors view the information as burdensome or less relevant to decision-making, whereas others—such as credit rating agencies—value it highly, as it aligns with their long-standing practice of capitalising lease commitments. This suggests that usefulness depends on the stakeholder’s perspective and objectives.
- **Banks and internal management:** As noted in our response to Question 1(b), some banks and internal management teams routinely exclude IFRS 16 information, focusing instead on cash flows and future lease commitments. This practice indicates that for certain key users, the usefulness of information arising from IFRS 16 may not be as high as expected.
- **Analysts and transaction-focused users:** Feedback also indicated that analysts often find the information more difficult to reconcile for comparability and valuation purposes, particularly in merger and acquisition scenarios. This adds complexity to their work and may reduce the perceived usefulness of the information.

Question 2(b)

Do you agree that the requirements in IFRS 16 provide a clear and sufficient basis for entities to make appropriate judgements and that the requirements can be applied consistently? If not, please explain why not.

We noted that section 2 of the [PIR](#) focuses on judgement in determining the lease term, the discount rate and variable lease payments and we have structured our comments below around these topics. However, we have also received feedback on other areas of contention where judgement is required, which we address in our comments under Question 6.4 below.

We agree that, in general, IFRS 16 provides a clear and sufficient basis for entities to exercise appropriate judgement and apply the requirements consistently. Some stakeholder feedback received however highlights that challenges remain in more complex areas of application in relation to lease terms, discount rates and variable lease payments as set out below:

- **Determination of lease term:** To assist with lease-term determination, stakeholders noted that the relevant IFRIC agenda decision (Lease Term and Useful Life of Leasehold Improvements (IFRS 16 Leases and IAS 16 *Property, Plant and Equipment* -

November 2019) has been relied upon to resolve ambiguities, such as how to define lease term when contracts lack explicit lease-term extensions. It has been observed that since the IFRIC agenda decision only deals with a specific scenario, it does not always result in the best outcomes for a range of scenarios that relate to the exercise of judgement around lease term determination.

In practice, this has resulted in inconsistent application across entities. For example, there is diversity in the application of lease-term thresholds when assessing whether lease extensions are “reasonably certain.” These differences can materially affect reported lease liabilities and ratios such as return on assets, undermining comparability.

We also understand diversity exists in how retailers assess “reasonably certain” extension options, particularly for long-life retail leases. Different interpretations can materially affect reported assets, liabilities, and performance ratios, suggesting a need for clearer guidance.

While IFRS 16 provides a framework for determining lease term, its application remains highly judgmental and resource intensive. Concerns remain in terms of inconsistent outcomes and limited comparability in practice. Feedback strongly supports the need for clearer, more integrated guidance and practical examples, particularly for property leases, to reduce complexity and ensure the requirements deliver meaningful and useful information.

- **Interest rate implicit in the lease vs incremental borrowing rate (IBR):** The CPA Australia commissioned research (Research Report 1 in **Attachment B**) notes that where auditors have identified a KAM, the primary area where challenges arise is in the determination of discount rates (particularly IBR) which requires significant auditor judgement.

Beyond the research findings, stakeholders consistently noted that determining the IBR represents one of the more judgement-intensive aspects of applying the standard, given that the implicit rate is rarely observable for many leases including property leases. Entities therefore default to using the IBR, which requires assumptions about credit risk, lease terms, and financing conditions. While workable, this approach creates variation across entities, as methodologies and inputs can differ. Stakeholders also noted that although a portfolio-based approach to discount rates (e.g., using standardised rates for 3, 7 or 15 year leases) could improve consistency, most systems are not equipped to support this, forcing companies into manual workarounds and increasing inconsistency in practice.

Similar to the observations made in the PIR, our feedback also indicates that it is often not possible to directly observe or readily determine the interest rate implicit in the lease, resulting in preparers defaulting to using the IBR. Some consideration should be given to whether more guidance can be provided within the standard to assist with the determination of the interest rate implicit in the lease. Where it is not possible to identify or determine the interest rate implicit in the lease, the standard should provide further guidance to assist with the calculation of the IBR. The IASB should also consider whether there is room for simplification by introducing standardised discount rates for common lease contracts including portfolios. This should assist with removing some of the complexity surrounding the judgement required in arriving at the IBR, which should lead to more consistent and comparable information.

- **Variable lease payments:** Current requirements prohibit the estimation and inclusion in the lease liabilities of future increases to lease payments linked to consumer price index (CPI) or market rent reviews. This can exclude substantial obligations from lease liabilities, reducing consistency and making like-for-like comparisons difficult. It also provides challenges and additional ongoing costs with remeasuring the lease liability (and right-of-use asset) every time there is a change in lease payments as a result of a variable such as CPI. We recommend reconsidering the exclusion of future variable lease payments with a view to incorporating and estimate of some or all of future variable lease payments into the initial calculation of lease liabilities.

Question 2(c)

If your view is that the IASB should improve the usefulness of financial information resulting from lessees’ application of judgement, please explain: (i) what amendments you propose the IASB make to the requirements (and how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs); or (ii) what additional information about lessees’ application of judgement you propose the IASB require entities to disclose (and how the benefits would outweigh the costs)

See our response to Question 2(b) above.

Question 3

Do you agree that the improvements to the quality and comparability of financial information about lease-related cash flows that lessees present and disclose are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the improvements are significantly lower than expected, please explain why.

We acknowledge that overall, IFRS 16 has improved the quality and comparability of information through its requirements for presentation and disclosure of lease-related cashflow information.

However, some stakeholders have observed that there is no clear distinction of cash flows now between assets that are essentially purchased through debt-financing (finance leases under IAS 17 *Leases*) and assets that are 'rented' for operational requirements (operating leases under IAS 17 *Leases*). From a user perspective, feedback we have received is that this treatment overcomplicates what is essentially a straightforward cost of doing business. We however note that the current model for lease accounting under IFRS 16 works well as highlighted previously and we expect there is nothing further the IASB can do on this matter in IFRS 16. Some stakeholders have also raised concerns that the cash flows relating to leases is now less clear due to separation of cash flows into operating and financing categories.

We suggest the IASB considers the above and any other matters brought to its attention on this topic as part of its ongoing project on the Statement of Cash Flows and Related Matters.

Question 4(a)

Do you agree that the ongoing costs of applying the measurement requirements in IFRS 16 are largely as the IASB expected? If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain why, considering how any entity-specific facts and circumstances (such as IT solutions) add to these costs.

See our response to Question 1(c) above.

Question 4(b)

If your view is that the ongoing costs are significantly higher than expected, please explain how you propose the IASB reduce these costs without a significant negative effect on the usefulness of financial information about leases.

See our response to Question 1(c) above.

Question 5

Based on your experience with the transition to IFRS 16, would you recommend the IASB does anything differently when developing transition requirements in future standard-setting projects? If so, please explain how your idea would ensure: (a) users have enough information to allow them to understand the effect of any new requirements on entities' financial performance, financial position and cash flows; and (b) preparers can appropriately reduce their transition costs when implementing new requirements for the first time.

Overall, feedback we have received indicates that the transition approach adopted for IFRS 16 worked well and provided an effective and appropriate balance between providing, during the transition period, useful information for users and cost relief for preparers.

- **Transition choices:** The availability of both full retrospective and modified retrospective approaches was seen as a positive. This allowed flexibility for entities, with most opting for the modified retrospective method, while those seeking greater comparability were still able to apply the full retrospective approach.
- **Contextual challenges:** Some stakeholders noted that the onset of COVID-19 coincided with adoption, which diverted resources and meant there were competing and sometimes more important priorities for preparers, which may have led to some treating initial application of the standard as a compliance exercise. This may have meant the real challenges became evident only later once entities had more capacity to engage more closely with the requirements. It is therefore difficult to isolate whether any transition issues were due to the design of the transition provisions or the unusual circumstances surrounding the timing of the standard's first-time implementation.
- **Grandfathered contracts:** Some feedback also suggested that issues have since emerged where grandfathered contracts unexpectedly trigger reapplication of IFRS 16 due to subsequent modifications or renegotiations. Even minor changes in long-term contracts can cause material balance sheet impacts, adding significant judgement and complexity when historical data was not captured at transition. To address this matter and to avoid disproportionate costs, we suggest considering whether grandfathered contracts could remain exempt from reapplication, or that immaterial modifications should not trigger full reassessment.

Question 6.1(a)

How often have you observed the type of rent concession described in Spotlight 6.1?

Question 6.1(b)

Have you observed diversity in how lessees account for rent concessions that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

Question 6.1(c)

If your view is that the IASB should act to improve the clarity of the requirements, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

No further comments.

Question 6.2(a)

How often have you observed difficulties in assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale?

Question 6.2(b)

Have you observed diversity in seller–lessees’ assessments of the transfer of control that has had, or that you expect to have, a material effect on the amounts reported, thereby reducing the usefulness of information?

Question 6.2(c)

If your view is that the IASB should act to help seller–lessees determine whether the transfer of an asset is a sale, please describe your proposed solution and explain how the benefits of the solution would outweigh the costs.

We have received some feedback that highlights complexities in assessing whether the transfer of an asset in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale. These include:

- **Whether transfer constitutes a sale:** Stakeholders observed they encountered frequent difficulties in assessing whether a transfer constitutes a true sale, noting IFRS 16 provides limited guidance on this point, leaving them reliant on the 'transfer of control' framework enshrined in IFRS 15 *Revenue from Contracts with Customers* (IFRS 15). This has created uncertainty, particularly in hybrid or complex transactions (for example, where only part of a building or infrastructure asset is transferred).
- **Diversity in practice and impact:** Some entities conclude transactions are sales, while others treat them as failed sales (transactions that do not qualify as a sale under IFRS 15), leading to inconsistent recognition of gains/losses and ROU assets/lease liabilities. This can be further complicated when there are changes to the underlying asset after the transaction, for example if there is a remeasurement of useful economic life or when the underlying asset is replaced with a different asset. Inconsistent approaches also arise from reassessments where “unit of account” questions are handled differently (e.g., entire asset vs. physically distinct components). This divergence undermines comparability and reduces the usefulness of reported information.

Stakeholders have recommended that the IASB develop clearer, dedicated guidance for sale-and-leaseback accounting, rather than relying on references to IFRS 15 and IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments*. Key areas for improvement include:

- Clarifying the criteria for assessing whether a transfer is a true sale or a failed sale, possibly by embedding principles similar to those used in IFRS 3 *Business Combinations* for valuing asset acquisitions as part of business combinations, which separate different transaction components.
- Providing guidance on how to treat subsequent events or modifications — i.e., whether and when reassessment or modification is required.
- Addressing conceptual inconsistencies between IFRS 15, IFRS 9 and IFRS 16, so preparers are not left unclear on which path to follow for specific fact patterns.
- Developing and providing further illustrative examples, including for partial asset transfers and hybrid arrangements (e.g., one floor of a building), to improve comparability in practice.

Question 6.3(a)

Do you agree that restricting the amount of gain (or loss) an entity recognises in a sale and leaseback transaction results in useful information?

Question 6.3(b)

What new evidence or arguments have you identified since the IASB issued IFRS 16 that would indicate that the costs of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, and the usefulness of the resulting information, differ significantly from those expected?

Question 6.3(c)

If your view is that the IASB should improve the cost–benefit balance of applying the partial gain or loss recognition requirements, please describe your proposed solution.

We have no further comments other than those provided in our response to Question 6.2 above.

Question 6.4

Are there any further matters the IASB should examine as part of the post-implementation review of IFRS 16? If so, please explain why, considering the objective of a post-implementation review as set out on page 5

Based on feedback and observations, we suggest the IASB considers the following matters as part of this PIR. These are some of the areas identified by our stakeholders as more challenging to apply as part of the IFRS 16 requirements:

(i) Areas where an exercise of judgement is required (apart from lease terms, discount rate and variable lease payments addressed in our comments in response to Question 2(b) above)

- **Fragmentation of guidance and role of Agenda Decisions:** We note that IFRIC has already issued six separate agenda decisions relating to IFRS 16 since its introduction:
 - i. Lease Term and Useful Life of Leasehold Improvements (Nov 2019)
 - ii. Definition of a Lease (Dec 2019)
 - iii. Sale and Leaseback with Variable Payments (Jun 2020)
 - iv. Non-refundable VAT on Lease Payments (Apr 2021)
 - v. Lessor Forgiveness of Lease Payments (Oct 2022)
 - vi. Definition of a Lease—Substitution Rights (Apr 2023)

The volume and breadth of these decisions indicate that preparers and auditors frequently encounter interpretative challenges in applying the standard. Relying on agenda decisions as the primary mechanism for clarification risks fragmenting the guidance, creating accessibility issues, and leading to inconsistent application. We therefore recommend that the IASB considers formally incorporating the substance of these agenda decisions into IFRS 16, either as practical expedients or integrated guidance, to improve clarity, consistency, and accessibility.

- **Lease modifications:** Preparers often confuse modifications with remeasurements, particularly for CPI-driven rent resets or umbrella agreements covering multiple assets. For example, some preparers incorrectly apply modification provisions and update discount rates when variable lease payments change, even though these should be treated as remeasurements. This lack of understanding adds unnecessary cost and inconsistency, highlighting the need for clearer guidance and practical examples.

The administering of contract law in the Australian environment gives rise to some challenges. Local legal practice often involves extending leases by amending the original contract rather than creating a new one, with resets every few years. This structure does not align well with the accounting requirements of IFRS 16, creating ambiguity in distinguishing between new leases and modifications. From an auditing perspective, modification versus remeasurement is also a recurring source of difficulty. This often leads to disagreements between preparers and auditors, giving rise to time and cost pressures.

Stakeholders have emphasised the need for more clarity in distinguishing between reassessments and lease modifications, and clearer practical guidance to reduce inconsistent application.

- **Lease incentives:** We previously raised this matter in our 2019 submission to the IASB, highlighting concerns around the accounting for lease incentives under IFRS 16, particularly in relation to:
 1. whether lease incentives should be excluded from both the right-of-use asset and lease liability, or whether a separate lease incentive liability should be recognised (Issue 1 in our submission), and
 2. whether reimbursements for leasehold improvements should fall within the scope of the definition of lease incentives (Issue 2 in our submission).

These uncertainties created the potential for inconsistent practices and undermined comparability, as evidenced by divergent interpretations amongst preparers and auditors. In response, the [IASB's 2020 Annual Improvements](#) amended Illustrative Example 13 by deleting the reference to leasehold improvements, primarily to avoid confusion. While this action removed a source of inconsistency in the example, it did not substantively address the underlying interpretative questions raised by stakeholders. Accordingly, the treatment of lease incentives continues to lack clarity, and diversity in practice may persist, warranting further consideration as part of this PIR.

(ii) Other matters and observations

- **Use of lease liabilities in performance metrics:** As noted in our commissioned research (Research Report 1 in Attachment B), among Australia's largest entities with significant leased assets, most include lease liabilities in Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) calculations. However, a notable minority exclude them, which may lead to inconsistent or potentially misleading performance measures. Whilst we appreciate this would be considered 'non-IFRS' information, the inconsistent approaches taken to presenting IFRS 16-based information as part of financial ratios could have an impact on information presented as management performance measures under IFRS 18 *Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements* (IFRS 18). This may be a matter the IASB wishes to consider as part of any future guidance or other material it develops in relation to IFRS 18.
- **Low value leases:** Stakeholders noted that materiality remains an unresolved issue, with current exemption thresholds (USD\$5,000 noted in the Basis for Conclusions for low value assets) set too low to be meaningful. In practice, these thresholds often capture only minor items such as personal computers, while most lease value is concentrated in a small number of significant contracts (e.g. 20 leases covering around 90% of value of all leases held by the entity). As a result, entities still need to apply lease accounting to numerous low-value items, creating unnecessary burden. Stakeholders suggested clearer principles that explicitly allow immaterial leases to be disregarded while ensuring materially significant assets are recognised.

CPA Australia Leases Research Report 1

IFRS 16 *Leases*: A review of
implementation and
effectiveness

Index Page

Executive summary	4
Lease recognition	4
Key audit matters.....	4
Management commentary	4
Background	4
Introduction.....	5
Section 1: Frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition	6
Section 2: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters	10
Section 3: Computation of ROIC reported in management commentary	11
Conclusions and policy recommendations	13
Appendix A	
TABLE SUMMARY	14
Appendix B	
ILLUSTRATIVE AUDIT REPORT WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KAM.....	18
Appendix C	
EXTRACTS FROM THE “WHY SIGNIFICANT” SECTION OF AUDIT REPORTS, WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KEY AUDIT MATTER.....	19
Appendix D	
SAMPLE CONSTRUCTION FOR DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS IN REGARD TO FREQUENCY AND MAGNITUDE OF LEASE LIABILITES	25
Appendix E	
METHODOLOGY FOR CLASSIFICATION OF KEY AUDIT MATTER SUBJECT MATTER	26

Contributors

Research team

University of Melbourne

Prof. Matthew Pinnuck
Prof. Michael Davern FCPA
Nikole Gyles FCPA

CPA Australia

Ram Subramanian FCPA
Vincent Lok CPA

Copyright notice

© CPA Australia Ltd (ABN 64 008 392 452) ('CPA Australia'), 2025. All rights reserved. This document is protected by copyright. Other than for the purposes of and in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth) and Copyright Act 1994 (NZ), this document may only be reproduced, published, stored in a retrieval system or communicated in whole or in part provided that it is not amended or adapted without express prior written permission and the ownership of copyright by CPA Australia ABN 64 008 392 452 is attributed at all times.

Disclaimer

CPA Australia and its contributors do not warrant or make representations as to the accuracy, completeness, suitability or fitness for purpose of the Materials and accepts no responsibility for any acts or omissions made in reliance of the Materials. The Materials have been produced for reference purposes only and are not intended, in part or full, to constitute legal or professional advice or to be relied upon for any purpose whatsoever. You shall not rely on the Materials and instead, shall rely on your own enquiries. If appropriate, you shall obtain your own independent legal, regulatory, tax, business, investment, financial or other professional advice in relation to the issues to which the Materials relate, the contents of the Materials and all matters arising from or relating to or in any way connected with the Materials or their contents. To the extent permitted by the applicable laws in your jurisdiction, CPA Australia, its employees, agents and consultants shall have no liability for any loss, damage, claim, proceeding and or expense including but not limited to legal costs, indirect special or consequential loss or damage, arising from acts or omissions made in reliance on the Materials or as a result of receiving the Materials. Where any law prohibits the exclusion of such liability, CPA Australia limits its liability to the resupply of the relevant information, if appropriate.

Executive summary

This report provides an overview of the impact of adopting IFRS 16 Leases (IFRS 16) in Australia. The Australian version of IFRS 16 is AASB 16 Leases (AASB 16). The objective of this report is to assess whether IFRS 16 is achieving its intended goals, when applied by Australian listed companies. The report focusses on three key areas of IFRS 16 implementation in Australia:

- a. Lease recognition: The frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition following the adoption of IFRS 16;
- b. Key Audit Matters: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters (KAMs) disclosed in 2024 audit reports; and
- c. Management commentary: Whether firms include lease liabilities in the denominator (invested capital) when voluntarily reporting Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) in the management commentary section of annual reports.

Lease recognition

The data show a sharp increase in recognition, with the proportion of firms reporting lease liabilities, rising from 42% prior to IFRS 16 to approximately 90% post-adoption. This widespread recognition and economic materiality suggest that preparers have engaged with and operationalised the principles of IFRS 16. Moreover, the results indicate continued high level of compliance with the standard between 2021 and 2024, providing strong evidence that the standard's ongoing implementation costs are sustainable and in line with expectations.

Key audit matters

In relation to KAMs, leases were identified as a KAM in only four per cent of audit reports across the sample. The small proportion suggests that lease accounting under IFRS 16 is not a significant source of audit complexity or cost.

Management commentary

Finally, in relation to the reporting of ROIC, among the ten largest lease-intensive firms in Australia, 70% included lease liabilities in the ROIC denominator, consistent with the intention of IFRS 16 that leases are a source of funding and financial capital. This signals that many firms consider lease liabilities to be relevant and decision-useful for assessing financial performance, aligning with the objectives of IFRS 16. However, a notable minority (30%) excluded lease liabilities from the ROIC calculation. This practice has the potential to be misleading in relation to performance metrics.

Conclusion

Overall, the evidence presented in this report supports the conclusion that IFRS 16 is achieving its intended objectives. The only area highlighted where further refinement is warranted relates to the treatment of lease liabilities in voluntary performance metrics such as ROIC. Given that ROIC is a key performance indicator used widely by analysts and investors, we recommend that the IASB address this issue through further guidance or educational material in relation to management commentary, or in IFRS 18 and related standards.

Addressing this issue would help ensure that the benefits of IFRS 16 in the primary financial statements are not undermined by selective reporting practices in management commentary.

Background

There are two primary reasons for the University of Melbourne to undertake this current research project with the support of CPA Australia. Firstly, the research seeks to update previous research undertaken to

understand impacts of the standard when it was issued. This initial research culminated in two research reports:

- [Implementing AASB 16 Leases: are preparers ready?](#)
- [AASB 16 Leases: investor perspectives](#)

Secondly, the current research project seeks to gather and present suitable empirical evidence to assist with the post implementation review of IFRS/AASB 16 being undertaken by the IASB/AASB.

This research report sets out findings from a benchmark analysis of listed companies that explores some potential disclosure impacts arising from the standard as described above. In addition to the findings from the benchmark analysis showcased in this report, the research project will also be informed by a series of roundtables to be conducted with various sector-based stakeholders to obtain further evidence of the impacts of the standard and opportunities for improvement. The aim of the research project is to make available further information to the standard-setters and other stakeholders as it becomes available, with a further report to be published in the first half of 2026.

Introduction

The adoption of IFRS 16 *Leases* (IFRS 16) marked a pivotal shift in lease accounting, with the central aim of bringing greater transparency and comparability to financial statements by requiring lessees to recognise almost all leases on the balance sheet. The current International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) post-implementation review (PIR) evaluates the extent to which the standard is meeting these objectives, particularly in relation to its core principles, the informational value it provides to users of financial statements, and the costs incurred in its application, audit, and enforcement.

This report draws on data from Australian listed entities following mandatory adoption of IFRS 16 (AASB 16) and analyses the following focus areas:

- Lease recognition: The frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition following the adoption of IFRS 16;
- Key Audit Matters: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters (KAMs) disclosed in 2024 audit reports; and
- Management commentary: Whether firms include lease liabilities in the denominator (invested capital) when voluntarily reporting Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) in the management commentary section of annual reports.

In analysing these areas, we aim to address the following three components of Question 1 in the IASB's Request for Information:

1. Whether the core principles of IFRS 16 are clear and are being met in practice;
- d. Whether the information provided about leases meets the needs of users; and
- e. Whether the costs of applying, auditing, and enforcing the standard are as expected.

These and other findings are expanded on in the remainder of this report which is structured as follows. Section 1 documents the frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition under IFRS 16 for Australian listed companies. Section 2 documents the frequency and nature of the designation of leases as a Key Audit Matter in the audit reports of Australian listed companies in 2024. Section 3 examines if management, for the purpose of reporting ROIC in the management commentary section of the annual report, include lease liabilities in the calculation of invested capital (i.e., the denominator of ROIC).

Section 1: Frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition

The core principle of IFRS 16 is that lessees should recognise assets and liabilities arising from leases unless the lease is of low value or short-term. This approach represented a shift from the previous distinction between operating and finance leases under IAS 17 *Leases* (IAS 17), which allowed many lease obligations to remain off-balance sheet. IAS 17 drew a distinction between finance and operating leases, and only required recognition of assets and liabilities arising from finance leases.

To address whether the core principles of IFRS 16 are clear and are being met in practice we analysed the frequency and magnitude of lease liability recognition under IFRS 16 across the period from the year of adoption in 2020 to 2024 for a sample of Australian firms¹ across the following:

- the frequency² and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised under IFRS 16 in 2024; and
- f. yearly time-series of the frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities since the adoption of IFRS 16 in 2020.

Frequency and magnitude of leases liabilities – 2024 results

The following charts present the summary statistics for the sample as at 2024. The data these charts are based on are derived from Table 1 included in Appendix A to this report.

Chart 1 - Frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australia listed companies - full sample




Chart 2 - Frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australia listed companies - by entity size³

¹ See Appendix D for the sample construction.

² The frequency of recognition is simply measured as the number of firms that have recognised a lease liability as a percentage of the total sample of firms. The two metrics we use to assess magnitude are: (1) the value of lease liabilities as a percentage of total debt. Where total debt is the sum of borrowings and lease liabilities. The descriptive statistics for this metric are based on the sample of firms that have debt > 0 and thus is bounded between 0 and 100%, and (2) the value of lease liabilities as percentage of total funding where total funding is total debt plus total shareholder equity.

³ Firm size categories, based on total assets, are defined as follows: Micro – less than \$23 million; Small – \$23 million to less than \$102 million; Medium – \$102 million to less than \$593 million; Large – greater than \$593 million.

100.00%





Chart 3

- frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australia listed companies - by sector



Our findings strongly suggest that the core principle of IFRS 16, capitalisation of leases, is both widely understood and implemented in practice. By 2024, 84% of firms in our sample recognised lease liabilities (Chart 1 above). Importantly, lease recognition rates were consistent across firm size categories. Even among micro-cap firms, 77% recognised lease liabilities in 2024, and among small to large entities, this figure was 86% (Chart 2 above). All sectors have a high level of lease recognition with the lowest being in the mining (75%) and energy sectors (60%)⁴ (Chart 3 above). This widespread application indicates that the principle of capitalisation is understood and applied not only by large entities with sophisticated accounting functions, but also by smaller entities where accounting resources may be more limited.


Moreover, the reported lease liabilities were economically material, as demonstrated by the magnitude of lease liabilities as a percentage of total debt for the median firm being 45%⁵ (Chart 1 above).

Taken together, these findings support the conclusion that the core principle of lease capitalisation is not only clear but also being broadly applied consistently in practice. IFRS 16 is achieving its objective of bringing leases onto the balance sheet and improving the quality of financial statements.

Changes across time in the frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities

To provide insight into the impact of IFRS 16, we also undertook a time-series analysis of lease liabilities from 2016 to 2024.⁶ The results are presented in Table 2 (see Appendix A), and graphically in Figures 1 and 2 below.


Figure 1 – % Lease Liability Recognition



⁴ The sector with the greatest level of lease liabilities is the retail sector, where, in Australia, prime locations in shopping centres are typically held by property investors and must be leased rather than purchased.

⁵ The *variation* in the magnitude of leases as a % of debt financing is substantial. As reported in Table 1 panel A the 25th (75th percentile) is 14% (97%). This implies that for 25% of firms, leases are the primary or only source of debt financing (>97% of debt financing is from leases) and for another 25% of firms' leases are a very low source of debt financing (<14% of debt financing is from leases).

⁶ The analysis is restricted to firms that existed in all years of the sample period. This restriction ensures that observed changes are attributable to the adoption and application of IFRS 16, rather than to firms entering or leaving the listed population due to new listings or delistings. The data are reported by calendar year, based on the financial year-end of each firm. IFRS 16 became mandatory for financial years beginning on or after 1 January 2019. As a result, the calendar year 2020, which includes both 30 June and 31 December year-ends, represents the first full year of adoption for most Australian firms.

Figure 2 – Lease Liability/Total debt

A clear pattern emerges when comparing the year of adoption, 2020, to the preceding year, 2019. The proportion of firms recognising lease liabilities increased significantly from 42% in 2019 to 92% in 2020. In addition to this increase in frequency, there was a material change in the magnitude of reported lease obligations. The average ratio of lease liabilities to total debt rose from 18% in 2019 to 51% in 2020. This shift demonstrates that for the average firm, the capitalisation of leases had a substantial effect on reported leverage. These findings suggest that IFRS 16 impacted a broad cross-section of firms and materially changed the presentation of financial obligations. As such, they provide support for the view that the standard improves both the transparency and comparability of financial information.

Looking at the years following initial adoption, from 2021 through 2024, the percentage of firms recognising lease liabilities remained stable. Similarly, the average ratio of lease liabilities to total debt did not exhibit any material decline. This ongoing consistency suggests that firms have continued to comply with the requirements of IFRS 16 without withdrawing from recognition over time. The absence of any reduction in recognition implies that the costs of applying and complying with IFRS 16 have not deterred firms from ongoing compliance with the Standard nor led firms to alter financing arrangements significantly.

Implications for standard-setting

These findings provide evidence that the ongoing costs of applying IFRS 16 are reasonable and appropriate; broadly consistent with the IASB's expectations. Two factors support this interpretation:

- First, compliance with IFRS 16 does not appear to deter the use of leases by either micro firms or firms for which lease liabilities represent only a small proportion of total debt. This suggests that even firms with limited resources or minimal lease exposure are able to comply with the standard without undue cost or burden.
- Second, the near-universal recognition of lease liabilities implies the presence of substantial scale economies. The widespread use of leases across firms likely facilitates the sharing or adoption of common systems, software, and accounting processes for lease recognition, thereby reducing the per-unit cost of compliance, particularly for property and buildings leases.

In addition, the consistently high level of lease liability recognition, along with the economically significant magnitude of lease liabilities for the typical firm, provides evidence that the information produced under IFRS 16 is materially relevant. This supports the view that the standard meets its objective of improving the faithful representation of financial position and performance by bringing lease obligations onto the balance sheet.

Finally, the significant variation in the extent to which firms use leases as a source of debt financing indicates that IFRS 16 contributes meaningfully to improving the comparability of financial information. By requiring the

recognition of lease liabilities, IFRS 16 enables users to better assess and compare the total level of financial leverage and associated risk across different firms and industries.

Section 2: The frequency and nature of lease-related Key Audit Matters

The shift to on-balance sheet lease accounting was expected to improve the ability of users, especially investors, analysts, and creditors, to assess leverage, capital efficiency, and cash flow commitments. In this section of the report, we examine the frequency and nature of the designation of leases as a Key Audit Matter (KAM) in the audit reports of Australian listed companies.⁷

Audit reports offer a unique lens through which to observe the relative complexity and judgement involved in applying IFRS 16. Auditor's reports of listed entities in Australia are required to provide information about key audit matters (KAM). KAM are "those matters that, in the auditor's professional judgement, were of most significance in the audit of the financial statements of the current period".⁸ The audit report is required to include a description of each key audit matter that addresses why the matter was considered to be one of most significance in the audit and therefore determined to be a key audit matter. This is the "Why Significant" section of the audit report.⁹

As KAMs are relative, if the costs and complexities of accounting for and auditing leases are larger than expected we should find an abnormal frequency of leases identified as a KAM. Furthermore, if the costs are larger than expected, the designated reasons for the KAM in the "Why Significant" section of the audit report should be for underlying reasons of judgment and uncertainty that were not expected.

Out of the full sample, only 4% of firms (17 companies) had an audit report in which leases were identified as a KAM subject matter. These firms are listed in Table 3 included in Appendix A. Across all firms, there were 955 individual KAMs reported in total; of these, only 17, or 2%, had leases as the subject matter. This makes lease-related KAMs relatively rare. The full list of KAM subject matters and their frequency is reported in Table 3 in Appendix A.

The results also showed a concentration for KAMs in certain sectors. Fifteen of the 17 firms with lease-related KAMs were in the consumer staples or consumer discretionary sectors. This may reflect the higher prevalence of leased assets in retail and franchise-heavy industries, where physical premises and equipment are commonly leased.

Taken together, these findings suggest that leases are not frequently regarded as a high-risk area requiring special audit focus. As such, there is no evidence from audit frequency that the cost and complexity of auditing lease-related disclosures under IFRS 16 has been greater than expected.

Additional analysis

To explore the audit rationale for identifying leases as a KAM, we reviewed the "Why Significant" sections of the audit reports for all 17 firms. (See extracts in Appendix C). The rationale provided by auditors typically centred on two factors: the economic significance of lease liabilities, both in volume and value, and the

⁷ We sampled the full population of Australian listed entities (excluding mining, real estate and banking firms) with reporting periods ending in 2024. We categorised and classified the KAMs into subject matters based on the primary financial statement account that it related to (e.g., revenue, inventory, provisions, intangibles, leases). The details of the sample selection and methodology for classification of the KAMs is discussed in Appendix E. Overall, we have a final sample of 529 firms. We have classified 29 distinct KAM subject matters. As each audit report may have more than one KAM we have a total of 955 KAMs.

⁸ ASA 701.8 *Communicating Key Audit Matters in the Independent Auditor's Report*. For audits of financial statements for periods ending on or after 15 December 2016, auditor's reports of all listed entities in Australia have been required to provide information about key audit matters.

⁹ ASA 701.13. A full extract of an audit report with a lease as KAM is provided for illustrative purposes in Appendix B.

requirement for management to make key judgments and estimates. Among the 17 firms, the most commonly cited area of audit judgment was the determination of the incremental borrowing rate used to discount future lease payments. Other areas, though less frequently mentioned, included the accounting treatment of backdated rent variations, the assessment of renewal options contained within leases, and the handling of sub-lease arrangements, particularly in franchise models.

Overall, the review of audit report disclosures did not identify any unexpected sources of estimation uncertainty or judgment that would suggest IFRS 16 presents unforeseen challenges in practice. The findings provide further support for the conclusion that the auditing of IFRS 16 lease obligations is operating as intended and without undue burden.

Section 3: Computation of ROIC reported in management commentary

This section examines how companies treat lease liabilities when calculating Return on Invested Capital (ROIC) in the management commentary section of their annual reports. ROIC is widely regarded as a key performance measure for assessing the efficiency of capital use and value creation. The analysis focuses on whether lease liabilities recognised under IFRS 16 are incorporated into the denominator of ROIC, which reflects the total invested capital.

ROIC is a voluntary reported metric and, therefore, reflects the demand and needs of users. ROIC as following examples illustrate, is the most widely used metric to measure performance and productivity and thus the amount of value a company creates.¹⁰

“Underlying return on capital employed is an indicator of the Group’s capital efficiency” (BHP, 2024, p18.)

“ROC has been adopted as the principal measure of performance for the divisions. ROC focuses the divisions on increasing earnings and/or increasing capital productivity by managing existing assets efficiently” (Wesfarmers 2024 Annual Report, p.16)

“Underlying ROCE measures how efficiently we generate profits from investment in our portfolio of assets” (RIO Tinto, 2024, p.12)

We examine if firms include or exclude lease liabilities in their definition of Debt for purposes of computing *Invested Capital* and *ROIC*. It is expected that lease liabilities would be included in the calculation as the objective of ROIC is to measure the returns on all capital invested in the business.

As outlined in the below Table4, the findings indicate that a significant majority, 70% of the sampled companies, include lease liabilities in the denominator of ROIC. This finding suggests that most firms consider lease liabilities to represent a meaningful component of financial capital. Their inclusion in invested capital supports a more accurate and reliable assessment of financial performance and capital efficiency, in line with the broader objectives of IFRS 16.

¹⁰ At a conceptual level the definition of ROIC is:

$$ROIC = \frac{Profit}{Invested\ Capital}$$

Table 4 – Australian companies examined to determine if leases included in computation of ROIC¹¹

Company	Total Assets (\$m)	Leases Liabilities (\$m)	Lease liabilities / Total Funds	Lease included in ROIC?
Woolworths Group Limited	33,936	12,144	54.48%	Yes
Coles Group Limited	19,870	8,417	61.50%	Yes
Wesfarmers Limited	27,309	6,522	32.83%	No
Ramsay Health Care Limited	20,894	5,854	35.55%	No
Endeavour Group Limited	11,783	3,913	39.76%	Yes
BHP Group Limited*	102,362	3,116	4.46%	Yes
TPG Telecom Limited	19,094	2,205	12.62%	Yes
Woodside Energy Group Ltd	61,264	1,623	3.40%	Yes
Qantas Airways Limited	20,564	1,556	22.60%	Yes
Sonic Healthcare Limited	14,826	1,527	12.13%	No

*Numbers quoted are in US Dollars

However, a notable minority, 30% of the sample, exclude lease liabilities from their ROIC calculations. This practice raises concerns regarding the comparability and reliability of ROIC as a performance metric across firms. When lease liabilities are excluded, ROIC figures may be overstated, potentially presenting a distorted view of how efficiently a company uses its capital.

This inconsistency suggests that, while IFRS 16 has significantly improved the quality of financial statements, the effectiveness of lease information in management commentary and voluntary performance metrics remains uneven. The divergence points to a possible gap in guidance under IFRS 18 and IFRS Practice Statement 1. In particular, paragraph 121 of IFRS 18 requires management performance measures to faithfully represent financial performance, which may not be achieved when lease liabilities are selectively excluded from capital-based metrics.

To address this issue, we suggest that the IASB explore available educational avenues, such as through IFRS Practice Statement 1 *Management Commentary* (revised), or other educational material to provide clearer guidance on the appropriate treatment of lease liabilities in performance metrics disclosed in management commentary.

The issue is not limited to the consideration of IFRS 16, however. It also intersects directly with the reporting of management-defined performance measures and disclosures related to capital, as outlined in IFRS 18 *Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements* which becomes effective in Australia for annual reporting periods beginning on or after 1 January 2027.¹² Arguably, the exclusion of lease liabilities from invested capital in ROIC calculations may conflict with the objectives of IFRS 18. Specifically, such reporting may not provide users with an unbiased, representative, and faithfully presented view of a firm's financial performance.

¹¹ The information in Table 4 has been extracted from the publicly available 2024 Annual Reports

¹² See paragraphs 117–123 and 126–129.

Given the significance of ROIC to financial analysis and investor decision-making, we recommend that the IASB consider this issue as part of the post-implementation review of IFRS 18, if not addressed earlier.

We conclude that IFRS 16 is fulfilling its intended objective of improving information quality in the primary financial statements. Nonetheless, there is room for improvement in ensuring that this enhanced transparency is carried through to performance reporting in management commentary.

Conclusions and policy recommendations

The evidence presented in this report supports the conclusion that IFRS 16 has largely achieved its objectives. The requirement to recognise leases on the balance sheet has led to greater transparency and comparability in financial statements and has proven to be well-understood and applicable across a diverse range of entities. Auditors and preparers appear to be managing the judgements and estimates inherent in the standard without undue difficulty.

At the same time, our findings point to opportunities for improvement, particularly in the alignment of voluntary performance metrics with the principles of IFRS 16. Inconsistencies in the treatment of lease liabilities in metrics such as ROIC, despite their materiality, may undermine the comparability and reliability of management commentary. This is an area where further guidance or educational material in relation to management commentary, or in IFRS 18 and related standards would be beneficial.

Overall, we recommend that the IASB maintain the current scope and core principles of IFRS 16, which are being effectively applied in practice and provide additional guidance or examples to encourage the faithful representation of leases in management-defined metrics.

These measures would help ensure the full benefits of IFRS 16, going beyond the balance sheet to improve transparency, consistency and usefulness of financial reporting.

Appendix A

TABLE SUMMARY

Table 1 – Frequency and magnitude of lease liabilities recognised by Australian Listed Companies in 2024

Panel A Full Sample

	Observations	P25	Mean	Median	P75
% Lease Liabilities	622		83.76%		
Lease/ Total Debt	562	13.51%	50.13%	44.97%	96.66%
Lease/ Total Funding	622	1.06%	12.67%	5.16%	14.94%

Panel B By Firm size

Size Category	Observations	Lease Recognition (%)	Lease/ Total Debt			Lease/ Total Funding		
			P25	Median	P75	P25	Median	P75
Micro	150	77.33%	11.70%	52.66%	100.00%	0.26%	3.56%	12.85%
Small	158	86.08%	19.58%	77.37%	100.00%	1.01%	4.91%	16.93%
Medium	158	84.81%	17.37%	46.73%	97.14%	1.25%	5.72%	14.77%
Large	156	86.54%	10.46%	24.07%	53.10%	2.14%	6.65%	15.55%

Panel C By Sector

GICS Sector	Lease Recognition (%)	Lease/ Total Debt			Lease/ Total Funding		
		P25	Median	P75	P25	Median	P75
Mining	74.65%	3.80%	19.59%	89.78%	0.02%	0.77%	4.06%
Energy	59.18%	0.00%	11.52%	35.52%	0.00%	0.45%	2.35%
Materials	100.00%	14.75%	48.42%	73.94%	4.47%	8.50%	13.98%
Industrials	97.41%	15.43%	38.42%	84.89%	3.57%	8.54%	16.95%
Consumer Discretionary	97.78%	36.83%	73.60%	98.29%	5.88%	15.71%	39.31%
Consumer Staples	95.56%	14.59%	44.79%	72.62%	2.14%	8.57%	21.31%
Health Care	88.30%	19.31%	75.00%	100.00%	1.30%	3.63%	12.83%
Information Technology	93.75%	16.45%	48.51%	100.00%	1.93%	4.77%	10.70%
Communication Services	81.82%	12.48%	31.26%	84.36%	1.49%	5.98%	14.99%
Utilities	81.82%	0.96%	11.13%	62.10%	0.36%	3.03%	8.25%
Mining	74.65%	3.80%	19.59%	89.78%	0.02%	0.77%	4.06%

%Lease Recognition is the % of the total sample of firms that recognize lease liabilities

Total Debt is Borrowings plus Lease Liabilities

Total Funding is Shareholders Equity plus Total Debt

P25 and P75 are the observations at the 25th and 75th percentile of the distribution. They imply that 25% of the sampled firms lie below (above) the 25th (75th) percentile observation respectively.

The sample is all Australian listed companies in 2024 excluding companies in the mining, finance and real-estate sectors.

Table 2 – Lease liability recognition across time

Year	Lease Recognition (%)	Lease/ Total Debt	
		Mean	Median
2015	34.52%	8.86%	0.00%
2016	33.98%	11.33%	0.00%
2017	32.42%	10.87%	0.00%
2018	35.69%	13.73%	0.00%
2019	42.09%	18.01%	0.10%
2020	91.60%	51.49%	49.87%
2021	90.89%	53.37%	50.40%
2022	89.95%	51.26%	45.72%
2023	90.21%	52.54%	46.55%
2024	90.36%	50.26%	44.88%

% Lease Recognition is the % of the total sample of firms that recognize lease liabilities
The sample is Australian listed companies that existed for the years from 2019 to 2024.

Table 3 – Frequency of KAMS by subject matter for Australian companies in 2024

KAM Subject Matter	Lease Recognition (%)	Median
Impairment	261	27.33%
Revenue	229	23.98%
Inventory	67	7.02%
Business Combinations	59	6.18%
Financial Instruments	48	5.03%
Intangibles	43	4.50%
Share Based Payment	38	3.98%
Going Concern	33	3.46%
Taxation	32	3.35%
Provisions	22	2.30%
PPE	19	1.99%
Leases	17	1.78%
Discontinued Operation	15	1.57%
Deferred Tax Asset	12	1.26%
Account Receivable	9	0.94%
Information Technology	8	0.84%
Equity Method	6	0.63%
Exploration Assets	6	0.63%
Biological Assets	5	0.52%
Contingent Liabilities	5	0.52%
Investment Property	5	0.52%
Expenses	4	0.42%
Related Party Transactions	4	0.42%
Cash	2	0.21%
R&D	2	0.21%
Grant	1	0.10%
Joint Venture	1	0.10%
Management Fee	1	0.10%
Trade Payables	1	0.10%
Total	955	100.00%

Appendix B

ILLUSTRATIVE AUDIT REPORT WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KAM

Independent Auditor's Report to the members of JB Hi-Fi Limited¹³

[...]

Key Audit Matters

Key audit matters are those matters that, in our professional judgment, were of most significance in our audit of the financial report for the current period. These matters were addressed in the context of our audit of the financial report as a whole, and in forming our opinion thereon, and we do not provide a separate opinion on these matters.

[...]

Key Audit Matter	How the scope of our audit responded to the Key Audit Matter
<p>Lease accounting</p> <p>Refer to Note 16 of Right of use assets and lease liabilities</p> <p>The Group holds right of use assets of \$568.3 million and lease liabilities of \$642.4 million. These balances are significant in the context of the Group's balance sheet as at 30 June 2024.</p> <p>In applying AASB 16 Leases, the Group is required to make a number of judgments and estimates as disclosed in Note 16, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measuring the lease term (including judgements associated with lease renewal options and the accounting for leases in hold over). Determining an appropriate incremental borrowing rate to be applied in the measurement of right of use assets and lease liabilities upon initial recognition of a lease and for certain lease modifications. 	<p>Our audit procedures included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the Group's processes and key controls related to the accounting for leases. Testing on a sample basis, movements in the right of use assets and lease liabilities and recalculating the interest and depreciation recognised in profit or loss. Evaluating the judgements applied by management, including the probability of exercising renewal options. Assessing the incremental borrowing rates adopted by management, by preparing an independent expectation of the incremental borrowing rates. Evaluating the adequacy of the disclosures included in Note 16 to the financial statements.

¹³ As extracted in the independent auditor's report of JB HI-FI Annual Report 2024

Appendix C

EXTRACTS FROM THE “WHY SIGNIFICANT” SECTION OF AUDIT REPORTS, WHEN LEASES WERE DESIGNATED AS A KEY AUDIT MATTER

XREALITY GROUP LIMITED

Right of use asset and lease liability

The group performed a reassessment of the calculations for the right-of-use asset and lease liabilities due to the flow on effect of higher sustained inflation and the impact on future rent increases. The right-of-use assets and lease liability calculations involves a degree of complexity and judgement around potential rent increases based on inflation. We considered in the persistent inflationary environment reviewing the right-of-use asset and lease calculations are a key audit matter due to the significant uncertainty around the current period of economic volatility. The value of the right-of use assets also forms part of our impairment assessment described above

JB HI-FI LIMITED

Lease accounting

The Group holds right of use assets of \$568.3 million and lease liabilities of \$642.4 million. These balances are significant in the context of the Group’s balance sheet as at 30 June 2024. In applying AASB 16 Leases, the Group is required to make a number of judgments and estimates as disclosed in Note 16, including:

Measuring the lease term (including judgements associated with lease renewal options and the accounting for leases in hold over).

Determining an appropriate incremental borrowing rate to be applied in the measurement of right of use assets and lease liabilities upon initial recognition of a lease and for certain lease modifications.

SILK LOGISTICS HOLDINGS LIMITED

Assessment of Lease term and incremental borrowing rate under AASB 16 Leases

As at 30 June 2024 the Group has reported right of use assets of \$283.7 million (\$142.8 million at 25 June 2023) relating to property related leases. The estimated lease term of these properties and the incremental borrowing rate forms part of the assessment for determining the right of use asset and associated lease liability at the time of initial recognition. The accounting policy and the significant estimates and judgements in relation to determining the lease term are disclosed in Notes 2 and 3. In reassessing the lease term, the Group is required to determine whether there are significant events under their control which result in renewal options being required to be incorporated into the assessment. Where lease terms have been reassessed, the Group is required to determine an appropriate incremental borrowing rate to be applied in the calculation of right of use assets and lease liabilities.

GUZMAN Y GOMEZ LIMITED

Lease

The Group has a significant lease portfolio which includes leases for restaurant sites as well as office and other leases. As set out in Notes 15, 17 & 21 to the financial statements, at 30 June 2024 the Group has

recognised lease liabilities of \$239.5m, finance lease receivables of \$126.4m and right-of-use assets of \$93.8m. There were additions of \$65.5m to lease liabilities, \$24.3m to finance lease receivables and \$36.9m to right-of-use assets during the year. Included in the lease portfolio are leases which are entered into for franchise restaurants with the Group as the head lessee, and sub-leases entered into with the franchisees under the same terms as the head lease. Where the sub-lease transfers substantially all of the risks and rewards of the underlying right-of-use asset, the sub-lease is classified as a finance lease and is recognised as a finance lease receivable. Alternatively, other sub-leases are classified as operating leases and recognised as right-of-use assets. For lease additions and modifications during the year, the Group applied significant judgement in determining the incremental borrowing rate {IBR}, including the calculation method, appropriate data utilised, and the determination of the lease term with extension options.

PREMIER INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Accounting for leases

The Group holds a significant volume of leases by number and value over retail sites as a lessee. The recognition and measurement of new and remeasured lease agreements executed during the year in accordance with AASB 16 Leases (“AASB 16”) are dependent on a number of key judgements and estimates. These include:

The calculation of incremental borrowing rates;

The treatment of the option to extend the lease term under holdover; and

The impact of backdated rent variations.

Accordingly, given the significant judgements and estimates involved we considered this a key audit matter.

VIVA LEISURE LIMITED

Right Of Use Assets and Lease Liabilities

At 30 June 2024, the group recognized \$255,307,160 in Right of Use Asset and \$290,225,494 in lease liabilities. The group has numerous lease arrangements in place which requires certain judgments to be made at point of recognition and measurement. We focused on this area as a key audit matter given the significance of the balance and there is risk that the leases may not be accounted for in accordance with the requirements of AASB 16 Leases.

CARLY HOLDINGS LIMITED**Lease accounting**

As at 30 June 2023, the Group has recognised a current lease liability of \$346,770 and a non-current lease liability of \$640,550 in relation to an office lease and vehicle leases. We determined lease accounting to be a key audit matter as it is material, important to the users' understanding of the financial statements and involved the most audit effort and communication with management.

RETAIL FOOD GROUP LIMITED**Lease accounting - estimate of lease arrears and assessment of recoverability of lease receivables (\$61.7m)**

The Group has a significant lease portfolio that includes sub-lease arrangements with franchisees where the Group has entered into the head lease agreement with the landlord. Where the franchise store sub-lease is assessed by the Group as a finance lease using AASB 16 Leases, the Group recognise a finance lease receivable. Following this, the impairment requirements of AASB 9 Financial Instruments apply to the net investment in these leases. The Group determined their expected loss provisioning amounts using a forward-looking expected credit loss impairment model. This involves significant judgement as the expected credit loss reflects information about past, current and future conditions. Overall, the relative size of balances has a significant financial impact on the Group's financial position and performance. We involved our senior audit team members in assessing this key audit matter

CHRYSOS CORPORATION LIMITED**PhotonAssay operating lease income**

PhotonAssay operating lease income was a key audit matter due to:

The quantum of operating lease income earned during the year, which comprised 92% of total revenue and other income.

The judgement required in applying revenue recognition and lease accounting standards to the PhotonAssay leases.

To classify each lease the Group applies judgement to assess whether the agreements transfer substantially all the risks and rewards of ownership of the underlying PhotonAssay assets. If this is the case, then the lease is a finance lease; if not, then it is an operating lease. Significant judgement is required to determine the lease term. Consideration is given to the non-cancellable periods and early cancellation penalties contained in the leasing arrangements. In assessing this key audit matter, we involved senior audit team members who understand the Group's business and industry.

INGHAMS GROUP LIMITED

Accounting for AASB 16 Leases – (right of use assets and lease liabilities amounting to \$1,031.7 million and \$1,138.4 million respectively)

AASB 16 Leases ("AASB 16") is complex with specific lease-features driving different accounting outcomes, increasing the need for interpretation and judgement. AASB 16 Leases is a key audit matter due to the:

Relative materiality of the right of use assets and lease liabilities to the financial report.

Number of leases in the Group, including the individual nature of the lease agreements used to estimate the lease liability and right-of-use asset.

A focus for us was the accuracy of multiple and varied inputs which may drive different accounting outcomes, including key dates, fixed and variable rent payments, renewal options and incentives. The key areas of judgement we focussed on was in assessing the Group's:

Renewal options contained within leases. Assessing the Group's determination of whether it is reasonably certain renewal options will be exercised impacts the measurement of the lease, therefore is critical to the accuracy of the accounting.

Grower contractual arrangements and the features of the underlying grower contracts against the definition of a lease under the accounting standards.

Incremental borrowing rates determined by the Group. These are meant to reflect the Group's entity specific credit risk and vary based on each lease term. We involved our senior audit team members in assessing these areas

SONIC HEALTHCARE LIMITED

Lease accounting

Lease accounting was a key audit matter due to the:

financial significance of lease liabilities and right-of-use assets to the consolidated balance sheet; and

significant judgements required by the Group such as determining the lease term and the incremental borrowing rate

UNIVERSAL STORE HOLDINGS LIMITED

Accounting for leases

Accounting for leases was a key audit matter due to the size of right-of-use assets and lease liability balances included in the financial report and the judgement involved in determining the balances, including the incremental borrowing rate used for discounting, accounting for leases in holdover and treatment of lease incentives and modifications.

BAPCOR LIMITED

Accounting for leases

At 30 June 2024, the Group recorded right of use assets of \$249.9 million and a lease liability of \$288.6 million. Accounting for leases was a key audit matter due to the financial significance of right-of-use assets and lease liability balances and the judgement involved in determining these balances, including the incremental borrowing rate and option renewals.

BIOXYNE LIMITED

Accounting for leases

The Group has significant lease arrangements. AASB 16 Leases, has introduced new complexities in lease accounting, requiring significant management judgment and estimation. This includes determining the lease term, discount rates, and the classification of leases as either

operating or finance leases. Given the material impact on the financial statements and the complexity involved, accounting for leases was identified as a key audit matter

ALTERRA LIMITED

Leases

The Group has continued to recognise right-of-use assets and lease liabilities in relation to its lease arrangements over office premises and Carpenters plantation site. The majority of the right-of-use asset and lease liability recorded relates to the long-term Carpenters lease. Accounting for leases is a key audit matter as the balances recorded are material and there are significant judgements involved in determining the appropriate lease payments necessary to be used in the calculation of the lease liability and right-of-use asset

OOH MEDIA LIMITED

Lease Accounting

The accounting requirements of MSB 16 Leases are inherently complex, where specific and individualised lease-features drive different accounting outcomes, increasing the need for interpretation and judgement. This increases our audit effort and is a key audit matter. We focused on:

High volume of leases - the Group has a high volume of individualised lease agreements required to be assessed in determining the lease liability and right-of-use asset. A focus for us was the completeness of the lease population and the accuracy of multiple and varied inputs which may drive different accounting outcomes, including key terms of the lease agreements, such as key dates, fixed rent payments, renewal options and incentives.

Complex modelling process - the Group developed a lease calculation model, which is largely manual and complex, and therefore is at greater risk for potential error and inconsistent application.

Relative magnitude - the size of balances has a significant financial impact on the Group's financial position and performance.

The most significant areas of judgement we focused on were in assessing the Group's:

Incremental borrowing rates used - these reflect the Group's entity specific credit risk and vary based on each lease term. The Group periodically engages an external expert to assist with determining each of the Group's incremental borrowing rates.

Lease terms where leases have renewal options - assessing the Group's judgement of whether it is reasonably certain renewal options will be exercised impacts the measurement of the lease, therefore is important to the accuracy of the accounting. We involved our senior audit team members in assessing these areas

COLLINS FOODS LIMITED

Accounting for Leases

The Group applies Australian Accounting Standard AASB 16 Leases in accounting for the Group's portfolio of restaurant leases. As a result, Right-of-use assets and Lease liabilities are recognised in the balance sheet. We considered this a key audit matter given the financial significance of the

related balances in the Group's balance sheet and the critical judgements used in determining the lease term assumptions in the lease calculations, as well as the significant amount of audit effort in auditing the balances.

Appendix D

SAMPLE CONSTRUCTION FOR DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS IN REGARD TO FREQUENCY AND MAGNITUDE OF LEASE LIABILITES

The starting population is all Australian listed entities over the period from 2016 to 2024. We removed entities missing data on total assets, total revenue, shareholders' equity, net statutory income, or a GICS sector. We also removed entities in the GICS Sectors: financials (GICS #40), real estate (GICS #60) and mining (GICS Industry 151040). Finally, we removed entities with totals assets less than \$5 million.

The finance and real estate sectors were removed both because of their fundamental different business models to the typical firm (e.g. REITS and exchange traded funds) and the nature of the accounting is different. The mining sector was removed because of the predominance of Metals and Mining entities in the Australian economy

The size cutoffs in total assets are as follows. Micro (< \$m23); Small (>\$m23 and < \$m101); Medium (>\$101m and < \$593m) and Large (> \$m593).

Appendix E

METHODOLOGY FOR CLASSIFICATION OF KEY AUDIT MATTER SUBJECT MATTER

We classified the KAMs into subject matters based on the following three broad decision rules:

- First, if the subject matter was not an impairment and related to a specific primary financial statement account (e.g., revenue, receivables, inventory, provisions, leases) then that account was the category.
- Second, we had categories for any subject matter that related to impairments, and business combinations. The impairment category includes impairments regarding all assets.
- Finally, we had a range of subject matters that were relevant to the audit that may not directly affect a specific financial statement account (e.g., information technology, due to implementation of enterprise resource system).

Friday, 5 September 2025

Preliminary Staff Views: AASB 16 Leases

This document contains preliminary staff views on *Invitation to Comment (ITC) 55 Post-implementation Review of AASB 16 Leases*. We have not provided separate responses to Questions 2 and 3 of **Section 1 – AASB General Matters for Comment**, as they have been addressed within our responses to specific questions in **Sections 2 and 3**.

These views are informed by direct outreach and consultation with stakeholders, as well as discussions held in technical and professional forums.

Overall view

Our overall view is that IFRS 16 achieves its technical objective of providing relevant and faithful representation of lease transactions, with users affirming its usefulness. Despite benefits such as improved data quality and coordination, the cost and complexity of compliance are widely seen as disproportionate. There is minimal appetite for fundamental change, but strong support exists for targeted improvements, clearer guidance in judgement-heavy areas, and simplification where feasible.

AASB General Matters for Comment (AASB ITC 55 Section 1)

Question 1: Are there any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that adversely affect the application of AASB 16 Leases?

- Stakeholder feedback indicated instances in Australia where leases are extended by way of amending the termination date and payment terms of the original lease, rather than issuing a new lease agreement. This creates uncertainty as to whether such changes constitute a lease modification or a new lease under AASB 16. We recommend that the AASB investigate this issue further and consider providing more specific guidance tailored to common Australian leasing practices.

NFP and public sector topics (AASB ITC 55 Section 2)

Topic 1: Application of AASB 16

- Users of NFP and public sector entities' financial statements are typically primarily concerned with funding, resourcing, and service allocation. As such, the undue cost and effort for these entities is often viewed as unjustified relative to its usefulness.
- Smaller NFP and public sector entities face heightened challenges due to system limitations and the complexity of scenarios such as subleases and multiple discount rates. Lower-cost software often lacks necessary functionality, requiring manual workarounds and increasing risk of error. Some entities advised the complexity necessitates full-time staff solely dedicated to lease accounting.

- Auditors advised that lease accounting consumes a sizable portion of audit effort, with several adjustments stemming from preparer misinterpretation or misapplication of the standard.
- While there is little appetite for fundamental change due to potential disruption, these entities consistently support targeted simplifications such as practical expedients, materiality thresholds and “plain English” language in guidance.

Topic 2: Lease term

- Lease term assessment is particularly complicated in NFP and public sector due to the existence of informal or open-ended arrangements, which lack clear documentation and duration, making consistent application of the standard difficult.
- Public sector entities frequently face uncertainty in determining the lease commencement date, particularly when properties are accessed for fitouts prior to the lease agreement commencement date.

Topic 3: Lease modifications

- Modifications and reassessments are consistently identified as a key challenge.
- The complexity of determining whether a change constitutes a modification or reassessment is exacerbated by the informal arrangements and cost-sharing agreements prevalent in these sectors.
- Stakeholders have called for explicit criteria, decision trees or illustrative examples to assist in distinguishing reassessments from modifications.

Topic 4: Measurement of lease liabilities – incremental borrowing rate

- The interest rate implicit in the lease is rarely available or determinable, and as a result, many default to using the incremental borrowing rate (IBR). However, this is also challenging, as entities in these sectors often lack access to market-based borrowing rates, making it difficult to determine a realistic IBR. Simplified principles and clearer guidance tailored to these sectors would be welcomed.
- Preparers and auditors generally accept that the IBR determined may not be entirely accurate but consider the impact immaterial.

Topic 5: Public sector concessionary leases

- There is unanimous support for making the temporary accounting policy choice to measure concessionary ROU assets at either cost or fair value permanent for NFP public sector entities (like the choice available to NFP private sector entities). It is viewed as a practical expedient that accurately reflects how these entities operate.
- Determining control and assessing whether a sale has occurred is particularly challenging in these sectors when repurchase rights exist, or costs are nominal. Clearer guidance is needed to ensure consistent interpretation.

Topic 6: Sale and leaseback arrangements

- Sale and leaseback arrangements are prevalent in the NFP and public sectors, but are difficult to account for due to nominal values, informal agreements, inter-agency agreements and cost-sharing structures.
- Determining control and assessing whether a sale has occurred is particularly challenging when repurchase rights exist, or costs are nominal. Clearer guidance is needed to ensure consistent interpretation.
- Preparers would benefit from illustrative examples and decision trees to determine whether a sale has occurred, whether a change is a modification or reassessment, and whether informal arrangements are enforceable.

IASB Request for Information (AASB ITC 55 Section 3)

Question 1: Overall assessment of IFRS 16

- Many stakeholders agreed that IFRS 16 meets its technical objective of providing relevant information that faithfully represents lease transactions.
- While IFRS 16 provides a more comprehensive view of lease obligations than IAS 17, several preparers and users indicated that pre-IFRS 16 figures better reflect an entity's cash position and are therefore preferred for internal decision-making, performance monitoring, and external financing and valuation considerations.
- The indirect benefit of IFRS 16 leading to improvements in data quality and interdepartmental coordination have been acknowledged, but many stakeholders believe the cost of compliance remains disproportionate to the benefits.
- While there is a minimal appetite for fundamental change due to potential disruption, stakeholders support clarification of requirements, additional guidance in judgement-rich areas, and simplification where possible.
- In a poll of over 900 Chartered Accountants at a July 2025 webinar, we gathered targeted insights on the implementation and impact of IFRS 16. The following tables summarise the member responses:

Do you agree that bringing all leases on the balance sheet has improved the quality and comparability of financial statements?

■ Strongly agree ■ Agree ■ Neither agree or disagree ■ Disagree ■ Strongly disagree




How would you rate the ongoing cost of applying IFRS 16 Leases compared to expectations?

■ Much higher than expected ■ Higher than expected ■ As expected ■ Lower than expected



Do you believe the benefits of IFRS 16 Leases exceed the costs?

■ Strongly agree ■ Agree ■ Neither agree or disagree ■ Disagree ■ Strongly disagree



Question 2: Lessees' application of judgement

- Broadly, stakeholders agreed that the lessee's application of judgement reduces comparability across entities, thereby reducing the usefulness of the financial information. In addition, the complexity increases preparation and audit costs.
- Areas of specific concern include determination of lease term, discount rates, variable lease payments, and the distinction between reassessment versus modifications.
- **Lease term:** Significant ambiguity exists around assessing the "reasonably certain" threshold for determining lease term, especially in the context of incentives, extension options, and informal or undocumented arrangements. Clearer guidance and illustrative examples are needed to support consistent interpretation.
- **Discount rates:** Many preparers default to using their incremental borrowing rate (IBR) to calculate the discount rate as the information required to calculate the interest rate implicit in the lease is not as readily available. Reference benchmarks or simplified methodologies would assist smaller entities.
- **Variable lease payments:** Payments that appear variable but are economically unavoidable require nuanced interpretation and are often inconsistently applied. While IFRS 16 requires disclosure of excluded variable lease payments, the usefulness of this information depends on how clearly and consistently it is presented. It was suggested to introduce clearer criteria to distinguish between truly variable payments and in-substance fixed payments, particularly for market rent reviews and CPI-linked adjustments.

- **Reassessment or modification:** The distinction is complex, often unclear in practice, and may be unnecessarily burdensome. Stakeholders have called for explicit criteria or decision trees to guide the determination.

Question 3: Cash flow

- Users have indicated a preference for presenting the principal and interest components of lease payments within the same category in the cash flow statement. While IAS 7.31 does not specify a classification for interest paid, grouping the components may improve understandability of the complete transaction.
- Some stakeholders feel the current cash flow presentation of principal payments under financing activities does not always align with the entity's business operations (especially in industries like retail and telecoms). It was suggested that flexibility is permitted in the classification of such lease-related cash flows, possibly drawing on the concept in IFRS 18.50 allowing entities with specified main business activities to classify certain income and expenses in the operating category, even if they would otherwise be classified as investing or financing.
- Classification as financing activities has made it more complex for certain key users (banks, investors, valuers) to compare entities, leading to requests for pre-IFRS 16 adjusted figures.
- We recommend that lease-related cash flows be explored further as part of the IASB's [Statement of Cash Flows and Related Matters](#) project.

Question 4: Ongoing costs

- The IASB anticipated that ongoing costs would be little more than IAS 17 depending on the entity's software (i.e., whether the entity could extend its existing software, or if they needed to migrate to a new system, either entirely or just for lease accounting) and number of leases. Many stakeholders advised that they continue to incur high ongoing costs and see limited benefits.
- Specialist software, outsourcing, or dedicated lease accounting staff are often required to manage the complexity of lease accounting, all of which are costly.
- Main drivers of ongoing costs include initial and subsequent measurement, collection of disclosure information, and determination of discount rate and lease term.
- IFRS 16 issues contribute to a large portion of audit time and cost, with many queries and findings arising from misunderstanding of principals or application of judgment.
- Annual CPI-based lease liability adjustments are operationally burdensome; the US GAAP approach, which does not require remeasurement unless the lease is modified, is more practical.

Question 5: Transition requirements

- The first year of reporting under IFRS 16 was particularly challenging due to the volume and complexity of data required, especially for entities with large lease portfolios.
- The practical expedients and exemptions, such as for low-value and short-term leases, significantly assisted in reducing the implementation burden both during the initial transition and ongoing compliance.
- Transition guidance or instructions issued by the IASB, well before the standard was effective, would have been helpful to assist preparers collect new data, and update systems and processes.
- Several stakeholders noted that specialised software solutions were not available in time for the standard's effective date. As a result, some entities had to adopt a two-phased implementation approach and initially rely on manual workarounds or interim systems before transitioning to purpose-built software once available. A longer lead time may have enabled providers to develop and release appropriate tools prior to the effective date, easing the transition burden.

Question 6.1: Rent concessions

- The specific scenario in Spotlight 6.1 is not common amongst those consulted.
- Broadly, it was agreed there is a lack of guidance on distinguishing between a lease modification as defined in IFRS 16 and an extinguishment (or partial extinguishment) of a lease liability accounted for in accordance with IFRS 9.
- We support the IFRS Interpretations Committee's recommendation for the IASB to conduct a narrow-scope standard-setting project to clarify this distinction.

Question 6.2 & 6.3: Sale and leaseback transactions

- Stakeholders confirmed it is difficult to determine whether the transfer of an asset by the seller-lessee in a sale and leaseback transaction is a sale in accordance with IFRS 15. Additional illustrative examples or decision trees may assist in determining whether a sale has occurred.
- Restricting the gain or loss an entity recognises in a sale and leaseback transaction was broadly supported.