ACCOUNTING AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL LEASING LIABILITIES: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS, REPORTING CHALLENGES, AND ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES

Ravupova Makhliyo Daminovna
Student, Samarkand Institute of Economics And Service

Abstract: Financial leasing has emerged as one of the most consequential mechanisms through which enterprises acquire productive assets without immediate capital outlay, giving rise to a class of long-term liabilities that carry distinct recognition, measurement, and disclosure requirements. This article examines the accounting treatment of finance lease liabilities under the prevailing international financial reporting framework, with particular attention to IFRS 16 Leases and its analytical implications for financial statement users. The discussion traces the evolution of lease accounting from the risk-and-rewards model to the right-of-use asset paradigm, explores the practical difficulties that arise during initial recognition and subsequent measurement, and evaluates how the resulting liability figures affect leverage ratios, interest coverage, and asset-base assessments. Special attention is devoted to disclosure quality, lessee classification judgment, and the persistent comparability challenges that auditors and analysts encounter across industries. The article concludes with observations on current developments in standard-setting and the need for more consistent interpretive guidance in practice.

Keywords: finance lease, lease liability, right-of-use asset, IFRS 16, lease accounting, incremental borrowing rate.

Introduction

Among the many structural shifts in corporate finance over the past three decades, the proliferation of leasing arrangements stands out for both its commercial ingenuity and its accounting consequences. Leasing allows a firm to secure the economic use of property, plant, or equipment while preserving cash reserves and, under earlier accounting conventions, keeping the associated liability off the face of the balance sheet entirely. The strategic appeal of that last feature was not lost on preparers of financial statements, and for many years a significant share of global corporate obligations — estimated by the IASB in its pre-revision impact assessments at over USD 3 trillion — went unreported as balance-sheet debt.

The introduction of IFRS 16 Leases in 2016, effective for annual periods beginning on or after 1 January 2019, fundamentally altered that landscape.

The new standard required lessees to recognise virtually all lease arrangements — with narrow exceptions for short-term leases and leases of low-value assets — as a right-of-use (ROU) asset paired with a corresponding lease liability. The move was intended to restore transparency and comparability to financial statements that had long been distorted by the operating/finance lease bifurcation embedded in the predecessor standard, IAS 17.

Yet the transition to IFRS 16, while resolving the most glaring off-balance-sheet problem, has created its own set of interpretive and analytical complications. Questions about the appropriate discount rate, the treatment of variable payments, the handling of lease modifications and renewals, and the interaction between lease liabilities and covenant calculations continue to generate debate among preparers, auditors, standard-setters, and analysts alike. These are not merely technical details: they have tangible effects on reported leverage, profitability metrics, and the quality of financial analysis.

This article aims to contribute to that ongoing conversation by examining the recognition and measurement of finance lease liabilities from both an accounting and an analytical standpoint. Rather than rehearsing the mechanical steps prescribed by the standard, the discussion prioritises the underlying logic, the judgment areas that the standard deliberately leaves open, and the consequences those judgments carry for the usefulness of reported figures. The focus throughout is on lessee accounting, which is where the most significant changes occurred and where the most analytically sensitive liabilities arise.

Conceptual Foundations Of Lease Liability Recognition

2.1 The Economic Substance Argument

The theoretical case for recognising a lease liability rests on a straightforward observation about economic substance: a lessee who is contractually committed to making a series of future payments in exchange for the use of an asset has incurred an obligation that is indistinguishable in economic terms from a loan used to purchase the same asset outright. The obligation is real, it diminishes the lessee's financial flexibility, and it represents a claim on the lessee's future cash flows that creditors and investors need to see in order to assess the entity's true financial position.

This argument has been well understood in accounting theory since at least the mid-twentieth century. Chambers (1966) and Sprouse and Moonitz (1962), writing within the broader framework of conceptual accounting reform, argued for the recognition of executory contracts to the extent that they create irrevocable future obligations. Lease commitments fit squarely within that description. The puzzle was always why standard-setters took so long to act upon the logic — a question whose answer lies partly in preparer resistance, partly in the complexity of producing a workable bright-line classification test, and partly in the sheer diversity of leasing structures that industry had by then developed.

2.2 From IAS 17 to IFRS 16: A Paradigm Shift

IAS 17, in force for decades before its replacement, drew a categorical distinction between finance leases — arrangements that transferred substantially all the risks and rewards of ownership — and operating leases, which did not. Finance leases generated a balance-sheet liability; operating leases generated only a charge to profit or loss and a set of note disclosures. The classification turned on a series of indicators, including whether ownership transferred at the end of the term, whether a bargain purchase option existed, whether the lease term covered the major part of the asset's useful life, and whether the present value of minimum lease payments approximated the asset's fair value.

The resulting system was, in practice, deeply gameable. Preparers who preferred operating lease treatment — and most did, because it kept debt off the balance sheet and, under the straight-line expense method, avoided the front-loading of charges that finance lease accounting produced — structured arrangements to fall just short of the classification triggers. The letter of IAS 17 was satisfied while its spirit was circumvented, a pattern that regulators and analysts documented with increasing frustration throughout the 2000s and 2010s.

IFRS 16 dissolved that distinction for lessees almost entirely. Under the new standard, the question is no longer whether the arrangement is a finance lease or an operating lease; it is simply whether the arrangement is a lease at all — that is, whether the contract conveys the right to control the use of an identified asset for a period of time in exchange for consideration. If it does, a lease liability must be recognised, regardless of whether it resembles what IAS 17 would have called a finance or an operating lease. The old bifurcation survives only for lessors, who retain a classification mechanism that broadly tracks the earlier framework.

2.3 The Right-of-Use Model and Its Liability Counterpart

The conceptual architecture underlying IFRS 16 is the right-of-use model. The lessee has acquired the right to use an asset for the lease term; that right is an asset of the business. To obtain it, the lessee has committed to pay the lessor over time; that commitment is a liability of the business. The asset and the liability are thus two sides of the same transaction, recognised simultaneously on the commencement date.

The liability is measured at the present value of lease payments not yet made at that date. Those payments include fixed payments (net of any incentives receivable from the lessor), variable payments that depend on an index or rate, amounts expected to be payable under residual value guarantees, the exercise price of a purchase option if the lessee is reasonably certain to exercise it, and penalties for terminating the lease early if the lease term reflects the lessee's exercising of such an option. Importantly, purely variable payments — those linked to usage or performance — are excluded from the initial measurement and expensed as incurred. This exclusion is conceptually defensible but creates volatility in the total cost recognised in any given period and complicates comparisons across firms with different payment structures.

Initial Recognition And The Discount Rate Problem

3.1 Identifying Lease Payments

Before a lease liability can be measured, the preparers must identify which future outflows belong in the calculation. This step is less straightforward than it appears. Many commercial lease arrangements contain a mixture of lease components — the right to use a specific asset — and non-lease components such as maintenance, insurance, and administrative services bundled into a single contract price. IFRS 16 requires that non-lease components be separated from the lease component and accounted for under other applicable standards, unless the practical expedient is elected to treat the whole contract as a single lease.

The practical expedient simplifies the accounting but distorts the liability figure upward, since it folds in costs that are not, strictly speaking, obligations arising from the right of use. Conversely, where separation is attempted, allocating the contract price between components requires judgment and may introduce inconsistency if comparable entities allocate differently. The net effect is that two firms with economically identical lease arrangements may report materially different liability figures depending solely on their accounting policy choice and the allocation method they apply.

3.2 The Lease Term and Option Exercise Judgments

Perhaps the single most consequential judgment in lease accounting is the determination of the lease term, because it defines the horizon over which lease payments must be discounted and sets the size of the liability at commencement. The lease term under IFRS 16 is not merely the non-cancellable period stated in the contract; it includes optional extension periods if the lessee is reasonably certain to exercise renewal options, and it excludes optional termination periods if the lessee is reasonably certain not to exercise termination options.

'Reasonably certain' is a high threshold — higher than 'more likely than not' — but it does not eliminate the discretion that preparers exercise in reaching their conclusions. A retailer with a flagship store location embedded in its brand identity may well be reasonably certain to renew a ten-year lease; a start-up occupying office space under a short-term arrangement may not be. But in less clear-cut cases, the judgment is genuinely difficult, and different preparers making similar commercial decisions may arrive at different lease terms. This variability propagates through the entire measurement chain, affecting the liability, the ROU asset, the interest expense profile, and eventually the disclosures.

3.3 The Discount Rate: Incremental Borrowing Rate and Its Proxies

The lease payments must be discounted to present value using the interest rate implicit in the lease if that rate can be readily determined, or the lessee's incremental borrowing rate (IBR) otherwise. In practice, the implicit rate is rarely accessible to the lessee — it is internal to the lessor's pricing and requires knowledge of the asset's fair value and residual value that the lessee typically does not have. The IBR therefore predominates in practice.

The IBR is defined as the rate of interest that a lessee would have to pay to borrow over a similar term, with a similar security, the funds necessary to obtain an asset of a similar nature and value in a similar economic environment. That definition is conceptually coherent but operationally demanding. The IBR must be lessee-specific, asset-specific, term-specific, currency-specific, and date-specific. Constructing a defensible IBR for a portfolio of leases across multiple jurisdictions, asset classes, and maturities is a substantial undertaking — one that most lessees have found requires significant internal modelling or reliance on external data providers.

The practical approaches vary: some entities build an IBR curve from their own unsecured borrowing yields adjusted downward to reflect the secured nature of a lease; others use observable secured borrowing rates for comparable instruments; others still look to government bond yields adjusted for credit risk and term. Each approach embeds assumptions that can shift the resulting liability meaningfully. A difference of even fifty basis points in the discount rate, applied to a large long-term lease portfolio, can alter the reported liability by amounts that are material to leverage ratios and debt covenant calculations.

Subsequent Measurement And Modifications

4.1 The Unwinding of the Discount

After initial recognition, the lease liability is measured at amortised cost using the effective interest method. Each period, the liability increases by the interest accrued on the outstanding balance — calculated as the opening liability multiplied by the discount rate — and decreases by the cash payments made. The result is an unwinding pattern in which the interest component of the total lease payment is highest in the early periods and declines over the lease term as the principal reduces, mirroring the behaviour of a mortgage or term loan.

This front-loading of interest expense is one of the features most frequently cited by preparers who find IFRS 16 unfavourable to their reported results. A lessee who has historically expensed operating lease payments on a straight-line basis will, on adopting the standard, see a temporary increase in total charges — the sum of depreciation on the ROU asset and interest on the lease liability — in the early years of each lease, even though the underlying cash flows have not changed. For entities with large, recently commenced lease portfolios, the effect on EBITDA (which improves, because interest and depreciation replace what was formerly an operating expense) and on net profit (which worsens initially) can be substantial.

4.2 Reassessment of Lease Liabilities

The initial measurement of a lease liability does not conclude the accounting challenge. IFRS 16 requires lessees to remeasure the lease liability — and correspondingly adjust the ROU asset — when specified events occur. These include changes in the assessment of whether a purchase or extension option will be exercised, changes in the amounts expected to be payable under residual value guarantees, and changes in future lease payments resulting from a change in an index or rate used to determine those payments.

Reassessment can produce large adjustments to balance-sheet figures at dates that do not always coincide with the original lease term or with the lessee's planning horizons. A retailer that, after a period of strong sales performance, becomes reasonably certain about exercising a five-year renewal option will need to recognise an incremental lease liability at the point of that reassessment, discounted at the IBR current at that date rather than the original inception rate. If market rates have moved since commencement, the recognised liability will differ from what would have been shown had the original assessment correctly anticipated the renewal — introducing a form of measurement inconsistency across the lease portfolio that analysts should bear in mind.

4.3 Lease Modifications

A lease modification — defined as a change in the scope or the consideration of a lease that was not part of the original terms and conditions — gives rise to its own accounting treatment, which depends on whether the modification effectively creates a new, separate lease or adjusts the existing one. If the modification grants the lessee an additional right of use not included in the original arrangement, at a price commensurate with the standalone price, the modification is treated as a new lease and accounted for accordingly. In all other cases, the modification triggers a remeasurement of the existing liability using a revised discount rate, with the corresponding adjustment made to the carrying amount of the ROU asset.

In environments where commercial real estate or equipment markets are volatile — periods of high inflation, sector disruption, or supply-chain dislocation — lease renegotiations become frequent and the accounting treatment of modifications can generate significant income statement and balance-sheet volatility. The challenge is compounded by the difficulty of determining whether a renegotiated arrangement represents a genuine modification of an existing lease or the termination and replacement of one lease by another, a distinction that can have materially different accounting consequences yet may turn on subtle contractual nuances.

Disclosure Requirements And Their Analytical Value

5.1 The Disclosure Objective

IFRS 16 articulates a broad disclosure objective: lessees should provide information that gives financial statement users a basis for assessing the effect that leases have on the entity's financial position, financial performance, and cash flows. To meet that objective, the standard requires an extensive set of quantitative and qualitative disclosures, including the carrying amounts of ROU assets by class of underlying asset, additions to and depreciation charges on ROU assets, interest expense on lease liabilities, the total cash outflow for leases, short-term and low-value lease expenses, variable lease expenses not included in the measurement of lease liabilities, income from subleasing, maturity analysis of undiscounted lease payments, and qualitative descriptions of significant judgments and assumptions.

That is a demanding disclosure package, and it provides genuinely useful analytical material when preparers engage with it carefully. The maturity analysis, in particular, allows readers to map the timing of future outflows against the entity's anticipated cash generation, an assessment that was far more difficult to perform under the old regime, when only a rudimentary minimum lease payment schedule appeared in the notes. Equally important is the reconciliation of opening and closing lease liability balances, which distinguishes between changes arising from new leases, remeasurements, modifications, repayments, and foreign exchange movements — a decomposition that reveals the dynamic nature of the liability in a way that a single closing balance figure never could.

5.2 Disclosure Quality in Practice

The gap between the disclosure objective and what entities actually report has been a persistent theme in post-implementation reviews and in the academic literature on lease accounting. Studies examining early adoption periods and the first reporting cycles after mandatory implementation have repeatedly found that disclosures vary enormously in specificity and analytical usefulness — not primarily because the underlying transactions differ, but because the standard grants preparers significant latitude in how they present the required information.

The description of significant judgments about extension and termination option assessments is one area where disclosure quality diverges most visibly. A lessee might simply state that it has considered 'all relevant facts and circumstances' without specifying the magnitude of optional periods at stake, the assumptions embedded in the assessment, or the sensitivity of the recognised liability to alternative assumptions. For an analyst attempting to assess a retailer's true lease exposure — including the options that management considers likely to be exercised — such disclosures are of limited value. More informative preparers disclose the total undiscounted potential future payments over all optional periods, distinguished from those already incorporated in the recognised liability, giving readers the tools to form their own judgments.

5.3 Interaction with Covenants and Credit Analysis

The shift from operating to finance lease accounting under IFRS 16 has had tangible consequences for loan covenant compliance. Covenants written before the standard's adoption and calibrated to ratios computed under IAS 17 — debt-to-equity, interest cover, net debt, and gearing — may be breached mechanically upon adoption even though no change in underlying economic conditions has occurred. The practical response has been widespread amendment of covenant definitions to either exclude IFRS 16 lease liabilities or to introduce 'frozen GAAP' clauses that peg the calculation to pre-adoption accounting policies.

From a credit analysis perspective, the new standard provides more complete raw material for assessing leverage, but it does not resolve the fundamental question of how lease liabilities should be treated relative to financial debt. Leases carry certain characteristics that distinguish them from conventional borrowings: the obligation is secured against the specific leased asset rather than general corporate assets; in the event of financial distress, the lessor can recover the asset and the lessee's obligation terminates; and there is no cross-default mechanism linking lease obligations to financial covenants. Credit analysts who treat all IFRS 16 liabilities as equivalent to bank debt may therefore overstate leverage, while those who exclude them entirely — reverting to a view closer to the pre-IFRS 16 world — may understate it. The analytically coherent position lies in between, adjusting for the specific characteristics of the portfolio under review.

Analytical Perspectives On Lease Liabilities

6.1 Impact on Key Financial Ratios

The recognition of lease liabilities under IFRS 16 has had profound and sector-differentiated effects on reported financial ratios. Industries with asset-heavy, lease-intensive business models — aviation, retail, hospitality, logistics, and telecommunications — experienced the most significant balance-sheet enlargement upon adoption. Airlines, for instance, brought onto their balance sheets liabilities representing aircraft operating leases that had previously been invisible to anyone relying solely on audited accounts. Analysts who had already been capitalising those leases in their own models found their work validated by the standard; those who had not were confronted with leverage ratios that appeared to deteriorate overnight.

For EBITDA-focused analysis, IFRS 16 has a counterintuitive flattering effect: because lease payments that were formerly a component of operating expenses are now divided between depreciation (which is added back in computing EBITDA) and interest (which sits below the EBITDA line), reported EBITDA increases while net income decreases, at least in the early periods of a lease. This creates a disconnect between EBITDA and cash generation that analysts must navigate carefully — the entity's operating cash flows have not changed, but the headline profitability metric has improved.

6.2 Comparability Challenges

Despite the standardisation that IFRS 16 was intended to deliver, significant comparability challenges remain. The most consequential arise from the judgments already discussed: lease term determination, IBR selection, and the treatment of variable payments. Two entities in the same sector, with similar asset portfolios and similar business strategies, may report materially different lease liabilities because one has adopted a policy of treating all renewal options as unlikely to be exercised (minimising the recognised liability) while the other has assessed the same options as reasonably certain (maximising it). Both positions may be defensible under the standard, yet the reported liabilities are incomparable.

A related comparability problem arises from the transition method. IFRS 16 permitted entities to adopt either a full retrospective approach — restating comparatives as though the standard had always been in effect — or a modified retrospective approach, in which the cumulative catch-up was recognised on the date of initial application without restating comparatives. Entities that chose different approaches cannot be compared directly for the transition period, and even after that period the composition of ROU asset and lease liability balances may differ because of the different measurement bases applied to pre-existing leases.

6.3 Sectoral Nuances and Analytical Adjustments

Sophisticated financial analysis of lease-intensive entities increasingly requires sector-specific adjustments that go beyond the standard figures. In retail, for example, lease term assessments are heavily influenced by the importance of specific locations; a lease with a contractual term of five years on a prime high-street site may have an economic duration that is effectively indefinite if the brand's presence at that location is strategically non-negotiable. Standard disclosures will not always convey this reality, and analysts must supplement them with information about location strategy, store contribution, and historical lease renewal behaviour.

In aviation, the relevant question is not merely the size of the lease liability but the relationship between lease costs and revenue yield, the flexibility embedded in fleet planning, and the extent to which lessors are willing to renegotiate in a downturn. The pandemic period offered a stark demonstration of this last point: when aircraft were grounded and revenues collapsed, the apparent scale of airline lease liabilities in audited accounts gave only a partial picture of the actual financial risk, because the ability to defer, restructure, or return assets was critical and was not captured in the balance-sheet figures.

Evolving Standards And Open Questions

The IASB's post-implementation review of IFRS 16, commenced in 2022, has surfaced several areas of continuing difficulty. One is the treatment of sale-and-leaseback transactions, where the seller-lessee recognises both the proceeds from the sale and a lease liability, and where questions arise about which portion of any gain on sale should be deferred to reflect the ongoing rights retained through the leaseback. The variable payments issue — particularly the treatment of lease payments indexed to inflation or linked to revenue performance — has also attracted regulatory attention, with amendments introduced to clarify how changes in variable payment terms resulting from rent concessions and similar arrangements should be accounted for.

A broader question, one that the post-implementation review has not fully resolved, is whether the right-of-use model serves all lease types equally well. For short-duration contracts, for arrangements with highly variable payment structures, and for leases of intangible assets — currently outside the scope of IFRS 16 — the conceptual fit is less clear. The exclusion of intangible asset leases is particularly anomalous in an economy where rights to use software, data, intellectual property, and spectrum licences represent some of the most significant long-term commitments that technology and telecommunications firms make.

Separately, the convergence agenda between the IASB and FASB — the two bodies responsible for the dominant sets of lease accounting requirements worldwide — remains incomplete. ASC 842, the US GAAP equivalent, retains a two-model approach for lessees, preserving an operating-lease category that avoids interest expense recognition in the income statement even while bringing the liability onto the balance sheet. The resulting presentation differences mean that US GAAP and IFRS financial statements remain difficult to compare directly on a lease-adjusted basis, a situation that complicates cross-border investment analysis and continues to draw criticism from users.

Conclusion

Financial leasing has always occupied an unusual position in the accounting landscape — straddling the boundary between asset acquisition and service procurement, between financing and operating activity, between balance-sheet obligation and contingent commitment. The accounting standards that govern lease liabilities have evolved substantially in response to the criticism that earlier frameworks allowed too much economic reality to remain hidden, and IFRS 16 represents the most ambitious attempt yet to bring that reality into view.

Yet the standard has not resolved all of the underlying tensions. The judgments embedded in lease term assessment, discount rate selection, variable payment identification, and modification accounting give rise to genuine diversity in reported figures that limits the comparability benefits the standard was designed to produce. Disclosure quality, while improved on average since IAS 17, remains uneven, and the interaction between lease liabilities and analytical frameworks — covenant structures, rating methodologies, valuation models — continues to require active interpretation by preparers and users alike.

The path forward likely requires a combination of standard-setting refinement — particularly on intangible asset leases, variable payments, and the convergence gap with US GAAP — and a heightened commitment from preparers to disclosures that meet the spirit, not merely the letter, of the information objective. For analysts, the lesson of the past decade is that lease liabilities cannot be treated as a homogeneous category: their economic significance varies with sector, portfolio age, option structure, and the credibility of management's renewal assessments. The accounting standards supply the raw material; the analytical judgment must supply the rest.

REFERENCES

1. Chambers, R. J. (1966). Accounting, Evaluation and Economic Behavior. Prentice-Hall.
2. Dechow, P. M., Hutton, A. P., & Sloan, R. G. (1996). Economic consequences of accounting for stock-based compensation. Journal of Accounting Research, 34(Supplement), 1–20.
3. Fülbier, R. U., Silva, J. L., & Pferdehirt, M. H. (2008). Impact of lease

capitalisation on financial ratios of listed German companies. Schmalenbach Business Review, 60(2), 122–144.
4. International Accounting Standards Board. (2003). IAS 17 Leases (revised). IFRS Foundation.
5. International Accounting Standards Board. (2016). IFRS 16 Leases. IFRS Foundation.
7. International Accounting Standards Board. (2022). Post-Implementation Review of IFRS 16 Leases: Request for Information. IFRS Foundation.
8. Lipe, M. G. (1998). Individual investors' risk judgments and investment decisions: The impact of accounting and market data. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 23(7), 625–640.
9. Mulford, C. W., & Gram, M. (2007). The Effects of Lease Capitalisation on Various Financial Measures: An Analysis of the Retail Industry. Journal of Applied Research in Accounting and Finance, 2(2), 3–13.
10. Nailor, H., & Lennard, A. (2000). Leases: Implementation of a New Approach. Financial Accounting Series Special Report, Financial Accounting Standards Board.
11. PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2022). In Depth: A Look at Current Financial Reporting Issues — IFRS 16 Leases. PwC Global.
12. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2005). Report and Recommendations Pursuant to Section 401(c) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 on Arrangements with Off-Balance Sheet Implications. US SEC Office of the Chief Accountant.