V

arias veces hemos descrito el cambio del criterio de medición, que ha llevado a la contabilidad regulada por IASB a abandonar el valor histórico y adoptar el valor razonable en muchos casos. Esto es complicado para los contadores en países en los que hay pocos mercados organizados o estos negocian pequeñas partes del giro total.

La valuación o medición posterior es una actividad desconocida por muchos de nuestros contadores. Recurrir a expertos parece ser la solución. Sin embargo, habría que analizar los criterios de medición que éstos utilizan.

Adrienna Huffman, en su artículo [*Asset use and the relevance of fair value measurement: evidence from IAS 41*](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2529974) (Review of Accounting Studies, December 2018, Volume 23, Issue 4, pp 1274–1314), manifestó: “(…) *Overall, my findings suggest that asset use does influence the relevance of fair value information. Specifically, I find that the association between income (book value) and price significantly declines when firms switch measurement of their in-use biological assets to fair value, relative to the control sample. In addition I find that the association between income and returns, and the association between income and future operating cash flows, significantly improve (decline) when firms begin measuring their in-exchange (in-use) biological assets at fair value, relative to the control sample. Finally, in cross-sectional tests I find that investors discount the fair value of in-use biological assets and their associated URGL relative to in-exchange biological assets, confirming the DiD results. ―Recently, the IASB amended IAS 41 in a manner consistent with my findings. Specifically, an IASB (2012) issues paper that preceded the amendment argues that bearer biological assets are held for income generation (derive value in-use) and therefore should be treated as PP&E, which does not require fair value measurement. On the other hand, the IASB (2012a) issues paper argues that consumable biological assets are held for sale (derive value in-exchange) and thus should continue to be measured at fair value.15 The subsequent Exposure Draft (IASB 2013, ¶BC5) that amends IAS 41 further argues that investors, analysts, and other users of financial statements did not find the fair values of bearer (in-use) plants useful and would adjust reported statements to eliminate the effects of the fair value accounting. Moreover, the Exposure Draft (IASB 2013) does not propose disclosing fair value amounts for bearer (in-use) plants. The IASB amended IAS 41 on June 30, 2014, and bearer plants have been accounted for under IAS 16 as PP&E since January 1, 2016*. (…)”

En virtud de lo anterior no se trata, simplemente, de un cambio en el momento en el cual se hace la valuación. Se trata de resolver cuál es el criterio más adecuado en las circunstancias. Aquí se plantea que una cosa son los bienes destinados para la venta y otra los que se quieren mantener para continuar con la operación. El trabajo de un contador es pensar cuándo conviene un método u otro. La aplicación mecánica de los estándares se lo podríamos dejar a las máquinas.
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