

Mr Kevin Stevenson
Chairman
Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204,
Collins Street
WEST VICTORIA 8007

By Email: standard@aab.gov.au

10 November 2011

Dear Kevin

Request for Views – IASB Agenda Consultation 2011

Grant Thornton Australia Limited (Grant Thornton) is pleased to provide the Australian Accounting Standards Board with its comments on the International Accounting Standards Board's (the Board) Request for Views – Agenda Consultation 2011 (the Request for Views).

Grant Thornton's response reflects our position as auditors and business advisers to the Australian business community. We work with listed and privately held companies, government, industry, and not-for-profit organisations (NFPs). This submission has benefited with input from our clients, Grant Thornton International which will be finalising a global submission to the IASB by its due date of 30 November 2011, and discussions with key constituents.

Our comments should be seen as representing the Australian position on the impact that the IASB's Agenda will have for Australia in the coming years, and is for the information of the AASB in helping it submit an Australian view to the IASB. Grant Thornton International has, as detailed above, sole responsibility for providing the global Grant Thornton view to the IASB. From an Australian perspective Grant Thornton Australia believes that it is critical that there are in the short term there are agreed global rules around the accounting for both a carbon tax and emissions trading scheme given the current Australian minority Government's legislation to establish a carbon tax from 2013 (we note that AASB 26 October 2011 Agenda Paper 5.2 on this issue)

Broad Support for the consultation process

Developing the agenda is a critical part of the Board's standard-setting process. We, and many other constituents, have for some time been calling for a more transparent and inclusive approach to this aspect of the Board's work. We believe this will contribute to the quality of agenda decisions and, over time, lead to improvements in IFRSs. Strengthening

Grant Thornton Australia Limited
ABN 41 127 556 389

Level 17, 383 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Locked Bag Q800
QVB Post Office
Sydney NSW 1230

T +61 2 8297 2400

F +61 2 9299 4445

E info.nsw@au.gt.com

W www.grantthornton.com.au

the due process around agenda-setting decisions should also enhance the Board's and IFRS Foundation's accountability and legitimacy.

In particular we believe that all standards setters should make available for public review a collation of comments received from all submissions, and a response to each of the issues raised as appropriately grouped as otherwise there is both a transparency and accountability issue which does make many who provide submissions to various standards boards, with some question as to whether their own particular views have been understood and considered by the boards.

We therefore congratulate the Board on publishing the Request for Views and welcome the opportunity to provide input.

Key considerations in developing the agenda

This consultation takes place at a time when four major projects (Revenue, Leasing, Insurance, and Financial Instruments) are in progress and have uncertain finalisation dates. We expect that the Board will, quite rightly in our view, continue to prioritise these projects until their completion. This work, together with existing commitments such as post-implementation reviews, annual improvements and reviewing the IFRS for SMEs, will of course reduce the Board's and Staff's spare capacity especially during 2012.

Moreover, in determining the number and type of projects it should work on concurrently, it is important that the Board considers what lessons can be learned from recent experience of major projects. It appears to us that the Board has tended to set over-ambitious work plans, inevitably followed by delays and deferrals. The optimum scale of the future agenda should be assessed taking into account that:

- most major projects will be controversial to some degree
- the calls for additional outreach, field-testing and other due process activities continue to increase
- constituents will need time to evaluate and implement the major new standards referred to above (along with others issued recently in areas such as consolidations) and will have limited capacity and appetite for further substantial changes
- a number of jurisdictions are in the process of transitioning to IFRS, or are considering whether to do so. Entities in those jurisdictions would benefit from a period of calm in IFRS developments (often referred to as a stable platform).

Our views on the shape of the future agenda

Given this context, we suggest that the Board should restrict the major projects on its post-2011 to a small number – perhaps in the order of two to four (whether new projects or those added previously but deferred). We further suggest that the project selection should focus on areas where there is a broad consensus among constituents that change is needed.

We believe that other standards-level projects should be limited to targeted amendments to address particular issues. In selecting those projects, we suggest the Board aims for areas where simplifications appear to be achievable, or diversity reduced, through relatively uncontroversial and straightforward amendments.

In selecting these projects, the Board should also pay close attention to concerns raised in regions and jurisdictions that may have been accorded a lower priority in recent years. The Board's and Staff resources have understandably been heavily committed to US Generally

Accepted Accounting Practice convergence projects in recent years. Concerns in other regions may therefore have been given less attention. Some rebalancing may now be called for in future resource allocation decisions.

We expand on these comments, respond to the questions in the Request for Views and set out our detailed project suggestions in the Appendix to this letter.

If you require any further information or comment, please contact me.

Yours sincerely

GRANT THORNTON AUSTRALIA LIMITED



Keith Reilly

National Head of Professional Standards

Appendix 1: Comments

Question 1

What do you think should be the IASB's strategic priorities, and how should it balance them over the next three years?

Question 1(a)

Do you agree with the two categories we identified and the five strategic areas within them? If you disagree, how do you think the IASB should develop its agenda, and why?

We agree that the two categories (developing financial reporting and maintaining existing IFRS) are appropriate as broad headings.

We also agree that the five strategic areas identified (in summary: conceptual framework, research, major new projects, post-implementation reviews, responding to implementation needs) form a suitable basis for classifying possible activities and work-streams.

As detailed in our covering letter we would add a carbon tax/emissions trading new project given the pressing need in Australia for consistent global rules, and we also favour adding an Intangibles project as a new project given that Intangibles represent a significant part of many business worth and yet are often not recognised in the financial statements which widens the 'expectation gap' facing users and producers of financial information.

Question 1(b)

How would you balance the two categories and five strategic areas? If you have identified other areas for the IASB's agenda, please include these in your answer?

We doubt there is an objective basis to determine an optimal balance among the identified categories and strategic areas. Different constituents will undoubtedly have different priorities based on their particular circumstances.

That said, we suggest that the expected completion of the Board's major in-progress projects (Revenue, Leasing, Insurance, Financial Instruments) in 2012 will limit the capacity and tolerance of many constituents for other major standards-level projects. Moreover, in view of the extended timelines for these projects, and existing commitments to undertake post-implementation reviews, to review the IFRS for SMEs and suchlike, the Board's free capacity to develop major new standards in the next few years is likely to be quite limited. Accordingly, we suggest that the emphasis in the next few years should be more on maintaining existing IFRSs than developing financial reporting. In particular, as noted in our cover letter, we suggest that the Board should restrict the major new projects to a small number.

We comment more specifically on the five strategic areas in the following paragraphs.

Conceptual framework

Of the three areas in “developing financial reporting” category we suggest that completing a revised conceptual framework should be the highest priority. While the conceptual framework’s importance to standards-development can perhaps be overstated, we nonetheless consider that an up-to-date, comprehensive framework would be a useful tool for the Board in pursuing its standards-level projects.

We also suggest that many of the potential projects identified in the Request for Views should be pursued only once the underlying issues have been considered in the conceptual framework project.

Research and strategic issues

We agree that the Board and Staff should have access to relevant academic and other research to inform their standard-setting activities and decisions.

However, we are not convinced that a significant investment in research capability is an optimum use of the IASB's limited resources at present. Research is generally best conducted by academic institutions, national standard-setters and suitable regional organisations. The IASB should continue to strengthen its liaison with these bodies to promote research which is focused on relevant to its activities. Commissioning specific research projects might also be useful and appropriate from time to time.

The Request for Views refers to exploring the interaction of IFRSs with integrated reporting. We agree the Board should acknowledge the setting in which financial reporting is presented, and therefore should evaluate the extent to which it should engage in this field in the next few years. We also believe that high quality management commentary (and similar) has a vital role to play in serving the information needs of investors and other stakeholders. However, we think the Board also needs to consider the likelihood that it will in practice be able to achieve significant improvement and global harmonisation in this area in the foreseeable future. There are many underlying factors that could affect this evaluation. Overall, however, at present we are not convinced that the Board has a strong mandate from stakeholders or public authorities, or that sufficient consensus exists on the role of integrated reporting exists. Accordingly, we suggest the Board should not devote significant resources to this area for the time being.

New projects to fill gaps

We note that identifying "gaps" in a principle-based system such as IFRS is a subjective judgement. We suggest instead that the focus should be on the number and type of active major projects to be included in the future agenda (whether replacements, major amendments or completely new standards).

For the reasons given above and in our cover letter, we think that the Board should work on only a small number of major standards at any one time in the next few years. The selection should preferably focus on areas where there is a broad consensus on the need for change. We think that placing a realistic limit on the number of major projects is possibly more important than the specific projects selected. That said, we suggest five projects below and give our reasons in our response to question 2:

- Income taxes
- Extractive industries
- Other comprehensive income
- Carbon Tax and Emissions Trading
- Intangibles

Post-implementation reviews

Beyond 2011 we believe the IASB's work should place greater emphasis on assessing the effectiveness of the major recent changes already made. We consider that post-implementation reviews of significant pronouncements are essential to the achievement of high quality, global standards and therefore welcome the current indications that these will be a substantial part of the post-2011 agenda.

We think these reviews should consider more routine matters such as internal consistency and clarity, but also address broader matters such as complexity, costs and benefits, the

relevance of the information in practice and an appropriate level of consistent application (subject to the normal constraints on that outcome).

Responding to implementation needs

We support the inclusion of targeted improvements in the future agenda. This category presents opportunities to address problems that are significant for some constituents while placing relatively minor demands on Board and Staff resources.

In selecting improvement projects we suggest that the focus should be on areas where simplifications could be achieved, or diversity reduced, through relatively uncontroversial and straightforward amendments

With this in mind, our suggestions for specific targeted improvements are:

- Business combinations between entities under common control (acknowledging that this could become a major project depending in part on its direction)
- Agriculture, particularly bearer assets
- Foreign currency translation.

The Request for Views refers to consistency of integration of XBRL with IFRS under this heading. We are aware that the IFRS Foundation appears to be committed to developing and maintaining XBRL taxonomies and related initiatives as a strategic matter. However, we are not convinced that substantial IASB Board and Staff resources should be allocated to these areas, nor XBRL integration should be a major focus of the standard-setting process. We note that there is no specific reference to accommodating requests from jurisdictions that may decide to adopt IFRSs in the coming years. Experience suggests that such adoption decisions often lead to requests in areas such as IFRS 1 exemptions. Such matters could be included in the responding to implementation needs category.

Question 2

What do you see as the most pressing financial reporting needs for standard-setting action from the IASB?

Question 2(a)

Considering the various constraints, to which projects should the IASB give priority, and why? Where possible, please explain whether you think that a comprehensive project is needed or whether a narrow, targeted improvement would suffice?

See our response to question 2(b) below.

Question 2(b)

Adding new projects to the IASB's agenda will require the balancing of agenda priorities with the resources available.

Which of the projects previously added to the IASB's agenda but deferred would you remove from the agenda in order to make room for new projects, and why? Which of the projects previously added to the IASB's agenda but deferred do you think should be reactivated, and why? Please link your answer to your answer to question 2(a).

We have considered this and question 2(a) together. We have set out our project suggestions in two tables on the following pages (one for potential new projects and one for projects previously added but deferred).

Table 1: Projects previously added to agenda but deferred

Project	Restart?	Rationale
Business combinations under	✓	These transactions are widespread and the accounting is inconsistent. We anticipate that this could be a relatively uncontroversial and straightforward project. <i>(Limited scope)</i>

common control		<i>project</i>).
Earnings per share	✘	We suggest that a standard on EPS will inevitably be somewhat rule-based and , based on the 2009 ED, are not convinced that a significant improvement would be achieved.
Emissions trading schemes	✓	We recognise that these schemes have grown in importance and that applying existing IFRSs is challenging. Whilst we acknowledge that developing a satisfactory, principle-based IFRS may not be possible without considering the underlying IFRSs and conceptual framework, we believe that an interim solution is needed now given that various countries including Australia either have or will shortly have operating schemes.
Financial instruments with characteristics of equity	✘	We recognise that IAS 32 has shortcomings, in particular its rule-based approach to classifying puttables and instruments settled in own shares. However, we believe it is nonetheless relatively well understood and accepted in practice. We suggest a general review of IAS 32 is deferred until completion of the conceptual framework.
Financial statement presentation	✘	Although substantial work has been already been undertaken, we feel it has mainly served to highlight the challenges and controversy of developing a new model in this fundamental area.
Government grants	✘	We agree that IAS 20 has some conceptual problems but feel that it works reasonably well in practice.
Other comprehensive income	✓	We understand that issues around OCI presentation and recycling may be controversial and difficult to resolve but suggest that recent additions to the types of gains/losses presented in OCI render the current situation increasingly unsatisfactory. The role of OCI should preferably be considered first at the conceptual framework level. <i>(Major project)</i> .
Income taxes	✓	Many find deferred tax accounting is complex to apply and we believe it can produce information of questionable usefulness. We feel this area needs a rethink and support the commencement of a research project (building on EFRAG's proactive work if appropriate). We do not support rules-based amendments to IAS 12 along the lines of the 2009 ED. <i>(Major project)</i> .
Liabilities – amendments to IAS 37	✘	We have somewhat mixed views on this project. We acknowledge that IAS 37 has conceptual flaws and that some of its principles are challenging to apply. However, many consider that it nonetheless works reasonably well in practice given that it addresses items that are inherently very uncertain. On balance we suggest deferral until completion of the revised conceptual framework

Table 2: Potential new projects

Project	Add?	Rationale
Agriculture, particularly bearer biological assets	✓	Consistent with the reasons set out in the Request for Views, we believe that a limited scope project has the potential to achieve significant simplification for some constituents and is unlikely to be controversial. (<i>Limited scope project</i>).
Country-by-country reporting	✗	We do not view this as a priority for IFRSs. We understand primary demand is from particular interest groups rather than users of general purpose financial statements.
Discount rate	✗	We agree that discounting in IFRSs is problematic – both in terms of underlying principles (not always clearly or consistently articulated) and practical application. However, at this stage we find it difficult to envisage how the problems might be addressed. We suggest that a standard-level project should be preceded by consideration of the purpose and role of discounting in the conceptual framework project.
Equity accounting	✗	We think that IAS 28 has some conceptual shortcomings and areas of inconsistent application, but feel that it nonetheless works reasonably well in practice. We suggest that, if any work on IAS 28 is undertaken in the next few years, it should be limited to research.
Extractive industries	✓	Significant work has already been performed in this area and the Board has created an expectation (including by issuing IFRS 6) that it will be pursued. Accounting practices in this important sector are currently diverse. (<i>Major project</i>).
Foreign currency translation	✓	We agree with the reasons given in the Request for Views. We believe that a limited scope project has the potential to achieve significant simplification for some constituents and is unlikely to be controversial. (<i>Limited scope project</i>).
Inflation accounting	✗	We do not view inflation accounting as a significant problem and would not consider this area to be a priority.
Intangible assets	✓	We acknowledge that a broad scope project on intangible assets would be a major undertaking and likely to be highly controversial. We note that intangibles are ever more important in value creation the extent to which traditional financial statements should capture such matters is questioned by many, however ignoring intangibles does raise the question of what use are financial statements when often the most important asset is ignored in the financial statements..
Interim reporting	✗	We feel that the issues noted with IAS 34 are relatively minor and would not see revisions to this well-established standard as a high priority.
Islamic (Shariah-compliant) transactions	✗	While we appreciate the growing significance of Islamic finance we question whether the IASB is the most suitable organisation to develop guidance in this area.

Presentation and disclosure standard	×	We strongly agree that the Board needs to reassess the role and extent of disclosure in IFRSs but suggest this should first be considered in the conceptual framework project.
Rate-regulated	×	This is a narrow, sector-specific area and we think it can be resolved satisfactorily only when related element definitions have been addressed in the conceptual framework project.
Share-based payment	×	We understand the criticisms of IFRS 2 and agree with some of them. However, we feel that narrow-scope amendments may increase complexity and that a broad review may be too ambitious for this round of agenda-setting.



Department of Treasury and Finance

Contact: Steve Mitsas
Phone: +613 9651 2645
Our Ref: D11/220539

1 Treasury Place
GPO Box 4379
Melbourne Victoria 3001
Telephone: (03) 9651 5111
Facsimile: (03) 9651 2062
DX 210759

Mr Kevin Stevenson
Chairman
Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins Street West Victoria 8007


Dear Mr Stevenson

ITC 25 Request for Comments on Request for Views *Agenda Consultation 2011*

The Heads of Treasuries Accounting and Reporting Advisory Committee (HoTARAC) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Australian Accounting Standards Board on ITC 25 Request for Comments on Request for Views *Agenda Consultation 2011*.

In its submission to the IASB, HoTARAC has stated its view that future development of standards should encompass the perspectives of the not-for-profit (NFP) sector to achieve a single set of global financial reporting standards for the for-profit and the NFP sectors (including the public sector). HoTARAC believes that this is achievable through the continuation of the IASB's practice of issuing principle-based accounting standards, the completion of its conceptual framework and the use of generic/sector neutral terminology.

In addition, HoTARAC believes that completion of the conceptual framework project (including Phase G which relates to the NFP sector), is of utmost importance because the conceptual framework assists the IASB in setting standards that are principle-based, internally consistent and internationally convergent (as noted in the *Agenda Consultation 2011*). Attempting to determine conceptual issues at the standards' level prior to the completion of the conceptual framework project may result in inconsistencies between standards, lack of understandability and, consequently, extensive disclosures.

HoTARAC recommends that the following projects be given priority:

- Liabilities, Post-employment Benefits and Discount Rates
- Emissions Trading Schemes;
- Government Grants;

- Presentation and Disclosure standard;
- Other Comprehensive Income; and
- Financial Instruments.

If you have any queries regarding HoTARAC's comments, please contact Steve Mitsas from the Department of Treasury and Finance, Victoria on +613 9651 2645.

Yours sincerely



Grant Hehir

CHAIR

**HEADS OF TREASURIES ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

9 November 2011

HoTARAC Response to Request for Views *Agenda Consultation 2011*

Question 1

What do you think should be the IASB's strategic priorities, and how should it balance them over the next three years?

1. HoTARAC believes that one of the main IASB strategic priorities should be a single set of global financial reporting standards for the for-profit and the Not-For-Profit (NFP) sectors (including the public sector). To this end, the IASB should liaise closely with the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board (IPSASB).
2. Deferral of NFP considerations, and in particular the practice of developing standards that are solely applicable to the for-profit sector, is leading to national standard setters that cater for both sectors, such as Australia, developing NFP/public sector paragraphs to IFRSs for local application. This creates a risk that implementation and adoption practices will diverge. Alternatively, standard setters may decide to move away from applying the IASB's accounting framework and adopt other more suitable frameworks for the NFP sector (for example, New Zealand has recently announced using IPSAS as a basis for its public sector financial reporting).
3. This has led to a number of undesirable outcomes. Fragmentation of NFP and for-profit accounting is leading to increasing divergence in accounting practices for the sectors, with a resultant lack of comparability, comprehensiveness and understandability. Delegating responsibility for the NFP sector to the national standard setters also results in the duplication of accounting standard setting effort and reduces resourcing that may be otherwise available to the IASB.
4. The recent global financial crisis and lack of transparency in national government accounts, reinforces the need for a robust framework of public sector accounting. A single global set of standards for both NFP and for-profit sectors, widely adopted and accepted, would enhance public sector accountability:
 - (a) by setting a global benchmark for both sectors; and

- (b) by facilitating a common pool of accounting professionals for financial statement preparation and audit.

Question 1(a)

Do you agree with the two categories we identified and the five strategic areas within them? If you disagree, how do you think the IASB should develop its agenda, and why?

5. HoTARAC agrees that the work of the IASB broadly falls into two main categories:
- (a) developing financial reporting; and
 - (b) maintaining existing IFRSs.

However, HoTARAC has recommendations regarding the strategic areas within the categories as noted below.

Question 1(b)

How would you balance the two categories and five strategic areas? If you have identified other areas for the IASB's agenda, please include these in your answer.

Developing financial reporting category

A single set of global financial reporting standards for For-Profit and Not-For-Profit sectors

6. Although it is noted in paragraph 9 of the *Preface to IFRSs* that IFRSs are designed to apply to the general purpose financial statements and other financial reporting of profit-oriented entities, HoTARAC strongly encourages the IASB to consider issues pertinent to NFP activities in the private sector, public sector or government. One example of where this has occurred recently is the revision of IAS 24 *Related Party Disclosures* whereby a partial exemption is provided from the disclosure requirements for government-related entities – entities that are related by virtue of being controlled by the same government can provide reduced related party disclosures. As a result, IAS 24 is now more appropriate for the NFP public sector.
7. While HoTARAC acknowledges that the IPSASB prepares accounting standards for the public sector [excluding Government Business Enterprises (GBEs)], HoTARAC is of the view that it is an opportune time now to promote or at least consider not-for-profit (including public sector) perspectives in IFRSs for the following reasons.

- (a) While some specific NFP issues and characteristics may need additional consideration, development of transaction neutral standards, arguably, should not be unduly onerous.
- (b) A relatively modest investment in the consideration of NFP sector issues in the development of accounting standards and projects at this stage, may prevent a major exercise in future convergence of standards between the two sectors.
- (c) Due to the recent global financial crisis, a number of large entities now have government ownership. HoTARAC is of the view that the IASB should devote more time and effort in considering how to account for transactions that might result from increased government involvement in the private sector. Therefore, with regards to the 'developing financial reporting' category, HoTARAC is of the view that consideration of the not-for-profit sector (including public sector perspectives) should be a strategic area for the IASB. The inclusion of this strategic area would be consistent with the key aspect of considering reporting issues that cater to a more diverse IFRS community.
- (d) Currently, there is a divergence in accounting concepts/treatments between the Standards issued by the IASB and the IPSASB for certain transactions. For example, IPSAS 20 *Related Party Disclosures* does not explicitly consider key management personnel (KMP) of a parent entity to be a related party of a subsidiary entity. IAS 24, on the other hand, considers KMP of a parent entity to be a related party for the subsidiary entity. Although the IPSASB specifically develops accounting standards for the public sector (excluding GBEs), considering not-for-profit perspectives for IFRSs may provide a viable option for jurisdictions to achieve consistency and comparability across all types of entities via a single framework of Standards. HoTARAC believes this suggestion directly relates to objective (c) of the IFRS Foundation (as set out in Appendix A to the Agenda Consultation document).
- (e) A number of projects listed in Appendix C of the *Agenda Consultation 2011*, e.g. emissions trading schemes and grants issued by governments, consist of the government as one party to an economic event. The IASB should not neglect the

accounting for the government side of these transactions in order to achieve a more robust conceptual outcome, increase comparability and understanding and the possibility of greater support among constituents.

8. While this may not necessarily mean that the IASB should develop Standards specifically for the NFP sector and/or public sector, future development of Standards should be sector and transaction neutral. The continuation of IASB's practice of issuing principle-based accounting standards would make this objective more achievable. HoTARAC notes, from the April 2011 *Report of the IFRS Foundation Trustees' Strategy Review*, that the Trustees have considered the development of standards for non-private sector entities at a later stage.

Conceptual Framework

9. While the strategic areas are not prioritised, HoTARAC believes that the completion of the conceptual framework project (including Phase G which relates to the NFP sector) is of utmost importance for the following reasons.
 - (a) As noted in the *Agenda Consultation 2011*, the conceptual framework assists the IASB in setting standards that are principle-based, internally consistent and internationally convergent. Ideally, new standards should be formulated and existing standards should be revised, based on the principles in the conceptual framework. Therefore, the conceptual framework project should be completed first before other projects to enable consistency across standards. HoTARAC believes attempting to determine conceptual issues at the standards' level may result in inconsistencies between standards, lack of understandability and, consequently, extensive disclosures. This is the current situation where individual projects at the standards level are finalised in tandem or ahead of the conceptual framework projects, which has led to inconsistencies in proposed accounting treatments across projects. For example, the IASB has made a tentative decision for the leases project, that the asset and liability recognised under a lease contract for a lessee should exclude variable lease payments, except for those that are considered disguised minimum lease payments. This contrasts with the approach taken in recent redeliberations on the *Revenue from Contracts with Customers* project, where the IASB decided to include uncertain consideration when determining the transaction price.

(b) Although HoTARAC is of the view that accounting standards should take into account the NFP perspective as mentioned above, in the shorter term, the conceptual framework can provide guidance for transactions or issues relating to the NFP sector which are not specifically contemplated in the IFRS.

10. Based on the above reasoning, the conceptual framework should be transaction and sector neutral (i.e. as generic as possible). Sector neutrality in the wording of the proposed conceptual framework would assist in this. For example, focusing on the use of the word 'resources' instead of 'cash flows' so that it can be applied in both for-profit and NFP contexts and can be applied across the private and public sectors.

Maintaining existing IFRSs category

11. HoTARAC believes that the IASB needs to carefully balance the number of projects regarding the maintenance of existing IFRS with more fundamental projects regarding the development of IFRS. In this regard, HoTARAC believes the emphasis should be on developing, rather than maintaining IFRS. In particular, HoTARAC believes that the Board needs to avoid having too many narrow scope issues, which although may produce timely responses, may, delay, exacerbate or fail to address more fundamental issues. For example, the removal of the concept of the expected return on plan assets in IAS 19 *Employee Benefits* exacerbated existing and more fundamental problems associated with the discount rate, that time would arguably be better spent addressing the more fundamental discount rate issue.

12. Although HoTARAC agrees with using post-implementation reviews as a form of maintenance of existing IFRSs and is useful for identifying minor issues, HoTARAC believes that standards should be immediately reviewed and amended as necessary when major conceptual or practicality issues were identified. Adopting a strict review only after two years of implementation of a standard may not be optimal, as entities would by the end of two years have an established internal system to cope with the relevant standard. Further, HoTARAC is of the view that the existence of a post-implementation review process should not justify short-cuts being taken in the due process of developing (and researching/understanding the implications of) new or amended pronouncements. Consistent with HoTARAC's views in paragraph 11 above, HoTARAC believes it is

critical that deliberations prior to finalisation of a new or amended pronouncement properly consider all issues identified at that time.

Question 2:

What do you see as the most pressing financial reporting needs for standard-setting action from the IASB?

Question 2(a)

Considering the various constraints, to which projects should the IASB give priority, and why? Where possible, please explain whether you think that a comprehensive project is needed or whether a narrow, targeted improvement would suffice?

13. In many ways, determining which projects to:

- (a) undertake;
- (b) remove; and
- (c) prioritise;

should be driven by strategic priorities as discussed above. Although the IASB agenda criteria may assist, HoTARAC is of the view that the IASB needs to better convey its rationale when setting its priorities. For example, there were questions raised on the appropriateness of undertaking the project on the fundamental review of leases during the global financial crisis when the most urgent projects were deemed to be those on financial instruments. In this example, other projects may have ranked as a higher priority based on the criteria of 'relevance to users of the information involved and the reliability of information that could be provided' and 'resource constraints'.

14. Notwithstanding the above paragraph, HoTARAC recommends the following projects be given priority.

Liabilities, Post employment Benefits and Discount Rates

15. HoTARAC believes that the related projects on Liabilities, Post employment benefits and Discount rates should be given priority, as they raise a number of significant issues, which have been highlighted by the global financial crisis. Concerns have emerged about

the current method of valuing long term liabilities and the requirement to use particular discount rates in determining these values.

16. As noted on page 21 of *Agenda Consultation 2011*, IFRSs use a variety of discount rates. HoTARAC sees potential in developing a standard providing guidance on the use of appropriate discount rates (similar to guidance on fair value in IFRS 13 *Fair Value Measurements*). There is currently no guidance on the use of discount rates, and different standards have different discount rate requirements without the appropriate justification to explain the difference. For example, IAS 19 and IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets* both aim to give a present value figure of the liability by using a discount rate. However, the discount rates required by each standard are different, and the justification for this difference is not apparent. Therefore, HoTARAC considers the development of consistent guidance to be a priority for the IASB.
17. The IASB should also consider whether volatility engendered by the use of a single bond rate to discount long term liabilities, including defined benefit plan obligations, diminishes the ability of users of financial statements to make informed judgements of financial performance. For example, current IAS 19 uses high quality corporate bond rates, or in the absence of deep bond markets, a government bond rate. In the wake of the global financial crisis, these are not necessarily interchangeable; as investors have sought safe havens, and as a consequence, some government bond rates have fallen with a corresponding rise in the corporate borrowing rates. The value of a liability is inversely related to the discount rate, so changes in the discount rate, which may be unrelated to the future cash flows in respect of the liability, drive changes in expense and profit.

Emissions trading schemes (ETS)

18. HoTARAC believes the ETS project should be one of the top priorities of the IASB. Governments are currently developing and implementing carbon pricing schemes. In the absence of guidance, divergent accounting practices are developing in accounting for common sets of facts, compromising comparability between financial statements. The Kyoto protocol underpinning most of these schemes, is an international agreement with facilities for international trading of carbon permits. A continuing lack of guidance in this area results in divergent accounting practices, which is a particularly undesirable outcome.

19. While standard setters and their constituents have been unable to reach consensus on these issues in the past, national governments, responsible for implementing these schemes, are each developing mechanisms to record and account for carbon pricing. Consideration of transactions from the government side, where they are initiated, may pave the way for agreed guidance on accounting for these transactions by all affected entities.

Government Grants

20. As noted on page 23 of *Agenda Consultation 2011*, there are inconsistencies between the conceptual framework and IAS 20, as well as comparability issues resulting from the choices available in IAS 20. HoTARAC offers the following additional reasons for urgently updating IAS 20:

- (a) To ensure it is conceptually consistent with the performance obligation focus of the IASB's Exposure Draft *Revenue from Contracts with Customers*.
- (b) Currently, IAS 20 only considers government grants from the perspective of the grantee. Given the symmetrical characteristics of a grant transaction, HoTARAC strongly recommends the IASB also consider the grantor side of the transaction. The current situation in IAS 20 is tantamount to a hypothetical IAS 17 *Leases* which only addresses lessee accounting and not both lessee and lessor accounting.

Presentation and Disclosure Standard

21. HoTARAC shares the concerns expressed globally about the voluminous disclosures that have resulted from disclosure requirements being considered on a topic-by-topic basis. As mentioned in relation to the suggested "Presentation and Disclosure standard" project (in Appendix C to the Agenda Consultation document), consideration of all disclosures in a holistic way via a single IFRS may facilitate rationalisation of the existing requirements spread across a large number of standards. Therefore, to ensure general purpose financial statements continue to be genuinely useful to the broad range of users, HoTARAC urges the IASB to give this project a high priority.

22. Further, HoTARAC is aware of the review (requested by the IASB in October 2010) conducted by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland and the New Zealand Institute of Chartered Accountants regarding the levels of disclosure in existing IFRS - *Losing the excess baggage – reducing disclosures in financial statements to what's important*. Given the detailed nature of the recommendations arising from that review, HoTARAC also urges the IASB to act on those recommendations in the context of a “Presentation and Disclosures” project.

Other Comprehensive Income (OCI)

23. In HoTARAC’s view the OCI project should be a priority for the IASB. HoTARAC considers that this issue is more conceptual in nature, and recommends that it is determined at the conceptual framework level, with any additional specific requirements in the relevant standards. The current development of OCI at a standard level has been on an ad hoc basis, and a set of overarching principles may address concerns about which items should be included in OCI.

Financial Instruments

24. HoTARAC strongly recommends the IASB commit to completing the financial instruments project. This is very important to provide certainty to preparers of financial statements in preparation for implementation of the new requirements.

Question 2(b)

Adding new projects to the IASB’s agenda will require the balancing of agenda priorities with the resources available. Which of the projects previously added to the IASB’s agenda but deferred (see table page 14) would you remove from the agenda in order to make room for new projects, and why? Which of the projects previously added to the IASB’s agenda but deferred do you think should be reactivated, and why? Please link your answer to your answer to question 2(a)

25. In answering question 2(a) above, HoTARAC has indicated those projects they believe should be given priority by the IASB. Consequently, these can be accommodated by assigning relative priorities to existing projects, with no requirement to remove projects from the IASB’s agenda.

26. HoTARAC has identified 'complexity in financial reporting' as an item IASB may wish to consider adding to its list of projects. Some national standard-setters are already performing research on this matter, as it is perceived important for meeting financial reporting user needs.