

**Request for Comment on
IPSASB Exposure Draft ED 34 *Social
Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to
Individuals or Households* and
IPSASB Consultation Paper *Social
Benefits: Issues in Recognition and
Measurement***

Prepared by the
Australian Accounting Standards Board



Australian Government

**Australian Accounting
Standards Board**

Commenting on this Invitation to Comment

Constituents are strongly encouraged to respond to the AASB and the IPSASB on both the IPSASB Exposure Draft and the IPSASB Consultation Paper. The AASB is seeking comment on both documents by 16 June 2008. This will enable the AASB to consider Australian constituents' comments in the process of formulating its own comments to the IPSASB, which are due by 15 July 2008. Comments should be addressed to:

The Chairman
Australian Accounting Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins Street West Victoria 8007
AUSTRALIA
E-mail: standard@aab.gov.au

Technical Director
International Public Sector Accounting
Standards Board
International Federation of Accountants
277 Wellington Street West
Toronto Ontario CANADA
M5V 3H2
E-mail: edcomments@ifac.org

A copy of all non-confidential submissions to the AASB will be placed on public record on the AASB website: www.aasb.gov.au and forwarded to the IPSASB.

Obtaining a Copy of this Invitation to Comment

This Invitation to Comment is available on the AASB website: www.aasb.gov.au.

Other Enquiries

Phone: (03) 9617 7600
Fax: (03) 9617 7608
E-mail: standard@aab.gov.au

COPYRIGHT

© 2008 Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB). The text, graphics and layout of this Invitation to Comment are protected by Australian copyright law and the comparable law of other countries. The Invitation to Comment may be reproduced in print for the sole purpose of preparing a written submission to the AASB and/or the IPSASB in respect of the Invitation to Comment. Otherwise, no part of the Invitation to Comment may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the AASB except as permitted by law.

ISSN 1320-8713

CONTENTS

PREFACE

IPSASB Exposure Draft ED 34 *Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households*

IPSASB Consultation Paper *Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement*

PREFACE

Background

Australian Accounting Standards

The Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB) makes Australian Accounting Standards to be applied by:

- (a) entities required by the *Corporations Act 2001* to prepare financial reports;
- (b) all reporting entities engaged in the for-profit, not-for-profit or public sectors; and
- (c) any other entity that prepares general purpose financial statements.

Australian Accounting Standards incorporate International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), with the addition of paragraphs on the applicability of the Standard in the Australian environment.

Australian Accounting Standards also include requirements that are specific to Australian entities. In most instances, these requirements are either restricted to the not-for-profit or public sectors or include additional disclosures that address domestic, regulatory or other issues. In developing requirements for public sector entities, the AASB considers the requirements of International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS), as issued by the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board (IPSASB) of the International Federation of Accountants.

Invitation to Comment

The release of an Invitation to Comment (ITC) is not a mandatory step in the due process of issuing an Australian Accounting Standard. ITCs may be released during the formative stages of an accounting standard-setting project to present a comprehensive overview of an issue, possible approaches to addressing that issue as well as to invite feedback from constituents. This may help with the early identification of any significant flaws or implementation problems in the ITC's proposals.

The AASB considers whether to issue an IPSASB Exposure Draft and/or Consultation Paper as an AASB ITC on a case-by-case basis. Generally, the AASB will issue an ITC based on an IPSASB Exposure Draft or Consultation Paper to seek feedback on specific issues raised in the IPSASB document that are pertinent to Australian constituents.

The AASB will consider the comments received on IPSASB Exposure Draft ED 34 in the process of preparing its submission on ED 34 and determining its approach to the topic of social benefits.

Purpose of this Invitation to Comment

The purpose of this ITC is to invite comments from Australian constituents on the IPSASB's Exposure Draft ED 34 *Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households* and the IPSASB's Consultation Paper *Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement* that were issued in March 2008.

Structure of this Invitation to Comment

The AASB has decided to:

- (a) reproduce IPSASB Exposure Draft ED 34 *Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households* and IPSASB Consultation Paper *Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement* without amendment as part of this ITC;

- (b) identify the key proposals of ED 34 in this Preface;
- (c) identify the key issues of the IPSASB Consultation Paper in this Preface; and
- (d) seek constituents' views on the proposals in ED 34 and the Specific Matters for Comment in the Consultation Paper.

Background to the IPSASB Documents

Social Benefits

For the purposes of both ED 34 and the IPSASB Consultation Paper:

“*Social benefits* are cash transfers to individuals or households and collective and individual goods and services provided by an entity to individuals or households in a non-exchange transaction to protect the entire population, or a particular segment of the population, in any jurisdiction against certain social risks”; and

“A *social risk* is an event or circumstance that may adversely affect the welfare of individuals or households either by imposing additional demands on their resources or by reducing their incomes.”

Examples of social benefits are social security pensions, unemployment benefits, health and education services, national defence, policing and judicial processes.

IPSASB Projects

Social benefits compose a significant proportion of the expenses of governments. There has been considerable debate about whether governments and other public sector entities incur liabilities to provide social benefits in the future and, if so:

- (a) what is the event giving rise to such liabilities; and
- (b) whether the form in which social benefits are provided affects when liabilities for social benefits are incurred.

The IPSASB has had a project on social benefits on its work program for some years. An Invitation to Comment (ITC), entitled *Accounting for Social Policy Obligations*, was prepared by an IPSASB Subcommittee and published in January 2004. The ITC proposed principles for the recognition and measurement of social benefits. In view of difficulties encountered by the IPSASB in reaching a consensus on these issues, and the IPSASB's activation of a project to develop a public sector conceptual framework, the IPSASB decided to divide its project on social benefits into the following parts:

- first, the development of disclosure requirements for social benefits provided in the form of cash transfers ('cash transfer social benefits'), discussed below in relation to IPSASB Exposure Draft ED 34 *Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households*; and
- subsequently, the development of recognition and measurement requirements for all forms of social benefits (including the identification of any liabilities for social benefits). The IPSASB Consultation Paper explains the IPSASB's current strategy for addressing accounting issues regarding social benefits, including the IPSASB's new project on reporting information about long-term fiscal sustainability (see below). It discusses differing views on key issues regarding the recognition and measurement of liabilities and expenses for social benefits, and asks questions about those issues, but does not include recommendations.

Project on long-term fiscal sustainability

In November 2007, the IPSASB approved a brief for a project on reporting information about long-term fiscal sustainability. Fiscal sustainability may generally be described as the extent to which a government's obligations under existing legal frameworks can be met in the future. Its analysis considers estimated resource outflows under government programs and related estimated resource inflows that support those programs. Estimated resource outflows take account of both current and future beneficiaries, regardless of whether present obligations to them exist at the reporting date. The IPSASB considers that amounts recognised in respect of social benefit and other government programs may provide insufficient information about those programs to meet the needs of users of financial statements, and that reporting information useful for assessing long-term fiscal sustainability may be an important complement to amounts recognised in respect of government programs. The IPSASB's project brief may be accessed at

http://www.aasb.gov.au/workprog/IPSASB_ProjectBriefLong-TermFiscalSustainability_03-08.pdf

Australia's Requirements and Activities

AASB 137 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets* was amended in December 2007 to include the following recognition guidance transferred from AAS 29 *Financial Reporting by Government Departments* (paragraph 8.1.4) and AAS 31 *Financial Reporting by Governments* (paragraph 12.1.2) upon the withdrawal of AAS 29 and AAS 31:

“The intention to make payments to other parties, whether advised in the form of a local government or government budget policy, election promise or statement of intent, does not of itself create a present obligation which is binding. A liability would be recognised only when the entity is committed in the sense that it has little or no discretion to avoid the sacrifice of future economic benefits. For example, a government does not have a present obligation to sacrifice future economic benefits for social welfare payments that might arise in future reporting periods. A present obligation for social welfare payments arises only when entitlement conditions are satisfied for payment during a particular payment period.” (paragraph Aus26.1)

However, Australian Accounting Standards do not include comprehensive requirements for disclosure of social benefits by public sector entities. In addition, both the IPSASB and IASB have active projects to develop new or revised conceptual frameworks, and it remains to be seen whether the above-mentioned recognition guidance in AASB 137 would be consistent with those new or revised frameworks.

Because of the significance of social benefits to governments and other public sector entities, the AASB will prepare a submission on ED 34 and monitor the IPSASB project on social benefits to determine its approach to this topic. Accordingly, the AASB decided to issue this ITC to publicise the IPSASB's proposals (in ED 34) and issues (in its Consultation Paper) and to seek the views of constituents.

As the AASB has not discussed in detail the proposals in IPSASB ED 34 and the issues in the Consultation Paper, there are no preliminary AASB views on either document to report in this Preface.

Key Proposals in IPSASB ED 34

IPSASB ED 34 proposes particular disclosure requirements for public sector entities (generally governments) in respect of their cash transfer social benefits. It defines a cash transfer as “a social benefit, which is either provided directly in cash, or is an expense paid through the tax system, to protect individuals or households against certain social risks where use of the resources transferred is at the discretion of the individual or household”. Examples of these cash transfers are social security pensions, child benefits and unemployment benefits.

Disclosure of the Present Value of Future Cash Transfer Social Benefits in Respect of Eligible Individuals or Households

ED 34 proposes requirements to disclose, in respect of each cash transfer social benefits program, the best estimate of the present value of the amounts of social benefits expected to be transferred in cash to individuals or households who have satisfied all program eligibility criteria at the reporting date, and related disclosures. These proposals are elaborated below.

Discount Rate

ED 34 proposes that the discount rate used to determine the present value of the amounts of cash transfer social benefits should be a rate that reflects only the time value of money. It does not propose to specify how to determine this discount rate.

Other Disclosures

In addition to disclosure of the present value of cash transfer social benefits, the proposed disclosures in ED 34 for each cash transfer social benefits program include:

- a general description of the program, including the principal legislation and regulations governing it;
- the amount of any liabilities and expenses recognised during the period;
- the discount rate used;
- the principal assumptions used in the estimate of future cash transfers;
- changes in those assumptions since the last reporting date, and their financial effect;
- the basis on which benefits will be increased in the future;
- whether a qualified actuary has been used in the determination of the principal assumptions and, if so, whether the actuary is an employee of the reporting entity;
- the number of eligible individuals or households at the reporting date; and
- whether the program has terminated after the reporting date.

ED 34 also proposes disclosure of the entity's accounting policy for recognising liabilities and expenses relating to cash transfer social benefits.

Principle of Continuous Entitlement

ED 34 proposes that the amounts of cash transfer social benefits to eligible individuals or households should be estimated on the basis of continuous entitlement. This means estimated transfers relate to the estimated future period during which each individual or household will continue to satisfy eligibility criteria without a break in entitlement.

IPSASB Consultation Paper

Key Issues

The IPSASB Consultation Paper distinguishes three types of social benefits, namely, collective goods and services, individual goods and services, and cash transfers to individuals or households. It defines them as follows:

“Collective goods and services are social benefits in the form of goods and services provided to the entire population or to a particular segment of the population in any jurisdiction, to protect the population or one of its segments against certain social risks.

Collective goods and services include national defense and most aspects of the criminal justice system.”

“*Individual goods and services* are social benefits in the form of goods and services provided to protect an individual or household against certain social risks. Individual goods and services include healthcare and educational services provided directly to the recipient.”

“A *cash transfer to an individual or household* is a social benefit, which is either provided directly in cash, or is an expense paid through the tax system, to protect individuals or households against certain social risks where use of the resources transferred is at the discretion of the individual or household. Cash transfers include social security pensions, child benefits and unemployment benefits.”

In respect of each of these types of social benefits, the Paper asks whether a present obligation to provide them arises at any time and, if so, when.

In respect of cash transfers to an individual or household, the Paper asks whether and, if so, when, a present obligation arises if contributions of resources to the government are required for the individual or household to become entitled to benefits. For example, does the payment of contributions cause the government to incur a present obligation at an earlier time than if the program were non-contributory?

In relation to cash transfer programs that require individuals or households to revalidate their entitlement to benefits from time to time, the Paper asks whether revalidation is a criterion for the recognition of any such liabilities or a factor to take into account in the measurement of the liabilities.

Finally, the Paper asks whether a social benefit program should be treated as an in-substance ‘executory contract’ (that is, a contract in which neither party has performed any of its obligations or both parties have partially performed their obligations to an equal extent). Under that treatment, a government’s obligations to provide social benefits could be set off against the government’s rights to receive future taxes and other inflows from individuals or households in return for those social benefits.

Request for Comments

Comments are invited on any of the proposals or issues raised in the ITC, including the Specific Matters for Comment in the IPSASB Exposure Draft and the IPSASB Consultation Paper. Constituents are requested to identify in their submission:

- those comments that relate to the IPSASB Exposure Draft; and
- those comments that relate to the IPSASB Consultation Paper.

Constituents are strongly encouraged to respond to the AASB and the IPSASB. The AASB is seeking comment by 16 June 2008. This will enable the AASB to consider Australian constituents’ comments in the process of formulating its own comments on the ED and Consultation Paper to the IPSASB, which are due by 15 July 2008. The AASB would prefer that respondents supplement their opinions with detailed comments, whether supportive or critical, on the major issues. The AASB regards both critical and supportive comments as essential to a balanced review and will consider all submissions, whether they address all specific matters, additional issues or only one issue.

Specific Matters for Comment

In addition, the AASB would value comments on:

- (a) whether it should use the IPSASB's work on social benefits, such as issuing an Exposure Draft based on IPSASB ED 34 and/or a subsequent IPSASB Exposure Draft or Standard on the recognition and measurement of social benefits, in Australia;
- (b) any regulatory issues or other issues arising in the Australian environment that may affect the implementation of the proposals in ED 34 or the resolution of the issues in the Consultation Paper;
- (c) whether, overall, the proposals in ED 34 would result in financial statements that would be useful to users; and
- (d) whether the proposals in ED 34 are in the best interests of the Australian economy.

*Proposed International Public Sector Accounting
Standard*

Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households



**International Federation
of Accountants**

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

The International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board, an independent standard setting body within the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), approved this Exposure Draft, *Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households*, for publication in November 2007. This proposed International Public Sector Accounting Standard may be modified in light of comments received before being issued in final form.

Please submit your comments, preferably by email, so that they will be received by July 31, 2008. All comments will be considered a matter of public record. Comments should be addressed to:

The Technical Director
International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board
International Federation of Accountants
277 Wellington Street West
Toronto Ontario Canada M5V 3H2

Email responses should be sent to: edcomments@ifac.org

Copyright © March 2008 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Permission is granted to make copies of this work provided that such copies are for use in academic classrooms or for personal use and are not sold or disseminated and provided that each copy bears the following credit line: “*Copyright © March 2008 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Used with permission of IFAC. Contact permissions@ifac.org for permission to reproduce, store or transmit this document.*” Otherwise, written permission from IFAC is required to reproduce, store or transmit, or to make other similar uses of, this document, except as permitted by law. Contact permissions@ifac.org.

INTRODUCTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING STANDARDS

The International Federation of Accountants' International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board (IPSASB) develops accounting standards for public sector entities referred to as International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSASs). The IPSASB recognizes the significant benefits of achieving consistent and comparable financial information across jurisdictions and it believes that the IPSASs will play a key role in enabling these benefits to be realized. The IPSASB strongly encourages governments and national standard setters to engage in the development of its Standards by commenting on the proposals set out in Exposure Drafts (EDs).

The IPSASB issues IPSASs dealing with financial reporting under the cash basis of accounting and the accrual basis of accounting. The accrual basis IPSASs are based on the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRSs) issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) where the requirements of those Standards are applicable to the public sector. They also deal with public sector specific financial reporting issues that are not dealt with in IFRSs.

The adoption of IPSASs by governments will improve both the quality and comparability of financial information reported by public sector entities around the world. The IPSASB recognizes the right of governments and national standard setters to establish accounting standards and guidelines for financial reporting in their jurisdictions. The IPSASB encourages the adoption of IPSASs and the harmonization of national requirements with IPSASs. Financial statements should be described as complying with IPSASs only if they comply with all the requirements of each applicable IPSAS.

The IPSASB Strategy on Accounting for Social Benefits

Purpose of this Exposure Draft

1. The purpose of this ED is to provide requirements for the disclosure of amounts expected to be transferred to individuals or households that have met threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date, under the current terms and conditions of programs providing social benefits in non-exchange transactions in the form of cash transfers. The requirements are a preliminary step in developing accounting requirements for social benefits.

Background

2. IPSAS 19, “Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets” was issued in October 2002. Social benefits provided in non-exchange transactions were excluded from the scope of IPSAS 19. An Invitation to Comment (ITC), “Accounting for Social Policy Obligations” was issued in January 2004. The ITC proposed that the principles in IPSASs were applicable to accounting for social benefits provided in non-exchange transactions. Comments from constituents generally supported this proposal and the IPSASB decided to use the principles of IPSAS 19 to develop recognition and measurement requirements for social benefits provided in non-exchange transactions.
3. The IPSASB commenced a further stage of its project in April 2005, intending to develop an ED of an IPSAS that proposed requirements for identifying present obligations related to all social benefits and recognizing and measuring these liabilities.
4. In developing an ED, the IPSASB considered:
 - The objectives of general purpose financial reports (GPFs) in the public sector, in particular the GPFs of governments responsible for providing social programs, and how best to meet the information needs of users;
 - Whether the financial position of governments would be faithfully represented by recognizing liabilities associated with expected future outflows for social programs, while at the same time not recognizing as an asset future inflows of tax revenue; and
 - The appropriateness of the current definitions of assets and liabilities in IPSASs, in particular those in IPSAS 19 associated with liabilities.
5. In considering these issues the IPSASB concluded that, within the constraints of the current conceptual framework for general purpose financial reporting, traditional approaches to liability recognition may not be suitable for conveying information to users about the future provision of social programs by governments. In doing so, the IPSASB acknowledged the limitations of the primary financial statements including the statement of financial position and notes thereto. These limitations exist because, although financial statements use

estimation techniques to measure liabilities by reference to settlement amounts in future reporting periods, they focus primarily on past events.

6. This view led the IPSASB to consider other ways of conveying relevant information about social benefit programs to users. The IPSASB saw merit in requiring disclosures within the GPFs of governments about amounts expected to be transferred to individuals or households presently eligible for benefits under social programs. It therefore developed this ED. The IPSASB acknowledged that this is a preliminary step, of itself insufficient to completely satisfy user needs.
7. The IPSASB also began to explore the role that disclosures about long-term fiscal sustainability could play in helping to convey relevant information to users about the future of a government's social programs. Although the IPSASB accepts that there is uncertainty associated with such information, it considers that such information is highly relevant.

Strategic Approach to Addressing Social Benefits Accounting Issues

8. Therefore the IPSASB has concluded that:
 - The proposed disclosure requirements in ED 34 represent an important first step in signaling the importance of governments providing users with relevant information about their social programs,
 - Further consultation should be carried out on key issues relating to recognition and measurement of social benefits as a step in developing further guidance. For this reason the IPSASB has issued a Consultation Paper, "Social Benefits: Key Issues in Recognition and Measurement;" and
 - A project should be initiated to assess whether disclosures about long-term fiscal sustainability reporting might enhance the reporting of the impact of such programs by complementing the information reported in the GPFs.

Conceptual Framework and other Relevant Projects

9. The IPSASB's Conceptual Framework project was initiated by the IPSASB in collaboration with a number of national standard setters in March 2006. The project has already considered broadening (a) the objectives of financial reporting to include *accountability* and (b) the scope of financial reporting to include *general purpose financial reporting*, not just *general purpose financial statements*. The project has also recognized the long-term fiscal sustainability of social benefit programs as an aspect of financial reporting that could be significant to discharging accountability in the public sector. The component of this project on the elements of financial statements will also be considering the existing definitions of assets and liabilities. This is particularly significant because many consider that applying the existing definitions of assets and liabilities used in IPSASs would not lead to a faithful presentation of governmental responsibility for delivering social benefits in the future.

10. The IASB is developing its own Conceptual Framework and is also conducting a fundamental review of its Standard IAS 37, “Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets,” on which IPSAS 19 was based. Developments in thinking as a result of both projects and the development of IPSASB’s Conceptual Framework are likely to influence the development of further approaches to recognizing and measuring liabilities related to all social benefits.

Long-Term Fiscal Sustainability Reporting

11. In its 2007–2009 Strategy and Operational Plan, the IPSASB stated its intention to initiate a project on long-term fiscal sustainability reporting and has issued a project brief on the subject. It welcomes comments on that brief.
12. At a very high level, fiscal sustainability involves an assessment of the extent to which governmental obligations under existing legal frameworks can be met in the future. The analysis of fiscal sustainability therefore takes account of both current and future eligible individuals or households, regardless of whether present obligations to them exist at the reporting date. Fiscal sustainability is sometimes coupled with the concept of intergenerational equity, which evaluates the extent to which future generations of taxpayers will have to deal with the fiscal consequences of policies currently delivering social benefits in the form of goods and services.
13. Fiscal sustainability reporting may be a more versatile accountability tool than accrual-based financial statements, because such reporting involves the projection of inflows as well as outflows. Already a number of jurisdictions have made impressive progress in developing reports on long-term fiscal sustainability as key aspects of financial accountability, even though no universally agreed framework exists for preparing such reports.

Conclusion

14. This ED is one of three documents published together as an integrated package; the other two are the Consultation Paper, “Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement” and a Project Brief on “Long-Term Fiscal Sustainability Reporting.”
15. The IPSASB looks forward to receiving comments from interested parties on ED 34, the long-term fiscal sustainability reporting project brief and the key issues relating to recognition and measurement of liabilities related to all social benefits identified in the Consultation Paper.

Due Process

An important part of the process of developing IPSASs is for the IPSASB to receive comments on the proposals set out in EDs from governments, public sector entities, auditors, standard setters and other parties with an interest in public sector financial reporting. Accordingly, each proposed IPSAS is first released as an ED, inviting interested parties to provide their comments. EDs will usually have a comment period of four months, although longer periods may be used for certain EDs. Upon the closure of the comment period, the IPSASB will consider the comments received on the ED and may modify the proposed IPSAS in the light of the comments received before proceeding to issue a final Standard.

Purpose of the Exposure Draft

This ED proposes requirements for the disclosure of transfers required to be made to eligible individuals or households under the current terms and conditions of cash transfer programs.

Request for Comments

The IPSASB welcomes comments on all of the proposals in this ED. Comments are most useful when they include the reasons for agreeing or disagreeing. If you disagree please provide alternative proposals.

Specific Matters for Comment

The IPSASB would particularly value comment on whether you agree that:

1. The scope of this ED is appropriate (paragraphs 2–8). If you do not think that the scope is appropriate please detail how you would modify the scope. Please state your reasons.
2. The new definitions in this ED at paragraph 10 are sufficiently clear and comprehensive. If you disagree, please indicate (a) how these definitions should be modified and (b) which new terms should be defined. Please state your reasons.
3. The requirements for the determination of amounts expected to be transferred to eligible individuals or households are appropriate (paragraphs 30–44). If you do not think that they are appropriate please indicate what those requirements should be. Please state your reasons.
4. The disclosure requirements in paragraph 45 are appropriate. If you think that they are unduly onerous, which disclosures should not be required? Conversely, if you think that the disclosures are inadequate, what further disclosures would you include? Please state your reasons.
5. The disclosure requirements in paragraph 45 are going to provide information that is verifiable. If you think that the disclosure requirements are not going to provide information that is verifiable, please identify the specific disclosures and state what those implications are.

SOCIAL BENEFITS: DISCLOSURE OF CASH TRANSFERS
TO INDIVIDUALS OR HOUSEHOLDS

6. The implementation arrangements are appropriate (paragraphs 50–53). If the implementation arrangements are inappropriate, please specify how you would change them. Please state your reasons.

**INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING
STANDARD [EXPOSURE DRAFT 34]
SOCIAL BENEFITS: DISCLOSURE OF CASH TRANSFERS TO
INDIVIDUALS OR HOUSEHOLDS**

CONTENTS

	Paragraph
Introduction.....	IN1–IN9
Objective	1
Scope	2–8
Government Business Enterprises	7–8
Definitions	9–29
Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households and Goods and Services Encompassed by Social Benefits	11–12
Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households	13–17
Composite Social Security Programs	18–19
Collective Goods and Services	20–21
Individual Goods and Services	22–25
Eligibility Criteria and Threshold Eligibility Criteria.....	26–29
Determination of Amounts Expected to be Transferred under Cash Transfer Programs to Eligible Individuals or Households	30–44
Disclosures.....	45–49
Initial Adoption of this Standard	50–51
Effective Date	52–53
Illustrative Disclosures of Minimum Items Required by this Standard	
Basis for Conclusions	

SOCIAL BENEFITS: DISCLOSURE OF CASH TRANSFERS
TO INDIVIDUALS OR HOUSEHOLDS

International Public Sector Accounting Standard (IPSAS) XX, “Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households” is set out in paragraphs 1–53. All the paragraphs have equal authority. IPSAS XX should be read in the context of its objective, the Basis for Conclusions and the “Preface to the International Public Sector Accounting Standards.” IPSAS 3, “Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors” provides a basis for selecting and applying accounting policies in the absence of explicit guidance.

Introduction

Reasons for Issuing the IPSAS

IN1. For many governments and public sector entities, programs for the provision of social benefits in non-exchange transactions comprise a highly significant part of their operations. As a preliminary measure the IPSASB considers that the provision of information on the amounts expected to be transferred to individuals or households that have met threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date would be useful.

Main Features of the IPSAS

IN2. The Standard prescribes minimum disclosure requirements for amounts expected to be transferred under cash transfer programs to individuals or households that have satisfied all threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date (eligible individuals or households) and requirements for the disclosure of information about those cash transfer programs.

IN3. The Standard defines three categories of social benefits:

- (a) Cash transfers;
- (b) Collective goods and services; and
- (c) Individual goods and services.

IN4. The Standard provides requirements for disclosures related to cash transfers to individuals or households. Collective goods and services and individual goods and services are outside the scope of the Standard. The Standard does not include requirements for the recognition or measurement of expenses and liabilities relating to cash transfers in the statement of financial performance and the statement of financial position.

IN5. The Standard does not deal with cash transfers to individuals or households that are provided as consideration in exchange for service rendered by employees, including where such cash transfers are provided through composite social security programs, which also operate to provide cash transfers in non-exchange transactions. Where an entity operates a composite social security program, it considers whether it can distinguish the component of the program providing benefits in non-exchange transactions from the component of the program providing benefits in exchange transactions. If it can make this distinction, the entity estimates amounts expected to be transferred to eligible individuals or households in respect of the component dealing with non-exchange transactions. The Standard also does not deal with contracts with employees and third parties for the delivery of social benefits to individuals or households, as these give rise to exchange transactions.

IN6. Entities are required to determine the present value of amounts expected to be transferred under cash transfer programs to eligible individuals or households,

regardless of whether there is a formal legal obligation to transfer resources, for example, where a payment becomes due, under the terms of governing legislation or regulation, or after the date on which threshold eligibility criteria have been satisfied. The method by which a program making cash transfers is financed does not affect the approach to determining those amounts. Entities are encouraged to provide information on further amounts of cash transfers expected to be transferred that go beyond the minimal requirements of the Standard.

- IN7. In determining the expected amounts to be disclosed, the entity estimates the variables that will determine the ultimate cost of providing those benefits. These estimates include both demographic and financial assumptions. Where a cash transfer program requires the revalidation of eligibility criteria, those assumptions will also include estimates of the proportion of eligible individuals or households that will revalidate their entitlement and the timescale over which revalidation will take place. Unless legislation has been enacted to discontinue a program, the amount disclosed is not limited to the amount of the next payment or a fixed number of payments. If such legislation has been enacted, the estimate reflects the remaining term of the program. As noted at IN6 entities are encouraged to provide information on further amounts of cash transfers expected to be transferred that go beyond the minimal requirements of the Standard.
- IN8. Amounts expected to be transferred are discounted to present value using a discount rate that reflects the time value of money. This may be determined by reference to market yields at the reporting date on government bonds, high quality corporate bonds or another financial instrument.
- IN9. In addition to the disclosure of amounts expected to be transferred under cash transfer programs to eligible individuals or households, ancillary disclosures are required for such programs. These include details of the principal legislation and regulations governing the programs, principal assumptions and changes to those assumptions since the previous reporting date, and the financial effect of those changes. Aggregated information is required for programs which are not individually material, but are material in aggregate. The Standard also requires the disclosure of the reporting entity's accounting policy for recognizing expenses and liabilities relating to cash transfers to eligible individuals or households in non-exchange transactions on a program basis and the aggregate amount of any expenses recognized in the statement of financial performance and any liabilities recognized in the statement of financial position on a program basis.

INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING STANDARD
IPSAS XX
Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or
Households

Objective

1. Public sector entities provide members of the community with social benefits in the form of cash transfers and goods and services in the pursuit of social policy objectives. The objective of this Standard is to provide requirements for the disclosure of amounts expected to be transferred to eligible individuals or households for cash transfer programs. The Standard also includes other requirements to disclose details of the assumptions used in determining the amounts expected to be transferred and the nature of those cash transfer programs.

Scope

2. **An entity that prepares and presents financial statements under the accrual basis of accounting shall apply this Standard in disclosing information about cash transfer programs transferring economic benefits in non-exchange transactions to eligible individuals or households.**
3. Social benefits are provided to eligible individuals or households in non-exchange transactions. The entity providing these benefits does not receive consideration that is approximately equal to the value of the cash transfers and goods and services provided, directly in return from the recipients of these benefits. Social benefits include health and educational services and cash transfers such as unemployment benefits. This Standard deals with the disclosure of amounts expected to be transferred to individuals or households that are eligible at the reporting date for cash transfers provided in non-exchange transactions. It does not include requirements for social benefits provided in the form of goods and services or for recognizing expenses and liabilities relating to cash transfers provided in non-exchange transactions.
4. This Standard applies to social security pension benefits provided in non-exchange transactions, as well as to other cash transfers provided by governments in non-exchange transactions to individuals where attainment of retirement age is an eligibility criterion. In some jurisdictions cash transfers to individuals who have reached retirement age and satisfied other eligibility criteria are made through composite social security programs. Composite social security programs operate to provide benefits in non-exchange transactions and also as post-employment benefit plans. Transactions of composite social security programs as consideration in exchange for service rendered by employees are not within the scope of this Standard (see also paragraph 6 and paragraphs 18–19).

5. Certain cash transfer programs may also require contributions by or on behalf of individuals. Such programs are within the scope of this Standard provided that the amount of the contributions is not approximately equal to the economic benefits transferred by the government or public sector entity. This Standard does not deal with the disclosure of such contributions. IPSAS 23, "Revenue from Non-Exchange Transactions (Taxes and Transfers)" provides guidance on distinguishing exchange and non-exchange transactions.
6. This Standard does not apply to employee benefits, including post-employment benefits, provided to government employees and other employees as consideration in exchange for their services or to other cash transfers that are exchange transactions. Requirements in respect of employee benefits should be accounted for in accordance with IPSAS 25, "Employee Benefits." This Standard also does not apply to exchange transactions for the provision of goods and services by third parties.

Government Business Enterprises

7. This Standard applies to all public sector entities other than Government Business Enterprises (GBEs).
8. The "Preface to International Public Sector Accounting Standards" issued by the IPSASB explains that GBEs apply IFRS, which are issued by the IASB.

Definitions

9. **The following terms are used in this Standard with the meanings specified. These terms have been defined in other IPSASs (or draft IPSASs) (they will be omitted from the finalized Standard):**

Composite social security programs are established by legislation, and

- (a) **Operate as multiemployer plans to provide post-employment benefits; as well as to**
- (b) **Provide benefits that are not consideration in exchange for services rendered by employees.**

An exchange transaction is a transaction in which one entity receives assets or services, or has liabilities extinguished, and directly gives approximately equal value (primarily in the form of cash, goods, services or use of assets) to another entity in exchange.

Expenses paid through the tax system are amounts that are available to beneficiaries regardless of whether or not they pay taxes.

Non-exchange transactions are transactions that are not exchange transactions. In a non-exchange transaction, an entity either receives value from another entity without directly giving approximately equal value in

exchange or gives value to another entity without directly receiving approximately equal value in exchange.

10. The following terms are used in this Standard with the meanings specified:

A **cash transfer to an individual or household** is a social benefit, which is either provided directly in cash, or is an expense paid through the tax system, to protect individuals or households against certain social risks where use of the resources transferred is at the discretion of the individual or household.

A **cash transfer program** is a program that operates to make cash transfers to an individual or household.

Collective goods and services are social benefits in the form of goods and services provided to the entire population or to a particular segment of the population in any jurisdiction in order to protect the population or segment of the population against certain social risks.

An **eligibility criterion** is a requirement that must be satisfied for entitlement to cash transfers.

An **eligible individual or household** is an individual or household that has satisfied threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date.

Individual goods and services are social benefits in the form of goods and services provided for individual consumption to protect an individual or household against certain social risks.

Social benefits are cash transfers to individuals or households and collective and individual goods and services provided by an entity to individuals or households in a non-exchange transaction to protect the entire population, or a particular segment of the population, in any jurisdiction against certain social risks.

A **social risk** is an event or circumstance that may adversely affect the welfare of individuals or households either by imposing additional demands on their resources or by reducing their incomes.

Threshold eligibility criteria are all the criteria that an individual or household must satisfy when applying for a social benefit for the first time, or when reapplying for a social benefit after a period of ineligibility, in order to be entitled to individual goods and services or cash transfers.

Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households and Goods and Services Encompassed by Social Benefits

11. Goods and services provided by public sector entities in non-exchange transactions may be provided for collective consumption or for consumption by individuals or households. Government and public sector entities also provide

social benefits in the form of cash transfers. These goods and services and cash transfers are generally termed social benefits.

12. The definition of a cash transfer to an individual or household in this Standard requires resources to be transferred directly to individuals or households. Therefore, the definition does not include transfers from one level of government to another level such as shared tax revenues (for example, where the national government transfers a proportion of specified tax receipts to a provincial government), or from one national government to another national government (for example, resources for disaster relief).

Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households

13. In many instances, governments and public sector entities will provide social benefits in the form of cash transfers to individuals or households to address social risks facing individuals and/or their households. Such benefits include:
 - (a) Social security pensions;
 - (b) Child benefits;
 - (c) Invalidity and sickness benefits;
 - (d) Unemployment benefits;
 - (e) Income supplements; and
 - (f) Housing benefits (where paid to the applicant rather than directly to the landlord).
14. Access to cash transfers to individuals or households requires the satisfaction of eligibility criteria. The characteristic distinguishing cash transfers to individuals or households from individual goods and services is that the purposes for which the cash transferred may be used are at the discretion of the recipient (see also paragraph 23). If an individual or household has to validate that the cash has been used for a specified purpose, the transaction is a reimbursement rather than a cash transfer. Such a transaction is within the definition of individual goods and services and is therefore outside the scope of this Standard.
15. On occasions, cash transfers are made to individuals as reductions in the amount of income tax that they have to pay rather than as a direct cash payment. In such cases, for administrative efficiency, the taxation system is used to process a transfer, which would otherwise be made directly in cash. Such reductions in taxation are expenses paid through the tax system and are within the definition of cash transfers in this Standard. IPSAS 23 provides additional commentary on tax expenditures and expenses paid through the tax system. Tax expenditures are preferential provisions of the tax law that provide certain concessions to taxpayers that are not available to others. Tax expenditures are not within the definition of a cash transfer to an individual or household in this Standard.

16. There may be instances in which a particular program or arrangement providing social benefits includes both cash transfers and individual goods and services. An example is a housing support program in which rental allowances for the tenants of private landlords are paid to individuals in cash with no stipulation that they be used in a specified manner, whereas rental allowances to individuals who are tenants of social housing authorities are paid directly to the social housing authority. In such cases resource outflows under the program may be componentized into cash transfers and individual goods and services.
17. Cash transfers include social security programs which operate to provide benefits to individuals who have attained the retirement age laid down in governing legislation or regulations, as well as satisfying other eligibility criteria.

Composite Social Security Programs

18. Composite social security programs are complex types of cash transfer programs of particular significance in a number of jurisdictions. Such programs operate to provide cash transfers in non-exchange transactions to individuals who have satisfied the eligibility criteria laid down in governing legislation or regulations. Such eligibility criteria may include specification of a retirement age. They also operate as multiemployer plans to provide post-employment benefits in exchange transactions.
19. Where an entity operates such a program it considers whether it can identify as separate components non-exchange transactions and exchange transactions. If it is able to identify the transactions separately, the requirements of this Standard relate only to the non-exchange transactions. If it is not able to identify such transactions separately, it makes a judgment as to whether the program operates predominantly to provide benefits in the form of exchange or non-exchange transactions. If it operates mainly to provide economic benefits in non-exchange transactions, the disclosures in paragraph 45 are made.

Collective Goods and Services

20. Collective goods and services are made accessible simultaneously to all members of the community or to all members of a particular section of the community, such as all households living in a particular region. Such goods and services differ from individual goods and services and cash transfers to individuals or households in that they are automatically available and consumed by all members of the community, group of households in the community or section of the community. Access to collective goods and services does not normally require the satisfaction of eligibility criteria. By their nature, collective services cannot normally be sold to individuals or households in the market place. Goods and services provided for collective consumption vary in different jurisdictions. Examples include:
 - (a) National defense; and

- (b) Public order and safety (including police services, fire protection services, law courts and prisons).

21. This Standard does not require disclosures related to collective goods and services.

Individual Goods and Services

22. Governments and public sector entities provide a range of goods and services for consumption by individuals or households. Unlike collective goods and services, individual goods and services can generally be bought and sold in the market place. However, in many cases, programs providing goods and services do not require individuals or households to pay an amount equivalent to the fair value of the goods and services provided. Access to individual goods and services normally requires the satisfaction of eligibility criteria. Goods and services provided for individual consumption vary in different jurisdictions. Examples include:

- (a) Health services;
- (b) Education services;
- (c) Housing services;
- (d) Transport services; and
- (e) Social services to the community.

23. Individual goods and services can be distinguished from cash transfers to individuals or households because it is specified that the resources transferred are intended to be used for the service potential embodied in the goods and services. Therefore they differ from cash transfers to individuals or households where the individual or household has a wider discretion over the purposes for which the economic benefits may be used (see above paragraphs 13–16). It may, of course, be possible for the individual or household receiving the goods to sell those goods rather than use them for the purposes intended by the transferor. Such a course of action, however, requires a positive further action by the recipient following receipt of the resources transferred.

24. Individual goods and services may be provided by reimbursements for certain types of expenditure. Under such arrangements, rather than providing free or subsidized goods or services, a government or public sector entity requires individuals or households to purchase the goods and services and then apply for reimbursement; for example, individuals attending a doctor's surgery may be required to pay a standard fee, which a government will reimburse in full or part for certain individuals, or a government may reimburse individuals with disabilities for the full cost or part cost of certain home services when proof of purchase of those services is provided. Such reimbursements are not within the definition of cash transfers to individuals or households in this Standard.

25. This Standard does not require disclosures related to individual goods and services.

Eligibility Criteria and Threshold Eligibility Criteria

26. Programs for cash transfers require individuals or households to meet certain conditions. Such conditions are known as eligibility criteria. The eligibility criteria for entitlement to cash transfers are laid down in the legislation and regulations governing the program. Eligibility criteria can differ widely between types of benefits in their number and complexity.
27. Eligibility criteria may need to be revalidated at specified intervals in order for an individual or household to maintain entitlement to social benefits; for example, where unemployment benefit is only available to individuals with incomes below a specified level, individuals may be required to prove that their incomes are below this level on a regular basis.
28. The term threshold eligibility criteria refers to all the eligibility criteria that an individual or household must satisfy when applying for a cash transfer for the first time, or when reapplying for a cash transfer after a period of ineligibility, in order to be entitled to a transfer of resources. For example, an individual who has been making contributions to a program providing benefits to those aged 65 years and over cannot satisfy threshold eligibility criteria until he/she has reached the age of 65 years. At the reporting date, an individual below the age of 65 years may have already made sufficient contributions to qualify for benefits when, and if, they reach the age of 65 years. However, such an individual has not met threshold eligibility criteria.
29. The eligibility criteria for some programs may not all have to be satisfied at the same time. An example is a child benefit program, where the child must have reached a specified age, but further eligibility criteria related to the income and/or asset holdings of the child's parents must be satisfied before an entitlement to a cash transfer exists. In such cases, threshold eligibility criteria are not satisfied until those further eligibility criteria have been satisfied.

Determination of Amounts Expected to be Transferred under Cash Transfer Programs to Eligible Individuals or Households

30. **An entity shall determine its best estimate of the present value of amounts expected to be transferred under cash transfer programs to eligible individuals or households.**
31. The estimate of amounts expected to be transferred is in accordance with the legislation and terms governing the program at the reporting date. The estimate is on a gross basis, i.e., the estimate is not offset by estimates of inflows such as contributions on or behalf of individuals or households, earmarked taxation, general taxation, appropriations or transfers from other levels of government. Further, the estimate is not offset by income tax or other deductions payable by an individual. The estimate does not include the costs of program administration.

SOCIAL BENEFITS: DISCLOSURE OF CASH TRANSFERS
TO INDIVIDUALS OR HOUSEHOLDS

32. The estimate is determined on the basis of continuous entitlement. This means that the estimate is based on an individual or household continuing to satisfy eligibility criteria for a benefit over a future period without a break in entitlement from the point at which threshold eligibility criteria are initially satisfied; for example, in making an estimate of the amounts expected to be transferred for a program delivering benefits to unemployed individuals, the assessment includes estimates of the number of those currently eligible who will revalidate their entitlement so that they are continuously eligible for benefits from the reporting date. The assessment does not make estimates of amounts expected to be transferred to individuals following reestablishment of their eligibility to entitlements after a period of future ineligibility; for example following a break in entitlement due to a period of paid employment.
33. The estimate is not limited to the next payment or a fixed number of payments following the satisfaction of threshold eligibility criteria, unless legislation has been enacted at the reporting date to discontinue a program. If such legislation has been enacted, the estimate reflects the remaining term of the program.
34. Termination benefits are one-off payments arising when an individual or household that has previously satisfied eligibility criteria for periodic payments ceases to satisfy those eligibility criteria. For example, a child benefit program providing cash transfers for children under the age of 16 years may have a provision whereby a child receives a final lump sum on his/her sixteenth birthday. If programs include provisions for such termination benefits, the estimate of the amounts expected to be transferred in accordance with paragraph 30 takes into account the probability of an eligible individual or household qualifying for a termination benefit in the future.
35. **Assumptions used in determining the present value of the amounts expected to be transferred under paragraph 30 shall be complete, unbiased and mutually compatible. Assumptions shall be consistent between cash transfer programs.**
36. In determining the amounts expected to be transferred, the reporting entity makes estimates of the material variables that will determine the ultimate cost of providing those benefits. These variables depend upon the nature of the cash transfer program. Such estimates involve both demographic and financial assumptions. Demographic factors may include life expectancy, morbidity, emigration and the extent of periods of unemployment. Financial factors include projections of future benefit levels. Where a cash transfer program requires the revalidation of eligibility criteria, assumptions also include estimates of the proportion of those eligible at the reporting date, who will revalidate their entitlement on a continuous basis and the period of time over which revalidation will continue.
37. Assumptions are unbiased if they are neither imprudent nor conservative. Assumptions are mutually compatible if they reflect the economic relationships

between variables; for example, the relationship between inflation and unemployment rates.

38. In determining the amounts expected to be transferred under paragraph 30, the assumptions are consistent between cash transfer programs; for example, it would be inappropriate to use different inflation assumptions covering the same period for two cash transfer programs, if transfers under those programs are based on the general rate of inflation.
39. For many programs, assumptions may require actuarial calculations. This Standard does not require such assumptions to be made by members of the actuarial profession. However, entities are required to disclose whether qualified actuaries have been used to advise on some or all of those assumptions and, if so, whether internal or external actuaries have been consulted.
40. **The rate used to discount amounts expected to be transferred under cash transfer programs to eligible individual or households shall reflect the time value of money.**
41. In making an assessment of the present value of expected future cash transfers, the entity discounts the projected amount of those expected future cash transfers to their present value. The discount rate selected can have a material effect on the expected amounts disclosed. The discount rate reflects the time value of money. The discount rate does not reflect actuarial risk, investment risk, entity specific credit risk or other risks such as the risk that future experience may differ from actuarial assumptions. Where existing legislation gives an entity options to reduce the amounts to be transferred, it reflects such options in its estimation of the cash flows rather than by adjusting the discount rate.
42. An entity makes a judgment whether the discount rate that reflects the time value of money is best approximated by reference to market yields at the reporting date on government bonds or by another financial instrument; for example, where there is no deep market in government bonds, the market yields (at the reporting date) on high quality corporate bonds in a deep and liquid market might be used. The currency and term of the government bonds, high quality corporate bonds or other instrument are consistent with the currency and estimated term of the obligation related to the cash transfer program.
43. The discount rate used reflects the estimated timing of benefit payments and will be related to the yield on the instrument that provides the best reflection of the time value of money. In practice, an entity may apply a single weighted average discount rate that reflects the estimated timing and amount of all benefit payments.
44. For some programs, such as social security pensions, there may be no market in the instrument selected with a sufficiently long maturity to match the estimated maturity of all the benefit payments. In such cases, an entity uses current market rates at the appropriate term to discount shorter term payments and estimates the

discount rate for longer maturities by extrapolating current market rates along the yield curve.

Disclosures

45. **An entity shall disclose the following information for each cash transfer program for which amounts expected to be transferred are determined under paragraph 30:**
- (a) **A general description of the cash transfer program, including the principal legislation and regulations governing the program;**
 - (b) **The present value of the amounts expected to be transferred, determined in accordance with paragraphs 30–44;**
 - (c) **The number of eligible individuals or households for each cash transfer program at the reporting date;**
 - (d) **The principal assumptions used at the reporting date, including the discount rate used to discount amounts expected to be transferred to individuals or households that are eligible at the reporting date to their present value, and a description of the source of the discount rate, where the source is not government bonds;**
 - (e) **The basis on which benefits will be increased in the future;**
 - (f) **Changes to the principal assumptions since the last reporting date and the financial effects of such changes, distinguishing the financial effects of changes in the discount rate and the financial effects of other changes in principal assumptions;**
 - (g) **Whether a qualified actuary has been used in the determination of the principal assumptions and, if so, whether that actuary is an employee of the reporting entity or an external engagement;**
 - (h) **Programs that have been discontinued after the reporting date; and**
 - (i) **The entity’s accounting policy for recognizing expenses and liabilities relating to cash transfers and the amount of any expenses recognized in the statement of financial performance and the amount of any liabilities recognized in the statement of financial position relating to cash transfers in the reporting period on a program basis.**
46. The disclosures required by this Standard are of the minimum amounts expected to be transferred. They exclude projections of cash transfers for future potentially eligible individuals or households that have not satisfied threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date; for example, individuals who are likely to satisfy eligibility criteria in the next reporting period. They do not include projections of future cash transfers for individuals who have made contributions, or for whom contributions have been made by third parties, sufficient to entitle them to the

receipt of benefits at a future date, but who have not satisfied all threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date. An entity is encouraged to further categorize the amounts expected to be transferred according to the timing of the payments; for example under one year, after one year but not later than five years, and after five years. An entity is also encouraged to disclose broader assessments of the projected inflows and outflows associated with particular programs, so as to enhance the ability of users to assess the sustainability of those programs in the future. Where an entity discloses projections of outflows and inflows in relation to programs providing social benefits that exceed the requirements in this Standard, the entity is required to identify separately the information required by this Standard.

47. This Standard requires disclosures to be made on a program basis. Many entities operate a large number of cash transfer programs and judgment is needed to assess which programs should be presented on an individual basis and which should be aggregated in applying the concept of materiality in paragraphs 45–47 of IPSAS 1, “Presentation of Financial Statements.” In making this materiality assessment, preparers will consider both quantitative and qualitative factors. Quantitative factors include (but are not limited to) the proportion of the entity’s operating costs that are attributable to a particular program, and recent growth in expenditure for particular programs. Qualitative factors include (but are not limited to) the extent to which voluminous disclosures might impair understandability, levels of interest in particular programs shown by users and the extent to which the information in the note disclosure is the primary source of financial information to users.
48. This Standard requires the disclosure of the principal assumptions used to determine amounts expected to be transferred, any changes to those assumptions since the previous reporting date and the financial effects of the changes in assumptions. Entities are encouraged but not required to provide information on the sensitivity of projections to particular variables; for example the effect of a percentage point change in the average period of eligibility for unemployment benefit.
49. In accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3, this Standard does not include requirements for the recognition of liabilities and expenses related to social benefits. However, paragraph 45(i) requires entities to disclose the accounting policies adopted for the recognition of expenses and liabilities related to cash transfers to individuals or households. Paragraph 45(i) also requires entities to disclose the amount of any expenses recognized in the statement of financial performance and liabilities recognized in the statement of financial position relating to cash transfers to individuals or households. This information is disclosed on a program basis. Paragraph 132(c) of IPSAS 1 requires an entity to disclose other accounting policies that are relevant to an understanding of the financial statements. This may include the accounting policies for the recognition

of expenses and liabilities related to collective goods and services and individual goods and services.

Initial Adoption of this Standard

50. **In the first year of adoption of this Standard, an entity is not required to provide comparative information.**
51. Paragraph 50 provides relief to all entities from disclosing comparative information in the first year of adoption of this Standard. An entity is encouraged to include comparative information where this is available.

Effective Date

52. **This International Public Sector Accounting Standard becomes effective for annual financial statements covering periods beginning on or after MM DD 20IX (two years after issuance). Earlier application is encouraged. If an entity applies this Standard for a period beginning before MM DD 20IX (two years after issuance) it shall disclose that fact.**
53. When an entity adopts the accrual basis of accounting as defined by IPSASs for financial reporting purposes subsequent to this effective date, this Standard applies to the entity's annual financial statements covering periods beginning on or after the date of adoption.

ILLUSTRATIVE DISCLOSURES OF MINIMUM ITEMS REQUIRED BY THIS STANDARD

This guidance is for illustrative purposes only and is not meant to be prescriptive. The guidance accompanies, but is not part of IPSAS XX. In all the examples there is a reporting date of December 31.

Unemployment Benefit

1. Unemployment benefit is administered under the provisions of the Employment Act 1976, as amended by the Employment Acts of 1992 and 2003. Regulations laid under these Acts provide a number of detailed requirements. The main eligibility criteria are that individuals are:
 - Aged over 18, but under retirement age for a basic/welfare social security pension (currently 65 years);
 - Have not been in paid employment for a period of seven days;
 - Available for work; and
 - Actively seeking work — benefit may be terminated if an individual rejects more than three offers of work.

2. This disclosure provides an estimate of the amounts expected to be transferred to eligible individuals or households that have satisfied threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date. The estimate is a gross figure and is not offset by inflows such as taxation, appropriations and transfers from other levels of government. It does not take account of possible income tax or other deductions payable by eligible individuals.

<i>Present Value of Amounts Expected to be Transferred to All Eligible Individuals or Households at Reporting Date</i>	December 31, 20X2 (millions of currency units)	December 31, 20X1 (millions of currency units)
--	---	---

850

855

3. The number of eligible individuals at the reporting date was:

December 31, 20X2	December 31, 20X1
(000s)	(000s)
1,015	1,123

SOCIAL BENEFITS: DISCLOSURE OF CASH TRANSFERS
TO INDIVIDUALS OR HOUSEHOLDS

4. In making the projections, key assumptions in relation to those who receive benefits are that (where these assumptions have changed figures in brackets present the position at December 31, 20X1):
- 40% of those in receipt of benefit as at December 31, 20x2 will return to work or otherwise cease to be eligible for benefit within one year of the reporting date (42% as at December 31, 20 X1);
 - A further 35% will return to work or otherwise cease to be eligible for benefit within three years of the reporting date (31% as at December 31, 20X1);
 - A further 10% will return to work or otherwise cease to be eligible for benefit within five years of the reporting date (12% as at December 31, 20X1);
 - The remaining 15% of individuals currently eligible will still be claiming benefit after 5 years from the reporting date.
5. It is assumed that benefits payable under the program will increase in line with Central Bank targets for inflation. Currently this target is 2% a year.
6. The time value of money recognizes that cash outflows in years immediately following the reporting date are more onerous than those arising in later years. For this reason, projections are discounted to their present value using a discount rate that is not adjusted for risk. The rates used in this reporting period and the previous reporting period were:

December 31, 20X2	December 31, 20X1
2.4%	2.1%

7. The financial effect of the changes in assumptions is (millions of currency units):
- Decrease in expense due to change in discount rate: 101
- Increase in expense due to changes in other assumptions: 58
8. An external actuary was consulted on the assumptions used in determining these projections.
9. Currently liabilities and expenses related to unemployment benefit are recognized on a due and payable basis. This means that the next payment following the satisfaction of the eligibility criteria, listed in paragraph 1 above, is expensed when eligibility criteria are satisfied. Any payments that have not been made at the reporting date are recognized as liabilities in the statement of financial position. During the financial year ended December 31, 20X2 an expense of 39.2 million currency units was incurred (38.9 million currency units for the financial year ended December 31 20X1). At the reporting date, a liability of 1.4 million currency units was recognized (1.37 million currency units as at December 31 20X1).

Social Security Pension

1. The social security pension is a contributory program administered under the provisions of the Social Assistance Act 1962, as amended by the Social Assistance Acts of 1990 and 2002. Regulations laid under these Acts provide a number of detailed requirements. The social security pension is payable to all individuals over the age of 62 years who satisfy the following eligibility criteria:
 - Have a record of a minimum of 48 monthly contributions;
 - Have been residents within the jurisdiction for a minimum of three years;
 - Continue to be residents within the jurisdiction; and
 - Have annual incomes not higher than 20,000 currency units per annum and assets no greater than 50,000 currency units at September 30, 20X2.
2. This disclosure provides an estimate of the amounts expected to be transferred to individuals who have satisfied all eligibility criteria at the reporting date. The estimate is a gross figure and is not offset by inflows such as taxation, appropriations and transfers from other levels of government or by income tax or other deductions payable by eligible individuals.

<i>Present Value of Amounts Expected to be Transferred to Eligible Individuals or Households at Reporting Date</i>	December 31, 20X2 (millions of currency units)	December 31, 20X1 (millions of currency units)
	870	850

3. The number of eligible individuals at the reporting date was:

December 31, 20X2	December 31, 20X1
(000s)	(000s)
2,153	2,134

4. In making the projections, key assumptions in relation to individuals who receive the social security pension are that (where these assumptions have changed, figures in brackets present the position at 31, December 20X1):
 - The average life expectancy for individuals eligible and in receipt of the general/contributory pension is 83 years two months for women and 78 years five months for men (83 years one months for women and 78 years three months for men);

SOCIAL BENEFITS: DISCLOSURE OF CASH TRANSFERS
TO INDIVIDUALS OR HOUSEHOLDS

- 2.4% of those eligible and receiving the general/contributory pension will cease to satisfy eligibility requirements related to annual income and asset holdings over the four years following the reporting date (2.5%); and
 - 1.1% of those eligible and receiving the general/contributory pension will cease to maintain resident status within ten years of the reporting date (1.0%).
5. It is assumed that the social security pension will increase in line with government targets for inflation plus one percentage point. Currently the inflation target is 2.5% a year.
6. Because of the time value of money, cash outflows in years immediately following the reporting date are more onerous than those arising in later years. For this reason, projected cash flows are discounted to their present value. A discount rate determined by reference to the yield on high quality bonds at the reporting date is used. Such a rate is considered to be the best reflection of the time value of money. The rates used in this reporting period and the previous reporting period were:

December 31, 20X2	December 31, 20X1
-------------------	-------------------

2.4%

2.2%

7. The financial effect of the changes in assumptions is (millions of currency units):
Decrease in expense due to change in discount rate: 98
Increase in expense due to changes in other assumptions: 45
8. A directly employed actuary was consulted on the assumptions used in determining these projections.
9. Currently liabilities and expenses related to the social security pension are recognized when all eligibility criteria have been satisfied. An expense is recognized for benefits relating to the period up to the reporting date. If a payment is outstanding at the reporting date, the proportion of that payment that relates to the reporting period is recognized as an expense in the statement of financial performance and a liability in the statement of financial position. During the financial year ended December 31, 20X2, an expense of 62.1 million currency units was incurred. At the reporting date, a liability of 3.2 million currency units was recognized.

Basis for Conclusions

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, the Standard.

Introduction

- BC1. This Basis for Conclusions summarizes the IPSASB's considerations in reaching the conclusions in ED 34, "Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households." Individual members of the IPSASB gave greater weight to some factors than to others.
- BC2. IPSAS 19 was issued in October 2002. Social benefits were scoped out of IPSAS 19 to allow further consideration to be given to the topic. The ITC, "Accounting for the Social Policies of Government" was published in January 2004. The ITC proposed that the conceptual approach and definitions in IPSASs could be applied in determining when obligations arise from social policies in a non-exchange context. Respondents to the ITC supported this approach.
- BC3. The IPSASB's intention, when initiating this component of the project and throughout much of its development, was to develop a Standard with requirements for the identification of present obligations and the recognition and measurement of liabilities related to social benefits. The IPSASB's deliberations, together with global developments in accounting for social benefits after the project was initiated, led to a view that it should conduct a further and separate consultation on certain key issues related to recognition and measurement prior to finalizing its views on these issues. The IPSASB has therefore issued a Consultation Paper, "Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement" at the same time as the ED in order to promote a debate on these key issues. The IPSASB also initiated a project on long-term fiscal sustainability reporting in late 2007 and is also examining the reporting of the long-term fiscal sustainability of social benefit programs in the context of general purpose financial reporting in its project on the conceptual framework.
- BC4. For the above reasons, the Standard does not address the recognition and measurement or disclosure of expenses and liabilities related to social benefits. It deals only with the disclosure of amounts expected to be transferred under cash transfer programs to individuals or households that have met threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date. Such individuals or households are defined as eligible individuals or households. The IPSASB acknowledges that the Standard is a preliminary pronouncement. However, it considers that the proposed requirements are highly useful staging posts in the adoption of approaches towards accounting for social benefits for both accrual reporting and long-term sustainability reporting and that the information provided will be worthwhile to the users of general purpose financial statements. The proposed requirements are also a bridge between accrual based reporting and long-term fiscal sustainability reporting.

Scope

- BC5. The IPSASB considered whether the Standard should have within its scope all cash transfers including social security pensions and other benefits to citizens who have reached a specified retirement age. The IPSASB recognized the views of those who argue that social security pensions are so significant to the operations and financial position of many governments and public sector entities that they should be addressed in a separate Standard.
- BC6. The IPSASB concluded that, because the requirements for social security pensions do not differ from other cash transfer programs, social security pensions should be dealt with in the same Standard. The IPSASB saw little merit in developing a separate Standard, which would largely mirror the requirements and guidance for social benefits where attainment of retirement age is not an eligibility criterion. The IPSASB also acknowledged that, whilst they are of great fiscal significance in many jurisdictions, social security pensions are not the largest cash transfer program in many jurisdictions with developing economies.
- BC7. The IPSASB also considered whether the Standard should have within its scope cash transfer programs financed by contributions and/or earmarked taxation as well as those financed by general taxation. In the context of recognition and measurement, the IPSASB acknowledges the view that the payment of contributions by, or on behalf of, an individual may give rise to requirements different from those for programs financed from general taxation. The IPSASB concluded that the financing or funding of a program should not have an impact on the requirements of the Standard and that, therefore, cash transfer programs financed by contributions and/or earmarked taxation, should be within the scope.

Definitions

- BC8. The IPSASB considered whether the term social benefits should be defined. It noted the view of the Steering Committee that what constitutes social benefits varies between jurisdictions and that this makes the adoption of an exhaustive definition problematic. At consultation on the ITC, responses were almost evenly split as to whether a definition is necessary.
- BC9. There is an attraction in relying on a general notion of social benefits. However, on balance, it was decided that, in order to facilitate a full analysis of potential requirements, the term should be defined. As a starting point, the IPSASB took the definition used in the scope out in IPSAS 19. The IPSASB agreed that any definition should be generic rather than a detailed list of benefits and programs falling into particular categories.
- BC10. The IPSASB also noted the current definition of social benefits in statistical reporting bases including the Government Finance Statistics Manual 2001 (GFSM 2001), which itself is consistent with the System of National Accounts (SNA 1993). The IPSASB agreed with the view of the Steering Committee that, while this proposed Standard should use terminology consistent with statistical reporting

bases wherever possible, the definition of social benefits should be broader than that used in GFSM 2001. In this context, the IPSASB noted that GFSM 2001 explains that “there is no universally accepted definition of the scope of social benefits and the social risks covered are liable to vary from scheme to scheme and from government to government.”

BC11. The IPSASB therefore adopted a three part definition of social benefits as:

- Cash transfers;
- Goods and services provided for collective consumption; and
- Goods and services provided for individual consumption.

BC12. In the Standard, the shorthand terms collective goods and services and individual goods and services are used. The distinction between collective goods and services and individual goods and services is so entrenched in statistical accounting literature that the IPSASB concluded that it should be retained. It is also useful for analytical purposes as programs and arrangements for individual goods and services have eligibility criteria, unlike collective goods and services. This characteristic is shared with cash transfers.

BC13. The IPSASB examined the nature of individual goods and services and cash transfers, and considered the differences between them. The IPSASB identified one significant distinction. Whereas for individual goods and services the transferor can stipulate the purposes to which the resources must be applied, for cash transfers the individual or household has full discretion how to use those transferred resources. The IPSASB acknowledged that in cases in which the transfer of economic benefits is in the form of goods, it may be possible for the recipient to sell those goods rather than use them for the purposes specified by the transferor. However, this requires a positive further action on the part of the recipient and is likely to be at a distressed value.

BC14. There may be cases in which individuals or households are provided with cash for the purchase of specific goods and services. The IPSASB is of the view that such transfers are reimbursements and meet the definition of individual goods and services. In common with other methods of providing individual goods and services, the recipient does not have full discretion as to how the resources are to be used. The expenditure relating to such reimbursements will often require prior authorization and normally reimbursements will only be made after documented proof that the expenditure for which reimbursement is sought has been for purposes specified by the transferor. Such transactions are therefore different in substance from cash transfers.

BC15. In some cases, cash transfers will be made to individuals as reductions in the amount of income tax for which they are liable. The IPSASB concluded that, if government uses the tax system as a convenient method of paying benefits to taxpayers which would otherwise be paid using another method, such reductions should be within the definition of a cash transfer in this proposed Standard.

However, if allowances are only available to individuals who incur tax liabilities, they are tax expenditures: that is, preferential provisions of the tax law that provide taxpayers with concessions that are not available to others and are not social benefits. Consistent with the approach adopted in IPSAS 23, tax expenditures are foregone revenue; consequently they are not expenses paid through the tax system. They are therefore outside the scope of the Standard. This treatment is also consistent with the requirements on offsetting in paragraphs 48 and 49 of IPSAS 1.

Extent of Amounts to be Transferred

BC16. Having decided that the ED should not deal with recognition and measurement and should not require disclosures for collective and individual goods and services, the IPSASB considered whether the determination of amounts expected to be transferred at the reporting date should be restricted to eligible individuals or households, or whether it should include other groups, such as those expected to become eligible over a predetermined timeframe, or, for contributory programs, those currently making contributions.

BC17. The IPSASB concluded that the determination of the best estimate of the amount expected to be transferred should be limited to eligible individuals or households at the reporting date and that it should be a gross amount not offset by inflows or by income tax or other deductions payable by beneficiaries. This is because the IPSASB wishes to facilitate adoption of the Standard by as many entities as possible and therefore considers that the requirements should be straightforward. The IPSASB acknowledges that the estimate is a minimum amount and that entities in some jurisdictions may wish to make a more extensive disclosure that goes beyond the requirements in the Standard. The Standard includes a strong encouragement for entities to make more extensive disclosures. Where an entity makes more extensive disclosures, the Standard specifies that the amounts it requires to be disclosed are identified separately from other amounts disclosed.

Treatment of Revalidation Requirements

BC18. A number of cash transfer programs require eligible individuals or households to revalidate their eligibility at a future date. Requirements for revalidation are normally laid down in the legislation or regulations governing the program. The IPSASB considered how revalidation requirements should be addressed in the ED.

BC19. The IPSASB explored 3 options:

- (a) That the best estimate of the amount expected to be transferred should be limited to the next revalidation point;
- (b) That the best estimate of the amount expected to be transferred should take into account the extent to which eligible individuals or households would revalidate eligibility requirements on a continuous basis; or

- (c) That the best estimate of the amount expected to be transferred should take into account the extent to which eligible individuals or households would subsequently resatisfy threshold eligibility criteria in the future after a period of ineligibility.

BC20. The IPSASB considered that adoption of option (a) would provide limited information to users. This is because the amounts disclosed would depend completely upon the timing of eligibility revalidation requirements. Thus, different amounts would be disclosed for two programs with identical benefits and eligibility requirements, dependent upon the proximity of the date of revalidation to the reporting date. The IPSASB does not consider that this would enhance the comparability of reporting.

BC21. The IPSASB acknowledged the advantages of option (c), but concluded that, for a number of programs, entities might have the option to modify benefits after a period of ineligibility and that amounts disclosed on this basis might therefore be misleading. The IPSASB therefore concluded that option (b) is the best approach and that the amount to be transferred should take into account an estimate of the extent to which eligible individuals or households would revalidate eligibility requirements on a continuous basis. The IPSASB uses the term continuous eligibility to describe this approach.

Discount Rate

BC22. In considering the discount rate that should be used to discount amounts to be transferred under cash transfer programs to eligible individuals or households, the IPSASB considered whether it should explicitly require a rate based on yields on government bonds, high quality corporate bonds or another financial instrument. The IPSASB also acknowledged the view that the discount rate might be based on the expected long-term rate of return of the assets held to meet expected payments. The IPSASB acknowledges that there are jurisdictions where such an approach has been implemented. However, the IPSASB considered that such an approach is not feasible globally because, in most instances, there will not be assets held to meet the expected payments. The IPSASB concluded that the requirement should be principles based and that the discount rate should reflect the time value of money. In many jurisdictions government bonds will best reflect the time value of money. However, the IPSASB concluded that, globally, this will not always be the case and that it should be left to the professional judgment of preparers to determine which instrument provides a rate that best reflects the time value of money.

BC23. In extreme fiscal conditions, governments and other public sector entities may have the option to modify the terms of existing conditions for programs providing social benefits. The extent of this option will depend upon constitutional arrangements and other local circumstances. In practice, such discretion is likely to be highly limited in respect of individuals or households that have already satisfied threshold eligibility criteria. The IPSASB concluded that such options

should be reflected in the forecasting of cash flows rather than by the inclusion of a premium for risk in the discount rate.

Other Assumptions

BC24. The IPSASB considered whether there should be a requirement for entities to consult qualified actuaries on the assumptions necessary to meet the requirements of the Standard. The IPSASB concluded that, in many cases, it will be necessary for an actuary to be consulted, but that this should be left to the judgment of preparers. Entities are required to disclose whether qualified actuaries have been consulted, and, if so, whether they are internal employees or external to the entity.

Other Disclosures

BC25. The IPSASB considered whether it should require trend information covering the current reporting period and the four previous reporting periods for certain disclosures. The IPSASB concluded that requirements for trend information may be onerous for preparers and of limited value to users. Disclosures of trend information are therefore not required.

BC26. The IPSASB considered whether there should be a disclosure requirement for the number of eligible individuals or households. The IPSASB acknowledged the view that many programs delivering cash transfers are complex and subject to regular modification and therefore that such a disclosure might not provide relevant information. On balance, the IPSASB concluded that information on the number of eligible individuals or households is useful in putting the financial disclosures into context and that it should be required.

BC27. Whilst the Standard does not deal with the recognition and measurement of expenses and obligations related to cash transfer programs, the IPSASB considers that information on the accounting policy for the recognition and measurement of expenses and liabilities related to cash transfer programs and the amounts of expenses and liabilities recognized is relevant for users. Paragraph 45(i) therefore includes such a disclosure requirement.

Arrangements for Implementation

BC28. The IPSASB considered how the requirements in the Standard should be implemented. The IPSASB acknowledged that some entities may not have the systems in place to provide the necessary information to meet the requirements. However, the Standard is a preliminary pronouncement and a very extensive implementation period is likely to delay further developments in accounting for social benefits. Therefore, the IPSASB decided that the Standard should take effect for reporting periods beginning on a date two years after its issuance. Because of the relatively short implementation period, the IPSASB concluded that it was appropriate to include relief from providing comparative information in the first year of adoption.



International Federation of Accountants

545 Fifth Avenue, 14th Floor, New York, NY 10017 USA

Tel +1 (212) 286-9344 Fax +1 (212) 286-9570 www.ifac.org

Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement



REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

The IPSASB welcomes comments on the proposals in this Consultation Paper. Please submit your comments, preferably by email, so that they will be received by **July 15, 2008**. All comments will be considered a matter of public record. Comments should be addressed to:

Technical Director
International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board
International Federation of Accountants
277 Wellington Street West
Toronto Ontario Canada M5V 3H2

Email responses should be sent to: edcomments@ifac.org

Copies of this consultation paper may be downloaded free-of-charge from the IFAC website at <http://www.ifac.org>.

Copyright © March 2008 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Permission is granted to make copies of this work provided that such copies are for use in academic classrooms or for personal use and are not sold or disseminated and provided that each copy bears the following credit line: *“Copyright © March 2008 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Used with permission of IFAC. Contact permissions@ifac.org for permission to reproduce, store or transmit this document.”* Otherwise, written permission from IFAC is required to reproduce, store or transmit, or to make other similar uses of, this document, except as permitted by law. Contact permissions@ifac.org.

ISBN: 978-1-934779-31-6

SPECIFIC MATTERS FOR COMMENT

The IPSASB welcomes comments on all of the proposals in this Consultation Paper. Comments are most useful when they include the reasons for agreeing or disagreeing. If you disagree please provide alternative proposals. You are also asked to provide details of current policies for recognizing and measuring liabilities for programs that deliver social benefits in your jurisdictions

1. Do you agree that, within the constraints of the current implied conceptual framework for general purpose financial reporting, current financial statements such as the statement of financial position and the statement of financial performance cannot convey sufficient information by themselves to users about the financial condition of governmental programs providing social benefits? Please state your reasons.

2. Do you think that a present obligation to individuals or households arises at any time for:

- a) Collective goods and services; and/or
- b) Individual goods and services?

If you think a present obligation does arise for either (a) or (b) or both (a) and (b) please indicate when and indicate your reasons.

3. Do you think that a present obligation to individuals or households in respect of cash transfers arises when all eligibility criteria have been satisfied for:

- a) Non-contributory programs; and/or
- b) Contributory programs?

If you think that a present obligation arises at an earlier point for (a) or (b) or both (a) and (b), please indicate that point and give your reasons.

4. Where a cash transfer program requires individuals or households to revalidate their entitlement to benefits, do you think that revalidation is an attribute that should be taken into account in the measurement of the liability or a recognition criterion? Please state your reasons.

5. Do you think that in developing requirements for recognition and measurement of social benefits the IPSASB should further explore the executory contract accounting model briefly outlined in Key Issue 6. Please state your reasons.

Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement

The IPSASB Strategy on Accounting for Social Benefits

1. The purpose of this Consultation Paper is to:
 - Explain the IPSASB's strategy for developing approaches to address the issues involved in accounting for social benefits, including the reason for initiating a project on long-term fiscal sustainability reporting;
 - Explore some key issues in recognizing and measuring liabilities and expenses related to social benefits; and
 - Spread knowledge, and stimulate discussion, of current approaches to recognizing and measuring liabilities and expenses for different types of programs delivering social benefits in particular jurisdictions.

Background

2. IPSAS 19, "Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets" was issued in October 2002. Social benefits provided in non-exchange transactions were, however, excluded from the scope of IPSAS 19. An Invitation to Comment, "Accounting for Social Policy Obligations" was issued in January 2004. The ITC proposed that the principles in IPSASs should be applied to accounting for social benefits provided in non-exchange transactions. Comments from constituents generally supported this proposal, and the IPSASB decided to use the principles of IPSAS 19 to develop recognition and measurement requirements for social benefits provided in non-exchange transactions.
3. The IPSASB commenced a further stage of its project in April 2005, intending to develop an Exposure Draft of an IPSAS that proposed requirements for identifying present obligations related to all social benefits and recognizing and measuring liabilities.
4. In developing an exposure draft, the IPSASB considered:
 - The objectives of general purpose financial reports (GPFs) in the public sector, in particular the GPFs of governments responsible for providing social programs, and how best to meet the information needs of users;
 - Whether the financial position of governments would be faithfully represented by recognizing liabilities associated with expected future outflows for social programs, while at the same time not recognizing the future inflows of future tax revenue as an asset; and
 - The appropriateness of the current definitions in IPSASs, in particular those in IPSAS 19 associated with liabilities.
5. In considering these issues the IPSASB concluded that, within the constraints of its current implied conceptual framework for general purpose financial reporting, traditional approaches to liability recognition may not be suitable for conveying information to users about the future provision of social programs by governments. In doing so, the IPSASB acknowledged the limitations of the primary financial statements including the statement of financial position and notes thereto. These limitations exist because, although primary

financial statements use estimation techniques to measure liabilities by reference to settlement amounts in future reporting periods, they focus primarily on past events.

6. This view led the IPSASB to consider other ways of conveying relevant information about social benefit programs to users. The IPSASB saw merit in requiring disclosures within the GPFRs about amounts expected to be transferred to individuals or households presently eligible for benefits under social programs. It therefore developed an Exposure Draft (ED) 34, “Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households.” The IPSASB acknowledged that this is a preliminary step, of itself insufficient to satisfy user needs completely.
7. The IPSASB also began to explore the role that disclosures about long-term fiscal sustainability reporting could play in helping to convey relevant information to users about the future viability of a government’s social programs. Although the IPSASB accepts that there is uncertainty associated with such information, it considers that such information is highly relevant.

Strategic Approach to Addressing Social Benefits Accounting Issues

8. Therefore the IPSASB has concluded that:
 - The proposed disclosure requirements in ED 34 represent an important first step in signaling the importance of governments providing users with relevant information about their social programs,
 - Further consultation should be carried out on certain key issues relating to the recognition and measurement of liabilities and expenses relating to social benefits, as a step in developing further guidance, and
 - A project should be initiated to assess whether disclosures about long-term fiscal sustainability might enhance the reporting of the impact of such programs by complementing the information reported in the GPFRs.

Conceptual Framework Projects

9. The IPSASB’s Conceptual Framework project was initiated by the IPSASB in collaboration with a number of national standard setters in mid 2006. The project has already considered broadening (a) the objectives of financial reporting to include *accountability* and (b) the scope of financial reporting to include *general purpose financial reporting*, not just *general purpose financial statements*. The project has also recognized the long-term fiscal sustainability of social benefit programs as an aspect of financial reporting that could be significant to discharging accountability in the public sector. Also, the project has a component dealing with the elements of financial statements that will address the definitions of assets and liabilities. This is particularly significant, because many consider that applying the existing definitions of assets and liabilities in IPSASs would not lead to a faithful presentation of governmental responsibility for delivering social benefits in the future.
10. The IASB is revising its own Conceptual Framework and is also conducting a fundamental review of its Standard, IAS 37, “Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets,”

on which IPSAS 19 was based. Developments in thinking as a result of both projects and the development of the IPSASB's Conceptual Framework are likely to influence the development of further approaches to recognizing and measuring liabilities related to all social benefits.

Long-term fiscal sustainability reporting

11. In its 2007-2009 Strategy and Operational Plan, the IPSASB stated its intention to initiate a project on long-term fiscal sustainability reporting and has issued a project brief on that subject. It welcomes comments on that brief.
12. At a very high level, fiscal sustainability involves an assessment of the extent to which governmental obligations under existing legal frameworks can be met in the future. The analysis of fiscal sustainability therefore takes account of both current and future eligible individuals or households, regardless of whether obligations to them exist at the reporting date. Fiscal sustainability is sometimes coupled with the concept of inter-generational equity, which evaluates the extent to which future generations of taxpayers will have to deal with the fiscal consequences of policies currently delivering social benefits in the form of goods and services.
13. Fiscal sustainability reporting may be a more versatile accountability tool than accrual-based financial statements, because such reporting involves the projection of inflows as well as outflows. Already a number of jurisdictions have made impressive progress in developing reports on long-term fiscal sustainability as key aspects of financial accountability, even though no universally-agreed framework exists for preparing such reports.

Conclusion

14. This Consultation Paper is one of three documents published together as an integrated package; the other two are ED 34, "Social Benefits: Disclosure of Cash Transfers to Individuals or Households" and a Project Brief on "Long-term Fiscal Sustainability Reporting."
15. The IPSASB looks forward to receiving comments from interested parties on ED 34, the long-term fiscal sustainability reporting project brief and the key issues relating to recognizing and measuring liabilities related to all social benefits identified in this Consultation Paper.

Social Benefits: Issues in Recognition and Measurement

Definitions

16. The IPSASB defines *social benefits* as;

- (a) Cash transfers; and
- (b) Collective and individual goods and services

that are provided by an entity to individuals or households in non-exchange transactions to protect the entire population, or a particular segment of the population, against certain social risks."

17. The IPSASB has distinguished three types of social benefits:

Collective goods and services are social benefits in the form of goods and services provided to the entire population or to a particular segment of the population in any jurisdiction, to protect the population or one of its segments against certain social risks. Collective goods and services include national defense and most aspects of the criminal justice system.

Individual goods and services are social benefits in the form of goods and services provided to protect an individual or household against certain social risks. Individual goods and services include healthcare and educational services provided directly to the recipient.

A cash transfer to an individual or household is a social benefit, which is either provided directly in cash, or is an expense paid through the tax system, to protect individuals or households against certain social risks where use of the resources transferred is at the discretion of the individual or household. Cash transfers include social security pensions, child benefits and unemployment benefits.

18. These terms were used in the ITC, although they have been modified slightly during the course of the project. They are similar to, although not synonymous with, the definitions used in statistical accounting. Access to cash transfers and individual goods and services requires the satisfaction of eligibility criteria by individuals or households. Eligibility criteria are requirements that must be satisfied for entitlement to individual goods and services or cash transfers. Conversely, collective goods and services are automatically consumed by all or part of the population and, therefore, are not normally subject to the satisfaction of eligibility criteria.
19. There is one main distinction between individual goods and services and cash transfers. For individual goods and services the transferor can stipulate the purposes to which the resources must be applied, whereas for cash transfers the recipient has full discretion how to use those transferred resources. The IPSASB acknowledged that, in cases in which the transfer of economic benefits is in the form of goods, it may be possible for the recipient to sell those goods rather than use them for the purposes specified by the transferor. However, this requires a positive further action on the part of the recipient and is likely to be at a distressed value.
20. The IPSASB holds the view that the principles in IPSASs can be applied to the recognition and measurement of social benefits provided in non-exchange transactions. It has therefore considered how definitions and requirements in IPSAS 19, “Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets” can be used, in a non-exchange environment, to develop accounting requirements for different types of social benefits. The core of the project has been to determine when obligating events occur for different types of social benefits. It is therefore important to provide a number of definitions included in IPSASB’s current suite of Standards that are central to this discussion:
- Liabilities are present obligations of the entity arising from past events, the settlement of which is expected to result in an outflow from the entity of resources embodying economic benefits or service potential.

A present obligation only arises from a past event and may be a legal obligation or a constructive obligation. In most cases it is clear whether a past event has given rise to a present obligation. In cases where this is unclear an entity determines whether a present obligation exists at the reporting date.

An obligating event is an event that creates a legal or constructive obligation that results in an entity having no realistic alternative to settling that obligation.

A legal obligation is an obligation that derives from:

- (a) A contract (through its explicit or implicit terms);
- (b) Legislation; or
- (c) Other operation of law.

A constructive obligation is an obligation that derives from an entity's actions where:

- (a) By an established pattern of past practice, published policies or a sufficiently specific current statement, the entity has indicated to other parties that it will accept certain responsibilities; and
- (b) As a result, the entity has created a valid expectation on the part of those other parties that it will discharge those responsibilities.

Assets are resources controlled by an entity as a result of past events and from which future economic benefits or service potential are expected to flow to the entity.

Structure of the Consultation Paper

21. The majority of this Consultation Paper considers whether and, if so, when (a) obligating events occur and therefore (b) subject to the satisfaction of recognition criteria, liabilities should be recognized for:
 - Collective goods and services;
 - Individual goods and services;
 - Cash transfers for non-contributory programs; and
 - Cash transfers for contributory programs.
22. This Paper also considers whether requirements to revalidate eligibility criteria are recognition criteria or measurement attributes. This distinction is important because of the effect on the amount of liabilities recognized. This Paper concludes with a brief section asking whether models should be explored that are not based on IPSAS 19 principles.
23. This Paper only considers non-exchange transactions. Exchange transactions, such as the supply of goods and services under contractual arrangements (for example, a private sector entity providing home care services to aged persons under a contractual agreement with a government agency) are outside its scope. Throughout this Paper the term "government" is used. The term encompasses all public sector entities.

Key Issue 1: Do present obligations to beneficiaries for collective goods and services occur?*Arguments of those who do not consider that present obligations occur*

24. As highlighted above collective goods and services are consumed automatically by all or part of the population and are not normally subject to the satisfaction of eligibility criteria. While the future existence of governments depends on providing collective goods and services (such as defense and criminal justice) at some minimum level in the future, many argue that governments do not have a present obligation to individuals or households for the delivery of collective goods and services. They acknowledge that governments publicly announce future policy intentions, but do not think that such pronouncements are sufficiently specific to give rise to constructive obligations. They also accept that current legal frameworks will require a certain level of provision in the future, but consider that it is important to distinguish present obligations and future obligations or commitments. The general purpose financial statements are only concerned with present obligations.
25. Furthermore the existence of present obligations would lead to recognizing expenses and liabilities where delivery of the goods or services to settle the obligation occurs in subsequent reporting periods. Such an approach would be analogous to a manufacturer recognizing the production costs that will be incurred in future reporting periods on the grounds that it needs to incur such costs in order to remain a going concern.

Arguments of those who consider that present obligations occur

26. Others argue that it is possible for governments to have present obligations for collective goods and services. They consider that, through past practice and public announcements (such as budget reports, policy statements and electoral manifestos), (a) governments have indicated they will continue to provide collective goods and services, (b) citizens have valid expectations that such goods and services will be provided and (c) it is unrealistic for governments to avoid providing such items in the future. The extent of the obligation will depend on the specificity of the past policy announcement.

Key Issue 2: Do present obligations to beneficiaries for individual goods and services occur?*Arguments of those who do not consider that present obligations occur*

27. This section of the Paper explores whether present obligations occur for individual goods and services. Those holding the view that governments do not have a present obligation to provide goods and services for individual or household consumption rely on the argument outlined above for collective goods and services—that is, one, or more, of the conditions necessary for the existence of a present obligation has not been satisfied.

Arguments of those who consider that present obligations occur

28. Those who challenge this view put forward similar arguments to those made in asserting that governments have a present obligation to provide collective goods and services. They emphasize that, like cash transfer programs, access to individual goods and services depends on the satisfaction of eligibility criteria. Satisfaction of eligibility criteria increases

expectations that an individual or household will receive goods and services, and makes it more difficult for governments to avoid providing them. They may also question whether the method by which resources are transferred should dictate accounting treatments for programs that are otherwise similar; they consider it inconsistent for governments to recognize liabilities for individuals or households that have met eligibility criteria under programs delivering benefits in cash, but not to recognize liabilities where those benefits are delivered in the form of goods and services. An example of the latter type of program is one that provides medical benefits where (a) the individual is treated by a third party medical provider under a contractual arrangement with a government agency and (b) the agency pays the medical provider directly.

29. Furthermore, they highlight that the line between cash transfers and individual goods and services is sometimes blurred. For example, individuals may be authorized to purchase specified goods or services and be reimbursed for the expenditure incurred. Some programs may provide both cash transfers and individual goods and services. For example, a housing support program may have a cash transfer component and another component in which third party landlords provide accommodation to beneficiaries under contractual arrangements with a government agency. If it is deemed that a present obligation does not occur to beneficiaries for individual goods and services, an entity might recognize the cash transfer component as a liability to eligible individuals or households, but not the component in which the government agency pays the third party landlord directly.

Extent of present obligations

30. Accepting the view that a present obligation exists for individual goods and services raises the issue of the extent of that obligation. The obligation might be narrow or very broad, dependent on (a) the legal framework governing a program and (b) whether a particular stipulation is deemed to operate as an eligibility criterion or merely as an administrative requirement. For instance, in jurisdictions where free or subsidized education or health care is universally available, that availability raises the issue whether the present obligation is for education or healthcare services throughout an individual's life or, more narrowly, whether it depends on an individual meeting the eligibility criteria of specific entities. Such entities include school boards and hospitals, which may establish criteria for admittance to a school roll or acceptance onto a hospital waiting list. Resolution of this issue may depend on whether the focus is on the individual entity, or on an economic entity such as the whole-of-government.

Impact of arrangements for the provision of goods and services by third parties

31. As previously indicated, this Paper does not discuss present obligations and liabilities arising from contracts with employees and third parties for the delivery of goods and services to individuals or households. The accounting treatment of such contracts is likely to be the same as for any other executory contract. There is a view that the existence of contracts for the supply of goods and services for periods beyond the reporting date implies a commitment to provide benefits beyond the reporting date and therefore potentially a present obligation to individuals or households. Others reject such a link, and consider that the accounting treatment of such executory contracts is remote from, and has no relevance

to, the analysis of whether and when present obligations to individuals or households occur in a non-exchange context.

Key Issue 3: When do obligating events occur for cash transfers for non-contributory programs?

32. This section explores when an obligating event to individuals or households occurs for cash transfers for non-contributory programs—programs largely funded from general taxation that do not require contributions by or on behalf of individuals or households to entitle them to resources. There are a number of views regarding when constructive and legal obligations might arise.

Those who take the view that an obligating event does not occur before all eligibility criteria have been satisfied

33. One view is that an obligating event occurs when, and only when, all eligibility criteria have been satisfied, regardless of whether a legal obligation exists at this point. Those holding this view may accept that some individuals or households have expectations that benefits will be paid in the future. They may also accept that past practice indicates that the government accepts a responsibility to provide benefits. However, they consider that until all eligibility criteria have been satisfied, a government does have a realistic alternative to providing benefits by, for example, modifying governing legislation. The consequence of this view is that any liability recognized in the financial statements is limited to amounts that are due to be paid to individuals or households that have satisfied all eligibility criteria at the reporting date. Globally this has become known as the “due and payable” approach.
34. In most cases a legal obligation will likely occur when all eligibility criteria have been satisfied. However, there may be cases when a legal obligation does not occur until a later time. For example, eligibility criteria may have to be satisfied on 1 March, but payment is not legally required until 1 April. Some take the view that a present obligation can only arise as a result of a legal obligation. Under this view a liability does not arise until the date on which a government is legally required to make a payment even though all eligibility criteria have previously been satisfied. In the above example the liability would arise on 1 April not 1 March. Until an individual or household has a legal entitlement the entity can avoid transferring resources.
35. Some would go further than the above argument and contend that such a present obligation does not extend beyond the reporting date. This is because, although legislation for a program is in place, funding of benefits under that program depends on periodic (normally annual) appropriations. Until appropriations been made it is not legal to make the cash transfer, and therefore the government is unable to pay benefits even if all eligibility criteria have been satisfied.

Those who take the view that an obligating event occurs before all eligibility criteria have been satisfied

36. Another view is that an obligating event creating a constructive obligation might occur at a number of points before satisfaction of all eligibility criteria by individuals or households.

These points have been referred to as “key participatory events.” There are a range of potential “key participatory events” and not all these events are relevant to every program.

37. To explain the term “key participatory events,” consider the simplified example of a social security pension program paying benefits to individuals who are 65 or more years of age. There are no other eligibility criteria. Potential “key participatory events” for such a program include, but are not limited to:
- Birth;
 - Attaining school age;
 - Attaining the minimum age for entry into the workforce; and
 - A point between the minimum age for entry into the workforce and 65 years of age.
38. The rationale for maintaining that an obligating event occurs, for example, on entry into the workforce, is that the government has:
- Indicated through a pattern of past practice, published policies or a sufficiently specific current statement, that it will accept the responsibility of paying benefits to individuals when they reach retirement age;
 - Created a valid expectation for individuals that it will discharge those responsibilities and that expectation crystallizes when an individual attains the minimum age for entry into the workforce; and
 - No realistic alternative to paying benefits after an individual attains the minimum age for entry into the workforce even though the age at which benefits will be paid is many years in the future.
39. This would mean that, if recognition criteria are met, the government would recognize a liability and an expense in respect of the social security pension for individuals when they reach the minimum age for entry into the workforce. The liability and expense would be determined using actuarial principles and would be reassessed at each reporting date.

Practical issues in identifying when an obligating event occurs

40. Some accept that, in principle, an obligating event may occur before satisfaction of all eligibility criteria, but they highlight practical difficulties in identifying that event. Key participatory events may vary between jurisdictions and even between programs within jurisdictions. They may also vary between reporting periods of the same entity for a program as citizen expectations change. For example, in a number of jurisdictions survey evidence shows that younger age groups have lower expectations of a viable social security pension on retirement than older age groups and that those expectations are diminishing. Some consider that this variability would make consistent financial reporting difficult and undermine comparisons between governments. They would therefore prefer to identify the same point at which an obligating event occurs and a liability is recognized for all programs and in all jurisdictions.
41. However, others are less concerned with the fact that the point at which an obligating event occurs may vary between programs and between different entities. They argue that this is

consistent with the principle that different transactions should not be accounted for in the same way. They consider that the term “key participatory event” should be defined as the point, before satisfaction of all eligibility criteria, at which an obligating event occurs. Preparers can then determine when that event occurs, program-by-program. They accept that this event may occur at a different point for similar programs in different jurisdictions, and that this point may fluctuate over time. Even within jurisdictions there may not be a consistent approach to identifying a “key participatory event” in different programs.

42. Those with reservations about recognizing expenses and liabilities before the satisfaction of all eligibility criteria may also question whether such an approach faithfully represents an entity’s financial performance and financial position. They believe that recognizing very large expenses and liabilities related to social benefits on the face of the statement of financial performance and the statement of financial position is inappropriate for what they consider are commitments, but not present obligations. Recognition would present a misleading view of financial condition by showing a Government in an unsound financial light when that may not be the case. In this context, most standard setters that have considered the issue currently take the view that a government’s right to tax does not give rise to an intangible asset that would counter-balance the amount reported as a liability for these events.
43. Those who do not accept the above argument consider that, transactions and other events that meet currently accepted recognition and measurement criteria should be recognized. According to this view it is not acceptable to exclude items because of their magnitude, and because recognition might not show a government in a sound financial light.

Key Issue 4: Do present obligations for cash transfers financed by contributions occur at an earlier point than for non-contributory programs?

Arguments of those who consider that an obligating event occurs at an earlier point

44. Some consider that whether a program is contributory affects the point at which an obligating event occurs. Contributory programs are sometimes known as “social insurance programs.” According to this view, although the conceptual approach taken for Key Issue 3 can be applied, contributory programs should be considered separately from non-contributory programs. This is because it is suggested that an obligating event occurs at an earlier point for contributory programs. Under this view an obligating event occurs earlier because the payment of a specified number, or amount, of contributions creates a valid expectation (or reinforces an existing one) that an individual or household will receive benefits on the basis of a formula under the existing legal provisions governing the program. Such expectations are stronger than for non-contributory programs that are primarily funded from general taxation. Allied to such expectations is the argument that it is unrealistic for the government to avoid paying benefits, even though the point at which payment is required may be many years in the future. This expectation of receiving benefits may be strengthened by other factors such as:
 - Individuals receiving or accessing personal details of estimated future benefits on a periodic or real-time basis; or

- The program operating on a trust fund basis, so that fund assets can only be used for the legally specified purposes of the program and cannot be diverted for other governmental objectives.
45. Some argue that an obligating event occurs for a contributory program when an individual has recorded sufficient contributions to become eligible for benefits at a specified future date without taking further action. For example, for the US Social Security program this point is after an individual has been in 40 quarters of “covered” employment i.e., employment for which contributions are paid by or on behalf of an individual. A variant of this view is to acknowledge that an obligating event occurs before all eligibility criteria have been satisfied, but that, until all are satisfied, the amount of any entitlement cannot exceed the amount of an individual’s contributions, rather than being determined by an actuarially-based estimate.
 46. A different argument, but one that also shares the view that an obligating event occurs before all eligibility criteria have been satisfied, is that contributory programs give rise to quasi-exchange transactions. In this view, obligations under such programs should be recognized and measured in a similar manner to post-employment benefit obligations under IPSAS 25, “Employee Benefits”, which is based on IAS 19, “Employee Benefits.” According to this view, an obligating event occurs when a contribution is first made by or on behalf of a beneficiary. The fact that a proportion of those making contributions (or for whom contributions are being made), will not build a contribution record sufficient to achieve any entitlement to future benefits is (a) a variable to be taken into account in measuring the liability, but (b) is not a reason for not recognizing a liability.

Arguments of those who do not consider that an obligating event occurs at an earlier point

47. Those who argue that a present obligation does not arise until all eligibility criteria have been satisfied challenge the view that there is an earlier point at which a government has no viable alternative but to pay benefits. They emphasize that governments have the ability to amend or repeal legislation, an attribute that distinguishes them from private sector entities. They may acknowledge that individuals receive personal information on the benefits that they are likely to receive, but note that such communications are often accompanied by caveats or other qualifications, for example, that the payment of projected benefits depends on the future viability of the fund from which those benefits are paid. Therefore they argue that the validity of those expectations is doubtful.
48. Contributory programs vary widely in nature and may also depend partially on general taxation for their funding. Some therefore challenge whether citizens’ expectations of receiving benefits in the future for contributory programs are more valid than for non-contributory programs, such as those providing education and housing. Even when a program is non-contributory, individuals may have strong expectations of receiving benefits on the grounds that they are contributing indirectly through general taxation. Dependent upon local circumstances, these expectations may be as strong as if the individuals had made separate contributions, and governments may find it equally unrealistic to avoid providing benefits. Those who emphasize the above factors conclude that accounting for contributory programs should not differ from that for non-contributory

programs and that obligating events occur at the same point, which might be when all eligibility criteria have been satisfied.

49. In some instances fiscal projections suggest that existing benefit levels are unsustainable, and that, assuming that corporate and personal taxation levels and debt levels are viable in a global environment, the government will have little choice but to take action such as raising participants' contributions, reducing benefit levels or deferring the age at which benefits are first received. When programs are administered on a fund basis, benefits may be legally limited to the amount of the accumulated fund balance, so that, under current legislation, at a future point the fund will be exhausted and payments of benefits will not be legally possible unless benefit entitlements or contributions are modified. Therefore, some argue that recognizing liabilities under programs that are unaffordable and unsustainable is misleading, and could not faithfully represent the financial position of a government.

Reservations about relying on the ability of governments to make legislative changes to programs in evaluating present obligations

50. Some disagree with the views identified above. Although they accept that governments have the ability to make legislative changes to existing programs, and that on rare occasions governments have enacted retrospective legislation that repudiates existing liabilities, they are distrustful of a reliance on a government's ability to change legislation when determining the existence and extent of present obligations. They contend that identification of a present obligation should be in the context of the current legislation affecting social benefit programs. They consider that reliance on a government's ability to enact legislative change might be used to disregard a number of obligations, including those that have arisen through exchange transactions. They argue that if a government does modify the legislation affecting social benefit programs, the impact of that change should be reflected in the financial statements for the period in which the change is enacted, and not before. That is, preparers should not prejudge possible changes in legislation. Furthermore, although they acknowledge the tension between legislation specifying the social benefits to be provided and legislation specifying limits on government expenditures or debt, they do not consider that the limited future fiscal sustainability of a program is an adequate reason for not recognizing obligations under current legislation.

Key Issue 5: Is the Revalidation of Eligibility Criteria a Recognition Criterion or a Measurement Attribute?

The Issue

51. This section of the Paper deals with the accounting treatment of the revalidation of eligibility criteria. Many programs delivering social benefits require eligible individuals or households (those who have satisfied threshold eligibility criteria) to revalidate their eligibility at a future date in order to maintain their entitlement to benefits. Requirements for revalidation are normally laid down in the legislation or regulations governing the program. The key issue is whether revalidation is a recognition criterion or a measurement attribute. This decision is significant because it dictates the extent of the present obligation and, if recognition criteria are met, the measurement of the resultant liability.

Arguments of those who argue that revalidation is a recognition criterion

52. Those who believe that revalidation is a recognition criterion consider that the extent of a present obligation cannot exceed the maximum amount that an individual is entitled to receive from one revalidation point to the next. This view is based on the assumption that an entity can avoid further payments beyond the next revalidation date. Some who perceive revalidation as a recognition criterion go further, arguing that “continuing existence” of a beneficiary is an implicit eligibility criterion for all cash transfer programs. “Continuing existence” operates to limit the obligation to that which relates to the reporting date, even where an individual has satisfied all eligibility criteria explicitly laid down in governing legislation or regulations. From an assets and liabilities perspective, such an approach may be based on a presumption that an entity will not have to make further payments beyond the reporting date if an individual were to die. There might be programs under which (a) “continuing existence” is an explicit eligibility criterion and (b) governing legislation or regulations make it clear that the government can recover any resources paid in relation to the period beyond the time of death. Such an approach also results in the cost of providing benefits in what some would consider to be inappropriate reporting periods (also see below paragraph 58 for a discussion of inter-period equity).

Arguments of those who argue that revalidation is a measurement attribute

53. Those with reservations about treating revalidation as a recognition criterion highlight practical problems. First, they argue that treating validation points as key parameters in the determination of obligations and liabilities is not conducive to financial reporting that enhances comparisons between different governments. It leads to recognizing different liabilities, depending completely on the timing and frequency of eligibility revalidation requirements. Thus, two programs with identical benefits and nearly identical eligibility requirements can have different liabilities, because of different revalidation dates.
54. This can be illustrated by considering two social security pension programs. One program does not require the revalidation of eligibility criteria; the other requires those receiving benefits to complete and return a form confirming the beneficiary’s address and that he/she is still alive—this is not just an administrative procedure, because benefits are discontinued if the form is not returned by a specified date. If the entity adopts a policy of recognizing a liability when all eligibility criteria have been satisfied, the obligation for the second program would only extend to the date of revalidation, which may be a matter of a few days or weeks after the reporting date. On the other hand, the obligation recognized under the first program would extend to the end of a beneficiary’s life. Some argue that a difference in the timing of revalidation requirements should not give rise to a large difference in the amount of the recognized liability.
55. Second, they argue that restricting the extent of the present obligation to the maximum amount between revalidation points can give incentives to “gaming”. Liabilities and expenses can be artificially limited by instituting revalidation points shortly after the reporting date. In their view, these arguments lean towards treating revalidation as a measurement attribute. Under that treatment, the expected cash flows included in the

measurement of a liability for social benefits would take into account the probability that existing beneficiaries will satisfy revalidation criteria at future revalidation points.

Key Issue 6: An Alternative Model: Executory Contract Accounting with the Recognition of Liabilities Arising Only from Legal Obligations

56. The previous sections of this paper have highlighted some of the challenges and differences of opinion that have arisen in developing an approach to recognizing and measuring liabilities and expenses related to social programs based on the principles in IPSAS 19. These difficulties lead to the question whether applying another model would provide more useful information about social benefit programs.
57. One alternative model is to view obligations to provide social benefits by governments as quasi-contractual in nature, and adopt executory contract accounting. Executory contracts are contracts in which neither party has performed any of its obligations, or where both parties have partially performed their obligations to an equal extent. Under this model, (a) governmental obligations to provide goods, services and cash transfers to individuals or households and (b) the rights of individuals or households to receive those benefits, are acknowledged as commitments. However, those governmental obligations are effectively offset by the ongoing duty of individuals or households to contribute taxes and other sources of finance. Under this model, liabilities would not arise until legal entitlements have been established. The advantage of recognizing only legal obligations is that the point at which they arise is more objectively identifiable, and therefore subject to less ambiguity than the point at which constructive obligations arise. Long-term fiscal sustainability reporting would complement executory contract accounting by providing a fuller picture of a program's future viability.
58. For some, one advantage of such an approach is that it is consistent with the concept of "inter-period equity." The concept of inter-period equity has been developed by the US Governmental Accounting Standards Board and is a key element of its reporting model. Inter-period equity measures whether revenues in a particular reporting period are sufficient to pay for the goods and services provided in that period. The concept, which is strongly linked to accountability, is based on a view that governments generally have little earned revenue and no profit motive and are very different from profit-oriented entities. Inter-period equity also facilitates the analysis of outputs, outcomes and other performance measures and promotes inter-governmental comparability. Inter-period equity might not be supported by those who favor the strict "assets and liabilities" approach that is reflected in many IPSASs. Under the "assets and liabilities" approach the recognition of revenue and expenses is related to increases and decreases in assets and liabilities.
59. Some may find aspects of this model problematic and it would need to be explored much further before it could be applied. The model is a method of using an exchange transaction approach with modifications for the public sector environment for accounting for social benefits and taxation, which are the main examples of public sector specific non-exchange arrangements. It might also be difficult to argue that constructive obligations do not arise for social benefits, but do arise in areas such as accounting for post-employment benefit

obligations. The model can also be seen as a device that avoids dealing with the conceptual issue of the government's right to tax.

Conclusion

60. Accounting for social benefits is a developing area. The IPSASB acknowledges that the publication of ED 34 and this Consultation Paper are early steps in a journey to developing consistent and globally accepted accounting policies for social benefits. The IPSASB hopes that this Consultation Paper will stimulate debate on the major issues in accounting for social benefits and looks forward to receiving comments from interested parties.



International Federation of Accountants

545 Fifth Avenue, 14th Floor, New York, NY 10017 USA

Tel +1 (212) 286-9344 Fax +1 (212) 286-9570 www.ifac.org