

April 2011

IFRS Foundation

Report of the Trustees' Strategy Review

IFRSs as the Global Standard: Setting a Strategy for the Foundation's Second Decade

Comments to be received by 25 July 2011



**IFRSs as the global standard:
Setting a strategy
for the Foundation's second decade**

Report of the IFRS Foundation
Trustees' Strategy Review

April 2011

Comments requested by 25 July 2011

This document is published by the IFRS Foundation.

30 Cannon Street, London EC4M 6XH, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 (0)20 7246 6410 Fax: +44 (0)20 7246 6411

Email: info@ifrs.org Web: www.ifrs.org

Copyright © 2011 IFRS Foundation®

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be translated, reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form either in whole or in part or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage and retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the IFRS Foundation.

The IFRS Foundation, the authors and the publishers do not accept responsibility for loss caused to any person who acts or refrains from acting in reliance on the material in this publication, whether such loss is caused by negligence or otherwise.

Please address publication and copyright matters to:

IFRS Foundation Publications Department,

1st Floor, 30 Cannon Street, London EC4M 6XH, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 (0)20 7332 2730 Fax: +44 (0)20 7332 2749

Email: publications@ifrs.org Web: www.ifrs.org



The IFRS Foundation logo/the IASB logo/‘Hexagon Device’, ‘IFRS Foundation’, ‘eIFRS’, ‘IAS’, ‘IASB’, ‘IASC Foundation’, ‘IASCF’, ‘IFRS for SMEs’, ‘IASS’, ‘IFRIC’, ‘IFRS’, ‘IFRSs’, ‘International Accounting Standards’, ‘International Financial Reporting Standards’ and ‘SIC’ are Trade Marks of the IFRS Foundation.

1. Summary

In the ten years since its founding, the IFRS Foundation, through its independent standard-setting body, the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), has succeeded in establishing International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRSs) as the accepted set of financial reporting standards in more than 100 countries. In countries where IFRSs are not the locally accepted standard, adoption of IFRSs is under active consideration. As the organisation's second decade begins, the goal of a single high quality globally accepted set of accounting standards is now within reach. The next 18 months will be critical in determining whether this goal is achieved.

As a result of their second five-yearly review of the Constitution and because of the critical nature of the next 18 months, the Trustees launched a comprehensive review of the IFRS Foundation's strategy. This paper sets out a strategy and vision for the IFRS Foundation and the IASB as they evolve as the global accounting standard-setter.

In this paper, the Trustees set out a series of recommendations for the organisation's second decade. These recommendations address four areas: (1) the IFRS Foundation's mission, specifically the public interest served by the Foundation's work; (2) governance; (3) the process and procedures used by the Foundation and the IASB; and (4) the organisation's financing.

In making the recommendations contained in the Strategy Review paper, the Trustees have put forward proposals that affect the different components of the IFRS Foundation. These include actions for (1) the Trustees specifically as the non-executive body responsible for the oversight of the entire gamut of the IFRS Foundation's activities; (2) the Foundation in general (which includes the standard-setting function, an education programme, publication and content-related services, IFRS XBRL development, and general operations); and (3) the operations, procedures and strategy of the IASB, but not its technical activities. Consistently with their Constitutional responsibilities, the Trustees set out in this document a vision related to all three organisational components and identify where specific action is required, where appropriate. The Trustees do not comment on the technical content of IFRSs or possible technical items for the IASB's agenda.

The Trustees acknowledge that they are making these recommendations at a time when a number of major economies are considering the adoption of IFRSs for their domestic economies (including Japan and the United States). For the purpose of the review, the Trustees assume that these major economies will make a positive decision, in some form, on the adoption of global standards. Failure of such commitment on this basis would lead to the reconsideration of some elements of this strategy review document and could lead to modifications in the suggested geographical distribution of the membership of the IFRS Foundation Trustees and the IASB.

In making these recommendations, the Trustees also note that the IFRS Foundation Monitoring Board is undertaking its own review of the Foundation's governance arrangements. The Monitoring Board's review focuses primarily on institutional aspects of governance, particularly the composition and the respective roles and responsibilities of the Monitoring Board, Trustees and IASB. While addressing the issue of governance (in a manner consistent with the Monitoring Board's proposals), this paper addresses broader issues of the IFRS Foundation's mission and operations, the Trustees' activities, the IASB's due process, and financing.

The Trustees are committed to co-ordinating the conclusion of their review with the IFRS Foundation Monitoring Board, in order to arrive at an integrated set of proposals on the basis of the following proposals and the final decisions reached by the Monitoring Board following its separate public consultation.

The Trustees welcome comments on all matters discussed in this strategy review document. Respondents should submit comments in writing so as to be received no later than 25 July 2011. Respondents are asked to send their comments electronically to

Tom Seidenstein
Chief Operating Officer
IFRS Foundation
30 Cannon Street
London EC4M 6XH
United Kingdom
email: strategyreview-comm@ifrs.org

A summary of the principles and recommendations follow:

A. Mission: defining the public interest to which the IFRS Foundation is committed

Purpose of financial reporting standards

- A1** In carrying out the IFRS Foundation's mission as the standard-setting body, the IASB should develop financial reporting standards that provide a faithful presentation of an entity's financial position and performance. Those standards should serve investors and other market participants in their economic and resource allocation decisions. The confidence of all users of financial statements in the transparency and integrity of financial reporting is critically important to the effective functioning of capital markets, efficient capital allocation, global financial stability and sound economic growth.

Adoption of IFRSs

- A2** As the body tasked with achieving a single set of improved high quality global accounting standards, the IFRS Foundation must remain committed to the long-term goal of the global adoption, in their entirety and without modification, of IFRSs as developed by the IASB. Convergence may facilitate adoption over a transitional period. Convergence, however, is not a substitute for adoption. Adoption mechanisms may differ among countries and may require an appropriate period of time to implement but, whatever the mechanism, they should enable relevant entities to have an audit opinion stating full compliance with IFRSs as issued by the IASB.
- A3** With co-operation from national and international market and audit regulators, the IFRS Foundation should seek full disclosure where adoption of IFRSs is incomplete or there is divergence from the full set of IFRSs as issued by the IASB. The Foundation should seek a mechanism to highlight instances where jurisdictions are asserting compliance with IFRSs without adopting IFRSs fully.

Scope of standards and IFRS activities

- A4** In the near term, the primary focus of the IFRS Foundation and the IASB should remain on developing standards for private sector entities (ie both publicly traded entities and SMEs). Taking into account the necessary resource requirements, the Foundation and the IASB will consider developing standards for other entities and for other purposes at a later date.

Consistency of application and implementation

- A5 In pursuing its mission, the IFRS Foundation has a vested interest in helping to ensure the consistent application of IFRSs internationally. The Foundation should pursue that objective in the following ways:
- The IASB, as the standard-setter, should issue standards that are clear, understandable and enforceable.
 - The IASB will provide guidance on its standards that is consistent with a principle-based approach to standard-setting. All application guidance and examples must be necessary to understand the principles.
 - The IASB will work with a network of securities regulators, audit regulators, standard-setters and other stakeholders to identify divergence in practice. Where divergence in practice could be resolved through an improvement in the standard or an interpretation, the IASB or the IFRS Interpretations Committee will act accordingly.
 - The IFRS Foundation, through its education and content services, should undertake activities aimed at promoting consistent application.
 - The IASB, in partnership with relevant authorities, will identify jurisdictions where IFRSs are being modified and encourage transparent reporting of such divergence.
 - The IFRS Foundation will seek the assistance of the relevant public authorities to achieve this objective.

B. Governance: independent and publicly accountable

- B1 The independence of the IASB in its standard-setting decision-making process, within a framework of public accountability, must be maintained.
- B2 The current three-tier structure (Monitoring Board, Trustees, IASB) is appropriate for the organisation's mission. Within that governance structure, the Monitoring Board, the IFRS Foundation and the IASB should enhance their interaction and procedures where appropriate to reinforce the principles of transparency, public accountability and independence. In doing so, the roles and responsibilities of each element of the organisation's governance should be clearly defined.
- B3 Consistently with point B2, the Trustees should further clarify how they discharge their oversight responsibilities.
- B4 Elements of the governance structure should provide regular public reports to demonstrate their effectiveness.

C. Process: ensuring that its standards are of high quality, meet the requirements of a well-functioning capital market and are implemented consistently across the world

- C1 A thorough and transparent due process is essential to developing high quality, globally accepted accounting standards. The IASB's due process is and should continue to be reviewed and further enhanced regularly, benefiting from regular benchmarking against other organisations and from stakeholder advice.
- C2 The framework for the Trustees in their oversight of the IASB's due process should be clarified. The Trustees' Due Process Oversight Committee should review and discuss due process compliance regularly throughout the standard-setting process and at the end of the process before a standard is finalised. The Committee should report regularly on these activities to the Trustees and in its annual report.

- C3** Building on the existing due process framework and in an effort to improve the usability of financial information, the IASB should undertake the following:
- **Clear demonstration of how priorities on its agenda are set:** In the agenda-setting process and after the required public consultation, the IASB should provide full feedback. This will assist in demonstrating how the IASB's priorities are set.
 - **Agreed methodology for field visits/tests and effect analyses:** The IASB should work with relevant parties to develop an agreed methodology for field visits/tests and effect analyses (more often referred to as cost-benefit analyses or impact assessments).
 - **Integration of XBRL into the standard-setting process and the development of relevant XBRL taxonomy extensions:** In order to take into account the impact of technology, the development of the IFRS XBRL taxonomy should be integrated into the IASB's due process. In addition, the IFRS XBRL taxonomy should be expanded to include a relevant number of extensions to the existing base taxonomy.
- C4** To support the IFRS Foundation's interest in consistent application of IFRSs and within the IASB's standard-setting mandate, the Foundation and the IASB should undertake the following actions:
- using an agreed methodology, undertake post-implementation reviews to help identify implementation issues.
 - establish formal co-operation arrangements with securities regulators, audit regulators and national standard-setters to receive feedback on how IFRSs are being implemented and to encourage actions aimed at addressing divergence.
 - refine the scope of the IFRS Interpretations Committee's activities to ensure consistency of interpretation, without undermining the commitment to a principle-based approach to standard-setting.
- C5** The IFRS Foundation and the IASB should encourage the maintenance of a network of national and other accounting standard-setting bodies as an integral part of the global standard-setting process. In addition to performing functions within their mandates, national and other accounting standard-setting bodies should continue to undertake research, provide guidance on the IASB's priorities, encourage stakeholder input from their own jurisdiction into the IASB's due process and identify emerging issues.
- C6** To provide thought leadership in the field of financial reporting, the IASB should establish, or facilitate the establishment of, a dedicated research capacity.

D. Financing: ensuring the organisation is financed in a manner that permits it to operate effectively, efficiently and independently

- D1** The funding system must maintain the independence of the standard-setting process, while providing organisational accountability.
- D2** The existing base of financing should be expanded to enable the IFRS Foundation to serve the global community better and to fulfil the strategy described above. Specifically, funding should be proposed by the Trustees to be on a long-term basis (at least three to five years), be publicly sponsored, be flexible to permit the use of differing mechanisms and to adjust to budgetary needs, be shared among jurisdictions on the basis of an agreed formula (consistent with the principle of proportionality) and provide sufficient organisational accountability.

In the report that follows, the Trustees first provide broader context for the strategy review and the challenges facing the IFRS Foundation. Then the Trustees provide a fuller explanation on each of the recommendations above.

2. Background: the first decade (2001-2010): success and tensions

Much of the success of IFRSs to date is a result of three factors:

- 1 the IASB's strength as an organisation and the quality of IFRSs;
- 2 the European Union's decision to elect the IASB as its standard-setting body, which served as a catalyst for the adoption of IFRSs elsewhere internationally; and
- 3 the willingness of the United States to engage in convergence, accept IFRSs for non-US companies and consider possible adoption for US companies.

The new Foundation was established in 2000 as a non-governmental and independent body, blessed by, but not formally connected to, public institutions. The Foundation inherited a Constitution that established its governance arrangements. The Constitution declared that the new IASB would be focused on creating standards aimed at investor protection. An independent and professional IASB, not beholden to national or special parochial interests, endowed the standards with credibility.

The European Union soon became the catalyst for IFRS adoption worldwide, making IFRSs an alternative to US GAAP for international capital raising. In 2002 the European Union decided to adopt IFRSs for its publicly traded companies as part of the effort to create a common European capital market. Since 2005, the European decision has spurred the advancement of IFRSs across Asia-Oceania, Africa and the Americas.

Lastly, beginning with the 2002 Norwalk agreement, an intensive and joint convergence programme has been a dominant feature of the IASB's agenda. Importantly, the convergence process has led to improvements of the inherited standards, reduced differences with US GAAP, and the removal of the reconciliation requirement by the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). At the same time, the United States has yet to make a final decision on adopting IFRSs. A recent SEC staff work plan indicates that the SEC expects to make a determination in 2011 on the use of IFRSs. This determination will have an impact on the consideration of IFRSs by other major economies (eg China, India and Japan) and the growing number of emerging markets that are implementing IFRSs as their chosen accounting standards.

While these factors have spurred the organisation's success, a number of challenges remain for the organisation:

- **convergence and adoption:** In an effort to facilitate adoption of its standards, the IASB has devoted considerable energy to convergence. But convergence alone will not produce a single set of global standards. A number of countries still need to make decisions to adopt IFRSs for domestic use.
- **quality and implementation of the standards:** Two tensions have arisen in this area. First, the IASB must continue to demonstrate the quality and relevance of its standards to ensure global acceptance, including a need to reflect the lessons learned from the financial crisis. Second, even as the standards are adopted universally, there is a risk that practices related to implementation and adoption will diverge.
- **governance and accountability:** As adoption of IFRSs has extended to more and more countries, public authorities around the world have paid increasing attention to the accountability and governance of the institution. While the IASB's independence has been a source of strength, it is widely understood that those arrangements may need to evolve further, in order to enhance the IFRS Foundation's public accountability.

3. The IFRS Foundation's mission: serving the public interest through financial reporting standards

The IFRS Foundation's Constitution states that the objectives of the Foundation are:

- (a) to develop, in the public interest, a single set of high quality, understandable, enforceable and globally accepted financial reporting standards based upon clearly articulated principles. These standards should require high quality, transparent and comparable information in financial statements and other financial reporting to help investors, other participants in the world's capital markets and other users of financial information make economic decisions.
- (b) to promote the use and rigorous application of those standards.
- (c) in fulfilling the objectives associated with (a) and (b), to take account of, as appropriate, the needs of a range of sizes and types of entities in diverse economic settings.
- (d) to promote and facilitate adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRSs), being the standards and interpretations issued by the IASB, through the convergence of national accounting standards and IFRSs.

The Constitution makes a direct reference to the 'public interest' without providing a specific definition of the public interest. To address the challenges outlined above, the Trustees believe that it is important to define what the public interest means in relation to the IFRS Foundation's activities. In reviewing the Foundation's mission, the Trustees have identified the following areas:

- the purpose of financial reporting standards and standard-setting activities
- global adoption of IFRSs
- the scope of the IASB's work
- the Foundation's role in helping ensure the consistent application of IFRSs.

Purpose of financial reporting standards and standard-setting activities

The Constitution implies a strong investor perspective, while indicating that there are other users of financial information. The financial crisis has raised questions regarding the interaction between financial reporting standards aimed primarily at investors for capital allocation decisions and reporting requirements for, and their impact upon, other public policy objectives (eg prudential regulation, sustainability, anti-corruption measures and others). The question is to what extent and how these perspectives can be reconciled. While these tensions are not new, the financial crisis has served to bring them to the surface again. In order to meet the challenges of the next decade, the Trustees believe that it is important to define how the IASB intends to address these tensions.

The Trustees believe that tensions among the varying objectives are overstated, and the various public policy objectives are all served by transparency in financial reporting. At the same time, the Trustees believe that a clear statement of the Foundation's commitment to providers of capital as the primary, but not exclusive, users of financial information is essential. Therefore, the Trustees have set out the following principle, which is consistent with the IASB's *Conceptual Framework*, to guide the IFRS Foundation and the IASB's work in their second decade:

A1 In carrying out the IFRS Foundation's mission as the standard-setting body, the IASB should develop financial reporting standards that provide a faithful presentation of an entity's financial position and performance. These standards should serve investors and other market participants in their economic and resource allocation decisions. The confidence of all users of financial statements in the transparency and integrity of financial reporting is critically important to the effective functioning of capital markets, efficient capital allocation, global financial stability and sound economic growth.

Indeed, in setting out the above principle, the Trustees are reaffirming the current constitutional focus on the development of financial reporting standards aimed at capital allocation decisions. At the same time, the Trustees believe that transparency in financial reporting is an essential component of addressing the varying public policy perspectives. These perspectives can often be reconciled transparently within a single set of accounting standards. As the global standard-setter and without sacrificing the objective above, the IASB accounts for these perspectives appropriately in the development of high quality accounting standards.

The Trustees believe that the IASB can best account for differing perspectives, including the needs of a range of sizes and types of entities in diverse economic settings, through effective stakeholder engagement with a broad range of parties as part of the IASB's due process. Such a due process is essential to understanding diverse needs and the impact of standards (including their potential cost) and to minimising the need to have multiple reporting requirements. For example, when it comes to issues concerning the interaction of financial reporting and prudential concerns, the IASB should seek to build upon its 'enhanced technical dialogue' established with prudential supervisors and other stakeholders. One possibility would be to formalise existing informal arrangements in a manner that includes regular and joint meetings with specifically designated organisations (such as IOSCO, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, the Financial Stability Board, the IMF and the IAIS).*

At the same time, the Trustees recognise that general purpose financial reporting cannot, by itself, fulfil all public policy objectives that require financial information. In fulfilling its mission, the IASB should emphasise the needs of investors and other financial market participants in their resource allocation decisions. The IASB should work with regulators and other stakeholders, to the maximum extent possible, to enable other authorities to require the display of financial information outside the general purpose financial reports in a way that meets other public policy objectives without compromising transparency.

Global adoption of IFRSs

The IFRS Foundation Constitution states that the organisation's primary objective is to develop 'a single set of high quality, understandable, enforceable and globally accepted financial reporting standards based upon clearly articulated principles.' The Trustees remain committed to the belief that a single set of standards is in the best interests of the global economy, and any divergence from a single set of standards, once transition to IFRSs is complete, can undermine confidence in financial reporting.

A2 As the body tasked with achieving a single set of improved high quality global accounting standards, the IFRS Foundation must remain committed to the long-term goal of the global adoption, in their entirety and without modification, of IFRSs as developed by the IASB. Convergence may facilitate adoption over a transitional period. Convergence, however, is not a

* In addition to the existing enhanced technical dialogue, the IASB meets these groups regularly, most often on a bilateral basis. In a number of jurisdictions, a range of regulatory authorities, including standard-setters (as appropriate), meet regularly. Such a system could be set up on an international basis.

substitute for adoption. Adoption mechanisms may differ among countries and may require an appropriate period of time to implement but, whatever the mechanism, they should enable relevant entities to have an audit opinion stating full compliance with IFRSs as issued by the IASB.

A3 With co-operation from national and international market and audit regulators, the IFRS Foundation should seek full disclosure where adoption of IFRSs is incomplete or there is divergence from the full set of IFRSs as issued by the IASB. The IFRS Foundation should seek a mechanism to highlight instances where jurisdictions are asserting compliance with IFRSs without adopting IFRSs fully.

As described above, companies in more than 100 countries use IFRSs as developed by the IASB. Other countries are in the process of considering the adoption of IFRSs for domestic companies. A number of countries are still focused on bringing about convergence of national standards with IFRSs.

The Trustees recognise that countries will need to establish their own mechanisms for bringing IFRSs formally into national law and are unlikely to cede sovereignty in this area. Regardless of the mechanics of IFRS adoption, the end result should be the same—full adoption of IFRSs as issued by the IASB. Countries may also require some transitional period in the process of fully implementing IFRSs. National authorities will need to assess these transitional requirements against their national circumstances. However, the Trustees strongly support the need to maintain the long-term goal of full adoption of IFRSs.

There is a natural temptation for countries (and stakeholders within those countries) to argue against full adoption of IFRSs, to call for convergence of national standards and IFRSs rather than adoption, or to introduce national exceptions to IFRS rules. The temptation to pursue convergence rather than adoption should be resisted. Full adoption of IFRSs must be the end goal.

Convergence by definition will not lead to a common set of global standards. Convergence may narrow differences, but will not produce identical results because each set of standards has a different starting point and convergence will not address all of the details. Having once converged, standards could well diverge again.

Furthermore, in a world of standards that have converged, issues of mutual recognition are raised. Countries will seek acceptance of their 'equivalent' but different standards for access to capital markets. The benefits of IFRS adoption, particularly in relation to comparability for investors, are partially lost in favouring convergence rather than adoption.

Countries choosing to adopt IFRSs should also avoid creating national or regional variants of IFRSs. Understandably, different interest groups will cite special circumstances as justification for national and regional exceptions. However, national and regional exceptions have a cost, and these long-term costs should be weighed against the perceived immediate benefits.

The Trustees should seek the assistance of relevant public authorities in identifying divergence from full IFRSs. The goal should be twofold. First, disclosure should be made where adoption of IFRSs is incomplete or there is divergence from the full set of IFRSs as issued by the IASB. Second, there should be a mechanism to highlight instances where jurisdictions are asserting compliance with IFRSs without adopting IFRSs fully.

The scope of the IASB's work

The IASB has focused its work on developing standards for private sector (ie non-governmental) for-profit entities. At the same time, there is a demand for internationally consistent standards for the public sector and not-for-profit sectors. Furthermore, stakeholder groups are increasingly asking the IASB to consider issues not directly related to financial reporting for the purposes of making capital allocation decisions (one such example is sustainability reporting).

A4 In the near term, the primary focus of the IFRS Foundation and the IASB should remain on developing standards for private sector entities (both publicly traded entities and SMEs). Taking into account the necessary resource requirements, the Foundation and the IASB will consider developing standards for other entities and for other purposes at a later date.

The Trustees strongly support the need for transparent financial reporting requirements for not-for-profit and public sector bodies. The Trustees also understand the strong public policy interest of other stakeholders in the financial reporting process. Indeed, the Trustees believe they should consider the expansion of the organisation's mandate at some point in the future.

At the same time, in reaching conclusion A4, the Trustees were cognisant of the unsettled status of IFRS global adoption and the limited resources facing the IFRS Foundation. The time horizon for full global adoption of IFRSs is likely to require work over the next several years. At present, there is a need to provide stability to the organisation and the financial reporting environment.

Recognising the importance of financial reporting to other sectors and that its mandate may be broadened in the future, the IASB should develop standards in such a way as not to encourage 'regulatory arbitrage' by enabling entities to opt out of the IFRS regime by changing their category (ie from those covered by IFRSs to those not required to use IFRSs) in order to evade transparency requirements.

The Trustees will actively consider other areas related to financial reporting (eg not-for-profit, public sector, sustainability and others) as the system stabilises and as resources permit. The Trustees note that other standard-setting organisations produce standards on matters outside the current scope of the IASB's work. For example, companies should not establish a particular legal structure merely to avoid accountability using IFRSs. The IFRS Foundation should continue its co-operation, as appropriate, with these organisations. As appropriate, the IASB should agree to memoranda of understanding with these standard-setting organisations to formalise co-operation.

Consistent application of IFRSs

The IFRS Constitution states that the IFRS Foundation should 'promote the use and rigorous application of those standards [IFRSs].' This constitutional provision is an explicit acknowledgement that the success of IFRSs (and the objective of global standards) requires consistency and faithfulness in the application of IFRSs.

In this regard, the Trustees have concluded the following:

A5 In pursuing its mission, the IFRS Foundation has a vested interest in helping to ensure the consistent application of IFRSs internationally. The Foundation should pursue that objective in the following ways:

- **The IASB, as the standard-setter, should issue standards that are clear, understandable and enforceable.**

- **The IASB will provide guidance on its standards that is consistent with a principle-based approach to standard-setting. All application guidance and examples must be necessary to understand the principles.**
- **The IASB will work with a network of securities regulators, audit regulators, standard-setters and other stakeholders to identify divergence in practice. Where such divergence could be resolved through an improvement in the standard or an interpretation, the IASB or the IFRS Interpretations Committee will act accordingly.**
- **The IFRS Foundation, through its education and content services, should undertake activities aimed at promoting consistent application.**
- **The IASB, in partnership with relevant authorities, will identify jurisdictions where IFRSs are being modified and encourage transparent reporting of such divergence.**
- **The IFRS Foundation will seek the assistance of relevant public authorities to assist in the achievement of this objective.**

Among the tools available to the IFRS Foundation in its efforts to ensure consistent application are:

- **IASB's standard-setting process**, to ensure that standards are clear and, if they are not, to amend them.
- **IFRS Interpretations Committee**, to identify emerging areas of divergence before they become entrenched practice, to refer issues to the IASB when standards require improvement, and to issue interpretations within a principle-based environment.
- **IFRS XBRL taxonomy**, to maintain a high quality IFRS XBRL taxonomy to help ensure comparability of financial data for end users.
- **IFRS Foundation education and content service activities**, to undertake and serve as a catalyst for educational activities and information that will improve the consistency of application.

The Trustees also note the limitations of the IFRS Foundation in this field. Consistency of application depends upon enforcement and regulatory activities, rigorous audits and sound corporate financial reporting and governance, areas outside the mandate of the Foundation.

Lastly, the Trustees believe that transparency regarding IFRS adoption practices will encourage convergence of adoption practices and enforcement activities and discourage deviations. The IFRS Foundation does not have the mandate or the resources to monitor adoption practices, but a number of international and national institutions have significant experience in this area. Therefore, the Foundation will work with other organisations, including securities regulators, standard-setters and international financial institutions, to monitor the consistency of the application of IFRSs.

4. Enhancing governance arrangements to strengthen public accountability and independence

The IFRS Foundation is a unique example of international co-operation in the financial arena. Unlike other bodies that establish international rules, the IASB is composed of full-time professionals, not serving as representatives of particular jurisdictions and interests. The IFRS Foundation's Constitution establishes an independent standard-setting process, subject to extensive due process requirements, but protected from special and parochial interests. This independence has been a fundamental strength of the IFRS Foundation and the IASB, giving credibility to the standards.

Independence is a prized asset for the IFRS Foundation, but independence comes with the requirement of public accountability. A form of public accountability was provided from the outset insofar as the binding character of IFRSs depended on their validation by local authorities. Subsequently, following two formal reviews of the Constitution, the Trustees have enhanced their oversight function, increased the transparency of their operations and made a number of institutional reforms to expand representation. In 2009 a Monitoring Board was created and a Memorandum of Understanding linking it to the Trustees provided a formal public component to the governance structure for the first time. The creation of the Monitoring Board and the emergence of publicly sanctioned financing regimes for the IFRS Foundation anchored the organisation more formally with those responsible for serving the public interest.

The IFRS Foundation now has a three-tier system of governance: the Monitoring Board acting on behalf of public authorities, the Trustees as overseers, and the IASB, with the IFRS Foundation secretariat, as the standard-setting body. There is a sense that within the three-tier structure a further evolution is required to assure public trust as IFRSs become the global standard.

The Monitoring Board is making proposals regarding further enhancements to the three-tier governance structure. Consistently with their own independent responsibilities the Trustees are making proposals on Trustee, IASB, and IFRS Foundation activities relevant to issues of independence and public accountability. These proposals are meant to complement the Monitoring Board's proposals and further elaborate how the Trustees give operational effect to their role within the three-tier structure.

Therefore the following does not in any way prejudge the outcome of the Monitoring Board's Governance Review. It is recognised that the proposals in this section could require adjustment once the Monitoring Board finalises its review of the structural aspects of the Foundation's governance.

The Trustees acknowledge that broad participation from a range of professional and geographical backgrounds in the IFRS Foundation and IASB structures is also an important aspect of governance and public accountability concerns. As stated above, for the purposes of the strategy review, the Trustees are assuming that major jurisdictions considering the adoption of IFRSs for domestic purposes in the coming 18 months will make a positive commitment on a time frame for adopting IFRSs within their own jurisdictions. The Trustees believe that in the long term the governance and membership of the IASB and of the IFRS Foundation Trustees are likely to reflect the global coverage of IFRS adoption.

The Trustees propose:

- B1 The independence of the IASB in its standard-setting decision-making process, within a framework of public accountability, must be maintained.**
- B2 The existing three-tier structure (Monitoring Board, Trustees, IASB) is appropriate for the organisation's mission. Within that governance structure, the Monitoring Board, the IFRS Foundation and the IASB should enhance their interaction and procedures where appropriate to reinforce the principles of transparency, public accountability and independence. In doing so, the roles and responsibilities of each element of the organisation's governance should be clearly defined.**

The Trustees believe that the three-tiered structure, established through the creation of the Monitoring Board in 2009, is serving the organisation well and balances the needs of public accountability and the independence of the standard-setting process. Under these arrangements, the independence of the IASB's standard-setting process is protected and is overseen through an active and internationally diverse group of Trustees.

Public accountability is assured through a formal reporting line between the IFRS Foundation Monitoring Board and the Trustees. Specifically, the responsibilities of the Monitoring Board, as the public capital market authorities, are:

- 1 to participate in the Trustee nominations process and approve Trustee nominees;
- 2 to review the adequacy and appropriateness of Trustee arrangements for financing the IASB;
- 3 to review the Trustees' oversight of the IASB's standard-setting process, in particular with respect to its due process arrangements;
- 4 to confer with the Trustees regarding their responsibilities, particularly in relation to the regulatory, legal and policy developments that are pertinent to the IFRS Foundation's oversight of the IASB; and
- 5 through the IFRS Foundation Trustees, to refer for consideration by the IASB matters of broad public interest related to financial reporting.

The Trustees intend to co-ordinate their action with the Monitoring Board when it finalises its role and responsibilities in the context of its Governance Review project.

B3 Consistently with point B2, the Trustees should further clarify how they discharge their oversight responsibilities.

The Trustees support the continuation of this basic construct and believe that it has supported the primary objective of maintaining the IASB's independence, within the context of public accountability. However, many commentators have sought a more visible and clearer role for the Trustees. The Trustees are also recommending steps aimed at the clarification of their oversight responsibility and their relationship with the Monitoring Board. (These proposals are intended to be consistent with the Monitoring Board's own proposals on governance.)

In terms of enhancements in the Trustees' oversight role, the Trustees are recommending the following:

- The Trustees will enhance the role of their Due Process Oversight Committee to ensure that the Committee reviews the status of the IASB's due process on major projects periodically against an agreed framework regularly benchmarked against best practice.
- The Trustees will develop a staff resource, reporting direct to the Trustees, to manage their due process oversight responsibilities. This dedicated resource will better enable the Trustees to carry out their oversight of the IASB's due process and remove any perceived conflict of interest for staff in serving both the Trustees and the IASB.

The Trustees support further steps that would enhance the relationship with the Monitoring Board, including:

- The Trustees will enhance their discussions with the Monitoring Board on matters related to strategic priorities.
- Consistently with the Monitoring Board's proposals, the Trustees will work with the Monitoring Board in the development of enhanced procedures and clearer criteria for the nomination of Trustee candidates.

B4 Elements of the governance structure should provide regular public reports to demonstrate their effectiveness.

The Trustees believe that increased transparency and public reporting regarding the work of the Monitoring Board and the Trustees will improve the legitimacy of the organisation. In this regard, the Trustees have reached the following conclusions:

- The Trustees support the Monitoring Board's recommendations regarding increased communications related to the Monitoring Board's activities.
- As part of their regular reports to the Monitoring Board, the Trustees will describe how they are discharging their oversight responsibilities.
- The Trustees should regularly report on their oversight activities, in order to make their activities more visible to the general public.

5. Strengthening the process and procedures of the IFRS Foundation and the IASB

The standard-setting process is highly structured and has at its core the principles of multi-staged stakeholder consultation and transparency. This due process is described in full in the IASB's *Due Process Handbook*. The IASB meets and makes decisions in public. Issues are added to the IASB's work agenda only after consultation with the IFRS Advisory Council and the Trustees. The IASB also consults other groups, such as national accounting standard-setters, on its agenda and work programme. The IASB must publish exposure drafts (and often preliminary discussion papers) with the opportunity for public comment before reaching final conclusions. On major projects, the IASB establishes working (or advisory) groups reflecting the different stakeholders.

By making all of the decisions in the public domain and by sharing IASB documents on the IASB's website, the IASB has established a process that is recognised as one of the most transparent among international organisations. At the same time, the process is not without its critics.

Critics have often argued that the IASB does not account adequately for the views expressed by stakeholders nor does it sufficiently explain how it reconciles differing viewpoints, both in the setting of its agenda and strategy and in the resolution of technical issues, and for the effects of the standards. The Trustees and the IASB have taken a number of steps to address these concerns. First, the IASB makes greater use of working groups, publishes feedback statements and effect analyses, and has greatly expanded its outreach efforts. Second, the Trustees have expanded their oversight function and have reformed the IFRS Advisory Council to reflect better the views of stakeholder groups. Third, the recently revised Constitution requires a three-yearly public consultation on the IASB's work programme.

In the areas of working procedures and process, the Trustees are recommending the following principles, guidelines, and steps to ensure that the IFRS Foundation and the IASB fulfil their commitment to best practice:

Due process and benchmarking

- C1 A thorough and transparent due process is essential to developing high quality, globally accepted accounting standards. The IASB's due process is and should continue to be reviewed and further enhanced regularly, benefiting from regular benchmarking against other organisations and from stakeholder advice.**

The IFRS Foundation and the IASB will maintain a transparent due process. There should be a commitment to continued improvement in the due process, based upon regular and systematic benchmarking against other standard-setting and regulatory organisations. Such a benchmarking exercise is currently under way. Furthermore, as is current practice, the Trustees will consult stakeholders on proposed changes to the IASB's *Due Process Handbook*.

Trustee oversight of the IASB's due process

In 2006 the Trustees established their Due Process Oversight Committee to play a more active and visible role in the oversight of the IASB's due process. This Committee meets the IASB regularly to monitor its compliance with due process procedures, to review complaints regarding the IASB's due process and to assess other areas of concern related to the IASB's due process activities. Nevertheless, stakeholders regularly express concern regarding the effectiveness of the Trustees' oversight over the IASB's procedures.

- C2** **The framework for the Trustees in their oversight of the IASB's due process should be clarified. The Trustees' Due Process Oversight Committee should review and discuss due process compliance regularly throughout the standard-setting process and at the end of the process before a standard is finalised. The Committee should report regularly on these activities to the Trustees and in its annual report.**

The Trustees believe that stakeholders' confidence in the standard-setter process will improve if the regular interaction between the Trustees' Due Process Oversight Committee and the IASB includes a focused, regular and systematic review of the due process of current projects. While this occurs already, the Trustees recommend that the Committee should consider how it could enhance this interaction and then communicate its results publicly. Furthermore, the IASB should consult the Committee before it decides to skip a non-mandatory portion of its due process (under the 'comply or explain' approach). Any deviation from the mandatory due process requires full Trustee approval.

Before finalising a new standard or a major revision of an existing standard, the IASB should make a presentation to the Trustees' Due Process Oversight Committee explaining how it has complied with each step of its required due process. The IASB should also explain, using the constitutionally required 'comply or explain' approach, how it used the optional elements of its due process.

Following the IASB's presentation and before the conclusion of the IASB's project, the Due Process Oversight Committee would need to review and discuss compliance with the IASB's procedures and report on their oversight. To complement the other elements of the IASB's due process that are considered best practice, the Trustees believe that the addition of a regular and final review step will be a significant enhancement.

Stakeholder feedback and enhancements in the agenda-setting and standard-setting process

- C3** **Building on the existing due process framework and in an effort to improve the usability of financial information, the IASB should undertake the following:**
- **Clear demonstration of how priorities on its agenda are set: In the agenda-setting process and following the required public consultation, the IASB should provide full feedback. This will assist in demonstrating how the IASB's priorities are set.**

- **Agreed methodology for field visits/tests and effect analyses:** The IASB should work with relevant parties to develop an agreed methodology for field visits/tests and effect analyses (more often referred to as cost-benefit analyses or impact assessments).
- **Integration of XBRL into the standard-setting process and the development of relevant XBRL taxonomy extensions:** In order to take into account the impact of technology, the development of the IFRS XBRL taxonomy should be integrated into the IASB's due process. In addition, the IFRS XBRL taxonomy should be expanded to include a relevant number of extensions to the existing base taxonomy.

Agenda-setting: The Trustees recently introduced a requirement to have three-yearly public consultations on the IASB's agenda and priorities. The first such review will take place in 2011. In undertaking the public consultation, the IASB should actively engage the IFRS Advisory Council and other stakeholders. The Trustees believe that engaging stakeholders in the development of agenda priorities will enable the IASB to address the most pressing financial reporting issues. Furthermore, it will strengthen public confidence in the standard-setting process.

As part of the agenda-setting process and following the public consultation, the IASB should provide a feedback statement explaining how it accounted for the views of the Trustees, the IFRS Advisory Council, the Monitoring Board and stakeholders. As with other elements of the IASB's due process, the IASB will review progress on its agenda-setting process with the Trustees' Due Process Oversight Committee.

Field visits/tests and effect analyses: Field visits/tests and effect analyses (or impact assessments) are now considered best practice in the establishment of regulations. They are now regular parts of the IASB's due process (field visits and tests as part of a 'comply or explain' approach and effect analyses as a requirement for major projects). Nevertheless, there is a sense among stakeholders that the IASB should further clarify the role of these elements of the IASB's due process.

The Trustees believe that the organisation could benefit from receiving guidance in developing an agreed methodology for field testing and effect analyses. Therefore, the Trustees are recommending the establishment of a working group from the international community, chaired by the IASB, to develop an agreed methodology for field testing and effect analyses.

Integration of XBRL into the standard-setting process: The IFRS Foundation is already actively engaged in the development of an IFRS XBRL taxonomy. Until now, the XBRL taxonomy process has occurred after the development of standards by the IASB. In this manner, the development of the XBRL taxonomy is similar to a non-English language translation of IFRSs. There is no formal link between the technical aspect of standard-setting and its potential impact on XBRL-driven data.

The Trustees believe that in the future, as XBRL requirements become the norm, the standard-setting process and the XBRL taxonomy development should be integrated. This would mean that the IASB technical staff would have specialists in the development of XBRL taxonomies. The IASB would consider the impact of its decisions on how the standards are represented in the XBRL taxonomy and, hence, their usability for end users of financial data with access to XBRL data.

In addition, the Trustees are committed to providing an IFRS XBRL taxonomy that serves investors and other users of financial information. In this light, the XBRL team should develop an agreed methodology to develop a relevant number of extensions to the existing base taxonomy in order to reflect common IFRS practice.

Actions aimed at consistency of IFRS implementation

The Trustees have earlier emphasised that the IFRS Foundation has a vested interest in helping to ensure the consistent application of IFRSs internationally. The Trustees have borne that interest in mind through their approach on XBRL, education activities and publication. But in addition there are procedural steps that can support consistent application.

C4 To support the IFRS Foundation's interest in consistent application of IFRSs and within the IASB's standard-setting mandate, the Foundation and the IASB should undertake the following actions:

- **using an agreed methodology, undertake post-implementation reviews to help identify implementation issues.**
- **establish formalised co-operation arrangements with securities regulators, audit regulators and national standard-setters to receive feedback on how IFRSs are being implemented and to encourage actions aimed at addressing divergence.**
- **refine the scope of the IFRS Interpretations Committee's activities to ensure consistency of interpretation, without undermining the commitment to a principle-based approach to standard-setting**

Post-implementation reviews: The IASB can play an important role through its post-implementation review and, using the IFRS Interpretations Committee, the interpretations process. The IASB is required to undertake post-implementation reviews of new IFRSs, as well as major amendments to IFRSs and major interpretations after at least two full years of implementation, to be completed within three years of the pronouncement's effective date. These reviews were designed to be limited to important issues identified as contentious during the development of the pronouncement and would review any unexpected costs or implementation problems encountered.

The IASB is now about to consider the first standards subject to such a review. The IASB is developing a clear and transparent methodology for undertaking these reviews.

Co-operation with securities regulators, audit regulators and national standard-setters: Securities regulators, audit regulators and national standard-setters are best positioned to identify inconsistency in the application of IFRSs. The IASB should use existing or new formal networks with securities regulators, audit regulators and national standard-setters to identify issues and then develop an action plan with these parties.

IFRS Interpretations Committee: The IFRS Interpretations Committee should help to ensure consistency of interpretation, without undermining the commitment to a principle-based approach to standard-setting. The Committee could do this by:

- identifying emerging areas of divergence, before they become entrenched practice, by consulting auditors, audit regulators and securities regulators
- having timely public discussion and resolution of requests for interpretation or improvement
- developing authoritative guidance to clarify accounting principles and their application to a (narrow) range of circumstances
- communicating persuasive explanations and reasons for not issuing authoritative guidance
- correcting and clarifying the wording of IFRSs for matters that are relatively minor and do not justify a separate IASB project

- reaching out to all stakeholders to explain the interpretation and implementation process (conferences, standard-setter engagements, fact books, podcasts) and regularly reassessing the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the Committee in conjunction with the Trustees' Due Process Oversight Committee.

Importance of national and other accounting standard-setters

- C5** **The IFRS Foundation and the IASB should encourage the maintenance of a network of national and other accounting standard-setting bodies as an integral part of the global standard-setting process. In addition to performing functions within their mandates, national and other accounting standard-setting bodies should continue to undertake research, provide guidance on the IASB's priorities, encourage stakeholder input from their own jurisdiction into the IASB's due process and identify emerging issues.**

The IFRS Foundation and the IASB should encourage the maintenance of a network of national and other accounting standard-setting bodies as an integral part of the global standard-setting process. National and other accounting standard-setting bodies have important, specified and independent roles within their own national and regional context. They should also continue to undertake research activities with the IASB, provide guidance on the IASB's priorities, encourage stakeholder input from their own jurisdiction into the IASB's due process and identify emerging issues. The IASB should seek to enlist national and other accounting standard-setters in the identification and disclosure of deviations of national standards from IFRSs.

Dedicated research capacity

- C6** **To provide thought leadership in the field of financial reporting, the IASB should establish, or should facilitate the establishment of, a dedicated research capacity.**

The IFRS technical staff have no dedicated resource for accounting research to understand how existing standards are operating, to analyse trends of financial reporting and to identify future issues. This is the consequence of limitations on financial resources and the focus on completing the present work programme. The Trustees recommend establishing, or facilitating the establishment of, a research capacity that could draw upon some combination of internal and external intellectual resources, including a more active engagement of the academic community. The Trustees would necessarily seek dedicated, separate financing to support such a research capacity.

6. Financing: ensuring that the IFRS Foundation has a broad and sustainable source of funding

At the outset, the Foundation was financed through voluntary contributions by some 200 organisations. Occasionally, this partial dependence on voluntary contributions raised two concerns by a few observers. One was a possible lack of objectivity because of the temptation to provide special consideration in the standard-setting process to important financial supporters. Conversely, there were suggestions that supporters, dissatisfied with the outcome of a rigorous standard-setting process, might withdraw funding and disrupt the IASB's work. While neither of these concerns materialised in practice, there was a sense that dependence on voluntary contributions from largely private sources was inappropriate for an organisation acting in the public interest and could deprive the organisation of necessary resources in the future.

Since 2006 the Trustees have sought to establish national financing regimes, proportionate to a country's relative GDP, that establish a levy on companies or provide an element of publicly supported financing. Now the great majority of the Foundation's finances are based on such regimes, and this approach has been particularly successful in Asia-Oceania and Europe. However, voluntary systems remain in place in some jurisdictions; some countries contribute less than their fair share or not at all; budget deficits are currently projected if new financing is not found; and the Trustees do not have the authority to mandate financing.

The Trustees believe that further progress on financing is essential to safeguard the IFRS Foundation's position as the world's independent accounting standard-setter.

D1 The funding system must maintain the independence of the standard-setting process, while providing organisational accountability.

D2 The existing base of financing should be expanded to enable the IFRS Foundation to serve the global community better and to fulfil the strategy described above. Specifically, funding should be proposed by the Trustees to be on a long-term basis (at least three to five years), be publicly sponsored, be flexible to permit the use of differing mechanisms and to adjust to budgetary needs, be shared among jurisdictions on the basis of an agreed formula (consistent with the principle of proportionality), and to provide sufficient organisational accountability.

The 2011 budget for the IFRS Foundation (for all activities) is £26 million. This budget is relatively small compared with those of other international organisations with global reach and influence. Furthermore, the budgetary increases since the advent of the IASB in 2001 have failed to keep pace with the growing demands placed on the organisation.

To 'adjust' to the global spread and to implement the strategy contained in this report, the Trustees believe that the budget may need to grow to approximately £40-45 million (at current sterling amounts, ie excluding future inflation) annually over a period of time. This would still be a relatively small amount when compared with other international financial institutions. Furthermore, it would mark significant savings when compared with the sum of resource requirements for all national accounting standard-setting before global adoption of IFRSs.

Achieving that new funding target will require a robust financing system that builds upon and significantly advances efforts already under way.

The Trustees recognise that individual sovereign jurisdictions will have different methodologies for providing the necessary financing. Also, as the IFRS Foundation received publicly supported financing, requirements for organisational accountability regarding resource expenditures will grow. To address these two issues consistently with the principle D1 above, the Trustees seek a global funding system that has the following features:

- Will provide a long-term commitment. Funding should not be dependent on annual appropriations and not contingent on fulfilling any conditions that would compromise the independence of the standard-setting process.
- Should have public sponsorship (either direct or implicit governmental or regulatory support). This 'public' element will remove any perception of undue interference by private sector interest groups through the financing process.
- Should be flexible to take into account (1) agreed increases in the budget and (2) that national jurisdictions are likely to arrange the financing regimes to suit their legal frameworks and cultural background. However, the Trustees could indicate that a sensible formula would be a levy on users and beneficiaries of IFRSs (ie listed companies, investment companies). There should be a designated institution with which the IFRS Foundation should liaise in each funding jurisdiction.

- Should be shared proportionally so that the funding is shared by the major economies of the world (including but not exclusively the G20) on a proportionate basis, using GDP as the determining measure. Each country or jurisdiction should meet its designated target in a manner consistent with the principles above and should indicate which agency should serve as the interlocutor with the IASB.
- Provide public accountability in the budget process. The Trustees should publish annually how they seek to use the funds raised by national and international financing mechanisms. The final approval of the annual budget should include a review of the budget with the IFRS Foundation Monitoring Board.

In achieving the financing objectives, the Trustees are committed to working with the Monitoring Board to ensure that their collective responsibility to support the IASB is fulfilled.