



© DRSC e.V. || Zimmerstr. 30 || 10969 Berlin || Tel.: (030) 20 64 12 - 0 || Fax.: (030) 20 64 12 - 15
www.drsc.de - info@drsc.de

Diese Sitzungsunterlage wird der Öffentlichkeit für die FA-Sitzung zur Verfügung gestellt, so dass dem Verlauf der Sitzung gefolgt werden kann. Die Unterlage gibt keine offiziellen Standpunkte der FA wieder. Die Standpunkte der FA werden in den Deutschen Rechnungslegungs Standards sowie in seinen Stellungnahmen (Comment Letters) ausgeführt.
Diese Unterlage wurde von einem Mitarbeiter des DRSC für die FA-Sitzung erstellt.

IFRS-FA – öffentliche SITZUNGSUNTERLAGE

Sitzung:	11. IFRS-FA / 04.12.2012 / 18:00 – 19:00 Uhr
TOP:	07 – IFRSF Proposal to Establish an Accounting Standards Advisory Forum
Thema:	Accounting Standards Advisory Forum
Papier:	11_07a_IFRS-FA_ASAF



Zielsetzung

...Now that the convergence programme with the US Financial Accounting Standards Board is coming to an end and the use of IFRSs is spreading around the world, there is a pressing need for the IASB to rationalise its relationships with NSS and regional bodies and to put them onto a more logistically sustainable and compact basis.



The Strategy Review

„The IFRS Foundation and the IASB should encourage the maintenance of a network of national accounting standard-setting bodies and regional bodies involved with accounting standard-setting as an integral part of the global standard-setting process. In addition to performing functions within their mandates, national accounting standard-setting bodies and regional bodies involved with accounting standard-setting 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 current relationship with NSS

- Formal bilateral arrangements
 - ASBJ: MoU August 2007, meetings held twice a year
 - Brazilian Federal Council of Accounting and Brazilian Accounting Pronouncements Committee: MoU January 2010, no set timetable
 - FASB: MoU September 2002, joint monthly meetings held
- Sample of informal bilateral arrangements
 - AOSSG (25 jurisdictions): IASB and staff have observer status
 - EFRAG (30 EEA member states): IASB and staff participate in monthly meetings
 - GLASS (12 jurisdictions): Amaro Gomes participates
 - IFASS (around 25 jurisdictions / regions): IASB and staff participate



The challenge / proposals

- The current NSS community is very wide and diverse...the current list held by the IASB for the WSS conference details standard-setters from 119 separate jurisdictions, plus a number of regional bodies
- NSS vary significantly in their characteristics, including:
 - their composition and resources;
 - the roles they play;
 - the range of expertise they have;
 - the involvement / participation they have in regional and international groupings; and
 - their nature, ranging from independent, full-time private sector bodies to units within government departments
- Role: to provide advice and views to the IASB on major technical issues related to its standard-setting activities and to provide input on national and regional issues.



Commitments

1. Supporting the IFRS Foundation's mission to develop, in the public interest, a single set of high quality, understandable, enforceable and globally accepted financial reporting standards;
2. Encouraging input from their jurisdiction / region to the technical activities of the IASB, in order to contribute to a single set of high quality, understandable, enforceable and globally accepted financial reporting standards;
3. Supporting consistent application of IFRSs by jurisdiction and in the region;
4. Making their best efforts to promote the endorsement / adoption of IFRSs in full and without modification over time (recognising that, at present, jurisdictions are at different stages in moving towards IFRSs and have adopted different mechanisms to achieve this; and
5. In addition, any member would need to have the resources and capability to play a full role in the ASAF's technical work, including preparation for meetings and participation in substantive technical discussions.



Size and composition

- **...it is essential to define the size of the group in a logical and consistent manner, and to come up with a formula that will be at the same time globally representative, technically effective and efficient.**
- **The IASB would be represented by the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman, possibly accompanied by another IASB member with special expertise where appropriate.**
- **...large enough to accommodate those bodies with which the IASB currently has its major bilateral relationships, plus representatives from the regional bodies (such as AOSSG, GLASS and PAFA), while leaving room for other major NSS to become members.**
- **Membership to be reviewed every two years**
- **Membership would be on the basis of organisational rather than on an individual basis – a single designated individual – flexibility to allow representation with specialist expertise**



Potential impacts

„Another important consideration to be discussed is any potential impact, following this development, on existing Foundation bodies, such as the Advisory Council.“

„The proposal will need to be considered within the context of the IASB’s developing relationships with a wider network of stakeholders, in particular users of financial reports.“



Question 1

Do you agree with the proposed commitments to be made by ASAF members and that they should be formalised in a Memorandum of Understanding? Why or why not?



Question 2

The Foundation believes that, in order to be effective, the ASAF needs to be compact in size, but large enough to allow for an appropriate global representation. Do you agree with the proposed size and composition as set out in paragraphs 6.7 – 6.13? Why or why not?

Africa	1
Americas	3
Asia-Oceania	3
Europe (including non-EU)	3
World at large	2



EFRAG's draft comment letter (1)

Verpflichtung der ASAF Mitglieder

- Grundsätzliche Zustimmung zur Verpflichtung in einem MoU
 - a) Unterstützung des IFRSF Ziels „...single set of high quality...“ notwendig
 - b) Umformulierung: Repräsentativität muss als Ziel hervorgehoben werden
 - c) Unterstützung einheitlicher Anwendung im Grundsatz ja, aber nicht Fokus
 - d) Unterstützung unveränderter Indossierung Ziel ja, aber nur als best effort möglich
 - e) Ressourcen, ggf auch der Entwicklung von Diskussionsgrundlagen notwendig
- Noch nicht Anwender dürfen nicht ausgeschlossen werden
- MoU unterstützt Ernsthaftigkeit der Verpflichtung aller (auch IASB) Beteiligten (kein Widerspruch zu „solely advisory“)



EFRAG's draft comment letter(2)

Anzahl und Zusammensetzung Mitglieder

- Zustimmung zu 12 Mitgliedern unter der Voraussetzung, dass je Organisation mehr als eine Person akzeptabel; Delegation in Abhängigkeit vom Thema
- Zusammenspiel von globaler Repräsentanz, Expertise
- IASB Repräsentation auszuweiten: Chair, Vice Chair, Board member je Projekt
- Hinweis auf EFRAG's early input Initiative von allen europäischen NSS
- Referenz zu EFRAG's Mandat für die Europäische Kommission



EFRAG's draft comment letter (3)

Weitere Anmerkungen

- Vorsitz + dedicated staff
 - Vorsitz aller advisory fora / committees muss beim IASB Chair liegen; staff welcome
- Agenda
 - Den Mitgliedern von ASAF muss Zeit eingeräumt werden, die Stakeholder zu konsultieren: Themen müssen daher bereits vom IASB diskutiert sein.
 - So werde auch die Unabhängigkeit des IASB gewahrt
- Bilaterale Übereinkünfte
 - Bisherige Treffen EFRAG + 4 ENSS entfallen, EFRAG kann flexibel Mitglieder seiner Delegation bestimmen
 - Der „shared due process“ und die Teilnahme von IASB und staff an EFRAG Sitzungen soll weiterhin bestehen