



Deutsches Rechnungslegungs Standards Committee e.V.  
Accounting Standards Committee of Germany



Der Standardisierungsrat

DRSC e. V. • Zimmerstr. 30 • 10969 Berlin

Telefon +49 (0)30 206412-12

Telefax +49 (0)30 206412-15

E-Mail info@drsc.de

Hans Hoogervorst  
Chairman of the IASB  
30 Cannon Street  
London EC4M 6XH  
United Kingdom

Berlin, xx November 2011

161.DSR-Sitzung am 24.11.2011  
161\_04a\_AgCon\_CL\_Entwurf\_marked

Dear Hans,

### Request for Views – Agenda Consultation 2011

On behalf of the German Accounting Standards Board (GASB) I am writing to respond to the IASB's Agenda Consultation 2011. The GASB welcomes the discussion of the overall strategic direction and the balance of the IASB's agenda.

The GASB generally supports the IASB's view on the strategic areas driving the work of the IASB and the suggested categorisation of these areas into (1) development of financial reporting and (2) the maintenance of existing IFRSs. While we agree that both areas are important, we suggest focussing on the maintenance of existing IFRSs, and enhancing the quality and consistency of current IFRSs, e.g. by conducting post-implementation reviews. As the IASB suggests the consistency of the IFRSs will greatly benefit from We particularly agree with the IASB's view on the need to focus on the consistency of IFRSs by – amongst other – completing the conceptual framework. We therefore urge the IASB to focus on this project. Another urgent issue for constituents are excessive disclosure requirements. In the long-term a conceptual disclosure framework should be in place. However, for the time being the IASB should attend to a near-term relief from excessive disclosure requirements.

Overall, the IASB should seek a balanced agenda, more carefully considering its own limited resources and the restrictions of its constituents. There should only be a limited number of projects on its agenda, allowing for a timely completion of each project. However, while in principle we agree that it is reasonable to broad the scope of

Zimmerstr. 30 · 10969 Berlin · Telefon +49 (0)30 206412-0 · Telefax +49 (0)30 206412-15 · E-Mail: info@drsc.de  
Bankverbindung: Deutsche Bank Berlin, Konto-Nr. 0 700 781 00, BLZ 100 700 00  
IBAN-Nr. DE26 1007 0000 0070 0781 00, BIC (Swift-Code) DEUTDE33  
Vereinsregister: Amtsgericht Berlin-Charlottenburg, VR 18526 Nz

Vorstandsausschuss:

Dr. Werner Brandt, Joe Kaeser, Prof. Dr. Rolf Nonnenmacher (Schatzmeister), Dr. Jörg Schneider

~~the work of the IASB (e.g. in depth research, post-implementation reviews, improving the quality of the application of IFRSs) we suspect significant drawbacks from extending the work of the IASB to activities prior and following core standard-setting responsibilities. We suggest a careful evaluation of the scope of work. Much of the areas identified by the IASB could be (better) addressed by other institutions (such as academics, national standard-setters or national enforcement boards). In our opinion the IASB should seek a stronger involvement of these institutions, which will allow the IASB to independently evaluate their results and at the same time focus on the core standard-setting activities.~~

Please, find our detailed reasoning and comments on the questions raised by the IASB in the appendix to this letter. If you would like to discuss any aspect of our comments further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

*Liesel*  
President

## Appendix

### Strategic priorities and balance of the IASB's agenda

#### Question 1

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

#### Question 1(a)

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

#### Question 1(b)

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

In its request for views the IASB sets out five strategic areas driving the work of the IASB. We support the IASB's categorisation of these areas into developing financial reporting and maintaining existing IFRSs. We also believe each of the five strategic areas to be important and justified necessary in the broader context of standard-setting process international accounting standards. However, in its proposals the IASB lays out a wide range of possible working areas. This includes work on the fundamentals of financial reporting (such as research about possible future accounting issues) but also those activities following the standard-setting (such as post-implementation reviews and improving the consistency and quality of the application of IFRSs). Broadening the range of the IASB activities does not only potentially improve the IFRSs but also bears some risks, such as allocating insufficient resources to the standard-setting itself or inefficiently building up resources which are already available in other institutions. In our opinion a clear focus on the core standard-setting activities is preferable in order to most effectively use the limited resources of the IASB and to achieve the aspired high quality accounting standards.

Nevertheless, in line with the IASB's suggestions we see the need for the IASB to carefully consider areas of work prior and following the standard-setting process itself. These additional areas of work, however, should be clearly defined so as to limit

~~the scope of the work and e.g. avoid interference with the competencies of other institutions (such as national enforcement boards).~~

~~Nevertheless, While we do not intend to dismiss the other areas of work, in the light of the IASB's limited resources,~~ we suggest a stronger involvement of other institutions ~~in order to address e.g. research or IFRS implementation questions. For example, t~~The IASB does not necessarily need to build up research resources within ~~the IASB's~~ organisation, but can also ~~choose funding existing institutions~~ outsource these activities. ~~For example, there is~~ A large number of academics worldwide ~~who have specialized in analysing aspects potentially relevant to standard setting. Such research questions include the business environment of companies, analysing the needs of capital market participants and other stakeholder, as well as analysing the strengths and weaknesses of current financial information. Many academics have~~ build up the skills, resources and network necessary to undertake the kind of research needed to ~~identify upcoming accounting issues and to~~ envision future financial reporting. They could also address any additional issue that the IASB might like to get more detailed research on. The IASB in ~~return~~ will have the advantage to evaluate the different research results independently; an IASB-internal research process on the other hand might prevent the IASB from seeing the full picture as the research process itself might pre-determine the research outcome. We would like to emphasise that in the past (teams of) national standard-setters have provided promising results e.g. regarding research about intangible assets, national management commentary standards or developing a basis for discussion of the equity-liability-split. ~~However, the IASB needs to ensure that this research is integrated in the IASB's standard-setting process and that the research~~ Such results should be more will be carefully considered and discussed by the IASB, and will eventually result in publishable documents.

Kommentar [W1]: Streichen? Was ist damit gemeint?

~~Another example~~ We welcome the IASB's plans of significantly broadening the scope of the work of the IASB are regarding the conduction of post-implementation reviews (PiRs), ~~which the IASB plans to conduct~~ in order to obtain a better understanding of operational issues of new IFRSs and major amendments. The IASB plans to conduct PiRs once ~~after~~ a new IFRS has been applied approximately for two years. We be-

lieve that it will be necessary to decide from case to case after how much time a PiR should be conducted. For some standards, more than two years will be necessary to detect operational issues in their entirety. Furthermore,

**Kommentar [W2]:** Wollen wir uns auf „operational issues“ beschränken? Ist zB das Nicht-Anwenden von de facto control ein operational issue?

First of all, if the IASB were to agree on PiRs these should not be limited to new IFRSs and major amendments. Instead it is generally equally important to obtain an understanding of the implications of “older” IFRSs. Furthermore, it is just as important to gain an understanding of the issues that are not yet addressed in existing IFRSs. In determining when to conduct PiRs the IASB could consider the findings of that being said, again, other institutions have already built these exact capacities: constituents regularly inform national standard-setters, regulators and/or the IFRS IC about operational issues of (current) IFRSs. In our view, the IASB needs to allocate significant resources to conducting PiRs, to correspond to the importance of PiRs within the standard-setting process. Moreover, implementations issues and existing difficulties for a consistent and high quality application of IFRSs are analysed and detected through audits or the work of national enforcement boards. So again, there are various resources to draw from in order to obtain a better understanding of the operational issues of IFRSs. Therefore, while we acknowledge the importance of post-implementation reviews and the value of improving the consistency and quality of the application of IFRSs, we urge the IASB to carefully define the scope and intention of these reviews beforehand. As a result inefficient use of the IASB’s resources and the resources of its constituents would be avoided. It will also be crucial to pay careful attention to maintain the separation between setting IFRSs on the one side and on the other side enforcing the proper application of IFRSs.

**Kommentar [W3]:** Wiederum: nur operational issues?

Regarding the balance between the two categories (1) developing financial reporting and (2) maintaining existing IFRSs, we find both equally important to address within the responsibilities of an international standard-setter. We acknowledge that some constituents suggest a so called “period of calm” after a period of tackling complex accounting issues and the publication of several new or amended IFRSs. We agree that it will take considerable time for the constituents to analyse and implement the new requirements. However, we also believe there are still many several urgent more issues to be currently addressed by the IASB. In addition, the analysis of some of



~~these fundamental~~ issues (e.g. intangible assets, comprehensive income) and the development of proposals respectively will take ~~up a rather longsome~~ time. ~~And while at the moment there is little need for further standard-setting from a European point of view, there are several urgent issues that the IASB needs to address in order to respond to the various needs of their constituents worldwide.~~ Overall, while there might be less immediate “IFRS-output” there is no room for a “period of calm” regarding the work-load of the IASB.

With regard to the IASB’s particular proposals on the five strategic areas, we would like to express our strong support for the IASB focusing on the finalisation of the conceptual framework, including a presentation and disclosure framework. We agree with the IASB that the conceptual framework is essential for principle-based and internally consistent standards. Furthermore, the conceptual framework provides guidance to preparers, auditors, regulators and others. ~~More importantly, the completed framework needs to be the mandatory point of reference for future accounting standards. The (finished) framework should have a prominent role within the set of IFRS requirements and each future IFRS should be in line with the framework or else explain why compliance with the framework was not feasible.~~ The finalisation of the conceptual framework should be the first priority of the IASB. Despite those efforts this ~~project~~ will most likely be ~~finalised-achieved~~ only in ~~a couple of somea number of~~ years. Therefore, ~~for the time being~~ the IASB should not defer its other standard-setting activities until finalisation of the conceptual framework. While aligning future accounting standards with the conceptual framework, deferring the projects would – unnecessarily – put on hold any other needed standard-setting decisions. Any existing (tentative) views on the conceptual framework should nevertheless be considered for other accounting standards decisions.

For the IFRSs to be high quality accounting standards they need to be internally consistent. We are pleased to note that the IASB gives a high priority to the development of internally consistent IFRSs. In the past, decisions have often been convergence-driven, ~~with a clear focus on US-GAAP.~~ While we acknowledge that convergence with other accounting principles can be beneficial for certain issues, we are pleased to ~~read-note~~ that convergence ~~(with a focus on one particular set of accounting re-~~

quirements) will not (any longer) be the main driver of agenda decisions and standard-setting.

The GASB also agrees that the IASB needs to consider other aspects that touch on standard-setting and that possibly influence the consistency of IFRSs and the consistent application of IFRSs. We share the IASB's view on the importance of XBRL and believe that XBRL will be an integral part of standard-setting in the near future. However, XBRL-needs could significantly deviate from the principles on which accounting standards are based. As suggested by the IASB, XBRL should therefore be considered in the standard-setting process; however, it should not dictate the accounting requirements.

One additional important aspect that is not addressed in the IASB's request for views is the language used in translations of IFRSs. We believe it to be crucial that the IASB uses plain English and carefully defines the accounting requirements. Throughout the world ~~the~~ constituents most likely apply a translated version of IFRSs. ~~The IFRS Foundation closely monitors the translations and approves the translated version before publication. The IFRS Foundation promotes rigorous translations of the IFRSs. Lack of clarity. However, this~~ often results in reduced understandability of the translated IFRSs and inconsistent application of IFRSs ~~throughout the world~~, as certain ~~rigorously translated~~ concepts of the English language ~~do not exist in other languages.~~ The IASB, for example, often refers to qualifiers such as "remote", "probable", "more likely than not" or "virtually certain" to describe accounting requirements. To find a translation that fits just the nuance that is intended in the English language is difficult or even impossible. the German language there is no direct translation for the term "fair value". As far as possible, the IASB should also acknowledge this aspect of standard-setting and pay attention to possible differences and difficulties in translating the IFRSs. The IASB could consider possible difficulties in translating the IFRSs by (1) clearly defining the accounting concept using plain English and by (2) asking constituents (e.g. in the invitation to comment of draft documents) about such problems.

**Achieving balance – future IASB agenda**



#### Question 2

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

#### Question 2(a)

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

#### Question 2(b)

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

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

The agenda setting process is an essential part of the due process of the IASB as it pre-determines the scope of the IASB's work and the use of the IASB's resources – often for years in advance. We are pleased to note that the IASB is given careful consideration to its current agenda setting process which – in the past – has not been as transparent and comprehensible to the constituents as it should be.

Apart from a more straightforward communication of the agenda setting process and the agenda decisions the GASB suggests a more thorough upfront evaluation of agenda proposals in order to avoid inefficient use of the resources ~~of the IASB~~. An efficient use of resources is not only desirable for the IASB itself, but also for the many constituents of the IASB. A prolonged discussion of one project (which might in the end be withdrawn from the agenda altogether) does also tie up substantial resources in the organisations of all the constituents worldwide who follow the Board's discussion, analyse proposals and possible implications for their organisation, or develop and coordinate comment letters.



Therefore, a more thorough analysis of the agenda proposal and the ~~demonstrated~~ accounting issue respectively is crucial. More time and resources should be dedicated to analyse the issue at hand and to discuss and to develop the agenda proposals. During the development of agenda proposals and in discussing the agenda proposals the IASB should also – as far as possible – consider possible consequences of the specific project. For example, some proposals can be evaluated regarding the costs and benefits of a new or amended IFRS before further developing the accounting requirement.

Regarding the projects on the current agenda, ~~of the IASB~~ we support the IASB's proposal to continue to give the highest priority to progressing the work on: (1) revenue from contracts with customers, (2) leases, (3) insurance contracts, and (4) financial instruments.

Other than these projects the IASB should, in our view, give the highest priority to the finalisation of the conceptual framework. In addition, the IASB should – in due course – develop a conceptual disclosure framework. However, currently more important than a framework on (future) disclosure requirements is the reduction of the burden on constituents due to excessive disclosure requirements in the existing IFRSs. To give priority to this project is in line with our general proposal to give (at this point in time) more weight to the maintenance of existing IFRSs than to the development of new IFRSs.

Question 2(b)

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

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

As a principle for future agenda decisions the GASB suggests that the IASB should generally ~~not~~ work on ~~more than three~~ only a limited number of larger, fully active projects at the same time. However, the dimension of the project, e.g. "quick fix pro-

jects”, limited scope projects, or projects on conceptual issues, needs to be considered. Furthermore, in the future the IASB should generally give priority to those projects that are internationally relevant rather than those that are relevant for only a specific region. Another aspect of the IASB’s agenda decisions should be the changes in the environment of the reporting entities. For example, intangible assets are increasingly driving the value of an entity; however, their importance is not yet reflected in the IFRSs.

It would also be in the interest of constituents if the IASB consequently discarded projects from the IASB’s agenda, which are without prospects to be successfully finalised in time or which address accounting issues that currently cannot be resolved. This would be a clear indication for constituents that there will be no further discussions of that topic and there are no amendments or changes to be expected (unless another project proposal will be put out for discussion).

Based on these suggestions the GASB argues for adding the following projects on the agenda of the IASB:

- 1) Conceptual framework and conceptual disclosure framework
- 2) Foreign currency translation (internationally relevant issue),
- 3) Intangible assets (to correspond with the relevance of these assets),  
and
- 4) Post-employment benefits (project restricted to new types of plans which have not been addressed yet or which were excluded from the last amendment of IAS 19), and
- 5) Other comprehensive income (better be addressed within the conceptual framework project, however, we suggest to address the topic separately due to the urgency of the matter).

Kommentar [W4]: Ich würde hier eher „focussed on“ wählen

On the other hand, the GASB suggests discarding the following projects from the agenda of the IASB:

- 1) Country-by-country reporting,
- 2) Earnings per share, and

~~3) Financial statement presentation / presentation and disclosure standard  
(these should be dealt with within the conceptual framework project).~~

ENTWURF