

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the  
INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING STANDARDS BOARD  
Held on December 10–13, 2019 in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates**

**1. Attendance, Opening Remarks, and Approval of Minutes**

**Attendance**

	<b>Voting Members</b>	<b>Technical Advisors</b>
Present:	Ian Carruthers (Chair) Mike Blake (Deputy Chair) Stuart Barr Todd Beardsworth Lindy Bodewig Michel Camoin Francesco Capalbo (Wednesday-Thursday) Luzvi Chatto Adrienne Cheasty Neema Kiure-Mssusa Aracelly Méndez Rod Monette Leonardo Nascimento Chris Nyong Lynn Pamment Bernhard Schatz Marc Wermuth <b>Member Apologies:</b> Do-Jin Jung	Clark Anstis (Mr. Blake) Claudia Beier (Mr. Wermuth) Amanda Botha (Ms. Bodewig) Henning Diederichs (Ms. Pamment) Takeo Fukiya (Mr. Jung) Baudouin Griton (Mr. Camoin) Anthony Heffernan (Mr. Beardsworth) Williard Kalulu (Ms. Kiure-Mssusa) Leona Melamed (Mr. Monette) Fabrizio Mocavini (Mr. Capalbo) Ayres Moura (Mr. Nascimento) Renée Pichard (Mr. Barr) David Watkins (Mr. Carruthers) <b>Technical Advisor Apologies:</b> Samuel Agbevem (Mr. Nyong) Juan Moreno Real (Ms. Méndez) Annabelle Puserio (Ms. Chatto) Jakob Prammer (Mr. Schatz)

	<b>Non-Voting Observers</b>
Present:	Biodun Adeyemo (African Union) Rosa Aldea Busquets (European Commission) (Tuesday-Wednesday) Pedro Guazo (UNDP) Jerry Gutu (United Nations) Martin Koehler (European Commission) Delphine Moretti (OECD) (Tuesday) Madalitso Mvuso Lowole <sup>1</sup> (African Union) Thomas Müller-Marqués Berger (CAG Chair) John Verrinder (Eurostat)
Apologies:	Jon Blondal (OECD) Sagé de Clerck (IMF) Guohua Huang (IMF) Chai Kim (ADB) Fily Sissoko (World Bank Group)
	<b>IPSASB/IFAC Staff/Advisor</b>
Present:	Amon Dhliwayo, IPSASB João Fonseca, IPSASB Gwenda Jensen, IPSASB Edwin Ng, IPSASB Ross Smith, IPSASB Joanna Spencer, IPSASB John Stanford, IPSASB Dave Warren, IPSASB Paul Mason, Senior Advisor
Apologies:	James Gunn, Managing Director, Professional Standards

<sup>1</sup> Madalitso Mvuso Lowole<sup>1</sup> is an Observer for the African Union

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members, technical advisors and observers to the meeting in Abu Dhabi. The Chair thanked the Department of Finance, Abu Dhabi for hosting the meeting and welcoming the IPSASB to Abu Dhabi for the second time. He noted that the meeting in March 2013, hosted by the Abu Dhabi Accountability Authority, had been a great success and the IPSASB was pleased to be back.
- 1.2 His Excellency Mohamed Khalifa Mohamed Al Nuaimi, the Acting General Director of the Abu Dhabi Department of Finance, extended a welcome to Abu Dhabi to members, technical advisors and observers. The Chair presented His Excellency Mohamed Al Nuaimi with a plaque acknowledging the Department's hosting of the IPSASB meeting.
- 1.3 Do-Jin Jung was noted as an apology. Francesco Capalbo was noted as an apology for Day 1 (December 10) and Day 4 (December 13) of the meeting because of travel issues.
- 1.4 Members approved the minutes of the September 2019 meeting.
- 1.5 John Verrinder, the Eurostat observer, updated members on developments in the European Public Sector Accounting Standards (EPSAS) project, including an overview of recent meetings of the EPSAS Cell on Principles in October and the EPSAS Working Group in November.
- 1.6 The Technical Director updated members, technical advisors and observers on funding. The Asian Development Bank had recently confirmed funding of US\$330,000 for the period 2019–2021. He noted that he had previously advised the IPSASB that The Treasury Board of Canada had confirmed funding of CAD \$200,000 per annum for the five-year period from April 1, 2020-March 31, 2025.

## **2. Report on Activities/Communication Activities (Agenda Item 2)**

- 2.1 The Chair updated the IPSASB on the successful regional roundtables held in 2019 in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Chair thanked the co-hosts, the Asian Development Bank and the African Union Commission, for their support in holding these events, noting that the regional roundtables extended IPSASB's reach to stakeholders.
- 2.2 The Technical Director highlighted that the successful IPSASB Academic Forum held in September 2019 in Naples, Italy, had led to the formation of the Academic Advisory Group (AAG). He acknowledged the role of Francesco Capalbo in proposing the Forum and leading on, and coordinating, arrangements. He also noted that David Watkins had co-chaired the Forum.
- 2.3 Gwenda Jensen provided further details of the composition of the AAG, which will be chaired by Andreas Bergmann, with Gwenda as Secretary. The membership comprises Francesco Capalbo, incoming IPSASB members Patricia Varela and Scott Showalter, Maria Francesca Sicilia from the International Research Society for Public Management Accounting and Accountability Special Interest Group and Susana Jorge of the Comparative International Governmental Accounting Research Network, better known by its acronym, CIGAR.
- 2.4 Gwenda also updated members on the call for papers on the four research projects in IPSASB's 2019-2023 Strategy and Work Program, noting that the deadline for submission of abstracts was December 15<sup>th</sup>.

### 3. Governance (Agenda Item 3)

#### *Consultative Advisory Group*

- 3.1 Thomas Müller-Marqués Berger, the Chair of the IPSASB Consultative Advisory Group (CAG), provided a summary of the December 9, 2019 CAG meeting.

#### *Public Interest Committee*

- 3.2 Ian Carruthers, IPSASB Chair informed members that the Public Interest Committee will be undertaking its first governance review in 2020 and that more information on the review was expected in the near future.

### 4. Technical Director's Report on Work Program (Agenda Item 4)

#### *Initial Review of Work Program on Day One*

- 4.1 The Technical Director noted that the IPSASB had carried out an intensive review of the work program at the final meetings of the year in December 2017 and 2018 and that this was the third such annual review.
- 4.2 The Technical Director introduced the current work program on a project-by-project basis. He noted that, apart from Leases, the work program reflects a 'best-case scenario', which assumes a full staff complement and, for major projects, acceptance by respondents of the main principles in exposure drafts (EDs) and preliminary views in consultation papers, and four meetings between the initial review of responses on an ED and approval of a final pronouncement. He also noted that the work program aims to highlight project linkages – the importance of managing these linkages has been acknowledged in the creation of the role of Program and Technical Director that Ross Smith will assume on February 1<sup>st</sup> 2020.
- 4.3 The Technical Director informed members that Collective and Individual Service had been deleted from the work program following approval in September 2019 and that publication of the final pronouncement is due at the end of January 2020. He expressed views that:
- The initial review of responses to Public Sector Financial Instruments should take place in June 2020, rather than March 2020, due to the paternity leave of the lead staff member, Dave Warren, in the first quarter of 2020. The viability of approval of a final pronouncement in September 2020 would be assessed following that initial review;
  - The approval of a further ED on Leases in March 2020 was unrealistic. A timeline will be developed once key decisions have been taken on the approach to lessor accounting and the work program should reflect this;
  - The Revenue and Transfer Expenses EDs were due to be approved at this meeting and the project timelines would be re-assessed in the light of meeting developments if necessary;
  - The first high-level review of responses to the Consultation Paper, *Measurement*, was to be presented at this meeting. The work program timeline with approval of an ED in September 2020 and a final pronouncement in December 2021 appears challenging, but viable;

- Agenda time for Heritage and Infrastructure was limited at this meeting due to the prioritization of the Revenue and Transfer Expenses projects. EDs for Heritage and Infrastructure are still scheduled to be issued in September 2020 with final pronouncements in December 2021. This timeline appears viable;
  - Project briefs for the Natural Resources project and the Limited Scope Review of the Conceptual Framework will be presented at the March 2020 meeting and timelines will be determined at that meeting;
  - Improvements will continue as an annual project with an ED issued in June each year and a final pronouncement in December of each year; and
  - The Mid-Term Work Program Review Consultation will be discussed at the June 2020 meeting of the Consultative Advisory Group (CAG). Approval of the consultation document is projected for December 2020 with publication in early 2021.
- 4.4 Members generally agreed with the Technical Director's proposals.
- 4.5 Members questioned whether stakeholders will have the capacity to cope with the volume of consultation documents being issued at the same time and suggested this needs consideration. The Chair acknowledged this concern and stated that the Revenue and Transfer Expenses EDs are expected to have a longer consultation period than the standard four months. However, it is important that these EDs are issued simultaneously, so that respondents can see the linkages.
- 4.6 The Technical Director noted two facets of stakeholder capacity: (i) the ability to respond to consultation documents and (ii) the implementation of final pronouncements. He commented that the IPSASB has looked carefully at effective dates and transitional periods and a number of recent pronouncements, such as IPSAS 41, *Financial Instruments*, and IPSAS 42, *Social Benefits*, have effective dates more than two years in the future.
- 4.7 The Technical Director apologized for the fact that the 2019 Handbook had not been published. He explained that there were some issues with the contractors who are publishing the Handbook. An updated version of the Handbook is expected to be published in the first half of 2020. It is hoped that the same delays will not recur in the future.
- 4.8 A member questioned whether the Improvements project should be on an annual basis, suggesting that frequency could depend on the significance of the changes and staff capacity. The Technical Director responded that the Improvements project is not onerous and has staff development benefits, so he recommended retention of the annual cycle.
- 4.9 On the Limited Scope Review of the Conceptual Framework the Chair expressed a view that it is important to understand what is meant by 'limited'. The project will not address all significant issues. He recalled that during the latter stages of its development of the Framework, it had dominated the meetings agendas and it is important to limit Board time on this project, so that it does not crowd out other projects.
- 4.10 The CAG Chair reported on the CAG's consideration of the project at its meeting on December 9<sup>th</sup>. He said that the CAG generally agreed with the topics identified and their classification. He also noted the suggestion that the project title should be revised to convey that it was the areas selected for updating as part of this project that were limited rather than the long-list of potential topics.

- 4.11 Members highlighted the importance of considering the linkages between projects when determining timelines.
- 4.12 It was noted that David Watkins was developing a project brief for IFAC on updating Study 14 and that this would be brought to the March 2020 meeting.
- 4.13 For the Mid-Term Work Program Review it will be important to consider several possible projects that had been raised by the members and staff of the Public Sector Accounting Board of Canada at the Public Sector Standard Setters Forum.
- 4.14 Finally, the Board questioned the value of the indicative time allocations provided with the work program; there were mixed comments about whether or not they were useful.

*Further Review on Day Four*

- 4.15 With the approval of the Chair, the Technical Director deferred to the incoming Program and Technical Director who asked members if there had any further issues to those discussed on Day One. No further issues were identified.

## **5. Revenue/Transfer Expenses – Cross Cutting Issues (Agenda Item 5)**

- 5.1 Agenda Items 6, 7 and 8 summarize the decisions and instructions related to the cross-cutting issues which impacted the various streams of the projects.

## **6. Revenue with Performance Obligations (Agenda Item 6)**

- 6.1 Staff identified a number of cross-cutting issues and issues specific to [draft] ED 70, *Revenue with Performance Obligations*, raised in the November 2019 in-period review. The IPSASB carried out a page-by-page review of ED 70 and provided staff with a number of specific instructions. Subject to these instructions, members moved to a vote on approval. Staff responded to these instructions at the morning session on Friday, December 13, 2019.
- 6.2 The IPSASB **decided** to:
  - Approve [draft] ED70, (15 members were in favor, one abstention and two absentees); and
  - Set an exposure period of six months for the ED.
- 6.3 The IPSASB also agreed that an Editorial Group would be formed.

### **Instructions**

- 6.4 The IPSASB **instructed** staff to:
  - Incorporate ‘transfer revenue with performance obligations’ and ‘transfer revenue’ into ED 70 as follows:
    - Do not provide formal definitions, but acknowledge the IPSASB’s discussion of the terms in the basis for conclusions (BC);
    - Update the disclosures in ED 70 to include disclosure of revenue earned from the provision of goods or services to third-party beneficiaries; and
    - Add a Specific Matter for Comment (SMC) asking if definitions are needed.
  - Update the disclosure and related BC paragraphs as follows:
    - Explain why all IFRS 15 disclosures are retained in ED 70;
    - Highlight that the disclosures in ED 70 are not consistent with those in IPSAS 23;
    - Add a SMC asking if all IFRS 15 disclosures should be retained; and

- Clarify paragraph 120 of ED 70.
- Update the definition of 'a binding arrangement':
  - Amend the definition of a binding arrangement to explicitly refer to both rights and obligations on both parties to the arrangement;
  - Consider any consequential changes related to the BC and references to unenforceable arrangements;
  - Add a SMC asking if the revised definition of a binding arrangement is clear; and
  - Reconsider the definitions of 'a binding arrangement asset' and 'a binding arrangement liability' in ED 70 and ED 71, as well as the need for these.
- Add a SMC asking for constituents' views on the guidance in AG 70 and AG 71 regarding transactions with components in scope of both ED 70 and ED 71.
- Consider the need to add a reference to the residual approach to AG92 and related paragraphs regarding the determination of stand-alone price when market information is not available.
- Resolve the inconsistency between AG11 and AG19 regarding legislative authority.
- Remove the guidance on non-intellectual property licenses in AG115 and related paragraphs in the BC and illustrative examples.

## 7. Transfer Expenses (ED 72) (Agenda Item 7)

7.1 After the Staff presented a number of cross-cutting issues and issues specific to [draft] IPSAS [X] (ED 72), *Transfer Expenses*, raised in the November 2019 in-period review, the IPSASB carried out a page-by-page review of ED 72 and provided the Staff with a number of specific instructions. Subject to these instructions, members moved to a vote on approval. Staff responded to these instructions at the morning session on Friday, December 13, 2019.

### Decisions

- 7.2 The IPSASB **decided** to:
- Approve [draft] ED 72 (17 members were in favor, with one absentee); and
  - Set an exposure period of six months for the ED.
- 7.3 The IPSASB also agreed that an Editorial Group and a group to revise the drafting of the sections dealing with appropriations would be formed.

### Instructions

- 7.4 The IPSASB **instructed** staff to:
- Remove the recognition of expenditure in respect of taxes from the scope of ED 72, as follows:
    - Exclude taxes from the definition of transfer expenses, and ensure the definition is consistent with ED 71; and
    - Delete the paragraphs and references addressing the recognition of expenses in respect of taxes.
  - Revise the scope of the ED as follows:
    - Add the word 'directly' to the definition of a transfer expense;
    - Review the treatment of hybrid transactions to ensure consistency across ED 70, ED 71 and ED 72;

- Revise the wording of paragraph 9 regarding performance obligations;
- Move the reference to capital transfers from the Objective section to the Scope section, ensuring the terminology is consistent with ED 71; and
- Update the Scope section to emphasize that transactions where the transfer recipient receives something in return are outside the scope of the ED.
- Move paragraph AG2 into the Objective section of the core text (at paragraph 2).
- Clarify the Public Sector Performance Obligation Approach (PSPOA) as follows:
  - Draft a SMC seeking stakeholders' views on any practical issues that might be encountered in applying the approach;
  - Update the Application Guidance dealing with withholding future funding for consistency with ED 70;
  - Review the wording in ED 72 to ensure that the level of precision required in estimates is clear and consistent;
  - Review the Illustrative Examples to identify any necessary changes; in particular, compare the treatment for transfer expenses with performance obligations and without performance obligations when cash is provided at the start of an arrangement and when cash is provided at the end of an arrangement; and
  - Review the criteria for applying the PSPOA in relation to monitoring the transfer recipient's performance.
- Draft a SMC regarding the difference in accounting in ED 71 and ED 72 where a transfer provider provides cash and the transfer recipient has a present obligation.
- Revise the requirements addressing appropriations as follows:
  - Draft a SMC seeking stakeholders' views on the proposed accounting treatment for appropriations; and
  - Revise the drafting of the requirements for accounting for appropriations, ensuring that enforceability is the key driver.
- Revise the guidance on binding arrangements as follows:
  - Expand the guidance on binding arrangements to cover more than economic substance;
  - Review the wording in the guidance for consistency with ED 70; and
  - Review the definitions relating to binding arrangement assets and liabilities across ED 70, ED 71 and ED 72 to ensure they are consistent and necessary.
- Update the disclosure requirements as follows:
  - Include all relevant disclosures from ED 70 in the PSPOA section of the disclosure requirements; and
  - Include all relevant disclosures from ED 70 and ED 71 in the section of the disclosure requirements dealing with transfer expenses without performance obligations.
- Update the requirements in respect of transfer expenses without performance obligations as follows:
  - Review the references to enforceable activities and eligible expenditure in light of the discussions on ED 71; and
  - Review the measurement of variable consideration for consistency with ED 71.
- Revise the rationale for determining that the transfer recipient is a principal not an agent.
- Refer to IPSAS 3, *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Errors and Estimates*, in the discussion of funds being returned to the transfer provider.



- Consider whether an amendment to IPSAS 41, *Financial Instruments*, in respect of concessionary loans is required.

## 8. Revenue without Performance Obligations (ED 71) (Agenda Item 8)

- 8.1 After the Staff presented a number of cross-cutting issues and issues specific to [draft] ED 71), *Revenue without Performance Obligations*, raised in the November 2019 in-period review, the IPSASB carried out a page-by-page review of ED 71 and provided the Staff with a number of specific instructions. Subject to these instructions, members moved to a vote on approval. Staff responded to these instructions at the morning session on Friday, December 13, 2019.

### Decisions

- 8.2 The IPSASB **decided** to:
- Approve [draft] ED 71 (15 members were in favor, with one abstention and two absentees); and
  - Set an exposure period of six months.
- 8.3 The IPSASB also agreed that an Editorial Group would be formed.

### Instructions

- 8.4 The IPSASB **instructed** staff to:
- Draft a SMC seeking stakeholders' views on the proposed flowchart;
  - Draft a SMC seeking stakeholders' views on the proposed structure of ED 71;
  - Create "Taxes" and "Other Transfers" sections;
  - Evaluate the consistency of the definition of 'transaction price' across the three EDs;
  - Draft illustrative examples showing different types of capital transfers;
  - Draft BC paragraphs identifying multiple present obligations that may exist for capital transfers;
  - Update paragraphs 73 and 74 to clarify the allocation of transaction price to present obligations and the recognition of revenue;
  - Update guidance on present obligations to indicate that the liability cannot exceed the asset;
  - Update the revenue recognition guidance to clarify when revenue is recognized;
  - Add "outflow of resources" section to the ED;
  - Restructure guidance in order for eligible expenditures and enforceable activities to be a subset of a present obligation;
  - Draft guidance for the IPSASB's consideration on accounting for a breach of a binding arrangement;
  - Draft BC paragraphs to explain why the IPSASB has not adopted an approach drawn from IAS 20, *Accounting for Government Grants and Disclosure of Government Assistance*;
  - Remove the draft SMC on IAS 20;
  - Revisit paragraph 86 on accounting for hypothecated taxes;
  - Carry forward the definitions of 'a binding arrangement asset' and 'a binding arrangement liability' from ED 70 to ED 71; and
  - Reconsider the term 'enforceable' in enforceable activities.

## 9. Leases (Agenda Item 9)

9.1 Staff presented an issues paper revisiting the objective and scope of the Leases project and identifying options for moving the project forward.

### Decision

9.2 The IPSASB decided to revisit the objective and scope of the leases project.

### Instructions

9.3 In relation to the analysis of the three options, the Board **instructed** staff to:

- Refine the factors to reflect the IPSASB's discussion
- With input from the Task Force, refine the reasoning for the shading for each of the factors.

9.4 In relation to Option 2 (IFRS16-based) the IPSASB **instructed** staff to: consider potential variants of the lessor accounting approach in IFRS 16, *Leases*, that would address concerns expressed by members and stakeholders who had responded to ED 64.

9.5 In relation to concessionary leases the IPSASB **instructed** staff to consider examples of concessionary leases and access rights, which were to be provided by members and technical advisors and the implications these might have for how to approach this aspect of the project.

## 10. Improvements (Agenda Item 10)

10.1 Staff presented [draft] *Improvements to IPSAS, 2019*, for approval by the IPSASB together with an issues paper.

### Decisions

10.2 The IPSASB **decided** to:

- Approve the final pronouncement, *Improvements to IPSAS, 2019*, with no significant changes to the amendments proposed in ED 68, *Improvements to IPSAS, 2019* (17 members voted in favor with one absentee); and
- Approve an effective date of:
  - January 1, 2021 for improvements related to other IPSAS; and
  - January 1, 2022 for improvements relating to IPSAS 41, *Financial Instruments* in order to align with the effective date of that standard.

## 11. Public Sector Measurement (Agenda Item 11)

11.1 Staff and the Measurement Task Force Chair, David Watkins, presented a preliminary assessment of responses to the Consultation Paper, *Measurement*.

### Instructions

11.2 The IPSASB instructed staff to:

- Prepare a detailed review of responses for the March 2020 meeting; and
- Provide recommendations on how to take accounting for borrowing costs forward, based largely on the retention of the current approach (including draft text).

## 12. Infrastructure (Agenda Item 12)

12.1 Staff and the Infrastructure Task Force Chair, Marc Wermuth, presented the amended flowchart and tested its application by analyzing issues related to the separation of land under or over infrastructure assets, the control of such land and valuation.

### Decision

12.2 The IPSASB **decided** to approve the amended flowchart (subject to the change instructed in 12.3) and the analysis of the infrastructure assets issues related to the separation of land under or over infrastructure assets, the control of such land and valuation.

### Instructions

12.3 The IPSASB **instructed** staff to:

- Amend the Flowchart as follows:
  - Change the question in Decision 2 from *“Is there sufficient IPSAS guidance that already addresses this issue in the public sector?”* to *“Is there sufficient authoritative IPSAS guidance that already addresses this issue in the public sector?”*;
- Consider whether the guidance to separately account for land and buildings also applies to separate disclosure of land and infrastructure assets;
- Prepare guidance on control for land and infrastructure assets to address these issues:
  - Is control lost when land and infrastructure assets owned by central government is operated by different parties such as local government?
  - Is control lost when land and infrastructure assets owned by central government is operated by a different party for long periods (99-year term)? and
  - At what point is control lost/gained when land and infrastructure assets are transferred to another level of government?
- Align guidance on control for land and infrastructure assets with the Measurement and Heritage projects; and
- Make editorial changes to the draft guidance on the separation of land under or over infrastructure assets, the control of such land and its valuation.

## 13. Heritage (Agenda Item 13)

13.1 At the end of each of the first three days of the meeting members reconsidered the agenda in the light of meeting developments. In order to prioritize the Revenue and Transfer Expenses EDs it was decided to take Heritage off the agenda.

13.2 The IPSASB **instructed** staff that:

- Future Heritage Board papers and draft guidance must be developed using the same approach and in the same format as those for Infrastructure; and
- The changes to the flowchart approved under the Infrastructure item meant that the conclusions in the December papers, as well as the draft guidance need revision, and that these should be presented in March.

- 13.3 The Chair invited members to give staff comments on the agenda papers in order to inform agenda papers for the March meeting.

#### **14. Closing Remarks and Conclusion of the Meeting**

- 14.1 The Chair noted the approval of three EDs on Revenue and Transfer Expenses, and a final pronouncement, *Improvements to IPSAS, 2019*, as substantial achievements at this meeting. He thanked staff, members and technical advisors for their hard work, both since the September meeting, and during the December meeting that had made this possible. In closing the meeting, he once again thanked the Department of Finance, Abu Dhabi for the very generous hospitality in hosting the IPSASB.

**Appendix 1: Vote – Approve Exposure Draft (ED) 70, Revenue with Performance Obligations**

Final Standard <input type="checkbox"/>	ED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CP <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>	ABSENT	TOTAL
IPSASB MEMBER	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN		
Ian Carruthers, Chair	√				
Mike Blake, Deputy Chair	√				
Stuart Barr	√				
Todd Beardsworth	√				
Lindy Bodewig	√				
Michel Camoin	√				
Francesco Capalbo				√	
Luzvi Chatto	√				
Adrienne Cheasty			√		
Do-Jin Jung				√	
Neema Kiure-Mssusa	√				
Aracelly Méndez	√				
Rod Monette	√				
Leonardo Nascimento	√				
Chris Nyong	√				
Lynn Pamment	√				
Bernhard Schatz	√				
Marc Wermuth	√				
TOTAL	15	0	1	2	18

**Appendix 2: Vote – Approve Exposure Draft (ED) 71, Revenue without Performance Obligations**

Final Standard <input type="checkbox"/>	ED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CP <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>	ABSENT	TOTAL
IPSASB MEMBER	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN		
Ian Carruthers, Chair	√				
Mike Blake, Deputy Chair	√				
Stuart Barr	√				
Todd Beardsworth	√				
Lindy Bodewig	√				
Michel Camoin	√				
Francesco Capalbo				√	
Luzvi Chatto	√				
Adrienne Cheasty			√		
Do-Jin Jung				√	
Neema Kiure-Mssusa	√				
Aracelly Méndez	√				
Rod Monette	√				
Leonardo Nascimento	√				
Chris Nyong	√				
Lynn Pamment	√				
Bernhard Schatz	√				
Marc Wermuth	√				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>

**Appendix 3: Vote – Approve Exposure Draft (ED) 72, Transfer Expenses**

Agenda Item 7	Minutes Item 7	Date Vote Taken		December 11, 2019	
Description	<i>Exposure Draft</i>	<i>Transfer Expenses</i>		Approved at meeting	
Final Standard <input type="checkbox"/>	ED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CP <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>	ABSENT	TOTAL
IPSASB MEMBER	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN		
Ian Carruthers, Chair	√				
Mike Blake, Deputy Chair	√				
Stuart Barr	√				
Todd Beardsworth	√				
Lindy Bodewig	√				
Michel Camoin	√				
Francesco Capalbo	√				
Luzvi Chatto	√				
Adrienne Cheasty	√				
Do-Jin Jung				√	
Neema Kiure-Mssusa	√				
Aracelly Méndez	√				
Rod Monette	√				
Leonardo Nascimento	√				
Chris Nyong	√				
Lynn Pamment	√				
Bernhard Schatz	√				
Marc Wermuth	√				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>

**Appendix 4: Vote – Approve Improvements to IPSAS, 2019**

Agenda Item 10 Description	Minutes Item 10 <i>Final Standard</i>	Date Vote Taken <i>Improvements to IPSAS, 2019</i>	December 12, 2019 Approved at meeting		
Final Standard □	ED ■	CP □	Other □	ABSENT	TOTAL
IPSASB MEMBER	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN		
Ian Carruthers, Chair	√				
Mike Blake, Deputy Chair	√				
Stuart Barr	√				
Todd Beardsworth	√				
Lindy Bodewig	√				
Michel Camoin	√				
Francesco Capalbo	√				
Luzvi Chatto	√				
Adrienne Cheasty	√				
Do-Jin Jung				√	
Neema Kiure-Mssusa	√				
Aracelly Méndez	√				
Rod Monette	√				
Leonardo Nascimento	√				
Chris Nyong	√				
Lynn Pamment	√				
Bernhard Schatz	√				
Marc Wermuth	√				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>