

Meeting: International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board

Meeting Location: Toronto, Canada

Meeting Date: December 6–9, 2022

Agenda Item 10

For:

Approval

Discussion

Information

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK–LIMITED SCOPE UPDATE (CF-LSU) – PHASE TWO: MATERIALITY AND ELEMENTS

Project summary	The project objective is to update the Conceptual Framework for a limited number of issues based on the criteria of urgency, consequences, feasibility, and prevalence, with an emphasis on the first three of these criteria.	
Board Sponsor	Ian Carruthers, IPSASB Chair	
	Conceptual Framework–Limited Scope Update (CF-LSU)–Next Stage: Project Roadmap	10.1.1
	Instructions up to Previous Meeting	10.1.2
	Decisions up to Previous Meeting	10.1.3
Decisions for this meeting	SMC 4: Definition of a Liability	10.2.1
	SMC 5: Guidance on the Transfer of Resources	10.2.2
	SMC 6: Revised Structure of Guidance on Liabilities	10.2.3
	SMC 3: Rights-Based Approach to Resources	10.2.4
Other supporting items	ED 81, Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements in Financial Statements	10.3.1

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK–LIMITED SCOPE UPDATE (CF-LSU):
 PROJECT ROADMAP**

Meeting	Completed Actions or Discussions / Planned Actions or Discussions:
Conceptual Framework–Limited-Scope Update	
March 2020	1. Approve Limited Scope Update of Conceptual Framework Project Brief
June 2020	1. Discussion of Issues
September 2020	1. Discussion of Issues 2. Review [draft] Exposure Draft 76, <i>Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 7, Measurement of Assets and Liabilities in Financial Statements</i>
October 2020	1. Discussion of Issues
December 2020	1. Approve Exposure Draft 76
February 2021	1. Finalize remaining instructions
March 2021	1. Discussion of Issues
June 2021	1. Discussion of Issues
September 2021	1. Discussion of Issues 2. Review [draft] Exposure Draft 81, <i>Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements</i>
October 2021	1. Discussion of Issues 2. Review [draft] Exposure Draft 81
December 2021	1. Approve Exposure Draft 81.
February 2022	1. Publication of Exposure Draft 81
March 2022	1. First Review of Responses to Exposure Draft 76 2. Discussion of Issues
June 2022	1. Second Review of Responses to Exposure Draft 76 2. Discussion of Issues 3. Review Revised Chapter 7, <i>Measurement of Assets and Liabilities in Financial Statements</i>
September 2022	1. Third Review of Responses to ED 76: SMCs on Replacement Cost and Value in Use 2. Discussion of Issues 3. Initial Review of Responses to Exposure Draft 81
December 2022	1. Approve Revised Chapter 7, <i>Measurement of Assets and Liabilities in Financial Statements</i> 2. Second Review of Responses to Exposure Draft 81 3. Discussion of Issues
March 2023	1. Third Review of Responses to Exposure Draft 81 2. Discussion of Issues 3. Review Revised Chapter 3, <i>Qualitative Characteristics</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Elements in Financial Statements</i>

Agenda Item 10.1.1

June 2023	1. Approve Revised Chapter 3, <i>Qualitative Characteristics</i> , and Chapter 5, <i>Elements in Financial Statements</i>
July 2023	1. Publication of Revised, <i>The Conceptual Framework for General Purpose Financial Reporting by Public Sector Entities</i>

INSTRUCTIONS UP TO PREVIOUS MEETING

Meeting	Instruction	Actioned
Conceptual Framework–Limited-Scope Update: First Stage		
September 2022	1. No Instructions	1. N/A
February 2022	1. All instructions provided up until February 2021 were reflected in ED 81, <i>Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics Chapter 5, Elements in Financial Statements</i>	1. All instructions provided up until February 2021 were reflected in the ED 81, <i>Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics Chapter 5, Elements in Financial Statements</i>

DECISIONS UP TO PREVIOUS MEETING

Meeting	Decision	BC Reference
Conceptual Framework–Limited-Scope Update–First Stage		
September 2022	1. No decisions	1. N/A
February 2022	1. All decisions provided up until February 2022 were reflected in the ED 81, <i>Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements in Financial Statements</i>	1. All decisions provided up until February 2022 were reflected in the ED 81, <i>Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements in Financial Statements</i>

Definition of a Liability

Question

1. Does the IPSASB approve the recommendation in paragraph 2?

Recommendation

2. Board Sponsor and staff recommend that the definition of a liability proposed in ED 81, *Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements*, should be included in the updated Chapter 5 of the Conceptual Framework.

Background

3. The definition of a liability in the 2014 Conceptual Framework was:
A present obligation of the entity for an outflow of resources that results from a past event.
4. ED 81 proposed an amended version:
A present obligation of the entity to transfer resources as a result of past events.
5. Specific Matter for Comment (SMC) 4 asked for views on the proposed revised definition.

Approach in IASB literature

6. The definition in the International Accounting Standards Board's 2018 Conceptual Framework is:
A liability is a present obligation of the entity to transfer an economic resource as a result of past events.

Reasons for IPSASB changes

7. The IPSASB drew on the revised IASB definition in developing the definition proposed in ED 81. The only difference is that the IASB uses the term 'to transfer an economic resource' whereas the IPSASB uses the term 'transfer resources.' This is consistent with practice elsewhere in the IPSASB Conceptual Framework.
8. The proposed revised IPSASB definition replaced the term 'outflow of resources' with 'transfer resources.' This reflected an acceptance of the IASB's view that linkage of the term 'an outflow of resources' with the expectation of such an outflow potentially leads to confusion with a recognition threshold.
9. Guidance in ED 81 explained that the phrase 'as a result of past events' included a single past event. IPSASB considered that the use of the plural 'past events' rather than the singular 'past event' better conveys that present obligations that give rise to liabilities can accumulate over time due to an initial past event and further past events.

Definition of a Liability in IPSASB's literature

10. At the standards-level the term liabilities is defined in IPSAS 1, *Presentation of Financial Statements*, the revised version of which was issued in December 2006:

Liabilities are present obligations of the entity arising from past events, the settlement of which is expected to result in an outflow of resources embodying service potential or economic benefits

11. IPSAS 1 has not yet been revised to adopt the definition in the 2014 Conceptual Framework. IPSASB has a project on the *Presentation of Financial Statements* which is about to commence. The alignment of the definition of a liability at the conceptual and standards levels is likely to need to be considered as part of this project.

Analysis

12. The quantitative summary of responses to SMC 4 is in Table 1.

Table 1—Responses to SMC 4: Definition of a Liability

Response	Respondents	
	#	%
Agree	21	78
Partially Agree	0	0
Disagree	4	15
Subtotal	25	93
No Comment	2	7
Total	27	100

Respondents agreeing

13. 21 respondents have been classified as agreeing with the revised definition of a liability as proposed in ED 81 (R01, R03, R05, R06, R07, R08, R09, R10, R11, R13, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26, R27). Table 2 summarizes and analyzes issues raised by respondents.
14. R05 explicitly agreed with the proposed revised definition, but strongly disagreed with the inclusion of the concept of a non-legally binding obligation.

Table 2—Issues Raised by Respondents Agreeing to Proposed Revision of the Definition of a Liability

<i>Respondent(s)</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Analysis</i>
R05 <i>Non-legally binding obligations</i>	The explicit reference to non-legally binding obligations in a public-sector context is particularly problematic and may have potentially undesirable implications. On the one hand, we appreciate the examples that paragraphs 5.15F and 5.17B-D provide in order to clarify if and to what extent a present obligation may arise from a political promise, the announcement of a policy, economic coercion and so on. On the other hand, however, as pointed out in our comment to ED 71, <i>Revenue without Performance Obligations</i> , we would underline that, in several administrative regimes, the legal form is indisputable, so that it would be difficult, if not outright forbidden, to identify a non-legally binding obligation.	The question of whether non-legally binding obligations could give rise to liabilities was extensively debated in the development of the 2014 Conceptual Framework. The IPSASB finally decided that limiting liabilities to those arising from legal obligations risks distorting an entity’s net financial position by understating liabilities. This issue was not redeliberated during the Limited-scope Update.
R05 <i>Obligation imposed by higher level of government</i>	Condition (a), in particular, requires that “the entity has already obtained service potential or economic benefits or taken an action”. The reference to “taking an action” presumably refers to non-exchange transactions. In the public sector, however, obligations from non-exchange transactions often arise not because the entity has taken an action, but because a higher tier of government has done so (e.g., by passing a law that requires the entity to make payments to certain classes of beneficiaries). The wording of paragraph 5.17A could be modified to better capture this case.	Staff accepts that a present obligation could arise from an obligation imposed by a higher level of government. Staff proposes that the imposition of an obligation by a higher tier of government should be acknowledged in a footnote.

<p>R07/ R22/R27 <i>Appropriateness of term 'transfer'</i></p>	<p>Board should precisely define the term 'transfer', in particular in IPSAS 23, <i>Revenue from Non-Exchange Transactions (Taxes and Transfers)</i>. (R07)</p> <p>Term transfer should be used consistently throughout the suite of IPSASs. (R22)</p> <p>In line with IPSAS 23, the use of the word transfers in public sector connotes a different meaning that should be differentiated to avoid confusing the constituents. (R27)</p>	<p>'Transfers' is a defined term in IPSAS 23,</p> <p>IPSASB's projects on <i>Revenue and Transfer Expenses</i> will result in a new IPSAS that will supersede IPSAS 23. The draft IPSAS separately defines 'transfer expense', 'transfer obligation', 'transfer obligation' and 'transfer recipient.'</p> <p>These definitions will remove any inconsistency between the Conceptual Framework and the standards-level.</p>
<p>R18 <i>Potential inconsistency of guidance with liability definition</i></p>	<p>Highlights a potential inconsistency with the three criteria for a liability. The third criteria states... is a present obligation arising from one or more past events. Advocates deleting 'one or more' and leave it as 'past events' (R18)</p>	<p>The wording 'one or more past events' in paragraph 5.17 explains that 'past events' in the definition include a single 'past event'.</p>
<p>R20 <i>Perceived expansion of definition of liabilities</i></p>	<p>The expansion of the definition of liabilities to include potential liabilities should explicitly reference contingent liabilities as defined in IPSAS 19. Given the importance of contingent liabilities under (Government Finance Statistics Manual (GFSM 2014), and the ongoing commitment to align IPSAS with GFSM, it would be helpful for practitioners to have guidance on the proper classification of liabilities and contingent liabilities in the ED.</p>	<p>The revised definition is not intended to expand the number of cases where liabilities arise from obligations. The issue of contingent liabilities is a standards-level issue.</p>

Respondents *disagreeing*

- Four respondents have been classified as disagreeing with the proposed definition (R04, R12, R15 & R21). The issues raised are grouped and analyzed in Table 3 below.

Table 3—Issues Raised by Respondents Disagreeing with Proposed Revision of the Definition of a Liability

Respondent	Comment	Analysis
R04 <i>Wording of definition</i>	<p>Para: 5.14 has reworded the definition of 'liability'. This definition is different from IFRS. IFRS defines a liability as "A liability is a present obligation of the enterprise arising from past events, the settlement of which is expected to result in an outflow from the enterprise of resources embodying economic benefits."</p> <p>The more appropriate definition would be 'A present obligation of the entity to transfer resources (economic or otherwise) as a result of past events.' This is because an obligation of an entity to transfer its own equity claims to another party is not an obligation to transfer an economic resource.</p>	<p>The definition of 'a liability' was debated by the Board in the development of ED 81. The proposed definition is drawn from that in the IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework. (See paragraphs 6-9), amended as appropriate for the public sector.</p>
R04 <i>Identification of past event and conditionality</i>	<p>The Conceptual Framework is not clear about how to identify the past event and whether a past event is sufficient to create an obligation. Questions arise if there has been some event in the past that could result in a transfer of resources (economic or otherwise) but the entity still has some ability (at least in theory) to avoid the future transfer; in other words, if the requirement to transfer an economic resource remains conditional on some future action of the entity.</p> <p>The definition of a liability should encompass both constructive obligations and at least some obligations that are conditional on the entity's future actions.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 discusses past events and establishes the principle that one or more past events is necessary for an obligation to become a present obligation and therefore give rise to a liability. Specific requirements and guidance are provided at the standards level.</p> <p>Conditionality is addressed in paragraph 5.16B.</p>

<p><i>R12/R21</i> <i>Appropriateness of term 'transfer' in liability definition</i></p>	<p>The term "transfer" should not be used as it could confuse the specific obligation of government entities to transfer resources associated with the social function of the state with the traceability (recognition and derecognition) of other types of liabilities, this is in line with what is considered by the IPSASB in IPSAS 23. (R12)</p> <p>Transfer resources" may be confused with government transfers and it is best to avoid this possible confusion, and "transfer" again reflects a narrower (legalistic) approach to definitions that is not appropriate. (R21)</p>	<p>Staff propose that a paragraph should be inserted in the Basis for Conclusions acknowledging concerns about the specific public sector connotations of the term 'transfer' but stating the IPSASB's view that guidance supporting the definition clarifies the broader usage of term 'transfer of resources' in the Conceptual Framework. This is reinforced by proposed defined terms in the suite of standards developed from EDs 70-72.</p>
<p><i>R12/R21</i> <i>Past events</i></p>	<p>Referring to "past events" leaves aside the possibility that the liability is associated with only one past event. For this reason, it is suggested that it should not be limited to the singular plural and should be referred to as "one or more past events."(R12)</p> <p>Events" should be "event(s)." Making "event" plural, implies that more than one single event is required for a liability to occur, but a single event may create a liability for an entity. (R21)</p>	<p>Guidance in paragraph 5.17 states that 'to satisfy the definition of a liability, it is necessary that a present obligation arises as a result of one or more past transactions and or other past events and requires a transfer of resources from the entity.</p> <p>In adopting the plural 'past events' the IPSASB is using the same wording as the IASB. The IPSASB considered it better to use the same wording and explain in supporting guidance that past events include a singular past event.</p>
<p><i>R15</i> <i>Binding nature of obligations</i></p>	<p>In the public sector "present obligations" are a very common phenomenon and most of these present obligations do not necessarily bind the entity to transfer resources for example..... For there to be a liability – the emphasis should be on "binding" We suggest that the definition reads A Liability is a binding present obligation of the entity to transfer resources as a result of past events.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.15 states that 'obligations are binding when an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid them.'</p> <p>The opening sentence of paragraph 5.17 reinforces this in stating that 'a present obligation is binding'.</p>

<p>R21 <i>Rights-based approach: Perceived inconsistency between guidance on assets and liabilities</i></p>	<p>The introduction of a rights-based approach was not incorporated into the update to Liabilities. We are not suggesting it should be; we are noting this is an inconsistency which reveals the flaw of “rights” in the asset definition.</p>	<p>A rights-based approach is not appropriate for liabilities-an entity has an obligation not a right to an obligation. This does not vitiate such an approach for assets.</p>
---	--	--

Way Forward

- 16. Board Sponsor and staff consider that the issues raised by respondents had all been considered previously by the Board. They therefore recommend that the definition of a liability proposed in ED 81 should be included in the amended Chapter 5.

Decision Required

- 17. Does the IPSASB agree with the Board Sponsor and staff [recommendation](#) in paragraph 2?

Guidance on the Transfer of Resources

Question

1. Does the IPSASB approve the recommendation in paragraph 2?

Recommendation

2. Board Sponsor and staff recommend that guidance on the transfer of resources in the context of a liability proposed in ED 81, *Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements* should be included in the updated Chapter 5.

Background

3. ED 81 proposed the introduction of guidance on the transfer of resources. The term ‘transfer of resources’ replaced ‘an outflow of resources’ in the definition of a liability in the 2014 Conceptual Framework and is discussed in Agenda Item 10.2.2. This guidance is considerably more extensive than the guidance on an outflow of resources in the 2014 Conceptual Framework, which was limited to statements that ‘a liability must involve an outflow of resources from the entity for it to be settled’ and that ‘an obligation that can be settled without an outflow of resources from the entity is not a liability.
4. Specific Matter for Comment (SMC) 5 asked for views on the proposed new guidance.

Approach in IASB literature

5. The IASB’s 2018 Conceptual Framework included a subsection ‘Transfer of an Economic Resource.’ The IPSASB drew on this subsection in developing its proposed guidance.

Analysis

6. The quantitative summary to responses to SMC 5 is in Table 1

Table 2—Responses to SMC 5: Guidance on the Transfer of Resources

Response	Respondents	
	#	%
Agree	21	78
Partially Agree	2	8
Disagree	2	7
Subtotal	25	93
No Comment	2	7
Total	27	100

Respondents agreeing

7. 21 respondents (R01, R03, R05, R06, R07, R08, R09, R10, R11, R13, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R22, R23, R24, R26, R27) have been classified as agreeing with the proposed guidance in ED 81. Table 2 summarizes and analyzes issues raised by these respondents.

Table 2—Issues Raised by Respondents Agreeing with Proposed Guidance on the Transfer of Resources

Respondent(s)	Comment	Analysis
R10 <i>Recognition</i>	Guidance on the recognition of liabilities in the IASB's Conceptual Framework appears to be more detailed and robust than the IPSASB's existing guidance on recognition of liabilities. The chapter on recognition in the IPSASB Conceptual Framework includes some references to considering the qualitative characteristics. However, the chapter on recognition in the IASB's Conceptual Framework includes specific sections on considering relevance and faithful representation when determining whether a liability (or an asset) is recognised. These sections include a specific discussion on low probability of outflow (and inflow) of economic resources, as well as a discussion on existence uncertainty and measurement uncertainty.	Recognition was not within scope of the Limited Scope project and the IPSASB did not consult on amendments to Chapter 6, <i>Recognition in Financial Statements</i> . Paragraph 5.16B states that 'An obligation can meet the definition of a liability even if the probability of a transfer of resources is low.' It qualifies this statement by acknowledging that 'Nevertheless, that low probability might affect decisions about what information to provide about the liability and how to provide that information.' This guidance establishes a key principle but allows specific requirements and guidance to be developed at the standards-level.
R019 <i>Risk of increase in number of liabilities</i>	Paragraph 5.16B could lead to an increase in the number of the items considered as liabilities and create unintended consequences such as a presumption that, in principle, every possible liability should be recognized despite being irrelevant or measured at nil. Furthermore, once the element definitions, the recognition criteria and the measurement guidance in the IPSASB Conceptual Framework are applied, it is likely that items with low likelihood of realization will either not be recognized or will be measured taking into account the extent to which they are expected to be realized. (R19)	It is not the intention to create a presumption that every possible liability should be recognized on all occasions. (See reference to key sentence in paragraph 5.16B noted above in R10 analysis).

<p>R027 <i>Differentiating transfers in Conceptual Framework and transfers in Revenue context at the standards level</i></p>	<p>Consider including a paragraph in the Basis for Conclusions to differentiate between these transfers (in Conceptual Framework) and transfers in the context of IPSAS 23.</p>	<p>IPSAS 23 will be replaced by a single standard developed from ED 70, <i>Revenue with Performance Obligations</i>, and ED 71, <i>Revenue without Performance Obligations</i>. The defined terms in the forthcoming IPSAS will therefore clarify usages for specific transactions and events. A paragraph can be inserted in the Basis for Conclusions explaining the IPSASB's reasoning.</p>
---	---	--

Respondents partially agreeing

8. Two respondents (R04 & R25) have been classified as partially agreeing with the revised guidance.

Table 3—Issues Raised by Respondents Partially Agreeing to Proposed Revised Guidance on Transfer of Resources

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Analysis</i>
<p>R04 <i>Alternative wording to 'resources'</i></p>	<p>Substitute the words 'resources' ('economic or otherwise') where the word 'resources' occur in line with the definition of 'Liability' suggested by us.</p>	<p>Suggested change already considered in Agenda Item 10.2.1 on Definition of an Asset and rejected.</p>

<p>R25 <i>Areas for inclusion of additional guidance</i></p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.16D – 5.16 F could be further elaborated to include additional guidance for situations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When there is one entity that generates the obligation and there is a separate entity that actually transfers the resources (for example, when the Treasury Single Account transfers the resources on behalf of entities that not necessarily belong to the same reporting entity.) • Settling down obligations without a transfer of resources (offsetting). • Transactions that occur between entities of the same subsector or between subsectors with or without a transfer of resources. 	<p>The accounting treatment of the Treasury Single Account is a public sector specific issue. However, it is too low-level for consideration in the Conceptual Framework.</p> <p>Off-setting should be addressed at the standards-level. It is an aspect of presentation and not directly relevant to the determination of whether a transaction or other event gives rise to an element.</p>
---	---	---

Respondents disagreeing

9. Two respondents (R12 & R21) have been classified as disagreeing with the revised guidance. The issues raised are grouped and analyzed in Table 4 below.

Table 4—Issues Raised by Respondents Disagreeing to Proposed Revised Guidance on the Transfer of Resources

<i>Respondent(s)</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Analysis</i>
R12/R21 <i>Guidance on Transfer of Resources too broad and will lead to larger number of obligations giving rise to liabilities</i>	<p>The transfer of resources from an entity in paragraph 5.16A is too broad and ambiguities may arise. This is evidenced by mentioning that, to satisfy the definition of a liability, the obligation must have the potential to require the entity to transfer a resource to a third party and for that potential to exist it need not be certain or even probable. (R12)</p> <p>The wording in paragraphs 5.16A and 5.16B is too broad. By stating “the obligation must have the potential...” includes too many possibilities. Many liabilities have the potential to occur, however are unlikely or very unlikely to occur. (R21)</p>	<p>It is a key principle that the criteria for the definition of a liability are separated from recognition criteria. Chapter 6, <i>Recognition in Financial Statements</i>, deals with existence and measurement uncertainty.</p> <p>The section on “Transfer of Resources’ should be read in the overall context of the key components of the definition of a liability, particularly the section ‘<i>Present Obligations as a Result of Past Events</i>’. A key attribute of the definition of a liability is that there must be one or more past events that lead to an obligation becoming a present obligation.</p>

Way Forward

- There was wide support for the proposed guidance. While the term ‘transfers’ does have public sector connotations, notably the movement of resources between different levels of government, Board Sponsor and staff think it clear that its usage in revised draft Chapter 5 the Conceptual Framework is broad and not limited to such movements. Board Sponsor and staff therefore recommend that the guidance on Transfer of Resources enhances the utility of the discussion of a liability and should be included in the updated Chapter 5.

Decision Required

- Does the IPSASB agree with the Board Sponsor and staff [recommendation](#) in paragraph 2?

Revised Structure of Guidance on Liabilities

Question

1. Does the IPSASB approve the recommendation in paragraph 2?

Recommendation

2. Board Sponsor and staff recommend that the revised structure of guidance proposed in ED 81, *Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements*, should be included in the updated Chapter 5.

Background

3. ED 81 proposed a restructuring of the guidance on liabilities so that it reflected the components of the definition of a liability more clearly. The revised guidance is in paragraphs 5.14A-5.17D of ED 81. The guidance included the following subsections:
 - Obligation
 - Transfer of Resources from the Entity
 - Present Obligations as a Result of Past Events
4. The revised structure drew on the approach in the IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework in describing the characteristics of an obligation more clearly and also linking a present obligation to past events. The revised approach included some new material, but largely involved a relocation of existing material in the 2014 Conceptual Framework.
5. Specific Matter for Comment (SMC) 6 asked for views on the proposed restructuring.

Approach in IASB literature

6. The IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework guidance on a liability adopted the following structure:
 - Obligation
 - Transfer of an economic resource
 - Present obligation as a result of past events
7. As noted above the IPSASB drew on this structure in restructuring its guidance. The difference in terminology related to resources/economic resources is discussed in paragraph 7 of Agenda Item 10.2.2.

Analysis

8. The quantitative summary on SMC 6 is in Table 1.

Table 3—Responses to SMC 6: Revised Structure of Guidance on Liabilities

Response	Respondents	
	#	%
Agree	24	89
Partially Agree	1	4
Disagree	0	0
Subtotal	25	93
No Comment	2	7
Total	27	100

Respondents agreeing

9. 24 respondents have been classified as agreeing with the revised restructuring as proposed in ED 81 (R01, R03, R05, R06, R07, R08, R09, R10, R11, R12, R13, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R21, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26 & R27). Table 2 summarizes and analyzes issues raised by these respondents.

Table 2—Issues Raised by Respondents Agreeing with Proposed Revised Structure of Guidance on Liabilities

Respondent(s)	Comment	Analysis
R06 <i>Revision of second sentence of paragraph 5.17B</i>	Suggest revising the second sentence in paragraph 5.17B to read as follows because it seems fragmented: “For example, implementing a program or service could involve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making a political promise such as an electoral pledge; • Announcement of a policy; • Introduction (and approval) of the budget (which may be two distinct points); and • The budget becoming effective (in some jurisdictions the budget will not be effective until an appropriation has been effected).” 	Agree. Will action change in the next draft of Chapter 5.

<p>R10 <i>Public communication of intention to behave in a particular way</i></p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.15A and 5.17C both refer to public communication of intentions in the context of a liability. We note that there is a possible inconsistency between these references, as explained below.</p> <p>We acknowledge that paragraph 5.15A and 5.17C discuss public communication of intentions in different contexts. Nevertheless, to avoid confusion that could result from the perceived inconsistency between these two paragraphs, we recommend deleting the reference to public communication in paragraph 5.15A. That is, we recommend deleting from paragraph 5.15A the words “even where it has publicly communicated an intention to behave in a particular way”. We think that deleting these words would not detract from the usefulness of paragraph 5.15A.</p> <p>The relocated paragraph 5.17C lists factors that are likely to impact judgement around the point at which a liability arises. We note that in the ED, the last sentence in this bullet point is marked for deletion. The deleted sentence says: “Similarly, if an obligation is contingent on future events occurring, there may be discretion to avoid an outflow of resources before these events occur”.</p> <p>We recommend clarifying the reason for the deletion of this sentence in the Basis for Conclusions. We have received feedback that such clarification would be useful.</p>	<p>The wording ‘An entity cannot be obligated to itself, even where it has publicly communicated an intention to behave in a particular way’ in paragraph 5.15A reinforces an important principle-that an entity cannot be obligated to itself regardless of whether this has been communicated to external parties- and staff does not think it should be deleted. Staff will add a sentence to paragraph 5.17C that the public communication must create an obligation to an external party and insert a cross reference to paragraph 5.15A.</p> <p>Agree with this recommendation. Staff will add a sentence to the Basis for Conclusions stating that the sentence has been deleted because it is inconsistent with the statement in paragraph 5.16A.</p>
--	--	---

Respondents partially agreeing

10. R04 has been classified as partially agreeing with the revised definition.

Table 3—Issues Raised by Respondents Partially Agreeing with Proposed Revised Structure of Guidance on Liabilities

<i>Respondent(s)</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Analysis</i>
R04 Limitation of liabilities	The legislators of many countries have limited the performance of related obligations by a public entity with the status of an operator of essential services to specific essential services which relate to the exercising of the function of an operator of that service. In activities not directly related to the essential service, the public entity is not obliged to fulfil any obligations imposed by law on the operator of essential services..... The ED may tell how such obligations as a liability to be reported and how to quantify such liabilities in monetary terms.	This is a jurisdiction-specific issue and too low-level for guidance to be provided in the Conceptual Framework. It is for preparers to use judgment as to when and where such a public sector entity has a legal obligation. No change proposed.

Respondents *disagreeing*

- No respondents have been classified as disagreeing with the proposed revised structure.

Way Forward

- There was strong support for the proposed restructuring. As indicated above Staff and Board Sponsor, therefore recommend that the restructured section should be included in the amended Chapter 5 with the editorial amendments identified in paragraph 9.

Decision Required

- Does the IPSASB agree with the Board Sponsor and staff [recommendation](#) in paragraph 2?

Rights-Based Approach to Resources

Question

1. Does the IPSASB approve the recommendation in paragraph 2?

Recommendation

2. Board Sponsor and staff recommend that the rights-based approach to resources in ED 81, *Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements* should be included in the updated Chapter 5.

Background

3. ED 81 adopted a more explicit rights-based approach to the description of resources in the context of the definition of an asset,
4. Specific Matter for Comment (SMC) 3 asked for views on the proposed approach.

Approach in IASB literature

5. The IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework adopted a rights-based approach to resources.' The IPSASB drew on this subsection in developing its proposed guidance.

Analysis

6. The quantitative summary of responses to SMC 5 is in Table 1

Table 4—Responses to SMC 3: Rights-Based Approach to Resources

Response	Respondents	
	#	%
Agree	18	67
Partially Agree	2	7
Disagree	5	19
Subtotal	25	93
No Comment	2	7
Total	27	100

Respondents agreeing

7. 18 respondents (R03, R06, R07, R08, R09, R10, R11, R13, R15, R17, R18, R19, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26 & R27) have been classified as agreeing with the proposed approach in ED 81. Table 2 summarizes and analyzes issues raised by these respondents.
8. In addition, R07 noted that it had made critical comments on the right of use model in responding to ED 63, *Leases*, and ED 74, *Leases*.

Table 2—Issues Raised by Respondents Agreeing with Proposed Rights-Based Approach to Resources

Respondent(s)	Comment	Analysis
R06 <i>Accuracy of footnote on 'goods and services'</i>	Revise footnote 1 to read: "Subsequent references to 'services' in the Conceptual Framework encompass 'goods' unless the context indicates otherwise." This is because there are specific references to services or goods later in chapter.	Agree. Draft footnote is inaccurate because, as highlighted by R06 some subsequent references are specific to either goods or services. The footnote will be amended as suggested by R06.
R10 <i>Alternative description of a resource</i>	The description of a resource in paragraph 5.6A is: <i>a right to either service potential or the capability to generate economic benefits, or a right to both</i> . R10 proposes an alternative description: <i>A resource is a right that has the capability to generate economic benefits or service potential or both</i>	The wording of paragraph 5.6A was extensively considered in the development of ED 81. Staff don't think that the alternative proposed overall.
R10 <i>Reference in asset definition to past events rather than a past event</i>	Similarly, to the IASB's Conceptual Framework, the ED proposes to amend both the definition of an asset and a liability by replacing the term 'a past event' (singular) with 'past events' (plural). The Basis for Conclusions explains that the term 'past events' also includes scenarios where an asset or liability arises as a result of a single past event. However, we would recommend clarifying this point in the core text of the IPSASB Conceptual Framework, as proposed change from 'past event' to 'past events' seems to imply that a single event is no longer sufficient for an asset or a liability to arise.	Paragraph 5.13 includes an amended opening sentence: The definition of an asset requires that a resource that an entity presently controls must have arisen from a one or more past transactions or other past events. Staff propose reinforcing this by adding 'one or more' before 'past transactions.'
R13 <i>Sovereign Powers and Rights</i>	Recommend that the role governments' sovereign powers and rights play in identifying resources be explained more clearly. No changes are proposed to the BCs where this role is currently explained. It would be useful for the IPSASB to note in the BCs that the change in approach should not change governments' assessments of their resources resulting from sovereign powers and rights.	Staff propose adding a sentence to paragraph BC5.18. that the revised approach does not affect the discussion of sovereign powers and rights and the key principle that an asset arises when the power is exercised, and the rights exist to receive resources.

<p>R15 <i>Examples in sections on ‘Rights’ and ‘Presently Controlled by the Entity as a Result of Past Events.’</i></p>	<p>Examples in paragraph 5.7B and 5.13 should be simpler.</p>	<p>Student loans and the electromagnetic spectrum will not be pervasive in all jurisdictions, but they are topical where relevant and have featured in IPSASB deliberations over the last decade. No changes proposed.</p>
<p>R17/R18 <i>Purpose and wording of paragraph dealing with employee services and services-kind</i></p>	<p>Proposes that paragraph 5.7C should not use the word ‘rights’ rather than ‘capability’ so that it is consistent with the other paragraphs that have been inserted. (R17)</p> <p>The inclusion of paragraph 5.7C is unclear and it would be helpful to understand the purpose. (R18)</p>	<p>The paragraph deals with employee services and services in-kind and conveys that the reporting entity very briefly has an asset before the entity consumes the services. It is drawn from a very similar paragraph in the IASB 2018 Framework. This issue arose in the discussion of the accounting treatment of services in-kind in the ongoing Revenue project and staff think that the guidance is helpful.</p> <p>The reference to services in-kind has therefore been added to acknowledge a particular public sector circumstance.</p> <p>Staff agree propose changing the word ‘capability’ to ‘right’, in order to make the paragraphs significance clearer as suggested by R17.</p>
<p>R19 <i>Sovereign Rights</i></p>	<p>IPSASB views sovereign rights as a resource.</p>	<p>The Framework is silent on whether sovereign rights are a resource. The key principle is that an asset arises when the power is exercised, and the rights exist to receive resources</p>

R19 <i>Identification of differences with IASB 2018 Conceptual</i>	The reason for differences between the proposed IPSASB paragraphs and the IASB equivalent. may not be clear to stakeholders and should perhaps be explained in the Basis for Conclusion.	The Limited Scope Update project is not an IFRS alignment project, so such an analysis is inappropriate.
---	--	--

Respondents partially agreeing

9. Two respondents (R16 & R20) have been classified as partially agreeing with the revised guidance.

Table 3—Issues Raised by Respondents Partially Agreeing with Proposed Rights-Based Approach to Resources

Respondent	Comment	Analysis
<p>R16 <i>Structure of Guidance on Assets</i></p>	<p>Since not all of the concept discussed in the subheadings are part of the definition of an asset in ED 81.5.6, we think the proposed organization of this section may lead to confusion. We note that in the IASB CF, Chapter 4, the Definition of an asset section in 4.3 and 4.4 includes the definition of both an asset and an economic resource. Paragraph 4.5 then introduces the subsections below these definitions which discuss different aspects that align with the elements and terminology used in these definitions. We think this approach is more understandable and easier to follow and we recommend that the IPSASB consider more closely aligning its assets section in a similar manner as that of the IASB.</p> <p>In addition, we note that while the discussion on rights does touch on how a resource is a set of rights and not the physical object in paragraph 5.7F, we think it would be clearer to explicitly state that the concept of rights can lead to both tangible or intangible assets and that physical form is not a necessary condition of a resource, similar to existing paragraph 5.7, which is currently proposed to be removed, which states that “Physical form is not a necessary condition of a resource.”</p> <p>Furthermore, we think the discussion around rights in the context of control in paragraph 5.7D might be better placed in the separate section that discusses control. This approach would result in each concept in the definition being discussed separately which may be easier to understand.</p>	<p>Staff think that the existing structure does address all the components of the definition and are not persuaded that the IASB’s structure would improve the draft Chapter.</p> <p>Agree and will reinsert a sentence stating that physical form is not a necessary attribute of a resource in subsection on Service Potential and Economic Benefits. This implicitly acknowledges that rights can lead to both tangible and intangible assets.</p> <p>The main principle in paragraph 5.7D is that not all rights of an entity lead to an asset. There is a cross-reference to the later discussion of control, so staff think that the location of this paragraph is appropriate. Its location is also similar to that in the IASB’s 2018 Conceptual Framework.</p>

<p>R20 <i>Perceived complexity of rights-based approach</i></p>	<p>The change to a rights-based approach is very complex to interpret, particularly where it defines a specific right as equating to an asset, and while the logic appears sound, one wonders how practical it will be for these concepts to be applied in day-to-day accounting, particularly for non-current and non-financial assets such as Property, Plant and Equipment. A concern may be reasonably raised in respect of understandability, where viewing an asset as a set of rights (that is, right to use, sell, lease or pledge) may create a view where each right is viewed as a separate asset, which may change the unit of account.</p>	<p>Guidance acknowledges that in many cases, the set of rights arising from legal ownership of a physical object is accounted for as a single asset. Where different reporting entities have different rights over a physical object the accounting should reflect this.</p>
--	---	---

Respondents disagreeing

- Five respondents (R01, R04, R05, R12 & R21) have been classified as disagreeing with the rights-based approach. The issues raised are grouped and analyzed in Table 4 below.

Table 4—Issues Raised by Respondents Disagreeing with Proposed Rights-Based Approach to Resources

<i>Respondent(s)</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Analysis</i>
R01 & R05 <i>Reservations about divisibility of a physical assets/Reservations about rights-based approach</i>	<p>A physical asset dedicated to the service of the public needs to be reflected as a whole. This was actually one of the major improvements on cash basis accounting, being able to track and follow-up on physical assets and associated amortisation and replacement costs. We do think that reporting on a physical asset as a whole is more relevant for public sector specific operations than reporting on the various rights its legal ownership may give rise to.</p> <p>The rights-based approach be retained, the consequences should be further elaborated on. For instance, further guidance would be useful to allow for consistently identifying when the physical object should be considered as a whole versus when the set of rights that the physical object may give rise to separate assets. (R1)</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.7E and 5.7F note that related rights are often treated as a single unit of account that is a single asset and that, in many cases, the set of rights arising from legal ownership of a physical object is accounted for as a single asset. There may be cases where different entities have different rights over an asset, and this should be reflected in the accounting.</p> <p>Detailed requirements and guidance on unit of account are provided at the standards-level. Staff consider it inappropriate for the Conceptual Framework to provide examples of when the physical object is treated as a single unit of account and when there may be separate units of account.</p>

<p>R04/05 <i>Reservations about some of guidance on rights</i></p>	<p>Reservations about aspects of guidance on rights in paragraphs 5.7A, 5.7C, 5.7D and 5.7E:</p> <p>5.7A(a)(iii): Questions why rights to exchange have to be favorable</p> <p>5.7C: Questions whether the entity's capability to obtain the service potential or economic benefits produced by employee and in-kind services exists very briefly until the entity consumes the goods and services. Questions why such capability will be brief? Questions why such a capability cannot be perpetual?</p> <p>5.7D: This paragraph provides guidance that not all of an entity's rights are assets. R04 considers that what is in public domain cannot be a right of one entity and hence naturally not asset of that entity. Therefore, this part of the guidance is against the legal principles and should be omitted.</p> <p>5.7E: This paragraph provides guidance on the rights that may arise from legal ownership of a physical assets. R04 considers that an entity may own a physical object but not the intellectual property rights.</p> <p>Ownership is either vested or contingent. It is vested ownership when the title of the owner is already perfect. It is contingent ownership when the title of the owner is yet imperfect but is capable of becoming perfect on the fulfilment of some condition.</p> <p>Questions purpose of paragraph 5.7C</p>	<p>Staff are satisfied that these paragraphs are coherent. They are drawn from the IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework.</p> <p>5.7(a)(iii) Rights to exchange that are neither favorable nor unfavorable do not give rise to assets or liabilities.</p> <p>5.7C Entities are likely to access employee and in-kind services on an ongoing basis. An entity obtains an access prior to recognizing an expense.</p> <p>5.7D The guidance states that an entity can have rights of access to public goods that are controlled by other entities, such as public rights of way over land controlled by other entities, or know-how that is in the public domain but that such rights are typically not assets of the entities that hold such rights. Staff disagree with the view that an entity cannot have rights over items that are in the public domain.</p> <p>5.7E This is an example of different rights existing over a physical object and is in accordance with the principle illustrated in the guidance in this paragraph. Staff does not think that it is</p>
---	--	--

		appropriate to distinguish vested and contingent ownership.
R05 <i>Appropriateness of adopting rights-based approach in limited scope project</i>	The introduction of an explicitly rights-based approach is inappropriate for a limited scope project. Considers that the conceptual and practical benefits of espousing a rights-based approach in the public sector should be more extensively investigated, presented, and exemplified.	Approach was discussed in project brief approved by the IPSASB and made publicly available.
R05 <i>Overemphasis on alignment with IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework</i>	Exclusive emphasis on alignment with the IASB's Conceptual Framework.	The project has analyzed the rights-based approach and considered it appropriate for public sector.
R05 <i>Resource as a storage of services</i>	Advocates definition of an asset as a resource should mean that an asset is a storage of services.	Staff considers this definition too narrow-it does not include a resource's capability to generate economic benefits.
R12/R05 <i>Approach inappropriate for public sector</i>	Approach is insufficiently attuned to the needs of users in the public sector	Where different entities have rights over an asset a failure to recognize those rights risks not faithfully presenting assets and net financial position.
R21/R05 <i>Complexity of concept of rights</i>	The concept of rights is complex. It is a secondary characteristic of assets compared with control (R21)	The definition of an asset does not imply a hierarchy between the different components. All criteria in the definition must be met in order for an asset to exist.

Way Forward

- The above analysis has indicated a number of areas where the guidance can be improved. However, while a number of respondents highlight complexity particularly in the determination of rights, Board Sponsor and staff do not think that any fatal flaws have been identified. Board Sponsor and staff therefore recommend that a more explicitly rights-based approach is adopted in the updated Chapter 5, with the further explanations and amendments proposed above.

Decision Required

11. Does the IPSASB agree with the Board Sponsor and staff [recommendation](#) in paragraph 2?

Exposure Draft 81
January 2022
Comments due: May 31, 2022

IPSAS[®]

Proposed Update to Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Framework Update:
Chapter 3, *Qualitative*
***Characteristics* and Chapter 5,**
Elements in Financial Statements

IPSASB

**International Public
Sector Accounting
Standards Board[®]**

This document was developed and approved by the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board® (IPSASB®).

The objective of the IPSASB is to serve the public interest by setting high-quality public sector accounting standards and by facilitating the adoption and implementation of these, thereby enhancing the quality and consistency of practice throughout the world and strengthening the transparency and accountability of public sector finances.

In meeting this objective the IPSASB sets IPSAS™ and Recommended Practice Guidelines (RPGs) for use by public sector entities, including national, regional, and local governments, and related governmental agencies.

IPSAS relate to the general purpose financial statements (financial statements) and are authoritative. RPGs are pronouncements that provide guidance on good practice in preparing general purpose financial reports (GPFRs) that are not financial statements. Unlike IPSAS RPGs do not establish requirements. Currently all pronouncements relating to GPFRs that are not financial statements are RPGs. RPGs do not provide guidance on the level of assurance (if any) to which information should be subjected.

The structures and processes that support the operations of the IPSASB are facilitated by the International Federation of Accountants® (IFAC®).

Copyright © January 2022 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). For copyright, trademark, and permissions information, [please see page 62](#).

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

This Exposure Draft (ED), *Conceptual Framework Update: Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics and Chapter 5, Elements in Financial Statements*, was developed and approved by the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board® (IPSASB®).

The proposals in this Exposure Draft may be modified in light of comments received before being issued in final form. **Comments are requested by May 31, 2022.**

Respondents are asked to submit their comments electronically through the IPSASB website, using the “[Submit a Comment](#)” link. Please submit comments in both a PDF file and a Word file. Also, please note that first-time users must register to use this feature. All comments will be considered a matter of public record and will ultimately be posted on the website. This publication may be downloaded from the IPSASB website: www.ipsasb.org. The approved text is published in the English language.

Objective of the ED

This ED aims to update Chapter 3, *Qualitative Characteristics*, and Chapter 5, *Elements of Financial Statements*, of the Conceptual Framework, in light of the IPSASB’s experience in applying the Framework to the development and maintenance of IPSAS and developments in international thinking about conceptual issues since the Framework was approved in 2014.

Guide for Respondents

The IPSASB would welcome comments on all of the matters discussed in this ED. Comments are most helpful if they indicate the specific paragraph or group of paragraphs to which they relate, contain a clear rationale and, where applicable, provide a suggestion for alternative wording.

The Specific Matters for Comment for the ED are provided below.

Specific Matter for Comment 1: Prudence

In paragraphs 3.14A and 3.14B, the IPSASB has provided guidance on the role of prudence in supporting neutrality, in the context of the qualitative characteristic of faithful representation. Paragraphs BC3.17A-BC3.17E explain the reasons for this guidance. Do you agree with this approach?

If not, why not? How would you modify these paragraphs?

Specific Matter for Comment 2: Obscuring Information as a Factor Relevant to Materiality Judgments

In discussing materiality in paragraph 3.32 the IPSASB has added obscuring information to misstating or omitting information as factors relevant to materiality judgments. The reasons for this addition are in paragraphs BC3.32A and BC3.32B.

Do you agree with the addition of obscuring information to factors relevant to materiality judgments? If not, why not?

Specific Matter for Comment 3: Rights-Based Approach to a Resource

Paragraphs 5.7A-5.7G reflect a rights-based approach to the description of resources in the context of an asset. The reasons for this approach are in paragraphs BC5.3A-BC5.3F.

Do you agree with this proposed change? If not, why not?

Specific Matter for Comment 4: Definition of a Liability

The revised definition of a liability is in paragraph 5.14:

A present obligation of the entity to transfer resources as a result of past events.

The reasons for the revised definition are in paragraphs 5.18A-5.18H.

Do you agree with the revised definition? If you do not agree with the revised definition, what definition do you support and why?

Specific Matter for Comment 5: Guidance on the Transfer of Resources

The IPSASB has included guidance on the transfer of resources in paragraphs 5.16A-5.16F of the section on Liabilities. The reasons for including this guidance are in paragraphs BC5.19A-BC5.19D.

Do you agree with this guidance? If not, how would you modify it?

Specific Matter for Comment 6: Revised Structure of Guidance on Liabilities

In addition to including guidance on the transfer of resources, the IPSASB has restructured the guidance on liabilities so that it aligns better with the revised definition of a liability. This guidance is in paragraphs 5.14A-5.17D. Paragraph BC5.18H explains the reasons for this restructuring.

Do you agree with this restructuring? If not, how would you modify it?

Specific Matter for Comment 7: Unit of Account

The IPSASB has added a section of Unit of Account in paragraphs 5.26A-5.26J. The reasons for proposing this section are in paragraphs BC5.36A-BC5.36C.

Do you agree with the addition of a section on Unit of Account and its content? If not, how would you modify it and why?

Specific Matter for Comment 8: Accounting Principles for Binding Arrangements that are Equally Unperformed

The IPSASB took the view that guidance on accounting principles for binding arrangements that are equally unperformed should be included in the Conceptual Framework, but that a separate section on accounting principles for such binding arrangements is unnecessary. These principles are included in paragraphs 5.26G-5.26H of the section on Unit of Account. The explanation is at paragraphs BC5.36D-BC5.36F.

Do you agree that:

- (a) Guidance on principles for binding arrangements that are equally unperformed is necessary; and if so
- (b) Such guidance should be included in the Unit of Account section, rather than in a separate section?

If you do not agree, please give your reasons.

Note:

In ED 81, text deleted from the Conceptual Framework approved in 2014 is struck out. New text is underlined. Text that has been relocated is double underlined. Deleted text that has been relocated is both struck through and double underlined.

DRAFT

**EXPOSURE DRAFT 81, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK UPDATE:
CHAPTER 3, QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS AND CHAPTER 5,
ELEMENTS IN FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 3: QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS	7–23
CHAPTER 5: ELEMENTS IN FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.....	24–61

DRAFT

CHAPTER 3: QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS

CONTENTS

	Paragraph
Introduction.....	3.1–3.5
Relevance	3.6–3.9
Faithful Representation	3.10–3.16
Understandability	3.17–3.18
Timeliness	3.19–3.20
Comparability	3.21–3.25
Verifiability	3.26–3.31
Constraints on Information Included in General Purpose Financial Reports	3.32–3.42
Materiality	3.32–3.34
Cost-Benefit.....	3.35–3.40
Balance Between the Qualitative Characteristics	3.41–3.42
Basis for Conclusions	

Introduction

- 3.1 GPFRs present financial and non-financial information about economic and other phenomena. The qualitative characteristics of information included in GPFRs are the attributes that make that information useful to users and support the achievement of the objectives of financial reporting. The objectives of financial reporting are to provide information useful for accountability and decision-making purposes.
- 3.2 The qualitative characteristics of information included in GPFRs of public sector entities are relevance, faithful representation, understandability, timeliness, comparability, and verifiability.
- 3.3 Pervasive constraints on information included in GPFRs are materiality, cost-benefit, and achieving an appropriate balance between the qualitative characteristics.
- 3.4 Each of the qualitative characteristics is integral to, and works with, the other characteristics to provide in GPFRs information useful for achieving the objectives of financial reporting. However, in practice, all qualitative characteristics may not be fully achieved, and a balance or trade-off between certain of them may be necessary.
- 3.5 The qualitative characteristics apply to all financial and non-financial information reported in GPFRs, including historic and prospective information, and explanatory information. However, the extent to which the qualitative characteristics can be achieved may differ depending on the degree of uncertainty and subjective assessment or opinion involved in compiling the financial and non-financial information. The need for additional guidance on interpreting and applying the qualitative characteristics to information that extends the scope of financial reporting beyond financial statements will be considered in the development of any IPSASs and RPGs that deal with such matters.

Relevance

- 3.6 Financial and non-financial information is relevant if it is capable of making a difference in achieving the objectives of financial reporting. Financial and non-financial information is capable of making a difference when it has confirmatory value, predictive value, or both. It may be capable of making a difference, and thus be relevant, even if some users choose not to take advantage of it or are already aware of it.
- 3.7 Financial and non-financial information has confirmatory value if it confirms or changes past (or present) expectations. For example, information will be relevant for accountability and decision-making purposes if it confirms expectations about such matters as the extent to which managers have discharged their responsibilities for the efficient and effective use of resources, the achievement of specified service delivery objectives, and compliance with relevant budgetary, legislative and other requirements.
- 3.8 GPFRs may present information about an entity's anticipated future service delivery activities, objectives and costs, and the amount and sources of the resources that are intended to be allocated to providing services in the future. Such future oriented information will have predictive value and

be relevant for accountability and decision-making purposes. Information about economic and other phenomena that exist or have already occurred can also have predictive value in helping form expectations about the future. For example, information that confirms or disproves past expectations can reinforce or change expectations about financial results and service delivery outcomes that may occur in the future.

- 3.9 The confirmatory and predictive roles of information are interrelated—for example, information about the current level and structure of an entity’s resources and claims to those resources helps users to confirm the outcome of resource management strategies during the period, and to predict an entity’s ability to respond to changing circumstances and anticipated future service delivery needs. The same information helps to confirm or correct users’ past expectations and predictions about the entity’s ability to respond to such changes. It also helps to confirm or correct prospective financial information included in previous GPFRs.

Faithful Representation

- 3.10 To be useful in financial reporting, information must be a faithful representation of the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent. Faithful representation is attained when the depiction of the phenomenon is complete, neutral, and free from material error. Information that faithfully represents an economic or other phenomenon depicts the substance of the underlying transaction, other event, activity or circumstance—which is not necessarily always the same as its legal form.
- 3.11 In practice, it may not be possible to know or confirm whether information presented in GPFRs is complete, neutral, and free from material error. However, information should be as complete, neutral, and free from error as is possible.
- 3.12 An omission of some information can cause the representation of an economic or other phenomenon to be false or misleading, and thus not useful to users of GPFRs. For example, a complete depiction of the item “plant and equipment” in GPFRs will include a numeric representation of the aggregate amount of plant and equipment together with other quantitative, descriptive and explanatory information necessary to faithfully represent that class of assets. In some cases, this may include the disclosure of information about such matters as the major classes of plant and equipment, factors that have affected their use in the past or might impact on their use in the future, and the basis and process for determining their numeric representation. Similarly, prospective financial and non-financial information and information about the achievement of service delivery objectives and outcomes included in GPFRs will need to be presented with the key assumptions that underlie that information and any explanations that are necessary to ensure that its depiction is complete and useful to users.
- 3.13 Neutrality in financial reporting is the absence of bias. It means that the selection and presentation of financial and non-financial information is not made with the intention of attaining a particular predetermined result—for example, to influence in a particular way users’ assessment of the discharge of accountability by the entity or a decision or judgment that is to be made, or to induce particular behavior.

- 3.14 Neutral information faithfully represents the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent. However, to require information included in GPFRs to be neutral does not mean that it is not without purpose or that it will not influence behavior. Relevance is a qualitative characteristic and, by definition, relevant information is capable of influencing users' assessments and decisions.
- 3.14A Neutrality is supported by the exercise of prudence. Prudence is the exercise of caution when making judgments under conditions of uncertainty. The exercise of prudence means that assets and revenue are not overstated, and liabilities and expense are not understated. Equally, the exercise of prudence does not allow for the understatement of assets or revenue or the overstatement of liabilities or expense. Such misstatements can lead to the overstatement or understatement of revenue or expense in future reporting periods.
- 3.14B The exercise of prudence does not imply a need for asymmetry; for example, a systematic need for more persuasive evidence to support the recognition of assets or revenue than the recognition of liabilities or expense. Particular standards may contain asymmetric requirements where this is a consequence of decisions intended to select the most relevant information that faithfully represents what it purports to represent.
- 3.15 The economic and other phenomena represented in GPFRs generally occur under conditions of uncertainty. Information included in GPFRs will therefore often include estimates that incorporate management's judgment. To faithfully represent an economic or other phenomenon, an estimate must be based on appropriate inputs, and each input must reflect the best available information. Caution will need to be exercised when dealing with uncertainty. It may sometimes be necessary to explicitly disclose the degree of uncertainty in financial and non-financial information to faithfully represent economic and other phenomena.
- 3.16 Free from material error does not mean complete accuracy in all respects. Free from material error means there are no errors or omissions that are individually or collectively material in the description of the phenomenon, and the process used to produce the reported information has been applied as described. In some cases, it may be possible to determine the accuracy of some information included in GPFRs—for example, the amount of a cash transfer to another level of government, the volume of services delivered, or the price paid for the acquisition of plant and equipment. However, in other cases it may not—for example, the accuracy of an estimate of the value or cost of an item or the effectiveness of a service delivery program may not be able to be determined. In these cases, the estimate will be free from material error if the amount is clearly described as an estimate, the nature and limitations of the estimation process are explained, and no material errors have been identified in selecting and applying an appropriate process for developing the estimate.

Understandability

- 3.17 Understandability is the quality of information that enables users to comprehend its meaning. GPFRs of public sector entities should present information in a manner that responds to the needs and knowledge base of users, and to the nature of the information presented. For example, explanations of financial and non-financial information and commentary on service delivery and other achievements during the reporting period and expectations for future periods should be

written in plain language and presented in a manner that is readily understandable by users. Understandability is enhanced when information is classified, characterized, and presented clearly and concisely. Comparability also can enhance understandability.

- 3.18 Users of GPFRs are assumed to have a reasonable knowledge of the entity's activities and the environment in which it operates, to be able and prepared to read GPFRs, and to review and analyze the information presented with reasonable diligence. Some economic and other phenomena are particularly complex and difficult to represent in GPFRs, and some users may need to seek the aid of an advisor to assist in their understanding of them. All efforts should be undertaken to represent economic and other phenomena included in GPFRs in a manner that is understandable to a wide range of users. However, information should not be excluded from GPFRs solely because it may be too complex or difficult for some users to understand without assistance.

Timeliness

- 3.19 Users of GPFRs are assumed to have a reasonable knowledge of the entity's activities and the environment in which it operates, to be able and prepared to read GPFRs, and to review and analyze the information presented with reasonable diligence. Some economic and other phenomena are particularly complex and difficult to represent in GPFRs, and some users may need to seek the aid of an advisor to assist in their understanding of them. All efforts should be undertaken to represent economic and other phenomena included in GPFRs in a manner that is understandable to a wide range of users. However, information should not be excluded from GPFRs solely because it may be too complex or difficult for some users to understand without assistance.
- 3.20 Some items of information may continue to be useful long after the reporting period or reporting date. For example, for accountability and decision-making purposes, users of GPFRs may need to assess trends in the financial and service delivery performance of the entity and its compliance with budgets over a number of reporting periods. In addition, the outcome and effects of some service delivery programs may not be determinable until future periods—for example, this may occur in respect of programs intended to enhance the economic well-being of constituents, reduce the incidence of a particular disease, or increase literacy levels of certain age groups.

Comparability

- 3.21 Comparability is the quality of information that enables users to identify similarities in, and differences between, two sets of phenomena. Comparability is not a quality of an individual item of information, but rather a quality of the relationship between two or more items of information.
- 3.22 Comparability differs from consistency. Consistency refers to the use of the same accounting principles or policies and basis of preparation, either from period to period within an entity or in a single period across more than one entity. Comparability is the goal, and consistency helps in achieving that goal. In some cases, the accounting principles or policies adopted by an entity may be revised to better represent a particular transaction or event in GPFRs. In these cases, the

inclusion of additional disclosures or explanation may be necessary to satisfy the characteristics of comparability.

- 3.23 Comparability differs from consistency. Consistency refers to the use of the same accounting principles or policies and basis of preparation, either from period to period within an entity or in a single period across more than one entity. Comparability is the goal, and consistency helps in achieving that goal. In some cases, the accounting principles or policies adopted by an entity may be revised to better represent a particular transaction or event in GPFs. In these cases, the inclusion of additional disclosures or explanation may be necessary to satisfy the characteristics of comparability.
- 3.24 Information about the entity's financial position, financial performance, cash flows, compliance with approved budgets and relevant legislation or other authority governing the raising and use of resources, service delivery achievements, and its future plans is necessary for accountability purposes and useful as input for decision-making purposes. The usefulness of such information is enhanced if it can be compared with, for example:
- Prospective financial and non-financial information previously presented for that reporting period or reporting date;
 - Similar information about the same entity for some other period or some other point in time; and
 - Similar information about other entities (for example, public sector entities providing similar services in different jurisdictions) for the same reporting period.
- 3.25 Consistent application of accounting principles, policies and basis of preparation to prospective financial and non-financial information and actual outcomes will enhance the usefulness of any comparison of projected and actual results. Comparability with other entities may be less significant for explanations of management's perception or opinion of the factors underlying the entity's current performance.

Verifiability

- 3.26 Verifiability is the quality of information that helps assure users that information in GPFs faithfully represents the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent. Supportability is sometimes used to describe this quality when applied in respect of explanatory information and prospective financial and non-financial quantitative information disclosed in GPFs—that is, the quality of information that helps assure users that explanatory or prospective financial and non-financial quantitative information faithfully represents the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent. Whether referred to as verifiability or supportability, the characteristic implies that different knowledgeable and independent observers could reach general consensus, although not necessarily complete agreement, that either:
- The information represents the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent without material error or bias; or

- An appropriate recognition, measurement, or representation method has been applied without material error or bias.
- 3.27 To be verifiable, information need not be a single point estimate. A range of possible amounts and the related probabilities also can be verified.
- 3.28 Verification may be direct or indirect. With direct verification, an amount or other representation is itself verified, such as by (a) counting cash, (b) observing marketable securities and their quoted prices, or (c) confirming that the factors identified as influencing past service delivery performance were present and operated with the effect identified. With indirect verification, the amount or other representation is verified by checking the inputs and recalculating the outputs using the same accounting convention or methodology. An example is verifying the carrying amount of inventory by checking the inputs (quantities and costs) and recalculating the ending inventory using the same cost flow assumption (for example, average cost or first-in-first-out).
- 3.29 The quality of verifiability (or supportability if such term is used to describe this characteristic) is not an absolute—some information may be more or less capable of verification than other information. However, the more verifiable is the information included in GPFRs, the more it will assure users that the information faithfully represents the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent.
- 3.30 GPFRs of public sector entities may include financial and other quantitative information and explanations about (a) key influences on the entity's performance during the period, (b) the anticipated future effects or outcomes of service delivery programs undertaken during the reporting period, and (c) prospective financial and non-financial information. It may not be possible to verify the accuracy of all quantitative representations and explanations of such information until a future period, if at all.
- 3.31 To help assure users that prospective financial and non-financial quantitative information and explanations included in GPFRs faithfully represents the economic and other phenomena that they purport to represent, the assumptions that underlie the information disclosed, the methodologies adopted in compiling that information, and the factors and circumstances that support any opinions expressed or disclosures made should be transparent. This will enable users to form judgments about the appropriateness of those assumptions and the method of compilation, measurement, representation and interpretation of the information.

Constraints on Information Included in General Purpose Financial Reports

Materiality

- 3.32 Information is material if ~~its omission or misstatement~~ omitting, misstating or obscuring it could reasonably be expected could to influence the discharge of accountability by the entity, or the decisions that users make on the basis of the entity's GPFRs prepared for that reporting period. Materiality depends on both the nature and amount of the item judged in the particular circumstances of each entity. Where an entity judges that a material item is not separately displayed on the face of a financial statement (or displayed sufficiently prominently) an entity considers disclosure.

- 3.32A GPFs may encompass qualitative and quantitative information about service delivery achievements during the reporting period, and expectations about service delivery and financial outcomes in the future. Consequently, it is not possible to specify a uniform quantitative threshold characteristic or a uniform set of characteristics at which a particular type of information becomes material.
- 3.33 Assessments of materiality will be made in the context of the legislative, institutional and operating environment within which the entity operates and, in respect of prospective financial and non-financial information, the preparer's knowledge and expectations about the future. Disclosure of information about compliance or non-compliance with legislation, regulation or other authority may be material because of its nature—irrespective of the magnitude of any amounts involved. In determining whether an item is material in these circumstances, consideration will be given to such matters as the nature, legality, sensitivity and consequences of past or anticipated transactions and events, the parties involved in any such transactions and the circumstances giving rise to them.
- 3.34 Materiality is classified as a constraint on information included in GPFs in the Conceptual Framework. In developing IPSASs and RPGs, the IPSASB will consider the materiality of the consequences of application of a particular accounting policy, basis of preparation or disclosure of a particular item or type of information. Subject to the requirements of any IPSAS, entities preparing GPFs will also consider the materiality of, for example, the application of a particular accounting policy and the separate disclosure of particular items of information.

Cost-Benefit

- 3.35 Financial reporting imposes costs. The benefits of financial reporting should justify those costs. Assessing whether the benefits of providing information justify the related costs is often a matter of judgment, because it is often not possible to identify and/or quantify all the costs and all the benefits of information included in GPFs.
- 3.36 The costs of providing information include the costs of collecting and processing the information, the costs of verifying it and/or presenting the assumptions and methodologies that support it, and the costs of disseminating it. Users incur the costs of analysis and interpretation. Omission of useful information also imposes costs, including the costs that users incur to obtain needed information from other sources and the costs that result from making decisions using incomplete data provided by GPFs.
- 3.37 Preparers expend the majority of the effort to provide information in GPFs. However, service recipients and resource providers ultimately bear the cost of those efforts—because resources are redirected from service delivery activities to preparation of information for inclusion in GPFs.
- 3.38 Users reap the majority of benefits from the information provided by GPFs. However, information prepared for GPFs may also be used internally by management and result in better decision making by management. The disclosure of information in GPFs consistent with the concepts identified in the Conceptual Framework and IPSASs and RPGs derived from them will enhance and reinforce perceptions of the transparency of financial reporting by governments and other public sector entities and contribute to the more accurate pricing of public sector debt. Therefore, public sector entities may also benefit in a number of ways from the information provided by GPFs.

- 3.39 Application of the cost-benefit constraint involves assessing whether the benefits of reporting information are likely to justify the costs incurred to provide and use the information. When making this assessment, it is necessary to consider whether one or more qualitative characteristic might be sacrificed to some degree to reduce cost.
- 3.40 In developing IPSASs, the IPSASB considers information from preparers, users, academics, and others about the expected nature and quantity of the benefits and costs of the proposed requirements. Disclosure and other requirements which result in the presentation of information useful to users of GPFRs for accountability and decision-making purposes and satisfy the qualitative characteristics are prescribed by IPSASs when the benefits of compliance with those disclosures and other requirements are assessed by the IPSASB to justify their costs.

Balance Between the Qualitative Characteristics

- 3.41 The qualitative characteristics work together to contribute to the usefulness of information. For example, neither a depiction that faithfully represents an irrelevant phenomenon, nor a depiction that unfaithfully represents a relevant phenomenon, results in useful information. Similarly, to be relevant, information must be timely and understandable.
- 3.42 In some cases, a balancing or trade-off between qualitative characteristics may be necessary to achieve the objectives of financial reporting. The relative importance of the qualitative characteristics in each situation is a matter of professional judgment. The aim is to achieve an appropriate balance among the characteristics in order to meet the objectives of financial reporting.

Basis for Conclusions

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

Qualitative Characteristics of Information Included in General Purpose Financial Reports

- BC3.1 In developing IPSASs, the IPSASB receives input from constituents on, and makes judgments about, information that best satisfies the objectives of financial reporting and should be included in GPFRs. In making those judgments, the IPSASB considers the extent to which each of the qualitative characteristics can be achieved. Disclosure and other requirements are included in IPSASs only when the information that results from their application is considered to satisfy the qualitative characteristics and the cost-benefit constraint identified in the Conceptual Framework.
- BC3.2 Some respondents to the Exposure Draft issued in 2010 (the 2010 Exposure Draft) expressed concern about the application of the qualitative characteristics to all matters that may be presented in GPFRs, particularly those matters that may be presented in reports outside the financial statements. The IPSASB understands this concern. The IPSASB acknowledges that IPSASs and RPGs that deal with the presentation in GPFRs of information outside the financial statements may need to include additional guidance on the application of the qualitative characteristics to the matters dealt with.
- BC3.3 IPSASs and RPGs issued by the IPSASB will not deal with all financial and non-financial information that may be included in GPFRs. In the absence of an IPSAS or RPG that deals with particular economic or other phenomena, assessments of whether an item of information satisfies the qualitative characteristics and constraints identified in the Conceptual Framework, and therefore qualifies for inclusion in GPFRs, will be made by preparers compiling the GPFRs. Those assessments will be made in the context of achieving the objectives of financial reporting, which in turn have been developed to respond to users' information needs.
- BC3.4 Having in place accounting systems and processes that are appropriately designed and are operated effectively will enable management to gather and process evidence to support financial reporting. The quality of these systems and processes is a key factor in ensuring the quality of financial information that the entity includes in GPFRs.

Other Qualitative Characteristics Considered

- BC3.5 Some respondents to the 2010 Exposure Draft, expressed the view that additional qualitative characteristics should be identified. Those qualitative characteristics included "sincerity," "true and fair view," "credibility," "transparency," and "regularity".
- BC3.6 The IPSASB noted that "sincerity" as used in financial reporting has a similar meaning to "true and fair". The IPSASB took the view that sincerity, true and fair view, credibility, and transparency are important expressions of the overarching qualities that financial reporting is to achieve or aspire to. However, they do not exist as single qualitative characteristics on their own—rather, achieving these qualities is the product of application of the full set of qualitative characteristics identified in the Conceptual Framework, and the IPSASs that deal with specific reporting issues. Consequently, while important characteristics of GPFRs, they are not identified as separate

individual qualitative characteristics in their own right. The IPSASB also took the view that the notion of “regularity” as noted by some respondents is related to the notion of “compliance” as used in the Conceptual Framework—therefore, regularity is not identified as an additional qualitative characteristic.

Relevance

BC3.7 The Conceptual Framework explains that financial and non-financial information is relevant if it is capable of making a difference in achieving the objectives of financial reporting. As part of its due process the IPSASB seeks input on whether the requirements of a proposed IPSAS or any proposed RPGs are relevant to the achievement of the objectives of financial reporting—that is, are relevant to the discharge of the entity’s obligation to be accountable and to decisions that users may make.

Faithful Representation

BC3.8 The Conceptual Framework explains that to be useful information must be a faithful representation of the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent. A single economic or other phenomenon may be faithfully represented in many ways. For example, the achievement of particular service delivery objectives may be depicted (a) qualitatively through an explanation of the immediate and anticipated longer term outcomes and effects of the service delivery program, (b) quantitatively as a measure of the volume and cost of services provided by the service delivery program, or (c) by a combination of both qualitative and quantitative information. Additionally, a single depiction in GPFRs may represent several economic phenomena. For example, the presentation of the item “plant and equipment” in a financial statement may represent an aggregate of all of an entity’s plant and equipment, including items that have different functions, that are subject to different risks and opportunities and that are carried at amounts based on estimates that may be more or less complex and reliable.

BC3.9 Completeness and neutrality of estimates (and inputs to those estimates) and freedom from material error are desirable, and some minimum level of accuracy is necessary for an estimate to faithfully represent an economic or other phenomenon. However, faithful representation does not imply absolute completeness or neutrality in the estimate, nor does it imply total freedom from error in the outcome. For a representation of an economic or other phenomenon to imply a degree of completeness, neutrality, or freedom from error that is impracticable for it to achieve would diminish the extent to which the information faithfully represents the economic or other phenomenon that it purports to represent.

Faithful Representation or Reliability

BC3.10 At the time of issue of the 2010 Exposure Draft, Appendix A of IPSAS 1, *Presentation of Financial Statements*, identified “reliability” as a qualitative characteristic. It described reliable information as information that is “free from material error and bias and can be depended on by users to represent faithfully that which it purports to represent or could reasonably be expected to represent.” Faithful representation, substance over form, neutrality, prudence and completeness were identified as components of reliability. The *Conceptual Framework* uses the term “faithful representation” rather than “reliability” to describe what is substantially the same concept. In

addition, it does not explicitly identify substance over form and prudence as components of faithful representation.

- BC3.11 Many respondents to the 2010 Exposure Draft supported the use of faithful representation and its explanation in the 2010 Exposure Draft, in some cases explaining that faithful representation is a better expression of the nature of the concept intended. Some respondents did not support the replacement of reliability with the term faithful representation, expressing concerns including that faithful representation implies the adoption of fair value or market value accounting, and reliability and faithful representation are not interchangeable terms.
- BC3.12 The use of the term “faithful representation”, or “reliability” for that matter, to describe this qualitative characteristic in the Conceptual Framework will not determine the measurement basis to be adopted in GPFs, whether historical cost, market value, fair value or another measurement basis. The IPSASB does not intend that use of faithful representation be interpreted as such. The measurement basis or measurement bases that may be adopted for the elements of financial statements are considered in Chapter 7, Measurement of Assets and Liabilities in Financial Statements. The qualitative characteristics will then operate to ensure that the financial statements faithfully represent the measurement basis or bases reflected in GPFs.
- BC3.13 The IPSASB appreciated the concern of some respondents that the use of a different term may be interpreted to reflect different, and even lesser, qualities to those communicated by the term reliability. However, the IPSASB ~~took is of~~ the view that explanation in the Conceptual Framework that “Faithful representation is attained when the depiction of the phenomenon is complete, neutral, and free from material error”, and the elaboration of these key features will protect against the loss of any of the qualities that were formerly reflected in the use of the term reliability.
- BC3.14 In addition, the IPSASB has been advised that the term “reliability” is itself open to different interpretations and subjective judgments, with consequences for the quality of information included in GPFs. The IPSASB ~~took is of~~ the view that use of the term “faithful representation” will overcome problems in the interpretation and application of reliability that have been experienced in some jurisdictions without a lessening of the qualities intended by the term, and is more readily translated into, and understood in, a wide range of languages.

Substance over Form and Prudence

- BC3.15 Some respondents to the 2010 Exposure Draft expressed concern that substance over form and prudence are not identified as qualitative characteristics or that their importance is not sufficiently recognized or explained. Some also noted that prudence need not be incompatible with the achievement of neutrality and faithful representation.
- BC3.16 The Conceptual Framework explains that “Information that faithfully represents an economic or other phenomenon depicts the substance of the underlying transaction, other event, activity or circumstance—which is not necessarily always the same as its legal form.” Therefore, substance over form remains a key quality that information included in GPFs must possess. It is not identified as a separate or additional qualitative characteristic because it is already embedded in the notion of faithful representation.

- BC3.17 The IPSASB ~~is of~~ took the view that the notion of prudence is also reflected in the explanation of neutrality as a component of faithful representation, and the acknowledgement of the need to exercise caution in dealing with uncertainty. Therefore, like substance over form, prudence is not identified as a separate qualitative characteristic because its intent and influence in identifying information that is included in GPFRs is already embedded in the notion of faithful representation.
- BC3.17A The International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) revised its approach to prudence in the *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting*, published in 2018 (the IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework). The IASB did not include prudence as a qualitative characteristic, but, in the context of faithful representation, explained that 'neutrality is supported by the exercise of prudence' and that 'prudence is the exercise of caution when making judgments under conditions of uncertainty.' The IASB characterized the approach adopted in the 2018 Conceptual Framework as 'cautious prudence'.
- BC3.17B The IPSASB also noted that prudence had been the subject of much discussion in the European Public Sector Accounting Standards project.
- BC3.17C Because of the above developments, the IPSASB reconsidered the approach to prudence in the 2014 Conceptual Framework, in particular whether prudence should be included as a qualitative characteristic in its own right or whether guidance on prudence should be included in the context of neutrality and faithful representation.
- BC3.17D The IPSASB considered that prudence is insufficiently distinct from faithful representation to justify inclusion as an additional qualitative characteristic. Practical application of the IPSASB Conceptual Framework has not identified that the non-inclusion of prudence as a qualitative characteristic is problematic.
- BC3.17E The IPSASB acknowledged the case for retaining the approach in the 2014 Conceptual Framework on the grounds that an allusion to, and discussion of, prudence, adds little to the notion of neutrality, which itself conveys a lack of bias. However, the IPSASB concluded that clarifying that prudence entails caution in assessing uncertainty in the measurement of all elements would be beneficial and would respond to those who view the absence of references to prudence as a risk. The IPSASB is firmly of the view that caution should be applied consistently rather than focusing disproportionately on assets and revenue. The IPSASB therefore decided to include an explanation that, in the context of faithful representation, 'neutrality is supported by the exercise of prudence' and that 'prudence is the exercise of caution when making judgments under conditions of uncertainty. This is consistent with the approach of the IASB in its 2018 Conceptual Framework.

Understandability

- BC3.18 Although presenting information clearly and concisely helps users to comprehend it, the actual comprehension or understanding of information depends largely on the users of the GPFRs.
- BC3.19 Some economic and other phenomena are particularly complex and difficult to represent in GPFRs. However, the IPSASB is of the view that information that is, for example, relevant, a faithful representation of what it purports to represent, timely and verifiable should not be

excluded from GPFRs solely because it may be too complex or difficult for some users to understand without assistance. Acknowledging that it may be necessary for some users to seek assistance to understand the information presented in GPFRs does not mean that information included in GPFRs need not be understandable or that all efforts should not be undertaken to present information in GPFRs in a manner that is understandable to a wide range of users. However, it does reflect that, in practice, the nature of the information included in GPFRs is such that all the qualitative characteristics may not be fully achievable at all times for all users.

Timeliness

BC3.20 The IPSASB recognizes the potential for timely reporting to increase the usefulness of GPFRs for both accountability and decision-making purposes, and that undue delay in the provision of information may reduce its usefulness for these purposes. Consequently, timeliness is identified as a qualitative characteristic in the Conceptual Framework.

Comparability

BC3.21 Some degree of comparability may be attained by maximizing the qualitative characteristics of relevance and faithful representation. For example, faithful representation of a relevant economic or other phenomenon by one public sector entity is likely to be comparable to a faithful representation of a similar relevant economic or other phenomenon by another public sector entity. However, a single economic or other phenomenon can often be faithfully represented in several ways and permitting alternative accounting methods for the same phenomenon diminishes comparability and, therefore, may be undesirable.

BC3.22 Some respondents to the Exposure Draft expressed concern that the explanation of the relationship between comparability and consistency may be read as presenting an obstacle to the on-going development of financial reporting. This is because enhancements in financial reporting often involve a revision or change to the accounting principles, policies or basis of preparation currently adopted by the entity.

BC3.23 Consistent application of the same accounting principles, policies and basis of preparation from one period to the next will assist users in assessing the financial position, financial performance and service delivery achievements of the entity compared with previous periods. However, where accounting principles or policies dealing with particular transactions or other events are not prescribed by IPSASs, achievement of the qualitative characteristic of comparability should not be interpreted as prohibiting the entity from changing its accounting principles or policies to better represent those transactions and events. In these cases, the inclusion in GPFRs of additional disclosures or explanation of the impact of the changed policy can still satisfy the characteristics of comparability.

Verifiability

BC3.24 Verifiability is the quality of information that helps assure users that information in GPFRs faithfully represents the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent. While closely linked to faithful representation, verifiability is identified as a separate qualitative characteristic because information may faithfully represent economic and other phenomena even

though it cannot be verified with absolute certainty. In addition, verifiability may work in different ways with faithful representation and other of the qualitative characteristics to contribute to the usefulness of information presented in GPFs—for example, there may need to be an appropriate balance between the degree of verifiability an item of information may possess and other qualitative characteristics to ensure it is presented in a timely fashion and is relevant.

- BC3.25 In developing the qualitative characteristics identified in the Conceptual Framework, the IPSASB considered whether “supportability” should be identified as a separate characteristic for application to information presented in GPFs outside the financial statements. The IPSASB is of the view that identifying both verifiability and supportability as separate qualitative characteristics with essentially the same features may be confusing to preparers and users of GPFs and others. However, the Conceptual Framework does acknowledge that supportability is sometimes used to refer to the quality of information that helps assure users that explanatory information and prospective financial and non-financial information included in GPFs faithfully represent the economic and other phenomena that they purport to represent.
- BC3.26 Some respondents to the 2010 Exposure Draft expressed concern about the application of verifiability to the broad range of matters that may be presented in GPFs outside the financial statements, particularly explanatory information about service delivery achievements during the reporting period and qualitative and quantitative prospective financial and non-financial information. The IPSASB is of the view that the Conceptual Framework provides appropriate guidance on the application of verifiability in respect of these matters—for example it explains that verifiability is not an absolute and it may not be possible to verify the accuracy of all quantitative representations and explanations until a future period. The Conceptual Framework also acknowledges that disclosure of the underlying assumptions and methodologies adopted for the compilation of explanatory and prospective financial and non-financial information is central to the achievement of faithful representation.

Classification of the Qualitative Characteristics and Order of their Application

- BC3.27 Some respondents to the 2010 Exposure Draft expressed the view that the Conceptual Framework should identify:
- Relevance and faithful representation as fundamental qualitative characteristics, and explain the order of their application; and
 - Comparability, verifiability, timeliness, and understandability as enhancing qualitative characteristics.
- They noted that this would provide useful guidance on the sequence of application of the qualitative characteristics and reflect the approach adopted by the IASB. International Accounting Standards Board.
- BC3.28 In developing the qualitative characteristics, the IPSASB considered whether some characteristics should be identified as fundamental, and others identified as enhancing. The IPSASB also considered whether the order of application of the characteristics should be identified and/or explained. The IPSASB is of the view that such an approach should not be adopted because, for example:

- Matters identified as “fundamental” may be perceived to be more important than those identified as “enhancing”, even if this distinction is not intended in the case of the qualitative characteristics. As a result, there may be unintended consequences of identifying some qualitative characteristics as fundamental and others as enhancing.
- All the qualitative characteristics are important and work together to contribute to the usefulness of information. The relative importance of a particular qualitative characteristic in different circumstances is a matter of professional judgment. As such, it is not appropriate to identify certain qualitative characteristics as always being fundamental and others as having only an enhancing or supporting role, or to specify the sequence of their application, no matter what information is being considered for inclusion in GPFs, and irrespective of the circumstances of the entity and its environment. In addition, it is questionable whether information that is not understandable or is provided so long after the event as not to be useful to users for accountability and decision-making purposes could be considered as relevant information—therefore, these characteristics are themselves fundamental to the achievement of the objectives of financial reporting; and
- GPFs of public sector entities may encompass historical and prospective information about financial performance and the achievement of service delivery objectives over a number of reporting periods. This provides necessary input to assessments of trends in service delivery activities and resources committed thereto—for such trend data, reporting on a comparable basis may be as important as, and cannot be separated from, faithful representation of the information.

Constraints on Information Included in General Purpose Financial Reports

Materiality

- BC3.29 At the time of issue of the 2010 Exposure Draft, Appendix A of IPSAS 1 described materiality with similar characteristics to that described in the Conceptual Framework but identified materiality as a factor to be considered in determining only the relevance of information. Some respondents to the Exposure Draft noted that materiality may be identified as an aspect of relevance.
- BC3.30 The IPSASB has considered whether materiality should be identified as an entity-specific aspect of relevance rather than a constraint on information included in GPFs. As explained in the Conceptual Framework, and subject to requirements in an IPSAS, materiality will be considered by preparers in determining whether, for example, a particular accounting policy should be adopted, or an item of information should be separately disclosed in the financial statements of the entity.
- BC3.31 However, the IPSASB is of the view that materiality has a more pervasive role than would be reflected by its classification as only an entity specific aspect of relevance. For example, materiality relates to, and can impact, a number of the qualitative characteristics of information included in GPFs. Therefore, the materiality of an item should be considered when determining whether the omission or misstatement of an item of information could undermine not only the relevance, but also the faithful representation, understandability or verifiability of financial and

non-financial information presented in GPFs. The IPSASB is also of the view that whether the effects of the application of a particular accounting policy or basis of preparation or the information content of separate disclosure of certain items of information are likely to be material should be considered in establishing IPSASs and RPGs. Consequently, the IPSASB is of the view that materiality is better reflected as a broad constraint on information to be included in GPFs.

- BC3.32 The IPSASB considered whether the Conceptual Framework should reflect that legislation, regulation or other authority may impose financial reporting requirements on public sector entities in addition to those imposed by IPSASs. The IPSASB is of the view that, while a feature of the operating environment of many public sector (and many private sector) entities, the impact that legislation or other authority may have on the information included in GPFs is not itself a financial reporting concept. Consequently, it has not identified it as such in the Conceptual Framework. Preparers will, of course, need to consider such requirements as they prepare GPFs. In particular, legislation may prescribe that particular item of information are to be disclosed in GPFs even though they may not be judged to satisfy a materiality threshold (or cost-benefit constraint) as identified in the Conceptual Framework. Similarly, the disclosure of some matters may be prohibited by legislation because, for example, they relate to matters of national security, notwithstanding that they are material and would otherwise satisfy the cost-benefit constraint.
- BC3.32A In 2018 the IASB amended IAS 1, *Presentation of Financial Statements*, and IAS 8, *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors*. The amendments clarified the definition of material in order to resolve difficulties that entities experience in making materiality judgements when preparing financial statements, and to align the definitions in both standards. Because of these changes the IASB made minor, but significant, amendments to Chapter 2, *Qualitative Characteristics of Useful Financial Information*, of its 2018 Conceptual Framework. First, an amendment complemented the guidance that information is material if omitting or misstating it could influence decision making with a reference to 'obscuring information'. A second amendment softened the threshold for determining that information is material.
- BC3.32B In its Limited Scope Update project initiated in 2020 the IPSASB considered both changes in the context of public sector general purpose financial reporting. The IPSASB concluded that the reference to 'obscuring information' is relevant to the public sector as it suggests that, amongst other practices, the inclusion of immaterial disclosures can have a negative impact on users, rather than just being unnecessary. This is a relevant consideration for both the general purpose financial statements and other GPFs. The IPSASB also concluded that modifying the wording on adversely influencing users by adding the words 'reasonably expected to influence' imposes a more realistic expectation on preparers' assessments of materiality. The IPSASB therefore decided to adopt these changes in its Conceptual Framework and amended paragraph 3.32 accordingly.
- BC3.32C In the IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework, materiality is an aspect of the qualitative characteristic of relevance, rather than a constraint on information in general purpose financial reports as in the IPSASB Conceptual Framework. In the Limited Scope Update the IPSASB did


not reassess this classification. The IPSASB acknowledged that materiality can impact a number of qualitative characteristics.

BC3.32D In the Limited Scope Update the IPSASB acknowledged that in a number of jurisdictions, public sector entities are required to report on whether transactions have been recorded in accordance with governing legislation and regulations. In some jurisdictions such reports are referred to as a regularity assertion or statement. Auditors may be required to express an opinion on such statements, separate to that on the financial statements.

BC3.32E The IPSASB considered whether the Conceptual Framework should provide guidance on materiality considerations for regularity assertions/statements. Consistent with the reasoning in paragraph BC3.32, the IPSASB concluded that additional guidance is not justified.

Cost-Benefit

- BC3.33 Some respondents to the 2010 Exposure Draft expressed concern that the text of the proposed Conceptual Framework does not specify that entities cannot decide to depart from IPSASs on the basis of their own assessments of the costs and benefits of particular requirements of an IPSAS. The IPSASB is of the view that such specification is not necessary. This is because, as noted in paragraph 1.2 of the Conceptual Framework, authoritative requirements relating to recognition, measurement, and presentation in GPFs are specified in IPSASs. GPFs are developed to provide information useful to users and requirements are prescribed by IPSASs only when the benefits to users of compliance with those requirements are assessed by the IPSASB to justify their costs. However, preparers may consider costs and benefits in, for example, determining whether to include in GPFs disclosure of information in addition to that required by IPSASs.
- BC3.34 Some respondents to the 2010 Exposure Draft also expressed concern that the proposed Conceptual Framework did not recognize that cost-benefit trade-offs may differ for different public sector entities. They are of the view that acknowledgement of this may provide a useful principle to be applied when considering differential reporting issues. The IPSASB has considered these matters and determined that the Conceptual Framework will not deal with issues related to differential reporting, including whether the costs and benefits of particular requirements might differ for different entities.
- BC3.35 In the process of developing an IPSAS or RPG, the IPSASB considers and seeks input on the likely costs and benefits of providing information in GPFs of public sector entities. However, in some cases, it may not be possible for the IPSASB to identify and/or quantify all benefits that are likely to flow from, for example, the inclusion of a particular disclosure, including those that may be required because they are in the public interest, or other requirement in an IPSAS. In other cases, the IPSASB may be of the view that the benefits of a particular requirement may be marginal for users of GPFs of some public sector entities. In applying the cost-benefit test to determine whether particular requirements should be included in an IPSAS in these circumstances, the IPSASB's deliberations may also include consideration of whether imposing such requirements on public sector entities is likely to involve undue cost and effort for the entities applying the requirements.



CHAPTER 5: ELEMENTS IN FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

CONTENTS

	Paragraph
Introduction.....	5.1–5.5
Purpose of this Chapter	5.1
Elements and their Importance	5.2–5.4
Elements Defined	5.5
Assets.....	5.6–5.13
Definition	5.6– <u>5.6A</u>
A Resource.....	<u>5.6B</u> –5.7

<u>Rights</u>	<u>5.7A–5.7G</u>
Service Potential and Economic Benefits	5.8–5.10
Presently Controlled by the Entity <u>as a Result of Past Events</u>	5.11–5.13
Past Event	5.13
Liabilities.....	5.14– <u>5.17D</u>
Definition	5.14–5.14A
A Present Obligations	5.15–5.15F
Legal and Non-Legally Binding Obligations	5.15A–5.15E
An Outflow of Resources <u>A Transfer of Resources</u> from the Entity	5.16–5.16F
<u>Present Obligations as a Result of Past Events</u>	5.17– <u>5.17D</u>
Legal and Non-Legally Binding Obligations	5.18–5.26
Assets and Liabilities.....	<u>5.26A–5.26J</u>
<u>Unit of Account</u>	<u>5.26A–5.26J</u>
Net Financial Position, Other Resources, and Other Obligations.....	5.29–5.30
Net Financial Position, Other Resources, and Other Obligations	
5.27 As explained in paragraph 5.4, in some cases, in developing or revising an IPSAS, the IPSASB may determine that to achieve the objectives of financial reporting a resource or obligation that does not satisfy the definition of an element defined in the Conceptual Framework needs to be recognized in the financial statements. In these cases, the IPSAS may require or allow these resources or obligations to be recognized as other resources or other obligations, which are items additional to the six elements defined in this <u>Conceptual Framework</u> .	
5.28 Net financial position is the difference between assets and liabilities after adding other resources and deducting other obligations recognized in the statement of financial position. Net financial position can be a positive or negative residual amount.	
Revenue and Expense.....	5.31–5.33
Definitions	5.31–5.33
Surplus or Deficit for the Period	5.34
Ownership Contributions and Ownership Distributions	5.35–5.39
Definitions.....	5.35–5.39

Basis for Conclusions

DRAFT

Introduction

Purpose of this Chapter

- 5.1 This Chapter defines the elements used in financial statements and provides further explanation about those definitions.

Elements and their Importance

- 5.2 Financial statements portray the financial effects of transactions and other events by grouping them into broad classes which share common economic characteristics. These broad classes are termed the elements of financial statements. Elements are the building blocks from which financial statements are constructed. These building blocks provide an initial point for recording, classifying and aggregating economic data and activity in a way that provides users with information that meets the objectives of financial reporting and achieves the qualitative characteristics of financial reporting while taking into account the constraints on information included in GPFRs.
- 5.3 The elements defined in this Chapter do not refer to the individual items that are recognized as a result of transactions and events. Sub-classifications of individual items within an element and aggregations of items are used to enhance the understandability of the financial statements. Presentation is addressed in Chapter 8, Presentation in General Purpose Financial Reports.
- 5.4 In some circumstances, to ensure that the financial statements provide information that is useful for a meaningful assessment of the financial performance and financial position of an entity, recognition of economic phenomena that are not captured by the elements as defined in this Chapter may be necessary. Consequently, the identification of the elements in this Chapter does not preclude IPSASs from requiring or allowing the recognition of resources or obligations that do not satisfy the definition of an element identified in this Chapter (hereafter referred to as “other resources” or “other obligations”) when necessary to better achieve the objectives of financial reporting.

Elements Defined

- 5.5 The elements that are defined in this Chapter are:
- Assets;
 - Liabilities;
 - Revenue;
 - Expense;
 - Ownership contributions; and
 - Ownership distributions.

Assets

Definition

- 5.6 An asset is:

A resource presently controlled by the entity as a result of a past event.

A Resource

5.6A A resource is a right to either service potential or the capability to generate economic benefits, or a right to both.

5.6B This section discusses three components of these definitions:

- (a) Rights (paragraphs 5.7A-5.7G):
- (b) Service potential and economic benefits (paragraphs 5.8-5.10); and
- (c) Present control as a result of past events (paragraph 5.11-5.13).

5.7 ~~A resource is an item with service potential or the ability to generate economic benefits. Physical form is not a necessary condition of a resource. The service potential or ability to generate economic benefits can arise directly from the resource itself or arises from the rights to use the resource. Some resources embody an entity's rights to a variety of benefits including, for example, the right to:~~

- ~~• Use the resource to provide services;~~
- ~~• Use an external party's resources to provide services, for example;~~
- ~~• Convert the resource into cash through its disposal;~~
- ~~• Benefit from the resource's appreciation in value; or~~
- ~~• Receive a stream of cash flows. [Deleted]~~

Rights

5.7A Rights to service potential or to the capability to generate economic benefits take many forms, including:

- (a) Rights that correspond to an obligation of another party (see paragraph 5.16C), for example:
 - (i) Rights to receive cash;
 - (ii) Rights to receive goods or services¹;
 - (iii) Rights to exchange resources with another party on favorable terms. Such rights include, for example, a forward contract to buy a resource on terms that are currently favorable; and
 - (iv) Rights to benefit from an obligation of another party to transfer a resource if a specified uncertain future event occurs (see paragraph 5.16A).
- (b) Rights that do not correspond to an obligation of another party, for example:

¹ Subsequent references to 'services' in the Conceptual Framework encompass 'goods.'

- (i) Rights over physical objects, such as property, plant and equipment or inventories. Examples of such rights are a right to use a physical object or right to benefit from a leased object; and
- (ii) Rights to use intellectual property.
- 5.7B Many rights are established by binding arrangement, legislation, or similar means. For example, an entity might obtain rights from owning or leasing a physical object, from owning a debt instrument such as a student loan, or from owning software or the right to use intellectual property. However, an entity might also obtain rights in other ways, for example:

 - (a) By acquiring or creating know-how that is not in the public domain, such as a traffic management plan, or;
 - (b) Through an obligation of another party that arises because that other party has little or no realistic alternative to avoid a transfer of resources (see paragraph 5.15).
- 5.7C Some services—for example, employee services and services-in-kind—are received and immediately consumed. An entity’s capability to obtain the service potential or economic benefits produced by such services exists very briefly until the entity consumes the goods and services.
- 5.7D Not all of an entity’s rights are assets of that entity—to be assets of the entity, the rights must (i) have service potential or economic benefits beyond those available to all other parties (see paragraphs 5.8-5.10) and (ii) be controlled by the entity (see paragraphs 5.11-5.12). For example, rights available to all parties without significant cost—for instance, rights of access to public goods that are controlled by other entities, such as public rights of way over land controlled by other entities, or know-how that is in the public domain—are typically not assets for the entities that hold these rights.
- 5.7E In principle, each of an entity’s rights is a separate asset. However, for accounting purposes, related rights are often treated as a single unit of account that is a single asset (see paragraphs 5.26A–5.26J). For example, legal ownership of a physical object may give rise to several rights, including a right to:

 - (a) Use the object;
 - (b) Sell rights over the object; and
 - (c) Pledge rights over the object.
- 5.7F In many cases, the set of rights arising from legal ownership of a physical object is accounted for as a single asset. Conceptually, the resource is the set of rights, not the physical object. Nevertheless, describing the set of rights as the physical object will often provide a faithful representation of those rights in the most concise and understandable way.
- 5.7G The relationship between sovereign rights, resources and an asset is discussed in paragraph 5.13.

Service Potential and Economic Benefits

- 5.8 Service potential is the ~~capacity~~ capability of a resource to provide services that contribute to achieving the entity's objectives. Service potential enables an entity to achieve its objectives without necessarily generating cash flows.
- 5.9 Public sector assets that embody service potential may include recreational, heritage, community, defense and other assets ~~which~~ that are held by governments and other public sector entities, and which are used to provide services to third parties. Such services may be for collective or individual consumption. Many services may be provided in areas in which market competition is limited or non-existent. ~~where there is no market competition or limited market competition~~. The use and disposal of such assets may be restricted as many assets that embody service potential are specialized in nature.
- 5.10 Economic benefits are cash inflows or a reduction in cash outflows. Cash inflows (or reduced cash outflows) may be derived from, for example:
- An asset's use in the production and sale of services;
 - The direct exchange of an asset for cash; ~~or other resources; or~~
 - Extinguishing or reducing a liability by transferring the asset.

Presently Controlled by the Entity as a Result of Past Events

- 5.11 An entity must have control of the resource. Control of the resource entails the ability of the entity to use the resource (or direct other parties on its use) so as to derive the benefit of the service potential or economic benefits embodied in the resource in the achievement of its service delivery or other objectives.
- 5.12 In assessing whether it presently controls a resource, an entity assesses whether the following indicators of control exist:
- Legal ownership;
 - Access to the resource, or the ability to deny or restrict access to the resource;
 - The means to ensure that the resource is used to achieve its objectives; and
 - The existence of an enforceable right to service potential or the capability to generate economic benefits arising from a resource.
- While these indicators are not conclusive determinants of whether control exists, identification and analysis of them can inform that decision.
- 5.12A Sometimes one party (a principal) engages another party (an agent) to act on behalf of, and for the benefit of, the principal. For example, a principal may engage an agent to arrange the distribution of goods controlled by the principal to eligible beneficiaries. If an agent has custody of a resource controlled by the principal, that resource is not an asset of the agent.

Past Event

- 5.13 The definition of an asset requires that a resource that an entity presently controls must have arisen from a one or more past transactions or other past events. The past transactions or other events that result in an entity gaining control of a resource and therefore an asset may differ. Entities can obtain assets by purchasing them in an exchange transaction or developing them. Assets may also arise through non-exchange transactions, including through the exercising of sovereign powers. The power to tax or to issue licenses and to access or restrict or deny access to the benefits embodied in intangible resources, like the electromagnetic spectrum, are examples of public sector-specific powers and rights that may give rise to assets. In assessing when an entity's control of rights to resources arise the following events may be considered: (a) a general ability to establish a power, (b) establishment of a power through a statute, (c) exercising the power to create a right, and (d) the event which gives rise to the right to receive resources from an external party. An asset arises when the power is exercised and the rights exist to receive resources.

Liabilities

Definition

- 5.14 A liability is:
A present obligation of the entity for an outflow to transfer of resources as a result of that results from a past events.

5.14A For a liability to exist, three criteria must all be satisfied:

- (a) The entity has an obligation (paragraphs 5.15-5.15F);
- (b) The obligation is to transfer resources (paragraphs 5.16A-5.16E); and
- (c) The obligation is a present obligation arising from one or more past events (paragraphs 5.17-5.17D).

A Present Obligations

- 5.15 Public sector entities can have a number of obligations. Obligations are binding when an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid them. A present obligation is a legally binding obligation (legal obligation) or non-legally binding obligation, which an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid. Obligations are not present obligations unless they are binding and there is little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources.

Legal and Non-Legally Binding Obligations

- 5.15A Binding obligations can be legal obligations or non-legally binding obligations. Binding obligations can arise from both exchange and non-exchange transactions. An obligation must be to an external party in order to give rise to a liability. An entity cannot be obligated to itself, even where it has publicly communicated an intention to behave in a particular way. Identification of an external party is an indication of the existence of an obligation giving rise to a liability. However, it is not essential to know the identity of the external party before the time of settlement in order for a present obligation and a liability to exist.

5.15B Many arrangements that give rise to an obligation include settlement dates. The inclusion of a settlement date may provide an indication that an obligation involves an outflow a transfer of resources and gives rise to a liability. However, there are many agreements that do not contain settlement dates. The absence of a settlement date does not preclude an obligation giving rise to a liability.

Legal Obligations

5.15C A legal obligation is enforceable in law. Such enforceable obligations may arise from a variety of legal constructs. Exchange transactions are usually contractual in nature and therefore enforceable through the laws of contract or equivalent authority or arrangements. There are jurisdictions where government and public sector entities cannot enter into legal obligations, because, for example, they are not permitted to contract in their own name, but where there are alternative processes with equivalent effect. Obligations that are binding through such alternative processes are considered legal obligations in the Conceptual Framework. For some types of non-exchange transactions, judgment will be necessary to determine whether an obligation is enforceable in law. Where it is determined that an obligation is enforceable in law, there can be no doubt that an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid the obligation and that a liability exists.

5.15D Some obligations related to exchange transactions are not strictly enforceable by an external party at the reporting date but will be enforceable with the passage of time without the external party having to meet further conditions— or having to take any further action—prior to settlement. Claims that are unconditionally enforceable subject to the passage of time are enforceable obligations in the context of the definition of a liability.

5.15E Sovereign power is the ultimate authority of a government to make, amend and repeal legal provisions. Sovereign power is not a rationale for concluding that an obligation does not meet the definition of a liability in this Conceptual Framework. The legal position should be assessed at each reporting date to consider if an obligation is no longer binding and does not meet the definition of a liability.

Non-Legally Binding Obligations

5.15F. Liabilities can arise from non-legally binding obligations. Non-legally binding obligations differ from legal obligations in that the party to whom the obligation exists cannot take legal (or equivalent) action to enforce settlement. Non-legally binding obligations that give rise to liabilities have the following attributes:

- The entity has indicated to other parties by an established pattern of past practice, published policies, or a sufficiently specific current statement that it will accept certain responsibilities;
- As a result of such an indication, the entity has created a valid expectation on the part of those other parties that it will discharge those responsibilities; and
- The entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid settling the obligation arising from those responsibilities.

An Outflow of Resources—A Transfer of Resources from the Entity

- 5.16 ~~A liability must involve an outflow of resources from the entity for it to be settled. An obligation that can be settled without an outflow of resources from the entity is not a liability. [Deleted]~~
- 5.16A To satisfy the definition of a liability the obligation must have the potential to require the entity to transfer resources to another party (or parties). For that potential to exist, it does not need to be certain, or even likely, that the entity will be required to transfer resources—the transfer may, for example, be required only if a specified uncertain future event occurs. It is only necessary that the present obligation exists, and that, at least in one circumstance, it would require the entity to transfer resources.
- 5.16B An obligation can meet the definition of a liability even if the probability of a transfer of resources is low. Nevertheless, that low probability might affect decisions about what information to provide about the liability and how to provide that information. Chapter 6 provides guidance on recognition and Chapter 7 provides guidance on measurement.
- 5.16C Obligations to transfer resources include, for example:
- (a) Obligations to pay cash;
 - (b) Obligations to provide services or deliver goods.
 - (c) Obligations to exchange resources with another party on unfavorable terms. Such obligations include, for example, a forward contract to sell on terms that are currently unfavorable or an option that entitles another party to purchase resources from the entity;
 - (d) Obligations to transfer resources if a specified uncertain future event occurs; and
 - (e) Obligations to issue a financial instrument if that financial instrument will oblige the entity to transfer a resource.
- 5.16D Instead of fulfilling an obligation to transfer resources to the party that has a right to receive resources, entities may in some circumstances:
- (a) Settle the obligation by negotiating a release from the obligation;
 - (b) Transfer the obligation to a third party; or
 - (c) Replace the obligation to transfer resources with another obligation by entering into a new transaction.
- 5.16E In the situations identified in paragraph 5.16D an entity has an obligation to transfer resources until it has settled, transferred, or replaced that obligation.
- 5.16F In a principal-agent relationship (see paragraph 5.12A), if the agent has an obligation to transfer resources controlled by the principal to a third party, that obligation is not a liability of the agent. In such a case the resources that would be transferred are the principal's resources not the agent's.

Present Obligations as a Result of Past Events

- 5.17 A present obligation is binding. To satisfy the definition of a liability, it is necessary that a present obligation arises as a result of one or more ~~a~~ past transactions ~~and~~ or other past events and

~~requires an outflow of resources a transfer of resources from the entity. The complexity of public sector programs and activities means that a number of events in the development, implementation and operation of a particular program may give rise to obligations. For financial reporting purposes it is necessary to determine whether such commitments and obligations, including binding obligations that the entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid but are not legally enforceable (non-legally binding obligations) are present obligations and satisfy the definition of a liability. Where an arrangement has a legal form and is binding, such as a contract, the past event may be straightforward to identify. In other cases, it may be more difficult to identify the past event and identification involves an assessment of when an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources from the entity. In making such an assessment an entity takes jurisdictional factors into account.~~

5.17A A present obligation exists as a result of past events only if:

- (a) The entity has already obtained service potential or economic benefits or taken an action; and
- (b) As a consequence, the entity will or may have to transfer resources that it would not otherwise have had to transfer.

5.17B In the public sector, obligations may arise at a number of points. For example, in implementing a program or service:

- Making a political promise such as an electoral pledge;
- Announcement of a policy;
- Introduction (and approval) of the budget (which may be two distinct points); and
- The budget becoming effective (in some jurisdictions the budget will not be effective until an appropriation has been effected).

The early stages of implementation are unlikely to give rise to present obligations that meet the definition of a liability. Later stages, such as claimants meeting the eligibility criteria for the service to be provided, may give rise to present obligations that meet the definition of a liability.

5.17C The point at which an obligation gives rise to a liability depends on the nature of the obligation.

Factors that are likely to impact on judgments whether other parties can validly conclude that the obligation is such that the entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid a transfer ~~an outflow of resources~~ include:

- The nature of the past event or events that give rise to the obligation. For example, a promise made in an election is unlikely to give rise to a present obligation because an electoral pledge very rarely creates a valid expectation on the part of external parties that the entity has an obligation that it has little or no realistic alternative to avoid settling. However, an announcement in relation to an event or circumstance that has occurred may have such political support that the government has little option to withdraw. Where the government has committed to introduce and secure passage of the necessary budgetary provision such an announcement may give rise to a non-legally binding obligation;

- The ability of the entity to modify or change the obligation before it crystallizes. For example, the announcement of policy will generally not give rise to a non-legally binding obligation, which cannot be modified before being implemented. Similarly, if an obligation is contingent on future events occurring, there may be discretion to avoid an outflow of resources before these events occur; and
- There may be a correlation between the availability of funding to settle a particular obligation and the creation of a present obligation. For example, where both a budget line item has been approved and linked funding is assured through an appropriation, the availability of contingency funding or a transfer from a different level of government, a non-legally binding obligation may exist. However, the absence of a budgetary provision does not itself mean that a present obligation has not arisen.

5.17D “Economic coercion,” “political necessity” or other circumstances may give rise to situations where, although the public sector entity is not legally obliged to incur a transfer an outflow of resources, the economic or political consequences of refusing to do so are such that the entity may have little or no realistic alternative to avoid a transfer of resources. Economic coercion, political necessity or other circumstances may lead to a liability arising from a non-legally binding obligation.

Legal and Non-Legally Binding Obligations

- 5.18 Binding obligations can be legal obligations or non-legally binding obligations. Binding obligations can arise from both exchange and non-exchange transactions. An obligation must be to an external party in order to give rise to a liability. An entity cannot be obligated to itself, even where it has publicly communicated an intention to behave in a particular way. Identification of an external party is an indication of the existence of an obligation giving rise to a liability. However, it is not essential to know the identity of the external party before the time of settlement in order for a present obligation and a liability to exist. [Deleted]
- 5.19 Many arrangements that give rise to an obligation include settlement dates. The inclusion of a settlement date may provide an indication that an obligation involves an outflow of resources and gives rise to a liability. However, there are many agreements that do not contain settlement dates. The absence of a settlement date does not preclude an obligation giving rise to a liability. [Deleted]
- 5.20 A legal obligation is enforceable in law. Such enforceable obligations may arise from a variety of legal constructs. Exchange transactions are usually contractual in nature and therefore enforceable through the laws of contract or equivalent authority or arrangements. There are jurisdictions where government and public sector entities cannot enter into legal obligations, because, for example, they are not permitted to contract in their own name, but where there are alternative processes with equivalent effect. Obligations that are binding through such alternative processes are considered legal obligations in the Conceptual Framework. For some types of non-exchange transactions, judgment will be necessary to determine whether an obligation is enforceable in law. Where it is determined that an obligation is enforceable in law there can be no doubt that an entity has no realistic alternative to avoid the obligation and that a liability exists. [Deleted]

5.21 ~~Some obligations related to exchange transactions are not strictly enforceable by an external party at the reporting date but will be enforceable with the passage of time without the external party having to meet further conditions—or having to take any further action—prior to settlement. Claims that are unconditionally enforceable subject to the passage of time are enforceable obligations in the context of the definition of a liability. [Deleted]~~

5.22 ~~Sovereign power is the ultimate authority of a government to make, amend and repeal legal provisions. Sovereign power is not a rationale for concluding that an obligation does not meet the definition of a liability in this Framework. The legal position should be assessed at each reporting date to consider if an obligation is no longer binding and does not meet the definition of a liability. [Deleted]~~

Non-Legally-Binding Obligations

5.23 ~~Liabilities can arise from non-legally binding obligations. Non-legally binding obligations differ from legal obligations in that the party to whom the obligation exists cannot take legal (or equivalent) action to enforce settlement. Non-legally binding obligations that give rise to liabilities have the following attributes:~~

- ~~• The entity has indicated to other parties by an established pattern of past practice, published policies, or a sufficiently specific current statement that it will accept certain responsibilities;~~
- ~~• As a result of such an indication, the entity has created a valid expectation on the part of those other parties that it will discharge those responsibilities; and~~
- ~~• The entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid settling the obligation arising from those responsibilities. [Deleted]~~

5.24 ~~In the public sector, obligations may arise at a number of points. For example, in implementing a program or service:~~

- ~~• Making a political promise such as an electoral pledge;~~
- ~~• Announcement of a policy;~~
- ~~• Introduction (and approval) of the budget (which may be two distinct points); and~~
- ~~• The budget becoming effective (in some jurisdictions the budget will not be effective until an appropriation has been effected).~~
- ~~• The early stages of implementation are unlikely to give rise to present obligations that meet the definition of a liability. Later stages, such as claimants meeting the eligibility criteria for the service to be provided, may give rise to obligations that meet the definition of a liability. [Deleted]~~

5.25 ~~The point at which an obligation gives rise to a liability depends on the nature of the obligation. Factors that are likely to impact on judgments whether other parties can validly conclude that the obligation is such that the entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources include:~~

- ~~The nature of the past event or events that give rise to the obligation. For example, a promise made in an election is unlikely to give rise to a present obligation because an electoral pledge very rarely creates a valid expectation on the part of external parties that the entity has an obligation that it has little or no realistic alternative to avoid settling. However, an announcement in relation to an event or circumstance that has occurred may have such political support that the government has little option to withdraw. Where the government has committed to introduce and secure passage of the necessary budgetary provision such an announcement may give rise to a non-legally binding obligation;~~
 - ~~The ability of the entity to modify or change the obligation before it crystallizes. For example, the announcement of policy will generally not give rise to a non-legally binding obligation, which cannot be modified before being implemented. Similarly, if an obligation is contingent on future events occurring, there may be discretion to avoid an outflow of resources before those events occur; and~~
 - ~~There may be a correlation between the availability of funding to settle a particular obligation and the creation of a present obligation. For example, where both a budget line item has been approved and linked funding is assured through an appropriation, the availability of contingency funding or a transfer from a different level of government, a non-legally binding obligation may exist. However, the absence of a budgetary provision does not itself mean that a present obligation has not arisen. [Deleted]~~
- 5.26 ~~“Economic coercion,” “political necessity” or other circumstances may give rise to situations where, although the public sector entity is not legally obliged to incur an outflow of resources, the economic or political consequences of refusing to do so are such that the entity may have little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources. Economic coercion, political necessity or other circumstances may lead to a liability arising from a non-legally binding obligation. [Deleted]~~

Assets and Liabilities

Unit of Account

- 5.26A ~~The unit of account is the right or the group of rights, the obligation or the group of obligations, or the group of rights and obligations to which recognition criteria and measurement concepts are applied.~~
- 5.26B ~~A unit of account is selected for an asset or liability when considering how recognition criteria and measurement concepts will apply to that asset or liability and to the related revenue and expense. In some circumstances it may be appropriate to select one unit of account for recognition and a different unit of account for measurement. For example, arrangements may sometimes be recognized individually but measured as part of a portfolio of binding arrangements. For presentation and disclosure, assets, liabilities, revenue and expense may need to be aggregated or separated into components.~~
- 5.26C ~~If an entity transfers part of an asset or part of a liability, the unit of account may change at that time, so that the transferred component and the retained component become separate units of account.~~

5.26D A unit of account is selected to provide useful information, which implies that:

- (a) The information provided about the asset or liability and about any related revenue and expense must be relevant. Treating a group of rights and obligations as a single unit of account may provide more relevant information than treating, each right or obligation as a separate unit of account if, for example, those rights and obligations:
 - (i) Cannot be or are unlikely to be the subject of separate transactions;
 - (ii) Cannot or are unlikely to expire in different patterns;
 - (iii) Have similar characteristics and risks; or
 - (iv) Are used together in the operational activities conducted by an entity to provide services or to produce cash flows and are measured by reference to estimates of their interdependent service potential or future cash flows.
- (b) Information provided about the asset or liability and about any related revenue or expense must faithfully represent the substance of a transaction or other event from which they have arisen. Therefore, it may be necessary to treat rights or obligations arising from different sources as a single unit of account, or to separate the rights or obligations arising from a single source. Equally, to provide a faithful representation of unrelated, rights or obligations, it may be necessary to recognize and measure them separately.

5.26E In selecting a unit of account it is also important to consider the cost-benefit constraint of financial reporting discussed in Chapter 3. In general, the costs associated with recognizing and measuring assets, liabilities, revenue and expense increase as the size of unit of account decreases. Hence, in general, rights or obligations arising from the same source are separated only if the resulting information is more useful and the benefits outweigh the costs.

5.26F Sometimes, both rights and obligations arise from the same source. For example, some binding arrangements establish both rights and obligations for each of the parties. If those rights and obligations are interdependent and cannot be separated, they constitute a single inseparable asset or liability and hence form a single unit of account.

5.26G Some binding arrangements, or portions of binding arrangements, may be equally unperformed whereby neither party has fulfilled any of its obligations or both parties have partially fulfilled their obligations to an equal extent. Such binding arrangements establish a combined right and obligation to exchange resources. The right and obligation are interdependent and cannot be separated. Hence the combined right and obligation constitute a single asset or liability. The entity has an asset if the terms of the exchange are currently favorable; it has a liability if the terms of the exchange are currently unfavorable. Whether such an asset or liability is included in the financial statements depends on both the recognition criteria (see Chapter 6) and the measurement basis selected for the asset and liability (see Chapter 7).

5.26H To the extent that either party fulfills its obligations under the binding arrangement, the binding arrangement changes character. If the reporting entity performs first under the binding arrangement, that performance is the event that changes the reporting entity's right and obligation to exchange resources into a right to receive a resource. That right is an asset. If the other party

performs first, that performance is the event that changes the reporting entity's right and obligation to exchange resources into an obligation to transfer a resource. That obligation is a liability.

5.26I Conversely, if rights are separable from obligations, it may sometimes be appropriate to group the rights separately from the obligations, resulting in the identification of one or more separate assets and liabilities. In other cases, it may be more appropriate to group separable rights and obligations in a single unit of account, treating them as a single asset or a single liability.

5.26J Treating a set of rights and present obligations as a single unit of account differs from offsetting assets and liabilities. Offsetting occurs when an entity recognizes and measures both an asset and liability as separate units of account, but groups them into a single net amount in the statement of financial position. Offsetting classifies dissimilar items together and therefore is generally not appropriate.

Net Financial Position, Other Resources, and Other Obligations

5.29 As explained in paragraph 5.4, in some cases, in developing or revising an IPSAS, the IPSASB may determine that to achieve the objectives of financial reporting a resource or obligation that does not satisfy the definition of an element defined in the Conceptual Framework needs to be recognized in the financial statements. In these cases, the IPSAS may require or allow these resources or obligations to be recognized as other resources or other obligations, which are items additional to the six elements defined in this Conceptual Framework.

5.30 Net financial position is the difference between assets and liabilities after adding other resources and deducting other obligations recognized in the statement of financial position. Net financial position can be a positive or negative residual amount.

Revenue and Expense

Definitions

5.31 Revenue is:

Increases in the net financial position of the entity, other than increases arising from ownership contributions.

5.32 Expense is:

Decreases in the net financial position of the entity, other than decreases arising from ownership distributions.

5.33 Revenue and expense arise from exchange and non-exchange transactions, other events such as unrealized increases and decreases in the value of assets and liabilities, and the consumption of assets through depreciation and erosion of service potential and ~~ability~~ capability to generate economic benefits through impairments. Revenue and expense may arise from individual transactions or groups of transactions.

Surplus or Deficit for the Period

- 5.34 The entity's surplus or deficit for the period is the difference between revenue and expense reported on the statement of financial performance.

Ownership Contributions and Ownership Distributions

Definitions

- 5.35 Ownership contributions are:

Inflows of resources to an entity, contributed by external parties in their capacity as owners, which establish or increase an interest in the net financial position of the entity.

- 5.36 Ownership distributions are:

Outflows of resources from the entity, distributed to external parties in their capacity as owners, which return or reduce an interest in the net financial position of the entity.

- 5.37 It is important to distinguish inflows of resources from owners, including those inflows that initially establish the ownership interest, and outflows of resources to owners in their capacity as owners from revenue and expense. In addition to the injections of resources and the payment of dividends that may occur, in some jurisdictions it is relatively common for assets and liabilities to be transferred between public sector entities. Where such transfers satisfy the definitions of ownership contributions or ownership distributions they will be accounted for as such.
- 5.38 Ownership interests may arise on the creation of an entity when another entity contributes resources to provide the new entity with the capacity to commence operational activities. In the public sector, contributions to, and distributions from, entities are sometimes linked to the restructuring of government and will take the form of transfers of assets and liabilities rather than cash transactions. Ownership interests may take different forms, which may not be evidenced by an equity instrument.
- 5.39 Ownership contributions may take the form of an initial injection of resources at the creation of an entity or a subsequent injection of resources, including those where an entity is restructured. Ownership distributions may be: (a) a return on investment; (b) a full or partial return of investment; or (c) in the event of the entity being wound up or restructured, a return of any residual resources.

DRAFT

Basis for Conclusions

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

Scope of Chapter

- BC5.1 Respondents to the 2010 Consultation Paper, *Elements and Recognition in Financial Statements* (the 2010 Consultation Paper), questioned why the IPSASB was only addressing elements for the financial statements in this phase of the Conceptual Framework. They suggested that IPSASB should also develop elements for economic and other phenomena in the more comprehensive areas of financial reporting outside the financial statements. The IPSASB acknowledges the merits of these views and the need to develop such elements in the future. However, the IPSASB decided that in order to put its future standard-setting activities for the financial statements on a sound and transparent footing it is important to deal firstly with the development of elements for the financial statements.
- BC5.2 The IPSASB acknowledges a view that cash inflows and cash outflows should be defined as elements of the cash flow statement. The IPSASB took the view that cash inflows and cash outflows are components of the elements identified in this Chapter, and that further guidance should be provided at standards level.

Limited Scope Update of Conceptual Framework

- BC5.2A In March 2020 the IPSASB initiated a Limited Scope Update of the Conceptual Framework. The Limited Scope Update reviewed the definitions of an asset and a liability against the definitions in the IASB's Conceptual Framework, which was finalized in 2018 (IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework). The guidance supporting the definitions was also reviewed to take account of experience in applying the Framework in standards development and maintenance.
- BC5.2B The Limited Scope Update also evaluated the case for including guidance on the unit of account and binding arrangements that are equally unperformed. The 2014 Conceptual Framework did not address these issues.

Assets

The Definition of an Asset

BC5.2C The definition of an asset in the 2014 Conceptual Framework was:

A resource presently controlled by the entity as a result of a past event

BC5.2D The definition of an asset in the IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework is:

A present economic resource controlled by the entity as a result of past events.

BC5.2E Neither the IPSASB nor the IASB definitions included wording that could be interpreted as recognition thresholds, such as 'expected to flow.'

BC5.2F The 2014 IPSASB and 2018 IASB definitions contain the same components—a resource/an economic resource; control; and a past event/past events. The only differences were:

- (a) The IASB uses the term 'economic resource', whereas the IPSASB uses the term 'resource'.

Agenda Item

10.3.1

- (b) The IASB attaches 'present' to 'economic resource', whereas the IPSASB Conceptual Framework attaches 'presently' to control. The IASB's use of 'present economic resource' mirrors a present obligation for a liability.
- (c) The IASB uses 'past events' (plural). The IPSASB used 'past event' (singular). The IPSASB formulation indicated that there need be only one past event in order for the definition of an asset to be met.

BC5.2G The IPSASB considered the rationale for using the terms 'resource' and 'presently controlled'. The IPSASB considers that a resource is inherently economic and that the use of 'economic resource' might be confused with 'economic benefits', because of the guidance that rights with service potential are resources as well as those with the capability to generate economic benefits. The term 'presently controlled' reinforces the key point that control of a resource must be evaluated at the reporting date, rather than in the future. The prospect of control in the future is not sufficient to meet the asset definition. The IPSASB therefore reaffirmed the use and location of these terms.

BC5.2H The IPSASB considered that the use of the plural 'past events' rather than the singular 'past event' better conveys the point that resources can accumulate over time due to an initial past event and further past events. An example is a binding arrangement for the delivery of services to third party beneficiaries in which one party receives resources from another party in order to finance the arrangement. The resource recipient accumulates assets as it incurs eligible expenditure or complete specified activities in accordance with the binding arrangement. The term 'past events' includes the scenario where a single past event gives rise to an asset.

BC5.2I The revised definition of an asset is therefore:

A resource presently controlled by the entity as a result of past events.

BC5.2J In the Limited Scope Update the IPSASB reviewed the sequencing of guidance and reconfigured the guidance so that it reflected the components of the definition of an asset more clearly.

A Resource

BC5.3 The 2014 Conceptual Framework provided guidance that 'a resource provides benefits to an entity in the form of service potential or the ~~capability~~ ability to generate economic benefits or both. In reaching its conclusions on the nature of a resource the IPSASB considered whether the benefits of the resource must have already flowed to an entity in order for a resource to exist. However, the IPSASB concluded that resources themselves embody benefits—benefits that can be accessed by the entity that controls the rights to these benefits. The IPSASB also considered the nature of the benefits (see paragraphs BC5.7 and BC5.8) and control (see paragraphs BC5.9–BC5.14).

BC5.3A The 2014 Conceptual Framework distinguished service potential and the capability to generate economic benefits that ~~can~~ arise directly from legal ownership of the resource itself from service potential and the capability to generate economic benefits that arise from other rights to use the resource.

BC5.3B The IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework considered but decided not to make the distinction outlined in paragraph BC5.3A. The IASB took the view that 'ownership of a physical object arises because of rights conferred by law and that, although they differ in extent, the rights

conferred by full legal ownership of a physical object and by a contract to use an object for 99% (or 50% or even 1%) of its useful life are all rights of one kind or another.' The IASB also considered that there may be inconsistencies of what constitutes legal ownership in different jurisdictions or at different dates. In summary, the IASB guidance reflects a view that legal ownership is a particular form of right rather than a separate phenomenon.

BC5.3C The IPSASB acknowledged the view that physical ownership gives rise to a specific type of control and that this should be reflected conceptually, and that, from an accountability perspective, a conceptual approach which might lead to underlying assets not being recognized risks not meeting the qualitative characteristic of understandability.

BC5.3D However, on balance, the IPSASB decided to adopt a more overtly rights-based approach. In particular, the IPSASB found the view that legal ownership is a type of right rather than a separate phenomenon persuasive.

BC5.3E The IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework acknowledged that in many cases, the set of rights arising from legal ownership of a physical object is accounted for as a single asset. The IPSASB inserted paragraph 5.7F providing guidance that describing the set of rights as the physical item will often provide a faithful representation of those rights in the most concise and understandable way.

BC5.3F The IPSASB considered whether it should augment the guidance on a resource with guidance drawn from the IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework. The IPSASB decided that the following guidance should be added on issues on which the 2014 Conceptual Framework had previously been silent:

- Rights can be classified as those that correspond to an obligation of another party and those that do not correspond to an obligation of another party (paragraph 5.7A).
- Ways in which rights can be established (paragraph 5.7B).
- That when services are received and immediately consumed, an entity's right to obtain the service potential or/and economic benefits produced by such services exists very briefly until the entity consumes the services. This issue can arise when an entity receives in-kind services (paragraph 5.7C).
- Noting that not all rights are assets of an entity (paragraph 5.7D).
- In principle each of an entity's rights is a separate asset (paragraph 5.7E).
- In many cases, the set of rights arising from legal ownership of a physical object is accounted for as a single asset (paragraph 5.7F: also noted above in paragraph BC5.3E).

Unconditional Rights ~~and Executory Contracts~~

BC5.4 Unconditional rights to resources typically result from ~~contracts or other~~ binding arrangements that require provision of resources to the entity in the future. The IPSASB notes that there can be a large number of such rights and acknowledged that unconditional rights that represent service potential or the capability to generate economic benefits that are controlled by the entity as a result of ~~a past events~~ give rise to assets. Whether such assets are recognized depends on whether the recognition criteria have been satisfied. The IPSASB concluded that the

consequences of application of the definition of an asset to unconditional rights should be addressed at standards level.

~~BC5.5—Executory contracts are binding arrangements where there is an unconditional right to receive resources and an equal present obligation to transfer resources to the counterparty in the future. Public sector entities are likely to engage in a large number of such arrangements. The IPSASB acknowledges the view that such arrangements may give rise to both assets and liabilities, as there is a right to receive resources and a present obligation to sacrifice resources, which the entity has no realistic alternative to avoid. [Deleted]~~

~~BC5.6—The IPSASB also acknowledges the view that recognizing assets and liabilities from executory contracts would involve the inclusion of potentially very large amounts of assets and liabilities in the statement of financial position and the statement of financial performance and that this may conflict with the qualitative characteristic of understandability. Whether assets and liabilities arise from rights and obligations in executory contracts will be determined by an assessment of whether those rights and obligations satisfy the definitions of elements and recognition criteria identified in the Conceptual Framework. Such assessments, and the approach to presentation in the financial statements of any elements arising from executory contracts, are considered at standards level. [Deleted]~~

Service Potential and Economic Benefits

BC5.7 The term “service potential” has been used to identify the capability ~~capacity~~ of an asset to provide services in accordance with an entity’s objectives. The term “economic benefits” has been used to reflect the capability ~~ability~~ of an asset to generate net cash inflows. Some argue that economic benefits include service potential. Others argue that service potential includes economic benefits—a further view is that the terms can be used interchangeably. The IPSASB considered whether the explanation of a resource should include a reference to both service potential and the ~~ability~~ capability to generate economic benefits.

BC5.8 The IPSASB noted that many respondents to the 2010 Consultation Paper and 2012 Exposure Draft, *Elements and Recognition in Financial Statements*, supported inclusion of a specific reference to service potential as a characteristic of an asset, because of the service delivery objectives of most public sector entities. The IPSASB therefore concluded that the explanation of a resource should include both the terms “service potential” and “economic benefits”. This approach acknowledges that the primary objective of most public sector entities is to deliver services, but also that public sector entities may carry out activities with the sole objective of generating net cash inflows.

BC5.8A In the Limited Scope Update the IPSASB reaffirmed the term ‘service potential’ as an attribute of a resource. In the description of service potential in paragraph 5.8, the IPSASB changed the wording ‘the capacity to provide services’ to ‘the capability to provide services’, because of the ambiguity of ‘capacity’. Capacity has the same meaning of ability, but in other usages can mean the adequacy, availability and volume of resources. It is used with this second meaning in ED 77, *Measurement*, such as in guidance on the cost approach. The IPSASB acknowledged that in many languages ‘capacity’ and ‘capability’ will translate similarly. In addition, the IPSASB made a modification to the wording of economic benefits in the description of a resource in paragraph 5.8 and acknowledged that an item can have both

service potential and the capability to generate economic benefits. Guidance on the treatment of such assets is provided at the standards level.

Control

BC5.9 The IPSASB considered whether control is an essential characteristic of an asset or whether other indicators should be identified as essential characteristics of an asset including:

- Legal ownership;
- The right to access, and to restrict or deny the access of external parties to, the resource;
- The means to ensure that the resources are used to achieve the entity's objectives; and
- The existence of enforceable rights to service potential or economic benefits arising from a resource.

The IPSASB acknowledges the views of those who argue that control may be difficult to apply in some cases because it requires judgment to assess whether control exists. In addition, control can be erroneously applied to a resource in its entirety and not to the individual benefits that accrue from the resource. However, notwithstanding such difficulties, the IPSASB concluded that control is an essential characteristic of an asset because the presence of control facilitates the association of an asset with a specific entity.

BC5.10 Legal ownership of a resource, such as a property or item of equipment, is one method of accessing the service potential or economic benefits of an asset. However, rights to service potential or the ~~ability~~ capability to generate economic benefits may exist without legal ownership of the underlying resource. For example, the rights to service potential or the ~~ability~~ capability to generate economic benefits through the holding and use of leased property are accessed without legal ownership of the leased asset itself. Therefore, legal ownership of the resource is not an essential characteristic of an asset. Legal ownership is, however, an indicator of control.

BC5.11 The right to access a resource may give an entity the ability to determine whether to:

- Directly use the resource's service potential to provide services to beneficiaries;
- Exchange the resource for another asset, such as cash; or
- Use the asset in any of the other ways that may provide services or generate economic benefits.

BC5.12 While access to a resource is crucial, there are resources to which an entity has access which do not give rise to assets, such as air. Therefore, the ability to access a resource must be supplemented by the ability to deny or restrict the access of others to that resource—for example, (a) an entity might decide whether to set an entrance fee to a museum and restrict access to those who do not pay the fee, and (b) government may control a natural resource under its land to which it can restrict the access of others. Legally enforceable claims to specific resources, such as a right of access to a road or a right to explore land for mineral deposits, could represent an asset to the holder. However, an entity may be able to access the service potential or ~~ability~~ capability to generate economic benefits associated with a resource in ways that do not require legal rights. The IPSASB took the view that the factors identified in paragraph BC5.9 are likely to

be indicators of the existence of control rather than essential characteristics of the definition of an asset.

BC5.13 The IPSASB also considered whether the economic ownership approach is a viable alternative to the control approach. The economic ownership approach focuses on an entity's exposure to the underlying economic attributes that contribute to an asset's value to the entity. Some respondents to the 2012 Exposure Draft, *Elements and Recognition in Financial Statements*, in supporting the control approach, commented on the complexity of the economic ownership approach. The IPSASB concluded that the economic ownership approach is subjective and difficult to operate, and therefore rejected this approach.

BC5.14 The IPSASB considered whether an analysis of exposure to the risks and rewards of ownership is a useful indicator of control. The control approach focuses on the power of the entity to direct how the resource is used in order to benefit from the service potential and/or ~~ability~~ capability to generate economic benefits embodied in the resource. The risks and rewards approach focuses on an entity's exposure to the underlying economic attributes that contribute to an asset's value to the entity and the related risks. Consideration of the risks and rewards associated with particular transactions and events, and which party to any transaction or event bears the majority of those risks and rewards, may be relevant and useful in identifying the nature of the asset controlled by parties to the transaction or event. It may also be useful in determining how to quantify and associate the economic rights and obligations with particular parties. However, it is not of itself an indicator of the party that controls an asset. The IPSASB therefore decided not to include the risks and rewards of ownership as an indicator of control.

BC5.14A In the Limited Scope Update the IPSASB noted that the IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework included guidance on the principal-agent relationship. The 2014 IPSASB Conceptual Framework did not include guidance that in principal-agent relationships custody of a resource controlled by a principal does not give rise to an asset of the agent. While this is implicit in paragraph 5.11, the IPSASB considered that explicit guidance would be useful to underpin standards-level guidance and has therefore inserted a new paragraph 5.12A. This clarifies that in principal-agent relationships custody of a resource controlled by a principal does not give rise to an asset of the agent. The IPSASB included equivalent guidance for liabilities in paragraph 5.16F.

Past Events

BC5.15 Some respondents to the 2010 Consultation Paper and 2012 Exposure Draft argued that identification of a past transaction or other event which gives rise to the asset should be an essential characteristic of the definition of an asset. Others take the view that the identification of one or more past events is not necessary and should not therefore be an essential characteristic. They consider that such a requirement places undue emphasis on identifying the past event that gave rise to an asset. Such emphasis may be a distraction and lead to debates about which event is the triggering event instead of the more important issue of whether rights to resources exist at the reporting date. Those who take this view consider that the essential characteristic of an asset should be the existence of a resource. Some may accept that one or more a past events provides useful supporting evidence of the existence of an asset, but not that it should be an essential characteristic.

- BC5.16 Many respondents took the view that a past event should be identified as an essential characteristic of the definition of an asset. The IPSASB agrees with these respondents—in particular, that the complex nature of many public sector programs and activities means that there are a number of points at which control of a resource might arise. Therefore, the IPSASB concluded that identification of the appropriate past event is crucial in identifying whether an asset exists.
- BC5.17 The powers and rights of government are particularly significant for the identification of assets. The power to tax and issue licenses, and other powers to access or to deny or restrict access to the benefits embodied in intangible resources like the electromagnetic spectrum, are examples of sovereign powers. It is often difficult to determine when such powers give rise to a right that is a resource and asset of the entity.
- BC5.18 A government's power to establish a right to levy a tax or fee, for example, often begins a sequence of events that ultimately results in the flow of economic benefits to the government. The IPSASB considered two views of when an asset arises from the powers and rights of government to levy a tax or fee. The first view is that the government has an inherent power to tax at every reporting date and, therefore, that the general ability to levy taxes or fees is an asset. Proponents of this view accept that such an asset is unlikely to be capable of faithfully representative measurement but argue that this should not deflect from an acknowledgement that government has a perpetual asset. The contrary view is that the power to levy taxes and fees must be converted into a right by legal means, and that such a right must be exercised or exercisable in order for an asset to come into existence. Many respondents to the 2010 Consultation Paper and 2012 Exposure Draft supported this latter view. The IPSASB agrees with these respondents. In particular, the IPSASB concluded that a government's inherent powers do not give rise to assets until these powers are exercised and the rights exist to receive service potential or economic benefits.

Liabilities

BC5.18A The definition of a liability in the 2014 Conceptual Framework was:

A present obligation of the entity for an outflow of resources that results from a past event

BC5.18B The definition of a liability in the IASB's 2018 Conceptual Framework is:

A present obligation of the entity to transfer an economic resource as a result of past events.

BC5.18C As for the asset definition (see above paragraphs BC5.2A-J) both IPSASB and IASB definitions contained the same or similar components—resources/an economic resource; outflow of resources/transfer of resources; and a past event/past events. The differences were:

- (a) As in the asset definitions, the IASB uses the term 'economic resource', whereas the IPSASB uses the term 'resource'. The IPSASB's reason for retaining the term 'resource' is discussed in paragraph BC5.2G.
- (b) The IASB definition replaced the term 'outflow of resources' with 'transfer of an economic resource'. This was largely because of the linkage of the term an outflow of resources with

the expectation of such an outflow and therefore potential confusion with a recognition threshold.

- (c) As in the asset definition, the IASB uses ‘past events’ (plural). The IPSASB uses ‘past event’ (singular). The IPSASB formulation indicates that there need be only one past event in order for the definition to be met.

BC5.18D The IPSASB was persuaded by the adoption of the term transfer of resources and considered the standards-level implications of the adoption of the term “transfer of resources’ in the revised definition of a liability at the standards-level.

BC5.18E The IPSASB noted that the term ‘transfers’ is defined in IPSAS 23, *Revenue from Non-Exchange Transactions (Taxes and Transfers)*. A project to replace IPSAS 23 was underway at the time that the Limited Scope Update took place. The IPSASB concluded that any ambiguities or inconsistencies between conceptual and standards levels could be mitigated by adjustments to new defined terms and the provision of guidance on what a transfer of resources involves. Such guidance is in paragraphs 5.16A-5.16E.

BC5.18F Consistent with the analysis for assets at BC5.2H the IPSASB considered that the use of the plural ‘past events’ rather than the singular ‘past event’ better conveys that present obligations that give rise to liabilities can accumulate over time due to an initial past event and further past events.

BC5.18G The revised definition of a liability is:

A present obligation of the entity to transfer resources as a result of past events.

BC5.18H As for assets, the IPSASB considered the sequencing of guidance on liabilities and reconfigured the guidance so that it reflected the components of the definition of a liability more clearly. The revised structure also drew on the approach in the IASB’s 2018 Conceptual Framework in describing the characteristics of an obligation more clearly and linking a present obligation to a past event. This necessitated a relocation of guidance. The revised guidance is in paragraphs 5.14A-5.17D.

A Present Obligation

BC5.19 In considering when obligations are present obligations, the IPSASB accepts that a legal obligation gives rise to a present obligation. In some jurisdictions, public sector entities are not permitted to enter into certain legal arrangements, but there are equivalent mechanisms that give rise to a present obligation. Such mechanisms are considered legally binding. The IPSASB then considered how to classify obligations that are not legal obligations. The IPSASB noted that “constructive obligation” is a term embedded in standard-setting literature globally and has been used in IPSASs. However, it has proved difficult to interpret and apply in a public sector context. Therefore, the IPSASB considered alternative terminology, for example the term “a social or moral duty or requirement.” The IPSASB has concerns that the term “social” might be confused with political values and that the term “moral obligations” risks a perception that standard setters and preparers are arbiters of morality. Therefore, the IPSASB decided that making a distinction between “legally binding” and “non-legally binding obligations” is the most straightforward and understandable approach. The IPSASB considered and rejected the view that the term “non-

legally binding obligations” might be interpreted as referring to obligations, the legality of which is questionable. Paragraphs BC5.30–BC5.34 discuss non-legally binding obligations and explain their meaning for the purposes of the Conceptual Framework.

A Transfer of Resources

BC5.19A The guidance on ‘an outflow of resources from the entity’ in the 2014 Conceptual Framework was limited to statements that ‘a liability must involve an outflow of resources from the entity for it to be settled’ and that ‘an obligation that can be settled without an outflow of resources from the entity is not a liability.’

BC5.19B In IPSASB’s Revenue project some constituents indicated that ED 71, *Revenue without Performance Obligations*, was not clear on what gives rise to a liability in a binding arrangement. It became evident that this lack of clarity was partly attributable to uncertainty over what constitutes an outflow of resources from the entity.

BC5.19C The IPSASB noted that the IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework includes guidance on the application of a transfer of resources. With appropriate changes for public sector terminology, this guidance has been added in paragraphs 5.16A-5.16E of Chapter 5:

- (a) Paragraph 5.16A states that the obligation must have the potential to require the entity to transfer a resource to another party or parties. The transfer does not have to be certain or even likely and might be dependent on a specified uncertain future event occurring.
- (b) Paragraph 5.16B states that an obligation can meet the definition of a liability even if the probability of a transfer of a resource is low.
- (c) Paragraph 5.16C provides examples of obligations to transfer a resource.
- (d) Paragraph 5.16D indicates that rather than fulfill an obligation to transfer a resource to another party, entities may sometimes negotiate release from the obligation, transfer the obligation to a third party or replace the obligation with another obligation by entering into a new transaction. This paragraph reflects that in the public sector an entity’s ability to extinguish or reduce a present obligation other than by fulfillment may be limited.
- (e) Paragraph 5.16E states that in the situations described in paragraph 5.16D an entity has an obligation to transfer a resource until it has negotiated release, transferred or replaced the obligation.

BC5.19D The IPSASB emphasized that the ability to extinguish or reduce a present obligation by methods other than fulfillment does not mean that an entity has a realistic alternative of avoiding a transfer of resources and therefore a rationale for non-recognition of a present obligation as a liability, which otherwise meets recognition criteria.

Conditional and Unconditional Obligations

BC5.20 In the context of a present obligation, the IPSASB considered whether “conditional” and “unconditional” obligations, “stand-ready obligations” and “performance obligations” might be present obligations.

BC5.21 An unconditional obligation is one that stands on its own, independent of future events. Unconditional obligations give rise to liabilities if the definition of a liability is satisfied. A

conditional obligation involves the possible occurrence of a future event, which may or may not be under the control of the reporting entity. The IPSASB concluded that it is possible for conditional obligations to give rise to liabilities as defined in the Conceptual Framework. Determining whether a conditional obligation satisfies the definition of a liability will involve consideration of the nature of the obligation and the circumstances in which it has arisen. Given the complexity of public sector programs and activities, identifying the past event (or events), which has (have) resulted in the entity having little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources, often may not be straightforward. Guidance on whether conditional obligations that exist in particular arrangements or circumstances may give rise to liabilities consistent with the definitions identified in the Conceptual Framework is a standards-level issue.

- BC5.22 A variety of terms are used to describe present obligations that may arise from, or exist in conjunction with, conditional obligations in particular circumstances. Amongst these are stand ready-obligations and performance obligations. The characteristics of these obligations and the conclusions reached by the IPSASB in the context of the Conceptual Framework are outlined below.

Stand-Ready Obligations

- BC5.23 Stand-ready obligations are a type of conditional obligation. Stand-ready obligations require an entity to be prepared to fulfill an obligation if a specified uncertain future event outside the entity's control occurs (or fails to occur). The term stand-ready obligation is used to describe a liability that may arise in certain contractual circumstances, such as those related to insurance, certain financial instruments such as a derivative contract in a loss position, and for warranties where the entity has an obligation to transfer resources if a specified future event occurs (or does not occur). In such circumstances, there may be an identifiable past event and an outflow of resources from the entity, although the exact identity of the party to whom settlement will be made will not generally be known.
- BC5.24 The 2010 Consultation Paper included a discussion of stand-ready obligations. Many respondents found the distinction between a stand-ready obligation and other conditional obligations ambiguous. The 2012 Exposure Draft explained that the term stand-ready obligation is not widely used in the public sector, and does not work well in certain public sector circumstances, and suggested that whether a stand-ready obligation gave rise to a liability is a standards-level issue. Some respondents did not agree with the explanation in the 2012 Exposure Draft, and expressed a view that the Conceptual Framework should provide guidance for use at the standards level on whether stand-ready obligations can give rise to liabilities in certain circumstances.
- BC5.25 A public sector entity's obligation to transfer resources to another entity in particular circumstances that may occur in the future includes, for example, as a potential lender of last resort and in support of programs that provide a wide range of social benefits. The existence of an obligation to transfer resources to another party in these circumstances may be dependent on ongoing satisfaction of a number of conditions of differing significance and nature that are subject to change by the government or public sector entity. The IPSASB is of the view that the circumstances in which liabilities arise as a consequence of the obligation of a public sector entity to transfer resources to other parties consistent with the terms of programs, and how such

liabilities should be described and accounted for, should be considered at the standards level consistent with the principles established in the Conceptual Framework. The IPSASB decided that the Conceptual Framework should not resolve whether all obligations that might be classified as stand-ready meet the definition of a liability. The IPSASB also decided not to use the term “stand-ready obligation” in the Conceptual Framework.

Performance Obligations

- BC5.26 A performance obligation is an obligation in a contract or other binding arrangement between an entity and an external party to transfer a resource to that other party. Performance obligations are often explicitly stated in a contract or other arrangement. Not all performance obligations are explicit. For example, a statutory requirement may give rise to an implicit performance obligation of a public sector entity that is additional to the terms of an agreement or contract.
- BC5.27 A performance obligation also arises when an entity enters into an arrangement whereby it receives a fee and, in return, provides an external party with access to an asset of the government. The IPSASB concluded that it is not necessary to identify a specific external party for a performance obligation to arise, but it is important to analyze such obligations in order to determine whether they include a requirement to provide an outflow for a transfer of resources. Obligations that require an entity to provide access to a resource, but do not entail an outflow a transfer of resources do not give rise to liabilities. However, obligations that require an entity to forgo future resources may be liabilities. Performance obligations are often conditional obligations. Determining whether such obligations give rise to liabilities is dependent upon the terms of particular binding agreements and may vary between jurisdictions. The IPSASB concluded that the circumstances under which performance obligations give rise to liabilities should be considered at standards level.

Past Events

- BC5.28 The IPSASB considered whether the definition of a liability should require the existence of a past transaction or other event. Some take the view that identification of a past event is not an essential characteristic of a liability, and that, consequently, there is no need for the definition of a liability to include a reference to a past event. These commentators argue that there may be many possible past events and that establishing the key past event is likely to be arbitrary. They suggest that the identification of a past event is not a primary factor in determining whether a liability exists at the reporting date. This view mirrors the opposition to the inclusion of a past event in the definition of an asset, which is discussed in paragraphs BC5.15–BC5.18.
- BC5.29 The IPSASB acknowledges this view, but also noted that many respondents to the 2010 Consultation Paper and 2012 Exposure Draft consider that a past event is a characteristic of a liability. The IPSASB agrees with the view that the complexity of many public sector programs and activities and the number of potential points at which a present obligation might arise means that, although challenging, identification of the past event that gives rise to a liability is critical in determining when public sector liabilities should be recognized. The IPSASB reconsidered whether the definition of a liability should include a reference to past event(s) in the Limited Scope Update in 2020. The IPSASB reaffirmed the importance of past events and linked past events to present obligations.

An Incremental Sacrifice of Resources as a Result of Past Events

BC5.29A In developing proposals on revenue, the IPSASB acknowledged that the transfer of resources arising from a binding arrangement must be incremental in order to give rise to a liability. Paragraph 4.43 of the IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework provides guidance that the concept 'as a result of past events' means that:

- (a) An entity has already obtained economic benefits or taken an action; and
- (b) As a consequence, the entity will or may have to transfer an economic resource that it would not otherwise have had to transfer.

BC5.29B This guidance establishes a principle that, in order to meet the definition of a liability, the past events must give rise to an incremental sacrifice of resources. An obligation, which can be fulfilled without an incremental sacrifice of resources is not a present obligation and does not meet the definition of a liability.

Little or No Realistic Alternative to Avoid.

BC5.30 Some respondents to the 2012 Exposure Draft expressed concerns that the phrase “little or no realistic alternative to avoid” in the description of a present obligation is open to different interpretations. They proposed removal of the words “little or” from this phrase in order to reduce the potential for misinterpretation. The IPSASB considered this proposal. The IPSASB was concerned that such a change might be interpreted as establishing a threshold test of virtual certainty in determining whether a present obligation exists. The IPSASB considers such a threshold too high. ~~Consequently, the IPSASB confirmed that a present obligation is a legally binding or non-legally binding requirement that an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid.~~

BC5.30 Determining when a present obligation arises in a public sector context is complex and, in some cases, might be considered arbitrary. This is particularly so when considering whether liabilities can arise from obligations that are not enforceable by legal or equivalent means. In the context of programs to deliver social benefits there are a number of stages at which a present obligation can arise and there can be significant differences between jurisdictions, even where programs are similar, and also over time within the same jurisdiction—for example, different age cohorts may have different expectations about the likelihood of receiving benefits under a social assistance program. Assessing whether a government cannot ignore such expectations and therefore has little or no realistic alternative to transfer resources may be subjective. This gives rise to concerns that such subjectivity undermines consistency in the reporting of liabilities, and can also impact adversely on understandability. Some therefore take the view that an essential characteristic of a liability should be that it is enforceable at the reporting date by legal or equivalent means.

BC5.31 A converse view is that where a government has a record of honoring obligations, failing to recognize them as liabilities leads to an overstatement of that government's net financial position. According to this view, if a government has a consistent record of raising citizen expectations through publicly-announced obligations to provide financial support—for example to the victims of natural disasters—and has met such obligations in the past, a failure to treat such obligations as liabilities is not in accordance with the objectives of financial reporting, and leads to the provision of information that does not meet the qualitative characteristics of faithful representation and relevance.

- BC5.32 On balance, the IPSASB agrees with those who argue that, in the public sector, liabilities can arise from binding obligations that the entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid, even if they are not enforceable in law. The IPSASB decided to use the term “non-legally binding obligations” for such obligations in the Conceptual Framework. However, the IPSASB acknowledges the views of those who are skeptical that liabilities can arise from obligations that are not legally enforceable. Consequently, paragraph ~~5.23~~ 5.15F of this Chapter identifies the attributes that a non-legally binding obligation is to possess for it to give rise to a liability.
- BC5.33 The wide variation in the nature of public sector programs and operations, and the different political and economic circumstances of jurisdictions globally, means that categorical assertions of the circumstances under which obligations not enforceable in law become binding and give rise to present obligations are inappropriate. However, the IPSASB is of the view that present obligations are extremely unlikely to arise from election pledges. This is because electoral pledges will very rarely, (a) create a valid expectation on the part of external parties that the entity will honor the pledge, and (b) create an obligation which the entity has no realistic alternative but to settle. Therefore, the Conceptual Framework includes a presumption that liabilities do not arise from electoral pledges. However, it is accepted that in practice a government with a large majority will be better placed to enact intended legislation than a minority government, and that there may be infrequent circumstances where a government announcement in such circumstances might give rise to a liability. In assessing whether, in these circumstances, a non-legally binding obligation gives rise to a liability the availability of funding to settle the obligation may be an indicator. This is discussed in paragraph ~~5.25~~ 5.17C

Sovereign Power to Avoid Obligations

- BC5.34 The sovereign power to make, amend and repeal legal provisions is a key characteristic of governments. Sovereign power potentially allows governments to repudiate obligations arising from both exchange and non-exchange transactions. Although in a global environment such a power may be constrained by practical considerations, there are a large number of examples of governments defaulting on financial obligations over the last century. The IPSASB considered the impact of sovereign power on the definition of a liability. The IPSASB concluded that failing to recognize obligations that otherwise meet the definition of a liability on the grounds that sovereign power enables a government to walk away from such obligations would be contrary to the objectives of financial reporting and, in particular, may conflict with the qualitative characteristics of relevance and faithful representation. Many respondents to the Consultation Paper and the Exposure Draft supported this position. The IPSASB therefore concluded that the determination of the existence of a liability should be by reference to the legal position at the reporting date.

Commitments

- BC5.35 Commitment accounting procedures are a central component of budgetary control for public sector entities in many jurisdictions. They are intended to assure that budgetary funds are available to meet the government's or other public sector entity's responsibility for a possible future liability, including intended or outstanding purchase orders and contracts, or where the conditions for future transfers of funds have not yet been satisfied. Commitments which satisfy the definition of a liability and the recognition criteria are recognized in financial statements, in

other cases information about them may be communicated in notes to the financial statements or other reports included in GPFRs. The IPSASB concluded that commitment accounting might be addressed in the future when dealing with elements for the more comprehensive areas of general purpose financial reporting outside the financial statements.

Unit of Account and Accounting Principles for Binding Arrangements that are Equally Unperformed

Unit of Account

BC5.36A The IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework describes unit of account as ‘the right or the group of rights, the obligation or the group of obligations, or the group of rights and obligations, to which recognition criteria and management concepts are applied.’

BC5.36B The IPSASB took the view that unit of account was a standards-level issue during the development of the 2014 IPSASB Conceptual Framework and there was no guidance on unit of account. Since 2014 the importance of decisions on the unit of account has been highlighted in a number of projects and led the IPSASB to reevaluate the case for high-level guidance.

BC5.36C The IPSASB decided that guidance in the Conceptual Framework would be beneficial in informing standards-level requirements and guidance on unit of account. The IPSASB drew on the IASB 2018 Framework for this guidance, which is in paragraphs 5.26A-5.26J. The guidance on consideration of how the selection of a unit of account provides useful information in the IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework is in the context of the qualitative characteristics of relevance and faithful representation. The IPSASB took the view that other QCs may need to be taken into account in assessing whether information is useful in determining the unit of account.

Executory Contracts

BC5.36D The IPSASB 2014 Conceptual Framework does not include guidance on executory contracts. In the Limited Scope Update, the IPSASB evaluated whether guidance should be added to the Conceptual Framework.

BC5.36E The IASB 2018 Conceptual Framework describes an executory contract is as ‘a contract or a portion of a contract, that is equally unperformed—neither party has fulfilled any of its obligations, or both parties have partially fulfilled their obligations to an equal extent.’

BC5.36F The IPSASB noted that the term ‘contract’ has been problematic in some jurisdictions. This is because some public sector entities may not have powers to enter into contracts, although they may be able to enter into other binding arrangements. Consequently, the term ‘contract’ has not been used widely in the Conceptual Framework. At the standards level the term ‘binding arrangement’ has been generally used. The IPSASB has used this term in the Conceptual Framework. The IPSASB concluded that the principles of accounting for binding arrangements that are equally unperformed could be incorporated in the section on Unit of Account and that a separate section is unnecessary. This guidance is in paragraphs 5.26G-5.26J.

Net Financial Position, Other Resources and Other Obligations

BC5.36 This section of the Basis for Conclusions outlines the IPSASB’s approach to models of financial performance to be reported in the financial statements, and specifically the treatment of deferred inflows and deferred outflows.

Consultation Paper, Elements and Recognition in Financial Statements

- BC5.37 The 2010 Consultation Paper discussed two contrasting approaches to financial performance:
- An approach that measures financial performance as the net result of all changes in the entity's resources and obligations during the period. This was described as the asset and liability-led approach; and
 - An approach that measures financial performance as the result of the revenue inflows and expense outflows more closely associated with the operations of the current period. This was described as the revenue and expense-led approach.
- BC5.38 The 2010 Consultation Paper noted that the two different approaches could lead to different definitions of the elements related to financial performance and financial position. The revenue and expense-led approach is strongly linked to the notion of inter-period equity. Inter-period equity refers to the extent to which the cost of programs and providing services in the reporting period is borne by current taxpayers and current resource providers. The asset and liability-led approach is linked to the notion of changes in resources available to provide services in the future and claims on these resources as a result of period activity
- BC5.39 A further section of the 2010 Consultation Paper discussed Other Potential Elements and pointed out that, if IPSASB adopted the revenue and expense-led approach, IPSASB would need to address deferred flows. Under this approach, deferred flows are items that do not meet the proposed definitions of revenue and expense, but which are nevertheless considered to affect the financial performance of the period. The Consultation Paper identified three options for dealing with such flows:
- Defining deferred inflows and deferred outflow as elements on the statement of financial position;
 - Broadening the asset and liability definitions to include items that are deferrals; or
 - Describing deferred flows as sub-classifications of net assets/net liabilities (subsequently referred to as the residual amount).
- BC5.40 The 2010 Consultation Paper had two specific matters for comment on these areas. The first asked constituents to indicate whether they preferred the asset and liability-led approach or revenue and expense-led approach and to indicate their reasons. The second asked whether deferred inflows and deferred outflows need to be identified on the statement of financial position. If respondents supported identification on the statement of financial position they were asked to indicate which of the three approaches in paragraph BC5.40 they supported.
- BC5.41 The responses to these specific matters for comment were inconclusive. A small majority of respondents expressing a view favored the asset and liability-led approach. However, a number of respondents who supported the asset and liability-led approach also indicated that they favored identifying deferrals on the statement of financial position. The IPSASB took these views into account in the development of the at 2012 Exposure Draft stage.

Exposure Draft, Elements and Recognition in Financial Statements

BC5.42 The 2012 Exposure Draft expressed a view that it is important to be able to distinguish flows that relate to the current reporting period from those that relate to specified future reporting periods. The 2012 Exposure Draft therefore proposed the following definitions of a deferred inflow and a deferred outflow:

- *A deferred inflow is an inflow of service potential or economic benefits provided to the entity for use in a specified future reporting period that results from a non-exchange transaction and increases net assets; and*
- *A deferred outflow is an outflow of service potential or economic benefits provided to another entity or party for use in a specified future reporting period that results from a non-exchange transaction and decreases net assets.*

BC5.43 The two key features of these definitions were:

- The proposed elements were restricted to non-exchange transactions; and
- The flows had to be related to a specified future period.

BC5.44 The IPSASB's rationale for including these characteristics were as risk-avoidance measures to reduce the possibility of deferred inflows and deferred outflows being used widely as smoothing devices, and to ensure that deferred inflows and deferred outflows are not presented on the statement of financial position indefinitely. The Exposure Draft included two Alternative Views. The first Alternative View considered the meaning of net financial position to be unclear in light of the combined impact of deferred inflows and deferred outflows. The second Alternative View disagreed with the view that deferred inflows and deferred outflows should be identified and recognized as separate elements and expressed a view that these flows meet the definitions of revenue and expense.

BC5.45 Many respondents disagreed with defining deferred inflows and deferred outflows as elements. Some expressed reservations about the implications for alignment with the ~~International Accounting Standards Board's~~ IASB's Conceptual Framework, and International Financial Reporting Standards more generally. A number of respondents considered that the proposed approach did not reflect economic reality and that it would be more difficult to determine an objective basis for deferring revenue and expense under the revenue and expense-led approach. Nevertheless, a number of respondents also expressed the view that information on flows relating to particular reporting periods has information value.

BC5.46 The rationale for restricting the definitions to non-exchange transactions was challenged as conceptually weak both by respondents who favored defining deferred inflows and deferred outflows as elements and those opposed to these proposed elements. Respondents also disagreed with the restriction to specified time periods, because it would potentially lead to the different accounting treatment of very similar transactions dependent upon whether a specific period was identified—a grant without conditions receivable by an entity to finance its general activities for a five year period would have met the definition of a deferred inflow, whereas a similar grant for a future unspecified period would have met the definition of revenue.

Finalizing the Elements Chapter

- BC5.47 The IPSASB considered that it needed to balance the limited support for the proposals on deferred flows in the 2012 Exposure Draft, and the perceived needs of users for information about flows relating to particular reporting periods.
- BC5.48 The IPSASB therefore considered five options (A–E below) in responding to input from the due process and its perception of users’ information needs:
- A. Defining deferred inflows and deferred outflows as elements in a more principles-based manner and not specifying the financial statements in which the elements are to be recognized. As such, the Conceptual Framework would not predetermine the presentation of the elements
 - B. Deriving the definitions of revenue and expense from the asset and liability definitions;
 - C. Broadening the asset and liability definitions;
 - D. Accepting that certain economic phenomena that do not meet the definition of any element may need to be recognized in financial statements in order to meet the objectives of financial reporting; and
 - E. Reporting inflows and outflows that provide service potential or economic benefits, but do not affect assets and liabilities as defined in the Conceptual Framework and reporting inflows and outflows that do not affect revenue and expense
- BC5.49 The IPSASB ~~does~~ did not consider that defining deferred inflows and deferred outflows as elements in Option A is justified in light of the objections that respondents had made to the proposals in the 2012 Exposure Draft. The IPSASB therefore rejected Option A.
- BC5.50 The IPSASB considered two variants of Option B. In the first variant deferred flows would be taken directly to surplus/deficit, while in the second variant deferred flows would initially be taken to residual amount and then recycled to surplus/deficit in the period that time stipulations occur.
- BC5.51 The IPSASB considers that taking deferred flows directly to surplus/deficit under the first variant of Option B may not produce information that is representationally faithful of an entity’s sustainable performance and therefore does not meet the objectives of financial reporting. The second variant of Option B relies on recycling and, in the view of some IPSASB members would have implicitly introduced the notion of “other comprehensive income” into the Conceptual Framework. The IPSASB has strong reservations about such a development. For these reasons the IPSASB rejected Option B.
- BC5.52 The IPSASB noted that Option C would require changes to the definitions of an asset and a liability so that:
- The definition of an asset would include resources that an entity does not control; and
 - The definition of a liability would include obligations that are not present obligations.
- The IPSASB considers that such changes would distort the essential characteristic of an asset—that an entity controls rights to resources—and the essential characteristic of a liability—that an entity has a present obligation for an outflow of resources. In the view of the IPSASB this would make assets and liabilities less easily understandable. Adoption of such an

option would also be a departure from globally understood definitions of an asset and a liability. For these reasons the IPSASB rejected Option C

- BC5.53 Option E was a hybrid approach that involved components of the other four options. It would allow reporting of inflows and outflows that provide service potential or economic benefits, but would not affect the definitions of an asset and liability and the reporting of inflows and outflows that do not affect revenue and expense as defined in the Conceptual Framework. The idea of this approach was to acknowledge that further conceptual thinking on financial performance is necessary.
- BC5.54 Option D is broader than Option E because it is not necessarily restricted to deferred flows, but could encompass broader economic phenomena—for example obligations that are not present obligations, because, although they contain performance obligations, it is not clear that they require an outflow of resources. Option D acknowledges that there may be circumstances under which the six elements defined in the Conceptual Framework may not provide all the information in the financial statements that is necessary to meet users' needs. In the view of the IPSASB it is transparent to acknowledge that other items may be recognized. Unlike Option A, Option D does not involve defining additional elements, and, unlike Option C, Option D does not involve modification of generally understood definitions of an asset and a liability.
- BC5.55 The IPSASB concluded that Option D provides the most transparent approach. The terms “other obligations” and “other resources” are used to describe these economic phenomena in the Conceptual Framework. Option D also enhances the accountability of the IPSASB because the circumstances under which other obligations and other resources will be recognized will be determined at standards level and explained in the Bases for Conclusions of specific standards.

Financial Statements

- BC5.56 Net financial position is the aggregate of an entity's net assets (assets minus liabilities) and other resources and other obligations recognized in the statement of financial position at the reporting date. Where resources and obligations other than those that meet the definition of the elements are recognized in the financial statements, the amounts reported as net assets and net financial position will differ. In these circumstances, the interpretation of net financial position will be determined by reference to the nature of the other resources and other obligations recognized in the financial statements under the relevant IPSAS.
- BC5.57 The IPSASB considered whether it should use both the terms “net assets” and “net financial position” in the Conceptual Framework. The IPSASB acknowledges a view that net assets is a generally understood term. However, the IPSASB considered that using both terms could be confusing and therefore decided to use the term “net financial position” to indicate the residual amount of an entity.

Revenue and Expense

Gross or Net Increase in “Net Financial Position” in Definition of Revenue

- BC5.58 The IPSASB considered whether the definition of revenue should specify that the increase in net financial position is “gross” or “net”. The IPSASB acknowledges that a gross approach might not be appropriate in areas such as the disposal of property, plant, and equipment where such an

approach would require the full disposal proceeds to be recognized as revenue, rather than the difference between the disposal proceeds and the carrying amount. Conversely, a net approach might be similarly inappropriate in certain circumstances—for example, the sale of inventory. The IPSASB concluded that whether the increase in net financial position represented by revenue is presented gross or net should be determined at standards level, dependent on which treatment better meets the objectives of financial reporting.

Distinguishing Ordinary Activities from Activities outside the Ordinary Course of Operations

- BC5.59 Some standard setters structure their definitions of elements so that, for example, inflows and outflows arising from transactions and events relating to activities in the ordinary course of operations are distinguished from inflows and outflows that relate to activities outside the ordinary course of operations. An example of this approach is to define revenue and expense as elements that relate to an entity's "ongoing major or central operations," and to define gains and losses as elements that relate to all other transactions, events and circumstances giving rise to increases or decreases in net assets. ²
- BC5.60 The IPSASB acknowledges that distinguishing transactions and events related to the ordinary course of operations from transactions and events outside the ordinary course of operations can provide useful information for users of the financial statements. Therefore, it may be useful to adopt the terms "gains and losses" to reflect inflows and outflows from transactions and events outside the ordinary course of operations. However, the IPSASB is of the view that, conceptually, gains and losses do not differ from other forms of revenue and expense, because they both involve net increases or decreases of assets and/or liabilities. The IPSASB also noted that many respondents to the 2010 Consultation Paper and 2012 Exposure Draft shared this view. Therefore, the IPSASB decided not to define gains and losses as separate elements.

Ownership Interests in the Public Sector

- BC5.61 As discussed in more detail in BC5.66-BC5.70, the IPSASB considered whether, and, if so, under what circumstances, ownership interests exist in the public sector and whether transactions related to ownership interests should be excluded from the definitions of revenue and expense. Because transactions with owners, in their role as owners, are different in substance to other inflows and outflows of resources the IPSASB concluded that it is necessary to distinguish flows relating to owners from revenue and expense. Therefore, ownership contributions and ownership distributions are defined as elements and excluded from the definitions of revenue and expense.

Surplus or Deficit in the Reporting Period

- BC5.62 This chapter states that the difference between revenue and expense is the entity's surplus or deficit for the period. The IPSASB considered whether it should provide explanatory guidance on the interpretation of surplus or deficit. The IPSASB discussed a view that public sector entities have operating and funding models. According to this view a surplus provides an indicator of the ability of the entity to:

² See, for example, Financial Accounting Standards Board, Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 6, *Elements of Financial Statements*.

- Reduce demands for resources from resource providers;
- Increase either the volume and/or quality of services to recipients;
- Reduce debt (where an entity has debt-raising powers); or
- A combination of these factors.

BC5.63 Conversely a deficit provides an indicator of:

- The need to increase demands on resources from resource providers;
- Reduce either the volume and/or quality of services to recipients;
- Increase debt (where an entity has debt-raising powers); or
- A combination of these factors.

BC5.64 The IPSASB acknowledges that there is a need for greater clarity on the meaning of surplus or deficit in the public sector, and therefore that aspects of the above approach might be developed further in the future. However, the IPSASB considered the concept of an operating and funding model or business model is not well developed in the public sector, and that developing an operating and funding model appropriate for all public sector entities is problematic. Therefore, the IPSASB decided not to include guidance on the interpretation of surplus or deficit in the Conceptual Framework.

Ownership Contributions, and Ownership Distributions

BC5.65 The IPSASB considered whether net financial position is a residual amount, a residual interest or an ownership interest. The IPSASB acknowledges the view that the interest of resource providers and service recipients in the long-term efficiency of the entity, its capacity to deliver services in the future and in the resources that may be available for redirection, restructuring or alternative disposition is similar to an ownership interest. The IPSASB also accepts that the terms “residual interest” and “ownership interest” have been used in some jurisdictions to characterize third parties’ interests in net assets. The term “residual interest” indicates that service recipients and resource providers have an interest in the capability of the entity to finance itself and to resource future operations. The term “ownership interest” is analogous to the ownership interest in a private sector entity and, for some, indicates that the citizens own the resources of the public sector entity and that government is responsible to the citizens for the use of those resources. Some supporters of this approach argue that it emphasizes the democratic accountability of governments.

BC5.66 The IPSASB is of the view that the term “residual interest” may also suggest that service recipients and resource providers have a financial interest in the public sector entity. Similarly, the term “ownership interest” may suggest that citizens are entitled to distributions from the public sector entity and to distributions of resources in the event of the entity being wound up. The IPSASB therefore concluded that the terms “residual interest” and “ownership interest” can be misunderstood or misinterpreted, and that net financial position is a residual amount that should not be defined.

BC5.67 However, the IPSASB acknowledges that part of net financial position can in certain circumstances be an ownership interest. Such instances may be evidenced by the entity having

Agenda Item 10.3.1

a formal equity structure. However, there may be instances where an entity is established without a formal equity structure, with a view to sale for operation as a commercial enterprise or by a private sector not-for-profit entity. An ownership interest can also arise from the restructuring of government or public sector entities, such as when a new government department is created. The IPSASB therefore considered whether ownership interests should be defined as an element. The IPSASB acknowledges the view that identifying the resources (or claims on future resources) attributable to owners provides information useful for accountability and decision-making purposes. The IPSASB concluded that such interests can be identified through the sub-classification of net financial position. However, the IPSASB also concluded that it is important to distinguish inflows of resources from owners and outflows of resources to owners, in their role as owners, from revenue, expense, other resources and other obligations. Therefore, ownership contributions and ownership distributions are defined as elements. Detailed guidance to support the assessment of whether certain inflows and outflows of resources satisfy the definitions of ownership contributions and ownership distributions will be developed at standards level, as appropriate.

International Public Sector Accounting Standards, Exposure Drafts, Consultation Papers, Recommended Practice Guidelines, and other IPSASB publications are published by, and copyright of, IFAC.

The IPSASB and IFAC 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.

The 'International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board', 'International Public Sector Accounting Standards', 'Recommended Practice Guidelines', 'International Federation of Accountants', 'IPSASB', 'IPSAS', 'RPG', 'IFAC', the IPSASB logo, and IFAC logo are trademarks of IFAC, or registered trademarks and service marks of IFAC in the US and other countries.

Copyright © January 2022 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Permission is granted to make copies of this work to achieve maximum exposure and feedback provided that each copy bears the following credit line: "*Copyright © January 2022 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Used with permission of IFAC. Permission is granted to make copies of this work to achieve maximum exposure and feedback.*"

