

Project	Agenda Consultation
Topic	Update

Introduction

1. This paper provides the Board with an update on the development of the proposed agenda consultation and asks the Board if they approve the launch of this consultation.
2. The agenda consultation provides an opportunity for formal public input on the broad aspects of the Board's agenda-setting process, and will be conducted every three years. The consultation process was introduced by the Trustees of the IFRS Foundation in 2010, in response to comments received during the second Constitution Review of the IFRS Foundation.

Background

3. Since the Board discussed the agenda consultation at the June 2011 Board meeting, the IFRS Advisory Council has met and commented further on the proposals. We have considered their views and made changes to the consultation document where we think appropriate. A separate revised draft of the consultation document has been provided to Board members.
4. At the time of writing this agenda paper, the Trustees of the IFRS Foundation are expected to consider, on 13 and 14 July, the proposals for the agenda consultation. Feedback from the Trustees' meeting will be provided orally to the Board during the July Board meeting.

This paper has been prepared by the technical staff of the IFRS Foundation for discussion at a public meeting of the IASB.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the staff preparing the paper. They do not purport to represent the views of any individual members of the IASB.

Comments made in relation to the application of an IFRS do not purport to be an acceptable or unacceptable application of that IFRS—only the IFRS Interpretations Committee or the IASB can make such a determination.

The tentative decisions made by the IASB at its public meetings are reported in IASB *Update*. Official pronouncements of the IASB, including Discussion Papers, Exposure Drafts, IFRSs and Interpretations are published only after it has completed its full due process, including appropriate public consultation and formal voting procedures.

IASB Staff paper

Consultation approach

5. The approach adopted to the consultation is to look at the agenda from two perspectives:
 - (a) the overall strategic direction and balance of the agenda; and
 - (b) a consideration of individual financial reporting needs.
6. We have set out the Board's tentative views on the overall strategic direction and balance of the agenda, drawing on advice from the Advisory Council, in the Request for Views consultation document. Within this document we have also explained the competing factors we think the Board will need to balance in setting the agenda, to assist stakeholders when responding to the consultation. These competing factors include the financial reporting needs, capacity constraints (ours and those of our stakeholders) and our existing priorities, such as the need to perform post-implementation reviews.

Consultation questions

7. The questions proposed for inclusion in the agenda consultation are included in the appendix to this paper. Question 1 asks for stakeholders' views on the overall strategic direction and balance of the agenda. Question 2 asks for stakeholders' views on financial reporting needs and on the relative priorities of those needs.

Next steps

8. If the Board approves the launch of the proposed Request for Views, we anticipate the following timetable for the consultation:
 - (a) July 2011: launch of agenda consultation, with a minimum 120-day comment period.
 - (b) 30 November 2011: consultation period ends.

IASB Staff paper

- (c) Q1 2012: publication of comment summary, start of Board discussions and consultation with the IFRS Advisory Council.
- (d) Q2 2012: publication of Feedback Statement summarising what has been learnt from the agenda consultation.

Questions for the Board

Questions on the agenda consultation

Do Board members have any further questions or comments on the proposed agenda consultation?

Does the Board approve the launch of the agenda consultation?

IASB Staff paper

Appendix—Proposed agenda consultation questions

A1. The agenda consultation sets out the Board’s preliminary views on the overall strategic direction and balance of the agenda as follows:

- (a) Developing financial reporting:
 - (i) completing the revised conceptual framework;
 - (ii) researching strategic issues for financial reporting; and
 - (iii) filling gaps in the IFRS literature by undertaking standard-level projects.
- (b) Maintaining existing IFRSs:
 - (i) conducting post-implementation reviews; and
 - (ii) responding to implementation needs through targeted, narrow-scope improvements to IFRSs

A2. The proposed questions about the Board’s tentative view of the overall strategic direction and balance of the agenda are as follows:

Question 1:

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

Question 1(a):

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

Question 1(b):

How would you weight the two main classes and five areas?

If you have identified other areas for the IASB’s agenda, please include these in your answer.

IASB Staff paper

- A3. The proposed questions about financial reporting needs and associated priorities are as follows:

Question 2:

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

Question 2(a):

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

Question 2(b):

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