

STAFF PAPER

May 2012

IASB Meeting

Project	Request for views— <i>Agenda Consultation 2011</i>		
Paper topic	Covering memo to the agenda papers		
CONTACT(S)	April Pitman Michael Stewart Alan Teixeira	apitman@ifrs.org mstewart@ifrs.org ateixeira@ifrs.org	+44 (0)20 7246 6492 +44 (0)20 7246 6922 +44 (0)20 7246 6442

This paper has been prepared by the staff of the IFRS Foundation for discussion at a public meeting of the IASB and does not represent the views of the IASB or any individual member of the IASB. Comments on the application of IFRSs do not purport to set out acceptable or unacceptable application of IFRSs. Technical decisions are made in public and reported in IASB *Update*.

1. The Board began its public consultation on its agenda-setting process in 2011 by publishing a request for views *Agenda Consultation 2011* (the RFV). The preliminary analysis of responses received was discussed at the January Board meeting. In addition, both the Board and staff have taken part in over 80 outreach activities and have sought input from a range of sources. The output from this process will be a feedback statement and a strategy document.

Agenda papers presented

2. The papers presented this month are:

- (a) 13 A *Topics for the feedback statement*

This paper summarises the feedback received from the Board's public consultation on its agenda-setting process and discusses the suggested responses to that feedback. This paper will form the basis of the *Consultation Summary and Feedback Statement*.

- (b) 13 B *Developing the IASB's Technical Programme*

This paper sets out the staff recommendations for how the IASB should develop its technical work programme, including important changes to the way the IASB develops projects and consults with others. The paper also includes recommendations on which potential projects should be given priority in the short term. The intention is to use this

paper as the basis for a strategy document to accompany the feedback statement.

Questions for the Board

3. For each paper, we are seeking feedback from the Board about whether:
 - (a) the analysis in the paper is complete?
 - (b) Board members agree with the analysis?
 - (c) Board members have any further comments for inclusion in the published documents?