

---

## IASB<sup>®</sup> meeting

Date	<b>May 2026</b>
Project	<b>Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Tax Expense or Tax Income Applying IAS 12 <i>Income Taxes</i> (IFRS 18)</b>
Topic	<b>Background, possible ways forward and questions for the IASB</b>
Contacts	Stefano Tampubolon ( <a href="mailto:stampubolon@ifrs.org">stampubolon@ifrs.org</a> )

This paper has been prepared for discussion at a public meeting of the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB). This paper does not represent the views of the IASB or any individual IASB member. Any comments in the paper do not purport to set out what would be an acceptable or unacceptable application of IFRS<sup>®</sup> Accounting Standards. The IASB's technical decisions are made in public and are reported in the IASB<sup>®</sup> *Update*.

---

## Introduction

1. At its March 2026 meeting, the IFRS Interpretations Committee (Committee) decided:
  - (a) to finalise the Agenda Decision *Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Tax Expense or Tax Income Applying IAS 12 Income Taxes (IFRS 18 Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements)*.
  - (b) to finalise updates to two related agenda decisions:
    - (i) [\*Presentation of non-income tax payments\*](#) (IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements* and IAS 12); and
    - (ii) [\*Classification of tonnage taxes\*](#) (IAS 12).
2. Some respondents to the Tentative Agenda Decision *Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Income Taxes within the Scope of IAS 12 Income Taxes (IFRS 18)* raised concerns about the outcome of applying IFRS 18 requirements—as reinforced by the agenda decision—to zakat in the Saudi Arabian context. The Committee:
  - (a) discussed those concerns and possible courses of action the IASB could take to respond to those concerns;

- 
- (b) suggested we perform targeted outreach to users of financial statements to better understand those concerns; and
  - (c) decided to report those concerns to the IASB.
3. The purpose of this meeting is to ask the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) members:
- (a) whether—as required by paragraph 8.7 of the IFRS Foundation [Due Process Handbook](#)—they object to the agenda decision and the proposed updates to the two related agenda decisions;
  - (b) whether and how to respond to concerns about the outcome of applying the IFRS 18 requirements—as reinforced by the agenda decision—to particular non-income tax charges.

## Structure

4. This paper sets out:
- (a) background (paragraphs 7–22);
  - (b) assessment of possible ways forward (paragraphs 23–32);
  - (c) assessment of potential project against the IASB’s prioritisation framework (paragraph 33);
  - (d) conclusion (paragraphs 34–36); and
  - (e) next steps (paragraphs 37–38)
  - (f) questions for the IASB.
5. The discussion and analysis in this paper are supported by:
- (a) Agenda Paper 12B—*Finalisation of agenda decision and updates to related agenda decisions*;
  - (b) Agenda Paper 12C—*Concerns and findings from additional outreach*; and

- 
- (c) Agenda Paper 12D—*Possible ways forward*.
6. This paper includes our questions for the IASB. Agenda Papers 12B–12D do not include any questions. IASB members can raise any questions or comments on Agenda Papers 12B–12D when discussing questions in this paper.

## Background

### ***The Committee's discussions in November 2025***

7. The IASB's horizon-scanning activities had revealed a consistent application matter concerning the presentation in the statement of profit or loss of taxes or other charges that are not tax expense or tax income applying IAS 12 *Income Taxes*<sup>1</sup>. In the light of the imminent effective date of IFRS 18 the IASB decided to ask the Committee to consider the matter.
8. The Committee discussed the matter at its [November 2025 meeting](#). The Committee concluded that, applying IFRS 18, an entity is not permitted to present non-income tax charges:
- (a) in the 'income tax expense or income' line item of the statement of profit or loss required by paragraph 75(a)(iv) of IFRS 18; and
  - (b) in the income taxes category of the statement of profit or loss.
9. Based on its analysis, the Committee concluded that the principles and requirements in IFRS Accounting Standards provide an adequate basis for an entity applying IFRS 18 to determine how it presents in the statement of profit or loss non-income tax charges. Consequently, the Committee tentatively decided not to add a standard-setting project to the work plan and, instead, published a tentative agenda decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> For ease of reference, throughout the rest of this paper and in Agenda Papers 12B–12D, we refer to (a) taxes or other charges that are not tax expense or tax income applying IAS 12 as 'non-income tax charges'; and (b) taxes or other charges that are tax expense or tax income applying IAS 12 as 'income taxes'.

- 
10. In addition, the Committee has previously considered matters related to specific non-income tax charges and has published the following two agenda decisions (related agenda decisions):
    - (a) *Presentation of payments on non-income taxes* (IAS 1 and IAS 12); and
    - (b) *Classification of tonnage taxes* (IAS 12).<sup>2</sup>
  11. Following a request from the IASB to consider updating some agenda decisions which referred to IAS 1 (which IFRS 18 replaces), the Committee also proposed some updates to the related agenda decisions.
  12. Agenda Paper 12B includes further information about the Committee's discussions in November 2025.

### ***Feedback and the Committee's consideration of feedback***

13. The Committee received 49 comment letters on the tentative agenda decision and ten comment letters on the proposed updates to the related agenda decisions. Agenda Papers [9A](#) and [9B](#) for the Committee's March 2026 meeting (March agenda papers) summarise feedback on the tentative agenda decision and the proposed updates to the related agenda decisions and set out our analysis of that feedback. While respondents raised concerns about the outcome of applying the requirements in particular situations (which paragraphs 16–17 below discuss), they did not generally raise significant concerns about the Committee's technical analysis and conclusions.
14. For reasons set out in the March agenda papers, the Committee—at its March 2026 meeting—decided to finalise the agenda decision and the updates to the related agenda decisions with some wording changes.
15. Agenda Paper 12B explains in more detail the Committee's consideration of feedback and its decision to finalise the agenda decision and the proposed updates to the related

---

<sup>2</sup> For ease of reference, we refer to these two agenda decisions as the 'related agenda decisions' throughout the rest of this paper and in Agenda Papers 12B–12D.

---

agenda decisions. The appendices to Agenda Paper 12B include the wording of the agenda decision approved by the Committee and the wording of the two related agenda decisions with the updates as approved by the Committee.

*Concerns raised and the Committee's consideration of those concerns*

16. Many respondents to the tentative agenda decision—including almost all of the 34 respondents who were from Saudi Arabia<sup>3</sup>—discussed the outcome of applying IFRS 18 requirements—as reinforced by the tentative agenda decision if finalised—to zakat in Saudi Arabia (SA zakat).
17. Agenda Paper 12C explains the concerns raised and the Committee's considerations of those concerns. In summary:
- (a) we understand from feedback that SA zakat is a non-income tax charge which an entity would—applying IFRS 18 and as reinforced by the tentative agenda decision if finalised—generally classify in the operating category.
  - (b) respondents said classifying SA zakat in the operating category would (i) fail to reflect the economic substance of SA zakat, which in their view, is similar to that of income taxes; (ii) reduce comparability between entities that pay different proportions and amounts of income tax and zakat only because of different ownership structures and over time for the same entity when its ownership structure changes<sup>4</sup>; and (iii) provide less useful information.
18. Notwithstanding the Committee's decision to finalise the agenda decision, all Committee members acknowledged the concerns and decided to report these concerns to the IASB.

---

<sup>3</sup> As paragraph 15 of Agenda Paper 12B notes, these respondents primarily comprised the national standard-setter—the Saudi Organization of Certified and Public Accountants (SOCPA); the central bank—the Saudi Central Bank; preparers; individuals and accounting firms.

<sup>4</sup> As paragraph 4 of Agenda Paper 12C explains, whether and in what proportion an entity pays income tax or SA zakat depends on its ownership structure.

---

*Possible ways forward to address the concerns*

19. As Agenda Paper 12C explains in more detail, Committee members discussed possible ways the IASB could consider in response to the concerns. In summary:
- (a) a few said if the IASB does not amend IFRS 18 (Alternative I), an entity that is required to classify a non-income tax charge like SA zakat outside of the income taxes category of the statement of profit or loss may nonetheless be required, or able to, provide additional useful information by:
    - (i) presenting ‘additional line items and subtotals if such presentations are necessary for a primary financial statement to provide a useful structured summary’ as required applying paragraph 24 of IFRS 18; and
    - (ii) disclosing management-defined performance measures (MPMs) in accordance with IFRS 18.
  - (b) many suggested a narrow-scope amendment to IFRS 18 that would require or allow an entity to classify particular non-income tax charges that are similar to income taxes in the income taxes category (Alternative II). A few said this could be done by allowing or requiring an entity to classify, in the income taxes category, non-income tax charges:
    - (i) that are paid in lieu of income taxes (Alternative II.1); or
    - (ii) that meet the definition of ‘covered taxes’ under the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Pillar Two model rules (Alternative II.2).<sup>5</sup>
  - (c) Committee members said feedback on the tentative agenda decision came primarily from preparers of financial statements, accounting firms and accounting standard-setters. They said it would be important to obtain

---

<sup>5</sup> Paragraph 2 of Chapter 4 from the OECD’s Consolidated Commentary to the Global Anti-Base Erosion Model Rules (2025) (Commentary) states ‘the term [covered taxes] is broadly defined to include Taxes imposed on a Constituent Entity’s income or profits as well as Taxes that are functionally equivalent to such income taxes and Taxes on retained earnings and corporate equity.’

feedback from users of financial statements to help the IASB determine whether and how to amend IFRS 18 to respond to the concerns and suggested we (staff) perform targeted outreach with users to better understand if they share the concerns.

20. Following the Committee's suggestion to obtain user feedback, we performed targeted outreach with some users. In particular, we met:
  - (a) collectively with a group of users in Saudi Arabia;
  - (b) collectively with a group of users in Malaysia; and
  - (c) individually with five users from other jurisdictions.
21. In those meetings, we explained the concerns and asked users whether:
  - (a) in their view, more useful would be provided by presenting particular non-income tax charges (such as SA zakat) in the income taxes category of the statement or loss; and
  - (b) they had identified other non-income tax charges for which, in their view, presentation in the income taxes category of the statement of profit or loss would provide more useful information.
22. Agenda Paper 12C summarises our findings from these meetings.

## **Our assessment of the possible ways forward**

23. Agenda Paper 12D analyses the possible ways forward set out in paragraphs 19(a)–19(b) above. Paragraphs 24–32 below summarise our views on those possible ways forward.

### ***Alternative I—Do not amend IFRS Accounting Standards***

24. The IASB could, as paragraph 19(a) of this paper notes, not amend IFRS Accounting Standards (Alternative I). If the IASB chooses this alternative, we recommend the

IASB consider not objecting to the agenda decision and the updates to the two related agenda decisions.

25. This alternative would avoid disrupting entities' ongoing implementation of IFRS 18, particularly given IFRS 18's imminent effective date of 1 January 2027. While feedback from users (see Agenda Paper 12B) suggests that classifying non-income tax charges that are similar to income taxes (like SA zakat) outside of the income taxes category might not provide the most useful information, entities could still provide users with information about those charges through the use of additional line items, disaggregation and MPMs.
26. However:
- (a) this alternative would leave concerns about the classification of particular non-income tax charges like SA zakat unresolved.
  - (b) there could be costs for preparers in providing the information discussed in paragraph 25 of this paper and for users that currently consider some non-income tax charges together with income taxes to make appropriate adjustments.
  - (c) stakeholders—including users we spoke with—expressed a preference for amending IFRS 18 to address this matter, while suggesting that the use of additional line items, disaggregation and MPMs would help but not sufficiently address their concerns.
27. If the IASB decides not to amend IFRS 18 to address this matter, it could monitor the implementation of IFRS 18, particularly in relation to the classification of non-income tax charges. If issues arise in this regard, the IASB could consider them more holistically through, for example, post-implementation review of IFRS 18.

### ***Alternative II—Amend IFRS 18***

28. If the IASB decides to explore amending IFRS 18 to require or allow an entity to classify particular non-income tax charges in the income taxes category of the

---

statement of profit or loss, based on our analysis in Agenda Paper 12D, we think the IASB should explore Alternative II.2—that is, require or allow an entity to classify non-income tax charges that meet the definition of covered taxes applying Pillar Two model rules in the income taxes category.

29. Such an amendment would:

- (a) *address the concerns while avoiding the need for the IASB to develop its own definition.* This alternative would use a definition that is established, widely used and intended to capture the type of non-income tax charges that users said would be useful to classify together with income taxes. We do not have a complete list of taxes that meet the definition of ‘covered taxes’. There is therefore a risk that the amendment could result in an entity classifying a non-income tax charge in the income taxes category when the IASB might otherwise consider it inappropriate to do so. However:
  - (i) based on our understanding of what the definition is intended to capture—that is, income taxes and other taxes *functionally equivalent* to income taxes—and feedback from users supporting the classification of such taxes in the income taxes category, we think such an amendment could address the concerns while appropriately excluding classification of other non-income tax charges in the income taxes category.
  - (ii) we also understand that many entities and jurisdictions have implemented, or are in the process of implementing, the Pillar Two model rules and have determined which non-income tax charges are covered taxes.
- (b) *expedite any required standard-setting work.* By avoiding the need to develop its own definition, the IASB could expedite the required standard-setting work, thereby minimising any disruption to entities’ ongoing implementation of IFRS 18.

- 
30. However:
- (a) requiring an entity to classify only income taxes in the income taxes category results in an entity classifying amounts in that category which are in some way related to the entity's profit.<sup>6</sup> The amendment would result in an entity classifying in the income taxes category particular non-income taxes, which, while being functionally equivalent to income taxes, may not have such a link with profit.
  - (b) the amendment could result in further requests for changes to the classification requirements in IFRS 18.
31. We accept the amendment would not resolve all concerns—for example, investors in Malaysia said Malaysian zakat (discussed in paragraphs 25–28 of Agenda Paper 12C) should be classified in the income taxes category. However, our understanding is that Malaysian zakat does not meet the definition of 'covered taxes' and consequently, applying the amendment, an entity would not be able to classify it in the income taxes category. The amendment would not allow an entity to classify, in the income taxes category, non-income tax charges that do not meet the definition of 'covered taxes'. We think this would be an appropriate outcome of the amendment.
32. If the IASB decides to explore amending IFRS 18 applying Alternative II.2, then:
- (a) to avoid disrupting entities' implementation of IFRS 18, we think the IASB should also defer its decision on whether to object to the agenda decision or the proposed updates to the related agenda decisions—we will revisit these at an appropriate time in the future.
  - (b) we will, at a future meeting, present our analysis of the detailed technical aspects of the potential amendments (see paragraph 30 of Agenda Paper 12D which lists those technical aspects).

---

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 2 of IAS 12 states '...income taxes include all domestic and foreign taxes which are based on taxable profits...'

## Assessment of potential project against the IASB’s prioritisation framework

33. To help the IASB decide whether to add a standard-setting project to explore amending IFRS 18 applying Alternative II.2 to the work plan, we assessed such a project against the IASB’s [prioritisation framework](#).<sup>7</sup> Tables 1 and 2 below set out our assessment.

**Table 1—Technical considerations**

No.	Technical consideration	Staff analysis
(a)	<p><b>Pervasiveness</b>—that is, how many entities are affected or expected to be affected by the matter. Projects related to requirements that are not broadly applied (or projects related to voluntary guidance) may thus rank lower in priority. In assessing pervasiveness, the IASB also considers the jurisdictions, entities and industries affected.</p>	<p>Feedback to the tentative agenda decision and our discussions with users confirms the prevalence of the issue. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- we note SA zakat affects a number of entities and users who analyse or invest in those entities. In addition to Saudi Arabia, we understand zakat exists in many countries. However, the nature and method of determining zakat is not standardised globally and in at least some situations, zakat would not meet the definition of covered taxes and would—appropriately in that situation—not be captured by the amendment set out in paragraph 28 of this paper.</li> <li>- we do not have a comprehensive list of other non-income tax charges that are functionally equivalent to income taxes and are unable to assess the prevalence of such non-income tax charges. However, users</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> Paragraph 1 of the IASB’s [prioritisation framework](#) states: ‘[t]he objective of the IASB prioritisation framework is to facilitate prioritisation of individual technical projects between the holistic prioritisations conducted through the IASB’s five-yearly agenda consultations. The framework seeks to maximise the IASB’s contribution to the transparency, accountability and efficiency of capital markets around the world, given internal and external capacity constraints.’

		<p>generally said if a tax is similar to an income tax (for example, a tonnage tax that an entity elects to pay instead of an income tax), it would be useful to classify it in the income taxes category (with sufficient disaggregation and additional information to assist in their analysis).</p>
(b)	<p><b>Effects</b>—that is, whether the expected financial reporting benefits will exceed the costs of the requirements. The IASB considers effects primarily by assessing the needs of users of general purpose financial reports, while also taking into account the costs and benefits for other parties, including preparers of financial statements. In this regard, the IASB considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the expected benefits from any change in requirements, such as more decision-useful (including comparable) information or reduced costs; and</li> <li>ii. the expected initial and ongoing costs (financial and otherwise) resulting from any change in requirements.</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraphs 28–32 of this paper discuss the benefits and costs of Alternative II.2.</p> <p>While we think the benefits of amending IFRS 18 applying Alternative II.2 could outweigh the costs, we are unable to conclude on whether the balance of expected benefits and costs of this alternative would be better than the balance of expected benefits and costs of not amending IFRS 18 (which paragraphs 24–27 of this paper discuss).</p>
(c)	<p><b>feasibility of standard-setting, given the standard-setting investment</b>—that is, the resources and effort required to complete the project. These</p>	<p>Based on our analysis in Agenda Paper 12D (and as summarised in paragraphs 28–32 of this paper), we think it would be feasible to amend IFRS 18 applying Alternative II.2—that is, requiring or allowing an entity to classify non-</p>

	<p>considerations include the feasibility of identifying the scope and developing solutions. Feasibility might change after a project has been added and research has been conducted, triggering re-assessment of prioritisation.</p> <p>Some matters might be highly feasible in terms of standard-setting with a low level of standard-setting investment required—and may, therefore, rank higher in priority. In contrast, matters involving high degrees of judgement or non-compliance might not have a standard-setting solution—no matter how much standard-setting investment is made—and may, therefore, rank lower in priority.</p> <p>As a project progresses through its life cycle, the IASB might also consider the amount of remaining standard-setting investment required to complete the project and the likelihood of a supermajority vote in favour of an exposure draft, a final amendment or a Standard.</p>	<p>income tax charges that meet the definition of covered taxes.</p> <p>We think such an amendment would be sufficiently narrow in scope, thereby allowing the standard-setting project to be completed in a timely manner.</p> <p>While we still need to consider some of the detailed technical aspects of Alternative II.2, we think considering those aspects will not require significant effort. In our view, it would be feasible to complete our analysis of those matters and publish an exposure draft by early Q3 of 2026. This would allow the IASB to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) complete its consultation by Q4 2026; and</li> <li>(b) subject to feedback and the extent of analysis and redeliberation needed, possibly be in a position to issue final amendments in Q1 2027 (in time for when entities might publish their first interim reports applying IFRS 18).</li> </ul> <p>The IASB could also consider shortening the comment period by seeking approval from the Due Process Oversight Committee for an expedited consultation if it thinks it would be necessary to do so. We will present our assessment of whether to do so at a future meeting.</p>
(d)	<p><b>Strategic priority</b>—which could include considerations such as maintaining the principles-based nature of IFRS Accounting Standards, facilitating connectivity</p>	<p>Agenda Paper 12B summarises concerns about the outcome of applying IFRS 18 requirements to particular non-income tax charges. Based on our analysis in Agenda Paper 12D, we think Alternative II.2 could resolve those concerns.</p>

<p>with the ISSB, maintaining convergence where previously achieved with US GAAP, facilitating digital reporting or improving understandability to improve application of IFRS Accounting Standards.</p>	
--	--

**Table 2—Operational considerations**

No.	Operational consideration	Staff analysis
(a)	<p><b>Time-sensitivity</b>—that is, the urgency of the need for an improvement to an IFRS Accounting Standard. Urgent projects are started immediately, effectively bypassing the pipeline. The time-sensitivity of a matter may be related to technical considerations such as pervasiveness and effect.</p>	<p>Entities are currently in the process of implementing IFRS 18, which will become effective on 1 January 2027.</p> <p>Therefore, any project to amend IFRS 18 would need to be completed within a short time frame. Row (c) of Table 1 above includes our preliminary assessment of a possible timeline for completion of this project.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Project synergies</b>—that is, whether the matter in question has synergies with other projects, including relevant research by other standard-setters and organisations that could expedite the IASB’s work.</p>	<p>IAS 12 already references the Pillar Two Model Rules and many stakeholders applying IFRS Accounting Standards will be familiar with those rules. Alternative II.2 would utilise a definition developed by the OECD that is already established and widely used in the application of the Pillar Two Model Rules. While there are drawbacks in using a definition developed by another body, by using this definition, the IASB would not need to develop its own definition and related application guidance, thereby expediting any required standard-setting work.</p>
(c)	<p><b>Capacity</b>—that is, whether internal and stakeholder capacity</p>	<p>As part of its <a href="#">Third Agenda Consultation</a>, the IASB decided to leave unchanged the level of</p>

	<p>is available to meet project needs. Capacity also considers the strategic balance established during the agenda consultation for research and standard-setting versus maintenance and consistent application. If capacity is not available, the IASB will need to make relative prioritisation decisions—for example, to source capacity from active projects or delay the start of pipeline projects.</p>	<p>its resource allocation to maintenance and consistent application of IFRS Accounting Standards at 15–20%.</p> <p>A project to amend IFRS 18 would be part of the IASB's maintenance and consistent application activities. Considering other activities in this space, we think there are resources to complete this project on a timely basis. We note the issue is well-defined, and Alternative II.2 would be sufficiently narrow in scope to allow the standard-setting project to progress efficiently.</p> <p>If significant challenges arise during the course of the project that were not anticipated, the IASB could reconsider the project's prioritisation at that stage.</p>
(d)	<p><b>Effort</b>—that is, if a project is paused, the effort involved in restarting it.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

## Conclusion

34. Our assessment of the technical and operational considerations in the prioritisation framework suggests the IASB could add a project to the work plan to explore amending IFRS 18 applying Alternative II.2.
35. While we think the benefits of amending IFRS 18 applying Alternative II.2 could outweigh the costs (see paragraphs 28–32 of this paper), we are unable to conclude on whether the balance of expected benefits and costs of this alternative would be better than the balance of expected benefits and costs of not amending IFRS 18 (which paragraphs 24–27 discuss).

- 
36. Consequently, we do not have a view or recommendation on whether the IASB should:
- (a) make no amendment to IFRS Accounting Standards and instead, not object to the agenda decision and the updates to the two related agenda decisions; or
  - (b) add a standard-setting project to the workplan to explore amending IFRS 18 applying Alternative II. To avoid disrupting entities' implementation of IFRS 18, the IASB should also—in this situation—defer its decision on whether to object to the agenda decision or the proposed updates to the related agenda decisions to a future meeting.

### Next steps

37. If the IASB decides not to amend IFRS 18, at this meeting we will ask the IASB whether it objects to the finalised agenda decision and the updates to the two related agenda decisions. If the IASB does not object, we will publish the agenda decision and the updated agenda decision in an addendum to *IFRIC Update* March 2026.
38. If the IASB decides to add a standard-setting project to explore amending IFRS 18 applying Alternative II.2, we will:
- (a) *at a future IASB meeting*—present our analysis of the detailed technical aspects of the potential amendments (see paragraph 30 of Agenda Paper 12D which lists those technical aspects).
  - (b) *at an appropriate time during the standard-setting project*—ask the IASB whether it objects to the finalised agenda decision and the updates to two related agenda decisions.

## Questions for the IASB

1. Does the IASB agree to add a standard-setting project to the workplan to explore amending IFRS 18 to require or allow an entity to classify non-income tax charges that meet the definition of 'covered taxes' in the Pillar Two model rules in the income taxes category?
2. If 'yes' to question 1, does the IASB agree to defer a decision on whether to object to the Agenda Decision *Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Tax Expense or Tax Income Applying IAS 12 Income Taxes* (IFRS 18) and the updates to Agenda Decision *Presentation of non-income tax payments* (IAS 1 and IAS 12) and Agenda Decision *Classification of tonnage taxes* (IAS 12) to a future meeting?
3. If 'no' to question 1—that is, if the IASB decides not to amend IFRS 18:
  - a. regarding Agenda Decision *Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Tax Expense or Tax Income Applying IAS 12 Income Taxes* (IFRS 18), do you object to the Committee's:
    - i. decision not to add a standard-setting project to the work plan?
    - ii. conclusion that the agenda decision does not add or change requirements in IFRS Accounting Standards?
  - b. do you object to the updates to agenda decisions *Presentation of non-income tax payments* (IAS 1 and IAS 12) and *Classification of tonnage taxes* (IAS 12)?