

---

**IASB<sup>®</sup> meeting**

Date **October 2026**  
Project **Reassessment of Control (IFRS 10)**  
Topic **Finalisation of agenda decision**  
Contacts Stefano Tampubolon ([stampubolon@ifrs.org](mailto:stampubolon@ifrs.org))

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 September 2026 meeting, the IFRS Interpretations Committee (Committee) decided that a standard-setting project is not needed to address a submission about whether, in accordance with paragraph 8 of IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements*, an entity reassesses whether it retains control of an investee when the investee's governing document is amended.
2. The purpose of this meeting is to ask the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) whether it objects to the agenda decision, as required by paragraph 8.7 of the IFRS Foundation [Due Process Handbook](#).

**Background**

3. At its March 2026 meeting, the IFRS Interpretations Committee (Committee) published a tentative agenda decision in response to a submission about whether, in accordance with paragraph 8 of IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements*, an entity reassesses whether it retains control of an investee when the investee's governing document is amended.

- 
4. The submission described a fact pattern in which an entity was involved in setting the purpose and design of an investee when the investee was established. At that time, the entity concluded—applying IFRS 10—that it controlled the investee. At a later date, the governing document of the investee was amended in a way that could result in a change in the investee’s relevant activities, as well as in the rights of the entity and other parties relating to those relevant activities.
  5. The submission asked whether—applying paragraph 8 of IFRS 10—the amendments to the investee’s governing document require the entity to reassess whether it retains control of the investee.
  6. Evidence gathered by the Committee at the time it published the tentative agenda decision indicated that while not common across all jurisdictions, fact patterns similar to the one described in the submission occur and are common in some jurisdictions. However, that evidence showed no diversity in determining whether, in the fact pattern described in the submission, the entity reassesses whether it retains control of the investee. All but one of the respondents to the Committee’s information request on this matter said they observed no differences in determining whether to reassess control in the fact pattern described in the submission. These respondents said that in that fact pattern described in the submission, an entity reassesses whether it retains control of the investee.
  7. The Committee therefore concluded that the matter described in the submission does not have widespread effect—that is, the criterion in 5.16(a) of the *Due Process Handbook* was not met.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, the Committee tentatively decided a standard-setting project is not needed and, instead, published the tentative agenda decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> When the tentative agenda decision was published in March 2026, the ‘widespread effect’ criterion was in paragraph 5.16(a) of the *Due Process Handbook* (published in 2020). The *Due Process Handbook* was updated in April 2026, and the ‘widespread effect’ criterion, with some wording changes, now appears in paragraph 5.19(a) of the revised *Due Process Handbook*.

---

## Feedback on the tentative agenda decision

8. The Committee received 15 comment letters on its tentative agenda decision by the comment letter deadline. All comment letters received, including any late comment letters, are available on our website.<sup>2</sup> [Agenda Paper 3](#) for the Committee's September 2026 meeting (September agenda paper) summarised the comments and set out our analysis of those comments.
9. All 15 respondents agreed—or did not disagree—with the Committee's conclusion that the matter does not have widespread effect. In addition, many respondents said the applicable requirements in IFRS 10 support prevailing practice described in the tentative agenda decision—that is, in the fact pattern described in the submission, the entity reassesses whether it retains control of the investee.
10. Notwithstanding their agreement with the Committee's conclusion:
  - (a) the South African Institute for Chartered Accountants (SAICA) asked the Committee to reconsider the context of the submission and to add the matter to its agenda for further deliberation.
  - (b) a few respondents provided other comments—for example, wording suggestions for the tentative agenda decision.
11. For reasons explained in the September agenda paper, we:
  - (a) continued to agree with the Committee's findings and conclusion in the tentative agenda decision that the matter described in the submission does not have widespread effect;
  - (b) disagreed with SAICA's suggestion to reconsider the context of the submission or undertake further deliberation on this matter; and
  - (c) recommended no action in respect of other comments.

---

<sup>2</sup> At the date of posting this agenda paper, there were no late comment letters.

---

## The Committee's discussion and feedback

12. The Committee considered the feedback at its September 2026 meeting. The Committee:
- (a) agreed with our analysis of feedback on the tentative agenda decision;
  - (b) confirmed its conclusion that the matter described in the submission does not have widespread effect and its decision that a standard-setting project is not needed to address the submission; and
  - (c) made minor changes to the wording of its conclusion in the agenda decision to align with the wording in the updated version of the *Due Process Handbook* (published in April 2026).
13. All 14 Committee members voted to finalise the agenda decision. The [appendix](#) to this paper includes the wording of the agenda decision approved by the Committee.

### Questions for the IASB

Do IASB members object to the Committee's:

- a. decision that a standard-setting project is not needed?
- b. conclusion that the agenda decision does not add or change requirements in IFRS Accounting Standards?

---

## Appendix—The agenda decision

A1. The agenda decision below was approved the Committee at its September 2026 meeting.

### **Reassessment of Control (IFRS 10 *Consolidated Financial Statements*)**

The Committee received a request asking whether, in accordance with paragraph 8 of IFRS 10, an entity reassesses whether it retains control of an investee when the investee's governing document is amended. The entity's conclusion as to whether it controls the investee may or may not change as a result of such a reassessment.

#### **Fact pattern**

An entity was involved in setting the purpose and design of an investee when the investee was established. At that time, the entity concluded—applying IFRS 10—that it controlled the investee. At a later date, the governing document of the investee was amended in a way that could result in a change in the investee's relevant activities, as well as in the rights of the entity and other parties relating to those relevant activities.

#### **Question**

The request asks whether—applying paragraph 8 of IFRS 10—the amendments to the investee's governing document require the entity to reassess whether it retains control of the investee.

#### **Findings**

Evidence gathered by the Committee indicated no diversity in determining whether, in the fact pattern described in the request, the entity reassesses whether it retains control of the investee. Feedback suggests that, in that fact pattern, the entity reassesses whether it retains control of the investee.

#### **Conclusion**

Based on its findings, the Committee concluded that the matter described in the request does not have widespread effect. Consequently, the Committee decided that a standard-setting project is not needed to address the request.