

**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF ACCOUNTANTS  
INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING STANDARDS BOARD  
MINUTES OF THE MARCH MEETING  
Held on March 20 – 23, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE**

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>APOLOGY/NIA*</b>
United Kingdom	Mike Hathorn (M)	X	
	Ian Carruthers (TA)	X	
Argentina	Carmen Palladino (M)		X
	Pablo Maroni (TA)		X
Australia	Peter Batten (M)	X	
	Jim Paul (TA)	X	
Canada	Rick Neville (M)	X	
	Ron Salole (TA)	X	
China	Hong Lou (M)	X	
	Lu Yangchun (TA)	X	
France	Marie-Pierre Cordier (M)	X	
	Jean-Luc Dumont (TA)	X	
India	Pankaj Jain (M)		X
	Avinash Chander (TA)		X
Israel	Ron Alroy (M)		X
	Haya Prescher (TA)	X	
Japan	Tadashi Sekikawa (M)	X	
	Kenji Izawa (TA)	X	
Mexico	Alejandro Luna		X
	Rodríguez (M)		
Netherlands	Frans Van Schaik(M)	X	
	Thomas Van Tiel (TA)	X	
New Zealand	Greg Schollum (M)	X	
	Annette Davis (TA)	X	
Norway	Tom Olsen (M)		X
	Harald Brandsås (TA)	X	
South Africa	Erna Swart (M)	X	
	Freeman Nomvalo (TA)		X
United States	David Bean (M)	X	
Public Members	Andreas Bergmann (M)	X	
	Reto Fausch (TA)	X	
	John Peace (M)	X	
	Stefano Pozzoli (M)	X	
	Marcello Bessone (TA)	X	
ADB	TBA (O)		X
EU	Miguel Gracia (O)		X
Eurostat	John Verrinder (O)	X	
IASB	Warren McGregor (O)		X

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>APOLOGY/NIA*</b>
INTOSAI	Robert Dacey (O)	X	
IMF	Stephen Mayes (O)	X	
OECD	Jon Blondal (O)		X
UN	Jay Karia (O)		X
UNDP	Gwenda Jensen (O)		X
World Bank	Simon Bradbury (O)	X (Tuesday – Thursday)	X (Friday)
IFAC	Stephenie Fox (S)	X	
	Paul Sutcliffe (S)		X
	John Stanford (S)	X	
	Matthew Bohun (S)	X	
	Barry Naik (S)	X	
	Juan Zhang (S)	X	

\* NIA- Not in Attendance

(M) Member

(TA) Technical Advisor

(O) Observer

(S) IFAC Staff

## **1. WELCOME AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**

The Chair welcomed members, technical advisors, observers and staff, including the following to their first IPSASB meeting:

- Peter Batten, Member - Australia
- Hong Lou, Member - China (previously attended IPSASB meetings as a Consultative Group member);
- Marie-Pierre Cordier, Member - France;
- David Bean, Member - United States of America (previously attended IPSASB meetings as Technical Advisor to the previous US member);
- Lu Yangchun, Technical Advisor - China (attending this meeting only);
- Kenji Izawa, Technical Advisor - Japan;
- Annette Davis, Technical Advisor - New Zealand;
- John Verrinder, Observer - Eurostat (attending this meeting only); and
- Juan Zhang, Technical Manager IPSASB, on a one year secondment from the Ministry of Finance, China.

The Chair noted apologies from:

- Carmen Palladino, Member - Argentina;
- Ron Alroy, Member - Israel
- Tom Olsen, Member - Norway;
- Hongxia Li, Technical Advisor - China;
- Miguel Gracia, Observer - European Commission;
- Eduardo Barredo-Capelot, Observer - Eurostat;
- Jon Blondal, Observer - OECD;
- Jay Karia, Observer - UN;
- Darshak Shah, Observer - UNDP;
- Gwenda Jensen, Substitute Observer - UNDP;
- Warren McGregor, Observer - IASB; and
- Paul Sutcliffe, Senior Advisor, IPSASB.

The Chair noted this was the first time the IPSASB had met in West Africa and thanked the following for hosting the meeting:

- Professor Ato Ghartey, the Institute of Chartered Accountants Ghana;
- the Forum of Accountants-General and Auditors-General of West Africa (FAAGWA), and
- the Association of Accountancy Bodies of West Africa (AABWA).

The Board noted planned future IPSASB meetings - details:

- July 3 – 6, 2007 Montreal, Canada
- November 27 – 30, 2007 Beijing, China
- March 2008 Wellington, New Zealand
- July 2008 New York, USA
- November 2008 Zurich, Switzerland

## **2. MINUTES AND DECISION SUMMARY**

The November 7- 9, 2006 (Norwalk) minutes and decision summary were approved. The Board were reminded that the observer review minutes were approved on-line.

## **3. STRATEGY AND OPERATIONAL PLAN**

The IPSASB reviewed the draft strategy and operational plan and undertook a full day strategy session to come to some conclusions on the draft plan. The discussion was based on the staff prepared draft plan and was split into sessions dedicated to IFRS convergence, project priorities, communications and board processes and efficiency.

With respect to IFRS convergence, the IPSASB considered the advantages and disadvantages of three options as follows:

- Hierarchy;
- Copy IFRS; and
- Review and adapt.

The IPSASB noted that any approach to IFRS convergence would likely incorporate all of these options to varying degrees at various points in time. For example, relying on the hierarchy would be required in situations where the IPSASB has not yet addressed a particular standard. So, as a transitional measure, the IPSASB may need to rely on a number of approaches to standard setting. Overall however, the IPSASB supported the review and adapt approach whereby standards are developed based on the relevant IAS/IFRS but where public sector specific issues are addressed within the standard. This is considered the optimum approach conceptually and results in a consistent product that represents the needs of public sector constituents at this time. A longer time line for project completion is a natural outcome of this approach and must be acknowledged and accepted.

While supporting a review and adapt approach, the IPSASB noted the need to have clear parameters or criteria to apply to the IFRS in order to determine whether there are public sector specific issues that warrant modifications to the standard. The IPSASB asked staff to undertake a project to develop these criteria for consideration at the July meeting.

The IPSASB discussed project priorities for the period 2007 -2009 for the purposes of developing a work plan that would balance priorities and resources. The projects identified for initiation were:

**2007**

- Criteria for assessing IFRS for public sector specific differences (“Rules of the Road”);
- Updating IPSASs;
- Financial Instruments – amendments to IPSAS 15;
- Heritage assets;
- Review of the Cash Basis IPSAS; and
- Long-term fiscal sustainability.

**2008**

- Entity combinations;
- Fair value;
- MD&A; and
- Performance reporting.

**2009**

- Intangible assets; and
- Financial instruments – recognition and measurement.

In discussing communications the IPSASB highlighted the importance of enhancing communications with others including partnering with international organizations including member bodies and institutes, other IFAC boards and committees (such as the DNC), the World Bank and development banks. They also thought the outcome of communications activities should be to encourage adoption of IPSASs, obtain feedback on existing documents and becoming a benchmark for governmental financial reporting.

The IPSASB did not think that staff should be developing extensive training materials due to resources constraints but rather thought that communications resources should be devoted to activities that would leverage work being done elsewhere.

Finally the IPSASB discussed its own processes and efficiency, noting that the enhanced staff resources creates significant pressures on the IPSASB to use meeting time efficiently as well as using the time between meetings to enhance effectiveness. While no decision was made to extend the number of meetings at this time the IPSASB agreed that meeting time could be used better and that the focus of discussion should be on debating principles and not editing documents. Given the challenges for non-native English speakers the importance of advance distribution of materials was noted.

The IPSASB agreed that the time between meetings should be used to review documents and asked staff to schedule this consultation so that it can be better planned. The need to rationalize certain documents such as country reports to ease the pressure on members and technical advisors in the time leading up to the meetings was also highlighted and staff agreed to develop a process whereby country reports are prepared less frequently and possibly not directly tied to IPSASB meetings. The information could be made

available to all on the intranet. The IPSASB also agreed that they should experiment with the use of task forces though they cautioned on the need to ensure the relationship with the IPSASB is clear.

The IPSASB directed staff to finalize the plan noting that it is evolutionary, and will require flexibility in implementing and will require annual review.

#### **4. SOCIAL BENEFITS**

The IPSASB affirmed the tentative decision at Norwalk in November 2006 to develop an ED dealing only with disclosure rather than recognition and measurement. The ED will:

- provide minimum requirements for the disclosure of amounts to be transferred to those meeting threshold eligibility criteria for cash transfer programs at the reporting date. The minimum amounts disclosed will be actuarially based assessments of the present value of the cash flows to provide benefits to all those who have met threshold eligibility criteria at the reporting date;
- delete sections on Present Obligations/Liabilities for Major Cash Transfer Programs/ Measurement of Liabilities-Major Cash Transfer Programs and replace with a new section on the determination of the minimum amount to be disclosed to those meeting eligibility criteria at the reporting date;
- include definitions of collective goods and services and individual goods and services, but will not propose disclosure requirements for them;
- not use terminology and definitions associated with the recognition and measurement approach in IPSAS 19, such as constructive and present obligations, obligating events and liabilities.
- not use the term “major” in the context of cash transfer programs;
- include a short Introduction putting the ED into the context of an ongoing package of work including the conceptual framework and fiscal sustainability; and
- include a specific matter for comment on whether there are audit implications associated with the proposed disclosures.

The disclosures will be only for outflows and will not include inflows from contributions, earmarked taxation and general taxation. Whilst the Introduction will highlight the IPSASB’s intended approach to fiscal sustainability, the ED will be silent on fiscal sustainability disclosures.

There was considerable discussion of the terminology to be used in the ED. Some members favored the term “commitments” to designate the amount disclosed. Others felt that although “commitments” had not been formally defined in the IPSASB literature the term had been used in commentary in both IPSAS 24, *Presentation of Budget Information in Financial Statements* and the IPSAS, *Financial Reporting under the Cash Basis of Accounting*.

In many jurisdictions, “commitments” is used in a budgetary and management accounting context. There can also be translation difficulties in distinguishing “commitments” and “liabilities”. The term “entitlements” was also suggested. Some felt that the term was

used to denote a legal obligation in some jurisdictions. It was agreed staff follow-up on the issue further out of session.

There was no firm decision on the title of the revised ED. Some favor retaining the broad title: “Social Benefits: Disclosure”. A view was expressed that, because the ED will not propose requirements for collective and individual goods and services it would be more informative to insert the term “cash transfers” in the title: “Social Benefits: Cash Transfers: Disclosure” was suggested.

In developing the ED it was also decided that there will not be requirements for disclosure of trend information i.e. information covering the current reporting period and four previous reporting periods. As a consequence of this decision implementation arrangements will be more straightforward. Relief will be provided from the provision of comparative information in the first year of adoption.

The following further revisions will be made to the ED:

- Introduction to the Key Issues Section: to be deleted and material used in development of a consultation paper (see below);
- Introduction (IN Paragraphs which are in all new IPSASs) to be modified to reflect the agreed approach;
- Disclosures: to be modified to reflect new terminology;
- Implementation: to be simplified in consequence of the deletion of requirement for trend information;
- Implementation Guidance: to be deleted and replaced with expanded illustrative disclosures; and
- Basis for Conclusions: to be restructured to reflect new direction.

The US member disagreed with the reaffirmation of the decision that the ED deal with disclosure and indicated an intention to provide an alternative view.

It was also agreed that the IPSASB will develop a separate consultation paper, which will deal with contentious issues in the recognition and measurement of social benefits.

Such issues include:

- when present obligations occur for cash transfer programs and whether contributions and earmarked taxes have an impact on obligating events;
- whether present obligations arise to beneficiaries of programs delivering individual goods and services;
- whether the revalidation of eligibility criteria is a recognition criterion or a measurement attribute; and
- the measurement of liabilities arising from present obligations.

The IPSASB reaffirmed its commitment to investigate fiscal sustainability reporting and disclosures and agreed to consider a project brief at the November 2007 meeting.

## **5. HERITAGE ASSETS**

The IPSASB considered the staff proposal to develop a further consultation paper as the project's next step. They agreed the ultimate project objective is to develop accounting and disclosure requirements for heritage assets, either through a separate standard or amending IPSAS 17, *Property, Plant and Equipment*.

They agreed the proposed project brief identified the majority of the key issues that a further consultation paper would need to address. However, members considered that further analysis of certain issues is necessary prior to a final decision on whether to proceed with a further consultation paper or move straight to development of an ED of a separate standard or amending IPSAS 17. In particular the definition of heritage assets will be key as this impacts the range of assets to which the accounting and disclosure requirements will apply.

Members noted the staff suggestion that the project explore whether the definition should include requirements that heritage assets need to be held for "public benefit" purposes. Some had reservations about this term and staff acknowledged that it had not been defined in the IPSASB literature. Members also raised the following additional key issues for further consideration:

- the redesignation as operational property, plant and equipment, and vice-versa and the transfer of heritage assets;
- measurement difficulties and ambiguities;
- assets which public sector entities hold in trust and assets which, although owned by the state, are not operated by the state; and
- the need for active engagement with the valuation profession in order to provide practical examples of how different types of heritage asset are measured.

In the context of engagement with the valuation profession, a UK project was highlighted that involves the development of specific case studies covering a range of heritage items, including flora and fauna, buildings housing heritage assets and national symbols.

It was noted that there are strong links with issues that are likely within the scope of the public sector conceptual framework project. In particular, cost-benefit and materiality considerations are key on whether to provide financial information. The cost of recognizing heritage assets out-weighing benefits to users is often used by those against recognition.

These key issues will be considered in more detail in a further paper at the November 2007 meeting.



## **6. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The IPSASB was updated on the status of the conceptual framework project. It was noted that:

- Membership of both the subcommittee and wider monitoring group are confirmed;
- The project brief had been revised in accordance with the Board's instructions from the Norwalk meeting and provided to both IPSASB and national standards setters, ministry of finance and other organizations who participated in the July 2006 meeting in Paris and posted on the IFAC website;
- Initial issues papers had been prepared for "group 1 projects"; and
- First subcommittee meeting is to be in Hong Kong, 26 March 2007.

The IPSASB discussed the interrelationships between the objectives and users component and the scope of the project and the need therefore for the national standards setters to work together closely.

The major issue in the scope of the project relates to whether the conceptual framework applies only to general purpose financial statements or whether it should be expanded to include general purpose financial reporting. It was noted that IPSAS 1 refers to the need to demonstrate accountability and that this opens the door toward performance reporting and other types of reporting beyond general purpose financial statements.

Some members noted that there is still room for improvements in the area of standards for financial statements and expressed concern about going beyond this scope. They highlighted that this is where the IPSASB has added value to date and that there continues to be an ability to add value.

Other members thought it self-evident that the work the IPSASB is doing should clearly go beyond general purpose financial statements to other areas. What these other areas might be would need to be debated. So, while there was some feeling among these members that the scope should include financial reporting there was nervousness about the extent of potential expansion.

Issues with translations were raised and it was noted that these should not be underestimated. For example "stewardship" has been identified as having particular translation problems in other languages. The need for clear definitions of terms was emphasized particularly in the context of translation.

If the scope is expanded to general purpose financial reporting, then there may be a need to break this down into smaller parts thereby focusing on areas first where there is less debate about IPSASB involvement and leaving alone those areas that are contentious for the time being.

Members generally had fewer concerns with expanding the scope to include long-term fiscal sustainability, narrative reporting (MD&A), prospective financial information and performance reporting. They noted that the further the IPSASB moves out in the scope

the more likely there will be controversy. The IPSASB also discussed concerns surrounding auditability of this other information and it was noted that discussing with INTOSAI early in the process would be helpful.

The IPSASB also discussed the reporting entity component of the project. The need to find boundaries for reporting was noted. Some members were concerned that it would be challenging to have a single definition of a reporting entity across jurisdictions because of differences in legislation. Constitutional arrangements may also be problematic to the definition of control. Recognition of the size of an entity was also suggested to be an important consideration.

In closing the discussion, the IPSASB noted that there is an enormous range of issues and that it is important that the IPSASB continues to move together in a leadership mode with the subcommittee to identify issues and come to resolutions.

## **7. SERVICE CONCESSION ARRANGEMENTS**

The IPSASB was updated on the status of the service concession arrangements project, key points being:

- Membership of the subcommittee and project advisory panel (PAP) is confirmed. The subcommittee now has representation from the IASB's IFRIC 12 project (Ms Noreen Whelan);
- The project brief has been revised in accordance with the Board's instructions from Norwalk and sent to the subcommittee and PAP;
- Staff, subcommittee chair and GASB have agreed on a draft:
  - structure/content of the consultation paper; and
  - timeframe for its completion;
- to enable a fuller analysis of issues for the consultative paper, the timeframe for bringing the paper to the Board for approval for public comment has been moved to November from July 2007; and
- the timing of development of the consultative paper is related to the timely response to requests for information (though it is acknowledged that the requirement for information in English only could limit the information received).

Staff clarified that though GASB was preparing the consultative paper, it is not a member of the subcommittee – though could be considered if interest was shown.

In response to a question, staff confirmed that the consultation paper will take into consideration the notions of 'control' / 'risks & rewards' in its analysis of issues in how to best account for service concession arrangements.

The IPSASB Chair gave feedback from his presentation at the International Seminar on Strengthening Public Investment and Managing Fiscal Risks from Public-Private Partnerships held in Budapest, Hungary; March 7–8, 2007. The honesty of the IPSASB's presentation that it currently has no guidance but is definitely working on the issue was

well received. There was much interest in the composition of the subcommittee and timing of the IPSASB project.

The Board then discussed various facets/issues from their respective jurisdictions related to involvement in, and accounting for service concession arrangements. These included differing legislative frameworks, off-balance sheet reporting, warranty/contingent liability issues, wanting to minimize guidance which conflicts with existing standards, the complexity of some contracts, SCAs vs PPP and the use of guarantees.

It was noted that Australia had commenced a project on accounting for PPPs with the intention of adopting IFRIC 12 for operators and development of guidance for grantors.

Staff advised that it will bring key issues for the Board's consideration at the July meeting with the consultation paper to be considered for approval in November.

## **8. IMPROVEMENTS**

Staff noted the project's objective is to update IPSASs to reduce differences between them and equivalent IFRSs/IASs. It was proposed improvements to the following 9 IPSASs be commenced by the end of 2009:

- 2007: IPSASs 4, 18 & 5;
- 2008: IPSASs 8, 20 & 19; and
- 2009: IPSASs 1, 6 & 9.

Staff advised the timing and process for updating individual IPSASs should be finalized by the IPSASB after reviewing the extent of proposed changes.

Staff also noted the criteria used for identifying the IPSASs for improvement:

- if an equivalent IFRS/IAS had been updated since January 2004 (or was to be updated as of December 2009); and
- those amendments were not related to consequential amendments stemming from changes to IASs/IFRSs for which there was not at present an equivalent IPSAS.

The IPSASB commended staff on the project brief, and approved its key proposals. They also noted that 'improvements' is not so much a distinct project but more a continuous cycle ensuring that IPSASs reflect as much as appropriate for the public sector, the latest related IAS/IFRS.

Members felt a process should be set-up to improve input on IASB material issued for public comment acknowledging that dependent upon how structured, the process may have significant resource implications for staff. The process would need criteria to ensure the IPSASB is selective in the comments provided. eg: comments could be either of concern or support and may not necessarily be public sector related but instead broader and of interest to both Boards.

This process would help the IPSASB get an earlier appreciation of IASB proposals, any possible public sector issues and also help ensure some IPSASB concerns get considered early in the process before an IAS is finalized – therefore helping the IPSASB's convergence strategy. This process could be a component of the 'rules of the road'.

A member brought to the Board's attention the IASB exposure draft of proposed amendments to IAS 24 *Related Party Disclosures* - state-controlled entities and the definition of a related party with a comment date of May 25, 2007. The member noted that the ED had implications for the public sector and as such the Board may wish to consider submitting a response. The Board agreed and asked that staff develop a response for Board approval out of session.

Finally, the Board discussed the role and relevance of IASB IFRICs and Interpretations to the IPSASB Handbook, concluding that these items do fall within the realm of the IPSASB GAAP hierarchy.

## **9. ENTITY COMBINATIONS**

Staff presented a project brief acknowledging that earlier Board discussions about the IPSASB strategic plan, in particular, future projects both selected by the Board and timeframes for their commencement, would influence proposed timeframes in the brief.

In reviewing the brief, the Board considered that overall, IFRS 3 *Business Combinations* is convergent for the public sector – in particular application of the purchase/acquisition method. However, the Board believed there to be numerous entity combinations occurring in the public sector for which application of the purchase/acquisition method would not be the most appropriate method of accounting.

Entity combinations could often result in there not necessarily being an acquirer or control. As such, the Board wanted a fuller understanding of a broader range of entity combinations occurring in the public sector – which would help in scoping what could be a very significant portion of an overall entity combinations project.

Examples of entity combinations for which the application of the principles of IFRS 3 could be problematic included (but not necessarily limited to);

- entities under common control;
- amalgamations of cities/municipalities; and
- transfer of activities from central government to local government or vice versa.

To help discussion on next steps for a project, the Board requested an issues paper be developed which considered accounting issues associated with these combinations and others. To assist in making the issues paper as comprehensive as possible, the Board asked for the opportunity to provide examples of combinations which they would like to see reflected in the paper. Further, requests were made for the paper take into account fair value considerations and also issues related to combining entities with different accounting policies. The paper will be provided later in 2007.

## **10. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS**

The IPSASB agreed IPSAS 15, *Financial Instruments: Disclosure and Presentation* should be amended quickly to ensure convergence with updated IAS 32, *Financial Instruments: Presentation*. This will require the removal of IPSAS 15's disclosure requirements and other minor amendments. Given the nature of the changes, staff were directed to prepare a draft ED for the July meeting.

The IPSASB discussed developing financial instrument recognition and measurement requirements for the public sector noting that the definition of financial instruments did not include some public sector specific instruments. They also noted there is considerable debate internationally about the appropriateness of IAS 39, *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*, in particular noting the ongoing work of the IASB and FASB to harmonize their requirements.

Members concluded that this could result in substantial change to IAS 39 in the near term and that the IPSASB should not proceed to develop an IPSAS until that project is concluded with international consensus on recognition and measurement. The IPSASB noted the IASB's ultimate desire to have all financial instruments measured at fair value, and concluded that developing an IPSAS on that basis is not appropriate at this time as it would mean that the IPSASs were diverging from the IFRSs, contrary to the IPSASB's and IFAC's stated goal of international convergence.

Staff were directed to monitor IASB developments and keep the IPSASB updated. The IPSASB agreed the draft ED amending IPSAS 15 should exclude from its scope the public sector financial instruments highlighted in the staff issues paper.

## **11. PROMOTION AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board discussed how to improve use of the country reports as overall the effort to prepare them did not appear to be greater than the benefit currently attained from them. There is concern that the frequency of IPSASB meetings meant that the activity within member jurisdictions between meetings is often not meaningful for reporting to the IPSASB.

An alternative suggestion is to have jurisdictions prepare country reports on a rotational basis with each IPSASB meeting focusing on select countries so that each country reports once a year with total coverage within the year.

A further suggestion is to post country reports on the IFAC intranet only (perhaps with some discussion at the IPSASB meeting). To ensure postings are current, maintenance by members would be part of the IPSASB operational plan.

The Board noted that the structure/content of country reports is currently inconsistent across countries. The notion of staff developing some form of template to improve consistency was discussed.

Special mention was made of the Chinese country report which was considered a very useful document.

Staff agreed to consider all these ideas further for future meetings.

**INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING STANDARDS BOARD  
ACTION LIST – MARCH 2007 MEETING**

<b>Action Required</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Date to be Completed</b>
<b>1. Strategy and Operational Workplan:</b> Complete for 2007-2009  New projects to be actioned 2007: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fiscal sustainability</li> <li>• Cash Basis review</li> <li>• Rules of the road (see 2 below)</li> <li>• Heritage assets (see 3 below)</li> <li>• Improvements (see 4 below)</li> <li>• Financial Instruments – disclosure (see 5 below)</li> </ul>	Fox  Stanford Bohun Fox /Bohun Stanford Zhang Bohun	May 2007  November 2007 November 2007 July/November November 2007 July/November July/November
<b>2. Rules of the road:</b> Develop criteria for modifying IAS/IFRS for public sector differences	Fox/Bohun	July 2007
<b>3. Heritage Assets:</b> Develop additional issues paper	Stanford	November 2007
<b>1. Improvements:</b> Provide 1 <sup>st</sup> round of improvements for consideration	Zhang	July 2007
<b>5. Financial Instruments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop draft ED amending IPSAS 15</li> <li>• For recognition and measurement, prepare discussion paper on nature and use of FIs in the p.s.</li> <li>• Monitor IASB FI project</li> </ul>	Bohun	July 2007  2008 - 2009  On-going
<b>6. Social Benefits:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further revise ED</li> <li>• Develop consultative paper</li> </ul>	Stanford Members & TAs to comment on drafts	May 2007
<b>7. Service Concession Arrangements:</b> Provide key issues for Board consideration	Naik	July 2007

Action Required	Person(s) Responsible	Date to be Completed
8. <b>Entity Combinations:</b> Develop issues paper which considers numerous p.s combination arrangements	TBD	2008
9. <b>Promotion and Communications:</b> Develop more effective approach for using country reports	Naik	July 2007
10. <b>Liaison with IASB</b>  Prepare response to IASB ED on Related Parties and circulate to members and TAs for review by response date.	Zhang	June 8, 2007  (Note, response date May 25, 2007; IASB granted extension of 2 weeks)