

Meeting: IPSASB Consultative Advisory Group

Meeting Location: New York, USA

Meeting Date: December 1, 2025

Agenda Item 2

For:

☐ Approval

☒ Discussion

☐ Information

PROGRAM AND TECHNICAL DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Project summary	The purpose of this session is to receive updates on changes on the work program.	
Meeting objectives	Topic	Agenda Item
Discussion items	Update on IPSASB Work Program	2.1
Other supporting items	Climate-related Disclosures—June 2025	2.2.1
	Natural Resources—June 2025	2.2.2
	2025 Work Program Consultation—June 2025	2.2.3

Prepared by: Ross Smith (November 2025)

The 'International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board', 'International Public Sector Accounting Standards', 'Recommended Practice Guidelines', 'International Federation of Accountants', 'IPSASB', 'IPSAS', 'RPG', 'IPSASB SRS', 'IFAC', the IPSASB logo, and IFAC logo are trademarks of IFAC, or registered trademarks and service marks of IFAC in the US and other countries.

Update on IPSASB Work Program

Purpose

1. To receive the Program and Technical Director's report on the work program and other activities, including key changes since the last IPSASB CAG (CAG) meeting in June 2025.

Program and Technical Director's Report

Due Process – CAG's Role

2. The CAG has a formal role in the IPSASB's oversight arrangements and Due Process. The CAG executes its important role, by providing input and advice to IPSASB to ensure the perspectives of its diverse membership are considered on significant matters of public interest.
3. The IPSASB consults the CAG for input and advice on:
 - (a) The Strategy and Work Program, including project priorities;
 - (b) Significant issues relating to the development of an international standard (significant issues for consideration as part of the development of a project proposal, Consultation Paper (CP) (if applicable), and Exposure Draft (ED)); and
 - (c) Significant issues raised in comment letters to consultations (CP and ED).
4. Since the CAG's inception in 2016, it has enhanced the effectiveness of the IPSASB's processes to set standards and has added value by ensuring that broader CAG perspectives are considered during the Board's processes to develop standards and determine its strategic priorities.
5. The IPSASB approved its Strategy 2024-2028 in Q4 2024, which sets the direction for IPSASB activities during the next few years, and consultation with the CAG will be an important part of the IPSASB's activities to achieve the Board's objectives.

Work Program Updates

6. For CAG member information and context, the following IPSASB project developments since June 2025 are highlighted:

New Guidance & Ongoing Consultations

- (a) The pronouncement [Amendments to IPSAS as a Result of the Application of IPSAS 46, Measurement](#) was approved by the IPSASB at its June 2025 meeting, and published in August 2025. The CAG provided significant input to the project to develop IPSAS 46, *Measurement*, which helped shape the final amendments resulting from this project. One remaining issue to be addressed in this project concerns the specific proposed amendments to IPSAS 31, *Intangibles* related to measurement at Current Operational Value, and the comments on these amendments, which will start to be reviewed by IPSASB at the December 2025 meeting.
- (b) The pronouncement [Definition of Material \(Amendments to IPSAS 1, IPSAS 3 and the Conceptual Framework\)](#) was approved in September and published in October 2025. This project made limited updates to the definition of material across the IPSASB's literature to enhance the clarity and consistent application in IPSAS Standards.
- (c) The [IPSASB 2025 Work Program Consultation](#) was published in October 2025 and will be out for consultation until May 4, 2026. The CAG reviewed a draft of the Consultation at the June

Agenda Item 2.1

2025 CAG meeting. Agenda Item 4.2.3 includes the Report Back with the advice/input received from CAG members and the IPSASB's consideration and feedback related to the input received.

- (d) The updated [IPSAS 33, First-time Adoption of Accrual Basis International Public Sector Accounting Standards](#), was approved in September and will be published in Q4 2025. This project updates IPSAS 33 based on the practical experience and issues encountered by several countries that have used the standard in the process to transition to accrual. The CAG provided IPSASB with advice relevant to this project during recent implementation sessions, which have helped shape the changes in the updated standard. The specific CAG implementation sessions included:
 - (i) **December 2022.** Update on IPSAS Implementation in Saudi Arabia.
 - (ii) **June 2023.** IPSAS Implementation in the United Republic of Tanzania; and
 - (iii) **December 2023.** Cameroon - IPSAS Implementation Update.
- 7. The following updates are provided for CAG members' information on other IPSASB projects and initiatives:
 - (a) **Maintenance Activities.** The IPSASB continues its work on implementing maintenance activities, which were added as part of its new 2024-2028 Strategy. The maintenance activities include setting up a formal Post-Implementation Review (PIR) process and the IPSASB Application Group (IAG). The IPSASB launched the IAG webpage in Q2 2025 (<https://www.ipsasb.org/submit-issue-ipsasb-application-group>), creating an avenue for stakeholders to submit queries for consideration. CAG members are asked to continue to let interested stakeholders in their jurisdictions know about the IAG.
 - (b) **Presentation of Financial Statements.** The CAG has been providing helpful input to the Presentation of Financial Statements project since the research and scoping of this project commenced in 2022. The CAG discussed this project several times since the development of the Consultation Paper (CP), which the IPSASB plans to approve at the March 2026 meeting.
 - (c) **Implementation Session.** The IPSASB CAG will discuss '*Adoption of Accrual-based IPSAS Financial Reporting in the African Region*' during Agenda Item 3. This session will include a presentation from the African Association of Accountants General (AAAG) regarding the transition to accrual accounting in Africa. During the session, CAG members will be asked to share their input and perspectives, including providing views on how IPSASB and other groups in the public sector can support adoption and implementation efforts, particularly with regard to regional and international cooperation. A copy of the presentation will be shared in advance of the December 1 CAG meeting.

Agenda Item 2.1.1


IPSASB WORK PROGRAM THRU 2026: DECEMBER 2025


Project	Meetings				
	Dec 2025	Mar 2026	Jun 2026	Sep 2026	Dec 2026
Standard Setting Projects					
Climate-Related Disclosures: Own Operations [Phase 1]	IP				
Climate-Related Disclosures: Public Policy Programs [Phase 2]		RR/DI	RR/DI	DI/IP	IP
Natural Resources	IP				
Presentation of Financial Statements	DI	CP			RR/DI
Strengthening Linkages Between IPSAS Standards and the GFSM	DI/ED		RR/IP		
Measurement – Application Phase: COV in IPSAS 31 – Narrow Scope Amendments	RR/DI	RR/DI	RR/DI	IP	
Improvements	DI	DI/ED		RR/IP	
Making Materiality Judgements—Phase 2	DI	DI/ED			RR/IP
Work Program Consultation			RR/DI/WP	WP	
Maintenance & Research Activities					
International Application Group	DI	DI	DI	DI	DI
Post Implementation Reviews – Pilot - IPSAS 20, Related Party Disclosures		DI	DI	DI/RFI	
Academic Advisory Group – Public Sector Research	DI			RES	
Other Initiatives					
Advancing Public Sector Sustainability Reporting: I) General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Information II) Natural Resources: Non-Financial Disclosures	IG	IG	IG	IG	IG
IPSASB Handbook			Publish		


Legend:


DI = Discussion of Issues; RR = Review of Responses

 = Approval of Project Brief


 = Approval of Consultation Paper


 = Approval of Exposure Draft

 = Approval of Final Standard or Amendments to IPSAS

 = Approval of Strategy and Work Program

 = Planned Consultation Period

 = Research and Scoping Activities

 = Information Gathering

Project Management—Outputs:

Recent Pronouncements:

Definition of Material (Amendments to IPSAS 1, IPSAS 3, and the Conceptual Framework) is expected to be published by end of October 2025.

An updated version of IPSAS 33, *First-time Adoption of Accrual Basis International Public Sector Accounting Standards* is expected to be published by mid-November 2025.

Recent Consultations:

A [Work Program Consultation](#) was published on October 16, 2025 and will be open for comment until May 4, 2026.

PROJECTS COMPLETED AND/OR PUBLISHED DURING 2019-2023 STRATEGY AND WORK PROGRAM PERIOD

Project	Date Issued	Effective Date
IPSAS 33, <i>First-time Adoption of Accrual Basis IPSAS Standards</i>	To be issued in Q4 2025	January 1, 2028
<i>Definition of Material</i> (Amendments to IPSAS 1, IPSAS 3 and the Conceptual Framework)	October 2025	January 1, 2027
<i>Amendments to IPSAS Standards as a Result of the Application of IPSAS 46, Measurement</i>	August 2025	January 1, 2028
<i>Amendments to IPSAS Standards: Specific IFRIC Interpretations</i>	January 2025	January 1, 2026
<i>Stripping Costs in the Production Phase of a Surface Mine</i> (Amendments to IPSAS 12)	November 2024	January 1, 2027
IPSAS 50, <i>Exploration for and Evaluation of Mineral Resources</i>	November 2024	January 1, 2027
<i>2024–2028 Strategy and Work Program</i>	October 2024	N/A
<i>Concessionary Leases and Other Arrangements Conveying Rights over Assets</i> (Amendments to IPSAS 43, IPSAS 47, and IPSAS 48)	October 2024	January 1, 2027
<i>Improvements to IPSAS, 2023</i>	April 2024	Various ¹
IPSAS 49, <i>Retirement Benefit Plans</i>	November 2023	January 1, 2026
Conceptual Framework Update—Chapter 3, <i>Qualitative Characteristics</i>	October 2023	N/A*
<i>Reporting Sustainability Program Information—Amendments to RPGs 1 and 3: Additional Non-Authoritative Guidance</i>	May 2023	N/A*
IPSAS 48, <i>Transfer Expenses</i>	May 2023	January 1, 2026
IPSAS 47, <i>Revenue</i>	May 2023	January 1, 2026
IPSAS 46, <i>Measurement</i>	May 2023	January 1, 2025

¹ Improvements includes multiple amendments. The amendments related to Part 1 and Part 3 are effective January 1, 2026, and the amendments related to Part 2 are effective January 1, 2025.

*These pronouncements do not have an effective date because they are amendments to the relevant IPSASB's literature that do not require an effective date.

**The effective dates of these pronouncements were originally January 1, 2022. However, the IPSASB deferred the effective dates until January 1, 2023 through the pronouncement COVID-19: *Deferral of Effective Dates*.

IPSAS 45, <i>Property, Plant, and Equipment</i>	May 2023	January 1, 2025
Conceptual Framework Update—Chapter 5, <i>Elements in Financial Statements</i>	May 2023	N/A*
Conceptual Framework Update—Chapter 7, <i>Measurement of Assets and Liabilities in Financial Statements</i>	May 2023	N/A*
IPSAS 44, <i>Non-current Assets Held for Sale and Discontinued Operations</i>	May 2022	January 1, 2025
IPSAS 43, <i>Leases</i>	January 2022	January 1, 2025
<i>Improvements to IPSAS, 2021</i>	January 2022	January 1, 2023
<i>Amendments to IPSAS 5, Borrowing Costs—Non-Authoritative Guidance</i>	November 2021	N/A*
<i>Non-Authoritative Amendments to IPSAS 41, Financial Instruments</i>	December 2020	January 1, 2023
<i>COVID-19: Deferral of Effective Dates</i>	November 2020	January 1, 2023
<i>Collective and Individual Services</i> (Amendments to IPSAS 19)	January 2020	January 1, 2023
<i>Improvements to IPSAS, 2019</i>	January 2020	January 1, 2023**
IPSAS 42, <i>Social Benefits</i>	January 2019	January 1, 2023**
<i>Amendments to IPSAS 36, Investments in Associates and Joint Ventures, and IPSAS 41, Financial Instruments</i>	January 2019	January 1, 2023**

*These pronouncements do not have an effective date because they are amendments to the relevant IPSASB's literature that do not require an effective date.

**The effective dates of these pronouncements were originally January 1, 2022. However, the IPSASB deferred the effective dates until January 1, 2023 through the pronouncement *COVID-19: Deferral of Effective Dates*.

Status of Application of Due Process – December 2025

APPENDIX A

PROJECT	DUE PROCESS ELEMENTS (✓= ELEMENT COMPLETE)						ANTICIPATED FINAL APPROVA
	A. PROJECT COMMENCEMENT	B. DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARD		C. PUBLIC EXPOSURE	D. CONSIDERATION OF EXPOSURE COMMENTS	E. APPROVAL	
		CP PHASE (IF APPLICABLE)	ED PHASE				
Measurement—Application Phase	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	June 2025
Measurement—Application Phase : Narrow Scope Amendment: Application of Current Operational Value to IPSAS 31, Intangible Assets	✓	✓	✓	✓	ONGOING		September 2026
Natural Resources	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	ONGOING	December 2025
Presentation of Financial Statements	✓	ONGOING					December 2028
Sustainability-Climate-related Disclosures : Own Operations [Phase 1]	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	ONGOING	December 2025
Sustainability-Climate-related Disclosures : Public Policy Programs [Phase 2]	✓	N/A	✓	✓	ONGOING		December 2026
IPSAS 33—Limited Scope Update	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	September 2025
Making Materiality Judgements—Limited Scope (Phase 2)	✓	N/A	ONGOING				March 2027
Definition of Material – Narrow Scope Amendments	✓	N/A	✓	✓	✓	✓	September 2025
Strengthening Linkages Between IPSAS Standards and the GFSM	✓	N/A	ONGOING				June 2026

PROJECT	DUE PROCESS ELEMENTS (✓= ELEMENT COMPLETE)					ANTICIPATED FINAL APPROVAL	
	A. PROJECT COMMENCEMENT	B. DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARD		C. PUBLIC EXPOSURE	D. CONSIDERATION OF EXPOSURE COMMENTS		E. APPROVAL
		CP PHASE (IF APPLICABLE)	ED PHASE				
Advancing Public Sector Sustainability Reporting (General Disclosures & Natural Resources/Biodiversity projects) – <i>(Information Gathering – project commitments for sustainability reporting to follow 2025 Work Program Consultation)</i>	ONGOING						To be decided in 2026 or after

N/A – Consultation Paper (CP) phase is not a required due process element; IPSASB determines on a project-by-project basis whether a CP is needed.

Overview of Due Process steps:

A. Project Commencement—due process step complete when the project proposal (project brief) is approved.

B. Development of Standard—due process step complete when exposure draft approved for public exposure.

C. Public Exposure—due process step complete when exposure draft comment period ends and comments received publicly posted on IPSASB website.

D. Consideration of Exposure Comments—due process step complete when significant issues raised on exposure have been deliberated by IPSASB.

E. Approval—due process step complete after board approval of final standard, considered the need for re-exposure, agreed the basis for conclusions and set an effective date for the standard.

Climate-related Disclosures—June 2025 Report Back

June 2025 CAG Discussions

1. Extracts from the draft minutes of the June 2025 CAG and how the IPSASB has responded to the Representatives' and Observers' comments are included in the table below.

Representatives' and Observers' Comments	IPSASB Staff Response
June 2025 CAG Meeting Comments	
<p>IPSASB Manager, Karen Leung and Principal Consultant, Alex Metcalfe, presented analysis on the feedback received in response to IPSASB SRS ED 1, <i>Climate-related Disclosures</i> and outlined the themes emerging from constituent responses. Mr. Metcalfe presented an analysis on whether the project should proceed as a single standard, or as separate standards (to reflect the two reporting perspectives: Own Operations and Public Policy Programs), noting mixed constituent preferences to achieve clarity vs. an integrated approach. Ms. Leung presented analysis and shared constituents views on the rebuttable presumption that entities use the GHG Protocol and the proposed disclosure requirements for Scope 3 emissions.</p> <p>Ms. Colignon asked CAG members to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question 1 – What additional advice would CAG members provide to the IPSASB in considering whether to proceed with single or separate standards? • Question 2 – What is the CAG's advice on balancing consistency with jurisdictional flexibility through the use of a rebuttable presumption that entities use the GHG Protocol? • Question 3 – What is the CAG's view on the value of Scope 3 emissions disclosures in the public sector, particularly in terms of comparability, usefulness, and practicality? 	
The CAG members commented on Question 1 as follows:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Winrow emphasized the importance of ensuring auditability of public sector sustainability reporting information. He observed that while this appears feasible for Own Operations in the short-term, it remains uncertain whether information related to Public Policy Programs could meet the same level of auditability. He therefore advised the IPSASB develop separate Standards, starting with Own Operations, while acknowledging the need for future guidance on Public Policy Programs. Mr. Winrow also questioned whether this decision would set a precedent for the IPSASB to adopt a similar dual-standard approach across other sustainability topics, particularly in 	<p>This point was noted by IPSASB staff. The IPSASB has decided to proceed with separating the project into two phases: Phase 1, Own Operations, and Phase 2, Public Policy Programs.</p> <p>CAG member feedback has been incorporated into the IPSASB discussions. In the IPSASB's discussion on whether to proceed with single or separate standards, the IPSASB considered factors including the clarity of guidance, timeliness of issuing guidance, and supporting preparers with adoption and implementation of the standard. Following its deliberations, the IPSASB decided that separate standards was the pragmatic approach in moving forward.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.1

the context of developing general sustainability-related disclosures.	
2. Ms. Stachniak supported the development of two separate Standards, but emphasized the need for clear guidance to assist preparers in determining whether activities fall under Own Operations or Public Policy Programs. She highlighted the importance of delineating Public Policy Program disclosures, as they may address broader sustainability-related topics relevant to general sustainability-related disclosures. Ms. Stachniak encouraged the IPSASB to clarify the sequencing and timeline for the development of these Standards.	Mr. Metcalfe shared that at the upcoming meeting, staff will recommend the IPSASB start with Own Operations, with a targeted completion by the end of 2025, followed by the development of Public Policy Program disclosures. See also response to Comment 1 above.
3. Mr. Zhang supported the development of separate Standards, starting with Own Operations, as this approach would enable timely progress by leveraging existing private sector guidance, while allocating time to address the challenges associated with Public Policy Programs. He suggested the IPSASB group policies based on the extent to which they impact climate outcomes and ensure the Standards reflect differences in institutional roles and abilities to influence climate action.	See response to Comment 1 above.
4. Ms. Faye supported the development of separate Standards, noting that this would facilitate alignment with the ISSB. However, she cautioned against the risk of fragmentation and emphasized the need for strong conceptual linkage to ensure consistency across the Standards.	See response to Comment 1 above.
5. Mr. Close agreed on the importance of separating the two reporting perspectives and encouraged the IPSASB to ensure that alignment is maintained between the two resulting Standards.	See response to Comment 1 above.
6. Mr. Johri expressed support for developing separate Standards. Starting with Own	See response to Comment 1 above.

Agenda Item 2.2.1

<p>Operations enables closer alignment with private sector guidance, and that the insights gained could inform the development of Public Policy Program disclosures. In addition, he highlighted the importance of precise definitions to ensure clarity and consistency.</p>	
<p>7. Mr. Braham viewed the development of separate Standards to be a pragmatic approach, and asked the IPSASB to consider the implications of this decision – for each future sustainability topic, will the IPSASB also be developing separate standards for the Own Operations component and the Public Policy Program component?</p>	<p>See response to Comment 1 above.</p>
<p>8. Ms. Buljubasic supported the development of separate Standards, noting that this approach better balances ambition with feasibility. She believes that this will simplify the sustainability reporting landscape and encourage adoption and implementation.</p>	<p>See response to Comment 1 above.</p>
<p>9. Mr. Williamson agreed with the proposal to develop separate Standards from a practical standpoint. He cautioned the IPSASB to consider sequencing, as there is significant interconnection between Own Operations and Public Policy Program disclosures, and recommended that the IPSASB develop the two Standards in parallel.</p>	<p>See response to Comment 1 above.</p>
<p>10. Ms. Attia supported the development of separate Standards, noting that this would facilitate implementation and improve alignment with international standards. Additionally, she emphasized the need for implementation support, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa region, and suggested that the development of Public Policy Programs reflect the lessons</p>	<p>See response to Comment 1 above.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.1

learned from developing Own Operations disclosure requirements.	
11. Ms. Dar supported the development of separate Standards and echoed Mr. Williamson's advice for the IPSASB to develop them in parallel, to avoid compromising the relationship between the two standards. She inquired about the basis for the assumption that only a limited number of entities would be subject to Public Policy Program disclosure requirements.	Mr. Metcalfe responded that the distinction is based on a conceptual conclusion. He explained that while that all entities are expected to have Own Operations, only those exercising sovereign powers would be subject to disclosures requirements relating to Public Policy Programs. See also response to Comment 1 above.
12. Ms. Colignon expressed support for the development of separate Standards, noting the fundamental differences in the two reporting perspectives of Own Operations and Public Policy Programs.	See response to Comment 1 above.
The CAG members commented on Question 2 as follows:	
13. Mr. Winrow supported maintaining the rebuttable presumption that entities use the GHG Protocol, and emphasized the importance that entities explain the rationale for their approach where alternative methodologies are applied.	This point was noted by IPSASB staff, and CAG member feedback has been incorporated into the IPSASB discussions. The IPSASB noted general support for the GHG Protocol as a principled and globally recognized methodology, and viewed the proposed rebuttable presumption as a pragmatic balance between global alignment and local adaptability. Overall, the IPSASB decided that it was appropriate to retain the rebuttable presumption on using the GHG Protocol.
14. Mr. Close noted the importance of both flexibility and comparability, as the public sector faces greater complexity in determining appropriate levels of aggregation than in the private sector.	See response to Comment 13 above.
15. Ms. Attia supported retaining the rebuttable presumption and noted the need for comprehensive guidance. She suggested that the Standard outline criteria for departing from the GHG Protocol, and to require entities to document such departures to ensure accountability.	See response to Comment 13 above.

Agenda Item 2.2.1

16. Ms. Dar expressed support for the flexibility provided by the rebuttable presumption, and noted the importance of transparency where an entity decides to depart from the rebuttable presumption. She also observed that the IPSASB SRS ED 1 appears to offer greater flexibility than the IFRS S2.	See response to Comment 13 above.
17. Ms. Colignon shared that France permits flexibility in GHG emission methodologies, particularly in terms of Scope 3 categories. She noted that in France, the guidance provides a correspondence table to illustrate differences between the GHG Protocol and the jurisdictional methodology.	See response to Comment 13 above.
18. Mr. Melo noted the complexity of applying the GHG Protocol in practice, reinforcing the need for public sector-specific guidance to support effective implementation.	See response to Comment 13 above.
The CAG members commented on Question 3 as follows:	
19. Ms. Colignon shared that Scope 3 emission disclosure requirements in France has led to tangible climate action, such as the adoption of greener transportation alternatives.	<p>This point was noted by IPSASB staff, and CAG member feedback has been incorporated into the IPSASB discussions.</p> <p>The IPSASB considered the importance of Scope 3 emissions disclosures for users, noting also some jurisdictional requirements for public sector entities, and concluded that it was appropriate to retain the proposed disclosure requirements. However, in light of significant implementation challenges relating to capacity, data availability, and readiness in the public sector, the IPSASB agreed to extend the transition relief for reporting Scope 3 emissions from one year to three years.</p>
20. Mr. Smith Mansilla emphasized the importance of Scope 3 emission disclosures in providing a complete picture of an entity's impact on the environment. He also observed that obtaining downstream emissions data is generally	See response to Comment 19 above.

Agenda Item 2.2.1

more feasible than that of upstream emissions.	
21. Mr. Zhang supported requiring entities to disclose Scope 3 emissions, which are potentially more important than Scopes 1 and 2 emissions, as it reflects the government's role in the broader society. He suggested that a staged approach would be appropriate to address the high costs of compliance.	See response to Comment 19 above.
22. Ms. Stachniak echoed Mr. Zhang's remarks and emphasized that, given their complexity, Scope 3 disclosure requirements should be accompanied by sufficient flexibility to support effective implementation. She suggested the IPSASB address these challenges with transition provisions.	See response to Comment 19 above.
23. Mr. Braham supported the requirement for entities to disclose Scope 3 emissions. He advised the IPSASB develop substantial implementation guidance to help entities tackle implementation challenges and facilitate effective application of the disclosure requirements.	See response to Comment 19 above.
24. Mr. Melo noted the importance of a pragmatic approach when requiring Scope 3 emission disclosures and also emphasized the need for implementation guidance.	See response to Comment 19 above.
25. Mr. Close concurred with other members and highlighted the implications of not requiring the disclosure of Scope 3 emissions. While supportive of a pragmatic approach, he noted that the absence of such requirements could undermine efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	Mr. Carruthers noted the challenges ahead for the IPSASB and emphasized the need to strike a balance between establishing robust principles and providing implementation support. He reflected that sustainability reporting is an evolving area of work and highlighted the importance of aligning with ISSB guidance, monitoring developments in the GHG Protocol, while ensuring relevance across jurisdictional contexts. Overall, he noted that this represents an initial step in the IPSASB's sustainability workstream.

Agenda Item 2.2.1

	See also response to Comment 19 above.
--	--

Matters for CAG Consideration

2. Representatives and Observers are asked to note the Report Back above.

Natural Resources—June 2025 Report Back

June 2025 CAG Discussions

1. Extracts from the draft minutes of the June 2025 CAG and how the IPSASB has responded to the Representatives' and Observers' comments are included in the table below.

Representatives' and Observers' Comments	IPSASB Staff Response
June 2025 CAG Meeting Comments	
<p>IPSASB Principal, Edwin Ng, introduced the natural resources session. Mr. Ng summarized feedback received on ED 92, <i>Tangible Natural Resources</i>. He noted that respondents disagreed with the proposed scope and requested the scope be narrowed. He shared that some constituents indicated that there was a lack of clarity related to the proposed disclosures of custodial responsibilities, especially around stewardship rights and responsibilities.</p> <p>Mr. Ng asked CAG members to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question 1 – Do you agree with staff's proposal to narrow the scope of the draft final IPSAS Standard to focus on natural resources held for conservation? If you agree, are there other reasons for narrowing the scope? If not, please provide your reasons. • Question 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Do you think the proposed requirement to disclose stewardship arrangements over recognized tangible natural resources is sufficient to meet the public interest? b) Do you think the proposed clarification to consider the accounting and disclosure implications from stewardship arrangements, even if the related tangible natural resource is not recognized, is sufficient? c) Are there other aspects of stewardship arrangements relating to natural resources that should be disclosed? 	
The CAG members commented on Question 1 as follows:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Braham agreed with narrowing the scope as proposed, as only assets held for conservation would be in scope. Furthermore, a narrower scope would be less burdensome for entities, as they do not have to go through all other IPSAS Standards first to determine whether an item is in scope. However, Mr. Braham highlighted the challenges around valuation of such items and asked whether a disclosure IPSAS Standard would better address this issue. 	<p>The scope of the draft IPSAS was narrowed to focus on tangible natural resources held for conservation and provides guidance on which standards are to be applied to tangible natural resources that are used for other purposes.</p> <p>The draft IPSAS will also emphasize situations where resources which meet the definition of an asset but cannot be reliably measured will lead to specific disclosures.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.2

<p>2. Mr. Smith Mansilla agreed with narrowing the scope as proposed. He acknowledged that subsoil resources would be out of scope at this stage, but encouraged the IPSASB to revisit its decision and permit the recognition of subsoil resources as technology and measurement methods may improve in the future.</p>	<p>Noted. The implementation guidance in the draft IPSAS discusses unrestricted subsoil resources and specifically mentions that the inability to recognize such resources as assets is dependent on the available scientific and technological know-how regarding their identification and quantification.</p>
<p>3. Mr. Zhang supported the proposal to narrow the scope, as this is consistent with other IPSAS Standards. He advised the IPSASB clearly define the term 'conservation', whether the conservation of resources is temporary or permanent, and whether future intention affects an entity's assessment of whether items are in the scope of this Standard. For example, some assets are currently held for conservation but expected to be used in the future for consumption (e.g. minerals, oil, forests). To finalize the scope, Mr. Zhang encouraged the IPSASB to ensure that no gaps will remain, and all natural resources are covered by this or existing IPSAS Standards.</p>	<p>Noted. See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope.</p> <p>Regarding conservation, the draft IPSAS has been updated to include a formal definition as well as application guidance and implementation guidance which explain conservation and how it is distinct from the uses of assets in other IPSAS.</p>
<p>4. Ms. Attia agreed with narrowing the scope of the Standard to focus on conservation, and encouraged the IPSASB to clarify the definition of 'conservation' to differentiate between natural resources held for conservation versus those that are heritage assets. She asked how water resources are included within the scope of the Standard, such as lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Mr. Ng responded that water can be within the scope of the Standard if it is being conserved and can be controlled, though measurement may be difficult. For example, if water in a lake is being conserved, is controlled and can be measured it would be an asset under the Standard. However, a river would likely not, as it is unlikely to be reliably measured.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.2

<p>5. Mr. Close agreed with narrowing the scope, and that an entity should consider whether the asset may be consumed in the future or perpetually held for conservation. However, he advised the IPSASB to revisit the definition and reconsider whether this Standard should only focus on disclosures. For example, the Great Barrier Reef is a natural resource that provides tremendous economic benefits to Australia but cannot be measured. If the government was able to value and recognize the Great Barrier Reef in its financial statements, it may make other assets and liabilities immaterial and reduce the usefulness of the financial statements. Thus, this information would only be useful as a disclosure to accompany the financial statements, rather than as an asset recognized on the face of the financial statements.</p>	<p>Noted. See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope.</p> <p>The draft IPSAS includes disclosure requirements for both recognized and unrecognized tangible natural resources held for conservation which meet the definition of an asset.</p> <p>The draft IPSAS has also been updated to include guidance on the accounting for a change in the primary reason for holding the asset.</p>
<p>6. Mr. Johri supported narrowing the scope, which better supports the project objectives. He encouraged the IPSASB to consider practical implementation challenges around data collection processes, highlighting the value of independent verification to support data quality management.</p>	<p>Noted. See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope.</p>
<p>7. Mr. Ndurunduru agreed with the rationale for narrowing the scope, which would be consistent with other IPSAS Standards and help avoid broadening of the project scope.</p>	<p>Noted. See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.2

<p>8. Ms. Dar noted that there are benefits to retaining a more open scope, to make it more future proof, but acknowledged that narrowing the scope is sensible to address respondent feedback. To help users determine the applicable Standard to account for a natural resource, she advised the IPSASB provide clear guidance, leveraging examples from respondents.</p>	<p>See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope.</p> <p>The draft IPSAS has been updated to include application guidance and implementation guidance on scope.</p>
<p>9. Ms. Buljubasic supported narrowing the scope of the Standard, as it is a more practical and achievable approach. Focusing on conservation better aligns with public sector mandates in many countries and will also draw attention to governments' stewardship roles. She also agreed with points raised by other CAG members on clarifying definitions and adding scoping guidance.</p>	<p>Noted. See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope and the response to Comment 3 regarding additional guidance on definitions.</p>
<p>10. Mr. Williamson agreed with narrowing the scope, which is a pragmatic approach. He emphasized that the definition is very important, as preparers and users need to understand that the proposed Standard only applies to specific assets and not all natural resources.</p>	<p>Noted. See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.2

<p>11. Ms. Raboy supported the proposal to narrow the scope, which will reduce the complexity of implementation. She noted that governments may struggle to define what constitutes a natural resource, which of those are held for conservation, and which can be reliably measured. As governments change, what one government considers for conservation might not be viewed the same by another. Hence, the disclosure of what is conserved might be appropriate as additional information in financial reports. Ms. Raboy highlighted that some examples of natural resources may be difficult to measure, as not everything in nature has or should have a value.</p>	<p>Noted. See the response to Comment 1 regarding scope, the response to Comment 3 regarding additional guidance on definitions, and the response to Comment 5 regarding measurement.</p> <p>The draft IPSAS has also been updated to included implementation guidance and an illustrative example on measurement, specifically the development of current operational value for a tangible natural resources held for conservation.</p>
<p>The CAG members commented on Question 2 as follows:</p>	
<p>12. Ms. Stachniak noted there are two types of unrecognized natural resources: those that are not controlled, and those that are controlled but cannot be reliably measured. She shared that she does not oppose disclosing information on stewardship arrangements but advised the IPSASB consider IPSAS 19, <i>Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets</i>, and the financial impact of natural resources that are not controlled.</p>	<p>Noted. The draft IPSAS clarifies that the disclosures for unrecognized resources only apply to resources which meet the definition of an asset (i.e., a resource controlled as the result of past events) but are not recognized because they cannot be reliably measured.</p>
<p>13. Mr. Close highlighted that tangible natural resources impact public interest and have public benefit, even if they cannot be recognized or measured. Other aspects of the proposed Standard look more like sustainability reporting (e.g. risk management) and may need to be considered in the definition or as a subset of the standard (e.g. disclosures if liability for rehabilitation).</p>	<p>Noted. The IPSASB had previously decided to only focus on tangible natural resources which are potentially assets. Rehabilitation liabilities and related disclosures are addressed by IPSAS 19, <i>Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets</i>.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.2

<p>14. Mr. Braham noted that such stewardship arrangements are not that prevalent in Europe. He urged the IPSASB to be clear about what should be included to mitigate potential risks of such disclosures in financial statements.</p>	<p>Noted. The core text of the draft IPSAS has been updated and implementation guidance has been added to clarify what is meant by stewardship arrangements.</p>
<p>15. Ms. Dar agreed there is value with the proposed disclosures regarding stewardship arrangements over recognized tangible natural resources. However, for unrecognized tangible natural resources (ones that meet the definition of asset for recognition but are not measurable and others that do not meet definition of asset), it was not clear whether the proposals would apply differently to these two types of items. She advised the IPSASB to update existing IPSAS Standards to address these arrangements and provide clarity to help constituents determine whether stewardship arrangements result in accounting implications.</p>	<p>Noted. See response to Comment 12 regarding the applicability of disclosure requirements for unrecognized tangible natural resources held for conservation.</p>
<p>16. Mr. Smith Mansilla agreed with proposed disclosure, which can highlight the financial implications such as transfers from government. He encouraged the IPSASB to provide more clarity in the proposed Standard to help constituents understand how various items, such as fishing conservation, are expected to be included in Standard or disclosures.</p>	<p>Noted. While fishing conservation is not explicitly included in the draft IPSAS, it includes implementation guidance on scope and recognition of living resources.</p>

Matters for CAG Consideration

- Representatives and Observers are asked to note the Report Back above.

IPSASB 2025 Work Program Consultation—June 2025 Report Back

June 2025 CAG Discussions

1. Extracts from the draft minutes of the June 2025 CAG and how the IPSASB has responded to the Representatives' and Observers' comments are included in the table below.

Representatives' and Observers' Comments	IPSASB Staff Response
June 2025 CAG Meeting Comments	
<p>IPSASB Principal, Sayja Barton, provided background and context regarding the upcoming work program consultation, the expected process, and the proposed approach.</p> <p>Ms. Barton asked CAG members to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question 1 – What comments do you have on the approach the IPSASB is taking to this public consultation? • Question 2 – What comments do you have on the format of the Consultation and are the instructions for the respondents in Agenda Item 6.2 clear to follow? What changes would you suggest, to clarify the content or instructions to enable the Board to obtain more useful feedback on the SMCs asked? • Question 3 – From your perspective/the perspective of your jurisdiction, are there any high priority financial reporting projects or sustainability reporting projects you think are missing from Appendix A and why? Similarly, are there any specific IPSAS Standards you think are of a high priority for the IPSASB to complete a Post-Implementation Review (PIR) on, and why? 	
The CAG members commented on Question 1 and Question 2 as follows:	
<p>1. Ms. Weinberg agreed with the use of the prioritization criteria, but noted that respondents would likely only submit high priority projects.</p>	<p>The project prioritization criteria were established as part of the 2019-2023 Strategy as a methodology that can be applied by the IPSASB to prioritize projects when adding them to the work program. Respondents including their highest priorities will facilitate the board's analysis in 2026.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.3

<p>2. Ms. Stachniak noted that some stakeholders may have difficulty or lack the knowledge to effectively apply certain criteria (e.g., assessing feasibility of a standard setting project, or prevalence of an issue at local vs. global level). She advised the IPSASB to soften the language in the consultation to avoid discouraging responses, and to clarify the lens which respondents should apply in formulating their responses. Ms. Stachniak also asked the IPSASB to clarify whether PIRs are part of, or in addition to, three major standard setting projects the IPSASB may be able to take on.</p>	<p>The Work Program Consultation has been clarified to indicate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The IPSASB will use the project prioritization criteria when evaluating what should be added to the future work program;- Respondents are encouraged to provide analysis in the context of the project prioritization criteria to the best of their abilities; and- The template provided was optional to use when submitting responses. <p>The Work Program consultation has also been clarified to indicate the work program already reflects resource allocation for the PIR and IPSASB Application Group (IAG), and the major projects would be on top of that</p>
<p>3. Mr. Close asked whether there is a way to set low/medium/high in a quantitative manner (e.g. urgency in terms of years instead), which IPSASB staff could calibrate to consistently assess and review feedback.</p>	<p>The IPSASB debated whether to evaluate each project in the 'Previously Suggested Project' document and whether more clarity could be provided to help respondents evaluate against the criteria. The IPSASB concluded retaining the project prioritization criteria was important for respondents as it was transparent in how the IPSASB would add projects to its work program. Members also agree subjectivity will naturally exist and cannot be eliminated simply by introducing a numerical approach. Each proposal will be considered objectively. Furthermore, a level of professional judgement is necessary for respondents and the IPSASB did not want to discourage against this by being prescriptive in how respondents should apply the project prioritization criteria.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.3

<p>4. Ms. Attia asked whether Appendix A projects are already set, and whether the IPSASB intends to allow respondents to suggest changes to the list in Appendix A or only suggest new projects. She advised the IPSASB include an FAQ to help constituents respond to the consultation.</p>	<p>The 'Previously Suggested Project' document is supplemental material developed by IPSASB Staff to support in responding to the consultation. It is not necessary to review the supporting document when responding to the consultation.</p> <p>This document will be updated for the IPSASB's reference to reflect responses to the consultation and to maintain the list of all projects proposed.</p> <p>See response to comment 3 related to developing material to help constituents apply the project prioritization criteria.</p>
<p>5. Ms. Buljubasic supported the open approach, as it allows stakeholders, particularly those in developing regions, to suggest projects that address their needs. She advised the IPSASB use prompts in the consultation document to remind respondents to raise implementation and emerging issues, and to provide an FAQ or illustrative examples to help respondents understand how they are to apply the prioritization criteria.</p>	<p>See response to comment 3 related to developing material to help constituents apply the project prioritization criteria.</p>
<p>6. Ms. Colignon advised the IPSASB to update the SMCs to specifically refer to the optional template.</p>	<p>The Work Program Consultation has been updated to indicate the template is optional and 'Respondents are encouraged to use the following format to explain each project they recommend the IPSASB add to its future Work Program'.</p>
<p>The CAG members commented on Question 3 as follows:</p>	
<p>7. Ms. Weinberg suggested the IPSASB add projects related to budget reporting and social insurance liabilities.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026. However IPSAS 24 already covers budget reporting.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.3

<p>8. Mr. Close recommended the IPSASB take on a project to revisit IPSAS 35, <i>Consolidated Financial Statements</i>, and consider adding guidance regarding parliamentary consolidated reporting. He also suggested the IPSASB develop guidance for budgeting and what should be included in the budget, as there is currently diversity in practice on traceability of capital expenditure, linkages between financial and economic information, treatment of contingency reserves, etc.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p>
<p>9. Mr. Williamson questioned whether the suggested projects on RPG 1, <i>Reporting on the Long-Term Sustainability of an Entity's Finances</i> and RPG 2, <i>Financial Statement Discussion and Analysis</i> could be considered on a government program basis. Such work could help organize information around financial and sustainability information, which promotes accountability and would be a shorter step to integrating this information into budget presentation. He also advised the IPSASB to consider developing guidance similar to IFRS for SMEs that could help developing or smaller jurisdictions with adoption and implementation.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p> <p>The IPSASB explored the development of a Differential Reporting model for the public sector in response to the constituents' feedback to the 2021 Mid-Period Work Program Consultation. At the September 2023 meeting, after deliberation the findings from this research and scoping activities, the IPSASB concluded that a non-standard setting solution would more effectively address the public sector need. A formal feedback statement was published in January 2024.</p>
<p>10. Ms. Dar suggested the IPSASB expand the IPSAS 31, <i>Intangible Assets</i> project to include cloud computing, digital assets, and cryptocurrency. She also asked whether the IPSASB's potential RPG 1 project could bridge sustainability and financial reporting information, address user needs, and provide forward-looking long-term sustainability information to improve transparency.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.3

<p>11. Ms. Attia concurred with Ms. Dar's suggestion, and noted that the intangible assets project could also include blockchain, and investments in technology. She encouraged the IPSASB to conduct a PIR on IPSAS 24, to determine whether it should be updated to address budget issues, and whether it should be a mandatory Standard.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p>
<p>12. Ms. Sanz Redrado noted that of the projects in Appendix A, RPG 2, alignment with IAS 37, <i>Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets</i>, and better communication in financial reporting are the highest priority for the EU. She suggested the IPSASB also undertake a PIR on IPSAS 41, <i>Financial Instruments</i>, to determine whether this standard based on private sector guidance is working as intended in the public sector, for example in applying judgement to account for guarantees.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p>
<p>13. Mr. Braham suggested a project on IPSAS 42, <i>Social Benefits</i> because the incremental information obtained through application of this Standard does not appear to be worth the effort from a cost-benefit perspective. He also agreed with the suggestion to consider a project on IPSAS 35, as it not widely used due to issues around the concept of control.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.3

<p>14. Ms. Faye suggested additional projects that would support development finance issues. For example, a project to align with IAS 37 guidance would help clarify how governments and funding organizations should account for the flow and changes in flow of development aid funds (for example governments issuing funding recognize contingent liabilities for funds they are to provide, but organizations receiving the funding do not recognize contingent assets related to this same funding). Ms. Faye noted that a project to update IPSAS 31 could also consider whether government expenses to increase capacity and human development may qualify as intangible assets to reflect the long term benefits of such spending. Lastly, she suggested the IPSASB consider whether a project on RPG 2 is an opportunity to bridge the gap between budgetary reporting and IPSAS financial statements, and encourage wider adoption and integration into program-based budgeting and service delivery.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p>
<p>15. Mr. Smith Mansilla suggested a PIR on IPSAS 32, <i>Service Concession Arrangements: Grantor</i>, which has been effective for 10 years, to understand application issues that have led to diversity in practice between government entities and private partners.</p>	<p>Noted by IPSASB Staff. Analyzing which projects to add to the future work program will occur in 2026.</p>
<p>16. Mr. Melo noted that the IPSASB has developed a robust, but complex framework, based on principles. He suggests the IPSASB not undertake development of any new IPSAS Standards but instead focus on clarifying and supporting implementation of its existing Standards.</p>	<p>This is consistent with the IPSASB 2024-2028 Strategy whereby the IPSASB has reallocated resources to place more emphasis on the maintenance of IPSAS Standards, including Post Implementation Reviews and the IPSASB Application Group.</p>

Agenda Item 2.2.3

17. Ms. Raboy shared a recent study on IPSAS adoption in various countries, highlighting that governments often adapt IPSAS Standards, using modifications to serve specific jurisdictional needs and characteristics. This leads to complexities in adopting IPSAS Standards, which could impede comparability across jurisdictions, and emphasizes the importance of the IPSASB's PIR work. Ms. Raboy emphasized that the IPSASB has established a robust and extensive framework, and that the feedback from the consultation can help the IPSASB refine its Standards to better meet the implementation needs of its users.	Noted by IPSASB Staff.
---	------------------------

Matters for CAG Consideration

2. Representatives and Observers are asked to note the Report Back above.