IPSASB International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board®

70 York Street Suite 710, Toronto, ON M5J 1S9
T + 1 (647) 826-3171
www.ipsasb.org

Meeting: International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board

Meeting Date: March 10th-13th, 2025

Agenda Item 6

MAKING MATERIALITY JUDGMENTS: IPSAS FINANCIAL REPORTING PRACTICE STATEMENT– NARROW SCOPE PROJECT

Project summary	Develop public sector non-authoritative guidance on making materiality judgments when preparing financial statements (in accordance with IPSAS Standards) aligned with IFRS® Practice Statement 2: *Making Materiality Judgements* (narrow scope project)	
Meeting objective	Approval of [draft] ED XX, IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments*	
Project staff lead[s]	• Agustina Llambi, Principal	
Task Force members	N/A - Task Force resources are not necessary for this project	
	Topic	***Agenda Item***
Essential Documents (Required Reading)	Guidance on Primary Users in [draft] ED XX	6.A.1
	Public Sector MMJ Examples	6.A.2
	Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors	6.A.3
	Type of Document for MMJ Guidance	6.A.4
	Development of [draft] ED	6.A.5
	[draft] ED XX, IPSAS Practice Statement: *MMJ*	6.A.6
	Approval of [draft] ED XX	6.A.7
Supporting Documents (Posted Separately on Meeting Page)	MMJ: IPSAS Financial Reporting Practice Statement Dashboard	6.B.1
	Process to Develop [draft] ED XX and Adapt Private Sector Guidance (Adaptation and Concurrence Tables)	6.B.2
	Other December 2025 Instructions	6.B.3
Background Information (Available on the project webpage)	Decisions and Instructions from previous IPSASB Meetings	
	December 2025 CAG Report Back	
	Due Process Checklist	
	Project Timeline	

Prepared by: Agustina Llambi (February 2026)

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.

Guidance on Primary Users in [draft] ED XX

Question

1. Does the IPSASB agree with the proposed adaptation to guidance on 'Primary Users and their Information Needs' in [draft] ED XX?

Recommendation

2. Staff recommend that the IPSASB approve the adapted guidance on 'Primary Users and their Information Needs' in [draft] ED XX, as proposed in paragraph 9.

Context

3. In December 2025, the IPSASB discussed the proposed approach to develop public sector guidance aligned with non-mandatory guidance in IFRS Practice Statement 2: *Making Materiality Judgements* (PS2). The section on 'Primary Users and their Information Needs' was not discussed then and target for discussion at this meeting.

4. This paper is intended to facilitate the discussion on public sector adaptations regarding 'Primary Users and their Information Needs'.

Analysis

Scope

5. Phase 2 of the Making Materiality Judgments (MMJ) project brief objective is to develop guidance on making materiality judgments when preparing General Purpose Financial Statements (GPFS) in accordance with IPSAS Standards, by adapting PS2 to the public sector context using the IPSASB's Process for Reviewing and Adapting IASB Documents.

Adaptation Process for 'Primary Users and their Information Needs' Section

6. The non-mandatory guidance in PS2 is based on existing principles in the International Accounting Standards Board's Conceptual Framework and IFRS Accounting Standards and explains how to make materiality judgments based on these.

7. Staff identified three National Standard Setters (NSS)[1] that have adapted PS2 to their public sector context. Consistent with PS2, the guidance on applying the concept of materiality to primary users and their information needs is based on their Conceptual Framework and Accounting Standards.

8. Similar to PS2, this project aims to provide guidance that helps entities apply materiality when preparing financial statements in accordance with IPSAS Standards based on existing principles in the Conceptual Framework and IPSAS Standards. Therefore, the development of non-authoritative guidance on making materiality judgments for the public sector will consider consistency with the Conceptual Framework (CF) and IPSAS® Accounting Standards.

9. The table below summarizes the guidance in PS2 and the adaptations proposed by staff in developing public sector guidance on 'Primary Users and their Information Needs' for [draft] ED XX:

[1] The Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB) – link, Singapore Accounting Standards for Statutory Boards – link, and Accounting Standard Board (ASB) – link.

Subsection	Guidance in PS2	Guidance Proposed in [draft] ED XX
Primary Users	It identifies the primary users of an entity's financial statements—such as existing and potential investors, lenders, and other creditors—and notes other parties who might benefit from them but for whom the financial statements are not necessarily prepared.	To adapt PS2 guidance to the public sector context, staff propose reflecting that the primary users, as described in the CF, are service recipients and their representatives, and resource providers and their representatives. Primary users in the public sector include a broader range of users than in the private sector. To help entities apply materiality, one NSS provided an example of how to identify primary users, while another NSS added a section offering guidance on identifying primary users and included examples from the public sector context. To assist entities, staff proposes adding an example (Example G in Agenda Item 6.A.6) to illustrate a specific fact pattern for how a public sector entity identifies its primary users. Additionally, the subsection on the information needs of primary users covers those of specific service recipients and resource providers.
Existing and Potential	It highlights that focusing on the information needs of existing primary users rather than both existing and potential users would be inappropriate. The guidance is illustrated by an example.	Staff proposes deleting this guidance because the primary users described in the CF do not include 'potential' service recipients and their representatives, and resource providers and their representatives.
Reasonable Knowledge	It notes that primary users are expected to have a reasonable knowledge of business and economic activities	This guidance is applicable to the public sector. Staff proposes retaining it and making editorial revisions.

Primary Users Information Needs	It notes that the primary users of an entity's financial statements make decisions about providing resources to the entity, and because of this, they need information such as the entity's resources, claims against it, and changes in those resources and claims.	To adapt PS2 guidance to the public sector context, staff propose reflecting that in the public sector the primary users information needs are about the discharge of accountability of the entity by holding it accountable for the resources entrusted to it, as well as decisions about the performance of the entity during the reporting period, the entity's ability to meet its obligations as they become due, and an entity's ability to continue to provide services currently provide and other operations over the long term.

10. For the exact guidance proposed, refer to Agenda Item 6.A.6 paragraphs 13 to 24 of the [draft] ED XX.

Decision Required

11. Does the IPSASB agree with the guidance on 'Primary Users and their Information Needs' proposed by staff in [draft] ED XX?

Public Sector Making Materiality Judgments Examples

Question

1. Does the IPSASB agree with the proposed new examples and adaptations to existing examples to illustrate the application of materiality in the public sector?

Recommendation

2. Staff recommend that the IPSASB approve the inclusion in the [draft] ED XX of the proposed:

   (a) New examples, see paragraph 9(a)-9(c), and

   (b) Adaptations to existing examples to improve the relevance of the fact pattern to public sector entities, see paragraph 9(d).

Context

3. In December 2025, the IPSASB discussed the proposed approach to adapt the examples in IFRS Practice Statement 2: *Making Materiality Judgements* (PS2) to the public sector context following the IPSASB Process for Reviewing and Adapting IASB Documents (Adaptation Process).

4. This paper is intended to facilitate the discussion on developing new examples and making further adaptations of examples to reflect the CAG advice received by the IPSASB in December 2025 and the IPSASB December 2025 instructions related to examples.

Analysis

5. The IPSASB's Adaptation Process notes that additional public sector examples may need to be added, and clearly inappropriate or inapplicable examples to the public sector should be deleted when adapting an International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) document.

CAG Advice—December 2025

6. Staff engaged the CAG in December 2025 to obtain their input about challenges faced by entities in making materiality judgments that might require examples to be added in [draft] ED XX, as well as examples[2] from their perspective or the perspective of their jurisdictions.

7. CAG members highlighted that materiality judgments examples in the public sector differ from the private sector, noting that:

   (a) Quantitative factors alone are often insufficient because primary users' information needs are about service potential, program outcomes, and public interest issues; and

   (b) Identifying primary users is context-dependent and can be complex because it might not be a homogeneous group, given the wide range of resource providers and service recipients.

---

[2] Examples on identification of primary users, primary users' information needs, and recognition and measurement requirements in IPSAS Standards.

IPSASB Instructions—December 2025

8. In December 2025, the IPSASB instructed staff to develop specific examples and suggest further adaptations to existing ones to better address public sector issues when making materiality judgments. The examples should illustrate:

   (a) Decision to capitalize an item of property, plant, and equipment based on a qualitative factor rather than a quantitative one;

   (b) Materiality judgments on classification and presentation of financial statements elements;

   (c) Adapt certain examples considered too specific and with limited relevance to a wider set of jurisdictions/entities[3]:

Proposed Way Forward

9. Considering the advice from CAG members and the IPSASB's December 2025 instructions, staff recommends including the following examples and/or further adaptations to existing examples:

   (a) An example where an entity with an accounting policy to expense items of property, plant, and equipment (PPE) below a specified threshold decides to recognize the asset, considering a qualitative factor (Example B in Agenda Item 6.A.6).

   (b) An example illustrating an entity cannot reduce its disclosures to the information needs of one of its primary users; rather, it should focus on the information needs of the entity's identified primary users as a whole (Example H in Agenda Item 6.A.6).

   (c) An example where an entity with an accounting policy to aggregate expenses of a similar nature below a specified threshold decides to separately present such expenses, considering a qualitative factor (Example E in Agenda Item 6.A.6).

   (d) Adaptations to the specific examples are proposed to enhance the relevance of terminology to the public sector and relevance across jurisdictions. (Example F and Example K in Agenda Item 6.A.6)

Decision Required

10. Does the IPSASB agree with the new examples and adaptations to existing examples proposed by staff in [draft] ED XX?

[3] Example C—Materiality Judgments that Lead to the Disclosure of Information in Addition to the Specific Disclosure Requirements in IPSAS Standards and Example G—Information that is Material According to IPSAS Standards not Required by Laws and Regulations from Agenda Item 7.3.3 of the IPSASB December 2025 Meeting. These are Example F and Example K of Agenda Item 6.A.6, respectively.

Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors

Question

1. Does the IPSASB agree with the proposed enhancements to the 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' section?

Recommendation

2. Staff recommends that the IPSASB:

   (a) Maintains the adapted content and its order of the Section as discussed in the December 2025 IPSAS meeting; and

   (b) Enhances the 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' section by highlighting the specific circumstance mentioned in the Conceptual Framework, as noted in paragraph 9.

Context

3. In December 2025, the IPSASB instructed staff to:

   (a) Adapt the section 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' to reflect the prevalence of qualitative considerations in the public sector when making materiality judgments; and

   (b) Adapt examples in the section 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' to reflect the prevalence of qualitative considerations.

4. This paper is intended to facilitate the discussion on enhancing the guidance in [draft] ED XX around the interaction of qualitative and quantitative factors when making materiality judgments.

Analysis

Guidance in PS2 on the Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors

5. IFRS Practice Statement 2: *Making Materiality Judgements* (PS2) notes that an entity might find it helpful to follow a systematic process in making materiality judgments when preparing financial statements and illustrates one possible way to make materiality judgments. The materiality process identifies four sequential steps: identify, assess, organize, and review. The section 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' is included in step 2—assess.

6. Step 2 of PS2 notes that an entity might conclude that an item of information is material for various reasons, such as the item's nature or size, or a combination of both. PS2 notes that making materiality judgments involves both quantitative and qualitative considerations. The guidance in PS2 clarifies that it would not be appropriate for the entity to rely solely on numerical guidelines or to apply a uniform quantitative threshold for materiality. It provides guidance and examples illustrating that:

   (a) Initially assessing materiality from a quantitative perspective could be an efficient approach.

   (b) The presence of a qualitative factor lowers the thresholds for the quantitative assessment.

   (c) In some circumstances, an item of information could reasonably be expected to influence primary users' decisions regardless of its size, noting that a quantitative threshold could even be reduced to zero.

7. Staff identified three National Standard Setters (NSS) that have adapted PS2 to their public sector context. The guidance on the 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' section of two of the three NSS is consistent with PS2[4]. One NSS[5] has revised the guidance and its order to give greater prominence to qualitative factors when an entity makes materiality judgments.

Relevant IPSASB Guidance on Materiality

8. The guidance about the interaction of qualitative and quantitative factors in PS2, discussed in paragraph 6, is consistent with guidance in IPSAS 1, *Presentation of Financial Statements*. IPSAS 1 notes that whether information is material depends on the nature and amount of the item judged in the particular circumstances of each entity[6]. It does not consider one factor to be more prevalent than the other. This is because whether information is material is a matter of judgment and depends on the facts involved and the circumstances of a specific entity.

9. The Conceptual Framework highlights a specific circumstance where information may be deemed material due to its nature, regardless of the amounts involved. This includes disclosure of information about compliance or non-compliance with legislation, regulation, or other authorities[7]. PS2 includes guidance noting this possibility, as noted in paragraph 6(c).

Proposed Path Forward

10. When considering further adaptations to the 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' section, staff notes guidance in [draft] ED XX:

    (a) [draft]Is consistent with the principles in the Conceptual Framework and IPSAS 1, as discussed in paragraphs 8-9, and the scope of Phase 2 of the MMJ project brief.

    (b) Offers an efficient and effective way to make materiality judgments, the Four-Step Materiality Process. However, it is one potential way, rather than the only way, to assess materiality.

    (c) Includes new examples illustrating that information might be material based solely on its nature. See Agenda Item 6.A.2

11. To better reflect the public sector in the guidance within the 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' section, the drafting in [draft] ED XX has been improved, highlighting the specific circumstance mentioned in the Conceptual Framework, as noted in paragraph 9.

Decision Required

12. Does the IPSASB agree to maintain the content and order of the guidance in the 'Interaction of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors' while highlighting that compliance or non-compliance with legislation, regulation, or other authorities may be considered material due to its nature?

---

4 Consistent with the IPSASB's Process for Reviewing and Adapting IASB Documents, the Australian Accounting Standards Board and the Singapore Accounting Standards for Statutory Boards have made adaptations for consistency with their Conceptual Frameworks and accounting standards.

5 The South Africa Accounting Standard Board, paragraphs 5.20 to 5.25 of Guidelines on The Application of Materiality to Financial Statements.

6 These are amendments included in the *Definition of Material* (Amendments to IPSAS 1, IPSAS 3, and the Conceptual Framework). See paragraph 12.A in IPSAS 1.

7 See paragraph 3.33 of the *Conceptual Framework*.

Type of Document for MMJ Guidance

Question

1. Does the IPSASB agree with staff recommendation to issue guidance on making materiality judgments when preparing financial statements in accordance with IPSAS Standards as a new type of document?

Recommendation

2. Staff recommend that the IPSASB approve the non-mandatory guidance on making materiality judgments as an IPSAS Practice Statement.

Context

3. When the IPSASB approved the project brief, in March 2025, it identified the type of document for the issuance of the guidance as a key issue to be discussed in the development of [draft] ED XX.

4. This paper is intended to facilitate the discussion on the type of document with which non-authoritative guidance on “Making materiality judgments when preparing financial statements (GPFS) in accordance with IPSAS Standards” should be issued, considering the IPSASB’s ecosystem.

Analysis

5. In the project brief, the IPSASB agreed that the guidance will not be authoritative in nature and will be within the scope of due process. Considering this, the guidance could be published in the existing IPSASB literature (non-authoritative guidance within an IPSAS Standard or a new Recommended Practice Guidelines (RPG)) or as a new type of document.

Nature of PS2 Guidance

6. IFRS Practice Statement 2: *Making Materiality Judgements* (PS2) is a stand-alone document that provides reporting entities with non-mandatory guidance on making materiality judgments when preparing general purpose financial statements in accordance with IFRS Standards. The guidance does not change any requirements in IFRS Standards or introduce any new requirements.

7. The IASB decided to issue the guidance in a stand-alone document to provide guidance on how to make materiality judgments in the form of a non-mandatory Practice Statement because:

   (a) Issuing mandatory requirements in an IFRS Standard risks seeming prescriptive, potentially undermining entities' need to apply judgment when assessing materiality; and

   (b) Issuing guidance as a separate non-mandatory document, instead of as implementation guidance supporting a specific IFRS Standard like IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements*, would emphasize that materiality is pervasive across IFRS Standards.

8. National Standard Setters (NSS) that have adapted PS2 to their jurisdictional context have taken a consistent approach to the IASB and issued stand-alone documents[8] that provide non-mandatory guidance[9], which is based on existing principles of its accounting standards.

IPSASB's Adaptation Approach

9. The IPSASB's Process for Reviewing and Adapting IASB Documents does not outline what type of IPSASB document an IFRS Practice Statement[10] should be issued in.

Analysis of the Type of Document

10. When considering if guidance should be included in an existing IPSASB document, staff notes that:

    (a) Including the guidance as non-authoritative guidance in an IPSAS Standard, such as IPSAS 1, *Presentation of Financial Statements*, where the definition of material information is included, will fail to emphasize the pervasiveness of the concept of materiality throughout IPSAS Standards. This is because an entity makes materiality judgments when deciding on recognition, measurement, presentation, and disclosure across IPSAS Standards. This is consistent with the IASB's approach.

    (b) Issuing the guidance as a new RPG would conflict with the role of RPGs in the IPSASB's reporting landscape. These are non-authoritative pronouncements that provide guidance on good practices in preparing GPFR that are not financial statements[11]. The guidance under development aims to provide guidance when applying materiality in preparing GPFS in accordance with IPSAS Standards, and its application is not required to state compliance with IPSAS Standards.

11. Considering the scope of the project, to develop aligned guidance to PS2, staff recommends that the IPSASB issue the guidance as an IPSAS Practice Statement consistent with the approach used by the IASB and NSS. Creating a new type of IPSASB document:

    (a) Allows the IPSASB to establish the scope and authority of the guidance, in this case, non-mandatory guidance, that does not change requirements in IPSAS Standards nor introduce new ones, and be explicit that application of guidance in ED 97 is not required to state compliance with IPSAS Standards.

    (b) Helps emphasize that the concept of materiality is pervasive throughout IPSAS Standards, as the guidance will be issued in a stand-alone document, fit for purpose.

    (c) It is consistent with the MMJ project scope and explains why the IPSASB undertook the project: to address the needs of IPSASB stakeholders for public sector guidance aligned with PS2.

Decision Required

12. Does the IPSASB agree to issue [draft] ED XX as a new type of IPSASB document?

---

8 The Australian Accounting Standards Board – link, Singapore Accounting Standards for Statutory Boards – link, and Accounting Standard Board (ASB) – link.

9 ASB issued its adaptation of PS2 as a Guideline, which is not explicit on whether the guidance in it is non-mandatory. However, it notes that the guidelines do not replace or amend the principles in Generally Recognised Accounting Practice.

10 When the IPSASB developed RPG 2, *Financial Statement Discussion and Analysis*, it decided not to develop guidance converged with IFRS Practice Statement 1: *Management Commentary*.

11 Consistent with paragraph 21 of IPSAS 1, RPGs are not part of a complete set of financial statements.

Development of ED

Question

1. Does the IPSASB agree with staff recommendation on the development of the [draft] ED XX, IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments*?

Recommendation

2. Staff recommend that the IPSASB approve the following items made during the development of [draft] ED XX:

   (a) Proposed introduction to IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments*;

   (b) Proposed non-mandatory guidance on making materiality judgments when preparing financial statements in accordance with IPSAS Standards; and

   (c) Proposed SMCs.

Context

3. This paper is intended to facilitate the discussion of the reminder items requiring the approval of IPSASB on the development of [draft] ED XX, such as:

   (a) Review and approval of the introduction section, considering the IPSASB's decision on Agenda Item 6.A.4; and

   (b) The approval of proposed non-mandatory guidance in [draft] ED XX, SMCs and the Basis for Conclusions.

Analysis

4. Staff recommend that the IPSASB approve the following items developed during the development of [draft] ED XX, see Agenda Item 6.A.6:

   (a) Introduction outlining the role and authority of the guidance in this IPSAS Practice Statement, consistent with the project scope and analysis in Agenda Item 6.A.4;

   (b) Proposed non-mandatory guidance on making materiality judgments when preparing financial statements in accordance with IPSAS Standards, as discussed with the IPSASB:

      (i) The development of such guidance was discussed with the IPSASB in Agenda Item 7 of the December 2025 IPSASB meeting, and this Agenda Item, see Agenda Item 6.B.2, for a detailed process on the development of [draft] ED XX.

      (ii) Staff has actioned IPSASB's December 2025 Decisions and Instructions:

         a. As discussed in Agenda Item 6.A.2 and Agenda Item 6.A.3;

         b. Analyzed the inclusion of guidance in [draft] ED XX about the interaction of materiality with the approved budget. Staff notes that this is outside the scope of

this project, because the approved budget is not a financial statement[12], and providing guidance on how materiality interacts with the approved budget is beyond the IPSASB's responsibilities and could conflict with local budgetary requirements; and

c. Analyzed the inclusion of guidance on funding conditions in the 'Information on Covenants' section under Specific Topics of [draft] ED XX. Staff notes that, although covenants are contractual, funding conditions may or may not be contractual. Therefore, developing guidance on materiality judgments on funding conditions goes beyond the narrow scope of this project, as approved in the MMJ Project Brief.

(iii) In addition to the examples discussed in Agenda Item 6.A.2, staff proposes adding Example C—Materiality Judgments on the Application of Accounting Policies. This example illustrates applying materiality to measurement principles in IPSAS Standards, specifically when using an alternative method like simple interest instead of effective interest rate in IPSAS 41, *Financial Instruments*. This example is proposed for inclusion, based on IPSASB's discussion during the Education Session on PS2 at the June 2025 IPSASB meeting, where an additional example applying materiality to measurement principles in IPSAS Standards was requested.

(iv) Proposed Basis for Conclusions.

(c) Include two Specific Matters for Comments (SMC), asking whether respondents:

(i) **SMC 1**. Agree with how the IPSASB adapted Practice Statement 2 guidance for the public sector context; and

(ii) **SMC 2**. Find the examples in [draft] ED XX on applying the concept of materiality when preparing financial statements in accordance with IPSAS Standards helpful, and whether additional ones are needed.

Decision Required

5. Does the IPSASB agree with how staff developed non-mandatory guidance in [draft] ED XX?

[12] An approved budget is not a financial statement. However, entities that make their approved budget(s) publicly available are required to comply with the requirements of IPSAS 24, *Presentation of Budget Information in Financial Statements,* and include a comparison of budget and actual amounts with their financial statements.

[draft] ED XX, IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments*

1. The [draft] ED XX, IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments* is posted separately for easier readability.

Review instructions

2. IPSASB members, Technical Advisors, and Observers are asked to note the following when reviewing [draft] ED XX.

   (a) For readability purposes, this supporting document does not include track changes;

   (b) Incremental adaptations from those discussed with the IPSASB at the December 2025 IPSASB meeting are highlighted in grey; and

   (c) IPSASB members are welcome to provide editorial comments to staff offline by Friday, March 20th, 2026.

Approval of [draft] ED XX, IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments*

Question

1. Does the IPSASB agree to approve [draft] ED XX, IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments*, with a 120-day exposure period?

Recommendation

2. Staff recommend that the IPSASB approve:

   (a) [draft] ED XX for exposure (see Agenda item 6.A.6); and

   (b) Expose [draft] ED XX for a 120-day exposure period.

Context

3. This paper is intended to facilitate the formal voting process to approve the ED for exposure.

Analysis

Due Process

4. The *Making Materiality Judgments* (MMJ) project commenced with the formal approval of the MMJ Project Brief in March 2025. The scope of Phase 2 included the development of an ED aligned with IFRS Practice Statement 2: *Making Materiality Judgements* (PS2), adapted to the public sector context.

5. The proposed adaptations to PS2 were presented to the IPSASB for its consideration in Agenda Item 7 of the December 2025 IPSASB Meeting and in this Agenda Item. Its development is consistent with the project's scope, as outlined in the MMJ project brief, and consistent with the IPSASB's Process for Reviewing and Adapting IASB Documents.

ED Title

6. Staff propose that the IPSASB use the title "Exposure Draft 97, IPSAS Practice Statement: *Making Materiality Judgments*" consistent with the type of guidance and document, based on the analysis in Agenda Item 6.A.4.

Exposure Period

7. Staff have not identified any reason to depart from the ordinary exposure period of 120 days as stated in the IPSASB's Due Process and Working Procedures.

Decision Required

8. Does the IPSASB agree to approve [draft] ED XX for a 120-day exposure period?