

Meeting: International Public Sector Accounting
Standards Board

Meeting Date: June 9-11, 2026

Agenda Item 6

WORK PROGRAM CONSULTATION

Project summary	The project objective is to perform a limited-scope public consultation during 2025 on projects to add to the IPSASB's future Work Program.	
Meeting objective	Review Responses to the Work Program Consultation and provide Staff direction for September 2026 IPSASB meeting.	
Project staff lead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sayja Barton, Principal 	
	Topic	Agenda Item
Essential Documents (Required Reading)	Overview of Responses to Work Program Consultation	6.A.1
	Review of Responses to SMC 2 – Key Themes	6.A.2
	Review of Responses to SMC 3 – Key Themes	6.A.3
	Review of Responses to SMC 1 – Key Themes & Breakout Group Discussion	6.A.4
Supporting Documents (Posted separately on the meeting webpage)	Work Program Consultation Dashboard	6.B.1
	Supporting Document 1 – WPC: Analysis of Respondents by Region, Function, Language and List of Respondents	6.B.2
	Supporting Document 2 – WPC: Specific Matters for Comment	6.B.3
	Supporting Document 3 – IPSASB Project Prioritization Criteria	6.B.4
	Supporting Document 4 – Report Back from Regional Roundtables	6.B.5
	Supporting Document 5 – Additional Financial Reporting Projects Recommended (SMC 1)	6.B.6
	Supporting Document 6 – Additional Post Implementation Review Topics Recommended (SMC 2)	6.B.7
	Supporting Document 7 – Additional Sustainability Reporting Projects Recommended (SMC 3)	6.B.8

Prepared by: Sayja Barton (May 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.

	Supporting Document 8 – Additional Staff Analysis on SMC 2 Themes	6.B.9
	Supporting Document 9 – Additional Staff Analysis on SMC 3 Themes	6.B.10
	Supporting Document 10 – Additional Respondent Feedback on Themes	6.B.11
	Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes	6.B.12
	Supporting Document 12 – Overview of Breakout Groups	6.B.13
Background Information (Available on the project webpage)	Decisions and Instructions up to previous IPSASB Meeting	
	Due Process Checklist	
	Project Timeline	

Overview of Responses to Work Program Consultation

Purpose

1. To provide IPSASB members with an overview of the feedback received from respondents to the work program consultation (WPC or Consultation) and general considerations to keep in mind when reviewing Agenda Items [6.A.2](#), [6.A.3](#), and [6.A.4](#) to assist with Board session and Breakout Group discussions.

Context

2. In the fall of 2024, the IPSASB released its [2024-2028 Strategy and Work Program](#) (Strategy). In the Strategy, the Board committed that as resources became available, the Board would consult with stakeholders, to understand their greatest needs in relation to financial reporting projects, post implementation reviews (PIRs) and sustainability reporting projects.
3. The Board anticipated that resources would begin to become available in late 2026/early 2027, and issued the [Work Program Consultation](#) to gather this feedback from stakeholders in October 2025. The Consultation was open for comment for a 201-day period.
4. The Consultation asked stakeholders to provide their views on three specific matters for comment (SMCs)¹ in regard to which financial reporting projects (SMC 1), PIRs (SMC 2) and sustainability reporting projects (SMC 3) the Board should prioritize adding to its Work Program when resources become available.
5. The Consultation asked stakeholders to use the IPSASB's Project Prioritization Criteria² to clearly explain their assessment of each project recommendation against these criteria, as the Board will use these criteria when determining which projects to add to the Work Program.

Analysis

Feedback received

6. As part of the consultation process, the Board sought feedback from stakeholders in a variety of ways including through written responses, regional roundtables, and discussions at the Public Sector Standards Setters Forum.

Written responses

7. In terms of written responses, the IPSASB received 28 comment letters from a diverse group of constituents, both from regional and functional perspectives³. Many respondents provided feedback on all three SMCs, while others only focused on one or two SMCs.

¹ Supporting Document 2 in Agenda Item [6.B.3](#) includes the detailed wording of the three SMCs.

² Supporting Document 3 in Agenda Item [6.B.4](#) includes the detailed wording of the IPSASB Project Prioritization Criteria.

³ Supporting Document 1 in Agenda Item [6.B.2](#) includes an analysis of respondents by region, function and language. It also includes the list of respondents. Comment letters received by the IPSASB are available on the public website: [IPSASB 2025 Work Program Consultation](#).

Agenda Item 6.A.1

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

8. Overall, respondents' recommendations for the IPSASB in terms of financial reporting projects, PIRs and sustainability reporting projects covered a wide range of topics.
9. Agenda Items [6.A.2](#), [6.A.3](#), and [6.A.4](#) summarize the key themes in the respondents' recommendations for each of SMC 2, SMC 3, and SMC 1 respectively. Note that the feedback received on SMC 1 will be discussed last during the Board meeting session as this feedback will be part of the Breakout Group discussions.

Regional Roundtables

10. The following five regional roundtables were held from October 2025 through April 2026:

Roundtable	Location	Date	# of Participants	# of Organizations	# of Countries
Middle East & North Africa	Riyadh, Saudi Arabia	Oct 1, 2025	72	43	15
Latin America	Santiago, Chile	Oct 15, 2025	64	28	19
Forum of Firms	Madrid, Spain	Oct 30, 2025	16	16	13
Africa	Johannesburg, South Africa	Mar 25, 2026	209	79	22
Asia	Virtual	Apr 28 & 30, 2026	59	27	25

11. During the roundtables participants were asked to share their views on which financial reporting projects, PIRs and sustainability reporting projects the Board should prioritize adding to its Work Program to meet their greatest needs.
12. Consistent with the written feedback, a wide range of projects were recommended. The details of the recommendations received from each roundtable are included in Supporting Document 4 – Report Back from Regional Roundtables⁴.
13. This feedback has been included in the analysis of the key themes for each SMC in Agenda Items [6.A.2](#), [6.A.3](#), and [6.A.4](#).

Public Sector Standards Setter Forum (PSSSF)

14. Immediately prior to its September 2025 Board meeting, the IPSASB held its 5th Public Sector Standards Setters Forum (PSSSF or the Forum) in Lisbon, Portugal from September 7-9th. The Forum focused on listening to regional priorities from public sector standard setters from around the world. Feedback was provided through a series of presentations, roundtables and direct engagement with the Board.
15. This feedback has been included in the analysis of the key themes for each SMC in in Agenda Items [6.A.2](#), [6.A.3](#), and [6.A.4](#).

⁴ Supporting Document 4 in Agenda Item [6.B.5](#) includes the most suggested topics for financial reporting projects, PIRs and sustainability reporting projects as well as a complete list of participant responses by roundtable.

General Considerations

Resources

16. As was outlined in the Consultation, the Board has limited resources to take on new projects. Based on current resources and the current Work Program⁵, it is expected the Board can undertake up to two new projects. This includes both financial reporting and sustainability reporting projects. It however does not include PIRs as there are already separate resources allocated in the Work Program for PIRs.
17. It is expected that:
 - a. Resources to take on one new financial reporting project will become available in late 2026/early 2027 as multiple financial reporting projects wrap up; and
 - b. Resources to take on one new sustainability reporting project will become available in late 2027/early 2028 as the Climate-related Disclosures: Public Policy Outcomes project concludes.

Timing

18. As will be seen in the discussions in Agenda Items [6.A.2](#), [6.A.3](#), and [6.A.4](#), some of the projects recommended by respondents are impacted by ongoing IASB or ISSB projects. The timing of completion of those projects could impact the timing of when the IPSASB would begin related project(s) if alignment with the related IASB or ISSB guidance is to be maintained.

September 2026 Board Meeting

19. Decisions the IPSASB makes during this session of the June 2026 Board meeting will inform staff's recommendations for the September 2026 Board meeting of which financial reporting, PIR and sustainability reporting projects the IPSASB add to the Work Program when resources become available. Staff will consider the interrelationships between the projects proposed and the resources available in developing recommendations for the September 2026 Board meeting.

Recommendation

20. See recommendations for each SMC in Agenda Items [6.A.2](#), [6.A.3](#), and [6.A.4](#).

⁵ Note this may change as Board decisions are made throughout the June 2026 IPSASB meeting.

Review of Response to SMC 2 – Key Themes

Decision Required

1. The IPSASB is required to decide whether they agree with staff's analysis that IPSAS 35, *Consolidated Financial Statements*, is a key priority for respondents for a potential PIR.

Context

2. A post implementation review (PIR) is intended to assess whether the effects of applying the core text and application guidance of an existing IPSAS Standard on primary users of the financial statements, preparers, auditors and regulators are as originally intended by the IPSASB when the Standard was developed.
3. SMC 2 of the Consultation asked respondents which IPSAS Standards are the highest priority for the IPSASB to undertake a PIR on.
4. While there was diversity in the PIR topics suggested by respondents, staff's analysis noted there were two key themes that emerged from the responses to SMC 2:
 - (a) Theme 1: IPSAS 35, *Consolidated Financial Statements*; and
 - (b) Theme 2: IPSAS 18, *Segment Reporting*.
5. For information on:
 - (a) Other PIR topics recommended by participants at the regional roundtables, see Supporting Document 4 (Agenda Item [6.B.5](#)).
 - (b) Other PIR projects recommended by written responses, see Supporting Document 6 (Agenda Item [6.B.7](#)).

Analysis

6. As it relates to PIRs the IPSASB should prioritize, two themes emerged:
 - (a) *Theme 1: IPSAS 35, Consolidated Financial Statements*
 - (i) There was one key theme respondents overwhelmingly supported for a PIR, IPSAS 35, *Consolidated Financial Statements*. A presentation at the IPSASB's PSSSF also focused on the need for a PIR on IPSAS 35. This topic received support from global standard setter participants at the Forum as a need in their jurisdictions. Overall, based on the feedback there is broad support for the IPSASB to undertake a PIR on IPSAS 35.
 - (ii) See full analysis in paragraphs 8-12 below.
 - (b) *Theme 2: IPSAS 18, Segment Reporting*.
 - (i) Respondents also supported the IPSASB undertaking a PIR on IPSAS 18, *Segment Reporting*. Additionally, the need for a PIR of IPSAS 18 was discussed at the IPSASB's PSSSF. Overall, based on the feedback there is some support for the IPSASB to undertake a PIR on IPSAS 18.
 - (ii) However, staff is of the view that at this time it is not appropriate to prioritize a PIR of IPSAS 18 as most respondents' support alignment with IFRS 8, *Operating Segments*

and a request for information for the IASB's Fourth Agenda Consultation, which may result in a project on IFRS 8, has been deferred until 2027.

- (iii) See Supporting Document 8 – Additional Staff Analysis on SMC 2 Themes (Agenda Item [6.B.9](#)) for full analysis.

Other PIR Topics Recommended

- 7. There was a wide variety of additional topics recommended by respondents for PIRs. However, the other PIR topics were raised by only a few respondents, were outside of the Board's agreed upon timeline for undertaking a PIR⁶ and/or consisted of application issues that would be better resolved through the development of educational materials or implementation support (i.e. addressed through IPSASB Explains) instead of changes to the underlying Standard.

Theme 1: IPSAS 35, Consolidated Financial Statements

Project scope

- 8. Respondents generally agreed with the project description for the PIR included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#), which outlined that:
 - (a) The PIR would evaluate the operation of IPSAS 35, *Consolidated Financial Statements*, in practice. Specifically, considering the application of control when defining the perimeter of entities to be consolidated in the public sector and what additional guidance can be provided to clarify its application.
- 9. The majority of respondents cited issues with application of the control criteria as the main reason the Board should undertake a PIR of IPSAS 35. While some respondents noted there are issues with the principles of control in IPSAS 35 and questioned whether they were appropriate for the public sector, a majority of respondents acknowledged it was not a principles issue, but a lack of application guidance / examples about how to apply those principles to complex government organizations in the public sector. Respondents requested the IPSASB perform a PIR on IPSAS 35 to gain a better understanding of the issues with the Standard and develop additional application guidance, illustrative examples and implementation guidance to support application of the control principles.
- 10. Respondents also noted that inconsistent application in practice or lack of adoption of IPSAS 35 in various jurisdictions point to the need for the Board to undertake a PIR. Some respondents noted that amendments were made to IPSAS 35 in their jurisdiction to improve consistency and appropriateness of control assessments in the public sector and a PIR would help the Board understand if other jurisdictions have also experienced challenges in applying the control criteria or made modifications to the standard to address application challenges. This may also help the Board gain an understanding of why some jurisdictions have chosen not to adopt IPSAS 35. Further detail

⁶ The operating procedures for the PIR process note that IPSAS are applied globally, in some cases directly, and in other cases indirectly through a local endorsement process that may require a translation process, and which also may make changes to the IPSAS requirements. Therefore, it takes time for application issues and trends to emerge after the effective date of a standard. Other factors such as the complexity of a new standard, the new standard's extent of changes from an existing standard, and if applicable, the results of PIRs performed by the IASB or national standards setters, could also result in additional time for application issues to emerge. In general, a PIR is not considered until at least five years after the effective date of a standard. However, this timeframe, as well as which standards to prioritize, could be adjusted based on certain considerations.

on respondents' feedback is included in Supporting Document 10 – Additional Respondent Feedback on Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.11](#).

Project prioritization criteria

11. The following provides an overview of staff's assessment of the project prioritization criteria, informed by respondents' analysis for undertaking this PIR. It is noted below whether there have been any changes in the ranking of each criterion compared to the ranking that was originally included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#).
 - (a) **Prevalence** – *Medium (no change)*
 - (b) **Consequences** – *Medium (no change)*
 - (c) **Urgency** – *Medium (increased from Low to Medium)*
 - (i) Ranking increased to medium because there was clear direction from respondents that a PIR is needed to determine whether additional application guidance / examples within the standard, and / or implementation guidance would improve consistency of application and adoption within the public sector, especially as more governments move to adopt IPSAS.
 - (d) **Feasibility** – *Medium (increased from Low to Medium)*
 - (i) Ranking increased to medium for the following reason. Some respondents noted there are issues with the principles of control in IPSAS 35 and questioned whether they were appropriate for the public sector. In terms of feasibility, it may be quite challenging to develop another internationally supported consolidation principle (reason why feasibility previously ranked as low). However, respondents from many jurisdictions acknowledged it is not a principles issue, but a lack of application guidance/ examples about how to apply the principles of control in IPSAS 35 to complex government organizations in the public sector. Gaining a better understanding of stakeholders' challenges in applying the control criteria through a PIR and then adding additional application guidance / illustrative examples and/or developing implementation resources on how to apply the existing control criteria in IPSAS 35 (rather than determining new control criteria) in the public sector increases the feasibility.
12. For Staff's detailed assessment of the project prioritization criteria, refer to Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.12](#).

Recommendation

13. Overall, based on respondents' clear feedback, staff recommend that the Board prioritize IPSAS 35 for a future PIR, informed by the implementation leaders on the FRIF to obtain a better understanding of the issues stakeholders are currently encountering with the guidance in IPSAS 35, specifically around determining control.

Review of Response to SMC 3 – Key Themes

Decision Required

1. The IPSASB is required to decide whether they agree with staff's analysis that general sustainability-related disclosures is a key priority for respondents for a potential sustainability reporting project when resources become available, after the completion of the Climate-related Disclosures: Public Policy Outcomes project.

Context

2. SMC 3 of the Consultation asked respondents which sustainability reporting projects should the IPSASB prioritize.
3. While there was diversity in the sustainability reporting projects recommended by respondents, staff's analysis noted there were two key messages and three key themes that emerged from the responses to SMC 3:
 - (a) Key message 1: Prioritize completion of Climate-related Disclosures: Public Policy Outcomes project;
 - (b) Key message 2: Implementation support needed for IPSASB SRS 1, *Climate-related Disclosures*;
 - (c) Theme 1: General Sustainability-related Disclosures
 - (d) Theme 2: RPG 1 & RPG 3
 - (e) Theme 3: Nature-related Disclosures
4. For information on:
 - (a) Other sustainability reporting projects recommended by participants at the regional roundtables, see Supporting Document 4 (Agenda Item [6.B.5](#)).
 - (b) Other sustainability reporting projects recommended by written responses, see Supporting Document 7 (Agenda Item [6.B.8](#)).

Analysis

5. The first key message relates to the Board's current project Climate-related Disclosures: Public Policy Outcomes. Several respondents stated that the Board should prioritize completing this project before undertaking any additional IPSASB SRS projects, noting that:
 - (a) Public interest is stronger in the area of public policy outcomes than in the area of own operations;
 - (b) For completeness and coherence, it is important that the public sector specific building block of public policy outcomes is addressed in a timely manner to ensure a consistent conceptual approach across future sustainability standards; and
 - (c) Public policy outcomes are central not only to climate-related reporting, but also to other sustainability topics such as health, education and clean water.

Agenda Item 6.A.3

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

6. The second key message related to the need for implementation support for the Board's recently issued IPSASB SRS 1, *Climate-related Disclosures*. Specifically, respondents noted that:
 - (a) Existing materials issued by the ISSB primarily reflect a private sector perspective and may not adequately address public sector specific challenges.
 - (b) The ISSB is prioritizing support and adoption guidance for its IFRS sustainability disclosure standards, it is recommended the IPSASB does the same.
 - (c) Preparing climate-related disclosures will be a new activity for many public sector entities and it is likely to be challenging, particularly in respect of developing systems to collect the appropriate data. Consequently, the IPSASB should, as a priority, develop more application material, drawing on the experience of those public sector bodies that have successfully implemented such reporting.
 - (d) Further work in this area to develop supporting implementation guidance will be crucial to ensure consistent successful adoption of the standard.
7. As it relates to new sustainability reporting projects the IPSASB should prioritize, three themes emerged:
 - (a) *Theme 1: General Sustainability-related Disclosures*
 - (i) There was one key theme respondents overwhelmingly supported for the IPSASB's next sustainability reporting project - general sustainability-related disclosures. Additionally, this topic received support from global standard setter participants at the PSSSF as a need in their jurisdictions. Overall, based on the feedback there is broad support for the IPSASB to undertake a project on general sustainability-related disclosures.
 - (ii) See full analysis in paragraphs 8-13 below.
 - (b) *Theme 2: RPG 1 & RPG 3*
 - (i) Respondents provided feedback related to the IPSASB undertaking a sustainability reporting project focused on developing authoritative guidance based on RPG 1, *Reporting on the Long-term Sustainability of an Entity's Finances*. Respondents equally provided feedback related to the IPSASB undertaking a separate sustainability reporting project focused on developing authoritative guidance based on RPG 3, *Reporting Service Performance Information*.
 - (ii) Respondents also noted that the IPSASB's work in scoping this project should be in collaboration with other standard setters and informed by relevant research. It should also consider potential connection with other existing guidance including IPSASB SRS 1 – phase 1 and 2.
 - (iii) See Supporting Document 9 – Additional Staff Analysis on SMC 3 Themes (Agenda Item [6.B.10](#)) for full analysis.
 - (c) *Theme 3: Nature-related Disclosures*
 - (i) A number of respondents provided feedback related to the IPSASB undertaking a sustainability reporting project focused on nature-related disclosures.

- (ii) The key message from respondents was that the IPSASB should monitor the work of the ISSB in this area, wait until the ISSB's project is finished and then begin a related public sector project leveraging the ISSB's work. Alignment with the ISSB was considered very important to minimize differences between the private and public sector. However, there will be additional public sector specific considerations for nature-related disclosures that will need to be taken into account to produce useful guidance.
- (iii) See Supporting Document 9 – Additional Staff Analysis on SMC 3 Themes (Agenda Item [6.B.10](#)) for full analysis.

Theme 1: General Sustainability-related Disclosures

Project scope

8. Respondents generally agreed with the project description included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#), which outlined that:
 - (a) IFRS S1, *General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information*, provides guidance on disclosing information about an entity's sustainability-related risks and opportunities. However, IFRS S1 was not developed to reflect the public sector context. This project would leverage IFRS S1 to develop principles for public sector entities to disclose sustainability-related information. In the absence of specific standards, a general sustainability-related disclosures standard could serve as an overarching framework to address emerging information needs across specific sustainability-related topics. This project could also entail an approach that would consider how guidance in existing non-authoritative Recommended Practice Guideline (RPG) 1, *Reporting on the Long-term Sustainability of an Entity's Finances*, and RPG 3, *Reporting Service Performance Information*, could fit into the authoritative guidance developed for the general sustainability-related disclosures standard.
9. Overall, respondents supported the development of a general sustainability-related disclosure standard. They noted that sustainability-related disclosures will become a requirement for public sector entities of every nation. Therefore, establishing a general sustainability-related disclosure standard would establish the foundational principles necessary to support consistency, connectivity and scalability across future IPSASB sustainability reporting standards and should be developed before guidance on other specific topics. This would also help eliminate inconsistencies in disclosure content and ensure comparability amongst the public sector. Respondents noted the importance of this project being public sector specific and reflecting the role of governments not only as reporting entities, but also as policymakers, regulators, service providers, asset owners, funders, and stewards of public resources.
10. Some respondents noted that jurisdictions have different priorities in terms of their sustainability concerns (e.g. addressing poverty, hunger, clean water, sanitation, etc.) and a separate IPSASB sustainability reporting standard on the general requirements and conceptual foundations of sustainability reporting would provide a framework that would allow public sector entities to disclose information on sustainability topics that are priorities in their jurisdiction but are not yet covered by a specific standard.
11. Respondents also noted that the IPSASB's work in scoping this project should be in collaboration with other standard setters and informed by relevant research. It should also consider potential connection with other existing guidance including IPSASB SRS 1 – phase 1 and 2 and RPG 1 and

Agenda Item 6.A.3

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

RPG 3. Further detail on respondents' feedback is included in Supporting Document 10 – Additional Respondent Feedback on Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.11](#).

Project prioritization criteria

12. An overview of staff's assessment of the project prioritization criteria, informed by respondents' analysis for undertaking this project is as follows. It is noted below whether there have been any changes in the ranking of each criterion compared to the ranking that was originally included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#).
 - (a) **Prevalence** – *High (no change)*
 - (b) **Consequences** – *High (no change)*
 - (c) **Urgency** – *High (no change)*
 - (d) **Feasibility** – *High (no change)*
13. For Staff's detailed assessment of the project prioritization criteria, refer to Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.12](#).

Recommendation

14. Staff recommend that the Board prioritize a future sustainability reporting project on general sustainability-related disclosures when resources become available, after the completion of the Climate-related Disclosures: Public Policy Outcomes project. The project scope should include identifying where RPG 1 and RPG 3 could fit within the IPSASB reporting landscape, but not include actual redevelopment of RPG 1 and RPG 3 within this project as that would make the project scope too large.

Review of Response to SMC 1 – Key Themes & Breakout Group Discussion

Decision Required

1. Through the use of the Breakout Group session, the IPSASB is required to prioritize which financial reporting project(s) the Board should add to its Work Program when resources become available.

Context

2. SMC 1 of the Consultation asked respondents which financial reporting projects should the IPSASB prioritize.
3. While there was diversity in the financial reporting projects recommended by respondents, staff's analysis noted there were five key themes that emerged from the responses to SMC 1:
 - (a) [Theme 1: Intangible Assets](#);
 - (b) [Theme 2: Provisions – Targeted Improvements](#);
 - (c) [Theme 3: Climate-related and Other Uncertainties in the Financial Statements](#);
 - (d) [Theme 4: Disclosure of Tax Expenditures](#); and
 - (e) [Theme 5: Rebalance Resources – Focus on Current Projects & Implementation Support](#).
4. These key themes are analyzed in Appendices A – E to this agenda item, which are required reading to support discussion during the breakout group portion of this session.
5. For information on:
 - (a) Other financial reporting projects recommended by participants at the regional roundtables, see Supporting Document 4 (Agenda Item [6.B.5](#)); and
 - (b) Other financial reporting projects recommended by written responses, see Supporting Document 5 (Agenda Item [6.B.6](#)).

Breakout Groups

6. To solicit feedback on the five key themes identified from the Consultation responses to SMC 1, IPSASB Members, Technical Advisors and Observers will be separated into three breakout groups. These breakout groups will be working sessions whereby Members, Technical Advisors and Observers will discuss which of the financial reporting project(s) outlined in Appendices A – E the IPSASB should prioritize adding to its Work Program when resources become available.
7. In preparing for these breakout group discussions, Members, Technical Advisors and Observers should keep in mind:
 - (a) The information discussed in the following sections of Appendices A-E of to this agenda paper for each of the five themes:
 - (i) **Key Considerations** – This section contains practical items, such as timing and resources, that would need to be considered when determining which project(s) could be added to the Work Program.
 - (ii) **IPSASB project prioritization criteria** – The Board will need to use its project prioritization criteria when determining which project(s) to add to the Work Program.

Agenda Item 6.A.4

- (iii) **Recommendation** – This includes staff's views on how each project could be added to the Work Program if the IPSASB chooses to prioritize that particular project.
- (b) The **General Considerations** (timing, resources - particularly the total number of projects that can be added for financial reporting and sustainability reporting) from [Agenda Item 6.A.1](#).

Questions for discussion

- 8. Breakout Groups will discuss the following questions:
 - (a) Which financial reporting project(s) from the five key themes for SMC 1 do you think the IPSASB should prioritize adding to the Work Program?
 - (b) In addition to the factors and considerations (e.g. timing, alignment with related IFRS project, resources, etc.) discussed in each of the key themes for SMC 1 in this Agenda Item, is there anything else you think staff should take into consideration when developing a recommendation for the September 2026 Board meeting of which financial reporting project(s) the IPSASB should add to the Work Program when resources become available?
 - (c) Are there any additional key themes in the responses to SMC 1 that staff have not identified?
- 9. For more details on the breakout groups refer to Supporting Document 12 (Agenda Item [6.B.13](#)).

Appendix A – Theme 1: Intangible Assets

Analysis

Level of support for undertaking project

1. The most proposed financial reporting project focused on intangible assets. IPSAS 31, *Intangible Assets*, was also raised in the context of a PIR in SMC 2. Additionally, multiple presentations at the IPSASB's Public Sector Standards Setters Forum (PSSSF or the Forum) focused on the need for additional or updated guidance on intangible assets, specifically related to new types of digital asset and cloud computing arrangements. These topics received support from global standard setter participants at the Forum as a need in their jurisdictions. Overall, based on the feedback there is broad support for the IPSASB to undertake a project on intangible assets.

Project scope

2. Respondents generally agreed with the project description included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#), which outlined that:
 - (a) IAS 38 provides guidance on accounting for intangible assets. The IASB is currently undertaking a project to perform a [comprehensive review of IAS 38](#)⁷ with the objective of improving the usefulness of information entities provide about intangible items in their financial statements and making the Standard more suitable for newer types of intangible items and new ways of using them. IPSAS 31, *Intangible Assets*, is based on IAS 38. As such, amendments resulting from the IASB's project would be relevant for IPSAS Standards and public sector entities with intangible assets. The IASB project is currently in the initial stages.
3. Most respondents supported maintaining alignment with IAS 38 where transactions are the same. However, they strongly believed that a comprehensive review of IPSAS 31 should include developing guidance to address public sector specific gaps not currently covered by existing standards. The review should also include providing guidance on new types of intangible assets, including considering service potential not just economic benefit when determining control, identifiability and useful life. Further detail on respondents' feedback is included in Supporting Document 10 – Additional Respondent Feedback on Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.11](#).

Key Considerations

4. In terms of undertaking this financial reporting project, the Board would need to consider:

⁷ Note that due to resource constraints the IASB is no longer intending to perform a comprehensive review of IAS 38 that results in a complete overhaul of the Standard. The IASB project is in the research phase and they have begun their review in a focused way, by exploring two initial streams: 1) assessing user needs for information about recognized and unrecognized intangible assets and expenditure associated with them in the financial statements; and 2) considering whether to update the definition of an intangible asset, associated guidance and some aspects of the recognition criteria, by initially using, as test cases, application issues related to newer types of intangible assets and new ways of using them; and then considering the effects of any potential amendments on the broader population of intangible assets. Once work on the initial streams is completed, the IASB will consider whether it can make discrete meaningful improvements to IAS 38 or whether more work is needed before considering any changes to the Standard. The IPSASB will receive a high level update on the current project status from IASB Staff during this session at the IPSASB Board meeting.

Agenda Item 6.A.4

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

- (a) **Timing and Alignment with IFRS** – The IASB is currently in the early phases of a comprehensive review of IAS 38, *Intangible Assets*.⁸
 - (i) The majority of respondents to the Consultation stated the IPSASB should carefully monitor the IASB's project, wait for the IASB's project to be completed, and then promptly review the IASB's findings/proposals and evaluate whether corresponding updates to IPSAS 31 would be appropriate and consider whether additional public sector specific guidance would also be needed.
 - (ii) However, a small minority of respondents encouraged the IPSASB to undertake work in IPSAS 31 in the area of cloud computing arrangements sooner as public sector entities are currently encountering issues in dealing with these types of arrangements.
- (b) **Resources** – In terms of best use of resources:
 - (i) Since IPSAS 31 is an aligned standard and there is support for maintaining alignment, there are benefits to the IPSASB waiting to see the outcomes of the IASB project before starting a project on IPSAS 31 as this would allow for retention of alignment with IFRS and the ability to leverage the work done in this area by the IASB, which would free up IPSASB resources for other projects in the meantime. However, the risk of waiting for the IASB's project is that stakeholders remain without guidance on public sector specific issues and new types of intangibles for longer. An additional risk is that at the time the IASB completes its IAS 38 project, there are no IPSASB resources available to start promptly with an IPSAS 31 project as requested by stakeholders.
 - (ii) On the other hand, if the IPSASB were to take on a comprehensive review of IPSAS 31 now, the benefits may be that the Board is able to respond to stakeholder requests for public sector specific guidance and guidance on new types of intangibles sooner. However, the risk is divergence from IFRS on treatment of similar transactions and duplication of effort in determining guidance for new types of intangibles.

Project prioritization criteria

- 5. An overview of staff's assessment of the project prioritization criteria, informed by respondents' analysis for undertaking this project is as follows. It is noted below whether there have been any changes in the ranking of each criterion compared to the ranking that was originally included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#).
 - (a) **Prevalence** – *High (no change)*
 - (b) **Consequences** – *High (no change)*
 - (c) **Urgency** – *Medium (increased from Low to Medium)*
 - (i) Ranking increased to medium as stakeholders have expressed concerns about the usefulness of the information entities can provide in their financial statements regarding new types of intangibles and their use, as well as different interpretations of existing

⁸ The IPSASB will receive a high level update on the current project status from IASB Staff during this session at the IPSASB Board meeting.

Agenda Item 6.A.4

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

guidance leading to inconsistent treatment of intangible items across jurisdictions, which hinders comparability and understandability for financial statement users.

(d) **Feasibility** – *Low (decreased from Medium to Low)*

- (i) Ranking decreased from medium to low as moving forward with this project and maintaining alignment with IFRS is dependent on the completion of the IASB project, which is in the very early stages.

- 6. For staff's detailed assessment of the project prioritization criteria, refer to Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.12](#).

Recommendation

- 7. If the IPSASB decides to prioritize this project, then Staff's recommendation is that:
 - (a) The Board closely monitors the IASB's project on intangible assets, particularly in terms of the scope of the project and the proposed outcomes.
 - (b) While the IASB's project is under development, the IPSASB uses its new tools, including the Financial Reporting Implementation Forum (FRIF) and any relevant topics submitted to the IPSASB Application Group (IAG), to obtain a better understanding of the issues stakeholders are currently encountering with the guidance in IPSAS 31 in the public sector. During this time the IPSASB could also explore what other standard setters, including National standard setters, are doing in regard to research on new types of intangible assets.
 - (c) Once the IASB project is complete/decision on the proposed amendments has been made, the IPSASB would undertake a PIR of IPSAS 31.
 - (d) Once the IPSASB has obtained and analyzed the feedback from the PIR, the Board will decide on the scope of an intangible assets project on IPSAS 31.
- 8. This topic will be discussed further during the [breakout groups](#).

Appendix B – Theme 2: Provisions – Targeted Improvements

Analysis

Level of support for undertaking project

1. Respondents also supported the IPSASB undertaking a financial reporting project to align the guidance in IPSAS 19, *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*, with the outcomes of the IASB's targeted improvement project focused on provisions for IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*. Respondents strongly favored keeping the guidance in IPSAS 19 aligned with the guidance in IAS 37 where there are no public sector differences. This project was also raised as a potential PIR the IPSASB should undertake. This topic was not part of the presentations at the PSSSF. Overall, based on the feedback received there is broad support for the IPSASB to undertake an alignment project with IFRS related to targeted improvements for provisions.

Project scope

2. Respondents generally agreed with the project description included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#), which outlined that:
 - (a) The IASB is currently undertaking a project proposing amendments to IAS 37 to clarify how entities assess when to record provisions, including levies currently accounted for under IFRIC 21 Levies, and how to measure them. The amendments would also require entities to provide more information about the measurement of provisions. IPSAS 19, *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*, is based on IAS 37. As such the amendments from the IASB's project would be relevant for IPSAS Standards and all public sector entities with provisions, particularly long-term provisions such as asset decommissioning obligations.
3. Respondents strongly supported maintaining alignment with IFRS where transactions are the same. However, they encouraged the IPSASB to consider public sector specific matters in these projects such as recognition of commitments under the Paris Agreement and other climate-related obligations, as well as other government obligations that may require tailored guidance to reflect the unique nature of public sector activities and reporting objectives.
4. Respondents also thought it would be important for this project to be considered in the context of the IPSASB's public sector specific standards that relate to expenses and liabilities, such as IPSAS 42, *Social Benefits*, and IPSAS 48, *Transfer Expenses*. Further detail on respondents' feedback is included in Supporting Document 10 – Additional Respondent Feedback on Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.11](#).

Key Considerations

5. In terms of undertaking this financial reporting project, the Board would need to consider:
 - (a) **Timing and Alignment with IFRS**– The IASB has received feedback from its Exposure Draft on this topic and at its May 2026 meeting is analyzing the final issue related to levies, which could impact the timing of the completion of their project.⁹ Respondents to the Consultation stated the IPSASB should carefully monitor the IASB's project, wait for it to be completed, and

⁹ The IPSASB will receive a high level update on the current project status from IASB Staff during this session at the IPSASB Board meeting.

Agenda Item 6.A.4

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

then promptly review the IASB's findings/proposals and evaluate whether the corresponding updates to IPSAS 19 would be appropriate and consider whether additional public sector specific guidance would also be needed. The IPSASB will have to be mindful of the allocation of resources to financial reporting projects to be able to respond in a timely manner to the IASB's completion of this project.

- (b) **Resources** – In terms of best use of resources:
 - (i) Since alignment with IFRS is of key importance to respondents, the IPSASB should leverage the work the IASB is doing on IAS 37 for this project, which means waiting to start an alignment project until the IASB's project is complete.
 - (ii) However, respondents raised some unique public sector issues that would require IPSASB resources be used to gain an understanding of these issues and the amendments that may need to be made to the guidance for IPSAS 19 as a result. This project is not a pure alignment project as there will be additional public sector work which should be considered when assessing resources for this project. A consideration is whether some of the work to research the public sector specific issues could begin prior to the completion of the IASB project.

Project prioritization criteria

- 6. An overview of staff's assessment of the project prioritization criteria, informed by respondents' analysis for undertaking this project is as follows. It is noted below whether there have been any changes in the ranking of each criterion compared to the ranking that was originally included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#).
 - (a) **Prevalence** – *High (no change)*
 - (b) **Consequences** – *High*
 - (i) Ranking increased to high if interaction with IPSAS 42, *Social Benefits*, and IPSAS 48, *Transfer Expenses*, are considered in the project scope.
 - (c) **Urgency** – *Medium (no change)*
 - (d) **Feasibility** – *Low (decreased from Medium to Low)*
 - (i) Ranking decreased from medium to low as moving forward with this project and maintaining alignment with IFRS is dependent on the completion of the IASB's project, which is still in progress.
- 7. For staff's detailed assessment of the project prioritization criteria, refer to Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.12](#).

Recommendation

- 8. If the IPSASB decides to prioritize this project, then Staff's recommendation is that:
 - (a) The Board closely monitors the IASB's project on provisions, particularly on the direction the IASB decided at its May meeting.
 - (b) Once the IASB project direction is known and while the project is being completed, the IPSASB use its new tools, including the Financial Reporting Implementation Forum (FRIF) and any relevant topics submitted to the IPSASB Application Group (IAG), to obtain a better

Agenda Item 6.A.4

understanding of the issues stakeholders are currently encountering with the guidance in IPSAS 19 related to provisions and the unique public sector specific issues.

- (c) Once the IASB project is complete and the amendments are known, the IPSASB could take on a narrow scope financial reporting project related to provisions. Note, if during initial research by the FRIF and IAG the Board determined a PIR would be more appropriate to ensure the Board has a full understanding of public sector issues related to IPSAS 19, it could also make the choice to do that prior to moving to a financial reporting project.
9. This topic will be discussed further during the [breakout groups](#).

Appendix C – Theme 3: Climate-related¹⁰ and Other Uncertainties in the Financial Statements

Analysis

Level of support for undertaking project

1. Respondents provided feedback related to the IPSASB undertaking a financial reporting project focused on climate-related and other uncertainties in the financial statements. Overall, based on the feedback received there is broad support for the IPSASB to undertake a financial reporting project on this topic and maintain alignment with IFRS, except for areas where there are public sector differences.

Project scope

2. Respondents generally agreed with the project description included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#), which outlined that:
 - (a) The IASB has recently completed a project which added examples illustrating how an entity applies the requirements in IFRS Accounting Standards to report the effects of climate-related and other uncertainties in the financial statements. As in the private sector, climate-related and other uncertainties also affect the financial statements of public sector entities. Thus, some of the illustrative examples from the IASB's project may be relevant for the public sector. As such, the IPSASB could undertake a similar project leveraging the IASB guidance in addition to considering other public sector specific illustrative examples.
3. Respondents supported maintaining alignment with IFRS. However, respondents noted there was a clear need to adapt the IASB's examples as appropriate for the public sector and to develop additional public sector specific examples, including more complex and judgement-based examples, in order for the guidance to be useful in practice. Further detail on respondents' feedback is included in Supporting Document 10 – Additional Respondent Feedback on Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.11](#).

Key Considerations

4. In terms of undertaking this financial reporting project, the Board would need to consider:
 - (a) **Timing and alignment with IFRS** – The IASB completed its project on this topic in November 2025. The improvements enacted by the IASB have been included as part of the IPSASB's annual improvements process (see [Agenda Item 3](#)). However, respondents have identified public sector specific issues and want the guidance to include public sector specific examples. Public sector specific issues are outside of the scope of the improvements proposed in [Agenda Item 3](#).
 - (b) **Resources** – Respondents raised some unique public sector issues that would require additional IPSASB resources to be used to gain an understanding of these issues to develop

¹⁰ Note that the IASB issued the final amendments for this project in November 2025 (after the IPSASB's work program consultation was published), and at that time they renamed the project "Disclosures about Uncertainties in the Financial Statements". The examples added by the IASB focused on climate-related uncertainties. However, the principles and requirements illustrated using climate-related fact patterns apply equally to other types of uncertainties, hence the name change.

Agenda Item 6.A.4

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

public sector specific examples so the Board would need to determine whether to undertake this portion of the project.

Project prioritization criteria

5. An overview of staff's assessment of the project prioritization criteria, informed by respondents' analysis for undertaking this project is as follows. It is noted below whether there have been any changes in the ranking of each criterion compared to the ranking that was originally included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#).
 - (a) **Prevalence** – *Medium (no change)*
 - (b) **Consequences** – *Medium (no change)*
 - (c) **Urgency** – *Medium (no change)*
 - (d) **Feasibility** – *High (no change)*
6. For staff's detailed assessment of the project prioritization criteria, refer to Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.12](#).

Recommendation

7. If the IPSASB decides to prioritize this project, then Staff's recommendation is that:
 - (a) The Board add a narrow scope project on this topic in relation to the development of public sector specific examples to the Work Program when resources are available (as noted previously, staff have already begun analyzing the IASB's amendments as part of the Improvements to IPSAS Standards process – refer to amendments proposed in [Agenda Item 3](#)).
 - (b) If the IPSASB also decides to prioritize the Provisions – Targeted Improvements project discussed previously in Theme 2 (See [Agenda Item 6.4.A Appendix B](#)), the IPSASB should consider looking at the connectivity between these two projects.
 - (c) As part of this project, the IPSASB should use its new tools, including the Financial Reporting Implementation Forum (FRIF) and any relevant topics submitted to the IPSASB Application Group (IAG), to ask stakeholders for fact patterns/feedback in this area to gain an understanding of what public sector specific examples would be useful in developing an Exposure Draft on the proposed amendments.
8. This topic will be discussed further during the [breakout groups](#).

Appendix D – Theme 4: Disclosure of Tax Expenditures

Analysis

Level of support for undertaking project

1. Respondents provided feedback related to the IPSASB undertaking a financial reporting project focused on disclosure of tax expenditures. Based on the feedback received there is a level of support for the IPSASB to undertake a public sector specific financial reporting project on this topic.

Project scope

2. Respondents generally agreed with the project description included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#), which outlined that:
 - (a) This project would develop proposals for disclosures on tax expenditures, to strengthen accountability and public financial management. IPSAS 23, *Revenue from Non-exchange Transactions (Taxes and Transfers)*, and its replacement IPSAS 47, *Revenue*, have requirements for tax expenses¹¹ and tax expenditures¹². Tax expenditures are foregone revenue, not expenses, and do not give rise to inflows or outflows of resources. IPSAS 23/IPSAS 47 requires taxation revenue to be presented net of tax expenditures. Therefore, providing disclosures on the forgone revenue as a result of the tax expenditures can be expected to provide useful information to primary users for accountability purposes.
3. Respondents supported undertaking this project as it is a high public interest issue to improve transparency and provide information on the effectiveness of the use of tax expenditures. They also noted this topic is key for long-term fiscal sustainability particularly in the face of governments globally facing rising deficits as tax expenditures reduce public revenue available for future service delivery. Further detail on respondents' feedback is included in Supporting Document 10 – Additional Respondent Feedback on Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.11](#).

Key Considerations

4. In terms of undertaking this financial reporting project, the Board would need to consider:
 - (a) **Resources** – In terms of best use of resources:
 - (i) This would be a public sector specific project. As such, there are no equivalent IFRS Standards the IPSASB could leverage in the development of this guidance. However, as outlined under “feasibility” in the Project Prioritization Criteria section (see Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.12](#)) there are some resources developed by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) that the Board could leverage in the development of this guidance. Additionally, the IPSASB can draw on its

¹¹ Benefits paid through the tax system, for example health insurance contributions.

¹² Tax expenditures are preferential provisions of the tax law that provide certain taxpayers with concessions that are not available to others. It is the use of the tax system to encourage or discourage behaviors, for example allowing homeowners to deduct mortgage interest from gross income to reduce taxable income.

Agenda Item 6.A.4

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

Conceptual Framework. However, this standard setting project would likely be more resource intensive than some of the other narrow scope projects respondents to the Consultation identified as key themes (e.g. uncertainties).

- (ii) The other resource consideration to consider is that this is a disclosure only standard. Previously developed disclosure only standards have not been widely adopted by users of the IPSAS Standards. As a result, it is questionable whether this standard would be widely adopted upon issuance. If it is not, this project may not be the most productive use of the Board's resources.

Project prioritization criteria

5. An overview of staff's assessment of the project prioritization criteria, informed by respondents' analysis for undertaking this project is as follows. It is noted below whether there have been any changes in the ranking of each criterion compared to the ranking that was originally included in the supplemental [potential projects document](#).
 - (a) **Prevalence** – *High (increased from Low to High)*
 - (i) Ranking increased to high as respondents expressed that while tax expenditures are limited to tax collecting entities in the public sector, they significantly influence fiscal outcomes, budgetary flexibility and long term fiscal sustainability. As a result, they are relevant to the entire public sector and to the informational needs of primary users.
 - (b) **Consequences** – *Medium (no change)*
 - (c) **Urgency** – *Low (no change)*
 - (d) **Feasibility** – *Medium (no change)*
6. For Staff's detailed assessment of the project prioritization criteria, refer to Supporting Document 11 – Detailed Project Prioritization Criteria Assessment for Themes in Agenda Item [6.B.12](#).

Recommendation

7. If the IPSASB decides to prioritize this project, then Staff's recommendation is that:
 - (a) The IPSASB add a project on this topic to the Work Program when resources are available.
 - (b) As part of this project, the IPSASB should use its new tools, including the Financial Reporting Implementation Forum (FRIF) and any relevant topics submitted to the IPSASB Application Group (IAG), to ask stakeholders for fact patterns/feedback in this area to gain an understanding of the specific issues in this area and what disclosure guidance would be the most useful, which would assist the IPSASB in developing the scope of this project.
8. This topic will be discussed further during the [breakout groups](#).

Appendix E – Theme 5: Rebalance Resources – Focus on Current Projects & Implementation Support

1. The final key theme noted through the feedback to the Consultation related to slowing down the pace of development of new standards, focusing on the completion of current financial reporting projects in progress, focusing resources on maintenance of existing standards through PIRs, and allocating resources to the development of implementation support for newly published and complex IPSAS Standards.

Analysis

Level of support for undertaking project

2. Respondents provided specific feedback on this theme. This theme and in particular focusing on implementation support of newly published and complex IPSAS Standards, as well as implementation support for public sector entities in the process of adopting IPSAS Standards was raised by a number of respondents. This theme was raised by respondents that are in the process of adopting IPSAS Standards, as well as respondents that are mature adopters of IPSAS Standards. Respondents noted the IPSASB has issued a large number of complex Standards over the past few years and respondents need time to implement those standards and need additional support materials to assist in this endeavor.
3. Overall, based on the feedback received there is strong support for the IPSASB to slow down the development of major new financial reporting projects and focus more resources on the development of educational and implementation support materials.

Project scope

4. In terms of what this would look like, respondents' feedback included:
 - (a) Not taking on any new major financial reporting projects, to allow entities sufficient time to implement the significant number of IPSAS Standards recently issued, and for their reporting processes to stabilize so quality information can be reported.
 - (b) Focus resources on completing financial reporting projects that are already in progress in a timely manner, including developing implementation resources related to those projects.
 - (c) Rethinking what it means to complete a financial reporting project (i.e. part of the project is developing education and implementation materials) and building in plans to develop education and implementation support when allocating time and resources to any new financial reporting project initially.
 - (d) Focusing resources on PIRs of existing IPSAS Standards.
 - (e) In determining priorities and allocation of resources, the overriding factor the IPSASB should focus on is the timely development and maintenance of a principles-based comprehensive set of high-quality financial reporting and sustainability reporting standards. Prioritization of future Work Program projects should be performed holistically across financial reporting and sustainability reporting, not in isolation.
 - (f) Focusing resources on educational and implementation materials for recently issued and complex IPSAS Standards, as well as adoption of IPSAS Standards. Respondents suggested various methods that could be incorporated to develop such resources, as well as specific

Agenda Item 6.A.4

IPSASB Meeting (June 2026)

Standards where such guidance is needed (e.g. IPSAS 41, IPSAS 43, IPSAS 45, IPSAS 46, IPSAS 47, IPSAS 51, etc.).

Key Considerations

5. In terms of undertaking this project, the Board would need to consider:
 - (a) **Resources** – In terms of best use of resources:
 - (i) Current projects already have resources allocated to them, though the Board would need to consider if the length of those projects would need to be extended and thus the related resources extended to develop educational materials and implementation support.
 - (ii) PIRs have already been allocated resources on the Work Program.
 - (iii) In terms of educational materials and implementation support for existing standards, the Board would need to determine the amount of resources to be allocated to this project when resources become available.
 - a. Based on early feedback from the Consultation regional roundtables, the IPSASB has already begun to implement initiatives to respond to stakeholder feedback, including early work on IPSASB Explains. Rebalancing resources towards implementation would delay work on other future financial reporting projects. The Board would need to think about whether stakeholders' perception of this slowing down of standard setting is an appropriate use of Board resources. A question on this topic has been posed to the IPSASB's Consultative Advisory Group (CAG) and will be discussed at their upcoming meeting on June 8, 2026. An update of the advice provided by the CAG will be provided to IPSASB members during the discussion of this Agenda Item on June 10th.
 - b. On the other hand, respondents are clearly communicating that implementation support is needed to improve consistent application of IPSAS Standards and this may increase adoption of complex IPSAS Standards and IPSAS Standards overall, which is in line with the IPSASB's strategic objective. The Board's current Strategy also recognized the maturity of the IPSAS Standards and the growing user community and rebalanced the financial reporting resources to include a new focus on maintaining the suite of IPSAS Standards to better meet user needs. Producing implementation materials that users are clearly communicating would help meet their needs to adopt and implement the IPSAS Standards would fit within the Strategy objective. Additionally, the Board would need to weigh the risk of not producing implementation materials when users are clearly communicating this is a need and are also communicating that in their view part of issuing new standards is following through to the completion of issuing accompanying implementation materials.

Project prioritization criteria

6. While supporting implementation is not strictly an IPSASB work program project, applying the project prioritization criteria supports in comparing rebalancing resources to implementation initiatives when compared to the other financial reporting priorities proposed. Staff's assessment of the project prioritization criteria, informed by respondents' analysis for undertaking this project is as follows:

(a) **Prevalence – High**

- (i) Based on respondent feedback the need for educational and implementation support materials is widespread globally and affects both new adopters of IPSAS and mature adopters.

(b) **Consequences – High**

- (i) Development of educational materials and implementation support materials could assist public sector entities with more consistent application of IPSAS Standards. It may result in increased adoption rates for complex IPSAS Standards and IPSAS overall, which is in line with the IPSASB's strategic objective of increasing adoption and implementation of accrual IPSAS.

(c) **Urgency – High**

- (i) Public sector entities have been adopting IPSAS Standards and IPSAS in general without dedicated educational materials and implementation materials from the IPSASB. However, the IPSASB does not know how many public sector entities have not started adopting IPSAS yet due to the complexity and lack of educational and implementation material to assist with the adoption and implementation process. Additionally, as more complex Standards have been developed recently, the requests for implementation support have increased to help stakeholders successfully implement these Standards.

(d) **Feasibility – High**

- (i) Resources will be becoming available to develop educational materials and implementation materials. This fits with the direction of the new initiative, IPSASB Explains, which the Board previously determined to undertake.

Recommendation

7. Based on early feedback from the regional roundtables, the IPSASB has already begun to implement initiatives to respond to stakeholder feedback on the need for educational and implementation support materials via the Financial Reporting Implementation Forum (FRIF), IPSASB Application Group (IAG), Academic Advisory Group (AAG), and IPSASB Explains. The written responses from stakeholders further reaffirm the IPSASB's decision in March 2026 to take on implementation initiatives.
8. If the IPSASB decides to prioritize this project, staff's recommendation is that:
 - (a) The IPSASB continue allocating resources to these initiatives (see [Agenda Item 9](#)).
 - (b) The IPSASB also use its new tools, including the Financial Reporting Implementation Forum (FRIF) and any relevant topics submitted to the IPSASB Application Group (IAG), to obtain a better understanding of the issues stakeholders are currently encountering to help ensure the educational materials and implementation support developed through IPSASB Explains are useful to stakeholders.
9. This topic will be discussed further during the [breakout groups](#).