

Meeting: International Public Sector Accounting
Standards Board

Meeting Date: September 15–17, 2026

Agenda Item 12

STRENGTHENING LINKAGES BETWEEN IPSAS STANDARDS AND THE GFSM

Project summary	Development of non-authoritative guidance on the accounting policy options in IPSAS® Standards that can be used for Government Finance Statistics Manual (GFSM) reporting.	
Meeting objective	Decide on guidance location, level of guidance on measurement, additional non-authoritative guidance, and red tracked changes in the [draft] Final Pronouncement compared with ED 94.	
Project staff lead	João Fonseca, Principal	
Task Force members	N/A	
	Topic	Agenda Item
Essential Documents (Required Reading)	ED 94: Location of Non-Authoritative Guidance in IPSAS 22 (SMC 1)	12.A.1
	ED 94: Level of Guidance on Measurement (SMC 2)	12.A.2
	ED 94: Development of Additional Non-Authoritative Guidance	12.A.3
	[draft] Final Pronouncement: Development	12.A.4
	Supporting Document 4 - [draft] Final Pronouncement, Linkages Between IPSAS Standards and the Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 (Amendments to IPSAS 22) (with tracked changes from ED 94) (posted separately)—expected page-by-page review at the meeting	12.A.5
Supporting Documents (Encouraged Reading: Posted Separately on Meeting Page)	Supporting Document 1 – Strengthening Linkages Between IPSAS Standards and the Government Finance Statistics Manual Final Pronouncement Dashboard	12.B.1
	Supporting Document 2 – ED 94: Analysis of Respondents by Region, Function, and Language, List of Respondents, Summary of Responses to SMCs, and Responses Review Methodology	12.B.2

Prepared by: João Fonseca (August 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 3 – Summary of Respondents' Suggested Additional Non-Authoritative Guidance and Staff's Views	12.B.3
	Supporting Document 4 – Respondents' Suggested Minor Enhancements to the Content of ED 94	12.B.4
Background Information (Available on the project webpage)	Decisions and Instructions from the previous IPSASB Meeting	
	December 2025 CAG Report Back	
	Due Process Checklist	
	Project Timeline	
	Responses to ED 94, <i>Linkages Between IPSAS Standards and the Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014</i> (Amendments to IPSAS 22) can be found on the publication page at: https://www.ipsasb.org/publications/exposure-draft-ed-94-linkages-between-ipsas-standards-and-government-finance-statistics-manual-2014	

ED 94: Location of Non-Authoritative Guidance in IPSAS 22 (SMC 1)

Decision Required

1. The IPSASB is to decide whether the proposed ED 94 non-authoritative guidance should be included as Implementation Guidance in IPSAS 22, *Disclosure of Financial Information About the General Government Sector*.

Context

2. The IPSASB issued [Exposure Draft \(ED\) 94, Linkages Between IPSAS Standards and the Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 \(Amendments to IPSAS 22\)](#) on February 17, 2026, with a comment end date of June 22, 2026.
3. The proposed amendments to IPSAS 22 explain the IPSAS Standards recognition and measurement requirements, and the accounting policy options that are available to allow IPSAS Standards-based accounting data to be used as an input for GFSM 2014 reporting. It also identifies the additional data requirements where key high-level recognition and/or measurement differences currently exist between IPSAS Standards and the GFSM 2014.
4. Sixteen responses were received to ED 94, which included two Specific Matters for Comment (SMCs).
5. This Agenda Item addresses the respondents' views on SMC 1 related to the **location** of the proposed ED 94 non-authoritative amendments (as Implementation Guidance in IPSAS 22 versus locating it in another IPSASB publication outside of the IPSAS Accounting Standards).

Analysis

Location of Guidance in IPSAS 22

6. Table 1 shows that most respondents to ED 94 agreed or partially agreed with SMC 1 to include the non-authoritative guidance in IPSAS 22.

Table 1—Responses to SMC 1

Response	Respondents	
	#	%
Agree	3	19
Partially Agree	11	69
Disagree	2	13
Total	16	100

7. Staff highlight that only a few respondents provided specific comments on the location of the proposed ED 94 non-authoritative guidance as Implementation Guidance accompanying IPSAS 22.
8. Respondents who partially agreed suggested developing additional non-authoritative guidance or making minor enhancements to the ED 94 material. These suggestions do not affect the assessment of the appropriate location for the guidance and are addressed separately in later papers within this agenda item.
9. Respondents who supported including the guidance within IPSAS 22 viewed this approach as an appropriate and proportionate way to help jurisdictions make fuller use of IPSAS-based accounting data for GFSM 2014 reporting (R02). They also emphasized that providing implementation guidance—

rather than introducing new authoritative requirements—preserves the principles-based nature of Standards while improving alignment between accounting and statistical reporting frameworks (R16).

10. Respondents who disagreed acknowledged the guidance's usefulness for statistical reporting but questioned its relevance for financial statement preparers, noting that the ED's benefits mainly relate to producing statistical information from accounting data (R09). They also argued that the high-level measurement-basis material would be better placed in a separate non-authoritative publication (R09) and that adding such guidance to an optional standard provides limited value (R15).
11. Staff consider that the ED 94 proposals help financial statement preparers by clarifying how IPSAS-based accounting data aligns with GFSM 2014 and by encouraging collaboration between accountants and statisticians. Staff also consider high-level measurement-basis guidance is consistent with the IPSASB's principles-based approach.

Location of Guidance Outside IPSAS 22

12. Some respondents suggested placing the guidance in a separate IPSASB publication, including:
 - (a) IPSASB Explains initiative or another IPSASB Staff publication (R09); and
 - (b) RPG Guideline (R01).
13. Regarding the suggestion in paragraph 17(a), Staff note that while the IPSASB Explains initiative provides modules focused on understanding, applying, and using information within IPSAS Standards, it is not an appropriate home for the ED 94 guidance because the material goes beyond what currently exists in IPSAS 22. Additionally, publishing the guidance separately risks reducing its perceived importance and fragmenting key material that supports entities electing to apply IPSAS 22.
14. Regarding the suggestion in paragraph 17(b), Staff highlight that RPG Guidelines provide guidance for good practice in preparing general purpose financial reports (GPFRs) other than financial statements, whereas the ED 94 material relates directly to information within the financial statements. As such, an RPG Guideline is not an appropriate location.

Conclusion

15. Staff conclude that placing the guidance within IPSAS 22 is the most appropriate approach because it was supported by most respondents and provides a proportionate, principles-based guidance on the linkages between IPSAS Standards and GFSM 2014 in a single, coherent Standard.

Recommendation

16. Staff recommend proceeding with the proposed ED 94 non-authoritative Implementation Guidance amendments to IPSAS 22.

ED 94: Level of Guidance on Measurement (SMC 2)

Decision Required

1. The IPSASB is to decide whether the proposed ED 94 non-authoritative guidance should be at the measurement basis level or at the measurement technique level.

Context

2. ED 94 proposed providing measurement guidance at the measurement basis level rather than at the measurement technique level, and Specific Matter for Comment (SMC 2) sought feedback on this approach.
3. This Agenda Item addresses the respondents' views on SMC 2 related to the appropriate **level of measurement guidance**.

Analysis

Respondents' comments

4. Table 1 shows that most respondents agree or partially agree with SMC 2, with only one respondent disagreeing with the proposal to provide measurement guidance at the measurement-basis level.

Table 2—Responses to SMC 2

Response	Respondents	
	#	%
Agree	4	25
Partially Agree	8	50
Disagree	1	6
No comment	3	19
Total	16	100

5. Respondents who agreed with SMC 2 emphasized that alignment between IPSAS Standards and GFSM 2014 depends on ensuring the measurement basis used in accounting can be reconciled with the measurement basis used for statistical reporting, rather than prescribing specific techniques (R08). They noted that this approach is non-authoritative, principles-based, and avoids excessive prescription, making it suitable across diverse jurisdictions (R08, R12, R16). They also highlighted that focusing on measurement bases preserves flexibility, supports consistent application, and remains adaptable as valuation practices evolve, avoiding technique-level comparisons that vary by context and data availability (R08, R12, R16).
6. Respondents who partially agreed suggested additional non-authoritative material or minor enhancements, but these suggestions do not affect the assessment of the appropriate level of guidance on measurement and are addressed in later papers within this agenda item.
7. The respondent who disagreed with SMC 2 argued that the guidance “does not provide a detailed understanding of how the measurement techniques in IPSAS compare to the valuation techniques in GFSM 2014” (R09).

Staff's views

8. Staff note that ED 94's focus on measurement bases is intentional and appropriate because it gives accountants and statisticians the flexibility to apply the most suitable techniques under IPSAS 46, *Measurement*, while still meeting both IPSAS Standards and GFSM 2014 requirements.
9. Respondents who supported the proposals reinforced that alignment between the two frameworks depends on conceptual measurement-basis logic, not detailed technique-level prescriptions. Staff consider concerns about the lack of technique-level detail being unpersuasive (see paragraph 7 above), as such detail would be overly prescriptive and inconsistent with the principles-based nature of both IPSAS Standards and GFSM 2014.
10. Overall, Staff conclude that proceeding with the ED 94 proposals is well-supported by respondents to ED 94 and appropriate.

Recommendation

11. Staff recommend proceeding with the proposed ED 94 non-authoritative Implementation Guidance amendments and keeping them at the measurement basis level.

ED 94: Development of Additional Non-Authoritative Guidance**Decision Required**

1. The IPSASB is required to decide on whether to develop additional non-authoritative guidance in this project.

Context

2. Beyond responding to the two Specific Matters for Comment, many respondents also expressed views on the need for additional non-authoritative guidance, with a majority suggesting further material to strengthen the linkages between IPSAS Standards and GFSM 2014.
3. This Agenda Item addresses respondents' views provided on the IPSASB undertaking additional work related to the **development of additional guidance** for the Final Pronouncement.

Analysis*Respondents' Comments*

4. Respondents requesting additional guidance argued that the proposed material lacks sufficient detail for practical implementation across several accounting and statistical areas (R01, R02, R05, R06, R07, R08, R10, R11, R12, R13, R14), is not well suited to developing or resource-constrained environments (R01), adds non-authoritative guidance to an optional Standard in a way that may limit its effectiveness (R03), and assumes a level of collaboration between accounting and statistical functions that often does not exist, thereby requiring more support to be operationalized (R03).
5. Respondents suggested a broad range of additional guidance, including reconciliation and mapping tools, operational implementation guidance, expanded conceptual and comparative guidance, guidance on consolidation and control issues, and charts of accounts and other structural aids. Respondents also called for more authoritative forms of guidance and raised specific technical requests, such as exemptions related to IPSAS 33 for GFSM 2014 reporting.

Staff's views

6. The project aims to strengthen IPSAS–GFSM 2014 linkages by providing non-authoritative guidance that clarifies how IPSAS recognition, measurement, and accounting policy choices can support high-quality statistical reporting, while also helping foster collaboration between accountants and statisticians who often work in silos.
7. Although respondents expressed a desire for more practical, implementation-focused material, their requests would require broader consideration of operational issues and extensive coordination with the GFSM 2014 community—work that goes well beyond the scope and resources of this limited project.
8. Accordingly, staff conclude that it is not appropriate to take forward these additional requests within the current project.

Recommendation

9. Staff recommend the IPSASB to:
 - (a) Finalize the proposed ED 94 amendments; and

Agenda Item 12.A.3

- (b) Log the additional requests for consideration of future areas of work, including potential collaboration with the GFS community.

[draft] Final Pronouncement: Development**Decision Required**

1. The IPSASB is required to:
 - (a) Make a page-by-page review of the [draft] Final Pronouncement; and
 - (b) Approve the red tracked changes compared with ED 94.

Context

2. This Agenda Item addresses the remaining issues that were considered during the development of [draft] Final Pronouncement.

Analysis

3. The [draft] Final Pronouncement has the following issues for IPSASB's decisions:
 - (a) Respondents' suggested minor enhancements to ED 94 related to:
 - (i) Removal of reference to 'exit-price assumptions' because there is no reference to such wording in GFSM 2014;
 - (ii) Removal of repetitive guidance in paragraph IG199;
 - (iii) Clarification of the distinction between market and non-market producers in IG42; and
 - (iv) The insertion in paragraph IG199 adding a cross-reference to paragraph IG195–196 to prevent repetitive paragraphs.
 - (b) New Basis for Conclusions paragraphs (BC36–BC46) related to the publication of ED 94 and respective review of responses, structured as follows:
 - (i) Overview of Responses to ED 94
 - a. Location of the Non-authoritative Guidance
 - b. Level of Guidance on Measurement
 - c. Development of Additional Guidance
4. The [draft] Final Pronouncement is posted separately for easier readability and in red tracked changes compared with ED 94.

Recommendation

5. Staff recommend the IPSASB to approve the revisions during the development of the [draft] Final Pronouncement.