

# Due Process Protocol

This document presents a reporting template for demonstrating how the IASB and the IFRS Interpretations Committee (the 'Interpretations Committee') have met their due process requirements. Although the document is consistent with the IFRS Foundation Due Process Handbook, it is not an integral part of the handbook and may be updated from time to time by the IASB and the technical staff.

## IASB

### Three-yearly consultation on the IASB work programme

General IASB requirements: at least once every three years the IASB is required to undertake a public consultation on its work programme. The primary objective of the review is to seek formal public input on the strategic direction and balance of the IASB's work programme, including the criteria for assessing projects that may be added to the IASB's standards-level programme (Due Process Handbook, paragraph 4.3).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that the IASB has undertaken a review of its work programme with sufficiently broad public consultation, considered that information and reported its findings.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>Planning</b>				
<b>Formal consultation with the IFRS Advisory Council (the 'Advisory Council').</b>	Required	Extent of discussions on the agenda consultation held with the Advisory Council.	Work programme consultation discussions scheduled on the Advisory Council agenda.  [The DPOC has met with the Advisory Council to ensure that discussions are scheduled on their agenda and that they occur.]	
<b>Keeping the Trustees informed.</b>	Required	Extent of discussions on the agenda consultation held with the Trustees.	Work programme consultation discussions scheduled on the Trustees' agenda with the IASB.  Letters or other communications that are received in connection with the IASB processes for the work programme have been submitted to the DPOC for consideration and response.  The IASB Chair has reported regularly to the DPOC and the Trustees on how the comments that have been received through extensive outreach and public consultation are taken into account.	
<b>Meetings with stakeholders to facilitate targeted discussions between the IASB and individual organisations or small groups.</b>	Required	Extent of outreach meetings held.  Webcast meetings held.	Summary of the meetings held has been provided to the DPOC.  Webcasts posted to the internet for the public to review.	
<b>Targeted efforts to reach investor groups.</b>	Required	A process for outreach has been devised with difficult-to-reach groups.  Special materials have been provided to facilitate	Summary of the meetings held has been provided to the DPOC.	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		investor outreach.  Number of targeted meetings held.		
<b>Public discussions with representative groups.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held.	Summary of the meetings held has been provided to the DPOC with explanations about how the raised issues have been cleared.	
<b>Outreach meetings, educational sessions and conferences with interested parties.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held.  Articles on items have been published.	Summary of the meetings held has been provided to the DPOC.	
<b>Request for Information (Rfi)</b> <b>This is a critical part of the consultation process in the three-year review.</b>				
<b>Rfi issued for input on the strategic direction and balance of the IASB's work programme.</b>	Required	Rfi has been issued and posted on the IASB website.	The DPOC has been informed that the IASB plans to issue an Rfi.  The DPOC has been given the opportunity to consider the comment period and any other factors that might be perceived as limiting the effectiveness of an Rfi.	
<b>Public announcement of the release of the Rfi.</b>	Required	Press release and web announcement have been issued.	The DPOC has been informed that the Rfi has been issued.	
<b>Rfi has appropriate comment period.</b>	Required	The IASB normally sets a 120-day comment period for response.  Any period outside the normal comment period requires an explanation from the IASB to the DPOC, and subsequent approval.	The DPOC has received notice of any change in the comment period length and has provided approval if required.	
<b>The IASB posts all comment letters that were received to an Rfi on the project pages.</b>	Required	Letters have been posted on the project pages.	The IASB has reported on progress, including summary statistics of respondents, as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>The IASB determines if focused investor consultation is required to supplement the comment letters.</b>	Required	Staff Paper.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings, making specific reference to investor-related activities.	
<b>Project team analyses and summarises Rfi comment letters for the IASB's consideration.</b>  <b>Summary of the comments is posted on the IASB website.</b>	Required	Comment analysis has been presented to the IASB in a public meeting.  Letters that were received have been posted on the IASB website.  The IASB has considered, in a public meeting, the comments received and	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		assessed how to take account of the issues that were raised.		
<b>The IASB considers comment letters and any related investor focused outreach in a public meeting.</b>	Required	Staff Papers have been discussed in public meetings.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Board meetings held in public, with papers available for observers. All decisions are made in public session.</b>	Required	Number of meetings held to discuss topic.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers have been posted in a timely fashion.	The IASB and DPOC have discussed the progress of the due process being conducted.  The IASB and DPOC have reviewed its due process over project life cycles, and how any issues arising from the due process have been/are being addressed.  The DPOC has met with the Advisory Council to understand stakeholders' perspectives.  The DPOC has reviewed and responded to comments on due process as appropriate.	
<b>Feedback Statement</b>				
<b>A Feedback Statement is provided. It contains a high-level summary of the outcome of the agenda consultation and explains how the IASB has responded to the comments received.</b>	Required	Publication of the Feedback Statement.	The IASB has provided a copy of the Feedback Statement to the DPOC at the point of publication.	
<b>Public announcement of the release of the RfI.</b>	Required	Release has been announced in a timely fashion.  Media coverage of the release.	The DPOC has received a copy of the press release and a summary of the media coverage.	

## Research Programme

General IASB requirements: the IASB maintains a broad research programme, which is used to help it identify areas where financial reporting could be improved. The IASB maintains a description of its activities on its website and reports regularly on its activities to the IFRS Advisory Council (the 'Advisory Council') and its network of standard-setters (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 4.6–4.15).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that the IASB is making effective use of its network of standard-setters and is operating in a transparent manner.

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>Maintenance of a transparent research programme.</b>	Required	An up-to-date website that identifies research activities.	The IASB has provided the DPOC with a summary of the projects in the research programme, identifying any other parties that are formally involved in the project and the progress that has been made.	
<b>Maintenance of a register of matters that are raised with the IASB.</b>	Required	Project requests have been posted on the IASB website.	The IASB has reported on requests that were received and any steps taken by it in response.	
<b>Formal updates to the Advisory Council.</b>	Required	Reports to the Advisory Council are available on the IASB website.	The IASB has reported to the DPOC when it has consulted with the Advisory Council and any relevant feedback it received.	
<b>Broad stakeholder engagement.</b>	Required	Summary statistics of outreach and other consultative activities are maintained on the IASB website.	The IASB has reported to the DPOC on outreach activities.	

## Development and publication of Discussion and Research Papers

General IASB requirements: although not a mandatory step in the due process, the IASB often publishes a Discussion Paper (DP), or sponsors the development of a Research Paper (RP), as its first publication on any major new topic as a vehicle to explain the issue and seek early comment from interested parties. It is normally the first major milestone in a research project. The IASB normally allows a period of 120 days for comment on such papers (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 4.16–4.19).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that a thorough process was followed in the development of the papers. The DPOC responds to any comments received on the due process that the IASB followed when it developed and published a DP or RP.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>Discussion or Research Paper development</b>				
<b>DP developed in public meetings.</b>  <b>Or</b> <b>Decision to publish an RP is made in a public meeting, with a clear statement of the extent of the IASB's involvement.</b>	Optional	Meetings held to discuss the topic.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers have been posted in a timely fashion.  Decision was supported by a paper and reported in the <i>IASB Update</i> .	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.  The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Consultation with the IFRS Advisory Council (the 'Advisory Council') has occurred.</b>	Optional	Discussions with the Advisory Council on the topic.	Advisory Council Chair is invited to Trustees' meetings and meetings of the DPOC.	
<b>Project-specific updates are sent via email alerts to registered users.</b>	Optional	Frequency of alerts provided.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Consultative groups are established depending on the nature of issues and the level of interest among interested parties.</b>	Optional	Argument provided for or against the use of the consultative group.  Extent of consultative group meetings that have been held.  Feedback to the consultative group has been provided.	Occasional survey of consultative group effectiveness.  The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	
<b>Online survey to generate evidence in support of or against a particular approach.</b>	Optional	Survey shown on the IASB website.  Number and diversity of respondents.  Analysis of the response.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	
<b>Outreach meetings to promote debate and hear views on</b>	Optional	Schedule of the outreach meetings.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>the financial reporting issue that is being examined.</b>				
<b>Public discussions with representative groups.</b>	Optional	Meetings held.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	
<b>Regional discussion forums, where possible, with national standard-setters with the IASB.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held and the venues where issues have been discussed.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	
<b>Podcasts to provide interested parties with high level updates or other useful information about the specific project.</b>	Optional	Number of podcasts.  Number of participants on podcasts.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	
<b>Publication</b>				
<b>DP or RP has appropriate comment period.</b>	Required	The IASB has set the comment period.  If outside the normal comment period, an explanation from the IASB to the DPOC has been provided, and the decision has been approved.	The DPOC has received notice of any change in the comment period length and has provided approval if required.	
<b>Press release to announce publication of the DP.</b>	Optional	Release was announced in a timely fashion.  Media coverage of the release.	The DPOC has received advance warning of the press release.	
<b>Snapshot document to explain the rationale and basic concepts included in the DP.</b>	Optional	Snapshot prepared at the time of the release.	The DPOC has received a copy of the Snapshot.	
<b>Webcast of interactive presentations streamed in real time from the IASB's office.</b>	Optional	Number of webcasts held.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	
<b>The IASB determines if focused investor consultation is required to supplement the comment letters.</b>	Required if DP issued	Staff Paper.	The IASB has reported on progress, making specific reference to investor related activities, as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Request for additional comment and suggestions by</b>	Optional	Meetings held.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>conducting fieldwork.</b>				
<b>Round-table meetings between external participants and members of the IASB.</b>	Optional	Number of participants in round-table meetings and venues for the round-table meetings confirmed.	The DPOC has received a report of the consultation that has been undertaken.	

## Development and publication of a Request for Information (RFI) (other than RFIs for the three-yearly consultation on the IASB work programme and Post-Implementation Reviews (PIRs))

General IASB requirements: although not a mandatory step in the due process, the IASB may publish a document to seek information on a particular topic. The IASB normally allows a period of 60 days for comment on a RfI (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 4.15–4.19).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that a thorough process was followed in the development of an RfI. The DPOC responds to any comments received on the due process that the IASB followed when developing and publishing an RfI.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>RfI issued to seek information on a specific matter.</b>	Optional	RfI has been issued and posted on the IASB website.	The DPOC has been informed that the IASB plans to issue an RfI.  The DPOC has been given the opportunity to consider the comment period and any other factors that might be perceived as limiting the effectiveness of an RfI.	
<b>Public announcement of the release of the RfI.</b>	Required	Press release and web announcement issued.	The DPOC has been informed when the RfI has been issued.	
<b>RfI has appropriate comment period.</b>	Required	The IASB sets the comment period.  If outside the normal comment period, an explanation from the IASB to the DPOC has been provided, and the decision has been approved.	The DPOC has received notice of any change in the comment period length and has provided approval if required.	
<b>The IASB posts all comment letters that were received in relation to an RfI on the project pages.</b>	Required if request issued	Letters have been posted on the project pages.	The IASB has reported on progress, including a summary of the statistics of respondents, as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>The IASB determines if focused investor consultation is required to supplement the comment letters.</b>	Required if request issued	Staff Paper.	The IASB has reported on progress, making specific reference to investor related activities, as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>The IASB considers comment letters and any related investor focused outreach in a public meeting.</b>	Required if request issued	Staff Papers have been discussed in public meetings.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Project teams analyse and summarise RfI comment letters for the IASB's consideration.</b>  <b>Summary of the comments is</b>	Required	Comment analysis has been presented to the IASB in a public meeting.  Letters received have been posted on the IASB website.  The IASB has considered	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	



<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>posted on the IASB website.</b>		the comments and has weighed them in an approach to the project.		

## Proposals for a standards-level project

General IASB requirements: the IASB evaluates the merits of adding an item to its standards-level programme. Factors that are taken into consideration include: the relevance to users and reliability of information; whether guidance presently exists; the quality of the Standard to be developed; and resource constraints. The main source of new projects is the research programme. The research, which usually includes a Discussion Paper (DP), should provide the IASB with sufficient information for it to make an informed decision about adding a project to its standards-setting programme (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 5.4–5.8).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that, before adding a project to its standards-setting programme, the IASB has assessed the project against its criteria, weighed it against other potential priorities and consulted appropriately.

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<p><b>If a DP or Research Paper (RP) has been issued, the project teams analyse and summarise DP comment letters for the IASB's consideration.</b></p> <p><b>A summary of the comments is posted on the IASB website.</b></p>	Required, if DP issued	<p>Comment analysis has been presented to the IASB in a public meeting.</p> <p>Letters received have been posted on the IASB website.</p> <p>The IASB has considered, in a public meeting, the comments and has weighed them in an approach to the project.</p>	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<p><b>Consultation with the Trustees and the IFRS Advisory Council (the 'Advisory Council').</b></p>	Required	Number of discussions held with both bodies on the project selection.	<p>The DPOC has met with the Advisory Council to ensure that the discussions scheduled on their agenda occur.</p> <p>The IASB Chair has reported regularly to the DPOC and the Trustees on how the comments that have been received through extensive outreach and public consultation are taken into account.</p> <p>The DPOC has responded to any letters or other communications that have been received in connection with the IASB process for agenda setting.</p>	
<p><b>Meetings with stakeholders to facilitate targeted discussions between the IASB and individual organisations or small groups.</b></p>	Required	<p>Extent of outreach meetings held.</p> <p>Webcast meetings held.</p> <p>Webcasts posted to the internet for the public to review.</p>	A summary of the meetings held has been provided to the DPOC.	
<p><b>Public discussions with representative groups.</b></p>	Optional	Extent of meetings held.	A summary of the meetings held, explaining how the raised issues have been cleared, has been provided to the DPOC.	
<p><b>Outreach meetings, educational sessions and conferences with interested parties.</b></p>	Optional	<p>Extent of meetings held.</p> <p>Articles on items are published.</p>	A summary of the meetings held has been provided to the DPOC.	
<p><b>Targeted efforts to reach investor</b></p>	Required	A process for outreach with difficult-to-reach	Outreach activities with investors have been reported to	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
groups.		groups has been devised.  Special materials have been provided to facilitate investor outreach.  Targeted meetings held.	the DPOC.	
<b>Project Decision</b>				
<b>IASB publicly discusses potential projects and its decision to adopt new projects.</b>	Required	Papers have been prepared in a thorough and considered manner and have been posted for the public to see.  An analysis has been provided using the project criteria.  An account of the public consultation and summaries of the comments received are completed for IASB use.	Without commenting on the technical analysis, the DPOC has received evidence of public discussions and agenda papers, including an analysis of issues and comments received.  The DPOC has met with members of the IASB to discuss its process for weighing priorities and has ensured that the IASB has considered the comments it received when adding or deleting an item to its programme.  The DPOC has met with the Advisory Council to discuss views on the project development process.  The IASB has reported on new project decisions as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	

## Project planning

General requirements: when adding an item to its standards-level programme, the IASB provides a proposed project plan that describes the scope of the work and the process for consultation (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 5.1–5.3 and Section 3).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that the IASB has considered the relevant steps in developing a project plan that should result in a high-quality decision-making process with extensive outreach and public consultation. The DPOC responds to any comments received on due process that the IASB followed during its project planning.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>The project plan is considered in public board meetings.</b>	Required	<p>The project plan has been discussed in IASB meetings.</p> <p>Input sought from standard-setters and others to develop a workable plan.</p> <p>Materials have been made publically available on a timely basis.</p> <p>The scope, timing and other critical aspects of effective planning of the project plan are clear.</p>	The IASB has provided a summary of its project plans as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>The IASB considers whether it should establish a consultative group.</b>	Required	<p>Argument for or against the use of a consultative group has been provided.</p> <p>Proposal for the scope and membership of the consultative group has been presented to, and discussed with, the DPOC.</p>	<p>The DPOC has reviewed any decision not to have a consultative group on a major project.</p> <p>The DPOC has reviewed the proposal for the scope and membership of the consultative group for competence and balance.</p> <p>The DPOC has reviewed the membership of the consultative group to ensure an appropriate balance of perspectives.</p>	
<b>The IASB considers whether it should conduct fieldwork.</b>	Required	Argument for or against the use of fieldwork has been provided.	The DPOC has reviewed any decision not to have fieldwork.	
<b>The IASB considers the extent to which it should hold meetings with stakeholders to facilitate targeted discussions between the IASB and individual organisations or small groups.</b>	Required	The proposed outreach plan for the project is included in the work programme.	The DPOC has reviewed the outreach plan.	
<b>The IASB considers the extent to which it should undertake outreach to investor groups.</b>	Required	Outreach plan specifically for investors has been outlined.	The DPOC has reviewed the outreach plan.	

## Development and publication of an Exposure Draft (ED) for a Standard, Practice Guidance or *Conceptual Framework* chapter

General IASB requirements: publication of an ED is a mandatory step in the due process. Irrespective of whether the IASB has published a Discussion Paper (DP), an ED is the IASB's main vehicle for formally consulting the public. Unlike a DP, an ED sets out a specific proposal in the form of a proposed Standard (or amendment to a Standard). Its development is based on the consideration of issues included in staff research and recommendations, as well as comments received on any DP. Suggestions by the IFRS Advisory Council (the 'Advisory Council'), consultative groups and accounting standard-setters and those that arise from public education sessions are also taken into account. The IASB normally allows a period of 120 days for comment on EDs (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 6.1–6.18 and Section 3).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that the process for developing an ED is extensive. The DPOC responds as necessary to comments received on the due process that the IASB followed when developing and publishing an ED and in response to comments received.

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>Board meetings held in public, with papers available for observers. All decisions are made in public session.</b>	Required	Meetings held.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers posted in a timely fashion.	Members of the IASB have discussed with the DPOC the progress of the due process that is being conducted on major projects.  The DPOC has reviewed, when appropriate, the comments that have been received from interested parties on the due process that the IASB followed.	
<b>Consultation with the Trustees and the Advisory Council.</b>	Required	Discussions with the Advisory Council.	The DPOC has met with the Advisory Council to understand stakeholders' perspectives.  The Advisory Council Chair is invited to Trustees' meetings and meetings of the DPOC.	
<b>Consultative groups used, if formed.</b>	Optional	Extent of consultative group meetings, and evidence of substantive involvement in issues.  Consultative group review of the draft ED.	The DPOC has received from the IASB a report of the activity of the consultative group.	
<b>Fieldwork is undertaken to analyse proposals.</b>	Optional	The IASB has described publicly the approach taken on fieldwork.  The IASB has explained to the DPOC why it does not believe fieldwork is warranted, if that is the preferred path.  Extent of field tests taken.	If the IASB has deemed fieldwork to not be a requirement, the DPOC will have the opportunity to discuss and review the IASB's explanation for its decision.  The DPOC has received a report of fieldwork activities and how findings have been taken into consideration by IASB.	
<b>Outreach meetings with a broad range of stakeholders, with special effort to consult investors.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held.  Evidence of specific targeted efforts to consult investors.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities. The DPOC and the IASB have reviewed the outreach plan for the ED and its approach to the optional steps to ensure extensive outreach and public consultation.	
<b>Webcasts and</b>	Optional	Extent of, and	The DPOC has received a	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>podcasts to provide interested parties with high-level updates or other useful information about specific projects.</b>		participation in, webcasts.	report of outreach activities.	
<b>Public discussions with representative groups.</b>	Optional	Extent of discussions held.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>Online survey to generate evidence in support of or against a particular approach.</b>	Optional	Extent and results of surveys.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>The IASB hosts regional discussion forums, where possible, with national standard-setters.</b>	Optional	Schedule of meetings held in these forums.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>Round-table meetings between external participants and members of the IASB.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>Analysis of the likely effects of the forthcoming Standard or major amendment, for example, initial costs or ongoing associated costs.</b>	Required	Publication of the Effect Analysis as part of the Basis for Conclusions.	The IASB has reviewed, with the DPOC, the results of the Effect Analysis and how it has considered such findings in the proposed Standard.  The IASB has provided a copy of the Effect Analysis to the DPOC at the point of the Standard's publication.	
<b>Finalisation</b>				
<b>Due process steps reviewed by the IASB.</b>	Required	Summary of all due process steps discussed by the IASB before a Standard is issued.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Exposure Draft is issued.	
<b>The ED has an appropriate comment period.</b>	Required	The period has been set by the IASB.  If outside the normal comment period, an explanation from the IASB to the DPOC has been provided, and the decision has been approved.	The DPOC has received notice of any change in the comment period length and has provided approval if required.	
<b>Drafting</b>				
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The Translations team has been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps</b>	Required	The XBRL team has been included in the review	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due	

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>are adequate.</b>		process.	process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	The Editorial team has been included in the review process.  In addition, external reviewers are used to review drafts for editorial review and the comments collected are considered by the IASB.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued, including the extent to which external reviewers have been used in the drafting process.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Drafts for editorial review have been made available to members of the International Forum of Accounting Standard-Setters (IFASS) and the comments have been collected and considered by the IASB.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Exposure Draft is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Review draft has been posted on the project website.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Exposure Draft is issued.	
<b>Publication</b>				
<b>ED published.</b>	Required	ED has been posted on the IASB website.	The DPOC has been informed of the release of the ED.	
<b>Press release to announce publication of ED.</b>	Required	Press Release has been published.  Media coverage of the release.	The DPOC has been informed of the release of the ED.	
<b>Snapshot document to explain the rationale and basic concepts included in the ED.</b>	Optional	Snapshot has been posted on the IASB website.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.  The Snapshot has been sent to DPOC members.	

## Finalisation of a Standard, Practice Guidance or *Conceptual Framework* chapter

General IASB requirements: The development of a Standard is carried out during IASB meetings, when the IASB considers the comments received on the Exposure Draft (ED). The IASB will consider whether to expose its revisions for public comment, for example, a second ED. The IASB needs to consider transitional provisions and the effective date (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 6.19–6.39).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: To satisfy the DPOC that the consultation process has been sufficient for the IASB to justify its decisions. The DPOC needs to be assured that the IASB has appropriately considered views of stakeholders before concluding its deliberations, including the scope of the Standard and its technical content. The DPOC must also be assured that the IASB has appropriately considered the need to re-expose changes before finalising a Standard. The DPOC responds to the comments received on the IASB due process in developing a Standard.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>Consideration of information gathered during consultation</b>				
<b>The IASB posts all of the comment letters that are received in relation to the ED on the project pages.</b>	Required if request issued	Letters posted on the project pages.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings, including summary statistics of respondents.	
<b>Round-tables between external participants and members of the IASB.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>IASB meetings are held in public, with papers being available for observers. All decisions are made in public sessions.</b>	Required	Meetings held.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers posted in a timely fashion.  Extent of meetings with consultative group held and confirmation that critical issues have been reviewed with them.	The IASB and the DPOC have discussed progress on major projects, in relation to the due process being conducted.  The IASB and the DPOC have reviewed the due process over the project life cycle, and how any issues about the due process have been/are being addressed.  The DPOC has met with the Advisory Council to understand stakeholders' perspectives.  The DPOC has reviewed and responded to comments on due process as appropriate.	
<b>Analysis of likely effects of the forthcoming Standard or major amendment, for example, costs or on-going associated costs.</b>	Required	Publication of the Effect Analysis.	The IASB and the DPOC have reviewed the results of the Affect Analysis and how it has considered such findings in the proposed Standard.  The IASB has provided a copy of the Effect Analysis to the DPOC at the point of the Standard's publication.	
<b>Email alerts are issued to registered recipients.</b>	Optional	Evidence that alerts have occurred.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	



<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>Outreach meetings to promote debate and hear views on proposals that are published for public comment.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held, including efforts aimed at investors.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>Regional discussion forums are organised with national standard-setters and the IASB.</b>	Optional	Extent of meetings held.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>Finalisation</b>				
<b>Due process steps are reviewed by the IASB.</b>	Required	Summary of all due process steps have been discussed by the IASB before a Standard is issued.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Standard is issued.	
<b>Need for re-exposure of a Standard is considered.</b>	Required	An analysis of the need to re-expose is considered at a public IASB meeting, using the agreed criteria.	The IASB has discussed its thinking on the issue of re-exposure with the DPOC.	
<b>The IASB sets an effective date for the Standard, considering the need for effective implementation, generally providing at least a year.</b>	Required	Effective date set, with full consideration of the implementation challenges.	The IASB has discussed any proposed shortening of the period for effective application with the DPOC.	
<b>Drafting</b>				
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The Translations team has been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before a Standard is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The XBRL team has been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before a Standard is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	The Editorial team has been included in the review process.  In addition, external reviewers used to review drafts for editorial review and the comments collected have been considered by the IASB.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before an ED is issued, including the extent to which external reviewers have been used in the drafting process.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Draft for editorial review has been made available to members of the IFASS and the comments have been collected and considered by the IASB.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before a Standard is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality</b>	Optional	Draft for editorial review	The DPOC has received a	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>assurance steps are adequate.</b>		has been posted on the project website.	summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before a Standard is issued.	
<b>Publication</b>				
<b>Press release to announce final Standard.</b>	Required	Press release has been announced in a timely fashion.  Media coverage of the release.	The DPOC has received a copy of the press release and a summary of the media coverage.	
<b>A Feedback Statement is provided, which provides high level executive summaries of the Standard and explains how the IASB has responded to the comments received.</b>	Required	Publication of the Feedback Statement.	The IASB has provided a copy of the Feedback Statement to the DPOC at the point of the Standard's publication.	
<b>Podcast to provide interested parties with high level updates or other useful information about the Standard.</b>	Optional	Number of podcasts held.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>Standard is published.</b>	Required	Official release.	The DPOC has been informed of the release.	

## Post-implementation Reviews

General IASB requirements: The IASB is required to conduct a Post-implementation Review (PIR) of each new Standard or major amendment. This two-phase process normally begins after the new requirements have been applied internationally for two years. The first phase involves identification and assessment of the matters to be examined. These matters are then the subject to a public consultation by the IASB. In the second phase, the IASB considers the comments received and the information gathered through other consultative activities and then undertakes the review. On the basis of that information, the IASB presents its findings and sets out the steps it plans to take, if any, as a result of the PIR (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 6.52–6.63).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: To ensure that each PIR is undertaken in a timely manner, with an appropriate scope, and adequate consultation. The DPOC also seeks assurance that the IASB has responded to the findings of the review in an appropriate manner.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required /Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>Planning and development of a Request for Information (Rfi)</b>				
<b>Timetable for PIR is established.</b>	Required	The PIR has been discussed in a public meeting and included in the IASB work programme.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Establishment of scope, including identifying the important or contentious issues that came up during the development of the publication.</b>	Required	The initial review should draw on the broad network of IFRS-related bodies and interested parties.  Contentious issues are identifiable from the Basis for Conclusions, Project Summary, Feedback Statement and Effect Analysis.  Significant issues that have come to the attention of the IASB after the document was published.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings, including the extent of the IASB consultation in establishing the scope of the review.	
<b>After the initial assessment, one of two routes may be taken:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rfi published to invite public comment, with appropriate comment period; or</li> <li>• on the basis of its initial assessment, the IASB may decide that it would be premature to undertake a review at the time.</li> </ul>	Required	The Rfi explains why the IASB is seeking feedback on the specified matters and includes any initial assessment by the IASB of the Standard under review.  The Rfi describes the process that the IASB followed to establish the scope of the review.  The IASB sets a comment period for the response, normally a minimum of 120 days. If outside the normal comment period, an explanation has been provided from the IASB to the DPOC, and the decision has been approved.  If the second option is appropriate, the IASB has informed the DPOC of its intention to defer the PIR and explain why this	The DPOC has been informed that an Rfi is to be released, with a summary of the extent of the IASB's deliberations.  The DPOC has been consulted on any unusually short comment period.  The DPOC has received notice of the IASB's intention to defer a PIR, along with the reasons why the conclusion was reached and when the review is expected to resume. The DPOC must approve any such delay.	

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required /Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
		conclusion was reached and when it expects to resume the review.		
<b>The IASB considers whether it is necessary to supplement the RfI with other evidence, such as an analysis of financial information, a review of academic or other related research to the implementation of the Standard being reviewed, or consultations with relevant parties.</b>	Optional	Staff Paper has been provided to the IASB analysing its assessment of academic and other research.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Analysis and preparation of final report</b>				
<b>Project teams analyse and summarise comment letters for the IASB's consideration. IASB posts all comment letters in relation to the RfI online.</b>	Required	Analysis provided and discussion of comments received and any additional analysis for any supplementary undertakings that may have been conducted has been made in public.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>IASB meetings are held in public, with papers being available for observers. All decisions are made in public session.</b>	Required	Number of meetings held to discuss the PIR.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers have been posted in a timely fashion.	The IASB and the DPOC have discussed progress on the PIR, in relation to the due process being conducted.  The IASB and the DPOC have reviewed the due process over the cycle of the PIR, and how any issues about the due process have been/are being addressed.  The DPOC has reviewed and responds to comments on due process as appropriate.	
<b>Public report.</b>	Required	Once deliberations are complete, the findings are presented in a public report.	The IASB has informed the DPOC when it has completed its review and has provided the DPOC with a draft of the report.  When the DPOC believes that the review has been satisfactorily completed, the report can be finalised.	
<b>Implementation of PIR findings.</b>	Required	Minor amendments have been added to the IASB work programme.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Implementation of PIR findings.</b>		More substantial concerns have been considered as part of the research programme and a project proposal has been developed, if appropriate.	The IASB has reported on the progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Implementation of PIR</b>		Recommended changes to due process have been	Staff have prepared and presented the paper to the	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required /Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>findings.</b>		discussed by the DPOC.	DPOC, recommending appropriate actions.	

## Development and publication of Annual Improvements Exposure Drafts

General IASB requirements: Annual Improvements set out proposed amendments to Standards that are sufficiently minor or narrow in scope and can be packaged together and exposed in one document even though the amendments are unrelated. They are normally available for a period of 120 days for comment (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 6.10–6.15 and Section 3).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to ensure that the process for developing Annual Improvements is extensive. The DPOC responds as necessary to comments received on the due process followed by the IASB in developing and publishing an Annual Improvements Exposure Draft (ED) and in response to comments received.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>The IASB and the Interpretations Committee meetings are held in public, with papers being available for observers. All decisions are made in public session.</b>	Required	Meetings held.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers posted in a timely fashion.	The DPOC has reviewed comments from interested parties on the IASB due process as appropriate.	
<b>Finalisation</b>				
<b>Due process steps are reviewed by the IASB.</b>	Required	Summary of all the due process steps have been discussed by the IFRS Interpretations Committee (the 'Interpretations Committee') before an ED is issued.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued.	
<b>A check is performed to ensure that each amendment included in the package meets the Annual Improvements criteria.</b>	Required		The results of this check have been included in the summary report that is provided to the DPOC.	
<b>The ED has an appropriate comment period.</b>	Required	The Interpretations Committee has set the comment period.  If outside the normal comment period, an explanation from the IASB to the DPOC has been provided, and the decision has been approved.	The DPOC has received notice of any change in the comment period length and has provided approval if required.	
<b>Drafting</b>				
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The Translations team have been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The XBRL team have been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	External reviewers have reviewed drafts for editorial review and the comments have been collected and considered by the IASB.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued, including the extent to which external reviewers have been used in the drafting process.	

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Drafts for editorial review have been made available to members of the IFASS and the comments have been collected and considered by the IASB.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Review draft posted on the project website.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued.	
<b>Publication</b>				
<b>ED of Annual Improvements cycle published.</b>	Required	ED posted on the IASB website	The DPOC has been informed of the release of the ED.	
<b>Press release to announce publication of the Annual Improvements ED package.</b>	Required	Press release published.  Media coverage of the release.	The DPOC has been informed of the release of the ED.	

## Development and publication of a draft Rejection Notice

General IASB requirements: publication of a draft Rejection Notice (RN) is a mandatory step if the IFRS Interpretations Committee (the 'Interpretations Committee') decides not to add an item to its work programme. After considering comments on this tentative rejection, the Interpretations Committee will either confirm its decision, add the issue to its work programme or refer the matter to the IASB. It is generally available for a period of 60 days for comment (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 5.22 and Section 7).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that the process for rejecting a request for an Interpretation has been undertaken properly. The DPOC responds as necessary to comments received on the due process that the Interpretations Committee and the IASB followed when developing and publishing a draft RN and in response to comments received.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>Draft rejection notice</b>				
<b>The Interpretations Committee meetings are held in public, with papers being available for observers. All decisions are made in public session.</b>	Required	Meetings held.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers posted in a timely fashion.	The DPOC has reviewed comments from interested parties on the Interpretations Committee due process as appropriate.	
<b>Publication of the Interpretations Committee's intention not to add an item to its work programme.</b>	Required	Tentative rejection published in the <i>IFRIC Update</i> and on the IASB website.		
<b>Draft RN has an appropriate comment period.</b>	Required	The Interpretations Committee sets a comment period for response.  If outside the normal comment period, an explanation from the Interpretations Committee to the DPOC has been provided, and the decision has been approved.	The DPOC has received notice of any change in the comment period length and has provided approval if required.	
<b>Finalisation of rejection</b>				
<b>Decision to confirm rejection decision; add the issue to the Interpretations Committee work programme or refer the matter to the IASB.</b>	Required	This decision is made after the Interpretations Committee has considered comments on the draft RN.		
<b>RN published.</b>	Required, if rejection decision is confirmed.	RN has been posted on the Interpretations Committee website.	The DPOC has been informed of the release of the RN, as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	



## Development and publication of a draft Interpretation

General IASB requirements: publication of a draft Interpretation is a mandatory step in the due process. A draft Interpretation sets out a specific proposal in the form of a proposed Interpretation and is the IFRS Interpretation Committee's (the 'Interpretations committee') main vehicle for formally consulting the public. Its development is based on the consideration of issues included in staff research and recommendations. It is generally available for a period of 90 days for comment (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 7.3–7.13).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that the process for developing a draft Interpretation was extensive. The DPOC responds as necessary to comments received on the due process that the IASB followed when developing and publishing a draft Interpretation and in response to comments received.

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>The Interpretations Committee meetings are held in public, with papers being available for observers. All decisions are made in public session.</b>	Required	Meetings held.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers have been posted in a timely fashion.	The DPOC has reviewed comments from interested parties on the Interpretations Committee due process as appropriate.	
<b>Due process steps are reviewed by the Interpretations Committee.</b>	Required	Summary of all due process steps have been discussed by the Interpretations Committee before a draft Interpretation is issued.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before a draft Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Draft Interpretation has an appropriate comment period.</b>	Required	The Interpretations Committee sets a comment period.  If outside the normal comment period, an explanation has been provided by the Interpretations Committee to the DPOC, and approval is provided, if necessary.	The DPOC has received notice of any change in the comment period length and request for approval if required.	
<b>IASB members polled to identify any objections to releasing the draft Interpretation</b>	Required	Poll undertaken.	If a sufficient number of IASB members object, the matter has been discussed by the IASB and the outcome has been communicated to the DPOC.	
<b>Drafting</b>				
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The Translations team have been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before a draft Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The XBRL team have been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before a draft Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	The Editorial team has been included in the review process.  In addition, external reviewers have been used to review drafts and the	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before a draft Interpretation is issued, including the extent to which external reviewers have been	

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		comments have been collected and considered by the Interpretations Committee.	used in the drafting process.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Draft for editorial review is made available to members of the International Forum of Accounting Standard-Setters (IFASS) and the comments collected are considered by the Interpretations Committee.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before a draft Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Draft for editorial review has been posted on the project website.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before a draft Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Publication</b>				
<b>Draft Interpretation published.</b>	Required	Draft Interpretation has been posted on the Interpretations Committee website.	The DPOC has been informed of the release of the draft Interpretation.	
<b>Press release to announce the publication of the draft Interpretation.</b>	Required	Press release has been published.  Media coverage of the release.	The DPOC has been informed of the release of the draft Interpretation.	

## Finalisation of an Interpretation

General IASB requirements: the development of an Interpretation is carried out during IFRS Interpretations Committee (the 'Interpretations Committee') meetings, when the Interpretations Committee considers the comments received on the draft Interpretation. After the Interpretations Committee has voted to confirm the final Interpretation and has reached general agreement on the wording, it submits the Interpretation to the IASB for ratification. Ratification of an Interpretation takes place in a public meeting of the IASB and requires the same level of support by IASB members as for a new or amended Standard. If an Interpretation is not approved by the IASB, the IASB provides the Interpretations Committee with reasons for the objection (Due Process Handbook, paragraphs 7.14–7.27).

Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) objective: to satisfy the DPOC that the process for finalising the Interpretation was extensive, and that the Interpretations Committee appropriately considers views of stakeholders before concluding its deliberations. The DPOC responds to comments received on the due process that the Interpretations Committee followed when developing an Interpretation.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ Optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>Consideration of information gathered during consultation</b>				
<b>The Interpretations Committee posts all comment letters that are received in response to the draft Interpretation on the project website.</b>	Required if request issued	Letters have been posted on the project website.	The IASB has reported on the progress, including a summary of statistics of respondents, as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Interpretations Committee meetings are held in public and all decisions are made in public.</b>	Required	Meetings held.  Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.  Meeting papers have been posted in a timely fashion.  A number of meetings with the consultative group have been held and it is confirmed that critical issues have been reviewed with them.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>The IASB is satisfied that sufficient outreach has been undertaken.</b>	Required	Analysis of outreach has been undertaken, or an explanation has been given as to why no additional outreach was necessary.	The IASB has reported on progress as part of its quarterly report at Trustee meetings.	
<b>Email alerts are issued to registered recipients.</b>	Optional	Evidence that alerts have occurred.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	
<b>Finalisation</b>				
<b>Due process steps are reviewed by the Interpretations Committee.</b>	Required	Summary of all due process steps discussed by the IASB before an Interpretation is issued.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Need for re-exposure of the Interpretation is considered.</b>	Required	An analysis of the need to re-expose has been considered at a public Interpretations Committee meeting, using the agreed criteria.	The IASB has discussed its thinking on the issue of a re-exposure with the DPOC.	
<b>The Interpretations Committee sets an effective date for the Interpretation,</b>	Required	Effective date has been set, with full consideration of implementation challenges.	The DPOC has been informed of any proposed shortening of the period for effective application before the	

<b>Step</b>	<b>Required/ Optional</b>	<b>Metrics or evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided to DPOC</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>considering the need for effective implementation.</b>			Interpretation is released.	
<b>Ratification of an Interpretation by the IASB.</b>	Required	The IASB has discussed the Interpretation at a public meeting.	The DPOC has been informed of the IASB's discussions, including whether any IASB members are dissenting from the Interpretation.	
<b>Drafting</b>				
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Required	The Translations team has been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps have been followed before the Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate</b>	Required	The XBRL team has been included in the review process.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	The Editorial team has been included in the review process.  In addition, external reviewers have been used to review drafts for editorial review and the comments have been collected and considered by the Interpretations Committee.	The DPOC has received a summary report of due process steps that have been followed before the ED is issued, including the extent to which external reviewers have been used in the drafting process.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Review draft has been made available to members of the International Forum of Accounting Standard-Setters (IFASS) and comments have been collected and considered by the Interpretations Committee.	The DPOC have received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Drafting quality assurance steps are adequate.</b>	Optional	Review draft has been posted on the project website.	The DPOC has received a summary report of the due process steps that have been followed before the Interpretation is issued.	
<b>Publication</b>				
<b>Interpretation is published.</b>	Required	Official release.	The DPOC has been informed of the release.	
<b>Press release to announce final Standard.</b>	Required	Release has been announced in a timely fashion.  Media coverage of the release.	The DPOC has received a copy of the press release and a summary of the media coverage.	
<b>Podcast to provide interested parties with high level updates or other useful information about the Standard.</b>	Optional	Number of podcasts held.	The DPOC has received a report of outreach activities.	

## General reporting to the DPOC

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Evidence provided to DPOC</i>	<i>IASB actions</i>
<b>All comment letters are available on the IASB website.</b>	All comment letters have been posted on the relevant project pages.  Any redactions have been identified on the project page.	The IASB has reported annually to the DPOC on the extent of, and reasons for, any redactions from comment letters.	
<b>All material discussed by the IASB in public meetings is available to observers and on the IASB website.</b>	Project pages and IASB meeting pages include all IASB papers and supporting material.  Any redactions have been identified in the relevant papers.	The IASB has reported annually to the DPOC on the extent of, and the reasons for, any redactions from Staff Papers.	
<b>All IASB papers are distributed to staff and posted on its website in a timely manner</b>	Project pages and IASB meeting pages include all IASB papers and supporting material.	The IASB has reported at regular DPOC meetings on any papers that were distributed to it less than 5 working days before they plan to meet.	
<b>The IFRS Interpretations Committee (the 'Interpretations Committee') operates in an efficient and effective manner.</b>	Consultation with the Interpretations Committee.	The DPOC has met periodically with the Interpretations Committee to discuss their perceptions about the effectiveness and efficiency of the Interpretations Committee.	
<b>Annual review of consultative groups.</b>	Report to the IASB and the DPOC.	The IASB has reported annually to the DPOC on the effectiveness of its consultative groups, including recommendations for the continuation of membership.	
<b>Consistent application of Standards.</b>	Meetings with securities (markets) regulators.	The IASB has reported annually to the DPOC on the extent of its interactions with securities regulators.	
<b>Communication of the possible implications of standard-setting activity on other regulators.</b>	Meetings with prudential regulators.	The IASB has reported annually to the DPOC on the extent of its interactions with securities and prudential regulators.	
<b>Response to referrals from the Monitoring Board.</b>	Formal response to the Monitoring Board.	The DPOC has been actively involved, with full Trustees, to respond within 30 days, or sooner if required, of any referral of a financial reporting matter by the Monitoring Board.	