

STAFF PAPER

October 2014

IASB Meeting

Project	Conceptual Framework
Paper topic	Due process summary for the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> Exposure Draft
CONTACT(S)	Yulia Feygina yfeygina@ifrs.org +44 (0)20 7332 2743

This paper has been prepared by the staff of the IFRS Foundation for discussion at a public meeting of the IASB and does not represent the views of the IASB or any individual member of the IASB. Comments on the application of IFRSs do not purport to set out acceptable or unacceptable application of IFRSs. Technical decisions are made in public and reported in IASB *Update*.

Purpose of this paper

1. This paper:
 - (a) summarises the background to the *Conceptual Framework* project (paragraphs 2–7);
 - (b) considers the due process steps undertaken in developing the *Conceptual Framework* Exposure Draft (‘the *Conceptual Framework* ED’) (paragraphs 8–48);
 - (c) asks the IASB for permission to ballot and about any intentions to dissent (paragraphs 49–51); and
 - (d) discusses the comment period for the *Conceptual Framework* ED (paragraphs 52–54).

Background

2. In 2004, the IASB and the US national standard-setter, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), initiated a joint project to revise their *Conceptual Frameworks*. In September 2010, the IASB and the FASB issued two chapters of the revised *Conceptual Framework*:
 - (a) Chapter 1—The Objective of General Purpose Financial Reporting; and

(b) Chapter 3—Qualitative Characteristics of Useful Financial Information.¹

These chapters became effective as soon as they were published and now form part of the IASB's existing *Conceptual Framework*.

3. The IASB and the FASB also worked jointly on the reporting entity concept, leading to the publication of both a Discussion Paper and an Exposure Draft on this topic. In addition, they carried out some work on the definitions of the elements of the financial statements, and on measurement. However, in November 2010, the boards suspended work on the joint *Conceptual Framework* in order to concentrate on other projects.
4. In 2011, the IASB carried out a public consultation on its agenda. Many respondents to that consultation identified the *Conceptual Framework* as a priority project. In the light of those responses, in 2012, the IASB restarted its *Conceptual Framework* project. This project is no longer being conducted jointly with the FASB².
5. In their previous work, the IASB and the FASB planned to carry out revisions to the *Conceptual Framework* in eight phases. However, the phased approach made it difficult for both respondents and the boards to assess how possible approaches to particular areas would affect the *Conceptual Framework* as a whole. Consequently, the IASB decided to carry out its remaining work on the *Conceptual Framework* in one single phase.
6. The revived project focuses on:
 - (a) elements of the financial statements (including the distinction between liabilities and equity);
 - (b) recognition and derecognition;
 - (c) measurement;

¹ Chapter 2 was intended to cover the reporting entity concept but was not finalised.

² The FASB has also restarted the work on its Framework and is discussing presentation, disclosure and measurement.

- (d) presentation and disclosure (including presentation in profit or loss and other comprehensive income (OCI)); and
 - (e) the reporting entity.
7. In developing proposals for a revised *Conceptual Framework*, the IASB has built on both its previous work and the existing *Conceptual Framework*—updating, clarifying and filling in the gaps—rather than fundamentally reconsidering the existing *Conceptual Framework*. Specifically, the IASB did not propose to fundamentally reconsider Chapters 1 and 3 of the *Conceptual Framework* that were issued in 2010.

Due process steps

8. This section discusses the mandatory and ‘comply or explain’ due process steps undertaken by the IASB in developing the *Conceptual Framework* ED. Those due process steps are set out in paragraphs 3.43-3.44 of the *Due Process Handbook*. The following paragraphs discuss the following due process steps:
- (a) publishing a discussion document (paragraphs 10–18);
 - (b) debating proposals in public meetings (paragraphs 19–25);
 - (c) reporting to the IFRS Foundation Trustees and Advisory Council (paragraphs 26–27);
 - (d) consultative group (paragraphs 28–30);
 - (e) consultation and outreach (paragraphs 31–38);
 - (f) information on the IFRS Foundation website (paragraphs 39–41); and
 - (g) effects of the revised *Conceptual Framework* (paragraphs 42–48).
9. This section should be considered in conjunction with [Appendix A](#), which contains a detailed assessment of the due process steps followed in the development of the *Conceptual Framework* ED.

Publishing a discussion document

10. Publishing a discussion document, for example a Discussion Paper, before developing an Exposure Draft is a non-mandatory due process step.
11. In July 2013, the IASB published a Discussion Paper *A Review of the Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting* (the ‘Discussion Paper’)—the first consultation document in the revived *Conceptual Framework* project. The Discussion Paper had a 180-day comment period that ended in January 2014.
12. The Discussion Paper did not discuss the concept of ‘reporting entity’, because the IASB and the FASB had issued a Discussion Paper on that topic in 2008, followed by an Exposure Draft in 2010. The feedback received on those documents fed into the development of the reporting entity part of the forthcoming *Conceptual Framework* ED.
13. The IASB received more than 220 comment letters in response to the 2013 Discussion Paper. In addition, IASB members and staff conducted over 150 outreach meetings. Please refer to paragraphs 31–38 for further discussion of the outreach activities.
14. In March 2014 the IASB discussed the summaries of the comment letters and outreach activities. The comment letters and the summaries of the feedback received are available on the [Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website](#).
15. Respondents to the Discussion Paper expressed support for many of the suggestions included in the Discussion Paper. However, some respondents expressed the view that:
 - (a) the Discussion Paper was underdeveloped in particular areas. The sections on measurement, presentation and disclosure, presentation in the statements of profit or loss and OCI and the distinction between liabilities and equity were often cited as examples of this concern.
 - (b) the Discussion Paper appeared, in places, to simply justify existing practice rather than develop fundamental concepts.

- (c) the IASB should allow more time for in-depth discussions of the topics that will be included in the revised *Conceptual Framework*.
16. Many respondents also commented on the IASB’s proposal not to reconsider fundamentally Chapters 1 and 3 of the *Conceptual Framework*. They urged the IASB to reconsider particular aspects of those chapters, notably the notions of stewardship, prudence, reliability and substance over form.
17. The IASB has considered the feedback received in its deliberations and developed revised proposals for inclusion in the *Conceptual Framework* ED. The key changes since the proposals in the Discussion Paper include:
- (a) **measurement**—focus the discussion of measurement on the factors to consider in selecting a measurement basis; include a description of the different measurement bases and the information that they provide; and remove the detailed discussion of the implications of the measurement decisions for particular types of assets and liabilities.
 - (b) **presentation in profit or loss and OCI**—remove the discussion of the categories of items that can be included in OCI; emphasise the role of profit or loss as the primary source of information about an entity’s performance; and provide high level guidance to the IASB on the use of OCI.
 - (c) **presentation and disclosure**—remove the distinction between primary financial statements and notes and remove Standards-level detail; focus on the communication role of financial statements and presentation and disclosure in financial statements as a whole.
 - (d) **Chapters 1 and 3**—increase the prominence of stewardship within the overall objective of financial reporting; reintroduce a reference to prudence in the *Conceptual Framework*; and describe prudence as the exercise of caution when making judgments under conditions of uncertainty.
18. The IASB does not propose any substantive changes to the distinction between liabilities and equity in the existing *Conceptual Framework*, but it will continue

deliberations on that topic within the research project on *Financial Instruments with Characteristics of Equity*.

Debating proposals in public meetings

19. The IASB is required to debate all technical proposals in public meetings.
20. Before the *Conceptual Framework* project was suspended in 2010, the IASB and the FASB had discussed elements, measurement and the reporting entity at public meetings—and that work fed into the IASB’s deliberations after the project was revived.
21. In addition, in developing the proposals on the revised *Conceptual Framework* for the Discussion Paper and the *Conceptual Framework* ED, the IASB also drew on the public discussions in several Standards-level projects, such as:
 - (a) Financial Statement Presentation (presentation and disclosure);
 - (b) Non-financial Liabilities (measurement and elements);
 - (c) Emission Trading Schemes (elements and unit of account);
 - (d) Leases (elements and unit of account);
 - (e) Revenue Recognition (control);
 - (f) Liabilities/Equity (elements); and
 - (g) Financial Instruments (measurement).
22. These projects have included discussion of conceptual issues, because the IASB has endeavoured to develop consistent concepts across the projects.
23. After the *Conceptual Framework* project was revived in 2012, and leading up to the publication of the Discussion Paper, the IASB discussed the *Conceptual Framework* project at five public meetings (which, in total, lasted more than 28 hours) and three public education sessions in 2012 and 2013.
24. The IASB discussed the feedback received on the Discussion Paper and deliberated the proposals for inclusion in the upcoming *Conceptual Framework* ED at seven public meetings in 2014, including this month’s meeting (73 agenda

papers and a total of approximately 30 hours). The IASB also discussed the *Conceptual Framework* project at one public education session in June 2014.

25. Agenda papers discussed by the IASB over the course of the project as well as the meeting summaries (*IASB Update*) are available on the [Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website](#).

Reporting to the IFRS Foundation Trustees and Advisory Council

26. The IASB is required to update the Advisory Council on its technical programme and major projects as part of its due process. The Advisory Council was updated on the progress of *Conceptual Framework* project, as part of the reports on the technical work programme, at every meeting since the project was reactivated. In addition, the Advisory Council specifically discussed the *Conceptual Framework* project at its June 2013, October 2013, June 2014 and October 2014 meetings. Topics discussed included strategy for Chapters 1 and 3, strategy for the development of the *Conceptual Framework* ED and the purpose and status of the *Conceptual Framework*. There was also an optional education session on the project for the members of the Advisory Council at the June 2014 meeting.
27. The IFRS Foundation Trustees and the Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) have also been informed of the status and progress of the project at every meeting since the project was revived, as part of the reports on the technical work programme. The latest update provided to the DPOC was at its October 2014 meeting.

Consultative group

28. The *Due Process Handbook* states that the IASB usually establishes a consultative group for major projects. The purpose of a consultative group is to provide additional practical experience and expertise. The consultative group for the revived *Conceptual Framework* project is the Accounting Standards Advisory Forum (ASAF). ASAF is an advisory group to the IASB, consisting of national accounting standard-setters and regional bodies with an interest in financial

reporting. ASAF members have experience and expertise relevant to the *Conceptual Framework* project.

29. The IASB has consulted the ASAF at every ASAF meeting (April 2013, September 2013, December 2013, March 2014 and June 2014 and September 2014) since the *Conceptual Framework* project was revived. At each meeting, the ASAF was provided with an update on the progress of the project. In addition, the IASB has sought ASAF members' views on particular topics, such as strategy for the development of the *Conceptual Framework* ED, measurement, presentation in profit or loss and OCI, distinction between liabilities and equity, business model, complexity, executory contracts, prudence, and the implications of long-term investing for the *Conceptual Framework*.
30. ASAF meetings are held in public. Papers discussed at ASAF meetings and summaries of the discussion are available on the [Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website](#).

Consultation and outreach

31. In addition to reporting to the Advisory Council and to the IFRS Foundation Trustees and consulting the ASAF, the IASB has undertaken extensive outreach and consultation with a broad range of stakeholders over the course of the *Conceptual Framework* project. Some of those meetings were public, while others were private.
32. In 2007, before the *Conceptual Framework* project was suspended, the IASB and the FASB held joint public round-table meetings on measurement in London, Hong Kong and Norwalk.
33. In developing the 2013 Discussion Paper, the IASB sought only limited external input on its proposals, because the IASB felt that it would be more appropriate to seek input on the complete package of proposals, rather than on a piecemeal basis. That approach was consistent with the rationale for the IASB's decision to develop the proposals for the revised *Conceptual Framework* in a single phase.
34. After the publication of the Discussion Paper, IASB members and staff conducted over 150 outreach meetings, including 26 meetings with investors and analysts.

35. Outreach efforts included the following:
- (a) public [round-table meetings](#) in London, Toronto, São Paulo and Tokyo held in October and November 2013;
 - (b) outreach meetings organised by local standard-setters in Southern Africa, Europe, East Asia, Latin America and North America;
 - (c) discussions with the specialist advisory bodies to the IASB such as the Capital Markets Advisory Committee (CMAC) and the Global Preparers Forum (GPF);
 - (d) presentations and debate at various IFRS conferences, including presentations at World Standard-setters and IFRS conferences; and
 - (e) meetings with groups or individuals, from various backgrounds, including preparers, auditors, national standard-setters, academics, regulators and targeted outreach with investors and analysts.
36. At outreach events, the IASB members and staff provided an overview of the Discussion Paper and sought feedback on the IASB’s preliminary views. Not all topics were discussed at every meeting. Instead, the meeting agendas were tailored to the areas of interest and expertise of the meeting participants. For example, outreach meetings with investors and analysts focused on the distinction between liabilities and equity, presentation in profit or loss and OCI, measurement and issues related to prudence, reliability and stewardship.
37. As stated in paragraph 14, the feedback from outreach activities was included in [the summaries of feedback received](#), and was discussed by the IASB at its March 2014 meeting. [Feedback received from investors and analysts](#) was summarised in a separate agenda paper and was also discussed by the IASB at its March 2014 meeting.
38. The IASB and the staff have not conducted fieldwork on the proposals for the *Conceptual Framework* ED. This is because the *Conceptual Framework* is not a Standard and is expected to have only limited direct effect on parties other than the IASB. The effects of the revised *Conceptual Framework* are discussed in paragraphs 42–48.

Information on the IFRS Foundation website

39. The staff have made use of the IFRS Foundation website to provide interested parties with regular updates on the *Conceptual Framework* project. Specifically, the [Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website](#) includes:
- (a) the Discussion Paper and accompanying material, such as a snapshot of the Discussion Paper, recordings of webcasts and a podcast conducted during the period for comment on the Discussion Paper, and relevant investor resources such as an article on the proposals in the Discussion Paper;
 - (b) comment letters and feedback summaries;
 - (c) agenda papers, decisions summaries (*IASB Update*) and recordings of IASB meetings;
 - (d) papers discussed by the IASB with its formal advisory bodies (Advisory Council, ASAF, CMAC, GPF) and recordings of those meetings; and
 - (e) a high level comparison of the IASB's tentative decisions to date with the proposals in the Discussion Paper.
40. In addition, interested parties have received updates on major project news through subscriber email alerts. As of the end of September 2014, there were more than 3,000 subscribers to the *Conceptual Framework* email alerts.
41. The [Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website](#) also contains information about the work on the project before it was suspended in 2010.

Effects of the revised Conceptual Framework

42. The *Conceptual Framework* sets out the concepts that underlie the preparation and presentation of financial statements. The IASB has tentatively decided that the purpose of the revised *Conceptual Framework* will be to assist:
- (a) the IASB in developing and revising the Standards;

- (b) preparers in developing accounting policies when no Standard or Interpretation specifically applies to a particular transaction or event; and to assist
 - (c) all parties in understanding and interpreting the Standards.
43. The *Conceptual Framework* is not a Standard or Interpretation and does not override the requirements of any specific Standard or Interpretation. However, because the IASB will use the revised *Conceptual Framework* in developing and revising Standards, it will have an effect on any new or revised Standards. Consequently, the revised *Conceptual Framework* will affect other parties when they adopt any such new or revised Standards. It will also affect other parties when they:
- (a) develop new accounting policies for transactions or events that are not specifically addressed in an existing Standard or Interpretation; or
 - (b) select an accounting policy when IFRS permits a choice of accounting policies.
44. Agenda papers presented to the IASB in developing the *Conceptual Framework* ED have considered the effects that the revised *Conceptual Framework* could have on the different parties.
45. For example, the IASB [tentatively decided](#) in July 2014 that:
- (a) the IASB and the IFRS Interpretations Committee will start using the revised *Conceptual Framework* once it is finalised;
 - (b) entities that apply the *Conceptual Framework* in developing accounting policies will be granted a transition time of no less than approximately 18 months after the issuance of the revised *Conceptual Framework*; and
 - (c) early application of the revised *Conceptual Framework* will be permitted.
46. In addition, Agenda Paper 10D for this month's meeting considers the effects the proposals in the *Conceptual Framework* project might have if the IASB were to revisit its existing Standards.

47. The revised *Conceptual Framework* will not cause immediate changes to existing Standards. This is because any decision to start developing amendments to an existing Standard would require the IASB to go through its normal due process for adding a project to its agenda, including the required periodic agenda consultation. In addition, when the IASB considers whether to start a project to amend an existing Standard, the existence of any possible inconsistencies between the Standard and the *Conceptual Framework* is only one factor the IASB would consider. As stated in paragraph 4.23 of the *Due Process Handbook*, amending a Standard is not an automatic consequence of revisions to the *Conceptual Framework*. Instead, changes to Standards are made to address deficiencies in financial reporting.
48. Consistently with the provisions of the *Due Process Handbook*, discussion of the likely effects of the revised *Conceptual Framework* will be published in the Basis for Conclusions on the *Conceptual Framework* ED.

Permission to ballot and intention to dissent

49. In Appendix A of this paper the staff have summarised the due process steps undertaken in developing the Exposure Draft. The staff note that the required due process steps have been completed.
50. In accordance with paragraph 6.23 of the *Due Process Handbook*, any members of the IASB who intend to dissent from the *Conceptual Framework* ED are required to make that intention known at this time.
51. The publication of the *Conceptual Framework* ED is scheduled for Q1 2015.

Questions 1-3 for the IASB

1. Is the IASB satisfied that it has undertaken sufficient due process steps to proceed to balloting the *Conceptual Framework* ED?
2. Does the IASB grant the staff permission to begin the balloting process for the *Conceptual Framework* ED?

3. Do any IASB members plan to dissent from the publication of the *Conceptual Framework* ED?

Comment period

52. The *Due Process Handbook* states that the comment period for an Exposure Draft is normally at least 120 days. Accordingly, the IASB could decide to set a 120-day comment period for the *Conceptual Framework* ED. A 120-day comment period could be supported by the argument that the *Conceptual Framework* ED will be the second due process document in the revived *Conceptual Framework* project and therefore interested parties will be familiar with most of the topics addressed in the *Conceptual Framework* ED.
53. However, the staff note that the revised *Conceptual Framework* will have a profound and overarching effect on the future standard-setting process. Accordingly, the staff think that a longer comment period should be considered by the IASB. A longer comment period would enable interested parties to provide a more considered response and would also allow the IASB and the staff to conduct more outreach to gain a better understanding of various perspectives on the proposals.
54. As noted in paragraph 51, the *Conceptual Framework* ED is scheduled for publication in Q1 2015. The effect of different comment periods on the timetable for the project is shown in the following table:

Comment period	Projected end of comment period	Projected date for feedback summaries	Projected publication of the final <i>Conceptual Framework</i>
120 days	May/June 2015	Sept 2015	Q2 2016
150 days	June/July 2015	Sept/Oct 2015	Q2 2016
180 days	July/August 2015	Oct/Nov 2015	Q3 2016

Question 4 for the IASB

4. What comment period does the IASB consider appropriate for the *Conceptual Framework* ED?

Appendix A: Due process steps followed in the development of the *Conceptual Framework* ED

Step	Required/ optional	Metrics or evidence	Actions
<p>Board meetings held in public, with papers available for observers. All decisions are made in public session.</p>	<p>Required</p>	<p>Meetings held.</p> <p>Project website contains a full description with up-to-date information.</p> <p>Meeting papers posted in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>IASB meetings</p> <p>The IASB and the FASB held public meetings on the joint <i>Conceptual Framework</i> project in 2004-2010.</p> <p>The IASB held public meetings, including public education sessions, leading up to the publication of the Discussion Paper <i>A Review of the Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting</i>, from September 2012 to May 2013.</p> <p>The IASB held public meetings, including a public education session, in developing the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> ED from March 2014 to October 2014.</p> <p>Project website</p> <p>The Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website has been in place over the course of the project. It contains a description of the project objective and history, meeting papers, summaries of the tentative decisions made (<i>IASB Update</i>), and recordings of the meetings, as well as papers discussed with the IASB advisory bodies. It contains comment letters on the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> Discussion Paper that was issued in July 2013 and</p>

The IASB is the independent standard-setting body of the IFRS Foundation, a not-for-profit corporation promoting the adoption of IFRSs. For more information visit www.ifrs.org

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			<p>summaries of the feedback received. It also contains information about the work performed by the IASB and the FASB before the project was suspended in 2010.</p> <p>Meeting papers</p> <p>All meeting papers have been posted on the IASB website prior to the meeting dates.</p>
Consultation with the Trustees and the Advisory Council.	Required	Discussions with the Advisory Council.	<p>The Advisory Council has been updated on the progress of the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> project at every meeting. In addition, the Advisory Council discussed:</p> <p>(1) the feedback on the Discussion Paper at its June 2014 meeting and provided input on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the strategy and timetable of the project; and (b) the purpose and status of the <i>Conceptual Framework</i>, and <p>(2) long-term investment, at its October 2014 meeting.</p> <p>The papers are provided on the Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website.</p> <p>The DPOC</p> <p>The DPOC has been regularly updated on the status of the project, most recently at its meeting in October 2014.</p>

Step	Required/ optional	Metrics or evidence	Actions
Consultative groups used, if formed.	Optional	Extent of consultative group meetings, and evidence of substantive involvement in issues. Consultative group review of the draft ED.	As stated on the Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website , the <i>Conceptual Framework's</i> consultative group is the Accounting Standards Advisory Forum (ASAF). During the development of the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> ED, the ASAF discussed the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> project at every meeting: March 2014, June 2014 and September 2014. All papers and summaries from these meetings are included on the Conceptual Framework page of the IFRS Foundation website .
Fieldwork is undertaken to analyse proposals.	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.	The <i>Conceptual Framework</i> is not a Standard and does not override the requirements of specific Standards. The revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> will guide the IASB in setting Standards and other parties in applying any new or amended Standards or developing accounting policies on the basis of the revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> . The revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> will not cause immediate changes to existing Standards. The effects of the revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> on the existing Standards are discussed in greater detail below under the Effects Analysis section. Accordingly, the revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> is expected to have only a limited direct effect on parties other than the IASB and therefore fieldwork is not considered necessary.

Step	Required/ optional	Metrics or evidence	Actions
Outreach meetings with a broad range of stakeholders, with special effort to consult investors.	Optional	Extent of meetings held. Evidence of specific targeted efforts to consult investors.	<p>Before the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> project was suspended in 2010, the IASB and the FASB had round-table meetings on measurement, published Discussion Papers and Exposure Drafts on ‘reporting entity’, ‘objective’ and ‘qualitative characteristics’. Various parties contributed to those discussions. That work fed into the development of the 2013 Discussion Paper. In addition, in January 2013, the IASB held a public discussion forum on disclosure that also fed into the development of the proposals in the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Since the publication of the Discussion Paper, the IASB members and staff have conducted outreach and consultation with a broad range of interested parties from various jurisdictions. There were more than 150 outreach meetings conducted, including the following:</p> <p>(a) public round-table meetings in London, Toronto, São Paulo and Tokyo held in October-November 2013;</p> <p>(b) outreach meetings organised by local standard-setters in Southern Africa, Europe, East Asia, Latin America and North America during the comment period of the Discussion Paper;</p> <p>(c) discussions with the IASB advisory bodies (IFRS Advisory Council, ASAF, Capital Markets Advisory Committee (CMAC) and Global Preparers Forum (GPF));</p> <p>(d) presentations and debates at various IFRS conferences, including World</p>

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			<p>Standard-setters and IFRS conferences; and</p> <p>(e) meetings with groups or individuals, from various backgrounds, including preparers, auditors, national standard-setters, academics, regulators and targeted outreach with investors and analysts.</p> <p>The purpose of the outreach meetings ranged from providing an overview of the Discussion Paper to getting feedback on the IASB’s preliminary views. Not all topics were discussed at every meeting. Instead, the focus was on the topics that were thought to be of particular interest to the meeting participants.</p> <p><u>Investors and analysts</u></p> <p>The IASB members and staff conducted targeted outreach with investors and analysts that focused on the distinction between liabilities and equity, presentation in profit or loss and OCI, measurement and issues related to prudence, reliability and stewardship. There were a total of 26 meetings specifically with investors and analysts.</p>

Step	Required/ optional	Metrics or evidence	Actions
Webcasts and podcasts to provide interested parties with high level updates or other useful information about specific projects.	Optional	Extent of, and participation in, webcasts.	IASB members and staff conducted podcasts during the development of the Discussion Paper to provide updates on IASB discussions. Upon the publication of the Discussion Paper, the IASB members and staff conducted a webcast that provided an overview of the Discussion Paper and separate webcasts for every section in the Discussion Paper. The IASB has also conducted a podcast to explain particular proposals in the Discussion Paper.
Public discussions with representative groups.	Optional	Extent of discussions held.	The <i>Conceptual Framework</i> project was discussed by the members of the IASB's CMAC, GPF and ASAF at public meetings that fed into the development of the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> ED.
Online survey to generate evidence in support of or against a particular approach.	Optional	Extent and results of surveys.	The IASB undertook a survey on disclosures and that survey fed into the development of the Discussion Paper. A survey on other aspects of <i>Conceptual Framework</i> is not considered necessary at this point.

Step	Required/ optional	Metrics or evidence	Actions
The IASB hosts regional discussion forums, where possible, with national standard-setters.	Optional	Schedule of meetings held in these forums.	Most of the outreach meetings were organised together with either the regional national standard-setters or the national standard-setters. In addition, the IASB members and staff gave presentations on the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> project in IFRS Conferences in Singapore, London, Johannesburg and Mexico.
Round-table meetings between external participants and members of the IASB.	Optional	Extent of meetings held.	The IASB hosted public round-table meetings in London, Toronto, São Paulo and Tokyo in October–November 2013.
Analysis of the likely effects of the forthcoming Standard or major amendment, for	Required	Publication of the Effect Analysis as part of the Basis for Conclusions.	As stated above, the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> is not a Standard and does not override the requirements of specific Standards. The revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> will guide the IASB in setting Standards and will guide other parties in applying any new or amended Standards or developing accounting policies on the basis of the revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> . The revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> will not necessarily lead to changes to existing Standards.

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Actions</i>
example, initial costs or ongoing associated costs.			<p>Any decision to amend an existing Standard would require the IASB to go through its normal due process for adding a project to its agenda and for developing an Exposure Draft and an amendment to that Standard. In addition, when the IASB considers whether to start a project to amend an existing Standard, the existence of any possible inconsistencies between the Standard and the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> is only one factor the IASB would consider. As stated in paragraph 4.23 of the <i>Due Process Handbook</i>, amending a Standard is not an automatic consequence of revisions to the <i>Conceptual Framework</i>. Instead, changes to Standards are made to address deficiencies in financial reporting.</p> <p>The revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> is expected to have a limited direct effect on parties other than the IASB. The IASB has considered effects of the revised <i>Conceptual Framework</i> on parties other than the IASB in its deliberations of the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> ED. For example, the IASB discussed the transition period for entities that apply the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> in developing accounting policies.</p> <p>Effects Analysis will be also be included in the Basis for Conclusions in the <i>Conceptual Framework</i> ED.</p>

<i>Step</i>	<i>Required/ optional</i>	<i>Metrics or evidence</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Due process steps reviewed by the IASB.	Required	Summary of all due process steps discussed by the IASB before a Standard is issued.	To be discussed at this meeting.
The ED has an appropriate comment period.	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.	To be discussed at this meeting.