

EFRAG Survey on IASB Third Agenda Consultation and EFRAG Research Agenda

EFRAG Survey on IASB Third Agenda Consultation and EFRAG Research Agenda

Page description:

Introduction

The survey consists of two parts.

Part A: EFRAG's consultation on the IASB's Third Agenda Consultation

EFRAG is consulting on its [Draft Comment letter](#) in response to the [IASB's Third Agenda Consultation](#).

The IASB undertakes a public consultation on its activities and its work plan every five years (agenda consultation). This is the third time the IASB consults the public via an agenda consultation to help create its five-year plan (2022-2026).

The IASB is asking for views on:

- (a) the strategic direction and balance of the IASB's activities;
- (b) the criteria for assessing the priority of financial reporting issues that could be added to the work plan; and
- (c) new financial reporting issues that could be given priority in the IASB's work plan.

Part B: EFRAG's consultation on its own Proactive research agenda

EFRAG is also consulting on its own Research Agenda.

Part B of this survey allows constituents to provide feedback to EFRAG on the projects that could be considered as part of EFRAG's Proactive Agenda.

Stakeholders can provide their input to EFRAG in one of two ways:

Submit a comment letter to EFRAG ([here](#)); and/or

Complete this survey.

The consultation is open for comment until 17 September 2021

The completion of both parts of the survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes. It is possible to respond only to the questions that are the most relevant to you.

Background information (* Mandatory questions)

1. Personal information *

First name:

Last name:

Your organisation:

E-mail:

2. Please indicate whether you want to be contacted for any follow-up questions: *

- Yes, I want to be contacted
- No, I do not want to be contacted

3. What is your functional role? (please select one of the following): *

- Academic/Researcher
- Auditor/Accounting organisation
- Individual
- Preparer/Preparer organisation
- Professional organisation
- Regulator
- Standard-setter
- User/User organisation
- Other (please specify):

4. Please indicate the region or country in which you are based: *

European Union (please insert the country)

Other (please insert the country)

Part A – IASB’s THIRD AGENDA CONSULTATION

STRATEGIC DIRECTION AND BALANCE OF THE IASB’S ACTIVITIES

5. The IASB identified 6 main areas of activities and estimated for each the current ‘level of focus’ that is the level of IASB’s resources allocated to each of the activities. For an overview of the IASB’s main activities please see Table 1 in the Request for Information.

Should the IASB increase, leave unchanged or decrease the current level of focus for each of its main activities?

	Increase	Leave unchanged	Decrease	No opinion
New IFRS Standards and major amendments to IFRS Standards (current level of focus 40% to 45%)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintenance and consistent application of IFRS Standards (current level of focus 15% to 20%)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IFRS for SMEs Standard (current level of focus 5%)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reporting by developing and maintaining the IFRS Taxonomy (current level of focus 5%)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Understandability and accessibility of the Standard (current level of focus 5%)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stakeholder engagement (current level of focus 25%)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please use the text box if needed to explain your assessment. You can also specify the types of work within each main activities that the IASB should increase or decrease and the reasons for the changes.

6. In its draft comment letter in response to the IASB's Request for Information, EFRAG did not assign specific proportions to the IASB's activities but expected that, after the publication of several major standards over the last period (IFRS 15 Revenue from Contracts with Customers, IFRS 16 Leases and IFRS 17 Insurance Contracts) the next 5-year period would focus more on projects already active, Post-Implementation Review of large Standards and undertaking standard-setting projects when necessary.

In addition, EFRAG also suggested additional financial reporting issues not yet covered by the IASB's RFI, in particular (please click on the project for further description):

- Digital reporting; and
- Connecting financial and sustainability reporting (starting from climate-related financial implications).

Do you agree with the above view? Why or why not?

CRITERIA FOR THE IASB TO ASSESS THE PRIORITY OF FINANCIAL REPORTING ISSUES

LOGIC Show/hide trigger exists.

7. The IASB considers seven criteria, which are listed below, in deciding whether to add a potential project to its work plan. The criteria are:

- The importance of the matter to investors;
- Whether there is any deficiency in the way companies report the type of transaction or activity in financial reports;
- The type of companies that the matter is likely to affect, including whether the matter is more prevalent in some jurisdictions than others;
- How pervasive or acute the matter is likely to be for companies;
- The potential project's interaction with other projects on the work plan;
- The complexity and feasibility of the potential project and its solutions;
- The capacity of the Board and its stakeholders to make timely progress on the potential project.

Do you consider that the IASB has identified the right criteria?

- Yes
- No

Logic Hidden unless: #7 Question "The IASB considers seven criteria, which are listed below, in deciding whether to add a potential project to its work plan. The criteria are:

- The importance of the matter to investors;
- Whether there is any deficiency in the way companies report the type of transaction or activity in financial reports;
- The type of companies that the matter is likely to affect, including whether the matter is more prevalent in some jurisdictions than others;
- How pervasive or acute the matter is likely to be for companies;
- The potential project's interaction with other projects on the work plan;
- The complexity and feasibility of the potential project and its solutions;
- The capacity of the Board and its stakeholders to make timely progress on the potential project.

Do you consider that the IASB has identified the right criteria?

" is one of the following answers ("No")

Please explain why you do not agree with the criteria and whether you would propose other criteria:

LOGIC Show/hide trigger exists.

8. In its draft comment letter, EFRAG while generally agreeing with the 7 criteria considered by the IASB also suggested to consider in its assessment:

- evidence of structuring opportunities, and
- proliferation of non-GAAP information providing evidence that some requirements are not considered to result in relevant information.

Do you agree with the suggestions made by EFRAG?

- Yes
- No

LOGIC Hidden unless: #8 Question "In its draft comment letter, EFRAG while generally agreeing with the 7 criteria considered by the IASB also suggested to consider in its assessment:

- evidence of structuring opportunities, and
- proliferation of non-GAAP information providing evidence that some requirements are not considered to result in relevant information.

Do you agree with the suggestions made by EFRAG?

" is one of the following answers ("No")

Please explain your response:

[Load](#) Show/hide trigger exists.

9. EFRAG observes that the IASB has developed and used the following three additional criteria that were never submitted to proper due process:

- The potential project's interaction with other projects on the work plan;
- The complexity and feasibility of the potential project and its solutions; and
- The capacity of the IASB and its stakeholders to make timely progress on the potential project.

EFRAG suggests to give precedence, in selecting projects, to the 'official' criteria as contained in the Due Process Handbook; and consider whether these additional criteria could be considered for the inclusion into the Due Process Handbook as part of the next consultation.

Do you agree with the suggestions made by EFRAG?

- Yes
- No

Logic Hidden unless: #9 Question "EFRAG observes that the IASB has developed and used the following three additional criteria that were never submitted to proper due process:

- The potential project's interaction with other projects on the work plan;
- The complexity and feasibility of the potential project and its solutions; and
- The capacity of the IASB and its stakeholders to make timely progress on the potential project.

EFRAG suggests to give precedence, in selecting projects, to the 'official' criteria as contained in the Due Process Handbook; and consider whether these additional criteria could be considered for the inclusion into the Due Process Handbook as part of the next consultation.

Do you agree with the suggestions made by EFRAG?" is one of the following answers ("No")

Please explain your response:

FINANCIAL REPORTING ISSUES THAT COULD BE ADDED TO THE IASB'S WORK PLAN

10. The table below includes the financial reporting projects that EFRAG has tentatively assigned a highest priority in its Draft Comment Letter.

Please indicate whether you agree with the prioritisation and the scope of the financial reporting issues.

(the links in the table below will redirect you to the paragraph in EFRAG's DCL where the EFRAG suggested scope is described)

Please note that you will have the opportunity to indicate any other projects that you would like to add as a highest priority project in the next question (Question 11). Please be aware that EFRAG needs to limit the suggested high priority issues as the IASB has limited capacity. Therefore, please indicate which projects needs to be removed from the table below in order to add any other projects.

	Agree with prioritisation and scope	Disagree with prioritisation, remove from the list	Agree with prioritisation, but disagree with scope
Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Crypto-currencies and related transactions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discontinued operations and disposal groups	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intangible assets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statement of cash flows and related matters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variable and contingent consideration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with prioritisation, but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Crypto-currencies and related transactions](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with prioritisation, but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Crypto-assets and related transactions

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Discontinued operations and disposal groups](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with prioritisation, but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Discontinued operations and disposal groups

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Intangible assets](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with prioritisation, but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Intangible assets

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Statement of cash flows and related matters](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with prioritisation, but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Statement of cash flows and related matters

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Variable and contingent consideration](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with prioritisation, but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Variable and contingent consideration

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

11. The table below includes the remaining financial reporting projects that EFRAG has tentatively not assigned a highest priority in its Draft Comment Letter. The list consists of projects identified by the IASB in its RFI and additional projects suggested by EFRAG which are indicated as such.

a) Please indicate whether you agree with the prioritisation and the suggested scope

(the links in the table below will redirect you to the paragraph in EFRAG's DCL where the EFRAG suggested scope is described)

b) Please ensure that you have indicated an equal number of projects to

be removed from the list in Question 10, in order to assign a higher priority to the projects in Question 11.

	Agree with lower priority	Should be highest priority and agree with scope	Should be highest priority but disagree with scope
Borrowing costs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commodity transactions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Digital reporting (project suggested by EFRAG, not in IASB's RFI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discount rates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dynamic risk management other than for interest rate by banks (project suggested by EFRAG, not in IASB's RFI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Employee benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expenses - inventory and cost of sales	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Foreign currencies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Going concern	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Government grants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hedge accounting for insurers (project suggested by EFRAG, not in IASB's RFI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Income taxes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inflation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interim financial reporting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Negative interest rates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Operating segments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other comprehensive income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pollution pricing mechanisms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Separate financial statements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Supply chain financing
\(including reverse factoring\)](#)



LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Borrowing costs](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Borrowing costs

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Commodity transactions](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Commodity transactions

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Digital reporting \(project suggested by EFRAG, not in IASB's RFI\)](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Digital reporting

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Discount rates](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Discount rates

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Dynamic risk management other than for interest rate by banks \(project suggested by EFRAG, not in IASB's RFI\)](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Dynamic risk management other than for interest rate by banks

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Employee benefits](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Employee benefits

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Expenses - inventory and cost of sales](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Expenses - inventory and cost of sales

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Foreign currencies](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Foreign currencies

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Going concern](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Going concern

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Government grants](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Government grants

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Hedge accounting for insurers \(project suggested by EFRAG, not in IASB's RFI\)](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Hedge accounting for insurers

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Income taxes](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Income taxes

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Inflation](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Inflation

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Interim financial reporting](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Interim financial reporting

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Negative interest rates](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Negative interest rates

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Operating segments](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Operating segments

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Other comprehensive income](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Other comprehensive income

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Pollution pricing mechanisms](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Pollution pricing mechanisms

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Separate financial statements](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Separate financial statements

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOAC Hidden unless: Question "[Supply chain financing \(including reverse factoring\)](#)" is one of the following answers ("Should be highest priority but disagree with scope")

Alternative scope for project: Supply chain financing (including reverse factoring)

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

12. If you have any other highest priority projects that are not mentioned in this survey, please describe the scope and explain why it is a highest priority project.

13. If you have any other comments on the IASBs activities and current work plan, please explain.

14. EFRAG initially considers that its decision on which proactive projects to initiate, should be based mainly on:

a) European constituents' views on the importance of the various projects considered for the IASB's agenda consultation (that is the projects listed in Part A of this survey accompanying EFRAG's (draft) comment letter to the RFI and any additional projects suggested by constituents).

b) A short list of four projects which are considered important by European constituents and particularly suitable for an EFRAG proactive research project. While EFRAG will consider the projects that European constituents consider are most important to include on the IASB's 2022–2026 workplan, there may be projects that are considered important, but for which an EFRAG proactive project could be considered useful before the project would be addressed by the IASB (post 2026). Also, there may be projects that are considered important to be included on the IASB's 2022–2026 workplan which are considered less suitable for an EFRAG proactive research project, projects for which EFRAG has already done proactive work, or for which European thought leadership is considered to be less needed.

EFRAG will only be able to select a limited number (in this case less than five) of the projects that would result from (a) and (b) above.

The preliminary view of EFRAG is that the list of four projects mentioned above in b) should include the projects listed alphabetically below. **Please indicate whether you agree with including each of the four projects on the list of projects considered important for European constituents and particularly suitable for an EFRAG proactive research project.** The suggested scope of the listed projects corresponds to the scope EFRAG suggests in relation to the IASB's agenda consultation (the suggested scope can be seen by clicking on the name of the project which will redirect to EFRAG's DCL where the scope is described).

Note that EFRAG's research work is complementary to the IASB's work and EFRAG will also work as part of its commenting work on the projects that are finally selected by the IASB.

	Agree with including this project on the list and agree with the scope	Replace this project with another project	Agree with including this project on the list, but disagree with the suggested scope
--	--	---	--

[Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications](#)

[Digital reporting](#)

[Operating segments](#)

[Supply chain financing \(including reverse factoring\)](#)

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications](#)" is one of the following answers ("Replace this project with another project")

Replace project: Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications

Please specify an alternative project instead:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Digital reporting](#)" is one of the following answers ("Replace this project with another project")

Replace project: Digital reporting

Please specify an alternative project instead:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Operating segments](#)" is one of the following answers ("Replace this project with another project")

Replace project: Operating segments

Please specify an alternative project instead:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Supply chain financing \(including reverse factoring\)](#)" is one of the following answers ("Replace this project with another project")

Replace project: Supply chain financing (including reverse factoring)

Please specify an alternative project instead:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with including this project on the list, but disagree with the suggested scope")

Alternative scope for project: Connecting financial and sustainability reporting, starting from climate-related financial implications

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Digital reporting](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with including this project on the list, but disagree with the suggested scope")

Alternative scope for project: Digital reporting

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Operating segments](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with including this project on the list, but disagree with the suggested scope")

Alternative scope for project: Operating segments

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

LOGIC Hidden unless: Question "[Supply chain financing \(including reverse factoring\)](#)" is one of the following answers ("Agree with including this project on the list, but disagree with the suggested scope")

Alternative scope for project: Supply chain financing (including reverse factoring)

Please explain why you do not agree with the scope suggested by EFRAG and provide an alternative scope:

15. Are there any other projects that EFRAG should consider and are not included in the list in previous question?

If so, please ensure that you have indicated an equal number of projects to be replaced from the list in Question 14.

 Show/hide trigger exists.

16. Do you agree, that EFRAG's decision on which proactive projects to initiate, should be based on:

- a) European constituents' views on the importance of the various projects considered for the IASB's agenda consultation;
- b) A short list of four projects with are considered important by European constituents and particularly suitable for an EFRAG proactive research project.

- Yes
- No

Logic Hidden unless: #16 Question "Do you agree, that EFRAG's decision on which proactive projects to initiate, should be based on:

- a) European constituents' views on the importance of the various projects considered for the IASB's agenda consultation;
- b) A short list of four projects with are considered important by European constituents and particularly suitable for an EFRAG proactive research project." is one of the following answers ("No")

Please explain why you do not agree with the approach and how you think EFRAG should decide on which proactive projects to initiate.

Logic Show/hide trigger exists.

17. EFRAG's preliminary view is that, on average, the ratio between the resources it uses on reacting to IASB proposals and the resources it should use on proactive research projects should be 2:1. **Do you agree with this resource allocation?**

- Yes
- No

Logic Hidden unless: #17 Question "EFRAG's preliminary view is that, on average, the ratio between the resources it uses on reacting to IASB proposals and the resources it should use on proactive research projects should be 2:1. **Do you agree with this resource allocation?**" is one of the following answers ("No")

Please explain how you think the ratio should be between the resources EFRAG uses to react on IASB proposals and the resources to be used on proactive research projects.

Thank You!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.

Confirmation Email

To: agendaconsultation@efrag.org

From: Alchemer (noreply@alchemer.com)

Subject: New Response Notification