

**Post-Implementation Reviews – December 2024 Report Back**

1. A summary of the advice provided by CAG members from the December 2024 CAG Meeting and how the IPSASB has responded to the CAG member comments are included in the table below:

Representatives' and Observers' Comments	IPSASB Staff Response
<b>December 2024 CAG Meeting Comments</b>	
<p>IPSASB Principal, Edwin Ng, introduced Agenda Item 5 which seeks CAG advice on behalf of the IPSASB regarding its proposed Post-Implementation Review (PIR) procedures. He presented the objective, purpose, and the expected involvement of the CAG in the PIR process.</p> <p>Mr. Ng asked CAG members to consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the proposed operating procedures for the PIR consistent with the process' strategic objectives? Do the CAG members have any other advice regarding the implementation of the PIR process for IPSASB to consider?</li> </ul>	
<p>The CAG members commented on the Questions as follows:</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Gisby agreed that maintenance activities are consistent with the strategic objective and with the proposed level of CAG involvement. He asked for the rationale behind the proposed 5-year timeline, which is inconsistent with the IASB's practice, and whether it can be shortened if circumstances warranted. Additionally, Mr. Gisby asked if the lack of adoption and implementation of a standard would be considered a sign to conduct a PIR.</li> </ol>	<p>Mr. Ng responded that the 5-year timeline considers that there is no formal procedure to get jurisdictions to adopt and implement IPSAS and there is no, or limited, quarterly reporting in the public sector from which to draw information. He noted the 5-year timeline could be shortened or extended depending on circumstances and that the lack of adoption and implementation of an IPSAS could be considered an indication that a PIR should be performed.</p> <p>Mr. Smith shared that these are staff views at this point and the discussion with the IPSASB will take place later this week. Mr. Smith noted that the procedure outlines the formal process to undertake a PIR; however, it does not prevent the IPSASB from undertaking a PIR sooner.</p>

<p>2. Ms. Stachniak generally agreed with the PIR and IPSASB Application Group (IAG) procedures but recommended that the PIR process reconsider whether the assumption that principles aligned with the private sector are valid for the public sector. Additionally, she suggested that the IPSASB update the IAG procedure to ensure that outputs from IAG queries could feed into a PIR. Ms. Stachniak also asked whether the full suite of IPSAS, or only new IPSAS, are subject to PIR process.</p>	<p>Mr. Ng responded that the IPSASB would consider IPSAS by topic, rather than individually. The IPSASB's research and scoping activities will help determine if a PIR is warranted for a specific IPSAS.</p> <p>Mr. Smith reminded CAG members that the IPSASB is aiming to approve operating procedures and will discuss how to operationalize the procedures at a later date.</p> <p>Mr. Ng also noted that a query discussed by the IAG could lead to a PIR depending on the nature of the query or issue.</p>
<p>3. Mr. Simpson encouraged the IPSASB to consider whether the effect of each IPSAS occurred as intended during development.</p>	<p>Mr. Ng confirmed the expectation, and noted that the IPSASB's documents, such as consultations and basis for conclusions, should support the analysis of whether the IPSAS principles have achieved the intended impact.</p>
<p>4. Mr. Williamson asked whether a PIR would consider if an IPSAS objective is achieved in different contexts and jurisdictions, beyond accounting.</p>	<p>Mr. Smith responded that if a PIR leads to the development of guidance, the IPSASB due process is open to the public, which gathers feedback from different contexts, to assess the intended effect of applying an IPSAS. Similarly, the diversity of CAG and IPSASB members provides a diversity of perspectives in the development of IPSAS.</p> <p>Mr. Ng added that the development of IPSAS already considers impacts beyond accounting, such as the public interest.</p>
<p>5. Mr. Close asked if the process would distinguish between major and minor reviews, such as the review of a full standard versus a limited scope review. He noted the importance of communicating the scope and progress of reviews to constituents, including the identification of issues, and assessment of urgency.</p>	<p>Mr. Ng noted that progress of ongoing reviews, as well as whether the scope of review is expected to be limited, will be communicated publicly as agenda items on the IPSASB's website.</p>

<p>6. Ms. Faye supported the PIR operating procedures but encouraged the IPSASB to adapt them as needed to consider jurisdictional differences, and their respective challenges in adopting accrual accounting. She noted that ongoing communication with stakeholders is crucial, to acknowledge implementation challenges and support stakeholders in tackling these challenges.</p>	<p>Noted. Mr. Smith agreed that communication will be paramount and that as part of the proposed procedures, the IPSASB is expected to publicly publish Requests for Information and Feedback Statements. He indicated that a PIR may lead to the addition of a major or minor project to the IPSASB Work Program.</p>
<p>7. Ms. Raboy shared her support for the PIR procedures and encouraged the IPSASB to consider whether the implementation of any changes to existing IPSAS may result in substantial costs for preparers. She encouraged the IPSASB to explain the application of principles.</p>	<p>Noted. Any changes to existing IPSAS will be subjected to the IPSASB's due process, which will include the consideration of costs for preparers and other stakeholders.</p>
<p>8. Mr. Chughtai welcomed the PIR, noting that it will greatly help preparers interpret and apply principles, and in their subsequent conversations with external auditors.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>9. Mr. Zhang advised the IPSASB to clarify the rationale for the 5-year timeframe for a PIR, and whether it considers the adoption approach (direct or indirect).</p>	<p>Noted. Subsequent to the CAG meeting, the IPSASB decided that the adoption or endorsement approach by local jurisdictions would be one of the factors to consider when determining the timing for a PIR.</p>
<p>10. Ms. Buljubasic noted that the procedures clearly define the tasks and purpose. She advised the IPSASB to add details about the process for annual activities (for example, when a PIR starts, the timeframe to complete a PIR, etc.).</p>	<p>Noted. The detailed activities will vary depending on each review. Before commencing each review, staff will present a work plan, similar to a project brief, which will propose the topics and timelines for the review for the IPSASB's approval.</p>
<p>11. Ms. Colignon thanked CAG members for their valuable input, to help the IPSASB identify potential topics for the PIR process.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>