Australian Government
Australian Accounting Standards Board

Staff Paper

Project:	**n/a**	**Meeting**	AASB August 2026 (M222)
Topic:	**Documents open for comment to other organisations**	**Agenda Item:**	8.1
		Date of the Agenda Paper:	5 August 2026
Contact(s):	Mikhail Bhatia mbhatia@aasb.gov.au Maggie Man mman@aasb.gov.au Patricia Au pau@aasb.gov.au Lan Lu llu@aasb.gov.au	**Project Priority:** **Decision-Making:** **Project Status:**	n/a Low n/a

Objective of this paper

1 The objective of this paper is to **inform** the Board about consultative documents already issued or to be issued by other international standard-setting bodies; and ask the Board to **decide** which consultative documents to provide feedback/comments on.

Reasons for bringing this paper to the Board

2 The Board's strategy is to influence the work of the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board (IPSASB) and other relevant international organisations with a goal of having the principles in the Standards issued by these organisations aligned, where relevant and possible.

3 Historically, the Board has decided which consultation documents to comment on based on factors such as the relevance and importance of the consultation to the AASB's projects and strategies, the potential impact of the proposals on Australian constituents and the priority of projects as decided by the Board. This agenda paper will assist the Board in deciding which consultation documents to comment on.

4 Appendix A provides a summary of documents open for comment for which the Board has previously considered whether to comment.

Documents currently open for comment

5 The IFRS Interpretation Committee has tentative agenda decisions currently open for comment that have not been previously considered by the Board. The IASB have a forthcoming document noted below that will soon be open for comment that have not been previously considered by the Board.

<u>IASB</u> and <u>ISSB</u> documents currently open for comment – decision needed from the Board as to whether to comment or to take other action

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
N/A					

IFRS Interpretations Committee's Tentative Agenda Decisions currently open for comment – decision needed from the Board as to whether to comment or to take other action

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: Management-defined Performance Measures – Hypothetical Income and Expenses (IFRS 18)	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered whether a performance measure that includes hypothetical income and expenses can meet the definition of a management-defined performance measure (MPM) in IFRS 18. The fact pattern described hypothetical income and expenses as income and expenses that an entity has not recognised and will never recognise in its statement of financial performance applying IFRS Accounting Standards. The request asks whether, as set out in paragraph 117 of IFRS 18, a performance measure that includes such hypothetical income and expenses: • can be a subtotal of income and expenses; and • can faithfully represent an aspect of the financial performance of the entity as a whole.

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					The IFRS IC observed that: • paragraph 117 of IFRS 18 contains no restriction on how an entity calculates a subtotal of income and expenses that is an MPM. Therefore, a performance measure that includes hypothetical income and expenses is not precluded from being a subtotal of income and expenses that is an MPM; and • in the context of MPMs, faithful representation means faithfully representing management's view of an aspect of the financial performance of the entity as a whole. Paragraph BC360 to IFRS 18 explains that faithful representation does not provide information about whether a measure is a ‘good’ or ‘bad’ measure. Accordingly, if a performance measure that includes hypothetical income and expenses accurately represents what it purports to represent, namely management's view of financial performance of the entity as a whole, it may faithfully represent an aspect of the financial performance of the entity as a whole. The IFRS IC concluded that a performance measure that includes hypothetical income and expenses can be a subtotal of income and expenses and can faithfully represent what it purports to represent—that is, management’s view of an aspect of financial performance of the entity as a whole. The IFRS IC also concluded that if the hypothetical performance measure satisfied the criteria in paragraph 117 of IFRS 18 for identifying an MPM, then the hypothetical performance measure would be an MPM subject to IFRS 18. Those criteria would require the hypothetical performance measure to be used in public communications outside the financial statements to communicate to users of the financial

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					statements management's view of an aspect of the financial performance of the entity as a whole, as well as not being a subtotal of income and expenses that is listed in paragraph 118 of IFRS 18. **Staff observations** Staff note that the fact pattern considered in the Tentative Agenda Decision involves hypothetical income and expenses that the entity has not recognised, and would never recognise, applying IFRS Accounting Standards. Staff therefore question whether such a hypothetical subtotal could communicate management's view of an aspect of the entity's financial performance as a whole. Staff observe that a different conclusion might be reached if the hypothetical income or expenses potentially could be recognised in the future under IFRS Accounting Standards as a result of particular events or transactions that might or might not occur. However, this is not the fact pattern considered in the Tentative Agenda Decision. Staff also note practical challenges in applying the MPM disclosure requirements. In particular, it is unclear how hypothetical income and expenses that are not and will never be recognised in the IFRS-compliant financial statements could be reconciled to the most directly comparable subtotal or total specified by IFRS Accounting Standards, as required by paragraph 123(c) of IFRS 18. To describe the differences as "hypothetical" could hardly provide useful information to users of the financial statements. Staff also question the auditability of "reconciling" amounts.

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					Staff are concerned that the IFRS IC's tentative conclusion appears to be based on a narrow and unrealistic technical application of the form of the MPM definition and not the substance. The tentative conclusion also does not address paragraph B129(b) of IFRS 18, which states that communicating performance related to an accounting framework other than IFRS Accounting Standards can be reasonably taken as not communicating management's view of an aspect of the entity's financial performance as a whole. Hypothetical income and expenses that will never be recognised in IFRS-compliant financial statements must be regarded as relating to some other accounting framework. A Proposed Agenda Decision consultation document linked to the IFRS IC's tentative agenda decision on Management-defined Performance Measures – Hypothetical Income and Expenses (IFRS 18) was posted on the Open for Comment page of the AASB website, via approval by the Chair. Australian stakeholders have been requested to provide the AASB with a copy of any comments submitted to the IFRS Interpretations Committee. **Staff recommendation** Staff have concerns with the Tentative Agenda Decision and are seeking Board members' views. If Board members share similar concerns, staff recommend the preparation of an AASB comment letter to the IFRS Interpretations Committee via approval by the Chair. Staff consider that the use of hypothetical income and expense sub-totals as performance measures is likely to be quite limited. Furthermore, as the period to the comment deadline of 9 September is

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					short, staff do not recommend issuing a formal consultation document to seek views from stakeholders.
					Q1 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation to comment on this Tentative Agenda Decision via approval by the Chair?
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: Management-defined Performance Measures – Public Communications (IFRS 18)	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered a question whether presentations provided on a confidential basis to a small number of identifiable shareholders or potential investors are public communications for the purpose of identifying an MPM applying IFRS 18. The fact pattern is described as: • a private entity shares presentations (including pitch materials) containing performance measures that could otherwise meet the definition of a MPM with a small number of identifiable shareholders or potential investors; • the presentations are subject to confidentiality and non-redistribution requirements; and • the presentations are not accessible to a broader or undefined external audience. The IFRS IC considered that the reference to 'investor presentations' in paragraph B119 of IFRS 18 should not be read to mean that all presentations provided to investors are public communications and that entities must apply judgement in assessing whether a particular communication is a public communication.

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					The Committee concluded that the presentations described in the fact pattern are not public communications for the purposes of identifying an MPM applying IFRS 18. **Staff recommendation** Staff support the IFRS IC's clarification on 'investor presentations' in paragraph B119 of IFRS 18 and agree with the IFRS IC's conclusion on the fact pattern. Therefore, **staff recommend not to comment on the IFRS IC TAD**. **Q2 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation not to comment on the Tentative Agenda Decision Management-defined Performance Measures – Public Communications?**
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: [Classification of Income and Expenses from Cash and Cash Equivalents (IFRS 18)]	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered a question about how an entity classifies income and expenses from cash and cash equivalents in its consolidated statement of profit or loss if the entity has, alongside other business activities, a main business activity of: • investing in financial assets within the scope of paragraph 53(c) of IFRS 18; and • providing financing to customers. The question asked whether the requirement in paragraph 56(a) applies to the income and expenses from <u>all</u> cash and cash equivalents even if income and expenses from some of the cash and cash equivalents relate to providing financing to customers and some relate to another business activity such as manufacturing products. In the entity's consolidated statement of profit or loss, the IFRS IC observed that:

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					• paragraph 56(a) of IFRS 18 requires income and expenses from all cash and cash equivalents to be classified in the operating category, regardless of whether an entity has another specified main business activity. • although the entity also has a main business activity of providing financing to customers, the accounting policy choice (operating or investing category) described in paragraph 56(b)(ii) of IFRS 18 is not available to the entity and the requirement in paragraph 57 of IFRS 18 is not applicable. However, the accounting policy choice (operating or financing category) set out in paragraph 65(a)(ii) of IFRS 18, relating to liabilities that arise from transactions that involve only the raising of finance, remains available to the entity. • Figure 3.3 of the Illustrative Examples on IFRS 18 illustrates the application of the requirements set out in paragraphs 55–57 of IFRS 18. **Staff recommendation** Staff consider that the IFRS IC's analysis provides appropriate clarification for reporting entities with multiple specified main business activities, including which accounting policy choices remain available. Therefore, **staff recommend not to comment on the IFRS IC TAD**. **Q3 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation not to comment on the Tentative Agenda Decision Classification of Income and Expenses from Cash and Cash Equivalents?**
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: Classification of Income and	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered a request about how an entity that has a main business activity of providing financing to customers classifies income and expenses from liabilities that arise from transactions that involve

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
	Expenses when an Entity Has a Main Business Activity of Providing Financing to Customers (IFRS 18)				only the raising of finance (referred to hereafter as specified liabilities) in its consolidated statement of profit or loss in accordance with paragraphs 65(a) and 66 of IFRS 18. The request asked: • **Question 1:** whether, in preparing consolidated financial statements, the accounting policy choice in paragraph 65(a)(ii) of IFRS 18 applies to the entity as a whole or only to subsidiaries within the entity's group that have a main business activity of providing financing to customers; • **Question 2:** whether the requirement in paragraph 66 of IFRS 18 applies to income and expenses from all specified liabilities even if the entity can distinguish some, but not all, specified liabilities that relate to providing financing to customers from those that do not; and • **Question 3:** whether, applying paragraph 57 of IFRS 18, an entity that classifies income and expenses from cash and cash equivalents in the operating category because it cannot distinguish cash and cash equivalents that relate to providing financing to customers from those that do not, is required to apply the same classification to income and expenses from specified liabilities, even if it can distinguish those that relate to providing financing to customers from those that do not. The IFRS IC observed that • **Question 1**: whether an entity provides financing to customers as a main business activity is assessed for the reporting entity as a whole. If the entity concludes that providing financing to customers is a main business activity, paragraph 65 of IFRS 18 applies to <u>the reporting entity as a whole</u>. Thus, the accounting policy choice in

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					paragraph 65(a)(ii) (operating or financing category) applies to all specified liabilities of the consolidated group. • **Question 2**: since the entity can distinguish some, but not all, specified liabilities that relate to providing financing to customers, the requirements of paragraph 66 of IFRS 18 to classify income and expenses from 'all such liabilities' in the operating category of the statement of profit or loss apply. • **Question 3**: paragraphs 56(b)(ii) and 65(a)(ii) require an entity's choice of accounting policy for classifying income and expenses from cash and cash equivalents and specified liabilities to be consistent with each other. As such, in the fact pattern, if an entity classifies income and expenses from cash and cash equivalents in the operating category because it cannot distinguish between cash and cash equivalents that relate to providing financing to customers and those that do not, the entity is required to apply the same classification to income and expenses from specified liabilities. The entity is required to do so regardless of whether it can distinguish between the specified liabilities that relate to providing financing to customers and those that do not. **Staff recommendation** Staff consider that the IFRS IC's analysis provides useful clarification and supports the conclusions reached. Therefore, **staff recommend not to comment on the IFRS IC TAD**.
					Q4 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation not to comment on the Tentative Agenda Decision Classification of Income and Expenses when an Entity Has a Main Business Activity of Providing Financing to Customers?

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: Assessment of Specified Main Business Activities for a Manufacturer-Lessor (IFRS 18)	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered a request about how an entity that is a manufacturer-lessor assesses whether, applying IFRS 18, the entity's aggregated lease activity, comprising its finance lease and operating lease activities, is a main business activity of providing financing to customers. The fact pattern describes an entity that manufactures vehicles and either sells or leases them to customers. The entity: • manages vehicle sales, finance leases and operating leases together in one line of business. The entity's segments are based on geographical regions and not on product lines. • classifies its leases, which do not differ significantly in nature, as either finance or operating leases applying IFRS 16 *Leases*. • enters into a refinancing arrangement with a bank for each lease contract, regardless of whether the lease contract is a finance or an operating lease. The refinancing arrangement bridges the difference between the cash flows the entity receives and those it would have received in a sale. The refinancing arrangements generate interest expenses. • uses, for both internal and external reporting purposes, one subtotal for its aggregated lease activity that is similar to gross profit as an important indicator of operating performance. This gross profit-like subtotal includes income and expenses from finance and operating leases as well as interest expenses on the refinancing arrangements. The IFRS IC considered that an entity should apply the requirements in paragraph 49 of IFRS 18 and the application guidance in paragraphs B30-B41 of IFRS 18 in assessing whether an activity is a specified main

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					business activity. In making that assessment, an entity must apply judgement and consider all relevant facts and circumstances. In considering the fact pattern, the Committee observed that: • applying paragraph B34 of IFRS 18, it is likely that the entity's aggregated lease activity is a main business activity of providing financing to customers. This is evidenced by the use of a single gross profit-like subtotal (subtotal for its aggregated lease activity). • the classification of some of the entity's leases as operating leases does not preclude the entity's aggregated lease activity from being of a type that provides financing to customers. • the absence of an example that an entity that provides financing to customers in operating leases in paragraph B32 is not determinative; those examples are not an exhaustive list. **Staff recommendation** Staff consider that the IFRS IC has appropriately applied the requirements of IFRS 18 to the fact pattern and the clarification regarding operating leases is helpful. Therefore, **staff recommend not to comment on the IFRS IC TAD**.
					Q5 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation not to comment on the Tentative Agenda Decision Assessment of Specified Main Business Activities for a Manufacturer-Lessor?
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: Labels of	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered a request about the labelling of a subtotal in an entity's statement of profit or loss, when that subtotal is also an MPM (referred to as 'the measure'). In particular, the request asked whether

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
	Subtotals (IFRS 18)				the label of the measure is required to explicitly list all the elements excluded from (or included in) the measure. The measure described in the request: • complies with the requirements in paragraph 24 of IFRS 18 for additional subtotals in a primary financial statement; and • meets the definition of a management-defined performance measure in paragraph 117 of IFRS 18. The IFRS IC observed that determining how to appropriately label and describe the measure requires judgement based on an entity's specific facts and circumstances. The Committee noted that the requirements in IFRS 18 set out principles that an entity applies when labelling items, including subtotals and MPMs. The Committee observed that it is possible to meet the applicable requirements for labelling without listing in the measure's label all the elements excluded from (or included in) the measure. The IFRS IC concluded that the label of a subtotal that is an MPM is not required to explicitly list all the elements excluded from (or included in) the measure, as long as that label, and any related descriptions in the notes, comply with the applicable requirements in IFRS 18. **Staff recommendation** Staff consider that the IFRS IC's clarification regarding the labelling of MPMs and the related disclosure requirements is useful and provides adequate guidance. Therefore, **staff recommend not to comment on the IFRS IC TAD**.

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					Q6 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation not to comment on the Tentative Agenda Decision Labels of Subtotals?
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: [Presentation of Operating Expenses (IFRS 18)]()	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered a request asking: • **Question 1:** when is an entity required to use a 'mixed presentation' – that is, a presentation in which an entity classifies and presents in line items in the statement of profit or loss some operating expenses based on their nature and others based on their function within the entity—applying paragraph 78 of IFRS 18. • **Question 2:** whether an entity can disaggregate expenses of the same nature and classify and present some of those expenses in line items comprising operating expenses aggregated on the basis of nature and others in line items comprising operating expenses aggregated on the basis of function. The IFRS IC observed that • **Question 1:** an entity is required to use a mixed presentation when doing so provides the most useful structured summary of its operating expenses (as per paragraph 78 of IFRS 18). • **Question 2:** entity can include some expenses of the same nature in one or more function line items and it is not required to include all expenses of that nature in function line items. The IFRS IC referred to paragraph B82 of IFRS 18, which illustrates an example where some employee benefits may be included in a function line item and others in a nature line item, provided the resulting line items are labelled in a way that clearly identifies the expenses included in each line item (for example, "employee benefits other than those included in cost of sales")

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					Staff recommendation Staff consider that the IFRS IC's analysis and conclusion are appropriate and therefore, **staff recommend not to comment on the IFRS IC TAD**. **Q7 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation not to comment on the Tentative Agenda Decision Presentation of Operating Expenses?**
IFRS IC	Tentative Agenda Decision: Control Assessment for a Single-investor Fund (IFRS 10)	29 June 2026		9 September 2026	The IFRS IC considered a request whether, in accordance with IFRS 10, the investor described in the fact pattern is automatically deemed to have delegated its decision-making authority to the fund manager. In other words, whether that investor automatically treats the fund manager's decision-making rights as held by the investor directly because it is the only investor in the fund other than the fund manager and the fund manager is an agent. The fact pattern described a fund in which a single investor holds a 99.99% interest and a fund manager holds a 0.01% interest. The fund manager established and manages the fund, has extensive decision-making authority, and is assumed to be an agent. The investor was not involved in designing the fund and holds only protective rights. The IFRS IC observed that, in assessing control for this request, an investor is required to determine whether the fund manager is acting as an agent for the investor. If the investor has delegated decision-making authority over relevant activities to the fund manager, the investor would treat those decision-making rights as held directly. However, concluding that an investor holds all of a fund manager's decision-making rights solely because, or automatically if, the fund manager is an

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					agent could result in outcomes that are inconsistent with the control model in IFRS 10. The IFRS IC concluded that being the only investor in the fund other than the fund manager does not, in isolation, mean that the investor described in the fact pattern is automatically deemed to have delegated its decision-making authority to the fund manager. The investor described in the fact pattern is required to consider all the requirements in paragraphs 5–18 of IFRS 10 and the related application guidance in Appendix B to IFRS 10 when assessing whether it controls the fund. **Staff recommendation** Staff undertook targeted outreach with Australian stakeholders. Many stakeholders indicated that similar fact patterns and variations arise in Australia. Some stakeholders commented that identifying the manager as an agent may not automatically mean that the fund should be consolidated by the investor; rather, a full assessment of the specific facts and circumstances is required. Another stakeholder referred to paragraph B36 of IFRS 10 and noted that, if the manager is not an agent for the investor, it cannot automatically be concluded that the investor is the principal. Staff consider that the IFRS IC's clarification is helpful in reducing diversity in practice and is consistent with the Australian feedback shared. Therefore, **staff recommend not to comment on the IFRS IC TAD**.

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	AOSSG input	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
					Q8 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation not to comment on the Tentative Agenda Decision Control Assessment for a Single-investor Fund?

<u>IPSASB</u> documents currently open for comment – decision needed from the Board as to whether to comment or to take other action

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
N/A				

<u>Other relevant</u> documents currently open for comment – decision needed from the Board as to whether to comment or to take other action

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	Comments due	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
N/A				

<u>Forthcoming</u> documents for comment – decision needed from the Board as to whether to comment or to take other action

Originating organisation	Document	Expected date of release	Expected comment date	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
IASB	Forthcoming ED on *Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Tax Expense*	Q4 2026		In July 2026, the IASB tentatively decided to propose amendments to IFRS 18 *Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements*. The proposed amendments would require an entity to classify, in the income taxes category of the statement of profit or loss, tax charges imposed by a government as a direct substitute for

Originating organisation	Document	Expected date of release	Expected comment date	Staff recommendation for AASB approach
	or Tax Income Applying IAS 12 Income Taxes (IFRS 18)			income taxes. **Staff recommendation** Staff recommend commenting on the forthcoming Exposure Draft on *Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Tax Expense or Tax Income Applying IAS 12 Income Taxes (IFRS 18)* and will reach out to the AASB disclosure initiative panel. **Q9 Do Board members agree with the staff recommendation to comment on the forthcoming ED on *Presentation of Taxes or Other Charges that Are Not Tax Expense or Tax Income Applying IAS 12 Income Taxes (IFRS 18)*?**

Appendix A

Current and forthcoming documents open for comment – decisions already made by the Board at previous meetings

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	Comments due	Summary
IASB	ED on *Risk Mitigation Accounting*	December 2025	30 November 2026	The International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) has published the Exposure Draft *Risk Mitigation Accounting,* proposing to amend IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* and IFRS 7 *Financial Instruments: Disclosures.* The IASB is proposing a new risk mitigation accounting model for companies managing repricing on a net basis. Entities would be required to disclose their strategy for managing repricing risk and the effects of their risk management activities. The IASB is also seeking feedback on the proposed withdrawal of IAS 39 *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement.* At its November 2024 meeting, the Board decided to comment on the ED. The ED and the Australian equivalent of the ED were issued in December 2025 (AASB ED339). At its May 2026 meeting, the IASB decided to extend the deadline for comments to 30 November 2026 to match the deadline for final responses from the field test. Accordingly, the AASB extended the comment period of ED 339 to 18 September 2026.
IASB	ED on *IFRS for SMEs Accounting Standard—Consolidation Exception*	May 2026	9 September 2026	Given Australia has not adopted the *IFRS for SMEs* Standard and Tier 2 entities applying AASB 1060 apply the consolidation exemption under full IFRS, the proposals in the ED are not relevant in the Australian context. At its May 2026 meeting, the AASB decided not to comment on the Exposure Draft.

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	Comments due	Summary
IASB	Forthcoming ED on *Amortised Cost Measurement*	2027	TBC	The IASB aims to make targeted improvements to the amortised cost measurement requirements in IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* by clarifying their underlying principles and adding accompanying application guidance. At its April 2026 meeting, the IASB tentatively decided to amend paragraph B5.4.5 of IFRS 9 *Financial Instruments* to require that an entity adjust the EIR to account for a re-estimation of the contractual cash flows of a financial asset or a financial liability that provides consideration for the time value of money or for the credit risk. At its June 2026 meeting, the AASB decided to comment on the ED.
IASB	Forthcoming RFI PIR of *IFRS 9 – Hedge Accounting*	September 2026	TBC	The International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) decided in December 2025 to start a post-implementation review of the hedge accounting requirements in IFRS 9 Financial Instruments in the first quarter of 2026. At its June 2026 meeting, the AASB decided to comment on the RFI PIR of IFRS 9.
IPSASB	Consultation Paper (CP) *Presentation of Financial Statements*	April 2026	14 September 2026	The CP outlines IPSASB's preliminary views on how the principles in IFRS 18 should be applied to not-for-profit (NFP) public sector entities. The CP is accompanied by an illustrative ED to help visualise the proposals as a draft IPSAS intended to replace IPSAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements*. At its May 2026 meeting, the AASB decided not to comment on the CP.
IPSASB	ED 97 *IPSAS Practice Statement: Making Materiality Judgments*	April 2026	28 August 2026	The ED proposes non-mandatory guidance, adapted from IFRS Practice Statement 2 *Making Materiality Judgements*, to assist NFP public sector entities in making materiality judgements

Originating organisation	Document	Date of release	Comments due	Summary
				when preparing financial statements in accordance with IPSAS. At its May 2026 meeting, the AASB decided to undertake targeted outreach with key public sector stakeholders to understand their views on the proposal before deciding whether to respond to the ED.