

**Basis for Conclusions on
Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting
(2011)**

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting* (2011).

Conceptual Framework (2011) is based on *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting* issued by IASB in September 2010. In approving *Conceptual Framework* (2011), MASB considered and concurred with the provisions of *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting*.

The IASB's Basis for Conclusions on implementing *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting* is reproduced below for reference.

IASB documents published to accompany

The Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting

The *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting* (the *Conceptual Framework*) was issued by the International Accounting Standards Board. It superseded the *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements* in September 2010.

The text of the *Conceptual Framework* is contained in Part A of this edition. The text of the *Accompanying Guidance on the Conceptual Framework* is contained in Part B of this edition. This part presents the following accompanying documents:

BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS ON CHAPTERS 1 AND 3

Conceptual Framework

CONTENTS

from paragraph

BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS ON CHAPTER 1: THE OBJECTIVE OF GENERAL PURPOSE FINANCIAL REPORTING

INTRODUCTION	BC1.1
Background	BC1.3
General purpose financial reporting	BC1.4
Financial reporting of the reporting entity	BC1.8
PRIMARY USERS	BC1.9
Should there be a primary user group?	BC1.14
Why are existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors considered the primary users?	BC1.15
Should there be a hierarchy of users?	BC1.18
Information needs of other users who are not within the primary user group	BC1.19
USEFULNESS FOR MAKING DECISIONS	BC1.24
The objective of financial reporting for different types of entities	BC1.29
INFORMATION ABOUT A REPORTING ENTITY'S RESOURCES, CLAIMS AGAINST THE ENTITY AND CHANGES IN RESOURCES AND CLAIMS	BC1.31
The significance of information about financial performance	BC1.31
Financial position and solvency	BC1.34

Basis for Conclusions on Chapter 1: *The objective of general purpose financial reporting*

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, Chapter 1.

Introduction

- BC1.1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises considerations of the International Accounting Standards Board in reaching the conclusions in Chapter 1 *The objective of general purpose financial reporting*. It includes reasons for accepting some alternatives and rejecting others. Individual Board members gave greater weight to some factors than to others.
- BC1.2 The Board developed this chapter jointly with the US Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB). Consequently, this Basis for Conclusions also includes some references to the FASB's literature.

Background

- BC1.3 The Board began the process of developing the objective of financial reporting by reviewing its own framework and concepts as well as those of other standard-setters. In July 2006 the Board published for public comment a discussion paper on this topic. That same paper was also published by the FASB. The Board and the FASB received 179 responses. In its redeliberations of the issues on this topic, the Board considered all of the comments received and information gained from other outreach initiatives. In May 2008 the Board and the FASB jointly published an exposure draft. The boards received 142 responses. The Board reconsidered all of the issues on this topic. This document is the result of those reconsiderations.

General purpose financial reporting

- BC1.4 Consistently with the Board's responsibilities, the *Conceptual Framework* establishes an objective of financial reporting and not just of financial statements. Financial statements are a central part of financial reporting, and most of the issues that the Board addresses involve financial statements. Although the scope of FASB Concepts Statement No. 1 *Objectives of Financial Reporting by Business Enterprises* was financial reporting, the other FASB concepts statements focused on financial statements. The scope of the Board's *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*, which was published by the Board's predecessor body in 1989 (hereinafter called *Framework (1989)*), dealt with financial statements only. Therefore, for both boards the scope of the *Conceptual Framework* is broader.
- BC1.5 Some constituents suggested that advances in technology may make general purpose financial reporting obsolete. New technologies, for example the use of eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL), may make it practicable in the future for reporting entities either to prepare or to make available the information necessary for different users to assemble different financial reports to meet their individual information needs.
- BC1.6 To provide different reports for different users, or to make available all of the information that users would need to assemble their own custom-designed

Conceptual Framework

reports, would be expensive. Requiring users of financial information to assemble their own reports might also be unreasonable, because many users would need to have a greater understanding of accounting than they have now. Therefore, the Board concluded that for now a general purpose financial report is still the most efficient and effective way to meet the information needs of a variety of users.

- BC1.7 In the discussion paper, the Board used the term *general purpose external financial reporting*. External was intended to convey that internal users such as management were not the intended beneficiaries for general purpose financial reporting as established by the Board. During redeliberations, the Board concluded that this term was redundant. Therefore, Chapter 1 uses *general purpose financial reporting*.

Financial reporting of the reporting entity

- BC1.8 Some respondents to the exposure draft said that the reporting entity is not separate from its equity investors or a subset of those equity investors. This view has its roots in the days when most businesses were sole proprietorships and partnerships that were managed by their owners who had unlimited liability for the debts incurred in the course of the business. Over time, the separation between businesses and their owners has grown. The vast majority of today's businesses have legal substance separate from their owners by virtue of their legal form of organisation, numerous investors with limited legal liability and professional managers separate from the owners. Consequently, the Board concluded that financial reports should reflect that separation by accounting for the entity (and its economic resources and claims) rather than its primary users and their interests in the reporting entity.

Primary users

- BC1.9 The objective of financial reporting in paragraph OB2 refers to existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors. The description of the primary users in paragraph OB5 refers to existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors who cannot require reporting entities to provide information directly to them. Paragraph OB10 states that 'regulators and members of the public other than investors, lenders and other creditors' may find information in general purpose financial reports useful but clearly states that those are not the parties to whom general purpose financial reports are primarily directed.
- BC1.10 Paragraph 9 of the *Framework* (1989) stated that users included 'present and potential investors, employees, lenders, suppliers and other trade creditors' (and later added advisers in the discussion of investors' needs), all of which are intended to be encompassed by the phrase in paragraph OB2. Paragraph 9 of the *Framework* (1989) also included a list of other potential users such as customers, governments and their agencies, and the public, which is similar to the list in paragraph OB10 of those who may be interested in financial reports but are not primary users.
- BC1.11 Paragraph 10 of the *Framework* (1989) stated that 'as investors are providers of risk capital to the entity, the provision of financial statements that meet their needs will also meet most of the needs of other users that financial statements

can satisfy', which might have been read to narrow the focus to investors only. However, paragraph 12 explicitly stated that the objective of financial statements is to provide information 'that is useful to a wide range of users in making economic decisions.' Thus, the *Framework* (1989) focused on investors' needs as representative of the needs of a wide range of users but did not explicitly identify a group of primary users.

- BC1.12 FASB Concepts Statement 1 referred to 'present and potential investors and creditors and other users in making rational investment, credit, and similar decisions' (paragraph 34). It also stated that 'major groups of investors are equity securityholders and debt securityholders' and 'major groups of creditors are suppliers of goods and services who extend credit, customers and employees with claims, lending institutions, individual lenders, and debt securityholders' (paragraph 35). One difference in emphasis from the *Framework* (1989), which emphasised providers of risk capital, is that Concepts Statement 1 referred to 'both those who desire safety of investment and those who are willing to accept risk to obtain high rates of return' (paragraph 35). However, like the *Framework* (1989), Concepts Statement 1 stated that the terms investors and creditors 'also may comprehend security analysts and advisors, brokers, lawyers, regulatory agencies, and others who advise or represent the interests of investors and creditors or who otherwise are interested in how investors and creditors are faring' (paragraph 35).
- BC1.13 Paragraphs OB3, OB5 and OB10 differ from the *Framework* (1989) and Concepts Statement 1 for two reasons—to eliminate differences between the *Framework* and Concepts Statement 1 and to be more direct by focusing on users making decisions about providing resources (but not to exclude advisers). The reasons are discussed in paragraphs BC1.15–BC1.24.

Should there be a primary user group?

- BC1.14 The discussion paper and the exposure draft proposed identifying a group of primary users of financial reports. Some respondents to the exposure draft said that other users who have not provided, and are not considering providing, resources to the entity, use financial reports for a variety of reasons. The Board sympathised with their information needs but concluded that without a defined group of primary users, the *Conceptual Framework* would risk becoming unduly abstract or vague.

Why are existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors considered the primary users?

- BC1.15 Some respondents to the discussion paper and the exposure draft suggested that the primary user group should be limited to existing shareholders or the controlling entity's majority shareholders. Others said that the primary users should be existing shareholders and creditors, and that financial reports should focus on their needs.
- BC1.16 The reasons why the Board concluded that the primary user group should be the existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors of a reporting entity are:

Conceptual Framework

- (a) Existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors have the most critical and immediate need for the information in financial reports and many cannot require the entity to provide the information to them directly.
- (b) The Board's and the FASB's responsibilities require them to focus on the needs of participants in capital markets, which include not only existing investors but also potential investors and existing and potential lenders and other creditors.
- (c) Information that meets the needs of the specified primary users is likely to meet the needs of users both in jurisdictions with a corporate governance model defined in the context of shareholders and those with a corporate governance model defined in the context of all types of stakeholders.

BC1.17 Some respondents expressed the view that the specified primary user group was too broad and that it would result in too much information in the financial reports. However, *too much* is a subjective judgement. In developing financial reporting requirements that meet the objective of financial reporting, the boards will rely on the qualitative characteristics of, and the cost constraint on, useful financial information to provide discipline to avoid providing too much information.

Should there be a hierarchy of users?

BC1.18 Some respondents to the exposure draft who supported the composition of the primary user group also recommended that the Board should establish a hierarchy of primary users because investors, lenders and other creditors have different information needs. However, the Board observed that individual users may have information needs and desires that are different from, and possibly conflict with, those of other users with the same type of interest in the reporting entity. General purpose financial reports are intended to provide common information to users and cannot accommodate every request for information. The Board will seek the information set that is intended to meet the needs of the maximum number of users in cost-beneficial ways.

Information needs of other users who are not within the primary user group

Management's information needs

BC1.19 Some constituents questioned the interaction between general purpose financial reporting and management's needs. The Board stated that some of the information directed to the primary users is likely to meet some of management's needs but not all of them. However, management has the ability to access additional financial information, and consequently, general purpose financial reporting need not be explicitly directed to management.

Regulators' information needs

BC1.20 Some constituents said that maintaining financial stability in capital markets (the stability of a country's or region's economy or financial systems) should be

an objective of financial reporting. They stated that financial reporting should focus on the needs of regulators and fiscal policy decision-makers who are responsible for maintaining financial stability.

- BC1.21 Other constituents opposed establishing an objective to maintain financial stability. They said that financial statements should present the economic reality of the reporting entity with as little bias as possible, but that such a presentation is not necessarily inconsistent with a financial stability objective. By presenting economic reality, financial statements could lead to more informed decision-making and thereby support financial stability even if that is not the primary aim.¹
- BC1.22 However, advocates of a financial stability objective had a different outcome in mind. They did not encourage the Board to require reporting entities to provide information for use by regulators and fiscal policy decision-makers. Instead, they recommended that the Board consider the consequences of new financial reporting standards for the stability of the world's economies and financial systems and, at least at times, assign greater weight to that objective than to the information needs of investors, lenders and other creditors.
- BC1.23 The Board acknowledged that the interests of investors, lenders and other creditors often overlap with those of regulators. However, expanding the objective of financial reporting to include maintaining financial stability could at times create conflicts between the objectives that the Board is not well-equipped to resolve. For example, some may take the view that the best way to maintain financial stability is to require entities not to report, or to delay reporting, some changes in asset or liability values. That requirement would almost certainly result in depriving investors, lenders and other creditors of information that they need. The only way to avoid conflicts would be to eliminate or de-emphasise the existing objective of providing information to investors, lenders and other creditors. The Board concluded that eliminating that objective would be inconsistent with its basic mission, which is to serve the information needs of participants in capital markets. The Board also noted that providing relevant and faithfully represented financial information can improve users' confidence in the information, and thus contribute to promoting financial stability.

Usefulness for making decisions

- BC1.24 Both the Board's and the FASB's previous frameworks focused on providing information that is useful in making economic decisions as the fundamental objective of financial reporting. Those frameworks also stated that financial information that is useful in making economic decisions would also be helpful in assessing how management has fulfilled its stewardship responsibility.

¹ One group expressing that view was the Financial Crisis Advisory Group (FCAG). The FCAG comprised approximately 20 senior leaders with broad experience in international financial markets and an interest in the transparency of financial reporting information. The FCAG was formed in 2009 to advise the Board and the FASB about the standard-setting implications of the financial crisis and of potential changes in the global regulatory environment.

Conceptual Framework

- BC1.25 The discussion paper that led to Chapter 1 stated that the objective of financial reporting should focus on resource allocation decisions. Although most respondents to the discussion paper agreed that providing useful information for decision-making was the appropriate objective, they said that investors, lenders and other creditors make other decisions that are aided by financial reporting information in addition to resource allocation decisions. For example, shareholders who vote on whether to retain directors or replace them, and on how members of management should be remunerated for their services, need information on which to base their decisions. Shareholders' decision-making process may include evaluating how management of the entity performed against management in competing entities in similar circumstances.
- BC1.26 The Board agreed with these respondents and noted that, in most cases, information designed for resource allocation decisions would also be useful for assessing management's performance. Therefore, in the exposure draft leading to Chapter 1, the Board proposed that the objective of financial reporting is to provide financial information about the reporting entity that is useful to present and potential investors, lenders and other creditors in making decisions in their capacity as capital providers. The exposure draft also described the role financial statements can have in supporting decisions related to the stewardship of an entity's resources.
- BC1.27 The exposure draft discussed the *Objective of Financial Reporting* and *Decision-usefulness* in separate sections. The Board combined those two sections in Chapter 1 because usefulness in making decisions is the objective of financial reporting. Consequently, both sections addressed the same points and provided more detail than was necessary. Combining those two sections resulted in eliminating the separate subsections on usefulness in assessing cash flow prospects and usefulness in assessing stewardship. The Board did not intend to imply that assessing prospects for future cash flow or assessing the quality of management's stewardship is more important than the other. Both are important for making decisions about providing resources to an entity, and information about stewardship is also important for resource providers who have the ability to vote on, or otherwise influence, management's actions.
- BC1.28 The Board decided not to use the term *stewardship* in the chapter because there would be difficulties in translating it into other languages. Instead, the Board described what stewardship encapsulates. Accordingly, the objective of financial reporting acknowledges that users make resource allocation decisions as well as decisions as to whether management has made efficient and effective use of the resources provided.

The objective of financial reporting for different types of entities

- BC1.29 The Board also considered whether the objective of general purpose financial reporting should differ for different types of entities. Possibilities include:
- (a) smaller entities versus larger entities;
 - (b) entities with listed (publicly traded) debt or equity financial instruments versus those without such instruments; and

(c) closely held entities versus those with widely dispersed ownership.

BC1.30 External users of financial reporting have similar objectives, irrespective of the type of entities in which they invest. Therefore, the Board concluded that the objective of general purpose financial reports is the same for all entities. However, cost constraints and differences in activities among entities may sometimes lead the Board to permit or require differences in reporting for different types of entities.

Information about a reporting entity's resources, claims against the entity and changes in resources and claims

The significance of information about financial performance

BC1.31 A long-standing assertion by many constituents is that a reporting entity's financial performance as represented by comprehensive income and its components is the most important information.² Concepts Statement 1 (paragraph 43) stated:

The primary focus of financial reporting is information about an enterprise's performance provided by measures of comprehensive income and its components. Investors, creditors, and others who are concerned with assessing the prospects for enterprise net cash inflows are especially interested in that information.

In contrast, the *Framework* (1989) considered information on the reporting entity's financial position and financial performance of equal importance.

BC1.32 To be useful for decision-making, financial reports must provide information about a reporting entity's economic resources and claims, and the change during a period in economic resources and claims. A reporting entity cannot provide reasonably complete information about its financial performance (as represented by comprehensive income, profit or loss or other similar terms) without identifying and measuring its economic resources and the claims. Consequently, the Board concluded that to designate one type of information as the primary focus of financial reporting would be inappropriate.

BC1.33 In discussing the financial position of an entity, the exposure draft referred to *economic resources and claims on them*. The chapter uses the phrase *economic resources of the reporting entity and the claims against the reporting entity* (see paragraph OB12). The reason for the change is that in many cases, claims against an entity are not claims on specific resources. In addition, many claims will be satisfied using resources that will result from future net cash inflows. Thus, while all claims are claims against the entity, not all are claims against the entity's existing resources.

Financial position and solvency

BC1.34 Some constituents have suggested that the main purpose of the statement of financial position should be to provide information that helps assess the

² Concepts Statement 1 referred to *earnings and its components*. However, FASB Concepts Statement No. 6 *Elements of Financial Statements* substituted the term *comprehensive income* for the term *earnings*. The latter term is reserved for a component of comprehensive income.

Conceptual Framework

reporting entity's solvency. The question is not whether information provided in the financial reports should be helpful in assessing solvency; clearly, it should. Assessing solvency is of interest to investors, lenders and other creditors, and the objective of general purpose financial reporting is to provide information that is useful to them for making decisions.

- BC1.35 However, some have suggested that the statement of financial position should be directed towards the information needs of lenders, other creditors and regulators, possibly to the detriment of investors and other users. To do so would be inconsistent with the objective of serving the common information needs of the primary user group. Therefore, the Board rejected the notion of directing the statement of financial position (or any other particular financial statement) towards the needs of a particular subset of users.

**BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS ON CHAPTER 2:
*THE REPORTING ENTITY***

[to be added]

Conceptual Framework

CONTENTS

from paragraph

BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS ON CHAPTER 3: QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF USEFUL FINANCIAL INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION	BC3.1
Background	BC3.3
THE OBJECTIVE OF FINANCIAL REPORTING AND THE QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF USEFUL FINANCIAL INFORMATION	BC3.4
FUNDAMENTAL AND ENHANCING QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS	BC3.8
FUNDAMENTAL QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS	BC3.11
Relevance	BC3.11
Faithful representation	BC3.19
ENHANCING QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS	BC3.32
Comparability	BC3.32
Verifiability	BC3.34
Timeliness	BC3.37
Understandability	BC3.40
QUALITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS NOT INCLUDED	BC3.44
THE COST CONSTRAINT ON USEFUL FINANCIAL REPORTING	BC3.47

Basis for Conclusions on Chapter 3: *Qualitative characteristics of useful financial information*

This Basis for Conclusions accompanies, but is not part of, Chapter 3.

Introduction

- BC3.1 This Basis for Conclusions summarises considerations of the Board in reaching the conclusions in Chapter 3 *Qualitative characteristics of useful financial information*. It includes reasons for accepting some alternatives and rejecting others. Individual Board members gave greater weight to some factors than to others.
- BC3.2 The Board developed the chapter jointly with the US Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB). Consequently, this Basis for Conclusions also includes some references to the FASB's literature.

Background

- BC3.3 The Board began the process of developing the qualitative characteristics of useful financial information by reviewing its own framework and concepts as well as those of other standard-setters. In July 2006 the Board published for public comment a discussion paper on this topic. That same paper was also published by the FASB. The Board and the FASB received 179 responses. In its redeliberations of the issues on this topic, the Board considered all of the comments received and information gained from other outreach initiatives. In May 2008 the Board and the FASB jointly published an exposure draft. The boards received 142 responses. The Board reconsidered all of the issues. This document is the result of those reconsiderations.

The objective of financial reporting and the qualitative characteristics of useful financial information

- BC3.4 Alternatives are available for all aspects of financial reporting, including recognition, derecognition, measurement, classification, presentation and disclosure. When developing financial reporting standards, the Board will choose the alternative that goes furthest towards achieving the objective of financial reporting. Providers of financial information will also have to choose among the alternatives if there are no applicable standards available, or if application of a particular standard requires judgements or options, to achieve the objective of financial reporting.
- BC3.5 Chapter 1 specifies that the objective of general purpose financial reporting is to provide financial information about the reporting entity that is useful to existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors in making decisions about providing resources to the entity. The decision-makers on which this *Conceptual Framework* focuses are existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors.
- BC3.6 That objective by itself leaves a great deal to judgement and provides little guidance on how to exercise that judgement. Chapter 3 describes the first step in making the judgements needed to apply that objective. It identifies and

Conceptual Framework

describes the qualitative characteristics that financial information should have if it is to meet the objective of financial reporting. It also discusses cost, which is a pervasive constraint on financial reporting.

- BC3.7 Subsequent chapters will use the qualitative characteristics to help guide choices about recognition, measurement and the other aspects of financial reporting.

Fundamental and enhancing qualitative characteristics

- BC3.8 Chapter 3 distinguishes between the fundamental qualitative characteristics that are the most critical and the enhancing qualitative characteristics that are less critical but still highly desirable. The discussion paper did not explicitly distinguish between those qualitative characteristics. The Board made the distinction later because of confusion among respondents to the discussion paper about how the qualitative characteristics relate to each other.

- BC3.9 Some respondents to the exposure draft stated that all of the qualitative characteristics should be considered equal, and that the distinction between fundamental and enhancing qualitative characteristics was arbitrary. Others said that the most important qualitative characteristic differs depending on the circumstances; therefore, differentiating among the qualitative characteristics was not appropriate.

- BC3.10 The Board does not agree that the distinction is arbitrary. Financial information without the two fundamental qualitative characteristics of relevance and faithful representation is not useful, and it cannot be made useful by being more comparable, verifiable, timely or understandable. However, financial information that is relevant and faithfully represented may still be useful even if it does not have any of the enhancing qualitative characteristics.

Fundamental qualitative characteristics

Relevance

- BC3.11 It is self-evident that financial information is useful for making a decision only if it is capable of making a difference in that decision. *Relevance* is the term used in the *Conceptual Framework* to describe that capability. It is a fundamental qualitative characteristic of useful financial information.

- BC3.12 The definition of relevance in the *Conceptual Framework* is consistent with the definition in FASB Concepts Statement No. 2 *Qualitative Characteristics of Accounting Information*. The *Framework* (1989) definition of relevance was that information is relevant only if it actually makes a difference in users' decisions. However, users consider a variety of information from many sources, and the extent to which a decision is affected by information about a particular economic phenomenon is difficult, if not impossible, to determine, even after the fact.

- BC3.13 In contrast, whether information is *capable* of making a difference in a decision (relevance as defined in the *Conceptual Framework*) can be determined. One of the primary purposes of publishing exposure drafts and other due process documents is to seek the views of users on whether information that would be

required by proposed financial reporting standards is capable of making a difference in their decisions. The Board also assesses relevance by meeting users to discuss proposed standards, potential agenda decisions, effects on reported information of applying recently implemented standards and other matters.

Predictive and confirmatory value

- BC3.14 Many decisions by investors, lenders and other creditors are based on implicit or explicit predictions about the amount and timing of the return on an equity investment, loan or other credit instrument. Consequently, information is capable of making a difference in one of those decisions only if it will help users to make new predictions, confirm or correct prior predictions or both (which is the definition of predictive or confirmatory value).
- BC3.15 The *Framework* (1989) identified predictive value and confirmatory value as components of relevance, and Concepts Statement 2 referred to predictive value and feedback value. The Board concluded that confirmatory value and feedback value were intended to have the same meaning. The Board and the FASB agreed that both boards would use the same term (confirmatory value) to avoid giving the impression that the two frameworks were intended to be different.

The difference between predictive value and related statistical terms

- BC3.16 Predictive value, as used in the *Conceptual Framework*, is not the same as predictability and persistence as used in statistics. Information has predictive value if it can be used in making predictions about the eventual outcomes of past or current events. In contrast, statisticians use predictability to refer to the accuracy with which it is possible to foretell the next number in a series and persistence to refer to the tendency of a series of numbers to continue to change as it has changed in the past.

Materiality

- BC3.17 Concepts Statement 2 and the *Framework* (1989) discussed materiality and defined it similarly. Concepts Statement 2 described materiality as a constraint on financial reporting that can be considered only together with the qualitative characteristics, especially relevance and faithful representation. The *Framework* (1989), on the other hand, discussed materiality as an aspect of relevance and did not indicate that materiality has a role in relation to the other qualitative characteristics.
- BC3.18 The discussion paper and the exposure draft proposed that materiality is a pervasive constraint in financial reporting because it is pertinent to all of the qualitative characteristics. However, some respondents to the exposure draft agreed that although materiality is pervasive, it is not a constraint on a reporting entity's ability to report information. Rather, materiality is an aspect of relevance, because immaterial information does not affect a user's decision. Furthermore, a standard-setter does not consider materiality when developing standards because it is an entity-specific consideration. The boards agreed with those views and concluded that materiality is an aspect of relevance that applies at the individual entity level.

Conceptual Framework

Faithful representation

BC3.19 The discussion of faithful representation in Chapter 3 differs from that in the previous frameworks in two significant ways. First, it uses the term *faithful representation* instead of the term *reliability*. Second, substance over form, prudence (conservatism) and verifiability, which were aspects of reliability in Concepts Statement 2 or the *Framework* (1989), are not considered aspects of faithful representation. Substance over form and prudence were removed for the reasons described in paragraphs BC3.26–BC3.29. Verifiability is now described as an enhancing qualitative characteristic rather than as part of this fundamental qualitative characteristic (see paragraphs BC3.34–BC3.36).

Replacement of the term reliability

BC3.20 Concepts Statement 2 and the *Framework* (1989) used the term *reliability* to describe what is now called faithful representation.

BC3.21 Concepts Statement 2 listed representational faithfulness, verifiability and neutrality as aspects of reliability and discussed completeness as part of representational faithfulness.

BC3.22 The *Framework* (1989) said:

Information has the quality of reliability when it is free from material error and bias and can be depended upon by users to represent faithfully that which it either purports to represent or could reasonably be expected to represent.

The *Framework* (1989) also discussed substance over form, neutrality, prudence and completeness as aspects of faithful representation.

BC3.23 Unfortunately, neither framework clearly conveyed the meaning of reliability. The comments of respondents to numerous proposed standards indicated a lack of a common understanding of the term *reliability*. Some focused on *verifiability* or *free from material error* to the virtual exclusion of faithful representation. Others focused more on faithful representation, perhaps combined with neutrality. Some apparently think that reliability refers primarily to precision.

BC3.24 Because attempts to explain what reliability was intended to mean in this context have proved unsuccessful, the Board sought a different term that would more clearly convey the intended meaning. The term *faithful representation*, the faithful depiction in financial reports of economic phenomena, was the result of that search. That term encompasses the main characteristics that the previous frameworks included as aspects of reliability.

BC3.25 Many respondents to the discussion paper and the exposure draft opposed the Board's preliminary decision to replace *reliability* with *faithful representation*. Some said that the Board could have better explained what reliable means rather than replacing the term. However, many respondents who made those comments assigned a different meaning to reliability from what the Board meant. In particular, many respondents' descriptions of reliability more closely resembled the Board's notion of verifiability than its notion of reliability. Those comments led the Board to affirm its decision to replace the term *reliability* with *faithful representation*.

Substance over form

- BC3.26 Substance over form is not considered a separate component of faithful representation because it would be redundant. Faithful representation means that financial information represents the substance of an economic phenomenon rather than merely representing its legal form. Representing a legal form that differs from the economic substance of the underlying economic phenomenon could not result in a faithful representation.

Prudence (conservatism) and neutrality

- BC3.27 Chapter 3 does not include prudence or conservatism as an aspect of faithful representation because including either would be inconsistent with neutrality. Some respondents to the discussion paper and exposure draft disagreed with that view. They said that the framework should include conservatism, prudence or both. They said that bias should not always be assumed to be undesirable, especially in circumstances when bias, in their view, produces information that is more relevant to some users.
- BC3.28 Deliberately reflecting conservative estimates of assets, liabilities, income or equity has sometimes been considered desirable to counteract the effects of some management estimates that have been perceived as excessively optimistic. However, even with the prohibitions against deliberate misstatement that appear in the existing frameworks, an admonition to be prudent is likely to lead to a bias. Understating assets or overstating liabilities in one period frequently leads to overstating financial performance in later periods—a result that cannot be described as prudent or neutral.
- BC3.29 Other respondents to the exposure draft said that neutrality is impossible to achieve. In their view, relevant information must have purpose, and information with a purpose is not neutral. In other words, because financial reporting is a tool to influence decision-making, it cannot be neutral. Obviously, reported financial information is expected to influence the actions of users of that information, and the mere fact that many users take similar actions on the basis of reported information does not demonstrate a lack of neutrality. The Board does not attempt to encourage or predict specific actions of users. If financial information is biased in a way that encourages users to take or avoid predetermined actions, that information is not neutral.

Can faithful representation be empirically measured?

- BC3.30 Empirical accounting researchers have accumulated considerable evidence supporting relevant and faithfully represented financial information through correlation with changes in the market prices of entities' equity or debt instruments. However, such studies have not provided techniques for empirically measuring faithful representation apart from relevance.
- BC3.31 Both previous frameworks discussed the desirability of providing statistical information about how faithfully a financial measure is represented. That would not be unprecedented. Other statistical information is sometimes reflected in financial reports. For example, some entities disclose value at risk from derivative financial instruments and similar positions. The Board expects that the use of statistical concepts for financial reporting in some situations will

Conceptual Framework

continue to be important. Unfortunately, the boards have not identified any way to quantify the faithfulness of the representations in a financial report.

Enhancing qualitative characteristics

Comparability

- BC3.32 Comparability was an important concept in both the *Framework* (1989) and Concepts Statement 2, but the two previous frameworks disagreed on its importance. The *Framework* (1989) stated that comparability is as important as relevance and faithful representation.³ Concepts Statement 2 described comparability as a quality of the relationship between two or more pieces of information that, although important, is secondary to relevance and faithful representation.
- BC3.33 Relevant and faithfully represented information is most useful if it can be readily compared with similar information reported by other entities and by the same entity in other periods. One of the most important reasons that financial reporting standards are needed is to increase the comparability of reported financial information. However, even if it is not readily comparable, relevant and faithfully represented information is still useful. Comparable information, however, is not useful if it is not relevant and may mislead if it is not faithfully represented. Therefore, *comparability* is considered an enhancing qualitative characteristic instead of a fundamental qualitative characteristic.

Verifiability

- BC3.34 Verifiable information can be used with confidence. Lack of verifiability does not necessarily render information useless, but users are likely to be more cautious because there is a greater risk that the information does not faithfully represent what it purports to represent.
- BC3.35 The *Framework* (1989) did not explicitly include verifiability as an aspect of reliability, but Concepts Statement 2 did. However, the two frameworks are not as different as it might appear because the definition of reliability in the *Framework* (1989) contained the phrase *and can be depended upon by users*, which implies that users need assurance on the information.
- BC3.36 The discussion paper stated that reported financial information should be verifiable to assure users that it is free from material error and bias and can be depended on to represent what it purports to represent. Therefore, verifiability was considered an aspect of faithful representation. Some respondents pointed out that including verifiability as an aspect of faithful representation could result in excluding information that is not readily verifiable. Those respondents recognised that many forward-looking estimates that are very important in providing relevant financial information (for example, expected cash flows, useful lives and salvage values) cannot be directly verified. However, excluding information about those estimates would make the financial reports much less

³ The term *reliability* was used instead of *faithful representation*, but the meaning was intended to be similar.

useful. The Board agreed and repositioned verifiability as an enhancing qualitative characteristic, very desirable but not necessarily required.

Timeliness

- BC3.37 The *Framework* (1989) discussed timeliness as a constraint that could rob information of relevance. Concepts Statement 2 described timeliness as an aspect of relevance. However, the substance of timeliness as discussed in the two previous frameworks was essentially the same.
- BC3.38 The discussion paper described timeliness as an aspect of relevance. However, some respondents pointed out that timeliness is not part of relevance in the same sense that predictive and confirmatory value are. The Board was persuaded that timeliness is different from the other components of relevance.
- BC3.39 Timeliness is very desirable, but it is not as critical as relevance and faithful representation. Timely information is useful only if it is relevant and faithfully represented. In contrast, relevant and faithfully represented information may still be useful (especially for confirmatory purposes) even if it is not reported in as timely a manner as would be desirable.

Understandability

- BC3.40 Both the *Framework* (1989) and Concepts Statement 2 included understandability, a qualitative characteristic that enables users to comprehend the information and therefore make it useful for making decisions. Both frameworks also similarly described that for financial information to be understandable, users should have a reasonable degree of financial knowledge and a willingness to study the information with reasonable diligence.
- BC3.41 Despite those discussions of understandability and users' responsibilities for understanding financial reports, misunderstanding persists. For example, some have expressed the view that a new accounting method should not be implemented because some users might not understand it, even though the new accounting method would result in reporting financial information that is useful for decision-making. They imply that understandability is more important than relevance.
- BC3.42 If understandability considerations were fundamental, it might be appropriate to avoid reporting information about very complicated things even if the information is relevant and faithfully represented. Classifying understandability as an enhancing qualitative characteristic is intended to indicate that information that is difficult to understand should be presented and explained as clearly as possible.
- BC3.43 To clarify another frequently misunderstood point, the *Conceptual Framework* explains that users are responsible for *actually* studying reported financial information with reasonable diligence rather than only being *willing* to do so (which was the statement in the previous frameworks). In addition, the *Conceptual Framework* states that users may need to seek the aid of advisers to understand economic phenomena that are particularly complex.

Qualitative characteristics not included

- BC3.44 *Transparency, high quality, internal consistency, true and fair view or fair presentation and credibility* have been suggested as desirable qualitative characteristics of financial information. However, transparency, high quality, internal consistency, true and fair view or fair presentation are different words to describe information that has the qualitative characteristics of relevance and representational faithfulness enhanced by comparability, verifiability, timeliness and understandability. Credibility is similar but also implies trustworthiness of a reporting entity's management.
- BC3.45 Interested parties sometimes suggested other criteria for standard-setting decisions, and the Board has at times cited some of those criteria as part of the rationale for some decisions. Those criteria include simplicity, operationality, practicability or practicality, and acceptability.
- BC3.46 Those criteria are not qualitative characteristics. Instead, they are part of the overall weighing of benefits and costs of providing useful financial information. For example, a simpler method may be less costly to apply than a more complex method. In some circumstances, a simpler method may result in information that is essentially the same as, but somewhat less precise than, information produced by a more complex method. In that situation, a standard-setter would include the decrease in faithful representation and the decrease in implementation cost in weighing benefits against costs.

The cost constraint on useful financial reporting

- BC3.47 Cost is a pervasive constraint that standard-setters, as well as providers and users of financial information, should keep in mind when considering the benefits of a possible new financial reporting requirement. Cost is not a qualitative characteristic of information. It is a characteristic of the process used to provide the information.
- BC3.48 The Board has attempted and continues to attempt to develop more structured methods of obtaining information about the cost of gathering and processing the information that proposed standards would require entities to provide. The primary method used is to request interested parties, sometimes formally (such as by field tests and questionnaires), to submit cost and benefit information for a specific proposal that is quantified to the extent feasible. Those requests have resulted in helpful information and have led directly to changes to proposed requirements to reduce the costs without significantly reducing the related benefits.