

SELF-STUDY CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Decoding the FASB Codification

Fort Worth, Texas
(800) 231-1860
trainingcpe.thomson.com



THOMSON REUTERS

Copyright 2009 Thomson Reuters/PPC
All Rights Reserved

This material, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in another document or manuscript in any form without the permission of the publisher.

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional service. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional person should be sought.—*From a Declaration of Principles jointly adopted by a Committee of the American Bar Association and a Committee of Publishers and Associations.*



PPC is registered with the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA) as a sponsor of continuing professional education on the National Registry of CPE Sponsors. State boards of accountancy have final authority on the acceptance of individual courses for CPE credit. Complaints regarding registered sponsors may be addressed to the National Registry of CPE Sponsors, 150 Fourth Avenue North, Suite 700, Nashville, TN 37219-2417. Website: www.nasba.org.



PPC is registered with the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA) as a Quality Assurance Service (QAS) sponsor of continuing professional education. State boards of accountancy have final authority on acceptance of individual courses for CPE credit. Complaints regarding QAS program sponsors may be addressed to NASBA, 150 Fourth Avenue North, Suite 700, Nashville, TN 37219-2417. Website: www.nasba.org.

Registration Numbers

New York	001076
NASBA Registry	103166
NASBA QAS	006

INTRODUCTION

Decoding the FASB Codification is an interactive self-study CPE course designed to enhance your understanding of the latest issues in the field. To obtain credit, you must complete the learning process by logging on to our Online Grading System at **OnlineGrading.Thomson.com** or by mailing your completed Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet for print grading by **August 31, 2010**. Complete instructions are included below and in the Testing Instructions preceding the Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet.

Taking the Course

You are asked to read the material and, during the course, to test your comprehension of each of the learning objectives by answering self-study quiz questions. After completing each quiz, you can evaluate your progress by comparing your answers to both the correct and incorrect answers and the reason for each. References are also cited so you can go back to the text where the topic is discussed in detail. Once you are satisfied you understand the material, **answer the examination questions which follow each lesson**. You may either record your answer choices on the printed **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** or by logging on to our Online Grading System.

Qualifying Credit Hours—QAS or Registry

PPC is registered with the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy as a sponsor of continuing professional education on the National Registry of CPE Sponsors (Registry) and as a Quality Assurance Service (QAS) sponsor. Part of the requirements for both Registry and QAS membership include conforming to the *Statement on Standards of Continuing Professional Education (CPE) Programs* (the standards). The standards were developed jointly by NASBA and the AICPA. As of this date, not all boards of public accountancy have adopted the standards. This course is designed to comply with the standards. For states adopting the standards, recognizing QAS hours or Registry hours, credit hours are measured in 50-minute contact hours. Some states, however, require 100-minute contact hours for self study. Your state licensing board has final authority on accepting Registry hours, QAS hours, or hours under the standards. Check with the state board of accountancy in the state in which you are licensed to determine if they participate in the QAS program and allow QAS CPE credit hours. This course is based on one CPE credit for each 50 minutes of study time in accordance with standards issued by NASBA. Note that some states require 100-minute contact hours for self study. You may also visit the NASBA website at **www.nasba.org** for a listing of states that accept QAS hours. Credit hours for CPE courses vary in length. Credit hours for this course are listed on the “Overview” page.

CPE requirements are established by each state. You should check with your state board of accountancy to determine the acceptability of this course. We have been informed by the North Carolina State Board of Certified Public Accountant Examiners and the Mississippi State Board of Public Accountancy that they will not allow credit for courses included in books or periodicals.

Obtaining CPE Credit

Online Grading. Log on to our Online Grading Center at **OnlineGrading.Thomson.com** to receive instant CPE credit. Click the purchase link and a list of exams will appear. You may search for the exam using wildcards. Payment for the exam is accepted over a secure site using your credit card. For further instructions regarding the Online Grading Center, please refer to the Testing Instructions located at the beginning of the examination. A certificate documenting the CPE credits will be issued for each examination score of 70% or higher.

Print Grading. You can receive CPE credit by mailing your completed **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** to the Tax & Accounting business of Thomson Reuters for grading. The answer sheet is located at the end of the course materials. The answer sheet is identified with the course acronym. Please ensure you use the correct answer sheet for each course. **Payment of \$49** (by check or credit card) must accompany each answer sheet submitted. We cannot process answer sheets that do not include payment. Please take a few minutes to complete the Course Evaluation so that we can provide you with the best possible CPE.

If you are paying by credit card, you may **fax** your completed Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet and Course Evaluation to the Tax & Accounting business of Thomson Reuters at 817-252-4021.

If more than one person wants to complete this self-study course, each person must complete a separate **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet**. Payment of \$49 must accompany each answer sheet submitted. We would also appreciate a separate **Course Evaluation** from each person who completes an examination.

Express Grading. An express grading service is available for an **additional \$14.95** per examination. Course results will be faxed to you by 5 p.m. CST of the business day following receipt of your Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet. Expedited grading requests will be accepted by fax only if accompanied with credit card information.

Retaining CPE Records

For all scores of 70% or higher, you will receive a *Certificate of Completion*. You should retain it and a copy of these materials for at least five years.

PPC In-House Training

A number of in-house training classes are available that provide up to eight hours of CPE credit. Please call our Sales Department at (800) 387-1120 for more information.

Decoding the FASB Codification (CODTG09)

OVERVIEW

COURSE DESCRIPTION:	This interactive self-study course covers the basic aspects of the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ (ASC), including a historical perspective, implementation date, how ASC interfaces with XBRL and IFRS, and the mechanics of ASC.
PUBLICATION/REVISION DATE:	June 2009
PREREQUISITE/ADVANCE PREPARATION:	Basic knowledge of GAAP
CPE CREDIT:	4 QAS Hours, 4 Registry Hours Check with the state board of accountancy in the state in which you are licensed to determine if they participate in the QAS program and allow QAS CPE credit hours. This course is based on one CPE credit for each 50 minutes of study time in accordance with standards issued by NASBA. Note that some states require 100-minute contact hours for self study. You may also visit the NASBA website at www.nasba.org for a listing of states that accept QAS hours.
FIELD OF STUDY:	Accounting
EXPIRATION DATE:	August 31, 2010
KNOWLEDGE LEVEL:	Basic

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Lesson 1: Decoding the FASB Codification

Completion of this lesson will enable you to:

- Identify who authorized the project and when, and explain who is affected.
- Provide a historical perspective related to the need for ASC.

Lesson 2: Codification and Convergence

Completion of this lesson will enable you to:

- Consult with clients regarding their state of preparedness for an eventual conversion to IFRS should such a conversion be desired or required.
- Monitor ongoing developments as FASB and IASB standards converge under the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the two Boards.

TO COMPLETE THIS LEARNING PROCESS

Send your completed Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet, and Course Evaluation to:

**Thomson Reuters
Tax & Accounting—R&G
CODTG09 Self-study CPE
36786 Treasury Center
Chicago, IL 60694-6700**

See the test instructions included with the course materials for more information

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES

For information regarding refunds and complaint resolutions, dial (800) 323-8724, select the option for Customer Service, and your questions or concerns will be promptly addressed.

Table of Contents

Lesson 1: Decoding the FASB Codification	1
Why Did We Need the Codification?	1
Overview of the Project	2
Oversight and Effective Date	3
Moving from an Audit Focus to an Entity Focus	3
Reorganization and Codification	6
Example of Hierarchical Organization	13
Securities and Exchange Commission Supplemental Guidance	13
Drafting Conventions	14
Grandfathered Material	16
Post-Implementation Changes, Due Process, and Transitional Guidance	17
Exposure Draft: Proposed SFAS, <i>The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles</i> , a replacement of FASB Statement No. 162 (ASC 105)	17
Migration of Accounting Rules Contained in Auditing Literature	20
Exposure Draft of Proposed Statement of Financial Accounting Standards: <i>Going Concern</i>	20
Exposure Draft of Proposed SFAS: <i>Subsequent Events</i> (ASC 855)	21
Future Codification Updates	23
Implementing the Codification	23
 Lesson 2: Codification and Convergence	 31
The Proposed SEC “Roadmap”	33
Other Ways that IFRS Is Gaining Traction in the U.S.	42
Appendix to—Map of FASB ASC to IFRS	47
Codification, Convergence and XBRL—The Perfect Storm?	51
 Glossary	 61
 Index	 65
 To enhance your learning experience, the final examination questions are located throughout the course reading materials. Please look for the exam questions following each chapter.	
 Testing Instructions for Examination for CPE Credit	 67
 Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet	 69
 Self-study Course Evaluation	 70

CPE & Training Solutions

from the Tax & Accounting business of Thomson Reuters



THOMSON REUTERS

800.231.1860 | trainingcpe.thomson.com

Online Learning

MicroMash

A trusted provider of technology-based CPE and training for over 20 years. Choose from over 160 courses on hot topics that will help you stay on top of your field!

PASS Online

A CPE provider since 1990, PASS Online offers more than 240 electronic courses covering a variety of accounting and tax topics, including industry-leading state ethics training courses for accountants. Courses available online, as a download, or in CD format.

Required

Online CPE tracking for CPAs, customized learning plans for staff and accountants, self-service tools, and more! Required Learning Libraries now offer on-demand learning streamed directly through the Required interface.

Live Seminars & Conferences

Gear Up Live Seminars & Conferences

A leading provider of tax and accounting education for over 35 years, Gear Up offers nationwide seminars and week-long conferences at exciting vacation destinations! 2009 conferences include *Jackpot* in Las Vegas (May 11-16), *Windy City Week* in Chicago (Jul 27-Aug 1), *Royal Flush* in Las Vegas (Nov 30-Dec 5), and *Magic Week* in Orlando (Dec 15-19).

Gear Up Workshops—Formerly Bell Learning!

Exceptional instructor-led CPE at affordable prices! High-quality regional instructor-led courses in an affordable workshop format to meet your continuing professional education needs. Choose from 18 one-day courses, in Alabama, Florida, Illinois, North Carolina, and Texas.

PPC and AuditWatch Conferences

PPC and AuditWatch offer in-depth learning at conferences created to meet the needs of professionals nationwide. We gather field experts who bring attendees the most up-to-date, relevant information on important topics. 2009 Conferences include:

- PPC Conference on Tax Planning for Wealth Preservation | San Francisco | Jul 21-22
- AuditWatch National School for Audit Leaders | Chicago | Aug 6-7
- PPC & AuditWatch Conference on Audit Quality and Efficiency | Las Vegas | Oct 1-2
- PPC & AuditWatch Conference on International Financial Reporting Standards | Las Vegas | Oct 20-21
- PPC Users' Conference: Best Practices in Implementing the PPC Approach | New Orleans | Nov 5-6
- PPC & AuditWatch Conference on Accounting and Auditing Issues in Turbulent Times | Washington, DC | Dec 3-4

AuditWatch Live Seminars

AuditWatch, the audit profession's premier training and consulting firm and recognized leader in audit productivity, offers specialized auditing seminars in locations nationwide. For more details and a seminar schedule, visit trainingcpe.thomson.com/AuditWatch. *Also available:* AuditWatch University—an integrated development curriculum with five progressive levels of audit staff training available—and *New!* TaxWatch University—progressive levels of tax training brought to you by PPC In-House Training and AuditWatch.

In-House Training

PPC In-House Seminars

PPC offers on-site customized training on over 50 accounting and auditing, management, staff training, tax and Yellow Book topics. This learning experience is custom-tailored to meet your needs, taught by highly rated instructors, features current, relevant course content—and at approximately \$15 per credit hour, In-House training is very affordable!

Practitioners Monthly Video Digest

This monthly CPE product is a convenient and cost-effective way for firms to provide timely, leading-edge in-house training. Every month (excluding February and March) your firm will receive a training module that contains a high-quality instructional DVD and related course materials including an instructor's guide and participant materials. Members of your firm will meet monthly, view a DVD featuring leading experts addressing new and emerging issues, and participate in related discussions.

Webinar Learning Network

You'll find webinars on the latest developments in tax, accounting, auditing, finance and more—all you need is a high-speed internet connection and a phone! Also available—PPC Guide-based Webinars provide highlights and help maximize your PPC user experience.

Audio Conferences *New!*

One phone line—unlimited number of participants! For \$245 per site fee you and an unlimited number of participants can hear the latest updates and practical information from the most trusted name in CPE. Plus, each participant can earn 2 CPE Credits for only \$25! Registrants will receive one dial in code and one set of materials. All participants listening can copy this material and listen in!

AuditWatch

AuditWatch has an intense focus on serving the audit and accounting profession with leading experts to train and consult with firms that provide auditing services. Our integrated development curriculum for audit professionals and CPA firms, audit process consulting, and audit technology services make AuditWatch the recognized leader in audit productivity.

Self-Study Courses

Gear Up Self-Study

A leading provider of tax and accounting education for over 35 years, Gear Up offers print-based self-study courses based on our popular live seminars plus additional standalone specialty topics. Most live seminar topics can be supplemented with video and audio materials to provide you with the feel of an instructor-led seminar in your home or office—learn on your schedule!

PPC Self-Study

Learn with the company that provides the industry-leading PPC Guides—more than 80 convenient self-study courses are available on a variety of accounting & auditing and tax topics. Additionally, the CPE & Training Solutions Online Grading Center gives you easy access to many print-based self-study courses as downloadable PDFs and allows you to complete your CPE exams online for immediate results.

Quickfinder | Gear Up Self-Study CPE

Quickfinder's trusted content combined with Gear Up's 35-year+ history as a leader in tax & accounting professional education—a winning combination for your training needs!

RIA Self-Study CPE

New! RIA and PPC's Complete Analysis of the Tax and Benefits Provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Download PDF at no cost!

Lesson 1: Decoding the FASB Codification

Learning Objectives

Completion of this lesson will enable you to:

- Identify who authorized the project and when, and explain who is affected.
- Provide a historical perspective related to the need for ASC.

Introduction

Webster defines codification as “the act, process, or result of arranging in a systematic form or code.” On June 3, 2009 the FASB voted to approve the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ (ASC); what is known as U.S. GAAP. This codification will forever change the way accounting research is performed. Accountants who prepare financial statements will be affected the most by this change. The Codification brings accounting research into the digital age, but it also prepares U.S. GAAP for conversion to International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). Among other things, this course will explore what ASC means to accountants, when it is effective, what it does, and why such a program is needed in the first place. Also discussed is the impact of the Codification on XBRL and the move to adopt IFRS.

Why Did We Need the Codification?

Over the last ninety years or so the number of authoritative pronouncements issued by the FASB, AICPA, their predecessor organizations and countless other standard-setters have numbered in the thousands. Practitioners had to look for conflicts, amendments, and superseded statements when following authoritative GAAP guidance. In addition there was not defined organization within each standard to assist practitioners when researching. The 1990's and early 21st century saw perhaps some of the most egregious cases of fraud and mismanagement. Companies like Enron, WorldCom, Waste Management, and Computer Associates, were just a few of the companies whose names were smeared by scandal. Many believed that the complex and often difficult to follow accounting standards contributed to these failures.

There was plenty of blame to go around, and some felt that the regulators had failed to provide proper oversight of these companies who used the complexity and sheer volume of accounting standards to camouflage their misdeeds:

- The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC), Public Oversight Board (POB), American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), and others faced scrutiny and criticism on several fronts, not the least of which was FASB's rule concerning Special Purpose Entities (SPE); FASB's continued existence was reportedly in question, although in FASB's defense, changes it proposed during the years that preceded the meltdown were opposed by corporate America, the big accounting firms, and congressional leaders. FASB, in turn, tried to explain its role as an authoritative body and suggested that Congress should be involved in the overall process of FASB oversight without interfering in the process of technical decision-making.

- The POB was disbanded by the SEC and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX) was enacted, thereby creating the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) to oversee auditors of public companies.
- “Transparency” became a frequently-used word when describing efforts to resolve perceived problems in the system.
- In 2003, certain steps that had already been taken toward international convergence of accounting standards and financial reporting, and on developing a single source of GAAP (excluding SEC guidance); the development of and maintenance for which FASB would be responsible.

The end result was the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ (ASC) project. By itself, ASC can only do so much to promote international standards convergence—but it is critical to the process of streamlining GAAP standards and designating a sole authoritative source for the U.S. GAAP XBRL taxonomy.

Overview of the Project

With over 2,000 pronouncements accumulated over a 70-year period, and estimated to fill the equivalent of 20,000 pages, U.S. GAAP had become badly bloated, overly complex, and almost impossible to navigate. In the words of FASB Chair, Robert Herz, “In technical terms, it’s nuts.”

In September 2004, the Trustees of the Financial Accounting Foundation (FAF), the FASB’s oversight board, approved a 4-year project that involved over 200 people, the cost of which has been estimated at approximately \$16 million, with the following objectives:

- Clarify the authoritative status of accounting literature,
- Reduce the time and effort necessary to research issues,
- Improve the usability of GAAP and mitigate the risk of noncompliance,
- Provide a platform for real-time updating as new standards are released,
- Facilitate a smoother path to convergence with international financial reporting standards, and
- Support the development of the U.S. taxonomy for eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL).

In developing the ASC, the FASB sifted through thousands of pages of nongovernmental accounting pronouncements in order to organize them into the 90 topics of the new GAAP hierarchy.

FASB released the ASC project on January 15, 2008 for a one year verification period. In essence, ASC represents a major restructuring of authoritative guidance for levels A–D of the GAAP hierarchy. The previous four levels of the GAAP hierarchy have been reduced to two levels—authoritative and non-authoritative. This restructuring will affect all non-governmental U.S. entities, and has become the single source of authoritative GAAP for those entities (excluding SEC guidance). While certain SEC guidance is also included in the codification, ASC will not be the source of SEC guidance. ASC also includes some “grandfathered” material, but outdated or nonessential material is not included and neither will guidance for non-GAAP issues such as those concerning other comprehensive basis of accounting (OCBOA). The Codification excludes grandfathered GAAP because it can no longer apply the guidance to new transactions.

Oversight and Effective Date

In January 2009, FASB officially completed the verification phase of the ASC project. On January 15, 2009, the deadline for feedback, FASB released its codification and related online research system. Originally intended to become effective in April 2009, ASC was delayed until mid-2009.

The Codification became effective on July 1, 2009. At that time the Codification became the single source of authoritative U.S. GAAP for all nongovernmental entities, superseding all non-SEC accounting and reporting standards. The Codification is the initial step in preparing U.S. accounting standards for convergence with the International Financial Reporting Standards. The FASB will no longer maintain or update the superseded standards.

While the Codification does not intend to modify GAAP, it does introduce a new structure that is organized in an easily accessible online research system. Developers of the new system expect that it will substantially reduce the time and effort needed to research accounting issues. FASB product developers say that there have been no changes in GAAP, however, there is one change. The change incorporated into the Codification the AICPA's TIS 5100, *Revenue Recognition*, paragraphs 38–76, relating to software revenue recognition. (All other TIS are considered nonauthoritative sources of GAAP.) Companies that have not previously followed TIS 5100, paragraphs 38–76, will have to adopt that guidance on a prospective basis for revenue transactions entered into or materially modified in fiscal years on or after December 15, 2009, and interim periods within those years.

The Codification has been designed to present all of the authoritative accounting and financial reporting literature in a single, integrated offering using an online, real-time database. It reorganizes the pronouncements into about 90 accounting topics and displays all topics with in a consistent structure. It also includes relevant SEC guidance that follows the same topical structure in separate sections in the Codification. The FASB has been careful to state that the Codification doesn't change GAAP and that the project's goal was not to create any new GAAP. However, as noted above, the FASB has added selected items to the Codification that did not previously exist in the authoritative standards, which will, indeed, create GAAP in limited situations.

Moving from an Audit Focus to an Entity Focus

The pre-Codification GAAP hierarchy has been subject to certain criticisms, not the least of which is the ranking of FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Concepts (SFACs) relative to that of GAAP and industry practice since the latter category receives no due process consideration while SFACs are subject to the same level of due process as that of FASB SFAS. The SEC also noted that the existing hierarchy was too complex, and was addressed to auditors instead of the entity. In making these observations, the SEC recommended FASB improve the GAAP hierarchy.

With the Codification, the GAAP hierarchy has been shifted from an auditor focus to an entity focus. Prior to the issuance of FASB Statement Number 162, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles* in May 2008, GAAP for non-governmental entities had been established by an auditing standard, Statement on Auditing Standards Number 69, *The Meaning of Presents Fairly in Conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Standards.* These two standards divide GAAP into two tiers—Tier 1 (Accounting Principles) and Tier 2 (Other Authoritative Accounting Literature). In March 2009, the FASB issued a proposed

Standard, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles—a Replacement of FASB Statement No. 162*. The proposal will replace the four levels of the GAAP hierarchy in SFAS No. 162 with just two levels—authoritative and non-authoritative. Authoritative sources will be contained in the Codification, while non-authoritative sources won't.

The significant differences and similarities between the two standards are as follows:

- SEC rules, interpretive releases and Staff Accounting Bulletins continue to be classified as category (A) GAAP for SEC registrants. Note that FASB EITF Abstracts (EITF D-Topics) are category (A) for SEC registered companies and category (C) for non registered companies.
- SFAS No. 162 adds FASB Statement No. 133, *Implementation Issues* and FASB Staff Positions in category (A) of Tier 1. These items were not included in SAS No. 69 category (A).
- Category (B) and category (C) are the same for both SAS No. 69 and SFAS No.162.
- AICPA Industry Audit and Accounting Guides and Statement of Position not cleared by the FASB are specifically included in category (D) by SFAS No. 162; however they are not addressed in SAS No. 69. Otherwise category (D) is the same for both SAS No. 69 and SFAS No. 162.
- The classifications A through D indicate the relative importance of a standard with category (A) being the most authoritative, then category (B), etc.
- The following table compares the provisions of SAS No. 69 with SFAS No. 162 to highlight the similarities and differences between the two statements.

Tier 1 Accounting Principles

SAS No. 69	SFAS No. 162
Hierarchy of GAAP Under SAS 69 for Nongovernmental Entities	SFAS No. 162, The Hierarchy of GAAP
Category (A)	Category (A)
FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Standards and Interpretations	FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Standards and Interpretations
AICPA Accounting Research Bulletins	AICPA Accounting Research Bulletins not superseded by action of the FASB
Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinions	Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinions not superseded by actions of the FASB FASB Statement 133 Implementation Issues FASB Staff Positions
SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission) Staff Accounting Bulletins and other Rules and Interpretations	SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission) Staff Accounting Bulletins and other Rules and Interpretations
Category (B)	Category (B)
FASB Technical Bulletins and AICPA Industry Audit and Accounting Guides and Statements of Position that have been cleared by FASB	FASB Technical Bulletins and AICPA Industry Audit and Accounting Guides and Statements of Position that have been cleared by FASB
Category (C)	Category (C)
AICPA Accounting Standards Executive Committee (AcSEC) Practice Bulletins cleared by the FASB and consensus positions of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF)	AICPA Accounting Standards Executive Committee (AcSEC) Practice Bulletins cleared by the FASB and consensus positions of the FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF), and topics discussed in Appendix D of EITF Abstracts
Category (D)	Category (D)
AICPA accounting interpretations and implementation guides (Q&As) published by the FASB staff and widely recognized industry or general practices	AICPA accounting interpretations and implementation guides (Q&As) published by the FASB staff, AICPA Industry Audit and Accounting Guides and Statements of Position not cleared by the FASB, and widely recognized industry or general practices

Tier 2 Other Authoritative Accounting Literature

SAS No. 69	SFAS No. 162
FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Concepts	FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Concepts
AICPA Issue Papers	AICPA Issue Papers
Accounting Standards of the International Accounting Standards Committee	Accounting Standards of the International Accounting Standards Committee
Statements, Interpretations, and Technical Bulletins of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB)	
Statements, Interpretations, and Technical Bulletins of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB)	
Pronouncements of other professional associations or regulatory agencies	Pronouncements of other professional associations or regulatory agencies
AICPA Technical Practice Aids and Technical Information Service Inquires and Replies	AICPA Technical Practice Aids and Technical Information Service Inquires and Replies
Accounting textbooks, handbooks and articles	Accounting textbooks, handbooks and articles

Reorganization and Codification

FASB and its consultants designed an online, searchable database it calls the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ Research System (FASCRS) which includes a web-browser based interface optimized for use with either Microsoft Internet Explorer 6 and up and Firefox 2 and up (Mac users can use Firefox to access the tool). The thousands of pages of previous GAAP have been reorganized into approximately 90 topics.

What's Included in the Codification

The Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) includes all levels (A) through (D) GAAP issued by standard-setters. It excludes standards applicable to state and local governmental units. To the extent not superseded by subsequent standards, the content included in the ASC includes:

Standard Setter	Common Acronym	Type of Standard
AICPA Committee on Accounting Procedure (CAP) (1939-1959)	ARB	Accounting Research Bulletins
AICPA Accounting Principles Board (APB) (1962-1973)	APB	Opinions
AICPA	AIN	Accounting Interpretations
	SOP	Statements of Position
	AAG	Audit and Accounting Guides (only incremental GAAP guidance)
	PB	Practice Bulletins
	TIS	Technical Inquiry Service (only with respect to Software Revenue Recognition)
Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) (1973–?)	FAS	Statements
	FIN	Interpretations
	FTB	Technical Bulletins
	FSP	Staff Positions
	Q&A	Staff Implementation Guides
	—	FAS 138 Derivatives Examples
FASB Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF) (1984–?)	EITF	Consensuses
	D	Appendix D Topics
FASB Derivatives Implementation Group (DIG)	DIG	Issues

The project team responsible for the ASC used, as the initial starting point, the “as-amended” versions of the standards as they existed as of June 1, 2007. Thus, if a particular authoritative document was issued for the sole purpose of amending a previously issued standard, the subsequent standard is not identified or cross-referenced since its effects had already been reflected in codifying the standard that it amended.

The Codification is generally comprised of the authoritative literature included in levels (A) through (D) of the current GAAP hierarchy as follows:

- Financial Standards Board (FASB)
 - Statements (FAS)
 - Interpretations (FIN)
 - Technical Bulletins (FTB)
 - Staff Positions (FSP)
 - Staff Implementation Guides (Q&A)
- Emerging Issues Task Force (EITF)
 - Abstracts
 - Appendix D Topics
- Derivative Implementation Group (DIG) Issues
- Accounting Principles Board (APB) Opinions
- Accounting Research Bulletins (ARB)
- Accounting Interpretations (AIN)
- American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)
 - Statements of Position (SOP)
 - Audit and Accounting Guides (AAG)—only incremental accounting guidance
 - Practice Bulletins (PB)
 - Technical Inquiry Services (TIS)—only for Software Revenue Recognition

As a result, the Codification is made up of a smorgasbord of pronouncements issued by various standard-setting bodies over the years. The Codification also includes selected content issued by the SEC. However, the SEC content isn’t a complete representation of all rules, regulations, and other guidance relevant to public companies and does not replace or amend any guidance issued by the SEC or its staff.

What Does It Cost?

The basic version of ASC is free. Most CPA firms, however, will want to purchase the “professional view.” The professional version includes advanced text searching and a cross-reference function. The cost of the professional view is \$850 per single concurrent user.

The FASB has said that they plan to issue a paper version of the Codification. No price has been established for the print version at this time. The FASB will evaluate whether to print future editions of the Codification based on the demand for the printed version.

What's Not Included?

The ASC is not the official source of SEC guidance and does not contain the entire population of SEC rules, regulations, interpretive releases and staff guidance. Also, the ASC does not include governmental accounting standards.

- It is important to note that the FASB has not included some standards in their entirety. They identified some content included in the standards as nonessential content and, therefore, has excluded it from the Codification. Examples of such nonessential content include summaries of existing standards and summaries of constituent feedback.
- The Codification doesn't include standards for state and local governments. It also excludes guidance included in Level (E) of the previous GAAP hierarchy, such as accounting textbooks and articles. In developing the Codification, the FASB used a target effective date of December 31, 2008. Accordingly, the Codification excludes certain content that was superseded or outdated on December 31, 2008.
- The FASB also excluded from the Codification certain items referred to as "grandfathered materials." That includes guidance such as pooling of interests in a business combination, stock compensation for nonpublic entities, and pension transition assets or obligations.
- The ASC also does not include guidance for non-GAAP items such as OCBOA, Cash Basis, Income Tax Basis, and Regulatory Accounting Principles.

As part of the FASB's streamlining efforts, amending standards will be incorporated into amended standards. Standards that served merely to amend other standards have been eliminated.

How Is It Organized?

The Codification is generally organized in a hierarchical structure by topic, subtopic, section, and subsection. Therefore, under each topic, there may be multiple subtopics, which may, in turn, have multiple sections and subsections beneath them. Each topic, subtopic, and section is assigned a specific numeric code. Topics are the broadest categorization of content and represent a collection of related guidance. The paragraph level in the hierarchical structure is where the actual topical content is located. All of the other elements in the Codification structure serve to focus selection to the paragraph level. All authoritative GAAP issued by the FASB will be issued in this format regardless of the form in which such guidance has been issued in the past.

The Codification includes a cross-reference report that identifies where current standards reside in the Codification or the source of material that is included in the Codification.

Topical Organization

Numbering Conventions

The ASC database is organized into the following broad topic areas:

1XX	General Principles and Objectives
2XX	Presentation
3XX	Assets
4XX	Liabilities
5XX	Equity
6XX	Revenue
7XX	Expenses
8XX	Broad Transactions
9XX	Industry
	Master Glossary
	Post-Codification Standards (with Basis for Conclusions)
	Exposure Drafts

High-Level Topic Areas

General Principles and Objectives

- 105 Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
- 110 Placeholder for Conceptual Framework (not yet included in Codification)

Presentation

- 205 Presentation of Financial Statements
- 210 Balance Sheet
- 215 Statement of Shareholder Equity
- 220 Comprehensive Income
- 225 Income Statement
- 230 Statement of Cash Flows
- 235 Note to Financial Statements
- 250 Accounting Changes and Error Corrections
- 255 Changing Prices
- 260 Earnings per Share
- 270 Interim Reporting
- 272 Limited Liability Entities
- 275 Risks and Uncertainties
- 280 Segment Reporting

Assets

- 305 Cash and Cash Equivalents
- 310 Receivables
- 32X Investments
 - 320 Debt and Equity Securities
 - 323 Equity Method and Joint Ventures
 - 325 Other
- 330 Inventory
- 340 Deferred Costs and Other Assets
- 350 Intangibles-Goodwill and Other
- 360 Property, Plant and Equipment

Liabilities

- 405 Liabilities
- 410 Asset Retirement and Environmental Obligations
- 420 Exit or Disposal Cost Obligations
- 430 Deferred Revenue
- 440 Commitments
- 450 Contingencies
- 460 Guarantees
- 470 Debt
- 480 Distinguishing Liabilities from Equity

Equity

- 505 Equity

Revenue

- 605 Revenue Recognition

Expenses

- 705 Cost of Sales and Services
- 71X Compensation
 - 710 General
 - 712 Nonretirement Postemployment Benefits
 - 715 Retirement Benefits
 - 718 Stock Compensation
- 720 Other Expenses
- 730 Research and Development
- 740 Income Taxes

Broad Transactions

- 805 Business Combinations
- 810 Consolidation
- 815 Derivatives and Hedging
- 820 Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures
- 825 Financial Instruments
- 830 Foreign Currency Matters
- 835 Interest
- 840 Leases
- 845 Nonmonetary Transactions
- 850 Related Party Disclosures
- 852 Reorganizations
- 855 Subsequent Events
- 860 Transfers and Servicing

Industries

- 905 Agriculture
- 908 Airlines
- 910 Contractors-Construction
- 912 Contractors-Federal Government
- 915 Development Stage Entities
- 92X Entertainment
 - 920 Broadcasters
 - 922 Cable Television

924	Casinos
926	Film
928	Music
9XX	Extractive Activities
930	Mining
932	Oil and Gas
9XX	Financial Services
940	Brokers and Dealers
942	Depository and Lending
944	Insurance
946	Investment Companies
948	Mortgage Banking
950	Title Plant
952	Franchisors
954	Health Care Entities
958	Not-for-Profit Entities
96X	Plan Accounting
960	Defined Benefit Pension Plans
962	Defined Contribution Pension Plans
965	Health and Welfare Benefit Plans
97X	Real Estate
970	General
972	Common Interest Realty Associations
974	Real Estate Investment Trusts
976	Retail Land
978	Time-Sharing Activities
980	Regulated Operations
985	Software
995	U.S. Steamship Entities

Paragraph Structure

Each topic included in the database is organized consistently using the following numbering conventions (the first three digits correspond to the topic areas listed above):

### - ## - 00	Status
### - ## - 05	Overview and Background
### - ## - 10	Objectives
### - ## - 15	Scope and Scope Exceptions
### - ## - 20	Topical Definitions-Glossary
### - ## - 25	Recognition
### - ## - 30	Initial Measurement
### - ## - 35	Subsequent Measurement
### - ## - 40	Derecognition
### - ## - 45	Other Presentation Matters
### - ## - 50	Disclosure
### - ## - 55	Implementation Guidance and Illustrations
### - ## - 60	Relationships
### - ## - 65	Transition and Open Effective Date Information
### - ## - 70	Links to Grandfathered Material
### - ## - 75	XBRL Definitions (Reserved for future use)
### - ## - S##	Selected Incremental SEC Guidance

Example of Hierarchical Organization

The chart below illustrates how to “drill down” into ASC detail on a particular topic as well as how to use the numeric structure of topics, subtopics, sections, and paragraph numbers to reference the ASC when documenting the results of accounting research.

Using the convention of preceding a citation to the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ with the acronym, “ASC” as shown below is recommended.

Level	Example Caption	Example Cite
Overall Category	Expenses	
Topic	Income Taxes	ASC 740
Subtopic	Overall	ASC 740-10
Section	Other Presentation Matters	ASC 740-10-45
Subsection (not numbered)	General	
Paragraph Group 1	> Statement of Financial Position Classification of Income Tax Accounts	
Paragraph Group 2	> > Deferred Tax Accounts	
Paragraph Group 3	> > > Deferred Tax Accounts Related to an Asset or Liability	
Paragraph	Numbered, uncaptioned paragraph	740-10-45-7

Securities and Exchange Commission Supplemental Guidance

To enhance the usability of the ASC for public companies, the ASC includes selected content issued by the SEC and its staff such as:

1. Regulation S-X (SX)
2. Financial Reporting Releases (FRR) and Accounting Series Releases (ASR)
3. Interpretive Releases (IR)
4. SEC Staff Guidance included in—
 - a. Staff Accounting Bulletins (SAB)
 - b. EITF Topic D comments by the SEC Staff Observer

The SEC guidance is organized in a similar topical hierarchy as the other guidance in the ASC using unique section codes preceded with the letter “S” in order to clearly differentiate it from the guidance applicable to all entities.

FASB was careful to caution the user, in its *Notice to Constituents* that accompanies the ASC, that the SEC sections do not contain all of the Commission’s rules, regulations, interpretations, and staff guidance. The ASC also does not contain the text of major securities statutes such as the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or the Sarbanes-Oxley Act

of 2002. The ASC also does not include SEC materials with respect to content included in regulatory filings that would be outside of the basic financial statements such as Management's Discussion and Analysis (MD&A). Since the scope of the ASC is limited to accounting matters, SEC guidance with respect to auditing and independence were also excluded from its content.

For those companies not subject to SEC reporting, the ASC Research System permits the user to exclude SEC content from views.

Drafting Conventions

In committing to the ASC, the Financial Accounting Foundation intended that FASB would:

- Eliminate the confusing multi-tiered GAAP hierarchy.
- Use consistent grammatical construction and syntax.

Due to the fact that the content being codified was written by so many different parties over such a long period of time, it was important that, to the extent possible, the codified text be constructed using common grammatical and structural conventions to ease the process of reading, researching, understanding, and applying the guidance. The conventions used in the ASC include:

- The term "entity" is used instead of such comparable terms as—
 - Company
 - Enterprise
 - Organization
 - Firm
- The term "intra-entity" is used instead of intercompany.
- The term "shall" is used to refer to GAAP requirements instead of such terms as "should" or "must." It is important to note that this convention differs from the convention used in audit, attest, compilation, and review literature which uses "must" or "is required" to describe procedures deemed mandatory.
- "Would" and "should" are used in the implementation guidance and illustrations to refer to hypothetical situations.
- Generic qualifiers such as usually, ordinarily, and generally are avoided in the codification as FASB believes that they added ambiguity.
- Footnotes included in original pronouncements are avoided by incorporating the relevant text within the body of the discussion.
- Paragraphs containing lists are split out into a numbered hierarchy instead of being embedded within a paragraph.
- Although many of the legacy standards did not set forth their objectives, to the extent such objectives are stated, they are set off in boldfaced text to provide emphasis. FASB has committed to continuing this practice going forward to converge with this convention which is used by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB).

The ASC uses the following acronyms within its body. Any other acronym is defined in the glossary, referenced to the corresponding, spelled-out term.

Acronym	Definition
CD	Certificate of deposit
CUSIP	The nine-character unique alphanumeric identifier used in North America to identify securities for trading and clearing purposes
EPS	Earnings per share
FDIC	U.S. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
FIFO	First-in, first-out
FNMA	Federal National Mortgage Association
FHLMC	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (commonly referred to as "Freddie Mac")
GAAP	Generally accepted accounting principles
GNMA	Government National Mortgage Association
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
LIBOR	London Interbank Offered Rate
LIFO	Last-in, first-out
LOCOM	Lower of cost or market
MD&A	Management discussion and analysis
NFP	Not-for-profit
SEC	Securities and Exchange Commission
VIE	Variable interest entity

The results of the behind-the-scenes buildout of the project were introduced to the accounting community in January 2008 at the web address <http://asc.fasb.org>. The primary purpose of that introduction was to provide adequate time for preparers, auditors, and academics to provide feedback regarding whether the content, as codified in the ASC, was faithful to the original pronouncements from which it was derived. This process is critical to project success since FASB's intent was not to change the meaning or application of previously issued technical pronouncements.

Grandfathered Material

Previously Superseded Standards

Certain standards that have been superseded in the past were replaced with new standards that were to be applied prospectively to transactions occurring after the new standard's effective date. Thus, for transactions pre-dating the new standard, the entity was to continue to follow the authoritative guidance that had previously been in effect. The initial release of the ASC does not contain this grandfathered material and the researcher will need to continue to refer to the original pronouncements to access that guidance. After the July 1, 2009 date on which the ASC became authoritative, subsequent releases will populate, by relevant topic, any applicable grandfathered materials. Examples of grandfathered material excluded from the initial ASC release follows.

Description of Grandfathered Material	Pronouncement Originally Included In
1. Pooling of interests in a business combination.	FAS 141, ¶B217
2. Qualifying special-purpose entities (QSPEs).	FAS 140, ¶¶25 and ¶341
3. Pension transition assets or obligations.	FAS 87, ¶77
4. Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP) shares purchased by, and held as of 12/31/1992.	SOP 93-6
5. Loans restructured in a troubled debt restructuring prior to the effective date of FAS 114.	FAS 118, ¶24
6. Stock compensation for nonpublic and other entities.	FAS 123(R), ¶83
7. Investment company investments acquired prior to 3/28/2002, or those acquired after 3/27/2002, pursuant to an irrevocable binding commitment existing prior to 3/28/2002.	AAG-Investment Companies, ¶1.05

Other Grandfathered Standards

Prior to adoption of the ASC, FAS 162, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles* governed the authoritative status of GAAP literature. That standard permitted entities that, as of March 15, 1992, had followed, and, subsequent to that date, have continued to follow accounting treatments previously in category (C) or category (D) of that hierarchy, to retain those accounting policies and not be required to change to accounting specified in higher categories (B) or (C) of that hierarchy if those standards in (B) or (C) had been effective prior to March 15, 1992.

For pronouncements with effective dates subsequent to March 15, 1992, and for entities initially applying an accounting principle after March 15, 1992, the following provisions apply:

- If the pronouncement was not an EITF pronouncement, entities are to follow the post-March 15, 1992 pronouncement, as codified in the ASC, for pre-existing transactions as well as for initial adoption of an accounting principle.
- EITF Consensuses became effective in the prior GAAP hierarchy for initial application of an accounting principle occurring after March 15, 1993.

Post-implementation Changes, Due Process, and Transitional Guidance

Future changes will be proposed in documents consisting of two parts:

1. The text of the standard.
2. An appendix of ASC updating instructions showing how the standard would change the ASC using markup conventions (e.g., strikeout for deleted text and underlining for added text).

During the period between the date that a standard is approved and the date it becomes fully effective, the ASC will display it as “Pending Text” and will display it along with the existing content. The pending text will be accompanied by a link to any applicable transition guidance included in the new standard.

Once the new standard is fully effective, the outdated text will be removed from the paragraph and only the amended text will remain. The outdated text will be moved to a retrievable archive so that it can be accessed in future periods for research purposes.

In the future, new rules will come in the form of “Codification updates,” which will include the text to be replaced in order to highlight the changes. FASB intends to update the ASC concurrently with the release of a Codification Update.

Exposure Draft: Proposed SFAS, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles*, a replacement of FASB Statement No. 162 (ASC 105)

Project Chronology

Date Proposed	Comment Period Ends	Date Issuance Expected
3/27/2009	5/8/2009	2 nd Quarter 2009

Project Objectives

- To rescind FAS 162 (the previous GAAP hierarchy).
- To adopt the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ (ASC) as the single source of authoritative accounting principles for nongovernmental entities.

Effective Date and Transition Provisions

While the hierarchy is simplified the two-tiered structure has significant implications for determining the appropriate standards framework. Be aware of the drafting conventions which put implementation guidance and applications within the standards as opposed to stand-alone guidance.

The Codification will be effective July 1, 2009. It was effective for interim and annual periods ending after September 15, 2009, therefore, the Codification should be used for periods that began on or after July 1, 2009. An exception is provided, however, for nonpublic entities that have not been following the guidance included in paragraphs 38 through 76 of AICPA Technical Inquiry Service (TIS) Section 5100, *Revenue Recognition*. In order to provide for an orderly transition, those entities are to account for the adoption of that guidance prospectively as a change in accounting principle for revenue arrangements entered into or materially modified in fiscal years beginning on or after December 15, 2009, and interim periods included in those fiscal years.

Although FASB's intent was not to change accounting guidance, to the extent that adoption of the ASC results in an accounting change, management is to determine whether the change is considered a change in accounting principle or a correction of a prior period error. In either case, the necessary accounting and disclosure guidance from what will be the former FAS 154, *Accounting Changes and Error Corrections* (ASC 250) is to be applied, as applicable, including disclosure of the accounting treatment prior to application and the reasons why application resulted in the change.

Scope

The proposed statement would apply to financial statements of nongovernmental entities that are presented in conformity with U.S. GAAP.

Background and Summary of Key Provisions

Upon adoption of the ASC, planned for July 1, 2009, all previously issued standards will be rescinded, as will the former hierarchy of GAAP. From that date forward, there will only be two levels of GAAP:

1. **Authoritative** – The FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ will be the sole source of authoritative U.S. GAAP to be applied by nongovernmental entities, other than the rules and interpretive releases of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) which, under the federal securities laws are statutorily considered authoritative sources of GAAP for SEC registrants. All guidance contained in the ASC carries an equal level of authority.
2. **Nonauthoritative** – Nonauthoritative literature includes:
 - a. FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Concepts.
 - b. International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) of the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB).
 - c. AICPA Issues Papers.
 - d. AICPA Technical Information Service (TIS) inquiries and replies included in the publication, *AICPA Technical Practice Aids*.
 - e. Pronouncements of other professional associations or regulatory agencies.
 - f. Practices that are widely recognized and prevalent (either generally or in the industry).
 - g. Accounting textbooks, handbooks, and articles.

In evaluating the appropriateness of nonauthoritative guidance, due consideration is to be given to the relevance to the particular circumstances, the specificity of the guidance, and the general recognition of the issuer or author as an authority.

Under d. above, FASB codified as authoritative GAAP TIS § 5100, paragraphs 38 through 76 in ASC 855-10-60; ASC 985-605-15, ASC 985-605-55, ASC 985-845-25, and ASC 985-845-55. All other TIS issues are considered nonauthoritative.

With respect to c. above, the following is a list of AICPA Issues Papers that have not been superseded or incorporated in other literature since their original issuance by the Accounting Standards Division of the AICPA.

Title	Date Issued
Accounting for Changes in Estimates	12/15/78
Accounting for Allowances for Losses on Certain Real Estate and Loans and Receivables Collateralized by Real Estate	6/21/79
Joint Venture Accounting	7/17/79
Accounting by Investors for Distributions Received in Excess of Their Investment in a Joint Venture (An addendum to the 7/17/79 Issues Paper on Joint Venture Accounting)	10/8/79
“Push Down Accounting”	10/30/79
Accounting in Consolidation for Issuances of a Subsidiary Stock	6/30/80
Certain Issues That Affect Accounting for Minority Interest in Consolidated Financial Statements	3/17/81
Depreciation of Income Producing Real Estate	11/16/81
The Acceptability of “Simplified LIFO” for Financial Reporting Purposes	10/14/82
Accounting for Employee Capital Accumulation Plans	11/4/82
Computation of Premium Deficiencies in Insurance Enterprises	3/26/84
Accounting by Stock Life Insurance Companies for Annuities, Universal Life, and Related Products and Accounting for Nonguaranteed-Premium Products	11/5/84
Identification and Discussion of Certain Financial Accounting and Reporting Issues Concerning LIFO Inventories	11/30/84
Accounting for Loss Portfolio Transfers—Letter	1/16/85
Accounting for Options	3/6/86
The Use of Discounting in Financial Reporting for Monetary Items With Uncertain Terms Other Than Those Covered by Existing Authoritative Literature	9/9/87
Quasi Reorganizations	10/28/88

When GAAP Is Silent

Under the proposal, if guidance relevant to a transaction or event is not specified within a source of authoritative GAAP for that entity, management is to consider authoritative GAAP that would be applicable to that entity for similar transactions or events. If no such guidance can be found, management would then consider nonauthoritative guidance from other sources. Management is precluded from applying an accounting treatment specified for similar transactions or events when the accounting principles describing that treatment either prohibit the application of those principles to the particular transaction or event, or prohibit application of that accounting treatment by analogy.

Migration of Accounting Rules Contained in Auditing Literature

While the ASC was not intending to change GAAP, there are two notable exceptions. Historically, the provisions of GAAP that dealt with going concern and subsequent events have resided in the auditing literature. Since these matters both have financial reporting repercussions, FASB decided they should be migrated to GAAP literature.

Exposure Draft of Proposed Statement of Financial Accounting Standards: *Going Concern*

Project Chronology

Date Proposed	Comment Period Ended	Date Issuance Expected
10/9/2008	12/9/2008	3/31/2009

Proposed Effective Date

Interim and annual periods ending after June 15, 2009.

Objectives

- Provide guidance on management's responsibility to evaluate the entity's ability to continue as a going concern.
- Require disclosures when either (a) the financial statements are not prepared on a going concern basis, or (b) there is substantial doubt as to the entity's ability to continue as a going concern.
- Reduce differences between the going concern guidance in U.S. GAAP and the corresponding guidance in IASB Standard, IAS 1, *Presentation of Financial Statements*.

Scope

The proposal would apply to businesses and not-for-profit organizations that prepare their financial statements under U.S. GAAP. It would be applicable to both interim and annual financial statements.

Summary of Key Provisions

To converge with International Standards, the proposal would abandon the one-year, bright line that had been included in the auditing standard. Instead—

Management shall take into account all available information about the future which is at least, but is not limited to, 12 months from the end of the reporting period (Exposure Draft, ¶ 4).

To address the concerns of respondents to the proposal, FASB, at its February 18, 2009 meeting, indicated that it would clarify in the final standard that the time period for the going concern assessment is not a bright-line 12 months, but is also not intended to be an indefinite look-forward period.

Upon making its going concern assessment, if management is aware of material uncertainties regarding events or conditions that may cast substantial doubt about the entity's ability to continue as a going concern, the entity is to disclose those uncertainties. Specifically, management is to disclose information that will enable users of the financial statements to understand:

- The pertinent conditions and events that gave rise to management's assessment of substantial doubt about the entity's ability to continue as a going concern,
- The possible effects of those conditions and events,
- Management's evaluation of the significance of those conditions and events and any mitigating factors,
- Possible discontinuance of operations,
- Management's plans to mitigate the effect of the uncertainties and whether those plans alleviate the substantial doubt about the entity's ability to continue as a going concern, and
- Information about the recoverability or classification of recorded asset amounts, or the amounts or classification of liabilities.

If the financial statements are not prepared on a going-concern basis, disclose:

- The fact that the financial statements are not prepared on a going concern basis and describe the basis on which they are prepared, and
- The reasons why the entity is not regarded as a going concern.

Exposure Draft of Proposed SFAS: *Subsequent Events* (ASC 855)

Project Chronology

Date Proposed	Comment Period Ended	Date Issuance Expected
10/9/2008	12/8/2008	3/31/2009

Proposed Effective Date

Interim and annual periods ending after June 15, 2009.

Objectives

- Set forth the period after the balance sheet date during which management is to evaluate events or transactions that may occur to determine whether they require recognition or disclosure in the entity's financial statements.
- Specify the circumstances under which events or transactions occurring after the balance sheet date are to be recognized in the entity's financial statements.
- Specify the disclosures management is to make regarding post balance sheet transactions and events.

Scope

The proposal would apply to the accounting for and disclosure of subsequent events not addressed by other applicable GAAP.

Summary of Key Provisions

Under the proposal, it is the responsibility of management to evaluate subsequent events for recognition or disclosure. The date through which management is to evaluate subsequent events is determined as follows:

- If, as a matter of historical practice or current expectation, the entity has or will widely distribute its financial statements to its stockholders and other financial statement users, management is to evaluate subsequent events through the date the financial statements are issued. This requirement applies to both nonpublic entities and public entities, as those terms are defined by ¶ 9 of FAS 131, *Disclosures about Segments of an Enterprise and Related Information* (ASC 280-10-15-2).
- Management of all other entities is required to evaluate subsequent events through the date that the financial statements are available to be issued.

Proposed Disclosures

- The date through which management has evaluated subsequent events including whether that date is the date the financial statements were issued or the date the financial statements were available to be issued.
- For nonrecognized subsequent events that are of a nature that they must be disclosed in order to prevent the financial statements from being misleading.
 - The nature of the event, and
 - Management's estimate of the financial effect of the event or a statement that such an estimate cannot be made.
- If the nonrecognized subsequent event is so significant that disclosure can best be made by means of pro forma financial data, management is to consider supplementing the historical financial statements with such data giving effect to the event as if it had occurred on the balance sheet date. In some situations, management is also to consider presenting pro forma financial statements (usually a balance sheet only) in columnar form on the face of the historical financial statements.

Future Codification Updates

In the future, all new standards the FASB issues will include two parts: the Standard, and the Codification Update Instructions. New standards issued in the future by the FASB will not be considered authoritative in themselves but will serve only to update the Codification and provide background information and bases for conclusions on the changes made in the Codification.

Implementing the Codification

The first step in implementing the new Codification is learning how to use the system. The FASB has several options for training on how to use the Codification. They offer an online tutorial. This tutorial can be accessed at www.fasb.org. In addition, an archived webcast is available that provides step-by-step instructions.

The home page at <http://asc.fasb.org> includes various documents that users may find helpful including a “Notice to Constituents” that describes various Codification-related matters. It also includes general information about how to use the online research system and special features like the *Cross Reference Reports* that can be used to locate where standards are housed.

When preparing to implement the new Codification, consider the following recommendations to ensure a smooth transition to the new way of researching accounting standards:

- Be sure that your staff is trained on the use of the new Codification system. The key to successfully implementing the ASC is adequate training.
- Ensure that your firm is referencing the FASB ASC in all of its policies and procedures manuals.
- Determine which is the first set of financial statements that will need to reflect the ASC changes.
- Review how you are accounting for certain transactions to be sure that any changes resulting from the ASC have not caused you to improperly account for the transactions.

SELF-STUDY QUIZ

Determine the best answer for each question below. Then check your answers against the correct answers in the following section.

1. Which of the following groups will be most affected by the FASB Codification?
 - a. IASB.
 - b. Accountants.
 - c. SEC.
 - d. Tax preparers.

2. Which of the following is **not** cited in the text as having opposed financial reporting changes proposed by the FASB in the years prior to Enron's collapse?
 - a. Congress.
 - b. Large public accounting firms.
 - c. Public companies.
 - d. AICPA.

3. According to the text, what "buzzword" was often used when discussing ways to fix the reporting system?
 - a. Transparency.
 - b. SPEs.
 - c. Enron.
 - d. Andersen.

4. Who authorized the Codification?
 - a. SOX.
 - b. PCAOB.
 - c. AICPA.
 - d. FAF.

5. What is the effective date of the Accounting Standards Codification?
 - a. January 2008.
 - b. January 2009.
 - c. April 2009.
 - d. July 2009.

6. Which of the following shifted the GAAP hierarchy from an audit focus to an entity focus?
 - a. FASB Statement No. 133.
 - b. FASB Statement No. 162.
 - c. SAS No. 69.
 - d. SAS No. 95.

7. Where did SAS No. 69 rank EITFs within the pre-ASC GAAP hierarchy?
 - a. Category A.
 - b. Category B.
 - c. Category C.
 - d. Category D.

8. FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Concepts are found on what level of the pre-ASC GAAP hierarchy?
 - a. Category A.
 - b. Category B.
 - c. Category D.

9. Which of the following is one of the ways in which ASC meets current needs for authoritative guidance?
 - a. ASC will be the single source of GAAP guidance for public companies.
 - b. ASC will be the sole GAAP authority for governmental operations.
 - c. Amending standards will be incorporated into amended standards.
 - d. The AICPA will have sole authority for maintaining GAAP standards.

10. In the ASC codification structure, which of the following numbered elements contains the topical content?
 - a. Area.
 - b. Topic.
 - c. Subsection.
 - d. Paragraph.

SELF-STUDY ANSWERS

This section provides the correct answers to the self-study quiz. If you answered a question incorrectly, reread the appropriate material. **(References are in parentheses.)**

1. Which of the following groups will be most affected by the FASB Codification? **(Page 1)**
 - a. IASB. [This answer is incorrect. The ISAB is an international group, which is not affected by FASB ASC.]
 - b. Accountants. [This answer is correct. ASC is the single source of U.S. GAAP for accountants.]**
 - c. SEC. [This answer is incorrect. The SEC sets standards for publicly traded companies only, therefore is only partially affected by the ACS.]
 - d. Tax preparers. [This answer is incorrect. Tax preparers are generally not affected by the Codification since they do not prepare financial statements.]

2. Which of the following is **not** cited in the text as having opposed financial reporting changes proposed by the FASB in the years prior to Enron's collapse? **(Page 1)**
 - a. Congress. [This answer is incorrect. Congress put pressure on FASB to back down on some of its proposed changes and eventually, the FASB did back down.]
 - b. Large public accounting firms. [This answer is incorrect. The large public accounting firms kept their opposition low key, but wrote letters to the FASB expressing their opposition to certain proposed changes in reporting.]
 - c. Public companies. [This answer is incorrect. Corporate America opposed the FASB's proposed changes and some public companies staged public protests in opposition to rule changes proposed by the FASB during the 1990's.]
 - d. AICPA. [This answer is correct. The AICPA was not one of the entities that opposed the FASB's proposed standards changes although they did comment on them.]**

3. According to the text, what "buzzword" was often used when discussing ways to fix the reporting system? **(Page 2)**
 - a. Transparency. [This answer is correct. There was a perceived need for transparency in financial statements to prevent future occurrences of failures such as Enron and WorldCom.]**
 - b. SPEs. [This answer is incorrect. SPE is an acronym for special-purpose entity. SPEs were one of the vehicles used by Enron to cloud their financial picture, but it was not the word cited in the text as being used when discussing ways to fix the reporting system.]
 - c. Enron. [This answer is incorrect. Enron was a major failure early in this decade, but it was not the word cited in the text as being used when searching for solutions to problems in the financial reporting system.]
 - d. Andersen. [This answer is incorrect. Arthur Andersen became a poster child for conflicts of interest in the public accounting profession, but it was not the word cited in the text as being used when discussing ways to improve the financial reporting system.]

4. Who authorized the Codification? **(Page 2)**
- a. SOX. [This answer is incorrect. SOX pertains to public companies only, and is not affected by ASC.]
 - b. PCAOB. [This answer is incorrect. The PCAOB sets standards for registered public accounting firms involving audit reports of public companies. The PCAOB is not responsible for ASC.]
 - c. AICPA. [This answer is incorrect. The AICPA is not responsible for ASC and could not, therefore, authorize the project.]
 - d. **FAF. [This answer is correct. Authorization for the Codification was given by the Trustees of the Financial Accounting Foundation, the FASB's oversight board.]**
5. What is the effective date of the Accounting Standards Codification? **(Page 3)**
- a. January 2008. [This answer is incorrect. This is the date on which the verification period began.]
 - b. January 2009. [This answer is incorrect. This is the date on which the verification period ended.]
 - c. April 2009. [This answer is incorrect. This was originally intended as the implementation date, but the date was changed.]
 - d. **July 2009. [This answer is correct. The ASC was effective July 1, 2009.]**
6. Which of the following shifted the GAAP hierarchy from an audit focus to an entity focus? **(Page 3)**
- a. FASB Statement No. 133. [This answer is incorrect. FASB Statement No. 133 relates to the implementation issues but does not shift the GAAP hierarchy.]
 - b. **FASB Statement No. 162. [This answer is correct. FASB Statement No. 162, *The Hierarchy of GAAP*, shifts the focus of GAAP from auditor focus to an entity focus.]**
 - c. SAS No. 69. [This answer is incorrect. SAS No. 69, *The Meaning of Presents Fairly in Conformity with GAAP*, made GAAP auditor focused rather than entity focused.]
 - d. SAS No. 95. [This answer is incorrect. SAS No. 95 is the standard addressing audit standards not accounting standards.]
7. Where did SAS No. 69 rank EITFs within the pre-ASC GAAP hierarchy? **(Page 5)**
- a. Category A. [This answer is incorrect. Even though some EITFs have been subjected to FASB due process, they are not ranked on Level A.]
 - b. Category B. [This answer is incorrect. Level B is reserved for FASB Technical Bulletins and certain "FASB cleared" guidance, not EITFs.]
 - c. **Category C. [This answer is correct. Before SFAS 162, SAS 69 ranked all EITF guidance on Level C.]**
 - d. Category D. [This answer is incorrect. Prior to SFAS 162, SAS 69 ranked AICPA accounting interpretations and implementation guides published by the FASB staff on Level D.]

8. FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Concepts are found on under which category of the pre-ASC GAAP hierarchy? **(Page 5)**
- a. Category A. [This answer is incorrect. Although FASB SFACs are subject to FASB due process, they are not found under Category A of the pre-ASC GAAP hierarchy.]
 - b. Category B. [This answer is incorrect. Category B of the pre-ASC GAAP hierarchy is reserved for certain “FASB cleared” guidance such as AICPA SOPs.]
 - c. **Category D. [This answer is correct. Although FASB SFACs are subject to FASB due process, they are found on the lowest level, Category D of the pre-ASC hierarchy, as part of the body of “other relevant accounting literature.” The pre-ASC hierarchy has been criticized for its ranking of SFACs.]**
9. Which of the following is one of the ways in which ASC meets current needs for authoritative guidance? **(Page 9)**
- a. ASC will be the single source of GAAP guidance for public companies. [This answer is incorrect. Although certain SEC guidance will be included in ASC, the SEC, not the ASC, will be the authoritative source of guidance for public companies.]
 - b. ASC will be the sole GAAP authority for governmental operations. [This answer is incorrect. ASC does not include governmental accounting standards.]
 - c. **Amending standards will be incorporated into amended standards. [This answer is correct. As part of its streamlining efforts, FASB eliminated standards that served merely to amend other standards by incorporating the changes into the standards being amended.]**
 - d. The AICPA will have sole authority for maintaining GAAP standards. [This answer is incorrect. The authority will not lie with the AICPA, but with the FASB.]
10. In the ASC codification structure, which of the following numbered elements contains the topical content? **(Page 9)**
- a. Area. [This answer is incorrect. The Area is the first level of ASC organization, but is not a numbered part of the codification structure.]
 - b. Topic. [This answer is incorrect. The Topic is the first element of the codification structure, but does not contain topical content.]
 - c. Subsection. [This answer is incorrect. Subsections occur only occasionally; they are not numbered and do not contain topical content.]
 - d. **Paragraph. [This answer is correct. Paragraphs are the last element of the codification structure and contain the actual topical content. All other elements of the codification structure serve to focus selection to the paragraph level.]**

EXAMINATION FOR CPE CREDIT

Lesson 1

Determine the best answer for each question below. Then mark your answer choice on the **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** located in the back of this workbook or by logging onto the Online Grading System.

1. Which of the following organizations will be most directly affected by ASC?
 - a. GASB.
 - b. SEC.
 - c. IASC.
 - d. FASB.

2. What does the acronym "ASC" stand for?
 - a. American Standards Codification.
 - b. Accounting Standards Codification.
 - c. American Standard Codes.
 - d. Accounting Standard Codes.

3. Which of the following was **not** under criticism and review after Enron collapsed?
 - a. FASB.
 - b. POB.
 - c. IASC.
 - d. PCAOB.

4. Which of the following statements is correct?
 - a. The FASB is both an authoritative and a regulatory body.
 - b. FASB's existence was reportedly at risk after Enron's collapse.
 - c. Congress disbanded the POB prior to enacting SOX.
 - d. International convergence was cited as one reason for Enron's collapse.

5. Who is overseeing the ASC project?
 - a. FASB.
 - b. EITF.
 - c. APB.
 - d. AcSEC.

6. When was the ASC project approved?
 - a. Circa 2001.
 - b. Circa 2004.
 - c. Circa 2008.
 - d. Circa 2009.

7. How many levels of the pre-ASC GAAP hierarchy are considered authoritative?
 - a. Three.
 - b. Four.
 - c. Five.
 - d. Six.

8. How many levels of the ASC GAAP hierarchy are considered authoritative?
 - a. One.
 - b. Two.
 - c. Three.
 - d. Four.

9. ASC streamlines GAAP by organizing authoritative pronouncements into approximately how many topics?
 - a. 50.
 - b. 90.
 - c. 1,000.
 - d. 2,000.

10. Which of the following statements is correct concerning the interaction between ASC, XBRL, and IFRS?
 - a. ASC is the first step in the preparation for convergence with IFRS.
 - b. ASC codes will be updated for XBRL taxonomies once XBRL is official.
 - c. Between XBRL and ASC, XBRL is controlling.
 - d. IFRS will make only marginal use of XBRL.

11. Which of the following statements is correct concerning ASC organization and structure?
 - a. ASC reorganizes Levels A through C of the GAAP hierarchy.
 - b. ASC summarizes GAAP into five areas of subject matter.
 - c. ASC refers to GAAP by a code composed of five distinct elements.
 - d. ASC denotes SEC guidance with an “S” prefix.

Lesson 2: Codification and Convergence

Learning Objectives

Completion of this lesson will enable you to:

- Consult with clients regarding their state of preparedness for an eventual conversion to IFRS should such a conversion be desired or required.
- Monitor ongoing developments as FASB and IASB standards converge under the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the two Boards.

Introduction

As far back as 1979, the SEC, upon its adoption of Form 20-F, the basic disclosure document for foreign private issuers, expressed its aspiration for the “harmonization of international disclosure standards.” In 1988, the SEC issued a policy statement on the regulation of international securities markets in which it noted that the “ultimate goal should be the development of an integrated international disclosure system.”

The U.S. share of the market capitalization of worldwide capital markets is currently less than half. Based on statistics published by the World Federation of Exchanges, as of December 31, 2008, the market cap of listed stocks on the major exchanges was distributed globally as follows (in trillions of U.S. Dollars—“USD”):

Geographic Location	Market Cap of Listed Equity in USD Trillions	% of Total
United States	\$11.605	47%
Canada	1.033	4
Europe	6.029	25
Asia	<u>5.870</u>	<u>24</u>
	<u>\$24.537</u>	<u>100%</u>

Prior to the current distressed economic conditions, there had been a trend of explosive growth rates in countries such as Brazil, India, Korea, Singapore, and China, to name a few. While the current distressed worldwide economy may derail this growth, it is likely to resume when economic conditions improve.

Concerns are arising in U.S. political and economic circles that the U.S. regulatory environment, subsequent to the enactment of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (along with the litigious nature of our culture), may be making it less attractive for companies to seek listing on our stock exchanges, which they may view as cost-prohibitive.

Additionally, as markets have globalized, there are now unprecedented opportunities for U.S. investors to diversify their portfolios by investing globally. The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (part of the U.S. Department of Commerce) estimates that U.S. residents had collectively increased their investments in foreign equity securities from \$200 billion in 1990 to \$4.3 trillion in 2006.

In order to provide those investors with timely, complete, reliable and comparable financial information on which to base their decision making, a common global accounting platform will become a necessity.

Given the trends cited above, former SEC Chairman, Christopher Cox made it a high priority to pursue the elimination of barriers to U.S. capital markets. During his tenure as Chairman, supervisory arrangements for enforcement and regulatory cooperation were entered into with the SEC's counterpart regulators in the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Australia, Germany, Bulgaria and Norway.

In his role as the Chairman of the Technical Committee of the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO), he advocated for the convergence of U.S. GAAP and IFRS. In December 2007, the SEC adopted rules that permitted foreign issuers to list on U.S. exchanges using IFRS without reconciling between IFRS and GAAP as had been previously required. This development, more than any other, contributed to calls from many commentators, to level the playing field by allowing domestic filers the same ability to use IFRS for the purpose of regulatory filings as their foreign counterparts.

Chairman Cox's successor, Mary L. Schapiro was unanimously confirmed by the Senate on January 22, 2009 and is the first woman to chair the Commission. On January 15, 2009, during her confirmation hearings, she gave testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs that, to say the least, appeared to distance herself from the IFRS Roadmap. The transcript of those hearings included the following response to a question posed by Senator Jack Reed (D-RI):

I would proceed with great caution so that we don't have a race to the bottom. I think we all can agree that a single set of accounting standards used around the world would be a very beneficial thing, [would] allow investors to compare companies around the world. That said, I have some concerns about the road map that has been published by the SEC and is out for comment now, and I have some concerns about the IFRS standards generally. They are not as detailed as the U.S. standards. There's a lot left to interpretation. Even if adopted, there will still be a lack of consistency, I believe, around the world in how they are implemented and how they are enforced.

The cost to switch from U.S. GAAP to IFRS is going to be extraordinary, and I've seen some estimates that range as high as \$30 million for each U.S. company in order to do that. This is a time when I think we have to think carefully about whether imposing those sorts of costs on U.S. industry, really make sense. And perhaps my greatest concern is the independence of the International Accounting Standards Board and the ability to have oversight of their process for setting accounting standards and the amount of rigor that exists in that process today. So, I will tell you that I will take a big deep breath and look at this entire area again, carefully, and will not necessarily feel bound by the existing road map that's out for comment.

The following section of this course summarizes the "roadmap" proposed by the SEC. It should be read in the context that it is a nonbinding Concepts Release meant to elicit comments from market participants and constituents, and that there is a high degree of uncertainty regarding its future.

The Proposed SEC “Roadmap”

Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Release No. 33-8982, *Proposed Rule: Roadmap for the Potential Use of Financial Statements Prepared in Accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards by U.S. Issuers*

Date Released	Comment Period Ended	Date Issuance Expected
11/14/2008 ^a	4/20/2009 ^b	Unknown

^a Published in the *Federal Register*, Vol. 73, No. 226; Friday, November 21, 2008.

^b The original release specified that the comment period would end 2/19/2009; however on 2/3/2009, SEC Release 33-9005 extended the comment period until 4/20/2009. The roadmap poses 70 questions on which the SEC requests comments, thus the original comment period was deemed insufficient to enable thoughtful, thorough comments from respondents.

Proposed Scope and Scope Exceptions

The proposed roadmap relates solely to U.S. issuers with respect to their periodic reporting requirements under Sections 13 and 15(d) of the Exchange Act, proxy and information statements under Section 14 of the Exchange Act and registration statements under Section 12 of the Exchange Act and Section 7 of the Securities Act. The roadmap does not contemplate adoption of IFRS by investment companies regulated under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 USC § 80), or by regulated entities such as registered broker-dealers.

Proposed Phased Implementation Timetable

Type of Filer	Proposed Adoption for Fiscal Years Ending on or After	Years to be Included in Initial Filing
Filers Proposed to be Eligible for Early Election (“IFRS Issuer”)	12/15/2009	2007, 2008, 2009
Large Accelerated Filers	12/15/2014	2012, 2013, 2014
Accelerated Filers	12/15/2015	2013, 2014, 2015
Non-Accelerated Filers, Including Small Business Issuers	12/15/2016	2014, 2015, 2016

Issuers would be eligible for early election of IFRS if they met the following criteria:

- The issuer is among the 20 largest companies globally in a particular industry.
- IFRS is used as the basis of financial reporting more often than any other basis of reporting among the 20 largest listed companies worldwide in that industry.

Regulation S-K, Item 301(a) requires issuers to provide five years of selected financial data. The proposed Roadmap provides relief from this provision since IFRS-compliant data will not be available prior to the beginning of the first year of IFRS filing.

Year of Filing Using IFRS	Number of Years of IFRS Selected Financial Data Required
Initial	3
Second	4
Third and Later	5

Excluded from the proposed definition of “IFRS Issuer” are:

- Investment companies,
- Employee stock purchase, savings, and similar plans, and
- Smaller reporting companies.

At the time the proposed roadmap was issued, the SEC estimated that approximately 110 U.S. issuers in 34 industries (dubbed “IFRS Industries” if they meet the worldwide criteria specified above), could be eligible to adopt IFRS for its regulatory filings for fiscal years ended after December 15, 2009.

If an eligible issuer wished to elect early adoption, that issuer would need to obtain a letter of no objection from the SEC staff. These letters would be posted to the SEC website in order to provide information to investors and other interested parties about the possibility of an issuer filing reports with the SEC using IFRS. The proposal points out, however, that obtaining a staff no-objection letter would not be a binding commitment on the part of the issuer to use IFRS, rather the letter would provide the issuer the ability to start filing reports using IFRS for a period of three years from the date of the staff response without the need to use more current data to recalculate the issuer’s eligibility for the election.

Proposed Period-of-transition Disclosures

The Roadmap proposes that an issuer that changes the comprehensive set of accounting principles it uses to prepare its primary financial statements to IFRS be required to prominently disclose the following in its first annual report on Form 10-K that uses IFRS:

1. The fact that the financial statements have been prepared using IFRS,
2. The reasons for the change,
3. The corporate governance processes followed in electing to make the change (including whether a shareholder vote was held and whether the Company’s board of directors and audit committee considered the matter), and
4. The date the issuer submitted its request to the SEC staff demonstrating that it met the criteria to change to IFRS and the date the staff issued a no-objection letter.

Under the proposal, disclosures similar to items 1. through 3. above would be required from any IFRS issuer that subsequently chose to revert back to U.S. GAAP. That disclosure would be required to be included in the annual report on Form 10-K for the year in which the issuer reverted back to U.S. GAAP.

Summary of Key Provisions of the Proposal

The Seven Milestones

The stated objective of the Roadmap is to provide investors with financial information from U.S. issuers using a set of high-quality; globally accepted accounting standards that will enable them to better compare financial information of U.S. issuers and competing international investment opportunities. It is further intended to encourage market participants to consider the effect of IFRS on U.S. capital markets and to prepare for the use of IFRS financial statements by U.S. issuers in their filings with the SEC.

The Roadmap uses a “milestone-based” approach. It contains specific milestones that must be achieved in order for the SEC, in 2011, to go forward with a decision to mandatorily adopt IFRS for all domestic public registrants over the phased implementation timetable included in the proposal. This aspect of the proposal has been the subject of much criticism due to:

- The subjectivity of assessing whether the vaguely worded “milestones” are actually accomplished.
- The deferral of a decision regarding a “date certain” on which registrants would be required to adopt IFRS.
- The complex approach to be followed by registrants eligible to elect early adoption along with the risks that, if they should make the election, those companies might be required to switch back to U.S. GAAP if all of the milestones are not met.

In effect, the roadmap doesn't lead to a destination, it is only a commitment to defer a final decision to a later date.

The seven milestones set forth in the roadmap are as follows.

Milestone 1: Improvements to IFRS

The SEC will consider the extent of progress made by the FASB and the IASB on their joint work plan under the updated Memorandum of Understanding (abbreviated as the “MoU” or referred to as the “Norwalk Agreement”). The SEC encourages both boards to continue working toward completion of the projects included in that work plan so that, by 2011, the SEC will be able to judge the IFRS framework to be of high quality and sufficiently comprehensive for use in the United States.

In addition to evaluating improvements in the IFRS standards, the SEC also will evaluate whether improvements are made to the process followed to set those standards.

Milestone 2: Accountability and funding of the IASC Foundation

The London-based IASB is currently subject to oversight by the IASC Foundation, a stand-alone, not-for-profit organization based in London and incorporated in Delaware. The Foundation is governed by 22 trustees with geographically diverse backgrounds.

Financing for IASB operations is predominantly provided by voluntary contributions from accounting firms, companies, international organizations, central banks, and governments.

The SEC has expressed legitimate concerns regarding the independence of the IASB under the current funding mechanism and will closely monitor the efforts of the Foundation to obtain a secure, stable funding mechanism that supports the independent functioning of the IASB.

In addition, to improve the accountability of the IASB, the IASC Foundation Trustees have proposed amendments to its Constitution to provide accountability to a Monitoring Group composed of securities authorities that would be charged with participating in and approving nominations for IASC Foundation Trustees, reviewing funding arrangements for adequacy and appropriateness, and addressing matters that the IASC Foundation Trustees are responsible for, such as oversight of the IASB and potential areas for consideration by the IASB as it conducts its ongoing work.

Milestone 3: Improvement of the Ability to Use Interactive Data for IFRS Reporting

In order to ensure that, under IFRS, U.S. issuers would continue to be able to report using eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL), the SEC will consider progress made on the state of development of IFRS taxonomies prior to proceeding with rulemaking on IFRS for all U.S. issuers.

Milestone 4: Education and Training

Critical to a successful implementation of this magnitude, is the ability to effectively train a wide group of stakeholders involved in the entire financial statement chain of distribution. The wide range of stakeholders includes, but is not limited to:

- Academicians/Educators
- Actuaries
- Analysts, Internal and External
- Attorneys
- Audit Committees
- Boards of Directors
- CPE Developers and Instructors
- Customers
- Government Agencies
- Internal and External Auditors
- Investment Managers
- Individual Investors
- Issuer Personnel
- Lenders
- Pension Plan Trustees
- Ratings Agencies
- Statement Preparers
- Sureties
- Valuation Experts
- Vendors

Professional associations and industry groups would need to integrate IFRS into their training materials, publications, testing, and certification examinations, including the Uniform CPA Examination.

Milestone 5: Limited Early Use of IFRS Where it Would Enhance Comparability for U.S. Investors

As previously described, the SEC believes that the limited early use of IFRS by eligible electing companies will provide valuable information to those issuers that would be scheduled to adopt IFRS at a later date.

Milestone 6: Anticipated Timing of Future Rulemaking by the SEC

To assist the SEC in its decision whether to mandate the use of IFRS by U.S. issuers, it would direct the Office of the Chief Accountant, with appropriate consultation with other SEC Divisions and Offices, to undertake a study and report to the SEC on the implications for investors and other market participants of the implementation of IFRS for U.S. issuers. The SEC anticipates that it would make the resulting report public.

The SEC Staff has commenced a comprehensive review of all SEC rules relating to financial reporting in order to recommend amendments that would fully implement IFRS reporting throughout its regulatory framework for reporting under the Exchange Act and the Securities Act.

After reviewing the status of the milestones and the results of the study, the SEC would decide in 2011, whether to proceed with rules that would require U.S. public companies to file financial statements in accordance with IFRS starting in 2014. This step would only be taken if the SEC believed that it would promote investor protection and be in the public interest.

Should the SEC choose to proceed with rulemaking for the mandatory use of IFRS by all U.S. issuers, it would continue to require that issuers provide three years of audited financial statements prepared using IFRS. Thus, the large accelerated filers that would begin reporting under IFRS in 2014 would be required to file financial statements for 2012, 2013, and 2014 with the SEC.

The proposed Roadmap expresses the SEC's belief that action in 2011 would provide issuers with sufficient early notice of the transition to IFRS to permit them to begin their internal accounting using IFRS in 2012, which would be the earliest fiscal year covered under the earliest anticipated phase-in for IFRS reporting in 2014. Given the enormity of the task for some companies, this is highly debatable.

Milestone 7: Implementation of the Mandatory Use of IFRS by U.S. Issuers

The proposed Roadmap suggests a staged, mandatory transition that would commence in 2014 and result in all U.S. issuers covered by the scope of the Roadmap being IFRS-compliant by 2016. By basing the phase-in on the definitions of accelerated filer and large accelerated filer under the Exchange Act, which classifies issuers based on the size of the worldwide public float of their equity securities, the SEC believes that those most able to commit the resources to the conversion would be able to meet the earliest phase-in date. The SEC further believed that, by staging the transition, it would help manage resource demands on auditors, consultants and other market participants.

The Roadmap does acknowledge, however, that staging the transition in this manner does result in some noncomparability of financial information. Further, by basing the staging on issuer size, that noncomparability would exist among issuers within an industry. The staging of the transition would also temporarily create a dual reporting system for U.S. issuers that would require investor familiarity with both IFRS and U.S. GAAP.

Among the issues the SEC will consider in 2011 when making its decision, would be expanding the eligibility criteria to include additional U.S. issuers that would be eligible to voluntarily elect to use IFRS in their filings prior to the mandatory transition date.

Other Considerations

Effects on Other Reporting Requirements

Various issuers are subject to requirements of federal and state regulators in addition to the SEC. Regulators of financial institutions, insurance companies, and public utilities require periodic financial information on an ongoing basis. For example, U.S. GAAP financial statements are frequently used as a basis for determining capital requirements for financial institutions. Absent changes to these regulators' requirements, affected issuers might be required to maintain two sets of records to enable reporting under both IFRS and U.S. GAAP.

The Internal Revenue Code (IRC) contains LIFO inventory conformity provisions that require taxpayers that elect the last-in, first-out method of inventory valuation to use that method to value inventories in their basic, general-purpose financial statements. Since IFRS does not permit the use of LIFO, issuers converting to IFRS would be required to terminate their LIFO election and pay income taxes on the recapture of the "LIFO reserve." Absent a legislative change in the IRC, this could cause affected U.S. issuers to incur substantial additional income taxes.

Many U.S. companies have issued debt securities under indentures or have entered into loan agreements that contain various covenants based upon financial measurements such as a stated minimum tangible net worth. These contractual obligations may explicitly require the use of U.S. GAAP in connection with the computation of compliance with those financial covenants or for the purpose of submitting financial reports. This could potentially have an adverse effect on these issuers unless the legal agreements are amended to permit IFRS measurement and reporting.

Some widely referenced market indices, such as the S&P 500, currently only include issuers that file their financial statements using U.S. GAAP. Absent any changes in these indices, IFRS reporting could affect an issuer's ability to be included in such indices or financial instruments based on those indices. This could potentially have an adverse effect on these issuers, unless changes are made to the indices.

Accounting Systems, Controls and Procedures

Converting to IFRS would require issuers to make changes to their financial reporting systems including manual and automated controls, and related policies and procedures. Depending on the complexity of issuer's business activities, geographical reach, reporting structure, and transaction cycles, these changes can be quite extensive and costly, and require a substantial amount of lead time to design, build, test, and implement.

Many complications can arise in converting from U.S. GAAP to IFRS. In preparing IFRS financial statements, an issuer would be required to obtain IFRS-compliant financial information about its equity method investees in order to properly record its share of the investee's earnings for each period presented. If that investee did not report using IFRS, it would prove both difficult and costly for the issuer to obtain the necessary information.

Costs and complications would also arise with respect to private companies wanting to file an initial public offering (IPO). If the private company had previously been reporting under U.S. GAAP, as would undoubtedly be the case in most situations, substantial costs would be incurred to provide IFRS-compliant audited financial statements for the purposes of the initial registration statement to be filed with the SEC.

The Roadmap indicates that additional guidance would most likely be necessary from the PCAOB and that the PCAOB would need to amend references to U.S. GAAP that exist in their current standards.

The State of IFRS

In addition to seeking achievement of the "milestones," the SEC expects to consider, among other things, whether IFRS as issued by the IASB is a globally accepted set of accounting standards and whether it is consistently applied across companies, industries, and countries.

Concerns expressed in the proposed roadmap include:

- The lack of prescriptive, rules-based guidance and safe harbors that have been so prevalent under U.S. GAAP.
- The lesser amount of detailed implementation guidance included in IFRS and the effect this might have on consistency, auditors' legal liability, and the outcomes of discussions between management and auditors with respect to particular accounting treatments. There might also be a lesser ability on the part of the enforcement arms of the SEC and PCAOB to predict the outcomes of enforcement actions they choose to undertake.
- The effect on comparability of the greater "optionality" allowed under IFRS to elect different methods of accounting for similar transactions.
- The lack of guidance in IFRS for certain specific types of industries or transactions including:
 - Insurance contracts.
 - Extractive activities.
 - Certain common control transactions.
 - Recapitalizations.
 - Reorganizations.
 - Acquisitions of minority shares not resulting in a change of control and similar transactions.

- The lack of uniform, worldwide adoption of IFRS as issued by the IASB has been especially problematic. Different countries have adopted internal processes through which they adopt or incorporate IFRS into their national accounting standards on a standard-by-standard basis. Decisions made during those processes may result in those national accounting standards containing discrepancies from IFRS as issued by the IASB. These are referred to as “jurisdictional variants” of IFRS and they undermine the worldwide comparability of financial reporting. A notable example of this problem is the process followed in the European Union (EU). While the EU has adopted most of the IFRSs, the process of adoption can cause time lags. In addition, the EU modified IAS 39, *Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement* in adopting it, thus causing differences between how it is applied in the EU and how it is applied elsewhere. The EU also permits separate company financial statements to be issued in accordance with “IFRSs as adopted in the EU” even though their issuance is contradictory to IAS 27, *Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements* as issued by the IASB.

This “as-endorsed” versus “as-issued” approach may result in pressure on the IASB in the development of its standards. In addition, the need for the IASB to obtain consensus from such a diverse range of constituents could cause a lengthening of the time it takes to deliberate and issue new standards.

- The SEC also cites a concern regarding the reduction of influence that the U.S. and its capital markets would have over the process of standards-setting. The SEC’s participation in the oversight of the IASB would be through its participation in a proposed Monitoring Group. This would, of course, result in less direct oversight than the SEC currently has over the FASB.
- IFRS 7, *Financial Instruments: Disclosure* (as recently amended) requires disclosure in the notes to the financial statements of sensitivity analysis based on forward-looking information. U.S. issuers are currently subject to Item 305 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.3-05) which requires quantitative and qualitative disclosures about market risk with respect to certain financial instruments. That information, however, is not included in the financial statements of the filing and, to the extent that the information constitutes forward-looking statements, is expressly subject to statutory safe harbors provided under Section 27A of the Securities Act (15 USC 77z-2) and Section 21E of the Exchange Act (15 USC 78u-5).

The cited safe harbors do not apply to information appearing in the notes to audited financial statements. Obviously, this is a matter of great concern for management and the issuer’s auditors.

FASB Convergence Initiatives—The Norwalk Agreement/ Memorandum of Understanding; Current Project Inventory

In a joint meeting of the FASB and IASB in September 2002, the two Boards issued “The Norwalk Agreement” in which they mutually committed to the development of high-quality, compatible accounting standards that could be used to facilitate domestic and cross-border financial reporting. At that meeting the Boards pledged to use their best efforts to:

- Make their existing standards fully compatible as soon as was practically possible, and
- Coordinate their future technical agendas to ensure that once achieved, compatibility would be maintained.

It is important to note that the pledges made were drafted in a manner that suggests that the two Boards would continue to co-exist and that contains no hint that either of the Boards would ultimately be a globally accepted standard setter.

At various times in the ensuing years, the Boards reaffirmed their commitments and adjusted their agendas accordingly.

In February 2006, the Boards issued a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which set forth the relative priorities in their joint work programs. The MoU was based on three overriding principles:

1. Convergence of accounting standards is best achieved through the development, over time, of high-quality common standards,
2. Attempting to eliminate differences between two standards that are both in need of significant improvement is not the best use of either of the Boards' resources; rather, a common standard should be developed that improves the information provided to investors, and
3. Serving investors' needs means that the Boards should seek convergence by replacing standards in need of improvement with jointly developed new standards.

In 2007, based on its perception of the progress made by the Boards, the SEC removed its requirement that foreign companies registering securities in the U.S. reconcile financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRS as issued by the IASB to U.S. GAAP.

In September 2008, the Boards published an "agreed-upon pathway" describing their plans for completing the various projects that were the subject of the 2006 MoU. Notably, the timetable included in this "pathway" would result in completion of all of the major MoU projects by 2011, the year in which the SEC subsequently proposed, in its Roadmap document, to decide on whether to require U.S. issuers to convert to IFRS.

The current status of MoU and other joint FASB/IASB projects is set forth below. Consideration should be given, however, to recent economic developments and commitments made by FASB and IASB in response to the credit crisis as these matters are likely to cause revisions to the previously agreed-upon timetable.

Project Description	Estimated Year of Issuance of Final Document	Joint, MoU, or Both?
Consolidation	IASB-2009 FASB-TBD	Both
Derecognition of Financial Instruments	IASB-2010 FASB-TBD	Both
Emissions Trading Schemes	2010	Joint
Fair Value Measurement Guidance; <i>Both FASB and IASB are pursuing short-term measures to respond to the credit crisis; these efforts will most likely result in substantive guidance in 2009</i>	ASAP	MoU

Project Description	Estimated Year of Issuance of Final Document	Joint, MoU, or Both?
Financial Instruments; <i>Both FASB and IASB are pursuing short-term improvements projects; especially as they relate to impairment and valuation in inactive markets or under conditions of duress; these efforts will most likely result in substantive guidance in 2009 as well as longer-term efforts to simplify financial instrument accounting and the other-than-temporary impairment model</i>	TBD	Both
Distinguishing Liabilities from Equity	2011	Both
Financial Statement Presentation	2011	Both
Income Taxes	2010	Both
Insurance Contracts	2011	Joint
Leases	2011	Both
Pensions/Post-employment Benefits	2011	MoU
Revenue Recognition	2011	Both
Discontinued Operations	2009	Joint
Earnings per Share	2009	Joint
Joint Ventures	2009	MoU
Joint Conceptual Framework	TBD	Joint

Other Ways that IFRS Is Gaining Traction in the U.S.

The AICPA Council

The AICPA Council passed the following resolutions on May 18, 2008:

International Accounting Standards Board

RESOLVED: That the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) is hereby designated as the body to establish professional standards with respect to international financial accounting and reporting principles pursuant to Rule 202 [ET § 202.01] and Rule 203 [ET § 203.01]; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Council shall reassess, no sooner than three years but not later than five years after the effective date of this resolution, whether continued recognition of the IASB as the body designated to establish professional standards with respect to International financial accounting and reporting principles under Rule 202 and Rule 203 is appropriate.

Although, in recent years, the AICPA has diminished in influence and largely become a de facto trade association, the resolutions are significant because they enable members of the AICPA to be associated with and report on financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRS as issued by the IASB.

The Uniform CPA Examination

At its October 17–18, 2008 meeting, the AICPA Board of Examiners (BOE) approved new Content and Skill Specification Outlines (CSOs/SSOs) which constitute statements of the knowledge and skills to be measured by the CPA Examination. These outlines are developed considering input from state boards of accountancy, the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA), standard-setters, accounting firms, state CPA societies, the academic community, and individual CPAs. In addition, the BOE consults with psychometricians and other testing experts to ensure test validity.

The new CSOs include IFRS on the list of study materials for the Financial Accounting and Reporting (FAR) section of the examination. Additional guidance on the testing of IFRS as well as the implementation date for the changes will be included in an update of the CSOs to be issued in 2009. The BOE has indicated that the implementation date will be set so that candidates will have “ample time” to familiarize themselves with the new CSOs/SSOs prior to their going into effect.

These documents are available on the CPA examination website along with much of the supporting research. That site should be monitored for subsequent developments regarding both the nature of the IFRS content to be included as well as the date on which that content will commence being included on the examination.

Deliberations of the FASB Private Company Financial Reporting Committee (PCFRC) with Respect to Post-convergence Options for Nonissuers

Needless to say, the vast majority of businesses in the U.S. are not issuers and do not file financial statements with the SEC. The likely waning influence of FASB that will result from eventual conversion of public companies to IFRS has the potential to create a financial reporting vacuum for private entities. This is where the small nonpublic entity will have to adopt IFRS in order to access financial markets—no matter how small the company. As PCFRC monitors developments in the SEC roadmap comment process, it has issued a discussion document designed to facilitate a discussion of the various models that could potentially fill that vacuum. The following paragraphs briefly summarize those models.

Model 1: IFRS with Private Entities Option

All U.S. companies, public and private, would adopt IFRS as their accounting framework. Similar to companies in other countries, U.S. companies that do not have public accountability would have the option of following a simplified framework that the IASB expects to issue in 2009, which is referred to as IFRS for Non-Publicly Accountable Entities (NPAAE). If a company is not eligible to elect NPAAE, it would either follow full IFRS or, as is currently the case, elect to use an Other Comprehensive Basis of Accounting (OCBOA) such as the income tax basis or cash basis.

Model 2: U.S. Adapted Version of IFRS-NPAE

U.S. private companies would adopt a version of the IASB-NPAE framework tailored to needs unique to the United States.

Model 3: IFRS with Differential Reporting

The full IFRS framework as issued by the IASB is modified to meet the unique needs of U.S. private companies by deleting some requirements or embedding different treatments in the standards.

Model 4: Separate U.S. Private Company GAAP Adapted from Current U.S. GAAP

Under this model, current U.S. GAAP would be reviewed, modified, and built out into a comprehensive, self-contained accounting standards framework suitable for private companies. The framework would be designed to be suitable for private companies with or without significant external financial statement users, and would be sensitive to the unique needs of owner-managed entities.

Model 5: Separate U.S. GAAP, Maintained and Updated in the Future

The full U.S. GAAP framework would continue to be maintained as it currently exists (the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ (ASC) effective July 1, 2009) for continued use by private companies. The ASC, just as it is now, would be subject to periodic updating for needed changes and improvements while taking into account the standard setting activities of the IASB and emerging issues in the private company arena. This model does not call for the initial review and modification of current U.S. GAAP as described in Model 4.

The International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), The Forum of Firms (FOF), and the Transnational Auditors Committee (TAC)

The International Federation of Accountants (IFAC)

The International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) is the accounting profession's global organization. It has 157 members and associates in 122 countries and jurisdictions representing 2.5 million accountants employed in public practice, industry, commerce, government, and academia.

IFAC was founded in 1977 and its Secretariat is based in New York City. Its mission is to serve the public interest by strengthening the worldwide accountancy profession and contribute to the development of strong international economies by establishing and promoting adherence to high-quality professional standards, furthering the international convergence of those standards, and speaking out on public interest issues where the profession has unique, relevant expertise.

IFAC Boards and Committees are responsible for the following global standards.

Type of Standard	Issuing Body
International Standards on Auditing (ISA)	International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB)
International Standards on Review Engagements (ISRE)	
International Standards on Quality Control (ISQC)	
International Standards on Assurance Engagements (ISAE)	
International Standards on Related Services (ISRS) [compilations and agreed-upon procedures with respect to financial information]	
International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS)	International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board
Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants (the “Code”)	International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants (IESBA)
International Education Standards and International Education Practice Statements	International Accounting Education Standards Board (IAESB)

Members of IFAC include both the AICPA and Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants. In addition, IFAC is affiliated with the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) and the Information Systems Audit and Control Association (ISACA).

The Forum of Firms (FOF) and Transnational Auditors Committee (TAC)

Many U.S. CPA firms are affiliated with global networks to enable them to extend their reach in servicing the increasingly globalized needs of their clients. In 2002, the Forum of Firms (FOF) was established as an association of international networks of accounting firms that perform audits of financial statements that are used, or could potentially be used across national borders.

The objective of the FOF is to promote consistent and high quality standards of financial reporting and auditing practices worldwide. The FOF brings together firms that perform transnational audits and involve them more closely with the activities of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) in audit and other assurance-related areas.

The Transnational Auditors Committee (TAC) is a committee of IFAC and serves as the executive arm of the FOF. Thus it provides the official linkage between IFAC and the FOF.

The FOF is registered as a legal entity in Switzerland and, as of January 2009, had 21 full members and 1 provisional member (Polaris International):

Full Members

- Baker Tilly International Limited
- BDO International
- Constantin Associates Network
- Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu
- Ernst & Young Global Limited
- Grant Thornton International Limited
- HLB International
- Horwath International
- IEC
- INPACT Audit Limited
- JHI
- KPMG International
- Mazars
- Moore Stephens International Limited
- PKF International Limited
- PricewaterhouseCoopers International
- RSM International Limited
- Russell Bedford International
- SMS Latinoamérica
- Talal Abu-Ghazaleh & Co. International
- UHY International Limited

To qualify to be a member of the FOF, a firm or network must meet the following criteria:

- Has been engaged or is interested in being engaged to perform transnational audits,
- Promotes the consistent application of high quality audit practices worldwide, including the use of International Standards on Auditing (ISAs),
- Supports convergence of national auditing standards with the ISAs, and
- Agrees to meet the FOF's membership obligations, listed below.

FOF member firms must meet the following membership obligations:

- Maintain appropriate quality control standards in accordance with International Standards on Quality Control (ISQC) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB) in addition to relevant national quality control standards,
- Conduct, to the extent not prohibited by national regulation, regular globally coordinated internal quality assurance reviews,
- Implement policies and methodologies for the conduct of transnational audits that are based, to the extent practical, on ISAs,
- Implement policies and methodologies that conform to the IFAC *Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants* and national codes of ethics, and
- Agree to submit an annual report to the FOF Secretary in a form approved by TAC, indicating that the membership obligations have been met.

Naturally, not all accounting firms that belong to the FOF member networks conduct transnational audits. Thus FOF members are charged with identifying to the FOF those firms that comprise their membership in the FOF. Thus, FOF member networks will have some member firms that are excluded from the network for FOF purposes. These are referred to as “correspondent firms.” All other firms that are identified as comprising the FOF membership are covered by the above criteria and bound by the above membership obligations.

Attest standards have already been revised to allow for the issuance of and reporting on financial statements using the IFRS framework.

Appendix to—Map of FASB ASC to IFRS

The following comparison of U.S. GAAP and IFRS will show the differences and similarities of the two standards. FASB believes that one of the benefits of the structure of the ASC is that it more closely aligns with pronouncements of the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB). The following summarizes how U.S. GAAP contained in the ASC maps to the corresponding IASB pronouncements.

ASC Topic #	Topic	IFRS Pron.	IASB Pronouncement Title
105	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles	Preface	Preface to IFRSs
205	Presentation of Financial Statements	IAS 1	Presentation of Financial Statements
205–20	Presentation of Financial Statements—Discontinued Operations	IFRS 5	Non-current Assets Held for Sale and Discontinued Operations
210	Balance Sheet		
215	Statement of Shareholder Equity		
220	Comprehensive Income		
225	Income Statement		
230	Statement of Cash Flows	IAS 7	Statement of Cash Flows
235	Notes to Financial Statements		
250	Accounting Changes and Error Corrections	IAS 8 IFRS 1	Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors First-time Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards
255	Changing Prices	IAS 29	Financial Reporting in Hyperinflationary Economies
260	Earnings per Share	IAS 33	Earnings Per Share
270	Interim Reporting	IAS 34	Interim Financial Reporting
272	Limited Liability Entities		
275	Risks and Uncertainties		

ASC Topic #	Topic	IFRS Pron.	IASB Pronouncement Title
280	Segment Reporting	IAS 14 IFRS 8	Segment Reporting Operating Segments
305	Cash and Cash Equivalents		
310	Receivables		
320	Investments—Debt and Equity Securities		
323	Investments—Equity Method and Joint Ventures	IAS 28 IAS 31	Investments in Associates Interests in Joint Ventures
325	Investments—Other	IAS 40	Investment Property
330	Inventory	IAS 2	Inventories
340	Deferred Costs and Other Assets		
350	Intangibles—Goodwill and Other	IAS 38	Intangible Assets
360	Property, Plant, and Equipment	IAS 16 IAS 36	Property, Plant, and Equipment Impairment of Assets
405	Liabilities		
410	Asset Retirement and Environmental Obligations		
420	Exit or Disposal Cost Obligations		
430	Deferred Revenue		
440	Commitments		
450	Contingencies	IAS 37	Provisions, Contingent Liabilities, and Contingent Assets
460	Guarantees		
470	Debt		
480	Distinguishing Liabilities from Equity		
505	Equity		
605	Revenue Recognition	IAS18	Revenue
705	Cost of Sales and Services		
710	Compensation—General	IAS 19	Employee Benefits
712	Compensation—Nonretirement Postemployment Benefits		
715	Compensation—Retirement Benefits	IAS 26	Accounting and Reporting by Retirement Benefit Plans
718	Compensation—Stock Compensation	IFRS 2	Share—based Payment

ASC Topic #	Topic	IFRS Pron.	IASB Pronouncement Title
720	Other Expenses		
730	Research and Development		
731	Research and Development		
740	Income Taxes	IAS 12	Income Taxes
805	Business Combinations	IFRS 3	Business Combinations
810	Consolidation	IAS 27	Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements
815	Derivatives and Hedging		
820	Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures		
825	Financial Instruments	IAS 32 IAS 39 IFRS 7	Financial Instruments: Presentation Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement Financial Instruments: Disclosures
830	Foreign Currency Matters	IAS 21	The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates
835	Interest	IAS 23	Borrowing Costs
840	Leases	IAS 17	Leases
845	Nonmonetary Transactions		
850	Related Party Disclosures	IAS 24	Related Party Disclosures
852	Reorganizations		
855	Subsequent Events	IAS 10	Events after the Reporting Period
860	Transfers and Servicing		
905	Agriculture	IAS 41	Agriculture
908	Airlines		
910	Contractors—Construction	IAS 11	Construction Contracts
912	Contractors—Federal Government		
915	Development Stage Entities		
920	Entertainment—Broadcasters		
922	Entertainment—Cable Television		
924	Entertainment—Casinos		
926	Entertainment—Films		
928	Entertainment—Music		
930	Extractive Activities—Mining	IFRS 6	Exploration for and Evaluation of Mineral Assets

ASC Topic #	Topic	IFRS Pron.	IASB Pronouncement Title
932	Extractive Activities—Oil and Gas		
940	Financial Services—Broker and Dealers		
942	Financial Services—Depository and Lending		
944	Financial Services—Insurance	IFRS 4	Insurance Contracts
946	Financial Services—Investment Companies		
948	Financial Services—Mortgage Banking		
950	Financial Services—Title Plant		
952	Franchisors		
954	Health Care Entities		
958	Not-for-profit Entities		
960	Plan Accounting—Defined Benefit Pension Plans		
962	Plan Accounting—Defined Contribution Pension Plans		
965	Plan Accounting—Health and Welfare Benefit Plans		
970	Real Estate—General		
972	Real Estate—Common Interest Realty Associations		
974	Real Estate—Real Estate Investment Trusts		
976	Real Estate—Retail Land		
978	Real Estate—Time-sharing Activities		
980	Regulated Operations		
985	Software		
995	U.S. Steamship Entities		
		IAS 20	Accounting for Government Grants and Disclosure of Government Assistance

Codification, Convergence and XBRL—The Perfect Storm?

There are a lot of things that have to be accomplished before we will be able to have a redesigned GAAP codification system that possibly includes International Financial Reporting Standards that will permit the issuance of financial statements using XBRL. The new GAAP Codification is a reality and should improve financial reporting as it currently stands under U.S. GAAP and will significantly reduce the time and effort required to research GAAP issues. Implementing IFRS, however, is a more difficult proposition. There are so many issues that need to be addressed—will IFRS apply to private companies, will the U.S. fully adopt IFRS or only partially adopt the standards, will IFRS support XBRL reporting, and so on?

A more pressing problem relates to the new FASB Codification. The current XBRL taxonomy that is used to set tags corresponding to financial statement line items displays references to the accounting and regulatory rules applicable to that item. However, the current taxonomy uses the pre-codification organization of the FASB literature. A new taxonomy that references the new codification structure of the FASB GAAP Standards will not be available until early 2010.

Any issue caused by the adoption of IFRS is probably not going to impact the Codification since it is unlikely that IFRS will be adopted universally before 2014 if at all. There will be some cost involved in implementing the new Codification but this may be more than offset by the time saved when researching GAAP issues. XBRL may be an issue for public companies reporting in that time period before a new taxonomy has been put in place, so maybe that perfect storm will not be more than a summer rain.

SELF-STUDY QUIZ

Determine the best answer for each question below. Then check your answers against the correct answers in the following section.

11. Which of the following best describes the overarching reason for the convergence of FASB and IASB standards?
 - a. Investment markets have become global.
 - b. The U.S. share of the worldwide capital markets has fallen to less than half.
 - c. The litigious culture of the U.S. has made it less attractive to companies seeking a stock exchange listing.
12. Your client is an investment company regulated under the Investment Company Act of 1940. Is your client included on the IFRS roadmap?
 - a. Yes.
 - b. No.
13. Company A is eligible to be an early election issuer (IFRS Issuer). Company A has a fiscal year end of December 31. What is the first fiscal year Company A will be required to prepare IFRS compliant financial statements?
 - a. 2009.
 - b. 2014.
 - c. 2015.
 - d. 2016.
14. Lulu Be, Inc. decides to elect early adoption. What is the next step for Lulu Be, Inc.?
 - a. Include a disclosure in its first annual report that the financial statements have been prepared using IFRS.
 - b. Obtain a no-objection letter from the SEC staff.
 - c. Be aware that the no-objection letter is a binding commitment to use IFRS.
 - d. Include five years of IFRS selected financial data in its initial filing year using IFRS.
15. As a conscientious CPA, you are doing some planning to determine how your clients would be affected by the mandatory use of IFRS by all U.S. issuers. Under the mandatory reporting, what years of financial data will large accelerated filers be required to include in the first IFRS filing?
 - a. 2007, 2008, and 2009.
 - b. 2012, 2013, and 2014.
 - c. 2013, 2014, and 2015.
 - d. 2014, 2015, and 2016.

16. The IFRS standards are expected to have effects on other reporting requirements. From the list below, select the reporting requirements that will be affected by IFRS.
- i. An issuer required to provide state regulators with a financial statement based on GAAP.
 - ii. An issuer with a LIFO inventory election.
 - iii. An issuer with a loan covenant that requires the use of U.S. GAAP.
 - iv. An issuer who is included in the S&P 500.
- a. i only.
 - b. i and iii.
 - c. ii, iii, and iv.
 - d. i, ii, iii, and iv.
17. Which of the following companies could expect an easy transition when converting their financial reporting systems to IFRS?
- a. An issuer with relatively simple business transactions.
 - b. An issuer with an extensive geographical reach.
 - c. An issuer with a complex reporting structure.
 - d. An issuer with complex transaction cycles.
18. The FASB and IASB have two convergence initiatives, the Norwalk Agreement and the Memorandum of Understanding. Did the credit crisis of 2008–2009 have any effect on these documents?
- a. Yes.
 - b. No.
19. The PCFRC has issued several models concerning nonpublic entities that are not required to file financial statements with the SEC. Which of the following choices accurately describes the model known as IFRS with differential reporting?
- a. IFRS would be adopted by all U.S. companies as their accounting framework.
 - b. The framework of IFRS is modified to assist private companies by deleting some requirements.
 - c. U.S. GAAP would be modified into a self-contained accounting framework.
 - d. U.S. private companies would adopt an adapted version of IFRS.
20. Which of the following global networks might the FASB call upon to assist with global needs of the clients of U.S. CPA firms?
- i. The Forum of Firms.
 - ii. The International Federation of Accountants.
 - iii. The Transnational Auditors Committee.
 - iv. The International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board.
- a. i only.
 - b. i and ii.
 - c. i, ii, and iii.
 - d. i, ii, iii, and iv.

SELF-STUDY ANSWERS

This section provides the correct answers to the self-study quiz. If you answered a question incorrectly, reread the appropriate material. **(References are in parentheses.)**

11. Which of the following best describes the overarching reason for the convergence of FASB and IASB standards? **(Page 32)**
- a. **Investment markets have become global. [This answer is correct. Investors diversify their portfolios by investing globally. Those investors need timely, complete, reliable and comparable financial information thus making a global accounting platform a necessity.]**
 - b. The U.S. share of the worldwide capital markets has fallen to less than half. [This answer is incorrect. While it is true that the U.S. share of market capitalization on the worldwide markets is less than half, this is not the overarching reason for the convergence of FASB and IASB standards.]
 - c. The litigious culture of the U.S. has made it less attractive to companies seeking a stock exchange listing. [This answer is incorrect. Although the U.S. culture may be litigious, the U.S. culture is not the driving force behind the convergence of FASB and IASB standards.]
12. Your client is an investment company regulated under the Investment Company Act of 1940. Is your client included on the IFRS roadmap? **(Page 33)**
- a. Yes. [This answer is incorrect. The proposed roadmap relates solely to U.S. issuers with respect to their periodic reporting requirements under Sections 13 and 15(d) of the Exchange Act, proxy and information statements under Section 14 of the Exchange Act and registration statements under Section 12 of the Exchange Act and Section 7 of the Securities Act.]
 - b. **No. [This answer is correct. The roadmap does not contemplate adoption of IFRS by investment companies regulated under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 USC § 80), or by regulated entities such as registered broker-dealers.]**
13. Company A is eligible to be an early election issuer (IFRS Issuer). Company A has a fiscal year end of December 31. What is the first fiscal year Company A will be required to prepare IFRS compliant financial statements? **(Page 33)**
- a. **2009. [This answer is correct. Since Company A has a fiscal year ending on December 31, 2009, this is after the December 15, 2009 fiscal year end proposed in the SEC Roadmap for Phased Implementation of IFRS Reporting.]**
 - b. 2014. [This answer is incorrect. This is the proposed adoption date for large accelerated filers.]
 - c. 2015. [This answer is incorrect. This is the proposed adoption date for accelerated filers.]
 - d. 2016. [This answer is incorrect. This is the proposed adoption date for small business issuers.]

14. Lulu Be, Inc. decides to elect early adoption. What is the next step for Lulu Be, Inc.?

(Page 34)

- a. Include a disclosure in its first annual report that the financial statements have been prepared using IFRS. [This answer is incorrect. Such a disclosure is a requirement for an issuer that changes the comprehensive set of accounting principles it uses to prepare its primary financial statements to IFRS; however, this disclosure step would occur later in the adoption process.]
- b. Obtain a no-objection letter from the SEC staff. [This answer is correct. If an eligible issuer wished to elect early adoption, that issuer would need to obtain a letter of no-objection from the SEC staff.]**
- c. Be aware that the no-objection letter is a binding commitment to use IFRS. [This answer is incorrect. The proposal points out that obtaining a staff no-objection letter would not be a binding commitment on the part of the issuer to use IFRS, rather the letter would provide the issuer the ability to start filing reports using IFRS.]
- d. Include five years of IFRS selected financial data in its initial filing year using IFRS. [This answer is incorrect. The implementation timetable from the SEC is phased, and a filer provides three years of IFRS selected financial data in its initial filing year.]

15. As a conscientious CPA, you are doing some planning to determine how your clients would be affected by the mandatory use of IFRS by all U.S. issuers. Under the mandatory reporting, what years of financial data will large accelerated filers be required to include in the first IFRS filing? **(Page 37)**

- a. 2007, 2008, and 2009. [This answer is incorrect. These are the years to be included in the initial filing for early election filers “IFRS Issuers”.]
- b. 2012, 2013, and 2014. [This answer is correct. Should the SEC choose to proceed with rulemaking for the mandatory use of IFRS by all U.S. issuers, it would continue to require that issuers provide three years of audited financial statements prepared using IFRS. Thus, the large accelerated filers that would begin reporting under IFRS in 2014 would be required to file financial statements for 2012, 2013, and 2014 with the SEC.]**
- c. 2013, 2014, and 2015. [This answer is incorrect. These three years are required to be included in the initial filing for accelerated filers.]
- d. 2014, 2015, and 2016. [This answer is incorrect. The years 2014, 2015 and 2016 are the years the small business issuers must include in their initial filing under IFRS.]

16. The IFRS standards are expected to have effects on other reporting requirements. From the list below, select the reporting requirements that will be affected by IFRS. **(Page 38)**
- i. An issuer required to provide state regulators with a financial statement based on GAAP.
 - ii. An issuer with a LIFO inventory election.
 - iii. An issuer with a loan covenant that requires the use of U.S. GAAP.
 - iv. An issuer who is included in the S&P 500.
- a. i only. [This answer is incorrect. The transition to IFRS will have an effect on issuers subject to state regulators as well as other issuers.]
- b. i and iii. [This answer is incorrect. The IFRS requirements will have an effect on more than just these two reporting requirements.]
- c. ii, iii, and iv. [This answer is incorrect. The transition to IFRS is expected to be far reaching and will affect all of the reporting requirements listed in this answer choice as well as others.]
- d. i, ii, iii, and iv. [This answer is correct. All of the reporting requirements described in these answer choices will be affected by the IFRS requirements.]**
17. Which of the following companies could expect an easy transition when converting their financial reporting systems to IFRS? **(Page 38)**
- a. An issuer with relatively simple business transactions. [This answer is correct. An issuer with simple business transactions could expect the lead time necessary to convert to IFRS to be less, thus making the transition easier.]**
- b. An issuer with an extensive geographical reach. [This answer is incorrect. An issuer who is spread out geographically will need a longer lead time to design financial reporting systems that are ready for IFRS.]
- c. An issuer with a complex reporting structure. [This answer is incorrect. An issuer with a complex reporting structure can expect to incur more cost and more time in making the transition to IFRS.]
- d. An issuer with complex transaction cycles. [This answer is incorrect. An issuer whose business includes complex transaction cycles can expect to spend more and have a more complex transition to IFRS.]
18. The FASB and IASB have two convergence initiatives, the Norwalk Agreement and the Memorandum of Understanding. Did the credit crisis of 2008-2009 have any effect on these documents? **(Page 41)**
- a. Yes. [This answer is correct. The credit crisis caused both the FASB and IASB to pursue short-term measures to respond to the credit crisis.]**
- b. No. [This answer is incorrect. Both the FAB and IASB made commitments due to recent economic developments. These economic developments are likely to cause revisions in timetables the Boards had agreed upon to complete various projects.]

19. The PCFRC has issued several models concerning nonpublic entities that are not required to file financial statements with the SEC. Which of the following choices accurately describes the model known as IFRS with differential reporting? **(Page 44)**
- a. IFRS would be adopted by all U.S. companies as their accounting framework. [This answer is incorrect. The adoption of IFRS by all companies is the model known as IFRS with Private Entities Option.]
 - b. The framework of IFRS is modified to assist private companies by deleting some requirements. [This answer is correct. Some requirements would be deleted or different treatments would be embedded in the standards to meet the unique needs of U.S. private companies. This accurately describes the model known as IFRS with Differential Reporting.]**
 - c. U.S. GAAP would be modified into a self-contained accounting framework. [This answer is incorrect. Building current U.S. GAAP into a comprehensive, self-contained accounting standards framework suitable for private companies is the model known as Separate U.S. Private Company GAAP Adapted from Current U.S. GAAP.]
 - d. U.S. private companies would adopt an adapted version of IFRS. [This answer is incorrect. The model under which U.S. private companies adopt an adapted version of IFRS is the model known as U.S. Adapted Version of IFRS-NPAE.]
20. Which of the following global networks might the FASB call upon to assist with global needs of the clients of U.S. CPA firms? **(Page 45)**
- i. The Forum of Firms.
 - ii. The International Federation of Accountants.
 - iii. The Transnational Auditors Committee.
 - iv. The International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board.
- a. i only. [This answer is incorrect. The Forum of Firms (FOF) is not the only global network with the potential to assist the FASB across national borders.]
 - b. i and ii. [This answer is incorrect. In addition to the FOF, the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) is not the only global network that may assist the FASB in the area of audit and other assurance related topics.]
 - c. i, ii, and iii. [This answer is correct. The FOF, IFAC and the Transnational Auditors Committee (TAC) all have the potential to be global networks able to assist the FASB with the global needs of clients.]**
 - d. i, ii, iii, and iv. [This answer is incorrect. To be a member of the FOF, one of the requirements is that the member maintain appropriate quality control standards issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB). However, the IAASB is not a network of accounting firms that the FASB would call upon.]

EXAMINATION FOR CPE CREDIT

Lesson 2

Determine the best answer for each question below. Then mark your answer choice on the **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** located in the back of this workbook or by logging onto the Online Grading System.

12. When did the SEC first express a desire to standardize the U.S. GAAP and international disclosure standards?
 - a. 1979.
 - b. 1988.
 - c. 2002.
 - d. 2007.

13. Mary L. Schapiro, Chairman of the SEC gave testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs about the IFRS Roadmap. Which of the following was her position on adoption of the Roadmap?
 - a. She believes that the Roadmap should be fully adopted and implemented as scheduled.
 - b. She believes that the U.S. should proceed with great caution and not rush into implementing the roadmap.
 - c. She believes that the cost to implement the IFRS Roadmap switching from GAAP to IFRS should be minimal for most corporations.
 - d. She believes that the U.S. should be responsible for establishing international financial reporting standards, and therefore we should not adopt the Roadmap.

14. The IFRS Roadmap uses a milestone-based approach. Which of the following is **not** one of the milestones?
 - a. Education and training.
 - b. Improvements to IFRS.
 - c. Revision of the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate IFRS issues.
 - d. Accountability and funding of the IASC Foundation.

15. If a company wants to file an IPO and has previously been reporting under U.S. GAAP, which of the following would require substantial costs to be incurred before the IPO could be filed with the SEC?
 - a. Paying filing fees for the registration.
 - b. Printing and distributing information related to the public offering.
 - c. Travel costs to meet with the SEC staff for multiple reviews of the offering document.
 - d. Providing IFRS compliant audited financial statements for the initial registration filing.

16. Before adopting IFRS, the SEC is considering several things related to IFRS. Which of the following is one of those items?
- The rules-based guidance and safe harbors provided by IFRS.
 - The substantial guidance in IFRS for the extractive industries.
 - Whether IFRS is being consistently applied across companies and across industries.
 - The significant amount of detailed implementation guidance provided by IFRS.
17. Regarding IFRS, which of the following is correct?
- IFRS provides adequate guidance on reorganizations.
 - Safe harbors do not apply to information appearing in the notes to audited financial statements.
 - IFRS does not require disclosure in the notes to the financial statements of sensitivity analyses.
 - IFRS has worldwide uniform adoption of its standards.
18. The Norwalk Agreement resulted in the issuance of a Memorandum of Understanding between the FASB and the IASB. This memorandum was based on three overriding principles. Which of the following is **not** one of those principles?
- Issue common standards that improve information provided to investors.
 - Convergence of accounting standards is best achieved through development of high-quality common standards.
 - Both boards should seek convergence by replacing standards in need of improvement with jointly developed new standards.
 - FASB would eventually become the only recognized globally accepted standard setter.
19. Which of the following statements is correct concerning IFRS support in the U.S.?
- The Uniform CPA Exam now includes IFRS on its list of study materials for the Financial Accounting and Reporting part of the exam.
 - The AICPA council passed a resolution in 2008 designating the SEC as the body to establish international financial accounting and reporting standards.
 - The AICPA Board of Examiners for the Uniform CPA Exam has stated that exams beginning in 2009 will include questions on IFRS.
 - The AICPA council passed a resolution in 2008 designating the IASB as the body to establish accounting standards for the U.S.
20. Which of the following statements about private companies is correct?
- The majority of private companies file their financial statements with the SEC.
 - Small nonpublic entities can continue to prepare financial statements using U.S. GAAP in order to access financial markets.
 - Small nonpublic companies will have to adopt IFRS in order to access financial markets no matter how small the company.
 - The Private Company Financial Reporting Committee has issued a discussion document concerning a total of three potential models for nonpublic companies.

Glossary

A&A Guides – AICPA Accounting and Auditing Guides.

AcSEC – AICPA Accounting Standards Executive Committee.

AIA – American Institute of Accountants. The IPA changed its name to the AIA in 1917. In 1957, the AIA changed its name to the AICPA.

AICPA – American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

APB – Accounting Principles Board.

ARB – Accounting Research Bulletins.

ASC – Accounting Standards Codification.

ASCPA – American Society of Certified Public Accountants. This was a federation of state CPA societies formed in 1921. The ASCPA merged into the AIA in 1936.

EITF – FASB Emerging Issues Task Force.

FASAB – Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board.

FASB – The Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) is an independent authoritative body created in 1973 to replace the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) Accounting Principles Board and authorized by the AICPA *Code of Professional Conduct* as a promulgator of generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), primarily for nongovernment entities.

FASB Cleared – FASB reviewed and sanctioned authoritative guidance.

GASB – The Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) is the body authorized to promulgate standards of financial accounting and reporting for state and local governmental units. It was created by the Financial Accounting Foundation (FAF) in 1984 as successor to the National Council on Governmental Accounting (NCGA) and is recognized by the *Code of Professional Conduct* as an authorized body whose pronouncements must be followed in order to conform to Rules 202 and 203.

IASB – The International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) is an independent, private sector standards-setting body founded in 1973 by professional accounting organizations in nine countries. The IASB issues International Financial Reporting Standards.

IASC – The International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) is an independent private sector body with the objective of achieving uniformity in the accounting principles used around the world. The IASC issues Statements of International Accounting Standards. However, these Standards do not establish standards enforceable under the Code of Professional Conduct of the AICPA. The IASC was formed in 1973 through an agreement made by professional accounting bodies from 10 countries, including the United States.

OCBOA – Other Comprehensive Basis of Accounting. Financial records are maintained and reported according to a basis other than GAAP. A comprehensive basis of accounting other than GAAP is one of the following:

- A basis of accounting that the entity used to comply with the requirements or financial reporting provisions of a governmental regulatory agency to whose jurisdiction the entity is subject (e.g., pursuant to the rules of a state insurance commission)
- A basis of accounting used to file income tax returns for the period covered by the financial statements
- The cash receipts and disbursements basis of accounting, and modifications of the cash basis when such modifications are substantially supported, such as recording depreciation on fixed assets or accruing income taxes
- A definite set of criteria having substantial support that is applied to all items appearing in financial statements, such as the price level basis of accounting

PCAOB – The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) was founded under the provisions of Title I of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. The language in Title I that establishes the board and sets its status parallels the structure of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), which insures bank deposits and regulates a significant portion of the banking industry.

The act sets the following criteria for the PCAOB:

- a. Establishment of Board—There is established the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, to oversee the audit of public companies that are subject to the securities laws, and related matters, in order to protect the interests of investors and further the public interest in the preparation of informative, accurate, and independent audit reports for companies the securities of which are sold to, and held by and for, public investors. The Board shall be a body corporate, operate as a nonprofit corporation, and have succession until dissolved by an Act of Congress.
- b. Status—The Board shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government, and, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by, the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act. No member or person employed by, or agent for, the Board shall be deemed to be an officer or employee of or agent for the Federal Government by reason of such service.

POB – Public Oversight Board, a precursor to the PCAOB.

Q&As – AICPA accounting interpretations and implementation guides, published by FASB staff.

SEC – The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is a federal government agency charged with the responsibility of writing rules consistent with federal security laws, investigation of violations, maintenance of financial disclosure documentation, and the initiation of action against violators of federal securities acts. The SEC's main office is in Washington, D.C., but it has “enforcement” and field offices throughout the country.

The SEC is charged with the oversight of the Federal Securities Act of 1933, the Federal Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. The agency serves to govern the registration, offering, sale, and so forth of stocks, bonds, notes, convertible debentures, warrants, or other financial documents involving investments and purchases.

In addition to writing regulations, the SEC reviews registration statements for compliance with disclosure requirements. The SEC does not determine whether the information provided to investors is accurate or truthful, nor does the SEC determine whether the terms of the offering are fair or reasonable to investors.

The mission of the SEC is to protect the integrity of capital markets through enforcement of financial disclosure laws that apply when a business entity attempts to raise capital by selling ownership to investors. The SEC defines what information prospective investors must receive from offerors and what information the entities must continue to report to their shareholders if the entity has a certain number of owners.

SFAC – FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Concepts.

SFAS – FASB Statements of Financial Accounting Standards.

SOP – AICPA Statements of Position.

SOX – After major financial fraud brought down companies such as WorldCom and Enron, the U.S. Congress passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX). The act's major provisions relating to auditors of public companies can be explained as follows:

- The act establishes the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB). The board has the authority to regulate public accounting firms, including setting audit rules and ethics guidelines. All accounting firms that audit public companies must register with the PCAOB and the board must inspect them regularly.
- The independent auditors must communicate regularly and completely with the audit committee of their audit clients.
- In order to avoid conflicts of interest, the act establishes a rule that an accounting firm cannot audit a company if one of the company's top officers worked for the accounting firm in the last year and was involved in the company's audit.
- The act establishes term limits so that a lead audit partner cannot work on a client's audit in any auditing role for more than five years.
- The act ordered a study of the factors that since 1989 have caused the Big Eight accounting firms to shrink to the Big Four (Deloitte & Touche, Ernst & Young, KPMG, and PricewaterhouseCoopers).

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 applies to publicly held companies and other issuers. It is intended to provide the investing public with greater assurance about the reliability of a public company's financial reporting in quarterly and annual filings with the SEC.

Section 404 of SOX requires that public companies have an audit of their internal controls in conjunction with the audit of their financial statements. The audit is to be conducted in accordance with Auditing Standard No. 2, issued by the PCAOB. Visit the PCAOB website for additional information.

There is a push by some states and regulators to extend the provisions of SOX to nonpublic companies and not-for-profit entities and their auditors.

XBRL – eXtensible Business Reporting Language.

TESTING INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINATION FOR CPE CREDIT

Decoding the FASB Codification (CODTG09)

1. Following these instructions is information regarding the location of the **CPE CREDIT EXAMINATION QUESTIONS** and an **EXAMINATION FOR CPE CREDIT ANSWER SHEET**.
2. Indicate the best answer to the exam questions by completely filling in the circle for the correct answer. The bubbled answer should correspond with the correct answer letter at the top of the circle's column and with the question number.
3. If you change your answer, remove your previous mark completely. Any stray marks on the answer sheet may be misinterpreted.
4. The answer sheet has four bubbles for each question. However, not every examination question has four valid answer choices. If there are only two or three valid answer choices, "Do not select this answer choice" will appear next to the invalid answer choices on the examination.
5. If more than one person wants to complete this self-study course, each person must purchase the course and submit an original **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet**, accompanied by a **payment of \$49**.
6. To receive CPE credit, completed answer sheets must be postmarked by **August 31, 2010**. Send the completed **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** along with your payment to the address below. CPE credit will be given for examination scores of 70% or higher.
7. Only the **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** should be submitted for grading. **DO NOT SEND YOUR SELF-STUDY COURSE MATERIALS**. Be sure to keep a completed copy for your records.
8. Please allow a minimum of three weeks for grading. An **express grading** service is available for an **additional \$14.95** per examination. Course results will be faxed to you by 5 p.m. CST of the business day following receipt of your examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet.
9. Please direct any questions or comments to our Customer Service department at (800) 323-8724.
10. You may submit your examination for grading in one of the following ways:
 - Complete the exam by logging on to our **ONLINE GRADING** system at **OnlineGrading.Thomson.com**. Click the purchase link and list of exams will appear. You may search for the exam using wildcards. Payment for the exam is accepted over a secure site using your credit card. Once you purchase an exam, you may take the exam three times. On the third unsuccessful attempt, the system will request another payment. Once you successfully score 70% on an exam, you may print your completion certificate from the site. The site will retain your exam completion history. If you lose your certificate, you may return to the site and reprint your certificate.
 - If you are paying by credit card, you may **FAX** your completed **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** and **Course Evaluation** to the Tax & Accounting business of Thomson Reuters at (817) 252-4021.
 - You may continue to **MAIL** your **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet, Course Evaluation**, and **payment** to:

**Thomson Reuters
Tax & Accounting—R&G
CODTG09 Self-study CPE
36786 Treasury Center
Chicago, IL 60694-6700**

EXAMINATION FOR CPE CREDIT

To enhance your learning experience, examination questions are located immediately following each lesson. Each set of examination questions can be located on the page numbers listed below. The course is designed so the participant reads the course materials, answers a series of self-study questions, and evaluates progress by comparing answers to both the correct and incorrect answers and the reasons for each. At the end of each lesson, the participant then answers the examination questions and records answers to the examination questions on either the printed **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** or by logging on to the **Online Grading System**. The **Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet** and **Self-study Course Evaluation Form** are located at the end of the course materials. For more information on completing the **Examination for CPE Credit**, see the **Testing Instructions** on the preceding page.

<u>CPE Examination Questions</u>	<u>Page</u>
Lesson 1.....	29
Lesson 2.....	59

EXAMINATION FOR CPE CREDIT ANSWER SHEET

Decoding the FASB Codification

CODTG09 (Price – \$49)

First Name: _____

Last Name: _____

Firm Name: _____

Firm Address: _____

City: _____ State /ZIP: _____

Firm Phone: _____

Firm Fax No.: _____

Firm Email: _____

Express Grading Requested: Add \$14.95

Signature: _____

Credit Card Number: _____ Expiration Date: _____

Birth Month: _____ Licensing State: _____

ANSWERS:

Please indicate your answer by filling in the appropriate circle as shown: Fill in like this ● not like this \ X ✓

- | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d |
|------|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|
| 1. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 6. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 11. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 16. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 2. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 7. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 12. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 17. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 3. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 8. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 13. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 18. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 4. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 9. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 14. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 19. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 5. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 10. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 15. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | 20. ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

You may **fax** the completed Examination for CPE Credit Answer Sheet and Course Evaluation to Thomson Reuters at (817) 252-4021, along with your credit card information.

Expiration Date: August 31, 2010

Self-study Course Evaluation

Please print legibly - Thank you for your feedback!

Course Title: Decoding the FASB Codification Course Acronym: CODTG09

Your Name (optional): _____ Date: _____

Email: _____

Please indicate your answers by filling in the appropriate circle as shown:

Fill in like this not like this \ . X ✓

Satisfaction Level:	Low (1) . . . to . . . High (10)									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Rate the appropriateness of the materials for your experience level.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. How would you rate the examination related to the course material?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Does the examination consist of clear and unambiguous questions and statements?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Were the stated learning objectives met?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Were the course materials accurate and useful?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Were the course materials relevant and did they contribute to the achievement of the learning objectives?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Was the time allotted to the learning activity appropriate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. If applicable, was the technological equipment appropriate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. If applicable, were handout or advance preparation materials and prerequisites satisfactory?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. If applicable, how well did the audio/visuals contribute to the program?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any constructive criticism you may have about the course materials, such as particularly difficult parts, hard to understand areas, unclear instructions, appropriateness of subjects, educational value, and ways to make it more fun. Please be as specific as you can. (Please print legibly):

Additional Comments:

1. What did you find **most** helpful? _____
2. What did you find **least** helpful? _____
3. What other courses or subject areas would you like for us to offer? _____
4. Do you work in a Corporate (C), Professional Accounting (PA), Legal (L), or Government (G) setting? _____
5. How many employees are in your company? _____
6. May we contact you for survey purposes (Y/N)? If yes, please fill out contact info at the top of the page. **Yes/No**

For more information on our CPE & Training solutions, visit trainingcpe.thomson.com. Comments may be quoted or paraphrased for marketing purposes, including first initial, last name, and city/state, if provided. If you prefer we do not publish your name, write in "no" and initial here _____.

