



**August 9, 2017**

Memorandum

To: Members of the Board

From: Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director

Subj: **IPSASB Heritage Assets Consultation Paper – Tab J<sup>1</sup>**

MEMBER ACTIONS REQUESTED:

- Respond to staff question (p.2 ) by August 22nd

**MEETING OBJECTIVES**

- Discuss and revise as needed the response to the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board's (IPSASB) Consultation Paper – *Financial Reporting for Heritage in the Public Sector*

**BRIEFING MATERIAL**

This memo provides an update, a draft response to the IPSASB, and a copy of the consultation paper.

**BACKGROUND**

At the June meeting, members reviewed staff's analysis of the consultation paper including suggested positions on each IPSASB question. Members asked staff to prepare correspondence focusing on conclusions reached by the Board in existing concepts and standards, such as the use of nonfinancial information, deferred maintenance and repairs, and multi-use assets. In doing so, the Board would not risk establishing precedent setting positions. The letter will be signed by the chairman as an individual communication and not as an official document from the Board.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff reviewed existing standards and prepared a draft letter for members' consideration. Any feedback provided at the meeting will be considered in finalizing the letter. The consultation paper requests feedback by September 30<sup>th</sup> so this will be members' final opportunity to suggest changes to the letter.

---

<sup>1</sup> The staff prepares Board meeting materials to facilitate discussion of issues at the Board meeting. This material is presented for discussion purposes only; it is not intended to reflect authoritative views of the FASAB or its staff. Official positions of the FASAB are determined only after extensive due process and deliberations.

## **QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD**

**What changes would you suggest to enhance the response?**

Please contact me as soon as possible to convey your questions or suggestions. Communication before the meeting will help make the meeting more productive. You can contact me by telephone at 202-512-7357 or by e-mail at [paynew@fasab.gov](mailto:paynew@fasab.gov)



1 **DRAFT**

2 September XX, 2017

3 Submitted electronically: <http://www.ipsasb.org/>

4 Ian Carruthers, Chairman

5 Angela Ryan, Deputy Chair

6 International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board

7 529 Fifth Avenue

8 New York, NY 10017

9

10 **Consultation Paper: *Financial Reporting for Heritage in the Public Sector***

11

12 Dear Mr. Carruthers and Ms. Ryan,

13 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced consultation paper  
14 concerning heritage items in the public sector. Our Boards share similar interests in  
15 setting high-quality public sector accounting standards and we hope to offer insights  
16 from our past work in this area. We also share with you the challenges of developing  
17 proposals that balance the benefits of user information with the cost to preparers of  
18 providing that information.

19 The views expressed in this letter do not necessarily represent the current views of the  
20 Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB or Board), its sponsors,  
21 individual members, committees, task forces, or staff. As you know, formal positions of  
22 the FASAB are developed only through extensive due process and deliberation.  
23 Although I am not addressing each question in your consultation paper, I am providing  
24 insights gained from Board positions in existing FASAB guidance and alerting you to an  
25 ongoing project addressing land that should be relevant to your efforts.

26 **Asset Definition**

27 The Board has consistently concluded that heritage items<sup>1</sup> can be assets.<sup>2</sup> Key points  
28 from our concepts statements include:

29 a. To be an asset, an item must have “the ability to provide economic benefits or  
30 services.” The Board noted that the services embodied in an asset may benefit  
31 the government in ways other than inflows of cash or other resources. For  
32 example, assets such as museums and art galleries often provide educational  
33 and research opportunities to the public at no charge, “thereby assisting the  
34 federal government to achieve its mission to provide public services.”<sup>3</sup>

35 b. An item that meets the definition of an asset is an asset even if it is not  
36 recognized in the accrual-basis financial statements. “Unrecognized elements  
37 are candidates for disclosure in the notes to financial statements or as  
38 supplementary information.”<sup>4</sup>

39 Current standards provide that heritage assets should not be recognized on the balance  
40 sheet. Instead, a line item is presented on the balance sheet to refer readers to a note  
41 providing non-financial information about the heritage asset.<sup>5</sup>

42 **Reporting Objectives, Qualitative Characteristics, and Cost-benefit Constraints**

43 In developing the current standards, the Board concluded that the primary reporting  
44 objective for heritage assets and stewardship land is stewardship.<sup>6</sup> The stewardship  
45 objective is:

46 Federal financial reporting should assist report users in assessing the impact on  
47 the country of the government’s operations and investments for the period and  
48 how, as a result, the government’s and the nation’s financial condition has  
49 changed and may change in the future. Federal financial reporting should provide  
50 information that helps the reader to determine whether

51 • the government’s financial position improved or deteriorated over the period,

---

<sup>1</sup> FASAB does not define heritage items. However, the characteristics associated with heritage assets are similar. Henceforth, this letter refers to heritage assets.

<sup>2</sup> See Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) 6, [Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment](#); SFFAS 29, [Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land](#), and Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) 5, [Definitions of Elements and Basic Recognition Criteria for Accrual-Basis Financial Statements](#).

<sup>3</sup> SFFAC 5, par. 26.

<sup>4</sup> SFFAC 5, par. 9.

<sup>5</sup> SFFAS 29, par. 19-27.

<sup>6</sup> SFFAC 6, par. 123.

52 • future budgetary resources will likely be sufficient to sustain public services and  
53 to meet obligations as they come due, and

54 • government operations have contributed to the nation's current and future well-  
55 being.

56 In contrast, the Board concluded that the primary object regarding other assets such as  
57 general property, plant, and equipment is operating performance which requires  
58 financial information such as depreciation expense.

59 These decisions were based on user needs<sup>7</sup> and led the Board to focus on two  
60 important questions regarding heritage assets:

61 1. What and where are the important assets?

62 2. Is the government effectively managing and safeguarding its assets?<sup>8</sup>

63 The Board sought to address these questions by providing information that meets the  
64 qualitative characteristics established in its concepts. A key qualitative characteristic is  
65 that information be relevant to the user. To be relevant, a logical relationship must exist  
66 between the information provided and the purpose for which it is needed.<sup>9</sup> To focus on  
67 the established reporting objective and the questions users raised, the Board concluded  
68 that information about the existence and condition of heritage assets would be  
69 relevant.<sup>10</sup> In contrast, the Board concluded that attempting to capitalize and depreciate  
70 heritage assets is not useful because of the uncertain useful life and historical cost  
71 basis of such assets.<sup>11</sup>

72 During due process, the Board proposed requiring reporting on the fair value of assets  
73 transferred to state and local governments. However, respondents to the proposal  
74 questioned the cost-benefit of doing so even for this limited portion of heritage assets.  
75 The Board agreed and did not require fair value information.<sup>12</sup>

## 76 **Recognition**

77 The Board concluded that attempting to capitalize and depreciate heritage assets would  
78 not provide valuable information to readers of financial reports. This decision was made

---

<sup>7</sup> SFFAS 6, par. 124.

<sup>8</sup> SFFAS 6, par. 125.

<sup>9</sup> SFFAC 1, *Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting*, par. 161.

<sup>10</sup> SFFAS 8, par. 11 and 119.

<sup>11</sup> SFFAS 8, par. 119.

<sup>12</sup> SFFAS 8, par. 127-128.

79 because the Board could not identify a relevant measurement attribute and expressed  
80 concern about the cost and benefit of producing financial amounts that likely have little  
81 or no relevance. Current standards require the cost of acquiring heritage assets to be  
82 expensed when incurred.<sup>13</sup>

### 83 **Disclosure of Non-financial Information**

84 Given the reporting objectives and the conclusion that it is not meaningful to assign a  
85 monetary value to heritage assets, the Board developed disclosure requirements to  
86 meet our stewardship objective. Current standards require the following non-financial  
87 information:

- 88 a. A concise statement explaining how the heritage assets relate to the mission of  
89 the entity
- 90 b. A brief description of the entity's stewardship policies for heritage assets
- 91 c. A concise description of each major category of heritage asset
- 92 d. The physical units of each major category of heritage assets at the beginning and  
93 end of the reporting period as well as the number of units acquired and  
94 withdrawn during the reporting period

95 To ensure condition information is available, entities also should include a reference to  
96 deferred maintenance and repairs information reported in required supplementary  
97 information.<sup>14</sup>

98 The Board has consistently found the relevance of non-financial information regarding  
99 heritage assets especially high in the public sector.

### 100 **Deferred Maintenance and Repairs Information**

101 Heritage assets often possess distinctive features which create significant financial  
102 obligations including obligations to maintain or preserve heritage assets. Our Board  
103 concluded that reporting of deferred maintenance and repairs should be mandatory.<sup>15</sup>  
104 This information is directly responsive to the second question identified by users – Is the  
105 government effectively managing and safeguarding its assets?

### 106 **Land**

107 The Board recently amended standards regarding land that qualifies as general  
108 property, plant, and equipment (general PP&E). The amendments allow entities to elect  
109 to exclude such land values from opening balances when they first adopt generally  
110 accepted accounting principles. Further, entities making the election are required to

---

<sup>13</sup> SFFAS 8, par. 118-119.

<sup>14</sup> SFFAS 29, par. 25-26.

<sup>15</sup> SFFAS 42, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, par. 15.

111 expense future acquisitions. Instead, entities would disclose the number of acres of land  
112 they control as well as changes during each reporting period.<sup>16</sup>

113 In adopting this new standard, the Board considered that, unlike other general PP&E,  
114 land is not depreciated. Depreciation expense for other general PP&E provides  
115 information essential to assessing operating performance. In contrast, capitalizing land  
116 provides information primarily beneficial in the period of acquisition so that the  
117 acquisition can be evaluated. “The Board carefully considered those aspects of the land  
118 category, along with measurement challenges, cost-benefit considerations, and the  
119 qualitative characteristics of financial information. The Board determined the most  
120 practical and cost-beneficial approach to establishing an opening balance for land would  
121 be to permit the reporting entity to exclude land from the opening balance of general  
122 PP&E and to support accountability through disclosures.”<sup>17</sup>

123 However, members expressed concern regarding the resulting inconsistent reporting;  
124 reporting entities making this election would provide nonfinancial information about land  
125 and other entities would provide historical cost information for land qualifying as general  
126 property, plant, and equipment. Further inconsistencies have existed for some time  
127 because stewardship land is reported through disclosure of nonfinancial information  
128 such as physical quantities and policies.

129 The Board is currently considering proposals to address these inconsistencies. One  
130 proposal is to require acreage information for all land in lieu of assigning a monetary  
131 value. A proposal is expected before the end of 2017 and we hope it will prove relevant  
132 to your discussion of heritage items.

### 133 **Conclusion**

134 I hope that you find this overview of our current standards and projects, including the  
135 underlying rationale, in this area helpful. Should you require any clarification or wish to  
136 discuss this letter further, please do not hesitate contacting Ms. Wendy M. Payne,  
137 FASAB Executive Director at 202.512.7857 or email [paynew@fasab.gov](mailto:paynew@fasab.gov).

138

139 Sincerely,

140

141 D. Scott Showalter

142 Chairman, FASAB

143

144

---

<sup>16</sup> SFFAS 6, (as amended by SFFAS 50, *Establishing Opening Balances for General Property, Plant, and Equipment*), par. 40.f. and h.

<sup>17</sup> SFFAS 50, par. A16-A17.

**Consultation Paper**  
**April 2017**  
*Comments due: September 30, 2017*

IPSAS®

# Financial Reporting for Heritage in the Public Sector

IPSASB

International Public  
Sector Accounting  
Standards Board®

This document was developed and approved by the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board® (IPSASB®).

The objective of the IPSASB is to serve the public interest by setting high-quality public sector accounting standards and by facilitating the adoption and implementation of these, thereby enhancing the quality and consistency of practice throughout the world and strengthening the transparency and accountability of public sector finances.

In meeting this objective, the IPSASB sets International Public Sector Accounting Standards™ (IPSAS™) and Recommended Practice Guidelines (RPGs) for use by public sector entities, including national, regional, and local governments, and related governmental agencies.

IPSAS relate to the general purpose financial statements (financial statements) and are authoritative. RPGs are pronouncements that provide guidance on good practice in preparing general purpose financial reports (GPFRs) that are not financial statements. Unlike IPSAS, RPGs do not establish requirements. Currently all pronouncements relating to GPFRs that are not financial statements are RPGs. RPGs do not provide guidance on the level of assurance (if any) to which information should be subjected.

The structures and processes that support the operations of the IPSASB are facilitated by the International Federation of Accountants® (IFAC®).

Copyright © April 2017 by the International Federation of Accountants® (IFAC®). For copyright, trademark, and permissions information, please see [page 35](#).

## Executive Summary

Currently there are a variety of practices for the financial reporting of heritage in different jurisdictions. IPSAS 17, *Property, Plant and Equipment*, allows public sector entities to choose the accounting approach they use, including whether to recognize heritage items as assets in the financial statements and, if so, the measurement base applied. This diversity reduces comparability between public sector entities. Financial reporting practices may not provide the information that users of general purpose financial reports (GPFs) need for accountability and decision making.

This Consultation Paper (CP) asks constituents for their views on financial reporting for heritage in the public sector. Views will support the IPSASB's work to consider the need to develop additional guidance on financial reporting for heritage, in order to meet the needs of users of GPFs for information for the purposes of accountability and decision making.

For the purposes of this CP, heritage items are described as "items that are intended to be held indefinitely and preserved for the benefit of present and future generations because of their rarity and/or significance in relation, but not limited, to their archeological, architectural, agricultural, artistic, cultural, environmental, historical, natural, scientific or technological features."

This CP discusses whether heritage items meet the definition of an asset and whether they can be measured and recognized in the financial statements. This CP also considers whether heritage preservation responsibilities could involve present obligations for entities, which should be recognized as liabilities in the financial statements. It discusses presentation of information for heritage in financial statements and other GPFs.

The CP proposes that the special characteristics of heritage items do not prevent them from being considered as assets for the purposes of financial reporting, and that they should be recognized in the statement of financial position if they meet the recognition criteria in the Conceptual Framework. In many cases it will be possible to assign a monetary value to heritage assets. Appropriate measurement bases are historical cost, market value and replacement cost. Subsequent measurement of heritage assets can be approached in broadly the same way as subsequent measurement for other, non-heritage assets.

The CP also proposes that an intention to preserve heritage items for present and future generations, does not, of itself, result in a present obligation such that an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources and should therefore recognize a liability. An entity should present heritage-related information in line with existing IPSASB pronouncements.

## REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

This Consultation Paper, *Financial Reporting for Heritage in the Public Sector*, was developed and approved by the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board® (IPSASB®).

### **Comments are requested by September 30, 2017**

Respondents are asked to submit their comments electronically through the IPSASB website, using the “Submit a Comment” link. Please submit comments in both a PDF and Word file. Also, please note that first-time users must register to use this feature. All comments will be considered a matter of public record and will be posted on the IPSASB website. This publication may be downloaded from the IPSASB website: [www.ipsasb.org](http://www.ipsasb.org). The approved text is published in the English language.

### **Guide for Respondents**

The IPSASB welcomes comments on all of the matters discussed in this Consultation Paper, including all Preliminary Views (PVs) and Specific Matters for Comment (SMCs). Comments are most helpful if they indicate the specific paragraph or group of paragraphs to which they relate and contain a clear rationale.

The PVs and SMCs in this Consultation Paper are provided below. Paragraph numbers identify the location of the PV or SMC in the text.

#### **Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 1 (following paragraph 1.8)**

Do you agree that the IPSASB has captured all of the characteristics of heritage items and the potential consequences for financial reporting in paragraphs 1.7 and 1.8?

If not, please give reasons and identify any additional characteristics that you consider relevant.

#### **Preliminary View—Chapter 2.1 (following paragraph 2.11)**

For the purposes of this CP, the following description reflects the special characteristics of heritage items and distinguishes them from other phenomena for the purposes of financial reporting:

Heritage items are items that are intended to be held indefinitely and preserved for the benefit of present and future generations because of their rarity and/or significance in relation, but not limited, to their archeological, architectural, agricultural, artistic, cultural, environmental, historical, natural, scientific or technological features.

Do you agree with the IPSASB’s Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons.

#### **Preliminary View—Chapter 2.2 (following paragraph 2.12)**

For the purposes of this CP, natural heritage covers areas and features, but excludes living plants and organisms that occupy or visit those areas and features.

Do you agree with the IPSASB’s Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons.

#### **Preliminary View—Chapter 3 (following paragraph 3.11)**

The special characteristics of heritage items do not prevent them from being considered as assets for the purposes of financial reporting.

Do you agree with the IPSASB’s Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 4.1 (following paragraph 4.17)**

Do you support initially recognizing heritage assets at a nominal cost of one currency unit where historical cost is zero, such as when a fully depreciated asset is categorized as a heritage asset then transferred to a museum at no consideration, or an entity obtains a natural heritage asset without consideration?

If so, please provide your reasons.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 4.1 (following paragraph 4.40)**

Heritage assets should be recognized in the statement of financial position if they meet the recognition criteria in the Conceptual Framework.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 4.2 (following paragraph 4.40)**

Are there heritage-related situations (or factors) in which heritage assets should not initially be recognized and/or measured because:

- (a) It is not possible to assign a relevant and verifiable monetary value; or
- (b) The cost-benefit constraint applies and the costs of doing so would not justify the benefits?

If yes, please describe those heritage-related situations (or factors) and why heritage assets should not be recognized in these situations.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 4.2 (following paragraph 4.40)**

In many cases it will be possible to assign a monetary value to heritage assets. Appropriate measurement bases are historical cost, market value and replacement cost.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 4.3 (following paragraph 4.40)**

What additional guidance should the IPSASB provide through its Public Sector Measurement Project to enable these measurement bases to be applied to heritage assets?

**Preliminary View – Chapter 5 (following paragraph 5.14)**

Subsequent measurement of heritage assets:

- (a) Will need to address changes in heritage asset values that arise from subsequent expenditure, consumption, impairment and revaluation.
- (b) Can be approached in broadly the same way as subsequent measurement for other, non-heritage assets.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 5 (following paragraph 5.14)**

Are there any types of heritage assets or heritage-related factors that raise special issues for the subsequent measurement of heritage assets?

If so, please identify those types and/or factors, and describe the special issues raised and indicate what guidance IPSASB should provide to address them.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 6 (following paragraph 6.10)**

The special characteristics of heritage items, including an intention to preserve them for present and future generations, do not, of themselves, result in a present obligation such that an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources. The entity should not therefore recognize a liability.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 7 (following paragraph 7.9)**

Information about heritage should be presented in line with existing IPSASB pronouncements.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View? If not, please provide your reasons and describe what further guidance should be provided to address these.

# FINANCIAL REPORTING FOR HERITAGE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Chapter 1, Introduction to Financial Reporting for Heritage in the Public Sector .....	9
Introduction .....	9
The IPSASB's Heritage Project .....	9
Challenges of Financial Reporting for Heritage.....	9
The Public Interest and Financial Reporting for Heritage.....	10
Approach in this Consultation Paper .....	11
Structure of this Consultation Paper .....	11
Chapter 2, Descriptions of Heritage .....	13
Introduction .....	13
Heritage .....	13
Heritage Item Identification Issues .....	14
Description of Heritage Items .....	14
Chapter 3, Heritage Items as Assets .....	16
Introduction .....	16
Heritage Items as Resources .....	16
Control of a Heritage Resource .....	17
Past Event for Present Control over Heritage Resources .....	17
Heritage Items as Assets.....	18
Chapter 4, Recognition and Initial Measurement of Heritage Assets .....	19
Introduction .....	19
Recognition in the Conceptual Framework .....	19
Heritage Assets and the Measurement Objective .....	19
Measurement Bases.....	20
Measurement and the Qualitative Characteristics and Constraints .....	23
Recognition and Initial Measurement of Heritage Assets .....	25
Chapter 5, Subsequent Measurement .....	27
Introduction .....	27
Subsequent Measurement in the Conceptual Framework and IPSASs.....	27
Subsequent Measurement of Heritage Assets.....	27
Chapter 6, Heritage-Related Obligations .....	30

FINANCIAL REPORTING FOR HERITAGE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Introduction .....	30
Conceptual Framework, Liabilities and Present Obligations .....	30
Heritage-Related Present Obligations .....	30
Heritage-Related Past Events .....	31
Heritage-Related Liabilities.....	31
Chapter 7, Presentation of Information on Heritage Items .....	33
Introduction .....	33
Presentation Objectives for Information on Heritage.....	33

---

## Chapter 1, Introduction to Financial Reporting for Heritage in the Public Sector

### Introduction

- 1.1 *The Conceptual Framework for General Purpose Financial Reporting by Public Sector Entities* (the Conceptual Framework) identifies the holding of heritage items as a distinguishing feature of the public sector<sup>1</sup>. This consultation paper (CP) discusses financial reporting for heritage in the public sector and considers different approaches to address the information needs of users of general purpose financial reports (GPFRs), as a basis for consultation with those interested in how GPFRs can support accountability and decision making for heritage. Where the IPSASB has reached a preliminary view on a heritage-related financial reporting issue, the view is provided, along with discussion to explain how the IPSASB reached its view.

### The IPSASB's Heritage Project

- 1.2 The IPSASB first considered heritage accounting during development of IPSAS 17, *Property, Plant and Equipment* (IPSAS 17), which includes paragraphs on accounting for heritage assets. IPSAS 17 describes heritage assets and allows entities to recognize them. If an entity recognizes some or all of its heritage assets, then it needs to make disclosures identified in the Standard. However, entities are not required to apply IPSAS 17's measurement requirements. The IPSASB took a similar approach in IPSAS 31, *Intangible Assets* (IPSAS 31), which has paragraphs on accounting for intangible heritage assets, based on those in IPSAS 17. In effect, the IPSASB's approach in these two Standards acknowledged the difficult financial reporting issues raised by heritage items, and allowed preparers to determine how to account for heritage until this topic could be considered in depth.
- 1.3 In 2004 the IPSASB commenced a heritage assets project in collaboration with the United Kingdom's Accounting Standards Board (the ASB-UK). A CP, *Accounting for Heritage Assets under the Accrual Basis of Accounting*, was published in February 2006. The CP consisted of a discussion paper developed and approved by the ASB-UK, with an introduction and preface developed by the IPSASB's Heritage Assets Subcommittee. After reviewing submissions in late 2006, the IPSASB decided to defer further work until completion of its Conceptual Framework.
- 1.4 After completion of the Conceptual Framework in 2014, the IPSASB decided to reconsider financial reporting for heritage in the public sector. IPSASB constituents had indicated, in response to the 2014 strategy and work plan consultation, that developing coverage of financial reporting for heritage in its pronouncements should be an IPSASB priority.

### Challenges of Financial Reporting for Heritage

- 1.5 Worldwide there are different views on what items are heritage items; whether heritage items are assets or liabilities for financial reporting purposes; whether they should be recognized in the financial statements; and, if recognized, how they should be measured. Standard setters have also had different views on the presentation of information about heritage items, where presentation covers both:
- (a) Enhanced disclosures in the financial statements; and,

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, paragraph 15 of the preface to the Conceptual Framework.

- (b) Presentation of information in other general purpose financial reports (GPFs) that provide information which enhances, complements, and supplements the financial statements.
- 1.6 The financial reporting challenges may vary between countries. These challenges include the extent of funding available for heritage valuation, availability of valuation expertise and the place of heritage within competing government priorities. The main type of heritage for some countries could be natural heritage, while for others the primary focus could be historic buildings, infrastructure and artifacts dating back thousands of years.

*Characteristics of Heritage Items*

- 1.7 Characteristics of heritage items include that:
- (a) They are often irreplaceable;
  - (b) There are often ethical, legal and/or statutory restrictions or prohibitions that restrict or prevent sale, transfer or destruction by the holder or owner; and
  - (c) They are expected to have a long, possibly indefinite, useful life due to increasing rarity and/or significance.
- 1.8 These characteristics of heritage items may have consequences for financial reporting for heritage in the following areas:
- (a) *Measurement:* Is it possible to measure heritage items in a way that reflects their service potential or their ability to generate economic benefits?
  - (b) *Value:* If assignment of monetary values does not convey the heritage significance of heritage items or their future claims on public resources, would users of GPFs benefit more from non-financial information about heritage items, reported outside the financial statements?
  - (c) *Preservation:* If an entity's responsibility is to preserve heritage items rather than to generate cash flows from them, are heritage items resources or obligations from the entity's perspective?
  - (d) *Restrictions on use:* Given restrictions on entities' ability to use, transfer or sell heritage items, should heritage items be shown as assets in the financial statements?
  - (e) *Benefits to others:* Can a reporting entity be said to control a heritage item for financial reporting purposes, when it is held for the benefit of current and future generations?

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 1**

Do you agree that the IPSASB has captured all of the characteristics of heritage items and the potential consequences for financial reporting in paragraphs 1.7 and 1.8?

If not, please give reasons and identify any additional characteristics that you consider relevant.

**The Public Interest and Financial Reporting for Heritage**

- 1.9 Given these financial reporting challenges and the special characteristics of heritage, the question arises of what heritage-related information users of GPFs need for the purposes of accountability and decision making. Users may need information to:
- (a) Hold entities accountable for their preservation of heritage items; and
  - (b) Make decisions on resources needed for heritage preservation.

- 1.10 The purpose for which an entity holds heritage items could impact on the information that users of GPFRs need. For example, where an entity uses heritage items in its operations, users may need information for decision making on the entity's operational capacity and cost of services. This could have implications for information available to users for the purposes of accountability and decision making related to the entity as a whole.
- 1.11 As noted in paragraph 1.2 above, IPSAS presently allows entities to report on heritage items using different financial reporting practices. Worldwide there are inconsistent practices with respect to categorization of assets as either heritage or non-heritage, heritage items may or may not be recognized in an entity's financial statements and a variety of different measurement approaches are used. This has negative consequences for the public interest because it reduces the comparability of information reported.
- 1.12 This CP discusses financial reporting for heritage in light of constituents' concerns. It considers whether or not additional financial reporting requirements and/or guidelines are necessary, including scope for information in the financial statements and/or in other GPFRs. The IPSASB will take decisions on the nature and extent of any additional requirements in the context of feedback from constituents.

### **Approach in this Consultation Paper**

- 1.13 This CP draws on the Conceptual Framework to discuss financial reporting for heritage in the public sector. It considers what heritage-related information users of GPFRs need for the purposes of accountability and decision making, where such information should achieve the qualitative characteristics of information reported in GPFRs<sup>2</sup>. This CP draws on the Conceptual Framework's coverage of element definition, recognition and measurement, to consider whether heritage items could result in elements that should be recognized in the financial statements. Financial statement presentation issues are also discussed, drawing on the Conceptual Framework's approach to presentation, whereby presentation in the financial statements encompasses both the display and disclosure of information. Although this CP's primary focus is on information presented in the financial statements, it also notes scope to present information in other GPFRs, for example service performance information reported when an entity has heritage-related service performance objectives.
- 1.14 While the Conceptual Framework underpins this CP's consideration of financial reporting for heritage in the public sector, the IPSASB has also considered national standard setters' and the IPSASB's own pronouncements. In addition to IPSAS 17 and IPSAS 31, IPSAS 19, *Provisions, Contingent Assets and Contingent Liabilities* and the IPSASB's recommended practice guidelines (RPGs), which address information in other GPFRs, have been considered for their relevance to this project.

### **Structure of this Consultation Paper**

- 1.15 This CP covers financial reporting for heritage in the following order:
- (a) Chapter 2 describes heritage items and discusses issues related to their identification;

---

<sup>2</sup> The qualitative characteristics of information included in GPFRs are the attributes that make that information useful to users and support the achievement of the objectives of financial reporting. The qualitative characteristics are relevance, faithful representation, understandability, timeliness, comparability, and verifiability. (See paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 of the Conceptual Framework.)

- (b) Chapter 3 discusses whether or not heritage items could be assets for financial reporting purposes;
- (c) Chapter 4 discusses the recognition and initial measurement of heritage assets;
- (d) Chapter 5 examines subsequent measurement;
- (e) Chapter 6 considers obligations related to heritage items and discusses their recognition and measurement; and
- (f) Chapter 7 discusses presentation of information on heritage items in the financial statements and in other GPFs.

## Chapter 2, Descriptions of Heritage

### Introduction

- 2.1. This chapter considers what heritage is, discusses heritage identification issues, and then proposes a description of “heritage items”, as a basis for subsequent discussion of financial reporting for heritage in the public sector. This chapter does not consider whether heritage items are assets from the perspective of a reporting entity, which is discussed in Chapter 3.

### Heritage

- 2.2. There are different views on what is meant by “heritage” and, consequently, what things should be identified as heritage items. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) international conventions for heritage protection have defined heritage and different categories of heritage<sup>3</sup>. These definitions emphasize the importance, significance and/or value of heritage items, highlighting their sacred or historic nature and their rarity. 192 countries have ratified the UNESCO convention on protection of world heritage sites<sup>4</sup> and therefore the UNESCO meaning of heritage would appear to be widely accepted.
- 2.3. UNESCO classifies heritage as cultural and natural. The remainder of the discussion in this chapter uses these UNESCO categories as a basis for developing a description of heritage items for the purpose of financial reporting.

### Cultural Heritage

- 2.4. Cultural heritage consists of man-made heritage items that could be either tangible or intangible. Examples of tangible cultural heritage include:
- (a) Monuments, archaeological sites, historic buildings, works of art, and scientific collections;
  - (b) Underwater cultural heritage, for example, buildings that are beneath the water or sunken ships; and
  - (c) Natural history collections such as collections of insects, or mineral collections.
- 2.5. UNESCO defines intangible cultural heritage as, what this CP will call, “knowledge-in-action”. To align with financial reporting terminology, this CP also considers “intellectual property” as a second type of intangible cultural heritage:
- (a) Knowledge-in-action consists of practices, representations, expressions, knowledge; and skills that are heritage items. Examples include languages, performing arts, rituals, and traditional craftsmanship.
  - (b) Intellectual property includes rights over recordings of significant historical events and rights to use culturally significant films.

---

<sup>3</sup> Article 1, 1954 *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention* defines “cultural property”, as does Article 1 of the 1970 *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*. Article 1 of the 1972 *Convention on Protecting the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* defines “cultural heritage” and “natural heritage”. Article 1, 2001 *Convention on Safeguarding the Underwater Cultural Heritage*, defines “underwater cultural heritage”. Article 2, 2003 *Convention on Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, defines “intangible cultural heritage”.

<sup>4</sup> 1972 *Convention on Protecting the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*

## Natural Heritage

2.6. Natural heritage covers natural features or areas. Examples include natural features such as mountains, naturally occurring rock formations, and bodies of water such as lakes or waterfalls.

### Heritage Item Identification Issues

2.7. Some jurisdictions have developed different ways to identify heritage items. For example:

- (a) Schedules or lists enshrined in legislation or regulation;
- (b) Criteria or principles enshrined in legislation or regulation;
- (c) A defined review and approval process, involving expert recommendation and independent review; or
- (d) A combination of two or more of the three approaches above.

2.8. However, reliance only on legislation that identifies specific items as heritage presents two potential problems:

- (a) A legislated list of heritage items could either exclude items that are, in substance, heritage items, or include items that are not, in substance, heritage items. For example, legislation may list only those heritage items that warrant special funding or a special level of protection, so that other heritage items are not listed.
- (b) A legislated list may not remain up-to-date. For example, “new” heritage items may be identified and not be captured by the list, because, after enactment of the legislation, they are:
  - (i) Purchased or received through donation;
  - (ii) Discovered, for example through excavations that uncover previously unknown heritage items or through reassessments of items that were not viewed as heritage items; or
  - (iii) Created, for example through construction of an iconic building.

2.9. Given these problems with legislated lists of heritage items, other sources of information are needed to provide comprehensive and verifiable information on whether items are heritage items, such as:

- (a) Expert knowledge;
- (b) Historical studies, research writings and media reports; or
- (c) Established policies, systems and/or structures, which indicate that an entity expects to hold and preserve the item for present and future generations as a heritage item.

2.10. Although there is a view that identification of heritage items should be based on legislation, global disparities in approach mean that developing a description of heritage items for financial reporting purposes is necessary. This description identifies the special characteristics of heritage items that distinguish them.

### Description of Heritage Items

2.11. Given the special characteristics of heritage identified in the UNESCO conventions, and the discussion above on a principles-based approach to identification of heritage items, the IPSASB has developed the following preliminary view:

**Preliminary View—Chapter 2.1**

For the purposes of this CP, the following description reflects the special characteristics of heritage items and distinguishes them from other phenomena for the purposes of financial reporting:

Heritage items are items that are intended to be held indefinitely and preserved for the benefit of present and future generations because of their rarity and/or significance in relation, but not limited, to their archeological, architectural, agricultural, artistic, cultural, environmental, historical, natural, scientific or technological features.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons.

2.12. UNESCO conventions include living plants and organisms within natural heritage. However, individual living plants and organisms cannot be held indefinitely and preserved for present and future generations, and do not meet the proposed description of heritage items. On this basis they are excluded from further discussion in this CP.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 2.2**

For the purposes of this CP, natural heritage covers areas and features, but excludes living plants and organisms that occupy or visit those areas and features.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons.

## Chapter 3, Heritage Items as Assets

### Introduction

3.1. This chapter considers whether heritage items could be assets for financial reporting purposes. The Conceptual Framework states that an asset is “a resource presently controlled by the entity as a result of a past event<sup>5</sup>.” This chapter discusses each of these three aspects (resources, control and past event) in the context of heritage items, focusing particularly on the resource and control aspects. Where an asset exists it must also be measurable, before it can be recognized in financial statements, and this is considered in Chapter 4.

### Heritage Items as Resources

3.2. The Conceptual Framework states that a resource is an item with service potential or the ability to generate economic benefits<sup>6</sup>. Service potential is the capacity to provide services that contribute to achieving the entity’s objectives, without necessarily generating net cash inflows<sup>7</sup>. Economic benefits are cash inflows or a reduction in cash outflows<sup>8</sup>, which may be derived from, for example, an asset’s use in the production and sale of services<sup>9</sup>. Heritage items appear more likely to be held for their service potential rather than their ability to generate economic benefits<sup>10</sup>. Therefore, the discussion below focuses primarily on service potential.

3.3. Public sector entities’ objectives can include providing services either directly or indirectly to individuals or institutions. The objectives of an entity holding heritage items may include, for example:

- (a) Providing access to heritage items directly to individuals (for their education, appreciation, etc.);
- (b) Holding heritage items indefinitely in a custodial capacity;
- (c) Preserving heritage items to benefit the whole community; or
- (d) Promoting heritage-related tourism.

3.4. Heritage items may also provide services that contribute to achievement of an entity’s objectives, for reasons other than their heritage characteristics. For example, a heritage building can be used as office space.

### *Heritage Items with Ability to Generate Economic Benefits*

3.5. Some heritage items may be able to generate economic benefits for the reporting entity. Economic benefits could arise, for example, through one or more of the following:

- (a) Use of the heritage item in the production and sale of services;
- (b) Sale of tickets to view the heritage items and/or sale of related merchandising; and
- (c) Loan or rent of the item to other entities.

---

<sup>5</sup> Paragraph 5.6 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 5.7 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>7</sup> Paragraph 5.8 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>8</sup> Paragraph 5.10 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> The Conceptual Framework refers to heritage assets in its discussion of service potential in paragraph 5.9.

### Control of a Heritage Resource

- 3.6. The Conceptual Framework states that: “Control of the resource entails the ability of the entity to use the resource (or direct other parties on its use) so as to derive the benefit of the service potential or economic benefits embodied in the resource in the achievement of its service delivery or other objectives<sup>11</sup>.”
- 3.7. An entity is likely to have the ability to control heritage resources when it can demonstrate some or all of the following:
- (a) Legal ownership—for example through a purchase document or deed of transfer, etc.
  - (b) Other enforceable rights given to an entity that give it the ability to access or deny or restrict access. For example, an entity might:
    - (i) Decide whether to set an entrance fee to a museum and deny access to those who do not pay the fee;
    - (ii) Prohibit the use of a public square for commercial purposes; or
    - (iii) Grant other entities limited reproduction rights to a heritage film or audio-recording.
  - (c) Direct the use of heritage resources to achieve the entity’s objectives, as discussed in paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4.

### Inability to Control Knowledge-in-Action Intangible Cultural Heritage

- 3.8. As explained in Chapter 2, one subcategory of intangible cultural heritage called “knowledge-in-action” consists of heritage items such as languages, performing arts, rituals, and traditional craftsmanship. These heritage items require continued use or enactment by living people to exist and be preserved for future generations. They fall into the description of a heritage item, but they cannot be controlled by a single entity. This is because an entity cannot gain legal ownership over people’s on-going enactment of this type of cultural heritage, cannot restrict or deny access, cannot use the resource to achieve its objectives (except in the sense that something such as a shared language is a resource for everyone’s use) and it is impossible to hold an enforceable right to service potential or the ability to generate economic benefits arising from this type of heritage item. Knowledge-in-action intangible cultural heritage is “owned” by a whole community. Therefore, because it cannot be controlled by an entity, this type of intangible cultural heritage does not meet the definition of an asset.

### Past Event for Present Control over Heritage Resources

- 3.9. The Conceptual Framework describes the type of past event that could indicate that the entity presently controls a resource<sup>12</sup>. Past events that could indicate that an entity controls a heritage resource include:
- (a) Purchase from an external party;
  - (b) Receipt through a non-exchange transaction such as donation, confiscation or nationalization;

---

<sup>11</sup> Paragraph 5.11 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>12</sup> Paragraph 5.13 of the Conceptual Framework.

- (c) Passing of legislation and/or signing of treaties (supported by international law) that establish a government's rights to heritage items, including rights over otherwise unclaimed lands of natural significance or otherwise contested lands, waterways and/or bodies of water; and
- (d) Construction or development.

### **Heritage Items as Assets**

3.10. From the discussion in this chapter it appears that, drawing on the Conceptual Framework, the special characteristics of heritage items<sup>13</sup> do not prevent them being:

- (a) Resources;
- (b) Presently controlled by an entity;
- (c) As a result of a past event.

3.11. The IPSASB has therefore developed the following preliminary view:

#### **Preliminary View—Chapter 3**

The special characteristics of heritage items do not prevent them from being considered as assets for the purposes of financial reporting.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons.

3.12. The next chapter will consider whether heritage assets can be measured and recognized for the purposes of financial reporting.

---

<sup>13</sup> Chapter 2's description of heritage items describes the special characteristics of heritage items that distinguish them from other phenomena for the purposes of financial reporting.

## Chapter 4, Recognition and Initial Measurement of Heritage Assets

### Introduction

4.1. This chapter draws on the guidance in the Conceptual Framework to evaluate whether heritage items can meet the recognition criteria for assets. Chapter 3 concluded that the special characteristics of heritage items do not prevent them from being considered as assets, which is the first criterion for recognition. Therefore, this chapter focuses on the second recognition criterion, measurability at initial recognition<sup>14</sup>. Subsequent measurement is considered in Chapter 5.

### Recognition in the Conceptual Framework

4.2. Recognition is the process of incorporating and including an item in amounts displayed on the face of the appropriate financial statement<sup>15</sup>. The recognition criteria are that:

- (a) An item satisfies the definition of an element; and
- (b) Can be measured in a way that achieves the qualitative characteristics and takes account of constraints on information in GPFs<sup>16</sup>.

4.3. The Conceptual Framework states that measurement involves<sup>17</sup>.

- (a) Attachment of a monetary value to the item;
- (b) Choice of an appropriate measurement basis that meets the measurement objective; and
- (c) Determination of whether the measurement of the item achieves the qualitative characteristics, taking into account the constraints on information in GPFs, including that the measurement is sufficiently relevant and faithfully representative for the item to be recognized in the financial statements.

4.4. The objective of measurement is to select those measurement bases that most fairly reflect the cost of services, operational capacity and financial capacity of the entity in a manner that is useful in holding the entity to account, and for decision-making purposes<sup>18</sup>.

### Heritage Assets and the Measurement Objective

4.5. The following paragraphs discuss the measurement objective in the context of heritage assets.

#### *Cost of Services*

4.6. An entity's cost of services should reflect the amount of resources expended to acquire, develop and preserve heritage assets used in the provision of services. While many heritage assets are used to provide services but are not 'consumed' (e.g. conservation land, museum collections and art), some heritage assets may depreciate such that those costs could also be relevant. Where heritage assets are being used over time (e.g. buildings) or faithfully restored or purchased to build a current

---

<sup>14</sup> This chapter's discussion of initial recognition focuses on an entity's initial recognition on acquisition of heritage items rather than initial recognition on first time adoption of accrual basis IPSASs.

<sup>15</sup> Paragraph 6.1 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>16</sup> Paragraph 6.2 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>17</sup> Paragraph 6.7 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>18</sup> Paragraph 7.2 of the Conceptual Framework.

collection, the initial asset expenditure is important and does provide useful information about the cost of services.

*Operational capacity*

- 4.7. By assigning an appropriate monetary value to heritage assets<sup>19</sup>, the resulting information may be useful for users' assessments of the resources required to provide services and available for the entity's operations, which include delivery of services in future periods. Operational capacity relates to a range of services, as discussed in Chapter 3 (paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4)<sup>20</sup>.

*Financial capacity*

- 4.8. Heritage assets can appreciate in value over time or generate cash flows through, for example, access fees, and thereby contribute to an entity's financial capacity. Information on the monetary value of heritage assets could also be viewed as relevant to assessments of the entity's financial position. Inclusion of such information can provide information that is more faithfully representative of financial capacity.
- 4.9. Heritage assets' contribution to an entity's financial capacity may not be the primary focus for users, because heritage assets are not normally expected to raise funds through sale or as security for borrowings. In many situations the generation of cash will not have a direct relationship (or even any relationship) with the monetary value of the heritage assets. Where heritage assets cannot be sold and the cash they generate for the entity is much less than their monetary value some would argue that their measurement and recognition will overstate an entity's financial capacity.

Measurement of Heritage Assets and their Symbolic Value

- 4.10. Some argue that a monetary value cannot show the value of heritage assets, which is their heritage significance. From this perspective, either a monetary value understates the heritage assets' value in terms of service potential<sup>21</sup> or incorrectly implies that heritage significance can be represented with a monetary value. These are the arguments in favor of a "symbolic value" for heritage assets, which could be one currency unit.

**Measurement Bases**

- 4.11. The Conceptual Framework provides guidance on the selection of a measurement basis, rather than proposing a single measurement basis (or combination of bases) for all transactions, events and conditions. It identifies the following measurement bases for assets<sup>22</sup>.
- (a) Historical cost;
  - (b) Market value;

---

<sup>19</sup> Chapter 5 discusses subsequent expenditure. The same arguments for assignment of a monetary value are expected to apply to subsequent expenditure on heritage assets, where subsequent expenditure meets recognition criteria or, at standards level, specific criteria (appropriate to the type of asset) for capitalization versus expense.

<sup>20</sup> The Conceptual Framework describes operational capacity as "the physical and other resources currently available to support the provision of services in future periods" (paragraph 2.11) and "the capacity of the entity to support the provision of services in future periods through physical and other resources" (paragraph 7.3).

<sup>21</sup> The IPSASB's Public Sector Measurement Project is expected to consider measurement of service potential as one part of a broad consideration of measurement in IPSASs. Its recommendations could have implications for the valuation of heritage assets.

<sup>22</sup> Chapter 7 of the Conceptual Framework.

- (c) Replacement cost;
  - (d) Net selling price; and
  - (e) Value in use.
- 4.12. This section discusses the five measurement bases noted above, in the context of heritage assets, considering whether the resulting information is relevant to assessments of the cost of services, operational capacity and financial capacity.

*Historical Cost*

- 4.13. The Conceptual Framework describes historical cost information as relevant to assessments of cost of services, operational capacity and financial capacity, and as often being straightforward to apply, because information on the cost at acquisition is usually readily available.
- 4.14. Historical cost is likely to be available to measure heritage assets that have been purchased recently. Where historical cost information is unavailable – because, for example, heritage assets were acquired through a donation – or historical cost information has been lost, another measurement basis such as market value or replacement cost may be obtainable.
- 4.15. Where historical cost information is available but so old that it may not provide relevant information for achievement of the measurement objective, other measurement bases may be more appropriate.
- 4.16. Some take the view that there are cases where initial historical cost is zero; for example where an asset was fully depreciated before being categorized as a heritage asset and transferred to the entity, or where an entity obtains a natural heritage asset without consideration. In such cases if the controlling entity intends to incur subsequent capital expenditure, which is not separable from the underlying asset, they propose that a nominal cost of one currency unit should be used at initial recognition.
- 4.17. Those who support this approach consider that it provides useful information. They consider that this approach differs from symbolic value and is consistent with an historical cost approach. Those who do not support this approach argue that it does not provide information that is useful for decision-making and accountability purposes.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 4.1**

Do you support initially recognizing heritage assets at a nominal cost of one currency unit where historical cost is zero, such as when an asset was fully depreciated before being categorized as a heritage asset and transferred to the entity, or an entity obtains a natural heritage asset without consideration?

If so, please provide your reasons.

*Market Value*

- 4.18. Market values will be available for some heritage assets, through reference to the market values of similar items, if an active, open and orderly market exists. A market value generally supports information about operational and financial capacity.
- 4.19. However, market values in an active, open and orderly market may not be available in some circumstances. Many heritage assets have restrictions on their sale and/or disposal, which reduces the availability of market values. Where heritage assets are unique meaningful market values are unlikely to be available for them. Some heritage items, such as artwork and items of archeological

significance, are bought and sold through specialist markets, including auction houses. However, the market may not be sufficiently active, open and orderly to generate representationally faithful market values. Therefore, market values could be inappropriate in these circumstances.

#### *Replacement Cost*

- 4.20. The Conceptual Framework defines replacement cost to be the “optimized depreciated replacement cost”, which is: “The most economic cost required for the entity to replace the service potential of an asset<sup>23</sup>.”
- 4.21. Replacement cost relies on the existence of other assets that would provide the same service potential as the heritage asset being valued. Where a replacement cost is available for heritage assets, it could provide useful information for assessments of cost of services, operational and financial capacity. For heritage assets used in an entity’s operations, replacement costs that reflect their value in terms of their operational use appear likely to be available and relevant. For example, a replacement cost for a heritage building used as office space could be found through reference to market values of other office buildings of a similar size and functionality. However, a replacement cost will not be available for some heritage assets, because they are irreplaceable.
- 4.22. The Conceptual Framework notes that there may be cases where replacement cost equates to estimated reproduction cost, because the most economical way of replacing service potential is to reproduce the asset<sup>24</sup>. Restoration would aim to reproduce, as closely as possible, the heritage aspects of the original item. Restoration cost could be more relevant when optimized replacement cost could be inappropriate, because the heritage asset’s service potential is embodied in heritage aspects such as a historic appearance, rather than in an optimized modern equivalent.

#### *Net Selling Price*

- 4.23. The Conceptual Framework describes net selling price as being useful where the most resource-efficient course available to the entity is to sell the asset. It is not an appropriate measurement base if the entity is expected to be able to use the resource more efficiently by employing it in another way, for example by using it in the delivery of services.
- 4.24. Heritage assets are expected to be held and preserved rather than sold, and their value usually relates to their service potential<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, net selling price generally does not provide relevant measurement information for heritage assets. However, if an entity is able to sell its heritage assets and plans to do so, net selling price may be an appropriate measurement base.

#### *Value in Use*

- 4.25. The Conceptual Framework explains that value in use is appropriate where it is less than the replacement cost of the resource and greater than the net selling price. The operationalization of value in use for non-cash-generating assets involves the use of replacement cost as a surrogate. Many heritage assets are non-cash-generating assets, so in these cases value-in-use would be equivalent to replacement cost.

---

<sup>23</sup> Paragraphs 7.40, 7.47 and footnote 14 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>24</sup> Footnote 14 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>25</sup> Arguably, where an entity does not intend to hold heritage items indefinitely they cease to meet the special characteristics of heritage items, and accounting for them would be covered by existing IPSAS.

## Measurement and the Qualitative Characteristics and Constraints

4.26. This section considers whether heritage items' special characteristics<sup>26</sup> have implications for the ability to measure heritage assets in a way that achieves the qualitative characteristics and takes account of the constraints on information in GPFRs. The qualitative characteristics of information included in GPFRs of public sector entities are relevance, faithful representation, understandability, timeliness, comparability, and verifiability. Pervasive constraints on information included in GPFRs are materiality, cost-benefit, and achieving an appropriate balance between the qualitative characteristics.

### *Relevance and Representational Faithfulness of Monetary Values on Heritage Assets*

4.27. The Conceptual Framework explains that information is relevant if it is capable of making a difference in achieving the objectives of financial reporting. Information is capable of making a difference when it has confirmatory value, predictive value, or both. Information on the monetary value of heritage assets that entities hold supports users' ability to make decisions about entities' resources and hold entities accountable for their stewardship of heritage assets. Therefore, such information appears likely to achieve the qualitative characteristics of relevance. Monetary values for heritage assets also appear likely to provide information that supports users' assessments of entities' operational capacity and cost of services. The extent to which monetary values for heritage assets achieve the qualitative characteristic of representational faithfulness depends on the choice of measurement bases combined with other factors. For example, initial monetary values are likely to be representationally faithful in these circumstances<sup>27</sup>:

- (a) *Historical cost*: Where transaction information is available;
- (b) *Replacement cost*: Where replacement cost can be estimated simply and subjective judgments are not required; and
- (c) *Market value*: Where values are determined in an open, active and orderly markets<sup>28</sup>.

4.28. However, as noted in paragraph 4.10 above, some argue that the heritage significance of heritage assets cannot be represented by monetary values, because monetary values do not convey their value. From that perspective monetary values either do not provide relevant information or the information provided is not representationally faithful.

### *Understandability of Monetary Values on Heritage Assets*

4.29. Understandability is the quality of information that enables users to comprehend its meaning<sup>29</sup>. Monetary values for heritage assets appear more likely in many cases to provide understandable information to users, than would an absence of monetary values. Some may argue that monetary values for heritage assets could confuse users because there are often ethical, legal and/or statutory restrictions or prohibitions that restrict or prevent sale, transfer or destruction by the holder or owner of heritage assets. Disclosures on heritage asset restrictions and/or their special nature can be used

---

<sup>26</sup> Chapter 2's description of heritage items describes the special characteristics of heritage items that distinguish them from other phenomena for the purposes of financial reporting.

<sup>27</sup> This paragraph applies the discussion of measurement bases and their achievement of the qualitative characteristics in Chapter 7 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>28</sup> Paragraph 7.28 of the Conceptual Framework describes the characteristics of open, active and orderly markets.

<sup>29</sup> Paragraph 3.17 & 3.18 of the Conceptual Framework.

to further support users' understanding of the information reported. Similar restrictions on other types of assets do not prevent their recognition.

*Timeliness, Comparability and Verifiability*

- 4.30. Timeliness means having information available for users before it loses its capacity to be useful for accountability and decision-making purposes<sup>30</sup>. Comparability is the quality of information that enables users to identify similarities in, and differences between, two sets of phenomena<sup>31</sup>. Verifiability is the quality of information that helps assure users that information in GPFRs faithfully represents the economic and other phenomena that it purports to represent<sup>32</sup>.
- 4.31. The special characteristics of heritage items do not appear to raise issues additional to those identified in the Conceptual Framework for timeliness, comparability and verifiability of monetary values applying historical cost, replacement cost and market value. However, some may argue that monetary values attached to heritage assets could be difficult to verify.

*Materiality*

- 4.32. The Conceptual Framework explains that information is material if its omission or misstatement could influence the discharge of accountability by the entity, or the decisions that users make on the basis of the entity's GPFRs prepared for that reporting period. Materiality depends on both the nature and amount of the item judged in the particular circumstances of each entity. The Conceptual Framework does not specify a uniform quantitative threshold at which a particular type of information becomes material<sup>33</sup>. An entity will need to consider the materiality of their heritage asset holdings in the context of the legislative, institutional and operating environment within which it operates and prepares its GPFRs.

*Cost-Benefit*

- 4.33. The Conceptual Framework states that "Financial reporting imposes costs. The benefits of financial reporting should justify those costs"<sup>34</sup>.
- 4.34. Benefits of recognizing heritage assets in the Statement of Financial Position include:
- (a) Supports users' ability to:
    - (i) Hold the entity accountable for its heritage assets; and
    - (ii) Make decisions relevant to the entity as a whole and its heritage-related responsibilities;
  - (b) Provides relevant information to users of financial statements that helps them gain an overview of the financial position and performance of the entity, and which could also assist in driving improvements in an entity's performance management; and
  - (c) Improved asset accountability and management, including better identification of preservation priorities.

---

<sup>30</sup> Paragraph 3.19 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>31</sup> Paragraph 3.21 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>32</sup> Paragraph 3.26 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>33</sup> Paragraph 3.32 to 3.34 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>34</sup> Paragraph 3.35 of the Conceptual Framework.

- 4.35. It may be relatively straightforward to obtain monetary values, for example, when:
- (a) Heritage assets have been purchased recently or components of heritage assets have been replaced recently, so that a transaction is identifiable and the cost at acquisition is known;
  - (b) Replacement costs are available to value heritage assets that are also operational assets; or
  - (c) An active market exists.
- 4.36. Jurisdictions and entities have argued that the cost-benefit constraint could be a factor against attaching a monetary value to heritage assets. In this view, carrying out heritage asset valuations may be a costly exercise, and not justified by the benefits of the information for users. Specifically, those that hold this view argue that:
- (a) Disclosure of units and other information can provide appropriate accountability over heritage assets; and
  - (b) Benefits of assigning a monetary value to heritage assets are frequently limited, for example, where monetary values:
    - i. Are not used in decision-making related to heritage assets, including preservation, or
    - ii. May not represent relevant or meaningful information to users.
- 4.37. Others argue that the cost concerns commonly cited are either:
- (a) Similar to costs applicable to other assets that are, nonetheless, measured for recognition, because the benefits of recognition are viewed as justifying the costs; or
  - (b) Arise in the context of first time adoption of accrual basis financial reporting, when the cost of recognizing assets generally, not only heritage assets, can be viewed as very high.
- 4.38. Some jurisdictions respond to the cost-benefit constraint by assigning a one currency unit value to heritage items. Supporters of this approach point out that, in the case of very ancient assets measured on a historical cost basis, this approach is the only way to include them in the accounts without overstating the monetary value. Others consider that it provides useful information to users of financial statements and facilitates:
- (a) Asset management; and
  - (b) Recognition of subsequent capital expenditure.
- 4.39. However, during development of the Conceptual Framework the majority of the IPSASB concluded that this approach, which assigns a symbolic value to the asset, does not meet the measurement objective, because it does not provide information for the assessment of cost of services, operational capacity or financial capacity<sup>35</sup>.

### **Recognition and Initial Measurement of Heritage Assets**

- 4.40. Based on the discussion above, the IPSASB has concluded that in many cases it is possible to assign monetary values to those heritage items that meet the definition of an asset, and that there are benefits to both users and public sector entities by so doing. The measurement bases available to entities are likely to be restricted to historical cost, market value and replacement cost (where replacement cost includes restoration cost), each of which provides information relevant to an

---

<sup>35</sup> Paragraphs BC7.40-BC7.41.

assessment of one or more of the measurement objectives (cost of services, operational capacity and financial capacity). The IPSASB has therefore reached the following Preliminary Views, and requests constituents' comments on these and the related Specific Matters for Comment.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 4.1**

Heritage assets should be recognized in the statement of financial position if they meet the recognition criteria in the Conceptual Framework.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 4.2**

Are there heritage-related situations (or factors) in which heritage assets should not initially be recognized and/or measured because:

- (a) It is not possible to assign a relevant and verifiable monetary value; or
- (b) The cost-benefit constraint applies and the costs of doing so would not justify the benefits?

If yes, please describe those heritage-related situations (or factors) and why heritage assets should not be recognized in these situations.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 4.2**

In many cases it will be possible to assign a monetary value to heritage assets. Appropriate measurement bases are historical cost, market value and replacement cost.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 4.3**

What additional guidance should the IPSASB provide through its Public Sector Measurement Project to enable these measurement bases to be applied to heritage assets?

## Chapter 5, Subsequent Measurement of Heritage Assets

### Introduction

- 5.1. This chapter discusses the subsequent measurement of heritage assets. It builds on the IPSASB's preliminary views, reached in Chapter 4, that:
- (a) Heritage assets should be recognized in the statement of financial position if they meet the recognition criteria; and
  - (b) Historical cost, market value and replacement cost (where replacement cost includes estimated reproduction cost) are appropriate measurement bases for heritage assets, dependent on circumstances.
- 5.2. The discussion draws on the Conceptual Framework and existing IPSAS requirements for the subsequent measurement of non-heritage assets, on the basis that these illustrate approaches that could, potentially, be applied to heritage assets.

### Subsequent Measurement in the Conceptual Framework and IPSASs

- 5.3. During development of the Conceptual Framework, the IPSASB concluded that, in principle, the same considerations apply to initial and subsequent measurement<sup>36</sup>. Therefore, subsequent measurement:
- (a) Should achieve the qualitative characteristics, taking into account the constraints; and
  - (b) Has the objective to select those measurement bases that most fairly reflect the cost of services, operational capacity and financial capacity of the entity in a manner that is useful in holding the entity to account and for decision-making purposes.
- 5.4. IPSAS requirements<sup>37</sup> for subsequent measurement address entities' reporting of information on:
- (a) Subsequent expenditures related to assets, and the extent to which such expenditures should be capitalized or expensed;
  - (b) Consumption of tangible and intangible assets through depreciation and amortization, while allowing that some assets (for example, land) are not consumed;
  - (c) Impairment of cash-generating and non-cash-generating assets; and
  - (d) Revaluations of assets, where a revaluation model is applied.
- 5.5. Each of these topics is considered in the following paragraphs in relation to heritage assets.

### Subsequent Measurement of Heritage Assets

- 5.6. Once a measurement basis has been applied for initial recognition of a heritage asset, subsequent measurement in the form of (a) accounting for subsequent expenditures, (b) depreciation/amortization and (c) impairment, is facilitated through the existence of an initial measurement. For example, the initial monetary value of an asset is a starting point for adjustments for any subsequent expenditure. However, a change in measurement basis (for example, moving to

---

<sup>36</sup> Paragraph BC7.12 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>37</sup> IPSAS 17, *Property, Plant and Equipment*, IPSAS 21, *Impairment of Non-Cash-Generating Assets*, IPSAS 26, *Impairment of Cash-Generating Assets*, and IPSAS 31, *Intangible Assets*.

a revaluation model) may present the same issues as those raised at initial recognition (see Chapter 4).

#### *Subsequent Expenditure*

- 5.7. Entities could expend large amounts directly on preserving heritage assets. For example, parts of heritage buildings deteriorate; those parts need to be replaced, using similar materials, to maintain their historic character. The key issue will be whether such expenditure should be expensed or capitalized. Appropriate classification is important to provide users with relevant and representationally faithful information on expenses and assets for assessments of cost of services, operational capacity and financial capacity.
- 5.8. IPSASs apply a recognition principle, whereby subsequent expenditures are recognized, increasing the carrying amount of the relevant asset, if it is probable that they confer future economic benefits or service potential for the entity and can be measured reliably. For example, IPSAS 17 states an entity will recognize in the carrying amount of an item of property, plant, and equipment the cost of replacing part of such an item when that cost is incurred, if this recognition principle applies. The carrying amount of the replaced part is then derecognized<sup>38</sup>.
- 5.9. The special characteristics of heritage items<sup>39</sup> do not appear to have any particular implications for classifying subsequent expenditure as either an expense or asset.

#### *Depreciation and Amortization*

- 5.10. Many heritage assets deteriorate over time, although some, for example land and jewelry, do not. Heritage assets used in an entity's operations are likely to be consumed in line with those operations. Heritage assets held for their heritage significance are not expected to become functionally obsolete, because their heritage significance increases with age. Their useful lives can be difficult to determine, because the intention to preserve heritage assets for future generations suggests that they could be held in perpetuity or at least that their useful lives are significantly longer than those for non-heritage assets. Therefore, depreciation could be applicable to some (but not all) heritage assets and their components, to provide information relevant to assessments of cost of services and operational capacity.

#### *Impairment*

- 5.11. Heritage assets may be impaired, even though they are still intended to be preserved for future generations. Subsequent measurement that reflects impairment provides relevant information for assessments of costs of service and operational capacity.

#### *Revaluation*

- 5.12. This CP does not consider whether revaluation should be applied to heritage assets, but focuses on whether the special characteristics of heritage assets represent barriers to revaluation. When applying a revaluation model, entities will need to consider the pervasive constraints on information

---

<sup>38</sup> Paragraphs 14 and 23-25 of IPSAS 17.

<sup>39</sup> Chapter 2's description of heritage items describes the special characteristics of heritage items that distinguish them from other phenomena for the purposes of financial reporting.

included in GPFRs<sup>40</sup>, because these will affect the frequency with which heritage assets should be revalued. For example, from a cost-benefit perspective, the benefits of providing potentially more relevant information on heritage assets that have appreciated in value should be balanced against the costs of revaluation, which could be high for heritage assets.

- 5.13. After initial measurement at historical cost use of a revaluation model subsequently would require that market values and/or information for replacement cost will need to be available. As noted in paragraph 5.6, use of the new measurement basis will raise the same issues as those discussed in Chapter 4. Where the market value or replacement cost basis has been used for initial measurement, the same basis is likely to be available for subsequent revaluation.
- 5.14. Based on the discussion above, the IPSASB has concluded that the subsequent measurement of heritage assets can be approached in broadly the same way as for other, non-heritage assets. Subsequent measurement requirements for heritage assets will need to address changes in heritage asset values that arise from subsequent expenditure, consumption, impairment and revaluation, including the frequency of determining market value and their continued availability. Approaches in existing IPSASs are relevant to development of those requirements. The IPSASB has therefore reached the following Preliminary View:

**Preliminary View—Chapter 5**

Subsequent measurement of heritage assets:

- (a) Will need to address changes in heritage asset values that arise from subsequent expenditure, depreciation or amortization, impairment and revaluation.
- (b) Can be approached in broadly the same way as subsequent measurement for other, non-heritage assets.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons.

**Specific Matters for Comment—Chapter 5**

Are there any types of heritage assets or heritage-related factors that raise special issues for the subsequent measurement of heritage assets?

If so, please identify those types and/or factors, and describe the special issues raised and indicate what guidance IPSASB should provide to address them.

<sup>40</sup> Paragraph 3.3 of the Conceptual Framework.

## Chapter 6, Heritage-Related Obligations

### Introduction

6.1. The description of heritage items proposed in this CP indicates that they are items intended to be held indefinitely and preserved for the benefit of present and future generations<sup>41</sup>. This chapter discusses whether the intention to preserve heritage items could give rise to liabilities.

### Conceptual Framework, Liabilities and Present Obligations

6.2. The Conceptual Framework defines a liability as “a present obligation of the entity for an outflow of resources that results from a past event”<sup>42</sup>. A liability is recognized when an item satisfies the definition of a liability and can be measured in a way that achieves the qualitative characteristics and takes account of constraints on information in GPFRs<sup>43</sup>.

6.3. In considering whether an entity’s heritage preservation intentions might give rise to present obligations, the IPSASB had in mind the following types of events or transactions:

- (a) The receipt of funding for heritage preservation activities;
- (b) The receipt of services to preserve heritage items;
- (c) Legislation that requires entities to preserve heritage items (including penalties for failure to preserve heritage items);
- (d) Heritage items for which maintenance or preservation generally is needed because:
  - (i) They have deteriorated so that there is a demonstrable need to restore them;
  - (ii) Planned maintenance has been deferred; and/or
  - (iii) A need for maintenance is likely (foreseeable) in the future.

### Heritage-Related Present Obligations

6.4. An entity that holds heritage items is often viewed as having a moral duty to preserve them. However, this moral duty appears to be no different from that of, for example, maintaining infrastructure assets such as road networks or the electricity supply. A moral duty does not give rise to a present obligation and therefore a liability. A present obligation is either legally binding or non-legally binding, which an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid<sup>44</sup>. The Conceptual Framework states that an obligation must be to an external party in order to give rise to a liability<sup>45</sup>. An entity cannot be obligated to itself, even where it has publicly communicated an intention to behave in a particular way. Existing IPSASB pronouncements address obligations that could arise from the events in paragraph 6.3. It is unlikely that the types of events and transactions in bullet points 6.3(c) and (d) would, on their own, create a legally binding obligation.

---

<sup>41</sup> Chapter 2 includes the following description for heritage items: “Heritage items are items that are intended to be held indefinitely and preserved for the benefit of present and future generations because of their rarity and significance in relation, but not limited, to their archeological, architectural, agricultural, artistic, cultural, environmental, historical, natural, scientific or technological features.”

<sup>42</sup> Paragraph 5.14 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>43</sup> Paragraph 6.2 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>44</sup> Paragraph 5.15 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>45</sup> Paragraph 5.18 of the Conceptual Framework.

### Heritage-Related Outflows of Resources

- 6.5. A liability must involve an outflow of resources from the entity for it to be settled. An obligation that can be settled without an outflow of resources from the entity is not a liability<sup>46</sup>.
- 6.6. Holding heritage items is likely to involve outflows of resources over time. Given the ongoing expense of preserving heritage items for present and future generations, some have argued that a liability should be recognized to reflect these resource outflows, including deferred outflows, where deferral could be by comparison to an agreed cycle of maintenance or with respect to some other criteria. However, the ability to defer these outflows suggests that an entity does not have a present obligation for the outflow of resources.

### Heritage-Related Past Events

- 6.7. Possible past events relating to heritage preservation obligations might include when an entity:
- (a) Acquires heritage items;
  - (b) Makes a public commitment to preserve heritage items for future generations;
  - (c) Includes a heritage preservation objective (or other statement) in its publicly available planning documents;
  - (d) Creates a plan for resource outflows necessary for preserving heritage items;
  - (e) Receives an approved budget or an appropriation or other funding for preserving heritage items;
  - (f) Receives services for which payment is due.
- 6.8. Drawing on discussion in the Conceptual Framework, an assessment of each of these past events suggests that the entity appears likely to have alternatives enabling it to avoid an outflow of resources, with the exceptions of<sup>47</sup>:
- (a) *Receipt of funding*, if funding results in a performance obligation; and
  - (b) *Receipt of services*, if the entity has obligations (to pay for services received) arising from either a legal contract or other binding arrangement.
- 6.9. However, whether an entity has received funding or services related to heritage preservation, the arrangements are unlikely to differ from receipt of other funding with performance obligations or from any normal contract for services and there would appear to be no reason why the transaction should be accounted for in a different way.

### Heritage-Related Liabilities

- 6.10. The IPSASB acknowledges that there are many who believe that entities holding heritage items for the purposes stated in the description of heritage items developed in Chapter 2 have a moral duty to expend resources to preserve those items and to account for that duty as an obligation. The IPSASB

---

<sup>46</sup> Paragraph 5.16 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>47</sup> The IPSASB's Revenue and Non-Exchange Expenses project considers performance obligations. If funds contain conditions/performance obligations there is a present obligation to the resource provider until they are fulfilled. In such circumstances there is an obligation to an external party. Therefore it meets the requirement discussed in paragraph 6.4.

considers, however, that the special characteristics of heritage items<sup>48</sup> do not of themselves give rise to present obligations that would result in the recognition of a liability. The IPSASB has therefore reached the following Preliminary View.

**Preliminary View—Chapter 6**

The special characteristics of heritage items, including an intention to preserve them for present and future generations, do not, of themselves, result in a present obligation such that an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources. The entity should not therefore recognize a liability.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons.

---

<sup>48</sup> Chapter 2's description of heritage items describes the special characteristics of heritage items that distinguish them from other phenomena for the purposes of financial reporting.

## Chapter 7, Presentation of Information on Heritage Items

### Introduction

- 7.1. This chapter draws on the Conceptual Framework to discuss the presentation of information for heritage in GPFRs. It discusses whether the special characteristics of heritage items—the intention to hold them indefinitely and preserve them for the benefit of present and future generations, because of their rarity and/or significance—have implications for the presentation of information in GPFRs.
- 7.2. The Conceptual Framework states that the objectives of financial reporting are to provide information about the entity that is useful to users of GPFRs for accountability and decision-making purposes<sup>49</sup>. Presentation, defined as “the selection, location and organization of information that is reported in the GPFRs<sup>50</sup>”, is one of the means by which the objectives of financial reporting are met.

### Presentation Objectives for Information on Heritage

- 7.3. In Chapter 3 of this CP the IPSASB reached the Preliminary View that the special characteristics of heritage items<sup>51</sup>, as described in Chapter 2, do not prevent them from being considered as assets for the purposes of financial reporting. In Chapters 4 and 6 the IPSASB reached Preliminary Views that:
- (a) Heritage assets should be recognized in the statement of financial position if they meet the recognition criteria in the Conceptual Framework;
  - (b) In many cases it will be possible to assign a monetary value to heritage assets and historical cost, market value and replacement cost are appropriate measurement bases for heritage assets, dependent on circumstances; and
  - (c) The special characteristics of heritage items, including an intention to preserve them for present and future generations, do not, of themselves, result in a present obligation such that an entity has little or no realistic alternative to avoid an outflow of resources and should therefore recognize a liability.
- 7.4. The IPSASB concludes that the corollary of those Preliminary Views is that the special characteristics of heritage items (whether or not recognised as assets, with any associated liabilities), do not warrant presentation objectives specific to heritage. Rather, just as for any other revenues, expenses, assets and liabilities, an entity should present information in a way that meets the objectives of financial reporting, applying existing IPSASB pronouncements, including Recommended Practice Guidelines (RPG) where appropriate<sup>52</sup>.
- 7.5. Others take the view that the special characteristics of heritage items do require enhanced disclosures, to meet users’ need for information relevant to entities’ preservation of heritage items for present and future generations.
- 7.6. In line with existing IPSASB pronouncements, an entity considers materiality when deciding whether a line item for heritage assets should be displayed on the face of the financial statements and what

<sup>49</sup> Paragraph 2.1 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>50</sup> Paragraph 8.4 of the Conceptual Framework.

<sup>51</sup> Chapter 2’s heritage items description reflects their special characteristics of heritage items and distinguishes them from other phenomena for the purposes of financial reporting.

<sup>52</sup> The IPSASB has issued three RPGs; RPG 1, *Reporting on the Long-Term Sustainability of an Entity’s Finances*, RPG 2, *Financial Statement Discussion and Analysis*, and RPG 3, *Reporting Service Performance Information*.

information should be disclosed in the notes. If the entity applies one or more RPGs, it may also need to provide information in other GPFRs.

7.7 Information on recognized heritage assets might include:

- (a) The main types of heritage assets;
- (b) How heritage assets are measured, including impairment or other changes in measurement; and
- (c) Resource outflows and inflows as a result of holding, acquiring and disposing of heritage assets (for example through transfer or sale).

7.8 An entity could present information in its financial statements discussion and analysis or another GPFR to assist users to understand the:

- (a) Effect of the entity's holding of heritage items on its operational capacity, cost of services and financial capacity;
- (b) Extent of an entity's heritage holdings, encompassing any heritage items recognized as assets as well as unrecognized heritage items;
- (c) Extent of maintenance expenses; and
- (d) Nature of the entity's custodial responsibilities with respect to heritage and legislation that establishes such responsibilities.

7.9 Different entities have different portfolios of heritage items. Each entity will need to determine what information needs to be presented in light of the heritage items they hold and IPSASB pronouncements (IPSASs and, where applicable, RPGs).

**Preliminary View—Chapter 7**

Information about heritage should be presented in line with existing IPSASB pronouncements.

Do you agree with the IPSASB's Preliminary View?

If not, please provide your reasons and describe what further guidance should be provided to address these.

International Public Sector Accounting Standards, Exposure Drafts, Consultation Papers, Recommended Practice Guidelines, and other IPSASB publications are published by, and copyright of, IFAC.

The IPSASB and IFAC do not accept responsibility for loss caused to any person who acts or refrains from acting in reliance on the material in this publication, whether such loss is caused by negligence or otherwise.

The 'International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board', 'International Public Sector Accounting Standards', 'Recommended Practice Guidelines', 'International Federation of Accountants', 'IPSASB', 'IPSAS', 'RPG', 'IFAC', the IPSASB logo, and IFAC logo are trademarks of IFAC, or registered trademarks and service marks of IFAC in the US and other countries.

Copyright © April 2017 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Permission is granted to make copies of this work to achieve maximum exposure and feedback provided that each copy bears the following credit line: *"Copyright © April 2017 by the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). All rights reserved. Used with permission of IFAC. Permission is granted to make copies of this work to achieve maximum exposure and feedback."*

Published by:



**IPSASB**

**International Public  
Sector Accounting  
Standards Board®**

529 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10017  
T + 1 (212) 286-9344 F +1 (212) 286-9570  
[www.ipsasb.org](http://www.ipsasb.org)