



European Securities and
Markets Authority

Summary of Responses

Considerations of materiality in financial reporting





Table of Contents

Summary	3
I. Introduction	5
II. Overview of feedback received	6
A. Understanding, application and guidance in respect of the concept of materiality	6
B. Characteristics of primary users and the objective of financial reports	7
C. Attributes of the information	9
D. Errors, omissions, misstatements and aggregation	10
E. Accounting policy disclosure on materiality judgements	11
F. Note disclosures and materiality	12
G. Interim financial reporting and materiality	13

List of annexes to the paper

Annex I:	List of respondents
Annex II:	Number of respondents by question

List of abbreviations and acronyms used in this report

EC	European Commission
EECS	European Enforcers Coordination Sessions
EU	European Union
IAASB	International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board
IAS	International Accounting Standards
IASB	International Accounting Standards Board
IFRS	International Financial Reporting Standards
IFRS IC	International Financial Reporting Standards Interpretations Committee
ISA	International Standards on Auditing

Summary

In November 2011 ESMA issued a consultation paper entitled '*Considerations of Materiality in Financial Reporting*' to contribute to a consistent application of the concept of materiality in financial reporting. This summary of responses provides an overview of the views expressed by respondents to the questions in the Consultation Paper.


- The majority of respondents considered that the concept of materiality is generally well understood, but many respondents expressed the view that there is diversity in application. However, the user representative category was more divided on the issue with over half of those responding expressing the view that the materiality concept was not clearly and consistently understood.
- Diversity in application was a recurring theme raised by many respondents. This diversity was attributed to the exercise of management judgement, the separate perspectives of different stakeholder groups as well as challenges to proper application of the concept of materiality.
- Responses across most stakeholder groups raised concerns about the length of disclosures reaching the point where they could obscure readers' understanding of the entity's financial position and performance. Many respondents considered that proper application of the materiality concept could address this problem.
- There was widespread agreement among respondents that if further guidance was required in respect of the application of materiality, it should be addressed by the IASB, rather than by ESMA. Several respondents noted that the involvement of the IAASB would also be necessary.
- A majority of respondents expressed the view that there was no evidence of any significant divergence in practice in the assessment of materiality between financial reporting and auditing arising from different terminologies used in their respective standards. However, a number of the user representatives mentioned the need for greater consistency between accounting and auditing standards.
- Most respondents highlighted the role of qualitative as well as quantitative aspects in materiality assessments. Several respondents maintained that the qualitative and quantitative aspects of materiality judgements cannot be separated without driving a 'tick-box' mentality to its determination.
- The Consultation Paper provided specific examples of instances where an assessment of materiality may require particular consideration or where a materiality threshold may be lower. However, a common theme in the responses was that the provision of lists of items to be considered in materiality judgements was not considered desirable. This was because such a list could not be exhaustive, or alternatively that it was not in line with principle-based regulation and defeats the exercise of professional judgement.
- A majority of respondents agreed that the impact of all misstatement and omissions, including those of continued applicability which arose in earlier periods, should be assessed in determining

materiality decisions. A majority also agreed that uncorrected immaterial errors, aggregation of individually immaterial misstatements or omissions, netting of misstatements and accumulated misstatements should be considered in materiality assessments.

- There was little support for the inclusion of an accounting policy disclosure in financial statements in respect of materiality, with most respondents of the view that any such disclosures would become boilerplate, lacking entity-specific information. However, a number of user representatives did see merit in the provision of such information, either in the notes to the financial statements or as part of the report to the audit committee.
 - Most respondents were clearly not supportive of the view that the omission of required notes containing additional information about a material line item constitutes a misstatement. Those who explicitly supported the view outlined in the paper were all user representatives.
 - Amongst all stakeholder groups the vast majority agreed that when determining the materiality applying to notes which do not relate directly to financial statement items the same considerations should apply as in determining the materiality of financial statement items.
 - The majority of respondents were of the opinion that the principles to be applied in assessing materiality in interim and annual financial reports should be the same. However, many respondents share the view that, although the assessment should be the same, in practice it is not for several reasons (e.g. interim financial measurements rely more on estimates and interim financial statements have a different purpose as they are only intended to provide an update on the latest complete set of annual financial statements).
 - Given the range of views expressed and in order to further clarify the views ESMA has decided to organise a public roundtable on materiality in financial reporting where some of the issues raised in the Consultation Paper will be discussed. This summary of responses was prepared to facilitate discussion at the roundtable.
-

I. Introduction

1. Operating under ESMA the European Enforcers Coordination Sessions (EECS) is a forum in which all European national enforcers of financial information meet to exchange views and discuss experiences of enforcement of IFRS financial statements. A recurring theme of such discussions is the apparent differing views regarding the practical application of the concept of materiality amongst preparers, auditors, possibly users of the financial reports and, in some instances, accounting enforcers.
2. In November 2011, ESMA issued a consultation paper entitled '*Considerations of Materiality in Financial Reporting*' to seek comments from interested parties about their understanding of various aspects of materiality in an effort to contribute to a consistent application of this important concept in financial reporting. The broad range of respondents and thoughtful comments demonstrate the importance of, and interest in, this initiative.
3. The Consultation Paper objective was to seek views on the concept of materiality, and on the basis of answers that would be received, to consider the need for further developments in this area. The comment period closed on 31 March, 2012 with 50 responses received from a broad range of stakeholders (a list of the respondents grouped by category is provided in Annex 1 and details of the number of respondents to each question is provided in Annex 2). Given the wide-ranging implications of the issues raised in the Consultation Paper, ESMA was particularly pleased with the broad range of respondents.
4. This Summary of Responses provides an overview of the key messages from the responses received to the questions in the Consultation Paper. The views expressed offered valuable insights relevant not only to accounting enforcers, but also to accounting standard-setters, regulators and other stakeholders. The categories of respondents to the Consultation Paper are indicated in the chart below:



low:

Figure 1: Overview of respondents per category

5. ESMA believes that sharing what it has heard will be useful in stimulating further thinking and exploration of this very important concept. It will also provide a basis to begin the process of collaboratively working towards addressing some of the issues raised.

II. Overview of feedback received

A. Understanding, application and guidance in respect of the concept of materiality

6. In the Consultation Paper ESMA outlined the provisions of IFRS in respect of the application of the concept of materiality. ESMA asked:

Q1: Do you think that the concept of materiality is clearly and consistently understood and applied in practise by preparers, auditors, users and accounting enforcers or do you feel more clarification is required?

7. The majority of respondents considered that the concept of materiality is generally well understood, but many respondents expressed the view that there is diversity in application. However, the user representative category was more divided on the issue with over half of those responding expressing the view that the materiality concept was not clearly and consistently understood.
8. Respondents attributed this diversity in application to the fact that significant judgement is necessarily involved and that the concept is applied at the entity-specific level. Many respondents pointed out that differing judgements do not necessarily represent a lack of consistency, with more than one conclusion being valid. A number of respondents attributed differences arising in either understanding or application to the separate perspectives of the various stakeholder groups (e.g. preparers, auditors, regulators and users).
9. Failure to properly apply the concept of materiality to note disclosures was a common theme of the responses, with respondents noting reluctance to exercise judgement to exclude information from the financial report. Many respondents noted that when immaterial items are included in the notes, useful and material information could be obscured, making the financial report less relevant.
10. In respect of whether more clarification is required, views were split, with just over half of respondents either silent on, or not supportive of, the development of further guidance and the remaining responses evenly divided between those supporting further guidance on the concept of materiality generally and those supportive of further guidance only in respect of the application of materiality to note disclosures. Consistent with their view that the concept of materiality is not always clearly and consistently understood, a majority of the user representative category mentioned the provision of either additional guidance or greater consistency between accounting and auditing standards. Of those respondents that said that further guidance would be useful, a number clarified that such guidance should be general rather than prescriptive and should be issued by the IASB. This is discussed further in question 2 below.
11. Arising from the matters raised in question 1 of the Consultation Paper, ESMA also asked:

Q2: Do you think ESMA should issue guidance in this regard?

12. A large majority of the respondents considered that ESMA should not issue guidance.

13. The vast majority of respondents considered that if further guidance on the concept of materiality is deemed to be required, the IASB as the global standard-setter is the appropriate body to develop and issue it. Respondents were concerned that the issue of guidance by ESMA could give rise to an EU variation of IFRS which is not considered desirable in the context of the move towards global standards and would not assist with global consistency in application. Furthermore, such EU-specific guidance could cause difficulties for entities listed both within and outside the EU.
14. Several respondents suggested that the ESMA consultation is an important contribution and that ESMA could provide the IASB with the outcome of its consultation, raise its concerns with the IASB and contribute to any IASB project relevant to the issue.
15. While maintaining that ESMA should not issue any guidance in respect of materiality, in the event that ESMA was so minded, respondents cautioned against the provision of any rules-based, prescriptive requirements, which they considered would run counter to principled-based standards.

B. Characteristics of primary users and the objective of financial reports

16. In the Consultation Paper ESMA outlined that the definition of materiality in IAS 1, paragraph 7 puts emphasis on whether an item '*could influence the economic decisions that users make*', while the stated objective of general purpose financial reporting in the Framework is to provide useful information to aid user decision making about '*providing resources to the entity*'. ESMA asked:

Q3: In your opinion, are '*economic decisions made by users*' the same as users making '*decisions about providing resources to the entity*'? Please explain your rationale and if possible provide examples.

17. The responses to this question were mixed; half of the respondents to the question believed that '*economic decisions that users make*' is not the same as users making decisions about '*providing resources to the entity*' and the other half considered that the decisions are the same. The most cited elucidation by those who do not believe the decisions are the same was that decisions about providing resources to the entity is a subset of economic decisions.
18. An analysis of the responses by category follows the same pattern. Five out of seven audit firms believe there is no difference while a majority of user representatives and accounting bodies believe the decisions are not the same. Six out of eight preparer representatives did not answer the question.
19. In the Consultation Paper ESMA outlined that there are many stakeholders with an interest in an entity's financial reporting, including past and present employees. ESMA noted that the Framework states that the objective of general purpose financial reporting is to provide financial information about the reporting entity that is useful to existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors, who are termed the '*primary users*'. ESMA provided examples of the kind of decisions that primary users make, such as decisions about whether to buy, hold or sell an entity's equity or whether to provide loans or other forms of credit. ESMA asked:

Q4: Is it your understanding that the primary user constituency of general purpose financial reports as defined by the IASB and outlined in paragraph 13 of the Consultation Paper includes those users as outlined in paragraph 16 of the Consultation Paper? Please explain your rationale and if possible provide further examples.

20. A majority of respondents believe that the primary user constituents of general purpose financial reports as defined by the IASB (existing and potential investors, lenders and other creditors) do not include all those users as outlined in paragraph 16 of the Consultation Paper.
21. Many of those respondents believe that present and past employees are not primary users. Some indicate the employees might have conflicting information needs and desires that cannot be satisfied.
22. An analysis of the responses by category shows the following: the opinions of the accounting bodies are less split in this area with five out of six being of the opinion that the groups are not the same. Furthermore, three out of seven user representatives advocate the extension of the primary user group - by stewardship users (two) or credit rating agencies (one).
23. In the Consultation Paper ESMA explained that the assessment of materiality requires consideration as to whether an omission or misstatement '*...could... influence the economic decisions that users make...*'. ESMA asked:

Q5a: Do you agree that the IASB's use of the word '*could*' as opposed to, for example, '*would*' implies a lower materiality threshold? Please explain your rationale in this regard.

24. Most respondents to this question agreed that, in isolation, '*could*' and '*would*' do have different meanings. Use of the word '*would*' generally indicates a greater degree of certainty than the conditional '*could*'. For this reason, a few preparers indicated that preparers may not be able to judge explicitly what influences a user in his economic decision making and, therefore, that they prefer the expression '*could*'.
25. The vast majority of respondents, however, thought that the distinction between the two words exists only in semantics. In practice, they would not expect the usage of the two terms to give rise to any difference. Respondents noted that if it did, there would be many more modified audit reports in the accounts of IFRS issuers.
26. A small number of respondents thought it might be helpful if the terms could be clarified, but only in terms of the semantics as they did not see that any alignment would make any difference in practice.
27. A small number of respondents highlighted references in the IASB framework which discussed materiality in terms of being that which '*is capable of influencing the economic decision making of a user*' and which embraces, and is consistent with, the common understanding of '*could*'. Looking to the context in which the term is discussed, they advise against further interpretation.
28. A small number of respondents provided helpful explanation of both the history and discussion that there has been around the terms as applied by IASB, FASB and IAASB on this issue. Originally, there had been a perceived disconnect between IFRS and US GAAP. It was noted that IASB and FASB both now use the word '*could*' in their conceptual frameworks.
29. In the Consultation Paper ESMA noted that while the financial reporting assessment of materiality requires consideration of whether an omission or misstatement '*... could ... influence the economic decisions that users make...*', the auditing standards use the expression '*could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users*'. ESMA asked:

Q5b: In your opinion, could the inclusion of the expression ‘*reasonably be expected to*’ as per the Auditing Standards, lead to a different assessment of materiality for auditing purposes than that used for financial reporting purposes. Have you seen any instances of this in practice?

30. The majority of respondents felt that the terminology used gives rise to similar assessments and that specific reference to ‘*reasonably be expected to*’ would make no difference. Many pointed out that there is no evidence of significant divergence in practice, nor that the arguably different definitions in auditing and financial reporting standards give rise to different assessments. No respondent pointed to any evidence that there is such a difference.
31. Several respondents referred to text within IAS 1 – *Presentation of Financial Statements* supporting the definition of material within that standard. IAS 1, paragraph 7 concludes that the assessment of materiality needs to take into account how users could ‘*reasonably be expected to be influenced*’ by information when making economic decisions. The phrase from the auditing standards is, therefore, already embraced by the definition and guidance given within IAS 1 and no alignment is necessary.

C. Attributes of the information

32. In the Consultation Paper ESMA noted that materiality has qualitative as well as quantitative aspects. It was suggested that when considering a quantitative threshold in assessing materiality, the individual line item in the primary statement to which the item belongs should also be assessed when determining the materiality of the item in question. In order to gain the respondents’ views of the basis on which the quantitative analysis of materiality is established, absent consideration of any qualitative factors, ESMA asked:

Q6a: Do you agree that the quantitative analysis of the materiality of an item should not be determined solely by a simple quantitative comparison to primary statement totals such as profit for the period or statement of financial position totals and that the individual line item in the primary statement to which the item is included should be assessed when determining the materiality of the item in question? Please explain your rationale in this regard.

33. The vast majority of respondents focused on the need for the determination of materiality to be based on both quantitative and qualitative characteristics.
34. With only one exception, all respondents highlighted the fact that materiality is not a simple quantitative figure and that the qualitative aspects must take account of the specific facts and circumstances surrounding each item. It was highlighted that this requires professional judgment based on all relevant information. Several respondents believed that the guidance provided by the IASB is sufficient in this regard.
35. Because of the range of facts, circumstances and requirements that must be considered, many respondents argued that different materiality thresholds are applied all the time depending on the item under discussion.

36. Several respondents maintained that the qualitative and quantitative aspects cannot be separated and that to believe otherwise would drive a ‘tick box’ mentality to the determination of something which must, by definition, be decided by application of professional judgment.
37. Several respondents pointed to the US Securities and Exchange Commission’s Staff Accounting Bulletin: No. 99, *Materiality* suggesting that it provides some helpful guidance.
38. Two respondents answered the specific question that was asked, in terms of the quantitative assessment of materiality, believing that the matter was only material if the line item was also material to those financial statements.
39. In the Consultation Paper ESMA provided a list of examples where materiality judgements are usually particularly sensitive and thus where the adjudged materiality threshold may be lower. ESMA asked:

Q6b: Do you agree that each of the examples provided in paragraph 21 a – e of the Consultation Paper¹ constitute instances where the materiality threshold may be lower? Are there other instances which might be cited as examples? Please explain your rationale.

40. A number of respondents, spread across the range of categories, but with the specific exception of preparer and user representative bodies, argued that it was not appropriate to try and give a list of items where rather more judgment might be needed than in other cases.
41. They argued that a specific list defeats the exercise of professional judgment and undermines the argument that materiality is to be determined by consideration of attendant facts and circumstances and the application of judgment. Lists were considered to be unhelpful as they have a tendency to drive ‘tick-box’ compliance and detract from the need for consideration on a case by case basis.
42. Others suggested that the list was not exhaustive and other examples might be provided although they thought that in those given, there ‘may be’ rather more sensitivity around the determination of materiality than others but they were not at all convinced. They did not necessarily agree that the list was exhaustive or that the items referred to would require specific or particular consideration in every set of circumstances.
43. User representative bodies were more inclined to agree that the items listed would require a lower materiality level but also agreed that the list may not be exhaustive. A majority of the preparers and preparers’ representative bodies answering the question agreed that the list provided ‘may’ provide examples of instances where the threshold may be lower but emphasised that this would depend on the context and specific facts and circumstances attending. They argued that a qualitative consideration is always required.

D. Errors, omissions, misstatements and aggregation

¹ (a) breaches of legal and/or regulatory requirements;
 (b) transactions with related parties, including key management personnel’s compensation;
 (c) an unusual or non-recurring transactions(s)/balance(s);
 (d) an error that results in a reversal of a trend – for example, a loss being turned into a profit or *vice versa*; and
 (e) an error that impacts on ratios or other metrics used to evaluate, for example, compliance with debt covenants.

44. In the Consultation Paper under the subtitle ‘Errors, omissions and misstatements and aggregation’ ESMA listed some general situations where the assessment of materiality requires particular consideration, namely uncorrected immaterial errors, aggregation of individually immaterial misstatements or omission, netting of misstatements, and effects of accumulated misstatements. Based on descriptions of those situations ESMA asked:

Q7: Do you agree that preparers of financial reports should assess the impact of all misstatements and omissions, including those that arose in earlier periods and are of continued applicability in the current period, in determining materiality decisions. Please explain your views in this regard.

45. A majority of respondents agreed that preparers of financial reports should assess the impact of all misstatements and omissions, including those that arose in earlier periods. This majority sustained also among different respondent categories. Some respondents stated that current IAS 8 is sufficient for assessing these issues, including prior period’s misstatements. Some user representative bodies underlined that misstatements and omissions, even historic ones, are of particular importance since they raise questions not just about current reported numbers but about confidence in the future performance of the business.

46. Further to the matters outlined in paragraph 44 above, ESMA also asked:

Q8: Do you agree that preparers of financial reports should assess the impact of all misstatements and omissions as referred to in paragraphs 23 to 26 of the Consultation Paper¹ in determining materiality? Please explain your views in this regard and provide practical examples, if applicable.

47. A majority of respondents agreed that the impact of all misstatements and omissions as referred to should be assessed. This majority sustained also in different respondent categories. However, many respondents raised the concern that a kind of checklist is presented in the referred paragraphs, which is not in line with principle-based regulation. Some respondents added that no clearly trivial items should be included. Also, some respondents could not identify the difference between questions 7 and 8, and it is possible, therefore, that some other respondents responded to both as a whole.

E. Accounting policy disclosure on materiality judgements

48. In the Consultation Paper ESMA explained that materiality disclosures could be seen as being part of the IAS 1, paragraph 122 requirements with respect to the judgements made by management which have a significant effect on the amounts recognised in the financial statements. ESMA asked:

Q9a: Do you believe that an accounting policy disclosing the materiality judgments exercised by preparers should be provided in the financial statements?

Q9b: If so, please provide an outline of the nature of such disclosures.

Q9c: In either case, please explain your rationale in this regard.

49. Most respondents indicated that they were not in favour of including an accounting policy disclosing materiality judgements in the financial statements. In presenting the rationale for that, respondents indicated that there was a significant risk that such disclosures would become boilerplate (e.g. repeating the definition of materiality from the standard) and therefore, would not provide relevant entity-specific information to users. Alternatively, if such a requirement was to provide entity-specific information, it should be very detailed, but in such case it would become highly complex and difficult for preparers to draw the line and to articulate all judgements made with respect to different quantitative and qualitative consideration applied to the various items in the accounts.
50. Respondents from all categories made reference to IAS 1, paragraph 122 with respect to disclosures of management judgements which have the most significant effect on the amount recognised in the financial statements, indicating that materiality disclosures are covered by the above mentioned requirements.
51. Three user representatives indicated that such information would be useful for users of the financial statements. Having expressed a view in favour of presenting materiality disclosures, they indicated that such information was important for users in order to assess the key judgments made by the management, but suggested to include it either as part of the notes to the financial statements or alternatively as part of the report to the audit committee.

F. Note disclosures and materiality

52. In the Consultation Paper ESMA outlined that components of line items are a sub-category of the notes to the financial statements and stated that an assessment of the materiality of component line item disclosures is generally connected to the assessment of the materiality of the line item in the financial statements. ESMA further stated that omitting required notes giving additional information about a material line item may be considered a misstatement. ESMA asked:

Q10: Do you agree that omitting required notes giving additional information about a material line item in the financial statements constitutes a misstatement? Please explain your rationale in this regard.

53. With the exception of user representative bodies, the different categories of respondents uniformly answered the question raised by ESMA. The vast majority of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that omitting required notes containing additional information about a material line item necessarily constitutes a misstatement. Some respondents, although agreeing with the thrust of ESMA's argument, are of the opinion that the judgement of preparers and auditors is required in order to ensure that accounts are not overburdened by information which is only of minimal relevance. Consequently, those respondents share the view that a failure to provide a disclosure about an immaterial item would not be capable of representing a material misstatement.
54. Many respondents emphasised that the assessment as to whether the omission of a note represents a material misstatement requires a case-by-case judgement. According to many of those respondents, the judgement shall consider whether the omission would change the economic decisions of the users. Furthermore, several respondents are of the opinion that all quantitative and qualitative factors have to be considered when assessing the materiality of the omission. Some respondents expressed their concern that ESMA seems to favour an approach which would lead to a 'checklist' or 'tick-box' mentality.

55. Only three respondents explicitly agreed with the question raised by ESMA. All of them are user representative bodies.
56. In the Consultation Paper ESMA outlined examples of supplementary information included in the notes to the financial statements. It was noted that a number of notes do not relate directly to the financial statement items but are nonetheless of significance for the overall assessment of the financial statements of a reporting entity. ESMA asked:

Q11: Do you believe that in determining the materiality applying to notes which do not relate directly to financial statement items but are nonetheless of significance for the overall assessment of the financial statements of a reporting entity:

(a) the same considerations apply as in determining the materiality applying to items which relate directly to financial statement items; or

(b) different considerations apply; and

(c) if different considerations apply, please outline those different considerations.

57. Overall, the vast majority of respondents agree with (a): when determining the materiality applying to notes which do not relate directly to financial statement items the same considerations shall apply as when determining the materiality of financial statement items. According to more than 10 respondents, the critical consideration in that regard is the relevance of a note to a user, i.e. whether would the provision of a note cause a user to make a different economic decision.
58. However, several respondents share the view that while in principle the same considerations should apply irrespective of whether a note relates to financial statement items or not, in fact there are differences in practice. Audit firms in particular believe that, in practice, qualitative aspects are relatively more important than quantitative aspects in these cases.
59. Some respondents emphasised that a note should only be provided if it is deemed to contain material information in order to avoid information overload and the use of disclosure requirements in accounting standards as a checklist.

G. Interim financial reporting and materiality

60. In the Consultation Paper ESMA explained that in accordance with IAS 34 – *Interim Financial Reporting*, paragraph 23 the materiality assessment for interim financial reporting purposes shall be assessed in relation to the interim period financial data. ESMA asked:

Q12: In your opinion, how would the materiality assessment as it applies to interim financial reports differ from the materiality assessment as it applies to annual financial reports?

61. The opinions on this question were uniformly distributed amongst the different categories of respondents. The vast majority of the respondents were of the opinion that the principles for the materiality assessment in interim financial statements should be the same or are the same as in annual financial reports.

62. However, many respondents believe that, although in theory the materiality assessment should be the same, in practice it is not. The most commonly used explanation for existing differences was that interim measurements may rely on estimates to a greater extent (IAS 34, paragraph 23). Many respondents also emphasised that the purpose of interim financial reports is different to annual reports as interim reports are only intended to provide an update on the latest complete set of annual financial statements (IAS 34, paragraph 6). Only a few respondents clearly stated that this leads, in practice, to higher materiality thresholds compared to annual financial reports. Some other respondents put emphasis on the fact that materiality is determined in relation to interim period financial data (IAS 34, paragraph 23) without indicating whether this leads to lower materiality thresholds or not.
63. Whereas all preparers and auditors provided answers to this question, only two of the eight preparer representative bodies did so. The other respondents who did not answer the question were spread amongst the remaining respondent categories.

Annex I – List of respondents

This Summary of Responses aims to highlight the main messages stemming from the responses to the Consultation Paper. The comment letters are available on ESMA's website.

	Name of the respondent grouped by category
	Preparers
1	Barclays plc
2	BP p.l.c.
3	Deutsche Bank AG
4	HSBC Holdings plc
5	SAP AG
6	Standard Chartered Bank
	Accounting Bodies
7	ASSIREVI
8	FAR - the Institute for the Accountancy Profession in Sweden
9	Federation of European Accountants (FEE)
10	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW)
11	Institut der Wirtschaftspruefer in Deutschland e. V. (IDW)
12	Instituto de Contabilidad y Auditoria de Cuentas (ICAC) Spain
13	The Dutch Professional Accountancy Association (NBA)
14	The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland
15	The Joint Accounting Bodies, Australia
	Preparer representative bodies
16	ACTEO
17	Insurance Europe
18	Business Europe
19	Confederation of Swedish Enterprise
20	European Banking Federation
21	German Banking Industry Committee
22	The Hundred Group
23	The Quoted Companies Alliance
	User representative bodies
24	Association for Financial Markets in Europe
25	Association of British Insurers
26	Corporate Reporting Users' Forum (CRUF)
27	Eumedion
28	Hermes Equity Ownership Services
29	The Credit Rating Agency Observatory (CRAO)
30	CFA UK
	Academics
31	European Accounting Association
32	National center for accounting and auditing - Ukraine
33	University of Southern Denmark (SDU)
	Regulators and Public bodies
34	European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG)
35	SIX Exchange Regulation
36	Swedish Financial Reporting Board

	Name of the respondent grouped by category
	Individuals
37	Chris Barnard
	Standard-Setters
38	Austrian Financial Reporting and Auditing Committee (AFRAC)
39	Accounting Standards Committee of Germany (ASCG) DRSC e.V.
40	Dutch Accounting Standards Board
41	Norsk Regnskapsstiftelse (The Norwegian Accounting Standards Board), Oslo
42	UK Accounting Standards Board
43	Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB)
	Auditors
44	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited
45	Ernst & Young Global Limited
46	Grant Thornton International Ltd
47	KPMG IFRG Limited
48	MAZARS
49	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
50	BDO

Annex 2 – Number of respondents by question

The table below lists the number of respondents to each question.

As noted above, there were 50 respondents to the Consultation Paper. However, a number of respondents did not answer all of the questions posed, while others provided only general comments.

Where a respondent's general comments clearly address the substance of a particular question, they are included below as having responded to that question.

Question Number	No. of Respondents
Q1	45
Q2	47
Q3	36
Q4	36
Q5a	38
Q5b	30
Q6a	23
Q6b	36
Q7	38
Q8	38
Q9a-c	39
Q10	40
Q11a-c	37
Q12	36