

## **Invitation to Comment**

# Call for comments on the Exposure Draft *International Tax Reform – Pillar Two Model Rules: Proposed amendments*to IAS 12

Deadline for completion of this Invitation to Comment:

Midday, Friday 3 March 2023

Please submit to:

<u>UKEndorsementBoard@endorsement-board.uk</u>

#### Introduction

The objective of this Invitation to Comment is to obtain input from stakeholders on the Exposure Draft (ED) *International Tax Reform – Pillar Two Model Rules: Proposed amendments to IAS 12* (the Amendments), published by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) on 9 January 2023. The IASB's comment period ends on 10 March 2023.

#### **UK endorsement and adoption process**

The UK Endorsement Board (UKEB) is responsible for endorsement and adoption of IFRS for use in the UK and therefore is the UK's National Standard Setter for IFRS. The UKEB also leads the UK's engagement with the IFRS Foundation (Foundation) on the development of new standards, amendments and interpretations. This letter is intended to contribute to the IASB's due process. The views expressed by the UKEB in this letter are separate from, and will not necessarily affect the conclusions in, any endorsement and adoption assessment on new or amended International Accounting Standards undertaken by the UKEB.

### Who should respond to this Invitation to Comment?

Stakeholders with an interest in the quality of accounts prepared in accordance with international accounting standards.

1



#### **How to respond to this Invitation to Comment**

Please download this document, answer any questions on which you would like to provide views, and return it together with the 'Your Details' form to <a href="https://document-board.uk"><u>UKEndorsementBoard@endorsement-board.uk</u></a> by midday on Friday 3 March 2023.

Brief responses providing views on individual questions are welcome, as well as comprehensive responses to all questions.

#### **Privacy and other policies**

The data collected through responses to this document will be stored and processed by the UKEB. By submitting this document, you consent to the UKEB processing your data for the purposes of influencing the development of and adopting IFRS for use in the UK. For further information, please see our Privacy Statements and Notices and other Policies (e.g. Consultation Responses Policy and Data Protection Policy)<sup>1</sup>.

The UKEB's policy is to publish on its website all responses to formal consultations issued by the UKEB unless the respondent explicitly requests otherwise. A standard confidentiality statement in an e-mail message will not be regarded as a request for non-disclosure. If you do not wish your signature to be published, please provide the UKEB with an unsigned version of your submission. The UKEB prefers to publish responses that do not include a personal signature. Other than the name of the organisation/individual responding, information contained in the "Your Details" document will not be published. The UKEB does not edit personal information (such as telephone numbers, postal or e-mail addresses) from any other response document submitted; therefore, only information that you wish to be published should be submitted in such responses.

2

These policies can be accessed from the footer in the UKEB website here: https://www.endorsement-board.uk



## **Questions**

	moderrules. Do	you agree with this: I	lease explain why or w	ily flot.	
	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		
2.	Please include any comments you may have in response to question 1:				
Clic	k or tap here to er	iter text.			
3.	The UKEB's draft comment letter supports the absence of a 'sunset clause'. Do you agree with the absence of a 'sunset clause'? Please explain why or why no				
	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		
4.	Please include any comments you may have in response to question 3:				
	ok ar tan hara ta an	iter text			
Clic	k or tap here to en	iter text.			
Dis	closures in pe estantively ena	riods in which Pi acted, but not yet ft comment letter raise	llar Two legislation in effect es concerns about the concerns? Please exp	larity of draft	
Dis sub	closures in pe estantively ena	riods in which Pi acted, but not yet ft comment letter raise	in effect s concerns about the c	larity of draft	
Dis sub	closures in perstantively end The UKEB's dra paragraph 88C  Yes	eriods in which Pinacted, but not yet ft comment letter raise (a). Do you share these	in effect s concerns about the c concerns? Please exp	elarity of draft lain why or why no	

The UKEB's draft comment letter raises concerns that the disclosures required by draft paragraph 88C (b) may not meet the disclosure objective expressed at paragraph BC19, i.e. "to help users assess an entity's exposure to paying top-up tax", as effective tax rates calculated on an IAS 12 basis could be a poor proxy for those calculated on a Pillar Two basis. Do you share these concerns? Please explain why or why not.

#### Amendments to IAS 12 Draft Comment Letter—INVITATION TO COMMENT



	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		
3.	Please include	any comments you may	/ have in response to c	juestion 7:	
Clic	k or tap here to en	ter text.			
9.	88C (c) does no	comment letter notes to t provide a sufficient co se explain why or why r	orrective to 88C (b). Do		
	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		
10.	Please include any comments you may have in response to question 9:				
Clic	k or tap here to en	ter text.			
11.		ft comment letter recor ments in paragraph 88			
11.	detailed require provide informa recommendatio	ments in paragraph 88 ation sufficient to meet on? Please explain why	C with a more general the objective. Do you a or why not.	requirement to	
1.	detailed require provide informa	ments in paragraph 88 ation sufficient to meet	C with a more general the objective. Do you a	requirement to	
12.	detailed require provide informa recommendation	ments in paragraph 88 ation sufficient to meet on? Please explain why	C with a more general the objective. Do you a or why not. <b>No</b>	requirement to agree with this	
2. The to m ther resp	detailed require provide information recommendation Yes  Please include a UKEB's recommendation appropriate defore is properly toonse, the discloss	ments in paragraph 88 ation sufficient to meet on? Please explain why	C with a more general the objective. Do you a or why not.  No  y have in response to comple. It provides the fleected impact of Pillar ective. As set out in the pare not good proxies.	requirement to agree with this  Juestion 11.  exibility required Two and all de draft UKEB	
The to m	detailed require provide informate recommendation.  Yes  Please include and the appropriate defore is properly to bonse, the disclosurant of Pillar Two and the UKEB's drawing requirement should be reconjurisdictions has	ments in paragraph 88 ation sufficient to meet on? Please explain why any comments you may ndation is clear and sin lisclosure about the expargeted to meet the objures proposed in the ED	No	requirement to agree with this  Juestion 11.  exibility required Two and le draft UKEB for the expected general disclosure ary exception, but ents, once most	



Clicl	k or tap here to er	iter text.			
15.	The UKEB's draft comment letter supports the proposed requirement for entities disclose their current tax expense in relation to Pillar Two income taxes separately, once Pillar Two is effective. Do you agree with this proposal? Please explain why or why not.				
	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		
16.	Please include any comments you may have in response to question 15:				
Clicl	k or tap here to er	iter text.			
17.	drafted, the UK the objective of exposure to pa requirement its	B retain its disclosure r EB's draft comment let the disclosure require ying top-up tax" (ED/20 elf at paragraph 88C. D why or why not.	ter recommends that the ment, i.e. <i>"to help users</i> 23/01 paragraph BC19	ne IASB incorporates s assess an entity's ) in the disclosure	
	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$	
18.	Please include	any comments you ma	y have in response to c	juestion 17:	

As set out in the answer to question 11, the UKEB proposal provides the appropriate targeted disclosure required whereas the disclosure requirements for 88C(a), (b) and (c) do not. Retaining any part of these disclosures will not be good proxies for the expected impact of Pillar Two and could be misleading. It would be preferable if the UKEB response does not comment on the possibility of retaining the proposed disclosure requirements when, as set out in the response they are clearly deficient. It would be preferable if paragraph 19 in the current response is removed.

#### Disclosures in periods in which Pillar Two legislation is in effect

19. The UKEB's draft comment letter supports the proposed requirement for entities to disclose their current tax expense in relation to Pillar Two income taxes separately, once Pillar Two is effective. Do you agree with this proposal? Please explain why or why not.



	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No				
20.	Please include any comments you may have in response to question 19:						
Click	Click or tap here to enter text.						
Effe	Effective date and transition						
21.	The UKEB's draft comment letter supports the effective date and transition requirements. Do you agree with the support for these proposals? Please explair why or why not.						
	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No				
22. Please include any comments you may have in response to question 21:							
Click or tap here to enter text.							

# Thank you for completing this Invitation to Comment

Please submit this document
by midday on Friday 3 March 2023 to:
UKEndorsementBoard@endorsement-board.uk