Financial Reporting Considerations Arising from Current Global Economic and Geopolitical Developments

Extract, IFRS® Discussion Group Report on the Meeting – May 12, 2026

Background – Tariff Developments and Refunds

According to EY's March 2026 IFRS Resource "Accounting considerations for IEEPA tariffs and potential recoveries," the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on February 20, 2026, that the U.S. International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) does not provide the executive branch of government with the authority to impose tariffs. The ruling invalidated tariffs U.S. President Donald Trump imposed in April 2025 under the IEEPA on goods from Canada, Mexico, and China, as well as other global and country-specific tariffs. The ruling also invalidated the potential for tariffs in accordance with executive orders related to Venezuela, Russia, Iran, Brazil, and Cuba. The Supreme Court did not decide whether, and to what extent, importers may claim refunds of IEEPA tariffs already paid. Tariffs imposed by the administration under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 or Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 remain in place.

Further to the EY IFRS Resource "Accounting considerations for IEEPA tariffs and potential recoveries," the Trump administration has already invoked other available authorities to impose tariffs and maintain continuity in its tariff policy. Following the ruling, the 10 per cent global tariffs imposed by President Trump on most U.S. imports fall under Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974, which allows the president to adjust import duties for up to 150 days in response to trade imbalances. In addition to the tariff measures imposed under Sections 122, 232, and 301, other authorities include Section 338 of the Trade Act of 1930, which allows the president to increase tariffs up to 50 per cent or block imports if a trading partner is discriminating against U.S. goods or commerce.

On March 4, 2026, the U.S. Court of International Trade ordered the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to progress with the IEEPA tariffs refund process, noting, according to EY's March 2026 IFRS Resource, that "all importers of record whose entries were subject to IEEPA duties are entitled to the benefit" of the Supreme Court ruling that tariffs imposed under the IEEPA are unlawful. In a sworn declaration filed on March 6, 2026, U.S. CBP Executive Director for Trade Programs detailed, for the CIT's consideration, why immediate widescale resolution through liquidation (CBP's initial final determination of duties owed) and reliquidation (the statutory reopening and revision of entries that had already been finalized to remove duties imposed under the IEEPA) is operationally infeasible and described a new Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) refund process CBP aims to deploy within 45 days.

In a declaration filed on March 31, 2026, with the CIT, CBP reported that it had made material progress in developing a new Consolidated Administration and Processing of Entries (CAPE) functionality within ACE. This functionality enables the calculation and processing of refunds of tariffs imposed under the IEEPA. This CBP update provides more clarity on how the IEEPA refund process will operate (see the CBP webpage, “International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) Duty Refunds”).

According to the CBP IEEPA Duty Refunds webpage, on April 10, 2026, CBP announced that Phase 1 of the CAPE functionality would be operational in the ACE portal on April 20, 2026, enabling the processing of IEEPA duty refunds for entries that are either still open and not finalized (unliquidated) or have been finalized within the past 80 days. Entries that were liquidated more than 80 days prior are excluded from Phase 1 and are expected to be addressed in subsequent phases. Phase 1 refunds began processing as of April 20, 2026. At the time of this discussion, CBP has not announced a timetable for the deployment of Phase 2 of the CAPE functionality.

Issue 1: Is It Appropriate to Recognize an Asset at a March 31, 2026, Reporting Date for Potential IEEPA Tariff Recoveries?

Analysis

The recent Supreme Court decision limiting the use of IEEPA tariffs gave rise to potential recoveries of amounts previously paid on imported goods. These developments create the possibility of future economic benefits; however, realization depends on the implementation and operation of government-administered refund mechanisms and the entity’s ability to successfully submit and have claims accepted. At a March 31, 2026, reporting date, the refund process was still in development. The process was expected to be implemented in phases and was still subject to some administrative and legal uncertainty. Accordingly, while entities may expect potential recoveries, the existence and enforceability of a right to receive cash from a government authority for previously paid IEEPA tariffs may not have been firmly established in all cases as at March 31, 2026.

After March 31, 2026, CBP announced, as outlined on its IEEPA Duty Refunds webpage, that Phase 1 of the CAPE functionality would go live on April 20, 2026. The processing of Phase 1 refunds commenced as of that date. While the launch of Phase 1 represents a significant development in the implementation of the refund mechanism, it occurred after the reporting period.

View 1: At March 31, 2026, the tariff relief represents a contingent asset within the scope of IAS 37 *Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets*, and is recognized only when the inflow of economic benefit is virtually certain

Proponents of this view note that the potential recovery of IEEPA tariffs arises from past events but does not give rise to a present asset at the reporting date, as the existence of any right to recovery depends on uncertain future events that are outside the entity’s control.

IAS 37 defines a contingent asset as a possible asset whose existence will be confirmed only by the occurrence or non-occurrence of one or more uncertain future events. It establishes a high recognition threshold to prevent the recognition of income that may never be realized. Accordingly, entities do not recognize and record contingent assets until the inflow of economic benefits becomes virtually certain.

Proponents of this view think the Supreme Court decision, on its own, does not establish a sufficiently clear and enforceable right to a refund of tariffs previously paid. As at March 31, 2026, the Supreme Court had not ruled on refund entitlements, and further judicial and administrative steps remained ongoing. Although on March 4, 2026, the Court of International Trade directed CBP to proceed with a refund process and CBP outlined, through sworn declarations filed on March 6 and March 31, 2026, a proposed phased refund mechanism, that mechanism had not yet been implemented. Consequently, uncertainty remained at the reporting date regarding the timing, scope, and enforceability of any refund or reimbursement process. In particular, at March 31, 2026, uncertainty remains regarding the outcome of further judicial proceedings, the risk of appeal, and the design, approval, and implementation of any refund or reimbursement mechanism by government authorities.

At March 31, 2026, the potential tariff recovery is viewed as a possible asset whose realization depends on future legal, regulatory, and administrative actions. Under this view, entities should not recognize any asset until the refund mechanism is substantively in place and the entity's entitlement to recovery is no longer contingent. Nevertheless, when the potential tariff recovery is material, IAS 37 requires transparent disclosures describing the nature of the contingent asset, the significant judgments and assumptions applied, and the key factors that may affect the amount, timing, or likelihood of recovery. When an entity assesses an inflow of economic benefits as probable, paragraph 89 of IAS 37 further requires disclosure of an estimate of the financial effect, to the extent practicable. Such disclosures must be carefully framed to avoid giving misleading indications regarding the likelihood or timing of income.

View 2: At March 31, 2026, the tariff relief is an asset because it represents a right to a refund. This asset falls outside the scope of any existing IFRS Accounting Standard. Therefore, entities should apply the *Conceptual Framework for Financial Reportin*g (*Conceptual Framework*) and recognize an asset when the inflow of economic benefits is probable.

Proponents of this view think the potential recovery of IEEPA tariffs represents an asset at the reporting date because their recovery was triggered by past events. The *Conceptual Framework* defines an asset as a "present economic resource controlled by the entity as a result of past events." It defines an economic resource as a "right that has the potential to produce economic benefits." Proponents of this view therefore think this meets the definition of an asset because the contingent-asset guidance in IAS 37 does not apply.

Proponents of this view think the Supreme Court decision, together with subsequent developments up until March 31, 2026, provide a sufficient legal basis to conclude that entities have obtained a right to a refund of tariffs previously paid. In their view, any remaining uncertainty relates to the likelihood, timing, and mechanics of recovery, rather than to the existence of the right itself.

Proponents of this view think the potential tariff recovery is a present asset rather than a possible asset. Under this view, entities assess recognition and measurement by applying the hierarchy in paragraphs 10-12 of IAS 8 *Accounting Policies, Changes in Accounting Estimates and Errors* and the Conceptual Framework. Under this approach, the entity should recognize an asset when it is probable that economic benefits will flow to the entity and the amount can be measured reliably. The entity should address remaining uncertainties through measurement and disclosure rather than through deferring asset recognition until it achieves virtual certainty. The disclosure should address the significant judgments made as well as the sources of estimation uncertainty.

View 3: The accounting treatment at March 31, 2026, depends on the entity's assessment of the enforceability of the Supreme Court ruling

Proponents of this view think the accounting for potential tariff recoveries depends on an entity's assessment of whether, under the applicable legal framework, it had a valid and enforceable right to a refund at the March 31, 2026, reporting date. IAS 37 and the Conceptual Framework require an entity to assess the existence of assets and liabilities based on present rights and obligations, which may require judgment when enforceability is uncertain. Accordingly, the assessment focuses on whether the legal and regulatory developments give rise to a present right, a possible right, or no right to recovery.

The Supreme Court decision and subsequent court orders do not, in isolation, dictate a single accounting outcome. Instead, the analysis may differ depending on the processing status of an entity's tariffs, the risk of appeal, and the extent to which the relevant decisions are considered final and legally enforceable. An entity may conclude that the potential recovery represents no asset, a contingent asset (View 1 above), or a recognized asset (View 2 above), based on its assessment of its specific facts and circumstances. An entity should carefully consider and evaluate disclosure requirements based on its conclusion to ensure the financial statements reflect the entity's significant judgments and uncertainties.

The Group's Discussion

Most Group members supported View 1, as they thought that tariff relief meets the definition of a contingent asset in IAS 37 (i.e., a possible asset that arises from past events and whose existence will be confirmed by the occurrence or non-occurrence of an uncertain future event not wholly within the control of the entity). They noted that as of March 31, 2026, significant uncertainty existed regarding entitlement, timing, and approval of claims, making it difficult for entities to conclude that they met the recognition threshold under IAS 37. As a result, these Group members thought most entities should not recognize an asset at that date.

Some Group members supported View 2, as they thought that tariff relief does not meet the definition of a contingent asset and, instead, should be assessed using a probability threshold. Under this approach, an entity would recognize an asset when it determines that it is probable that economic benefits will flow to the entity and that it can measure the amount reliably. However, these Group members noted that significant uncertainty existed as at March 31, 2026, making it difficult for entities to conclude that they met the recognition threshold even under this approach.

Regardless of the approach applied, some Group members emphasized the importance of providing clear, entity-specific disclosures about the approach used, key assumptions, and how the tariff-refund process affects the entity. One Group member raised that IAS 37 clearly indicates that disclosures for contingent assets should not provide misleading indications of the likelihood of income arising.

Some Group members also noted that this discussion relates specifically to IEEPA tariffs and that entities should perform separate analyses for other tariff-refund arrangements, as differences in facts and circumstances could lead entities to different conclusions.

Issue 2: Should Entities Treat the Implementation of the CAPE Refund Mechanism as an Adjusting or Non-adjusting Subsequent Event for Periods Ending March 31, 2026?

Analysis

CBP's implementation of Phase 1 CAPE functionality on April 20, 2026, represents an event after the reporting period. In applying IAS 10 *Events After the Reporting Period*, entities should assess whether this event provides evidence of conditions that existed at March 31, 2026 (adjusting), or whether it is indicative of conditions that arose after that date (non-adjusting).

View 1: The implementation of a refund mechanism after the March 31, 2026, reporting period end is a non-adjusting subsequent event

Proponents of this view note that, as at March 31, 2026, the refund mechanism for IEEPA tariffs was still under development and subject to some administrative and legal uncertainty. While court decisions before period end indicated that refunds were expected, the ability of entities to submit claims and obtain cash refunds depended on the successful implementation and operation of a government-administered process that had not yet started nor existed before. As a result, any potential recovery at the reporting date did not give rise to a present enforceable right and, instead, met the definition of a contingent asset.

The commencement of Phase 1 processing through CAPE on April 20, 2026, represents the point at which the refund mechanism became operational, giving rise to new conditions after the reporting period. In the context of a contingent asset, an asset could only be recognized if, at the end of the March 31, 2026, reporting period, the entity could show that it was virtually certain that it would obtain a refund. Events after the reporting period that establish virtual certainty are non-adjusting events. Accordingly, the launch of CAPE Phase 1 would not affect recognition or measurement as at March 31, 2026, even though it may significantly increase the likelihood of recovery.

Under this view, entities would consider whether they are required to disclose the subsequent event to enable users of the financial statements to understand the nature of the development and, where practicable, its estimated financial effect. Entities would consider recognition in a subsequent reporting period once they meet relevant conditions.

View 2: The implementation of a refund mechanism after the March 31, 2026, reporting period end is an adjusting subsequent event

Under this view, the CBP's implementation of CAPE Phase 1 functionality on April 20, 2026, is an adjusting event in accordance with IAS 10. This view is based on the premise that the CAPE implementation provides additional evidence of conditions that existed as at March 31, 2026, rather than creating new conditions after the reporting date. Proponents of this view think the Supreme Court's decision and the CBP's various announcements through March 31, 2026, regarding the CAPE refund mechanism give rise to a present right to a refund of IEEPA tariffs previously paid as at March 31, 2026. Under this view, the launch of CAPE Phase 1 does not establish a new right but, instead, confirms a right that already existed at the reporting date. Proponents of this view think the CAPE implementation provides further clarity regarding the existence and realization of that right.

Under this view, the refund was not a contingent asset at March 31, 2026; rather, it was an asset. Consistent with IAS 10, events occurring after the reporting period that provide evidence of conditions existing at the reporting date require entities to adjust the amounts recognized in the financial statements. This includes the recognition or measurement of a receivable when an entity concludes that a present right existed at March 31, 2026. Under this view, CAPE Phase 1 may inform the measurement of the asset or the assessment of whether recognition criteria were met at the reporting date, rather than being treated solely as a subsequent non-adjusting disclosure event.

The Group's Discussion

The Group members who supported View 1 for Issue 1 also supported View 1 for Issue 2. They noted that CBP's implementation of CAPE Phase 1 functionality on April 20, 2026, is a non-adjusting subsequent event, as it does not provide evidence of conditions that existed on March 31, 2026, and does not establish virtual certainty of an entity's entitlement to the refund at that date.

Some Group members who supported View 2 for Issue 1 noted that subsequent developments may provide evidence of conditions that existed at the reporting date, which could support treatment as an adjusting subsequent event. However, several Group members observed that, given the high level of uncertainty on March 31, 2026, this distinction may not affect the outcome in practice, as entities would likely still conclude that recognition is not appropriate at that time.

Issue 3: How Should an Entity Classify and Present Tariff Recoveries?

Analysis

Entities may have capitalized IEEPA tariffs as part of the initial cost of assets, such as inventory or property, plant, and equipment (PP&E). Generally, it would be most appropriate for entities to record tariff recoveries in the same way they originally recorded them. Under this approach, entities would account for recoveries for tariffs they originally recorded in inventory or PP&E as follows:

Inventory: A reduction (i.e., credit) to the cost of the related inventory if still on-hand, or to cost of goods sold if the inventory has been sold to customers as at period end. Entities may need to evaluate their inventory turnover and costing method to determine the appropriate amount to record in inventory and the cost of goods sold.

PP&E: A reduction (i.e., credit) to the cost basis of the PP&E. Either of the following approaches are acceptable:

- Prospectively, by recording the full refund as a reduction to the carrying value of the PP&E and adjusting depreciation on a prospective basis.

- Cumulative catch-up, by allocating the refund between the carrying value of the PP&E and the reversal of previously recorded depreciation expense.

While generally it is appropriate to record tariff recoveries in this manner, other approaches may also be acceptable based on specific facts and circumstances. Entities should consider providing disclosures describing where the IEEPA tariffs and related tariff recoveries are recorded in the financial statements.

The Group's Discussion

The Group agreed with the analysis.

Background – Geopolitical and Global Economic Uncertainty

Geopolitical instability and ongoing global conflicts have continued to evolve in recent years, contributing to heightened economic uncertainty across global markets. These developments have had a pervasive impact on economic activity and financial markets, with direct implications for financial reporting.

A key consequence of geopolitical uncertainty has been increased volatility in energy and commodity markets, driven by factors such as supply disruptions, restrictions on imports and exports, and blockages of key shipping routes. These events have resulted in significant fluctuations in commodity prices contributing to elevated inflationary pressures across many jurisdictions. Higher commodity prices have affected entities through increased input and operating costs and changes in customer demand and pricing dynamics. Some of the key impacts arising from increasing commodity prices include, but are not limited to:

- increased cost of raw materials and energy;
- supply chain disruptions and delays in the availability of critical inputs;
- pressure on margins when cost increases cannot be passed on to customers;
- changes in demand for goods and services due to reduced consumer purchasing power;
- increased volatility in the valuation of financial instruments and derivative contracts; and
- heightened sensitivity of discount rates and valuation assumptions to changes in market-based inputs, including equity risk premiums.

In addition, entities should consider the broader and more persistent effects of commodity-price volatility on the global economy and financial markets. Many IFRS Accounting Standards require the use of assumptions that are sensitive to discount rates and market-based inputs, which may introduce heightened estimation uncertainty in the current environment.

Entities must carefully consider their specific facts, circumstances, and risk exposures when assessing how geopolitical uncertainty, rising commodity prices, and inflation affect their financial reporting. Financial statements and related disclosures should reflect all material impacts, including areas involving significant judgment and estimation uncertainty.

Standard setters and regulators have emphasized the importance of transparent, entity-specific disclosures in periods of heightened uncertainty. There is an increased focus on explaining how management has considered current economic conditions, including commodity-price volatility, when applying accounting policies and making key judgments and estimates.

Entities should provide clear disclosure of the impact on amounts they recognize, measure, and present in the financial statements, as well as the sensitivity of those amounts to reasonably possible changes in key assumptions such as commodity prices, and discount rates.

Rising commodity prices and the corresponding inflationary impacts may affect several areas of financial reporting, such as impairment assessments, deferred tax asset recognition, fair value measurements, and going concern considerations. Entities should consistently update changes in assumptions and estimates in these areas as new information becomes available and disclose when material.

Given the fluid and evolving nature of geopolitical risks and macroeconomic conditions, entities should continually reassess their judgments and estimates up to the date the financial statements are authorized for issue. Disclosures should be tailored to the entity's circumstances and provide users with insight into how management views current and expected impacts, including through the lens of heightened commodity-price volatility and broader inflationary effects.

Issue 4: Accounting Considerations of Geopolitical and Economic Uncertainty

Analysis

Geopolitical concerns and economic uncertainty around the world continue to impact entities globally and may give rise to a range of accounting considerations affecting both annual and interim financial statements. In particular, commodity-price volatility has contributed to broader inflationary pressures, with pervasive effects across financial statements, including increased estimation uncertainty and the impacts on measurement and disclosure.

Disclosures

Financial statement disclosure requirements will vary depending on the financial impact of current events. During periods of heightened uncertainty, there may be additional risks that the carrying amounts of assets and liabilities could require material adjustments within the next financial year. Accordingly, entities need to carefully consider whether additional disclosures are necessary to enable financial statement users to understand the judgments applied. IAS 1 *Presentation of Financial Statements* requires disclosure of information about assumptions concerning the future and other major sources of estimation uncertainty at the end of the reporting period that have a significant risk of resulting in a material adjustment to the carrying amounts of assets and liabilities (e.g., assets subject to impairment) within the next financial year. The nature and extent of the information entities provide will vary depending on the type of assumption and other circumstances. It may include:

- the nature of the assumption or other estimation uncertainty;

- the sensitivity of carrying amounts to the methods, assumptions, and estimates underlying their calculation, including the reasons for the sensitivity;
- the expected resolution of an uncertainty and the range of reasonably possible outcomes within the next financial year in respect of the carrying amounts of the assets and liabilities affected; and
- an explanation of changes made to past assumptions concerning those assets and liabilities, if the uncertainty remains unresolved.

Entities need to consider the level of volatility when determining the relevant sensitivity disclosures. That is, in times of high volatility, a reasonably possible change in assumptions will generally involve more significant changes than in times of low volatility.

An entity may have appropriately analyzed and concluded that it has limited quantitative exposure to a particular risk (e.g., dependence on commodities sourced from a geopolitically unstable region). In such cases, consistent with the IASB's November 2025 publication of illustrative examples on reporting uncertainties in financial statements, the entity is still required to assess whether information about the entity-specific and external factors considered in making that materiality judgment is subject to disclosure, taking into account the information needs of the primary users of the financial statements.

Forward-looking financial information

Geopolitical uncertainty and related macroeconomic volatility increase the importance of robust and consistent forward-looking financial information used in financial reporting. Projections, assumptions, and valuation inputs need to be applied consistently, must reflect conditions existing as of the reporting date, and based on reasonable and supportable assumptions that are internally consistent across the financial statements.

Entities are required to incorporate current market-participant assumptions, expected pricing trends, cost structures, and discount rates that reflect the prevailing economic environment. Forward-looking cash flow projections used in impairment tests, fair value measurements, and deferred tax asset recognition, should therefore incorporate the effects of commodity market volatility, demand uncertainty, and the corresponding inflationary pressures, when these factors are relevant at the reporting date.

Assumptions relating to growth rates, margins, commodity prices, and discount rates used should be aligned across all areas relying on forward-looking information. While entity-specific adjustments may be appropriate depending on the measurement objective (e.g., entity-specific cash flows for value-in-use compared with market-participant assumptions for fair value), underlying macroeconomic assumptions should be consistent across different accounting analyses.

Uncertainty around future cash flows may require using probability-weighted scenarios rather than single point estimates, particularly when outcomes are highly sensitive to commodity pricing or broader economic developments. Similarly, when significant judgment is required due to market volatility or reduced liquidity, entities may need to consider a range of observable and unobservable inputs and determine the point within that range that best represents fair value at the measurement date. In all cases, entities should apply assumptions consistently and adjust only for risks not already reflected elsewhere in the estimates (e.g., in discount rates).

Given the heightened uncertainty associated with geopolitical risks, entities may need to update projections more frequently and reassess whether assumptions remain reasonable and supportable at each reporting date.

Clear, entity-specific disclosures are required to explain key assumptions, sources of estimation uncertainty and sensitivities, including how changes in commodity prices, inflation or discount rates could affect impairment outcomes, fair value measurements, or the recoverability of deferred tax assets. Transparent disclosure of the interdependencies between forward-looking assumptions used across different accounting areas is essential to enable financial statement users to understand management's application of judgment in the current economic environment.

Other possible areas for consideration

Beyond the areas discussed above, geopolitical uncertainty may have many broader financial reporting implications. In particular, current geopolitical and macroeconomic conditions may give rise to heightened considerations related to an entity's going concern assessment and interim financial reporting, given the potential effects on liquidity, operational continuity, and forecast cash flows.

IAS 1 requires management to assess an entity's ability to continue as a going concern, taking into account all available information about the future, for at least 12 months from the end of the reporting period. Geopolitical developments may affect this assessment through increased volatility in commodity prices, inflationary pressures, supply chain disruption, or restrictions on operations, which may, in turn, impact liquidity, covenant compliance, or access to financing. When such conditions give rise to material uncertainties that may cast significant doubt on an entity's ability to continue as a going concern, transparent and entity-specific disclosures are required, reflecting the significant judgments applied and the underlying assumptions used.

Geopolitical and macroeconomic conditions may also have implications for interim financial reporting under IAS 34 *Interim Financial Reporting*. Entities are required to explain events and transactions that are significant to an understanding of changes in financial position and performance since the end of the last annual reporting period. In periods of heightened uncertainty, entities should consider whether changes in economic conditions, market volatility, or operating environments are significant enough to warrant updated disclosures, including updates to key judgments, estimates, or sensitivity information previously provided in the annual financial statements.

While geopolitical uncertainty may also affect a wide range of other accounting areas, those impacts will not be addressed further in this discussion. The purpose of highlighting going concern and interim reporting considerations is to draw attention to areas where the effects of geopolitical developments may be particularly pervasive and judgment-intensive in the near term.

The Group's Discussion

The Group agreed with the analysis.

Representatives from the Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA) emphasized that entities should provide clear, entity-specific disclosures in their financial statements and MD&A regarding key estimates, assumptions, judgments, and the impact of ongoing economic and geopolitical uncertainty. An entity's MD&A should include information on risks and uncertainties, expected future impacts on operations, projects, and financial condition, including liquidity and capital resources, as well as management's response to those conditions. The CSA representatives also noted that entities should carefully assess impairment, provisions, valuations, and other significant estimates, and provide appropriate sensitivity analyses when relevant. They further reminded entities of the securities regulatory requirements when an entity discloses forward-looking information, including the need to have a reasonable basis for including forward-looking information in public disclosures, clear identification of the forward-looking information, disclosure of material factors and assumptions and risk that actual events will be different, and to update previously disclosed forward-looking information when necessary.

One Group member noted that Canadian entities have operated in an uncertain environment for several years and that the current uncertainty is not unique. They emphasized that entities should provide robust, entity-specific disclosures, rather than treating each period of uncertainty as temporary or exceptional. Another Group member highlighted that the IASB's illustrative examples on reporting uncertainties can help entities assess whether they have sufficiently addressed uncertainty in their financial statement disclosures.

Overall, the Group's discussion raised awareness of the financial reporting considerations arising from current global economic and geopolitical developments. No further actions were recommended to the AcSB.