

Question 1:

Do you agree with the proposal to urge concrete efforts to deepen the pool of candidates for IASB membership from diverse geographical and professional backgrounds? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement.

Answer:

Yes, I think that having members from different geographical regions and different background will enhance the role of IASB and will take into considerations the different experiences and views around the globe.

Question 2:

Do you agree with the proposal to separate the roles of the IASB Chair and the CEO of the IFRS Foundation, and if so would you have suggestions on how to formalize this? Please provide reasons for your agreement/ disagreement.

Answer:

Yes, because the responsibilities of both are different. Therefore, the separation will benefit the IASB and the Federation. The Chair will concentrate his efforts to develop the IASB and increase its role. The CEO will be responsible for running day-to-day operations of the Federation and to develop the role of the Federation and the oversight function. This separation will eliminate the conflict of interest among the slandered setter and the oversight institution.

Question 3:

Do you agree that clearer division of responsibility between staff dedicated to the IASB operations and staff dedicated to the Foundation's administrative and oversight functions should be considered, and if so would you have suggestions on how to formalize this? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement.

Answer:

Yes, I support the idea of clearer division of responsibility between staff dedicated to the IASB operations and staff dedicated to the Foundation's administrative and oversight functions. Because we need to separate the roles of the IASB Chair and the CEO of the IFRS Foundation then we have to make a clear division of responsibilities between staff. In this case each staff will have a clear pictures of the jobs that he has to do.

Question 4:

Please provide comments on any aspects of Trustee composition or appointments that you believe the Monitoring Board should consider.

Answer:

We can expand the membership of Trustee by increasing the regions presented. For example we can add one member presents the Middle East and increase the members presents South America and Africa. These additions will increase the diversity of geographical composition of the Trustees.

Question 5-1:

Do you agree with the proposal to provide increased transparency into the process for Trustee nominations? Please provide reasons for your agreement/ disagreement. To what extent should the Monitoring Board be involved in the nomination process?

Answer:

Yes, because this will give a clear picture to all interested parties on the process adopted to select the Trustee. This will increase the accountability.

Question 5-2:

Do you agree that further clarification of criteria for the Trustees' candidacy would help support confidence of the stakeholders? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement.

Answer:

Off course, a clear, understandable, and a well explained criteria for the Trustees' candidacy will increase accountability and increase transparency hence enhance support the confidence of stakeholders in the Trustee.

Question 6-1:

Should the membership of the Monitoring Board continue to be confined to capital markets authorities responsible for setting the form and content of financial reporting in respective jurisdictions?

Answer:

Yes, but we can add some observers from international organizations.

Question 6-2:

Do you agree with the proposal to expand the Monitoring Board's membership by adding a mix of permanent members ([four]) representing primarily major emerging markets and rotating members ([two]) from all other markets? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement. How should the major markets be selected? Should a jurisdiction's application of IFRSs and financial contribution to standard-setting play a role?

Answer:

Yes, but with some modification which is adding for members represent regional committees in IOSCO emerging markets and no need for rotating members.

Question 6-3:

Do you agree that rotating members should be selected through IOSCO? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement.

Answer:

I think no need for rotating members.

Question 7:

Do you agree that the Monitoring Board should continue to make its decisions by consensus? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement. Are there any types of decisions taken by the Monitoring Board for which voting other than by consensus (for example, by qualified majority) may be appropriate? If so please describe why and suggest an appropriate voting mechanism.

Answer:

In case the numbers of Monitoring board increased to 10 members (for example) then the Board should take its decisions by qualified majority or by two-third.

Question 8:

To ensure increased involvement of public authorities and other international organizations in Monitoring Board activities, do you support the Monitoring Board (a) expanding the number of Monitoring Board observers, (b) holding more formalized dialogue, or (c) establishing an advisory body, and on what basis? What should be the criteria for selecting participants?

Answer:

It will be more appropriate to expand the observers membership. These observers can be other public authorities and international organizations and prudential authorities

Question 10:

What are the appropriate means and venues for the Monitoring Board to enhance the visibility and public understanding of its activities?

Answer:

Publications and internet will introduce the work done by the Monitoring Board, and will introduce the Monitoring Board to the public in a more appropriate way.

consideration, requiring feedback, is sufficient, or whether an explicit role should enable the Monitoring Board to place an item on the IASB agenda.

Question 11:

Do you believe that the current arrangements for Monitoring Board involvement in the IASB's agenda-setting are appropriate, or should the Monitoring Board have an explicit ability to place an item on the agenda, or would you consider other alternatives that would enhance the Monitoring Board involvement in the IASB agenda setting? Please provide reasons.

Answer:

I think there should be a close cooperation between the Monitoring Board and the IASB concerning the IASB agenda. The agenda should reflect the interest on all concerned parties.

Question 12:

Do you have concrete suggestions on how the Monitoring Board or the Trustees could encourage a move towards a more stable and independent funding model?

Answer:

The can create a stable and independent funding models by putting fees on membership and putting fees on the services they provide to others.

Question 13-1:

Do you believe that the Monitoring Board should have a more prominent role in the selection of the IASB Chair? Do you agree with the proposal that the role include involvement in establishing a set of publicly disclosed criteria for the Chair, and assessment of a short list of candidates against those criteria? Please provide reasons.

Answer:

Yes, I think the role of Monitoring Board should include involvement in establishing a set of publicly disclosed criteria for the Chair, and assessment of a short list of candidates against those criteria.

Question 13-2:

Do you believe that the Monitoring Board should be given any further, specific role in the selection of the IASB Chair? In particular, should the Monitoring Board approve the Trustees' final selection? Please provide reasons.

Answer:

The Monitoring Board shouldn't approve the Trustees' final selection because we said before the criteria for nomination of the Trustees should be published and be available for public. The Monitoring Board can give its recommendations.

Question 14:

Do you agree that the Monitoring Board's responsibilities should explicitly include consultation with the Trustees as they further develop the framework to ensure proper balance in the composition of the IASB? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement.

Answer:

Yes, this will benefit all parties and will create acceptance of the standard for all parties.

Question 15:

Do you agree with the proposal to consider establishing a permanent secretariat for the Monitoring Board to support its increasing roles in overseeing the governance of the standard-setter? Would you support this proposal even if it would require additional financial contributions from stakeholders? Please provide reasons.

Answer:

At the current situation I don't think we need a permanent secretariat for the Monitoring Board. We can create one in a latter stage.

Question 16:

Do you agree with the need for regular reviews, and the interval of five years as a benchmark? Should the reviews be aligned with the timing of the Foundation's mandated Constitution reviews? Please provide reasons for your agreement/disagreement.

Answer:

Yes, I think five years period is a good interval for regular reviews. Also we can make review in case something urgent happened.

Question 17:

Do you have any other comments?

Answer:

No