

1 The Leading Financial Changed of Revenue Recognition by
2 Business Enterprises under FASB vs. IASB

3 Prof. Edel Lemus¹

4 ¹ Carlos Albizu University

5 *Received: 13 December 2013 Accepted: 5 January 2014 Published: 15 January 2014*

6

7 **Abstract**

8 The purpose of this research study is to provide a relevant position about the emergence and
9 adoption process of the revenue recognition project under Financial Accounting Standard
10 Board (FASB) and International Accounting Standard Board (IASB) and its crucial financial
11 reporting performance by business enterprises. In 2014 the Financial Accounting Standard
12 Board (FASB) developed a conceptual framework in relation to the joint revenue recognition
13 project. As a result, the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) in an early
14 announcement this year stated that the revenue recognition project will take place as early as
15 2015 as noted by Lemus (2014). However, the revenue recognition project will change its
16 reporting perspective from historical cost value to fair value measurement. For example, the
17 International Accounting Standard Board (IASB) noted that more than 95

18

19 *Index terms*— financial reporting theory, U.S. securities and exchange commission (SEC), financial
20 accounting standard board (FASB), international accounting standa

21 **1 Introduction**

22 his research paper introduces the most relevant standards that exist under revenue recognition principles and
23 these are: (1). ??AS 1,(2). ??AS 18,and (3). IAS 20. Additionally, the joint revenue recognition project will
24 increase the financial transparency and comparability among industries in the United States capital market.
25 It was expected that by 2014 the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) would have to develop a
26 conceptual framework in relation to the joint revenue recognition project Therefore, the main objective of the
27 joint revenue recognition project is to consolidate the financial reporting inconsistencies that exist between the
28 Author : assistant professor in the Business Department (School of Business) at Carlos Albizu University. e-
29 mail: edellemus@hotmail.com Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) and the International Accounting
30 Standard Board (IASB).

31 The FASB codification in terms of treating revenue recognition consists of 100 pieces. The most relevant
32 standards that exist under revenue recognition are IAS 18 and IAS 11. As a result, the main conceptual aspect
33 adequately presented in the literature review demonstrates how to record revenue under United States GAAP
34 and IFRS. In 2009 the International Accounting Standard Board (IASB) decided to clarify current existing issues
35 between IFRS and the agency. Executives and business enterprises should be aware of the new accounting changes
36 in the accounting and finance sector during the next five years as the United States continues the convergence
37 effort toward adopting optional IFRS. Also, it is well noted that IFRS will help increase the cash flow of a
38 company as well as improve the quality financial reporting position of business enterprises. Therefore, the first
39 groups adopting IFRS in the United States are SMEs.

2 II.

3 Literature Review

In 2010 the Financial Accounting Standard (FASB) and the International Accounting Standard Board (IASB) began a joint project effort towards revenue recognition. In addition, the joint project revenue recognition addresses four crucial principles in relation to customer contract. Moreover, the joint project effort of revenue recognition is considered to pass from United States GAAP to IFRS. Furthermore, the four crucial principles of the project promulgate the following steps:

Step No. 1: Allocate the differences and obligation performance in a contract.

Step No. 2: Illustrate in the contract the importance of transaction price.

Step No. 3: Identify the performance transaction price in the contract.

Step No. 4: Comprehend and understand the rationale of the stipulated information in the contract.

As a result, this researcher noticed significant differences in the joint revenue recognition project. For instance: (1). Dealing with percentage contract completion, (2).The impact of sales and goods services changes in the market, (3). The importance of revenue recognition, and (4). The specific time and place where to recognize the revenues. Therefore, the most relevant standards that exist under revenue recognition principles are: (1). ??AS 1,(2). ??AS 18,and (3). IAS 20 (Dickins & Cooper, 2010).

The main importance of the joint revenue recognition project is to bring financial clarity to the financial market. In addition, the joint revenue recognition project is a simple language that can be used among accounting firms. Moreover, the main financial objective of the FASB and the IASB is to understand the similarities and differences that exist in the joint revenue recognition project. The number of existing industries under United States GAAP is 200 industries. Also, the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) noted that the recording position of revenue recognition under International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) is quite complex to measure. For example, throughout the revenue recognition process between the FASB and the IASB five principles must be met: Therefore, the joint revenue recognition project will increase financial transparency and comparability among industries in the United States market (FASB, 2014).

In 2011 the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) and the International Accounting Standard Board (IASB) issued a new revised proposal plan to clarify the main objectives of the financial revenue recognition project. In addition, over the last decade the two standard setters have proposed extensive guidance in relation to the joint revenue recognition project. Moreover, the two standard setters are in the process of understanding the financial position of recording gains and losses in the real estate industry. Furthermore, revenue recognition has been a major issue in the United States as well as internationally. Therefore, by 2014 it is expected that the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) would have to develop a conceptual framework in relation to the joint revenue recognition project (Weiss, 2012).

The conceptual framework of the joint revenue recognition project between the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) and the International Accounting Standard Board (IASB) is important to financial readers. In addition, researchers claim that reporting revenue under United States GAAP is quite distinctive from reporting revenue under IFRS. Moreover, both boards have accomplished a milestone in the joint revenue recognition project. Therefore, the main objective of the joint revenue recognition project is to consolidate financial reporting inconsistencies between the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) and the International Accounting Standard Board (IASB) (Bohusova, & Nerudova, 2011).

4 III.

5 United States G : Revenue Recognition

The promulgated Statement No. 6 by the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) provides a definition under generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) of how to treat revenues. In addition, the definition under Statement No. 6 indicates that the inflows of producing goods, creating operational services, and rendering services in a triangular position as recording revenue is applied. Moreover, the revenue recognition under United States GAAP must be met by two criteria. Furthermore, FASB Statement No. 5 properly highlights the criteria of revenue recognition. For example, the FASB states that in order to realize revenue the revenue must be earned. However, the statement SAB 104 states how public traded companies can recognize their income. Therefore, the FASB codification in terms of treating revenue recognition consist of 100 pieces (Bohusova, & Nerudova, 2011).

6 IV. I : Revenue Recognition

The conceptual framework of the IAS and the IFRS provide a definition for income and expenses when dealing with revenue recognition. In addition, the researcher promulgates two standards that presently exist under revenue recognition and these are: (i). IAS 18 and (ii). IAS11. Moreover, the joint revenue recognition project provides economic benefit to enterprises. For instance, IAS 18 provides different classification criteria for revenue transactions within the company by rendering services, by illustrating adequate sales of goods and products, the enterprise can yield interest, dividends, and royalties. For instance, the IAS 11 expresses the financial circumstances of construction contracts under revenue recognition. Nevertheless, the two approaches of revenue

98 recognition that exist under IFRS are: (1). A price in a construction contract and (2). The original transaction
99 of ()

100 **7 D**

101 The Leading Financial Changed of Revenue Recognition by Business Enterprises under FASB vs. IASB aap frs
102 relevant standards that exist under revenue recognition are IAS 18 and IAS 11 (Bohusova, & Nerudova, 2011).

103 **8 V. Revenue Recognition Differences**

104 under United States G and I

105 The major similarities and differences that exist between United States GAAP and IFRS is the treatment of
106 revenue recognition. In addition, there are considerable populations that follow revenue recognition under United
107 States GAAP. Moreover, fewer industries appear to be reporting revenue recognition under IFRS. Furthermore,
108 in order to properly measure revenue recognition under IFRS (as cited in Spiceland, Sepe, & Nelson, 2011) two
109 transaction events must occur and these are: (1). Analyze and judge the earnings process and (2). Analyze the
110 collective asset that must be received. As a result, as Spiceland, Sepe, and Nelson (2011) research work indicates,
111 revenue recognition under United States GAAP must meet four aspects and these are: (1). The association
112 cost of revenue that must be reliable, (2). The economic aspect of revenue recognition, (3). Treating sales of
113 goods properly to avoid financial risks and (4). The reliability and measurement of sales services. Therefore, the
114 main conceptual aspect adequately presented in the literature review demonstrates how to record revenues under
115 United States GAAP and IFRS practical guidance (Lin, & Fink, 2013).

116 **9 VI.**

117 **10 I Current Project: Financial Statements and Expected** 118 **Outcomes**

119 The standards setters of both boards, the FASB and the IASB, have decided to issue new proposals in terms of
120 how to treat revenue recognition in financial statements because the appropriate treatment of revenue recognition
121 represents a crucial and significant aspect by meeting the following expectations:

122 1. Providing a more robust framework for addressing revenue recognition issues 2. Removing inconsistencies
123 from existing requirements 3. Improving comparability across companies, industries, and capital markets 4.
124 Providing more useful information to users of financial statements through improved disclosure requirements
125 5. Simplifying the preparation of financial statements by streamlining the volume of accounting guidance
126 (Professional Services Close Up, 2011).

127 In 2007, the IFRIC indicated that IAS 18 revenue will not properly reflect the current existing cost between
128 the agency cost and IFRS standards. In addition, the IFRIC conducted specific interpretation on EITF 99-19 to
129 address the treatment of revenue recognition. As a result, the IFRIC considered new horizon accounting guidance
130 by reshaping the standard setting of the same. Therefore, in 2009, the International Accounting Standard Board
131 (IASB) determined to clarify current existing issues between IFRS and the agency (Kenny, & Larson, 2009).

132 Another major issue is the treatment for accounting lease in the IFRS work convergence plan. In addition, the
133 researchers prescribed in the research study that IFRS presents a lack of clarity when dealing with accounting
134 lease under revenue recognition. Moreover, the accounting treatment lease criterion under United States GAAP
135 is estimated by two standards and these are: (1). Predict and estimate the life of the lease stipulated in the
136 contract and (2). Calculate the present value (PV) of the lease by estimating the fair value of the asset. For
137 example, the lease capitalization under United States GAAP requires up to 75% of completion or more when
138 the life of the asset has been estimated. On the other hand, under IFRS the IAS No. 17 is less specific when
139 treating capitalization requirements for lease accounting because the life of the asset is expected to be used
140 at full capacity. As a result, as ASC 840 indicates, if a leased asset exceeds 90% it requires capitalization at
141 present value. Therefore, researchers throughout the research study provide less specific accounting language by
142 encouraging economic demand and at the same time discouraging the financial position in treating accounting
143 lease transactions at present value (Collins, Pasewark, & Riley, 2012).

144 **11 VII.**

145 **12 Final Outcome of Revenue Recognition**

146 The FASB provided an exposure draft update in relation to Topic 605. In addition, the main objective of the
147 exposure draft revision by the FASB is to replace current existing GAAP guidance in terms of treating revenue
148 recognition. Moreover, the two standard setters with the joint revenue recognition project brought clarity and
149 transparency to the standards of revenue recognition. In 2002, the promulgated exposure draft by the FASB was
150 finalized and concluded by providing three important roles within the market: (1). Customer's contract, (2).
151 Insurance contract, and (3). Lease contract. Therefore, in 2012 the FASB predicated five important provisions
152 and these are: 1. Contract with a customer, 2. The specification performance of the contract obligation, 3.

13 VIII. I AND UNITED STATES G ON THE FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE REPORTING BY BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

153 Determination of the transaction price, 4. The transaction performance in the contract, and 5. Recognition of
154 the performed revenue (FASB, 2014).

155 The FASB, in an announcement early this year, stated that the revenue recognition project will take place as
156 early as 2015. In addition, publicly traded companies that are in the process of adopting optional The above
157 table illustrates the importance of revenue recognition bases and the applicable principles guidance activities
158 from the departure of sales basis (Kieso, Weygandt, & Warfield, 2013).

159 13 VIII. I and United States G on the Financial Performance 160 Reporting by Business Enterprises

161 In the near future it is predicted that the financial reporting system in the United States will have a drastic
162 change. In addition, the SEC is in the process of joining more than 100 countries that have already adopted
163 IFRS. Moreover, the researcher attests in the literature review that multinational corporations (MNC) have been
164 using dual reporting language for the last two decades. Furthermore, the FASB is presently working with the
165 IASB to make the convergence project as one universal accounting language. For example, the two standard
166 setters have issued two memorandum of understanding in dealing with the complexity level in treating revenue
167 recognition and business combination from the financial reporting aspect. As a result, the accounting profession
168 will also have a drastic change. Therefore, executives and business enterprises should be aware of the new
169 accounting changes in the accounting and finance sector during the next five years as the United States continues
170 the convergence effort toward the optional IFRS (James, 2009).

171 The three boards known as the SEC, the FASB, and the IASB have determined to devote one section in the
172 convergence process to business enterprises. The stockholders equity account cannot be inconclusive under the
173 two standard settings. Therefore, Mr. Francesco Bellandi indicated that the treatment for stockholders equity
174 can be reported as relevant standards (Walters, 2011).

175 The convergence project from United States GAAP to IFRS raises a lot of questions about the unknown
176 financial reporting expectations under IFRS. In addition, accountants are concerned about equity based
177 compensation. Moreover, the reporting tax position between United States GAAP and IFRS is quite different.
178 Furthermore, some accountants argued that the tax equity position should be reported under fair value and other
179 accountants claimed that in order for the numbers to have a feasible reporting position they should be reported
180 under the historical cost. As a result, accounting firms are presently comparing the pro-forma income statement
181 and pro-forma balance sheet to understand the reporting results of the tax equity base position. For example,
182 researchers in previous accounting studies have determined that the tax yields under IFRS are less than the tax
183 yields under United States GAAP. Therefore, the researchers concluded that adopting IFRS will help increase
184 the cash flow of the company as well as improve the quality financial reporting position of the business enterprises
185 (Mc Anally, Mc Guirre, & Weaver, 2010).

186 A business enterprise should prepare the financial statement in accordance with United States GAAP,
187 the "Balance Sheet" by realizing the "statement of financial position", or "statement of financial condition"
188 ??Bellandi, 2007, p.32). In addition, the SEC acting as a primary regulator, does not use the term balance
189 sheet but instead prefers to use "statement of financial condition" when treating and dealing with employee stock
190 purchases or savings under section 210.6A-02(d) and 210.6A-02(a). Moreover, the form 20 is primarily used in
191 practice for both the balance sheet and statement of financial position. Furthermore, the term balance sheet, is
192 "applicable under business entities IAS1 as revised on December 2005, The Presentation of Financial Statements
193 (paragraph number 5) (Part 1, Item 5, E2(c), Part 1; General Instructions to Items 11(a) and 11(b), 3C (ii)"
194 ??Bellandi, 2007, p.32).

195 In the European Union, business enterprises in the financial market use the term Balance Sheet for recording
196 purposes. As illustrated by the researcher, in September 2007 the IAS1 was revised and it was moved to
197 "statement of financial position" by focusing primarily on auditing terminology. As a result, the joint project of
198 the FASB and the IASB is moving toward a solid position on each entity's industry. For instance, the discussion
199 of liquidity or mixed bases is illustrated under IAS1, paragraph 60. Nevertheless, the convergence project of
200 United States GAAP and IFRS (as cited in Lemus, 2014) brings transparency, relevance, and reliability and
201 these are: (1) the liquidity of the financial institution should be displayed in the financial statements, because it
202 is simply recorded in the industry sector and there is a liability test that is applicable under (IAS1, paragraph
203 63); (2) A business that is running multiple lines of business uses the mixed basis under (IAS1 paragraph 64); (3)
204 When the residual income is not applied correctly the originality of the operating cycle cannot be identifiable.
205 Another example, the mixed guidance accounting method under United States GAAP does not exist; therefore,
206 the convergence project from United States GAAP to IFRS needs to adopt the optional emerging position of
207 liquidity-based position, or a mixbasis in the balance sheet and also should be noted on section of IAS1, paragraph
208 61 (Bellandi, 2007).

209 The United Kingdom and the United States investors acting as corporate issuers are familiar with the reporting
210 position of a principles based standard. In addition, both Multinational Corporations (MNCs) and large enterprise
211 companies have implemented a dual reporting system as a parallel reporting position in the market. Moreover,
212 the embracement of the Extensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) and IFRS has become a main priority
213 to regulators in the United States market. However, as research studies indicate, the adoption of IFRS is arriving

214 sooner than expected to the United States capital market. For instance, regulators have to seek global financial
215 sustainability with IFRS. Therefore, it is likely (as cited in Lemus, 2014) that the full adoption process of IFRS
216 in the United States will take place as early as 2016 (Boerner, 2011).

217 The following five main standards of IFRS simplify the reporting process for SMEs and they are:

218 1. Some topics in IFRS are omitted because they are not relevant to typical SMEs-including earnings per
219 share, interim financial reporting, and segment reporting. 2. Some options in full IFRS are not allowed, because
220 a more simplified method is available to SMEs-for example, there is no option to revalue property, plant, and
221 equipment.

222 **14 Many of the recognition and measurement**

223 principles in full IFRS are simplified-for example, the amortization of goodwill and the expensing of all borrowing
224 and research and development costs. 4. Full IFRS requires more than 3,000 disclosures; IFRS for SMEs requires
225 less than 300. 5. Simplified redrafting provides easier understandability and translation” (Sanders, Lindberg, &
226 Seifert, 2013, p.32).

227 The IASB noted that more than 95% of SMEs are allowed to use EFRS. In addition, to some extent private
228 United States companies are implementing EFRS, because it serves as a simple approach to understand the full
229 adoption process from United States GAAP to IFRS. Moreover, in terms of cost position in the market EFRS
230 is less costly to implement than IFRS as primary guidance and is more relevant in terms of financial accounting
231 reporting standards. Furthermore, private companies are willing to expand their business horizon and continue
232 obtaining global financing comparability and efficiency by improving the reliability of the financial statement
233 measurement. Therefore, the first group adopting IFRS in the United States is Small

234 **15 Conclusion**

235 In conclusion, the joint revenue recognition project will increase financial transparency and comparability among
236 industries in the United States market. In addition, the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) would
237 develop a conceptual accounting framework in relation to the joint revenue recognition project. Moreover, the
238 Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB) has created 100 pieces of codification when treating revenue
239 recognition. Furthermore, the most relevant standards that exist under revenue recognition are IAS 18 and
240 IAS 11. As a result, the revenue recognition project will change its reporting perspective from historical cost
241 value to fair value measurement. For instance, executives and business enterprises should be aware of the new
242 accounting changes in the accounting and finance sector during the next five years as the United States continues
243 the convergence effort toward the optional IFRS. Therefore, the main objective of the joint revenue recognition
244 project is to consolidate the financial reporting inconsistencies that exist between the FASB and the IASB by
245 utilizing at best the six subject areas as a reference point prescribed in the literature review.

246 **16 Recommendation for Future Studies**

247 The author of this article suggests that the following aspects should be considered for future studies when studying
248 the emergency revenue recognition process for business enterprises under FASB vs. IASB: ¹ ²

¹© 2014 Global Journals Inc. (US)

²© 2014 Global Journals Inc. (US)The Leading Financial Changed of Revenue Recognition by Business Enterprises under FASB vs. IASB



Figure 1:

Specific Transactions	Accounting Guidance
Point of sale	See Illustration 18–12 (page 1080).
Long-term contracts (construction)	
(a) Percentage-of-completion method	Long-term construction of property; dependable estimates of extent of progress and cost to complete; reasonable assurance of collectibility of contract price; expectation that both contractor and buyer can meet obligations; and absence of inherent hazards that make estimates doubtful.
(b) Completed-contract method	Use on short-term contracts and whenever percentage-of-completion cannot be used on long-term contracts. Existence of inherent hazards in the contract beyond the normal, recurring business risks; conditions for using the percentage-of-completion method are absent.
Completion-of-production basis	Immediate marketability at quoted prices; unit interchangeability; and no significant distribution costs.
Installment-sales method and cost-recovery method	Absence of reasonable basis for estimating degree of collectibility and costs of collection. Collectibility of the receivable is so uncertain that gross profit (or income) is not recognized until cash is actually received.
Deposit method	Cash received before the sales transaction is completed. No recognition of revenue and income because there is not sufficient transfer of the risks and rewards of ownership.

Figure 2: D

Year
Volume XIV Issue IV Version I
)
D
(
Global Journal of Management and Business Research

Figure 3:

-
- 249 [James ()] ‘Accounting for consolidated entities and the convergence of U.S. GAAP and international financial
250 reporting standards’. M L James . *Proceedings* 2009. 2009. 16 (2) p. .
- 251 [Walters ()] ‘Accounting for equity and other comprehensive income: Dual reporting under U.S. GAAP and
252 IFRS’. P D Walters , CF A . *Journal of International Accounting Research* 2011. 10 (1) p. .
- 253 [Bellandi ()] ‘Dual reporting under U.S. GAAP and IFRS’. F Bellandi . *The CPA Journal* 2007. 77 (12) p. .
- 254 [Weiss ()] ‘FASB webcast: 2012 chairman’s outlook on the FASB with Leslie F’. J Weiss . *Seidman. Miller GAAP
255 Update Service* 2012. 12 (7) p. .
- 256 [Collins et al. ()] ‘Financial reporting outcomes under rules-based and principles-based accounting standards’. D
257 L Collins , W R Pasewark , M E Riley . *Accounting Horizons* 2012. 26 (4) p. .
- 258 [IASB and FASB publish revised proposal for revenue recognition Professional Services Close ()] ‘IASB and
259 FASB publish revised proposal for revenue recognition’. Professional Services Close 2011.
- 260 [Dickins and Cooper ()] ‘IFRS: A summary and update’. D Dickins , B Cooper . *Internal Auditing* 2010. 25 (6)
261 p. .
- 262 [Spiceland et al. ()] *Intermediate Accounting*, J D Spiceland , J F Sepe , M Nelson . 2011. New York, NY:
263 McGrawHill/Irwin. (th ed.)
- 264 [Kieso et al. ()] *Intermediate accounting*, D E Kieso , J Weygandt , D Warfield , T . 2013. New Jersey: John
265 Wiley & Sons, Inc. (th ed.)
- 266 [Lin and Fink ()] ‘International financial reporting standards: Are they right for the united states’. J Lin , P
267 Fink . *Journal of Global Business Issues* 2013. 7 (2) p. .
- 268 [Kenny and Larson ()] ‘Interpreting IFRS’. S Y Kenny , R K Larson . *Journal of Accountancy* 2009. 208 (4) p. .
- 269 [Bohusova and Nerudova ()] ‘Is an asset and liability approach to revenue recognition suitable for IFRS and US
270 GAAP convergence purpose?’. H Bohusova , D Nerudova . *The Business Review* 2011. 18 (2) p. .
- 271 [Sanders et al. ()] ‘Is IFRS for SMEs a beneficial alternative for private companies?’. J C Sanders , D L Lindberg
272 , D L Seifert . *The CPA Journal* 2013. 83 (2) p. .
- 273 [Revenue recognition-joint project of the FASB and IASB FASB. Financial Accounting Standards Board ()]
274 ‘Revenue recognition-joint project of the FASB and IASB’. [http://www.fasb.org/cs/
275 ContentServer?c=FASBContent_C&pagename=FASB%2FFASBContent_C%2FProjectUpdatePage&
276 cid=900000011146](http://www.fasb.org/cs/ContentServer?c=FASBContent_C&pagename=FASB%2FFASBContent_C%2FProjectUpdatePage&cid=900000011146) FASB. *Financial Accounting Standards Board* 2014.
- 277 [Boerner ()] ‘Sustainability and ESG reporting frameworks: Issuers have GAAP and IFRS for reporting
278 financials-what about reporting for intangibles nad non-financials?’. H Boerner . *Corporate Finance Review*
279 2011. 15 (5) p. .
- 280 [Lemus ()] ‘The similarities and differences between the financial reporting standards under United States’. E
281 Lemus . *GAAP versus IFRS. Global Journal of Management and Business Research* 2014. 14 (3) .
- 282 [Mcanally et al. ()] ‘to IFRS: The case of equity-based compensation’. M L Mcanally , S T Mcguire , C D Weaver
283 . *Accounting Horizons*, 2010. 24 p. .
- 284 [Mckee and Mckee ()] ‘Using learning curves for revenue recognition’. T E Mckee , L J B Mckee . *The CPA
285 Journal* 2013. 83 (4) p. .