

INTERNATIONAL VALUATION STANDARDS FOR GLOBAL PROPERTY MARKETS

Presentation by Michael R Milgrim PhD, IVSC Lead Editor, delivered at the Japan Real Estate Institute in Tokyo, 31 January 2001

In view of the global scope and applicability of the International Valuation Standards, I begin my presentation with a considerable degree of trepidation. To cover such a broad spectrum seems an ambitious, even daunting undertaking. Around the world, the characteristics of property markets differ. Consider, for example, differences in the sources and availability of information to which market participants respond. Market data differs as to the agencies that compile it. Data may come from commercial data bases, i.e., proprietary sources available through subscription service, or the publications of governmental agencies. In developed countries, market data may be more abundant while in emerging markets, it may be relatively scarce.

Around the world, there are differences in valuation practice. For example, in the UK, Australia, and New Zealand appraisers work closely with accountants on financial reports, whereas in North America, financial reporting is left to the domain of the accountants. This difference in practice reflects the differing accounting conventions that apply to fixed assets in the Commonwealth and North America--current cost [allowed alternative treatment under IAS] in the Commonwealth vs historic cost [benchmark treatment under IAS] in North America. These differing conventions have broader ramifications, but more on this later.

Around the world, there are differences in fundamental valuation concepts, terminology, and methodology. For example, in some countries, “market value under existing use” (Open Market Value for the Existing Use [OMVEU]) is an established concept whereas in others, practitioners recognize only “market value under highest and best use” (Open Market Value for an Alternative Use [OMVAU]). Or consider the methodological issue of how to value an improved property to which an owner holds

property rights but for which there is no occupant, what in the Commonwealth is called “vacant possession.” Should the valuer appraise the property “as is” (as vacant) or can the valuer assume a lease on the property?

In drawing your attention to such problematic and controversial areas at the very outset, it is certainly not my intention to suggest that international valuation standards are an impossible goal. Indeed, considering that the International Valuation Standards Committee has been in existence for a little more than two decades, I find it remarkable that as much agreement has been achieved. A foremost example of such agreement is the definition of Market Value in IVS 1. The Committee members are committed and dedicated to developing truly international Standards and to forging consensus.

Justifiably they take pride in the Standards, which represent a hard-won unanimity of opinion. And certainly, the first objective of the Standards is most admirable, namely

“to facilitate cross-border transactions and contribute to the viability of international property markets by promoting transparency in financial reporting as well as the reliability of valuations performed to secure loans and mortgages, for transactions involving transfers of ownership, and for settlements in litigation and tax matters.” (Introduction to IVS 2000, Objective no. 1, page 15)

The International Valuation Standards Committee envisions the standards to be statements of principle and prescriptions of what constitutes international best practice rather than “how to” guidance or explanations of methodology. Furthermore, the standards are intended to complement and reinforce national and regional valuation standards. Indeed, it is possible to talk of a bi-directional “hierarchy of standards” wherein harmonisation is both bottom-up from the best national and regional standards and top-down from the global standards. National and regional standards include the *Appraisal and Valuation Manual* of the UK Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (the RICS “Red Book”), the *Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP)* of the US Appraisal Foundation, Canadian *USPAP* (the Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Institute of Canada [AIC]), the Australian Property Institute’s *Professional Practice*, and The European Group of Valuers’ Associations (TEGoVA) *Approved European Property Standards* (the “Blue Book”). Another regional association, the Union

of Pan-American Valuers (UPAV), has also recently recommended that its member countries adopt the International Valuation Standards.

There is growing acceptance of the Standards by national valuation institutes. Recently, the Appraisal Institute gave “its support and recognition to the Standards that have been developed and promulgated by the IVSC” and advised its members “to consider the International Standards in their appraisal work where applicable.” To me “where applicable” suggests “in international assignments.” The IVSC is also working with the Appraisal Foundation toward some measure of endorsement. The Appraisal Foundation has set up a task force to study the IVSC proposal. Within RICS, there is a clear willingness to scrap the Red Book as is and to replace with the IVS, supplemented by national guidance. In effect, all chartered surveyors would be obliged to follow IVS.

The International Valuation Standards Committee comprises a membership from national valuation associations. The Committee works both with international agencies and other standard-setting bodies (IVS 2000, page 5). Included among the international agencies, with which the Committee works, are the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); the World Bank and its subsidiary, the International Development Corporation (IDC); the Inter-American Development Bank; the Asian Development Bank; the International Monetary Fund (IMF); the World Trade Organisation; the Commission of the European Union; and the Bank of International Settlements (BIS). In the words of the last of these organisations (the BIS), the work of the IVSC is “an important building block in assisting the globalisation of markets and could enhance transparency, which is so vital to global markets.”

Included among the standard-setting bodies, with which the IVSC works, are the International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC), the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), the European Group of Valuers’ Associations (TEGoVA) (TEGoVA publishes the *Approved European Property Valuation Standards* or “Blue Book”), the International Organisation of Security Commissions (IOSCO) (IOSCO is working toward a closer correlation of the *IAS* and the *FASB Standards* of the Financial Accounting Standards Board, the US standard-setting body), the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS)(the IMF is currently assessing BCBS proposals), the US Association of Investment Management and Research (AIMR) (AIMR sponsors the

Global Investment Performance Standards [GIPS]), and the US National Council for Real Estate Fiduciaries (NCREIF).

The IVSC also has an impressive list of sponsors and has raised more than US\$700,000 in funding. IVSC sponsors include six of the valuation associations of IVSC member countries (the valuation associations of Canada, the US, Australia, France, Romania, and the UK), twelve major accounting and valuation firms (e.g., Richard Ellis, Frank Knight, Jones Lang LaSalle, PricewaterhouseCoopers), and one professional association—the Association of German Mortgage Banks (der Verband deutscher Hypothekenbanken, eingetragener Verein—[a] Registered Association).

I will attempt to give you an overview of the accomplishments of the IVSC, its current and future agenda, and the Standards document itself. The Standards represent the collective work of the Standards Sub-Committee, which is made up of member delegates to the IVSC, who are representatives of their national valuation associations. As mentioned, the Standards Sub-Committee works with other standard-setting bodies, especially in the areas of accounting, banking, and finance, and the Standards project has the support of global economic organisations. To follow the many links that the IVSC maintains with these organisations as well as the various interconnections among the organisations is a prodigious task. I will attempt to keep my focus on the contours and not get lost in the details. My presentation is divided into four sections. At the beginning, I will sketch the background to the IVSC--its formation and objectives. Next, I will discuss the impetus behind the ongoing development of the IVS—the major organisations that have been the driving force behind the Standards. The third topic to be addressed is the IVS 2000 and 2001 projects. I will then move on to the structure of the Standards.

Background to the International Valuation Standards Committee.

Formation and Objectives of the IVSC. Rapid economic changes in 1970s underscored the importance of professional property valuations. In 1974 a property market crash occurred in the UK. In response both to market instability and the quickening pace of

globalization of capital markets,¹ members of a technical committee of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) and representatives of US appraisal organizations began a series of meetings at the end of the decade that culminated in the formation of The International Assets Valuation Standards Committee (TIAVSC) in 1981. This name of the Committee was subsequently changed in 1994 to the International Standards Valuation Committee (IVSC). The two principal objectives set by IVSC are:

“to formulate and publish, in the public interest, valuation *Standards* for property valuation and to promote their worldwide acceptance; and
to harmonise *Standards* among the world’s States and to identify and make disclosure of differences in statements and/or applications of *Standards* as they occur.”²

Membership and Functions of the VSC. Founded with a membership of twenty national associations, the IVSC has grown to include national associations representing 35 Full Member States, 12 States with Observer status, and four States represented by Correspondents. Japan, a Full Member State, is represented by the Japanese Association of Real Estate Appraisal (JAREA). It is through IVSC linkages to other valuation standard-setting bodies, that the IVS have international and regional (European, North American) application. The IVSC is an NGO (Non-Government Organization) member of the United Nations.³ Since 1985, the IVSC has played a consultative role for the UN Economic and Social Council. And as has been discussed, the IVSC also maintains liaison with international agencies and has a close relationship with several standard-setting bodies.

Impetus behind the Development of the *International Valuation Standards*.

¹ For a current American perspective on globalization and the *IVS* see John D. Dorchester, Jr., and Joseph Vella, “Valuation and the Appraisal Institute in a Global Economy: The European Initiative,” *The Appraisal Journal*, January 2000, v. 68, no. 1 (John Dorchester is a former US delegate to IVSC; Joseph Vella is a current US delegate); for a recent European viewpoint see John Edge, “The Globalization of Real Estate Appraisal: A European Perspective,” *Valuation 2000, Papers and Proceedings*, Part 2: Papers for Publication (John Edge is the current UK delegate to ISVC).

² *International Valuation Standards: 2000*, Introduction, page 3.

³ *Ibid.*, pages 4-5.

Over the past several years, the impetus behind the *International Valuation Standards* (IVS) has come from five major sources—IASC (*IAS*), IFAC (*IPSAS* [*International Public Sector Accounting Standards*]), BCBS (with which the IMF works), AIMR (*GIPS* [*Global Investment Performance Standards*]), and NCREIF (*Real Estate Information Standards* [*REIS*]).⁴

As communication between the accounting and valuation professions improves, it has become clear that each profession benefits from a better understanding of the other. Financial reporting is a principal use of valuations in many Commonwealth countries where fixed assets are carried at revalued amount (unlike in North America where the accounting convention for fixed assets is historic cost). The IVS application for financial reporting states “it is the allowed alternative treatment [i.e., revalued amount basis] that involves the work of Valuers throughout much of the world.”⁵ A symbiotic relationship exists between the IVS and *International Accounting Standards* (*IAS*) since rigorous interpretation and application of the *IAS* depend on an understanding of the IVS.

While the *IAS* deal with private sector assets, a second impetus behind the IVS comes from public sector accounting, in particular, the Public Sector Committee of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), with which the IVSC is in close contact. IFAC has developed exposure drafts of two standards, one on Property, Plant and Equipment and the other on Leases. IFAC has also done a draft document on Impairment of Assets. Currently the IVSC is preparing a response to IFAC on these materials.

The accounting concept of “fair value” and the valuation concept of “market value” are overlapping, if not identical concepts. While fair value may, in many situations, be equivalent to market value, in some situations it is not. The IVS have attempted to harmonise the two concepts. IVA 1 (para. 3.18.5.5) states that “fair value and market value may be equivalent when fair value meets all requirements of the market value definition in IVSC Standard 1, section 3.0.”... “Fair value takes in the concept of market value. However, the term fair value is a generic term used in accounting. The fair value concept is broader than market value, which is specific to property. Fair value can

⁴ Greg McNamara, “*International Valuation Standards—A Critical Component of a Global Financial Reporting Language*, *IASC Insight: The Newsletter of the International Accounting Standards Committee*, September 2000, pages 18-19 (Greg McNamara is the Australian delegate and IVSC Chairman).

⁵ *IVS 2000*, International Valuation Application no. 1, para. 3.11.

encompass a surrogate for market value in circumstances where market value is not readily identifiable.” Furthermore “while a Valuer provides an estimate of asset value for the directors and/or accountants of an enterprise, it is they who decide whether the value estimate meets the test of fair value.” Guidance Note no. 8 (DRC) (para. 3.10) makes this same point: “the fair value of a class of assets can only be determined by the directors of the company having regard to the market value and associated profitability of the assets.”

The IASC has recently approved a restructuring of its organization to consist mainly of world accounting standard-setting bodies. Japan has also embarked upon making Japanese accounting standards more compatible with the international standards and changes are already under way to help improve financial disclosure and to bring Japanese accounting practice in line with the international standards. The accounting standards of Japan are currently set by the Business Accounting Deliberation Council (BADC), under the supervision of the Financial Services Agency (the FSA was established on July 1, 2000) of the Ministry of Finance (a major restructuring of the ministries has resulted in the recent change in the Japanese name of the MOF, effective January 1, 2001; the former name of the MOF was Okura-sho; its current name is Zaimu-sho). The BADC and FSA are thus government-sponsored organizations. Various Japanese professional groups have established a review project team for the purpose of rebuilding the Japanese standards-setting body. These include the Japanese Institute of Certified Public Accountants (JICPA), the Japan Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren), the Tokyo Stock Exchange and Japan Securities Dealers Association. The Ministry of Finance and various academic groups will also participate in this project.

Both the JAREA and JREI are aware of the importance of IAS. Both JREI and JAREA have responded to the IASC exposure draft on Investment Property. JAREA was one of the three valuation institutes responding to the IASC exposure draft—the other two being the IVSC and the German Association of Chartered Surveyors. The JREI response indicated that the shift to valuing investment property at current value, as proposed by the exposure draft, is compatible with generally accepted investment standards and has the support of the JREI. The JREI response also stated that the definition of fair value, as given in the draft, is almost equivalent to market value as used

in the field of real estate appraisal, and is certainly measurable in Japan since regulations and codes of practice for real estate appraisal have been fully established.

Other Japanese organisations, however, have expressed doubt, e.g., the Japanese Institute of Certified Public Accountants, The Japanese Building Owners and Managers Association, and the Real Estate Companies Association of Japan. They have contended that the Japanese real estate market is not fully mature and that Japanese real estate business is unable to properly measure the fair value of investment property. JREI has countered both arguments. The IASC has publicly acknowledged the IVSC as a “sister organisation.” A close relationship between the IVSC and the JREI and JAREA, therefore, would appear to work to the mutual benefit of these organisations.

Another principal application of property valuation is to secure loans for property used as collateral. The global banking community represents a third voice calling for international valuation standards. With the objective of strengthening the soundness and stability of the international banking system, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) has laid out minimum requirements for banking supervision in its *Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision*. This document addresses key areas, including policies, practices and procedures that involve asset valuation for loans, the adequacy of bank reserves, and provisions for loan loss. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) is currently assessing the *Core Principles* document with the aim of judging the adequacy of rules for banking supervision and the ability of supervisors to monitor and limit major risks run by banks. The IMF recognizes defects in asset valuations for loans as a major source of weakness. The BCBS has also formed a task force on valuation, which includes representatives from Germany, Japan, and the US. The IVSC coordinates its work with the Basel Committee.

The IVSC is also working with development banks—the Inter-American Development bank, World Bank, and Asian Development Bank--toward drafting a financial sector standard. A new Commentary for IVS 2001 on valuation in emerging markets will provide a foundation.

The fourth impetus behind international valuation standards comes from the investment community, which has concerns over the measurement of the performance of investment and owner-occupied property, and the development of common indices for

the analysis of pooled property data. Over 13 years ago, the US Association of Investment Management and Research (AIMR) introduced standards for calculating and presenting investment performance. These have become known as the *Performance Presentation Standards* (AIMR-PPS). Since 1995 AIMR has sponsored and funded a special committee to develop the *Global Investment Performance Standards* (GIPS). *GIPS* were formally endorsed by AIMR in 1999. AIMR has established the Investment Performance Council (IPC) to help implement adoption of *GIPS* in countries where investment performance standards do not exist and to promote harmonisation with *GIPS* in countries where such standards do exist. *GIPS* do not yet address real estate. The Investment Performance Council has thus formed a Real Estate Subcommittee to draft the real estate provisions to be incorporated into *GIPS*. The IVSC is discussing with the IPC Real Estate Subcommittee a proposal that the provisions on real estate valuation be based on the IVSC standards.

The fifth group with a common interest in real estate valuation standards is the US National Council for Real Estate Investment Fiduciaries (NCREIF). NCREIF developed the Russell/NCREIF Property Index. At one time, the Frank Russell Company published the index, hence the name Russell/NCREIF Property Index. Produced quarterly, the NCREIF Property Index shows real estate performance returns based on data submitted by its Data Contributing Members. The NCREIF Property Index is used as an industry benchmark to compare an investor's own return against the industry average. Each property's return is weighted by its market value and each property's market value is determined by real estate valuation methodology. In 1993, NCREIF and two other organisations (the Pension Real Estate Association and the National Association of Real Estate Investment Managers) joined forces to create the *Real Estate Information Standards*, which describe terms commonly used to report commercial real estate performance to institutional investors. NCREIF's Performance Measurement Committee works closely with AIMR to coordinate the NCREIF *Real Estate Information Standards* and the AIMR *Real Estate Performance Presentation Standards*. The Japanese have translated the NCREIF *Real Estate Information Standards* and it is expected that these standards will be adopted as the Japanese real estate industry standards. NCREIF has invited the IVSC to address its winter 2001 Conference.

The IVS 2000 Project.

In 1999 the IVSC launched a three-year project aimed at producing “a set of comprehensive and robust international standards” and at the October 1999 meeting in Beijing, the IVSC Management Board announced the plan to publish a set of high quality standards and guidance by the year 2000. The first publication to result from the Standards Project has been the 2000 edition of the *International Valuation Standards (IVS 2000*, also commonly known as the “*White Book*”), which were released at the Valuation 2000 Conference in Las Vegas in July. The development of *IVS 2000* was directed by three principal objectives (I have already alluded to the first of these in the introduction):

- To facilitate cross-border transactions and contribute to the viability of international property markets by promoting transparency in financial reporting as well as the reliability of valuations performed to secure loans and mortgages, for transactions involving transfers of ownership, and for settlements in litigation or tax matters;
- To serve as a professional benchmark, or beacon, for Valuers around the world, thereby enabling them to respond to the demands of international property markets for reliable valuations and to meet the financial reporting requirements of the global business community; and
- To provide Standards of valuation and financial reporting that meet the needs of emerging and newly industrialized countries.⁶

Another important component of the IVSC plan was the goal of ensuring that the *International Valuation* and *International Accounting Standards* would be complementary. *IVS 2000* reflects the most up-to-date text of those specific *International Accounting Standards (IAS)* affecting valuation, i.e., Property, Plant, and Equipment (*IAS 16*), Leases (*IAS 17*), Impairment of Assets (*IAS 36*), and Intangible Assets (*IAS 38*). *IVS 2000* also addresses the relationship between the key accounting and valuation concepts

⁶ *IVS 2000*, Objectives and Scope, page 15.

of fair value and market value, which may be understood as overlapping if not identical categories.

Earlier versions of the Standards were published in 1985 and 1994/97. To ensure consistency and clarity, the existing *Standards* and *Guidance Notes* were revised and supplemented. In addition, several new areas of text were developed or redeveloped for *IVS 2000*, including

a Code of Conduct,

a section on Property Types (real property, personal property, businesses, and financial interests),

an introduction to the *Standards*,

the *Application* on Financial Reporting,

a *Guidance Note* on Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) (considered “an acceptable surrogate method for arriving at a market-related value of specialized properties in financial reporting”), and

a *Commentary* on Investment Property.

The *Glossary* was expanded to incorporate up-to-date accounting definitions, additional cross-referencing of entries, and definitions that had entered the new sections of the text.

The *Glossary* also became a guide to divergent usage of terminology in the Commonwealth, North America, and other English speaking communities.⁷

The IVS 2001 Project.

⁷ For example, in British usage, “worth” conveys the North American sense of “investment value.” Other standard British terms would not be intelligible to Americans, e.g., vacant possession (land or built-up property to which an owner holds property rights but for which there is no occupant), and service potential and trading potential (terms borrowed from accounting--the former refers to the future economic benefits embodied in an asset; the latter refers to the future profits to be derived from the sale of goods and products, e.g., petrol, food and drink, or the provision of specialised facilities such as for lodging, parking, gaming and entertainment. The term is associated with a category of properties (hotels, gas stations, or restaurants), the market value of which includes not only land, buildings, and personal property but intangibles, such as goodwill, and the business itself. On the other hand, North American usage such as personalty (personal property), eminent domain (compulsory acquisition), FF&E (furniture, fixtures and equipment), and collateralized (put up as security for payment of a loan) have not gained currency in the Commonwealth. British and American spelling also diverge. The rationale for employing British spelling in *IVS 2000* was based on the recognition that the British system is more widespread than American spelling.

A comparative matrix is currently in development. The matrix will facilitate the correlation of areas of coverage in *IVS* with other principal standards documents around the world, i.e.,

RICS Appraisal and Valuation Manual (commonly known as the “*Red Book*”),
TEGoVA’s Approved European Property Standards (the “*Blue Book*”),
USPAP (the *Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice* of the Appraisal Foundation and Appraisal Institute),
the Appraisal Institute of Canada’s *Canadian Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice*, and
the Australian Property Institute’s *Professional Practice 2000*.

A new *Guidance Note* on Valuation Reports is being drafted. Most recently, the Committee approved the formation of several expert consultative groups to review *IVS 2000* and make recommendations in areas such as 1) valuation for lending purposes, 2) valuation of public sector assets, 3) valuation in emerging markets, and 4) valuation and real estate securitisation.

Structure of *IVS 2000*.

The organization of the *Standards* document consists of preliminary sections, the *Standards*, *Applications*, *Guidance Notes*, *Commentary*, and *Glossary*. The preliminary sections of the document include the

Introduction—the history and constitution of the IVSC; objectives and organisation of the *IVS*, and format of the *Standards*, *Applications*, and *Guidance Notes*;
General Valuation Concepts and Principles—a discussion of the concepts (assets, price, cost, value, Market Value, highest and best use, utility) and economic principles upon which valuation practice is based;
Code of Conduct—the ethical and competency requirements of Valuers in professional practice; and
Property Types—the characteristics of and distinctions between real property, personal property, businesses, and financial interests.

The *Standards* are considered the most fundamental and permanent part of the document. Two standards have been published. *International Valuation Standard no. 1, Market Value Basis of Valuation*, provides a common definition of Market Value and explains the general criteria relating to its application when the intended use of a valuation is the estimation of Market Value. *International Valuation Standard no. 2, Valuation Bases Other Than Market Value*, identifies and explains non-market bases of value,⁸ and distinguishes these concepts from Market Value.

The two *Standards* serve as a foundation for the *Applications* that deal with valuations prepared for specific purposes, among which financial statements or related accounts and loan or mortgage security are especially prominent. *International Valuation Application no. 1, Valuation for Financial Reporting* (an exposure draft), discusses the background of accounting concepts, conventions and standards; the criteria that Valuers must observe when preparing valuations for financial statements; and the *IAS* treatment of fixed asset categories such as property, plant and equipment and investment property. *International Valuation Application no. 2, Valuation for Lending Purposes*, gives guidance to Valuers who perform valuations for lending institutions and others who provide financing secured by fixed assets.

The *IVS Guidance Notes* address particular valuation issues and the application of the *Standards* in specific business and service-providing situations. The *Guidance Notes* are considered more transitory than the *Standards* and may be amended from time to time with additional guidance from the IVSC as business or professional situations meriting guidance are brought to the Committee's attention. Eight *Guidance Notes* were published: Valuation of Real Property, Valuation of Lease Interests, Valuation of Plant and Equipment, Valuation of Intangible Assets, Going Concern Concept of Valuation (a revision is forthcoming), Business Valuation, Consideration of Hazardous and Toxic Substances in Valuation, and Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC)(an exposure draft).

Commentaries are issued to address questions regarding the *Standards* or their applicability that may require an immediate response. *Commentaries* are approved by the IVSC Management Board and are not subject to exposure. *IVS 2000* includes a

⁸ value in use, investment value, going concern value, insurable value, assessed or rateable value, salvage value, liquidation or forced sale value, special value, marriage value

Commentary on the implications for Valuers of recent IAS 40, Investment Property. IAS 40 was the first International Accounting Standard to refer to the International Valuation Standards. IAS 40 deals with what value companies should carry investment property on their balance sheets (IAS 40 allows an enterprise to choose a cost model or fair value model and identifies the various categories of investment properties). The Standard also sets guidelines for auditors. Since IAS 40 acknowledges IVS, it would not be unreasonable for auditors to require that valuations be carried out in accordance with IVS rather than national standards.

It is anticipated that the recommendations of the expert consultative groups on valuation in emerging markets, public sector asset valuation, and securitization will be incorporated into IVS 2001 as commentaries.

The Glossary includes valuation-specific definitions, current accounting definitions, cross-referencing of related entries, cross-referencing of divergent usage in various English speaking communities, and references to key paragraphs where terms are defined throughout the document.

Conclusion

I began this presentation by citing examples of significant differences involving valuation around the world—differences in property markets, valuation practice, and valuation concepts, terminology and methodology. In view of these differences, the development of global Standards is an ambitious undertaking. I believe the Standards represent a formidable achievement and that the IVSC is certainly worthy of the tasks it has taken up.

For information on how to obtain copies of *IVS 2000*, please contact the IVSC Executive Director, Marianne Tissier (mtissier@ivsc.org). Further information about the Committee and Standards is available on the IVSC web site (www.ivsc.org).

Other Standards Documents

Appraisal and Valuation Manual of the UK Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (the RICS “Red Book”),
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) of the US Appraisal Foundation,
Canadian *USPAP* (the Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Institute of Canada [AIC]),
Australian Property Institute’s *Professional Practice*, and
The European Group of Valuers’ Associations (TEGoVA) *Approved European Property Standards* (the “Blue Book”).

International Agencies

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD),
World Bank (and its subsidiary, the International Development Corporation [IDC]),
Inter-American Development Bank,
Asian Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF),
World Trade Organisation,
Commission of the European Union, and
Bank of International Settlements (BIS).

Standard-Setting Bodies

International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC),
International Federation of Accountants (IFACF),
The European Group of Valuers’ Associations (TEGoVA) (TEGoVA publishes the *Approved European Property Valuation Standards* or “Blue Book”),
International Organisation of Security Commissions (IOSCO) (IOSCO is working toward a closer correlation of *IAS* and *FASB Standards* of the Financial Accounting Standards Board, the US standard-setting body),
Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS)(the IMF is currently assessing BCBS proposals),
the US Association of Management and Research (AIMR) (AIMR sponsors *GIPS*), and
the US National Council for Real Estate Fiduciaries (NCREIF).

Five Major Organisations with which the IVSC has recently coordinated

International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) (*International Accounting Standards*),
International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) (*International Public Sector Accounting Standards* [IPSAS]),
Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (and the IMF),
the US Association of Investment Management and Research (*GIPS*), and
the US National Council of Real Estate Investment Fiduciaries (NCREIF) (*REIS*)