THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Overview of and Accounting for Cloud Computing

Ingrid Esther Pringle Masters of Accountancy Student, Keiser University, Florida, US Dahli Gray

Professor, Keiser University, University, Florida, US

Abstract:

It is clear that cloud accounting has revolutionized and changed the lives of many small and large business owners. Everyone has their own version of where and when the cloud originated. Many put the date back to 1955, when the idea of computing timeshares emerged. In those days, cutting-edge commercial computers, like the IBM 702, took up roughly the square footage of a roomy Brooklyn apartment and cost just about as much to rent ("A brief history." 2019). A new implementation cost in Cloud Computing arrangement was proposed by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) to clarify that a customer has a hosting arrangement. This article addresses the diversity in accounting and the cost incurred in hosting arrangement in a service contract. Some entities would defer certain implementation costs incurred during the application development stage. Entities would expense other costs as incurred like planning, training, maintenance, and data conversion. Cloud Computing and dynamic needs. Cloud Computing has changed the way companies do business with other businesses and the way their own data is stored.

Keywords: Future of cloud computing, different attacks on cloud, security handling in cloud, cloud technology, cloud computing security concerns

1. Introduction

Cloud Computing will be reviewed regarding how to account for implementation, setup and other upfront costs incurred in a Cloud Computing arrangement that is considered a service contract. This topic will be researched from all of the major accounting perspectives to provide a better understanding of the accounting requirements promulgated in the second decade of the 21st century. The Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) is a primary source information on the topic. Individual businesses, private business, and public organizations typically know about Cloud Computing. The most beneficial aspect of Cloud Computing is the fact that one can access any information stored from anywhere using any compatible device. There are times when it is needed to access certain information and one unable to do it due to the way it was stored. If the same information would have been stored in the cloud, then it could be easier to access from nearly anywhere.

Cloud Computing is very convenient to anyone currently in the work force, but also to those who are unemployed and need to store some valuable things in a storage. The cloud is capable of managing multiple infrastructures and also ties the resources necessary to give access to services when needed. Although Cloud Computing can provide many significant advantages, it also brings new security problems which present strong barriers for individuals/enterprises to adapt into Cloud Computing (Liu, Chen & Tung, 2011).

1.1. Cloud Computing Future

There are many companies that store data with cloud providers may no longer have physical control over it, but they're still on the hook legally for its protection and security (Mearian, 2013). The cloud maintains itself and all of it resources only requiring people to maintain the actual hardware and operating systems in complete working order for the cloud to run effectively. The following is a list of some companies that have adopted Cloud Computing as of 2013. (Allouche, 2013):

- Netflix
- Xerox
- Pinterest
- Instagram
- Etsy
- Apple
- Media Math

One of the main benefits and a top key feature of Cloud Computing is it scalability which is the ability of a program to scale. Organizations that offer Cloud Computing can offer companies more power and more hardware and software when they are needed instead of companies having to go through the hassle of securing additional hardware and

software themselves. This benefit led companies to worry less when their needs change or conditions require them to seek more data/server capabilities. Another benefit is the reduced costs that comes with the use of Cloud Computing. Cloud service providers manage cloud architecture and ensure data security. The top three cloud service provider companies are as follows (Dignan, 2018):

ISSN 2321-8916

- Amazon
- Google
- Microsoft

The key features of the cloud service are listed below (Dignan, 2018:

- High availability
- Service on demand
- Resource sharing and pooling
- Multi device support

1.2. Different Attacks on Cloud

There are various attacks that can affect the cloud. The injection of malware in the cloud can be done by the intruder attacking the client as well over server (Achbarou,El Kimar, &Elbouanani, 2017). Other attacks can be flooding attacks, in which there is flood of messages from cloud to client. The makes the client's behavior to appear in an abnormal way (Achbarou, et al.,2017).

1.3. Security Handling in Cloud

Cloud security also refers to the information security on the broad level, for securing the cloud data various set of rules and protocols have been made. One of these rules is cipher creation of the cloud data, that can be done using asymmetric or the symmetric encryption a-logs. Network Troubleshooting Tool for Cloud Computing Wireshark is one of the important troubleshooting tools. With Wireshark you can take snoop of the traffic data and with this snoop, easily troubleshoot the internal protocol packets and bits which are getting transferred.

1.4. Cloud Technology

While Cloud Computing is often described as a transformative and even revolutionary, technology that completely changes how organizations utilize its computing resources, the lack of agreed-upon terminology hinders the research (Blaskovich& Mintchik, 2011). Management accountants can play a role in not only evaluating costs of cloud technology, but also in ensuring that the advantages of more collaborative business processes are communicated to managers and realized by any implementations of cloud technology. Second, management accountants are well-placed to work with technical experts and/or cloud service providers to ensure data security issues are properly addressed. It may be that businesses decide to always keep some data in-house or to adopt a private-cloud (Sunarni, 2015).

1.5. Advantages to Cloud Computing Are as Follows

- It helps to reduce Information Technology cost in terms of maintenance and management
- It supports better business scalability
- It provides collaboration efficiency for the perspective of business
- It supports business continuity
- It provides automatic updates according to requirements of IT
- It supports flexible work practice environment.

1.6. Security Concerns in Cloud Computing:

- Conflict with other clients and cloud providers
- Availability of trusted Cloud Computing related to the security of the data from being lost or leaked.
- Trusted Cloud Computing environment is available or not with critical systems

Lists of insecure Application Programming Interface (API) and user interface; International accounting is a specialty within the entire discipline that is focused on using specific accounting standards that are as relevant in the United States (US) as they are when balancing the books of a company overseas. Cloud Computing is the on-demand delivery of compute power, database storage, applications, and other information technology(IT) resources through a cloud services platform via the Internet with pay-as-you-go pricing. The Cloud services platform provides rapid access to flexible and low-cost IT resources. With Cloud Computing, it is not needed to make large upfront investments in hardware and spend a lot of time on the heavy lifting of managing that hardware.

1.7. Cloud Income Tax Complexities

Cloud Computing can give rise to a number of tax complexities, especially in the cross-border arena. The Department of Taxes has issued a Fact Sheet that states that charges to remotely accessed computer software over the cloud and the use of the software is an exempt computer service or the sale of an intangible (Vertex, 2019). It could have been intended for the royalties' definition to be interpreted so broadly as to cover these other cases of payments for goods or services where some use of software is involved. Payments for Cloud Computing are not treated as royalties for tax purposes in Singapore, Germany, Japan, Hong Kong, and the U.S. (Internal Tax, 2018).

1.8. Internal and External Audits

Cloud Computing is a model for enabling ubiquitous, convenient, on-demand network access to a shared pool of configurable computing resources that can be rapidly provisioned and released with minimal management effort or service provider interaction.

Audits typically fall into two main categories:

- Internal
- External

Internal audits refer to work done by an organization's own employees, concern very specific organizational processes, and focus primarily on optimization and risk management. Internal audit and compliance have a key role to play in helping to manage and assess risk as cloud services evolve, especially for third-party compliance. <u>Externalaudits</u> give an outside perspective on an organization's ability to meet the requirements of various laws and regulations. Organizations have used traditional IT audits to evaluate issues such as availability to authorized users and integrity and confidentiality in data storage and transmission. An audit or compliance check is always done against a pre-specified benchmark. The clearer you are, fewer the possibilities of a costly misunderstanding (Computer Weekly, 2012). It is recommended for every company to develop their own in-house audit program such as the following (THEIIA, 2017):

- Develop a Company-specific audit program to assess and mitigate your organization's risks of Cloud Computing.
- Develop a company-specific audit program based on topic areas.
- The first portion of the audit program could focus on activities to be performed prior to using any new Cloud Computing vendors coming into use.
- The second portion of the audit program could focus on audit activities to be performed for existing Cloud Computing vendors.

1.9. Governmental Accounting

Governmental accounting is the process of recording and managing financial transactions incurred by the government which includes its income and expenditures. Cloud Computing has emerged as a dynamic and promising technological platform that can provide many benefits not only for business but also for local and central governments (Stefanou & Skouras, 2015). Various governmental accounting systems are used by various public sector entities. Cloud Computing is basically an on-demand computer system resource, especially data storage and computing power, without direct active management by the user.

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) issues new accounting and financial reporting standards only when the benefits of the standards improvements in the usefulness of reported financial in- formation for making decisions and assessing government accountability (GASB, 2018). GASB (2018) also said that a governmental entity that utilizes Cloud Computing services may incur costs related to the preparation and configuration of the existing system to be able to utilize those services.

1.10. Accounting Fraud

Accounting fraud is a deliberate manipulation of accounting records in order to make a company's financial performance or condition seem different than it actually is. The factors that contribute to fraud include the following:

- Poor internal control-will lead to fraud as perpetrators look for poor controls.
- Management override of internal control-If management does not look to internal control in operating the business there are chances of fraud
- Collusion between employees- These types of situation make it difficult to both prevent and detect. This is particularly true when the collusion is between managers and their subordinate employees. Management plays a key role in the internal control structure of an organization. They are relied upon to prevent and detect fraud among their subordinate. When managers participate in fraud then the organizations control structure is weakened and the company becomes more vulnerable to losses.
- Collusion between employees and third parties- this may also result in fraud and losses to the company.
- Lack of management information system- The inadequate management information system may result in fraud. Fraud in Cloud Computing is as popular as any other fraud and very similar when it comes to the causes. In Cloud

Computing, the security issues fall down into two categories, the first category the issues faced by cloud providers and second are their customers (CWPS, 2018). Mainly the security challenge comes down from the cloud service providers and their customer experiences faced during the operation of this service. Cloud Computing is increasingly being adopted by organizations worldwide due to its ease, cost benefits and flexibility in usage. Despite the benefits, Cloud Computing has also exposed individuals and organizations to various security and fraud related threats. Any internet-enabled device has the potential to access the cloud, such as a computer, tablet, smartphone or games console. Businesses also need to purchase, maintain and operate computer systems, operating systems, security products, network and broadband connectivity within the office. Without these, it will not be possible to access the cloud (Moorgate, 2011).

1.11. Public Opinion of Recent Proposed Financial Accounting Change

The FASB proposed changes to accounting for Cloud Computing received a total of fifty-three comment letters from various businesses (Appendix A). All commenters were thankful for the opportunity to comment and provide additional feedback. The first question was the only question that everyone supported. Most respondents agreed that eligible implementation costs of a hosting arrangement that is a service contract can be capitalized using the guidance on

internal-use software. For question two (questions are listed below the table in Appendix A), eighty-four percent of the customers agreed with including an amendment to the definition of a hosting arrangement in the Master Glossary. Question three was not supported by most of the respondents. Most of the commenters did not agree with the additional guidance needed to determine whether the amendments apply to arrangements that include a minor hosting arrangement. The guidance for determining the project stage on FASB Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) Subtopic 350-40 be applied to a hosting arrangement was supported by eighty percent of the respondents. A majority of the commenters did not agree with the idea of applying an impairment model to implementation cost. Question five had the same results since most of the respondents disagreed with most of the questions overall. Question six also has the same results with fifty-eight percent disagreeing with the proposal regarding the amendments being added to the internal use software and hosting arrangements. Number eight is regarding entities being permitted to elect prospective transition or retrospective transition. This question was supported by seventy percent. Question nine was also supported by most of the respondents. Questions ten and eleven did not receive the same since most of the commenters disagreed with it. The companies that agreed with all the questions and all statements made were the following:

- American bankers Association
- The Williams Companies Inc.
- Markel Corporation

The following five organizations disagreed with most of the questions:

- Independent Sector and TechSoup
 - Workiva Inc.
 - T-Mobile USA Inc.
 - Ford Motor Company
 - ICPAS/APC

1.12. Unresolved Questions for Future Research

Cloud computing is a new service style with many significant advantages. It seems to be becoming a trend in the world in the second decade of the 21st century. Although cloud computing can provide many significant advantages, it also brings us new security problems which present strong barriers for individuals/enterprises to adapt into cloud computing (Liu, Chen & Tung, 2011). There is the risk that hundred per cent safety is not available in the environment of information technology. Anything related to the cloud accounting world is not going to be completely without any risk. This will immediately present accounting problems that could possibly serve as future research. The general risks of using cloud computing in accounting field have been examined under three titles as "Risks Arising from Service Providers", "Contractual Risks" and "Risks Arising from Legal Structure" (Ozdemir & Elitas, 2015).

- Risk arising from service providers- Not being able to control your own data and unable to know where it is exactly being stored. While there is the risk to lose the data on cloud computing system due to the reasons such cyber-attack, it is also possible that the data stored on personal computers may get harmed.
- Contractual Risks-The provider of the service has the probability of leaving the sector after going bankrupt. In case of any disaster the service provider must be able to maintain the sustainability of your access.
- Risks arising from legal structure- Structural problems and tax related issued may be revealed clandestinely by viewing the customer's data.

2. Conclusions

The accounting new guidelines are hoped to improve the cloud computing world, customer's accounting for implementation, set-up, and other upfront costs incurred in a cloud computing arrangement that are hosted by the vendor. The cloud industry has matured and improved so much with the years that it will eventually become the generator for the next wave of technologies. Anyone creating anything new and businesses that use computers will eventually require the services cloud computing has to offer. What has been proposed does look like it could be beneficial, but more changes in the methods of accounting for cloud computing will probably emerge.

Network with a probability of the p		APPENDIX A Comment Letter Tabulation of Agreement versus Disagre	Comment Letter Tabulation of Agreement versus Disagreement												
Autor Consortion: boxelise Description		0=Agreement, 1=Disagreement, .5= Both	Quartian												
Unitation Canone Later Regarder UP UP UP UP <th< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>diat.</th><th>a.a</th><th>en en</th><th colspan="4"></th><th>en en</th><th>Au 10. 1</th><th></th></th<>			diat.	a.a	en en					en en	Au 10. 1				
Display	Affiliations	Comment Letter Respondent	QP1	404 A.S.	~~	1	~~		See.		Que e	Q ^a tare			
SULCEAMAGE CONTROL LOBBORIDE No Solution Solution<	APPLE INC.	CHRISKONDO	0	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0		
No. DDD BLACH DD BLACH <thdd blach<="" th=""> DD B</thdd>	CALCPA/APAS COMMITTEE	MATTHEW J. LOMBARDI	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0		
NATURE CLARENGERION DE DOMAID P ADDIERTON DE D <thd< th=""> D <thd< th=""> D D <thd< td="" tr<=""><td>N/A</td><td>ROB HOLLASCH</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></thd<></thd<></thd<>	N/A	ROB HOLLASCH	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1		
NINCORPORTATION ALENN YAAA O A I </td <td>WESTERN DIGITAL CORPORATION</td> <td>DONALD F. ROBERTSON JR.</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td>	WESTERN DIGITAL CORPORATION	DONALD F. ROBERTSON JR.	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1		
AMBRECK ADDIT <	IBM CORPORATION	ALISON YARA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Normalization Clamina Macadan Normalization Normalizatio	AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION	KISHUA STEIN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Inter Conduction Note Note Na Inter Conduction Note Note Na Station Line Control Note Note Na Inter Station Note Note Note Note Note Note Note Note	VSUPWAAAG THE WILLLAWS COMPANIES INC	CHARLES M. VALADEZ TED TIMMERMANK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NAM SLIP NA 0	HERTZ GLOBAL HOLDINGS INC.	ROHIN KRAMER	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		
Static Normanne Name American Control Static Norma Statin Norma Static Norma St	RSM US LLP	N/A	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		
NYNSCA IAAGUS L. BUTUSNII 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1<td>EXELON CORPORATION</td><td>FABIAN E. SOUZA</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></th1<>	EXELON CORPORATION	FABIAN E. SOUZA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
mm South Markas 0 0 0 1 <	NYSSCFA	HAROLD L. DEITERS III	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1		
NA DATN GRAVE D <th< td=""><td>PUP</td><td>MARIE MT DES</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>+</td><td></td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td></td><td>1</td><td>-</td></th<>	PUP	MARIE MT DES	0	0	-	0	+		-	0		1	-		
The interval Total Addition Total A	Maria	IAY N GRANT	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1		
NA TIM CLATTING I <	DUKE ENERGY	WILLIAM E. CURRENS JR.	0	0	n D	0	1	0	0 A	0	1	1	1		
CHAR CORPUTITION MARY 1. ADOCLAR MEELTZEL Image 1. Image 1. <th< td=""><td>NA</td><td>TIM CHATTING</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></th<>	NA	TIM CHATTING	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1		
MAREEL CORPORATION NORAN , CRUZZAR 0 <	CIGNA CORPORATION	MARY T. AGOGLIA HOELTZEL	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1		
MAREEL CORPORATION NNAN COROCI- 0	AGGREGATE SINGULARITY INC.	TERRY W. KIZZAR	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0		
NA 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 MAPRE MANNENENE MANNENENE MANNENENE MANNENENE MANNENENE MANNENENE MANNENENE MANNENENE MANNENENE 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 <t< td=""><td>MARKEL CORPORATION</td><td>NORA N. CROUCH</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></t<>	MARKEL CORPORATION	NORA N. CROUCH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
GLOBAL AVMENTS INC. DAVID IN SHEPPELID OPPENDEND	BDO USA LLP	N/A	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
MARTE NAXEY 1 SCHNOTER 0 0 1 0 1	GLOBAL PAYMENTS INC.	DAVID M. SHEFFIELD	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		
GRAFT TRUENTON LLP NA 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 AMAJARSHYNC: SEFLISTED 0 <td>IMAGRC</td> <td>NANCY J. SCHROEDER</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td>	IMAGRC	NANCY J. SCHROEDER	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0		
ALAMASSERIC TIEL LOMBULEU YORN 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 <th1< th=""> <th1< th=""> 1</th1<></th1<>	GRANT THORNTON LLP	N/A	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
WORD NSEC: SHELISTED 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<>	AAA/FARS/FRPC	TERI LOMBARIN YOHN	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		
NACHBO 3 SUKAN MENDRYD 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	WORLD VISION INC.	SEE LISTED	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		
NUMBER NA 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< th=""> <th1< th=""></th1<></th1<></th1<>	NACUBO	SUSAN M. MENDITTO	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		
Platter MEX HOMAN 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<>	INDEPENDENT SECTOR AND TECHSOUP	N/A	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		
DINNET HEALTH MORE CONNECK. JUNE STARR 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< th=""></th1<></th1<>	PERCER	MCK BOMAN	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1		
NOMENATION JM. SING. STARE JM. S	DIGNITY HEALTH	MARY CONNICK.	0	0	1	1	1	-	1	0	0	1	-		
Indextory Joint of America Joint of America <thjoint o<="" td=""><td>WORKLY'S ISC.</td><td>A W. MIRE STARK</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>+</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></thjoint>	WORKLY'S ISC.	A W. MIRE STARK	0	0	1	1	1	+	1	1	1	1	0		
Description Laber NetLor 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 <th1< th=""> <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<></th1<>	BANK OF AMERICA	ENERGY AND AND A STREET	0	0	1	0	1		0	1	0	1	1		
PEDEX CORPORATION KHEN L MERINO AND JENNIFER L KHENSON 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< th=""></th1<></th1<>	PNC FINANCIAL SERVICES GROUP INC.	LAUREN BELOT	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1		
PACEBOOK INC. NISARG JARIWALA 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> <th1<< td=""><td>FEDEX CORPORATION</td><td>JOHN L. MERINO AND JENNIFER L. JOHNSON</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></th1<<></th1<>	FEDEX CORPORATION	JOHN L. MERINO AND JENNIFER L. JOHNSON	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1		
BOK FINANCIAL KHIN C. MORROW 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 1<</th1<>	FACEBOOK INC.	NISARG JARIWALA	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CANTAL ONE FINANCIAL CORFORATION TIMOTHY GOLDEN 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 <td< td=""><td>BOK FINANCIAL</td><td>JOHN C. MORROW</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></td<>	BOK FINANCIAL	JOHN C. MORROW	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0		
MSEPAAPAN PHILIP & PACINO 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< th=""> 1</th1<></th1<>	CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORPORATION	TIMOTHY GOLDEN	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1		
NEXTERA INERGY INC. KIEK CREWS 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 <th< td=""><td>MSCPA/APAPC</td><td>PHILIP B. PACINO</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></th<>	MSCPA/APAPC	PHILIP B. PACINO	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1		
T-MOBILE US INC. DAN DROBAC AND ADAM NELSEN 0 1 <th1< th=""> <th1< th=""> 1</th1<></th1<>	NEXTERA ENERGY INC.	KIRK CREWS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		
CENCO SYSTEMS INC. PRAT IMATT 0 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <th1< th=""> 1<!--</td--><td>T-MOBILE US INC.</td><td>DAN DROBAC AND ADAM NELSEN</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></th1<>	T-MOBILE US INC.	DAN DROBAC AND ADAM NELSEN	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1		
ALPHABET INC. JOSH PAUL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	CISCO SYSTEMS INC.	PRAT BHATT	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1		
HEIMAGA BECHARD F. MCMAINON JR. AND GREGORY J. PETERSON 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<>	ALPHABET INC.	JOSH PAUL	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		
PLANTE & MORGAN PLLC NIA FINANCIAL REPORTING ADVISORS LLC NIA CONNOR GROUP INC. NIA CONNOR GROUP INC. NIA RUNTINGTON INGALLS INDUSTRIES NECOLAS SCHUCK FORD MOTOR COMPANY ALLE SHEPHIERD MOCPATIO MARK WINIARSKI MIKE SCANLON REFF ANTRAINER O 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	EHDAGA	RICHARD F. MCMAHON JR. AND GREGORY J. PETERSON	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1		
INANCIAL REPORTING ADVISORS LLC NA CONNOR GROUP INC. NA CONNOR GROUP INC. NA RUNTINGTON INGALLS INDUSTRIES NICOLAS SCHUCK ORD MOTOR COMPANY ALLE SHEPHERD OCTATIO MARK WINIARSKI MIKE SCANLON REPEANTRAINER O I	PLANTE & MORAN PLLC	N/A	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0		
CONSIDE GALLS INDUSTRIES NICOLAS SCHERCK INCLEAS SCHERCK INCOLAS SCH	FINANCIAL REPORTING ADVISORS LLC	N/A	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1		
ORD MOTOR COMPANY ALLE SHEPHERD 0 1 <t< td=""><td>FUNTINGTON INGALLS INDUSTRIES</td><td>NG NICOLAS SCHUCK</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>+</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></t<>	FUNTINGTON INGALLS INDUSTRIES	NG NICOLAS SCHUCK	0	1	0	0	0	+	1	0	0	1	0		
MOCPATHE MARK WINIARSKI MIKE SCANLON JEFF ANTRAINER 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< td=""><td>FORD MOTOR COMPANY</td><td>ALLIE SHEPHERD</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></th1<></th1<>	FORD MOTOR COMPANY	ALLIE SHEPHERD	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0		
SALESFORCE COM INC. JOSEPH C. ALLANSON AND ALEXANDRA BUILDRINI 0 0 1 0 1	MOCPATIO	MARK WINIARSKI MIKE SCANLON JEFF ANTRAINER	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1		
ICPASIANC BRIAN KOT AND WILLIAM KEIRSE 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<>	SALESFORCE.COM INC.	JOSEPH C. ALLANSON AND ALEXANDRA BULDRINI	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1		
TUTAL 0 8.5 30 21 38 31 26 16 21 37 38 AGREE 53 44.5 14 32 17 22 27 37 32 16 15 DISAGREE 0 8.5 39 21 38 31 26 16 21 37 38 Agree % 0 8.5 39 21 38 31 26 16 21 37 38 Agree % 100% 84% 26% 60% 32% 42% 51% 70% 60% 30% 28% Disagree % 0% 16% 74% 40% 70% 40% 70%	ICPAS/APC	BRIAN KOT AND WILLIAM KEIRSE	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
AGREE 53 44.5 14 32 17 22 27 37 32 16 15 DISAGREE 0 8.5 39 21 38 31 26 16 21 37 38 Agree % 100% 84% 26% 60% 32% 42% 51% 70% 60% 30% 28% Binagree % 0% 16% 74% 40% 72% 58% 40% 30% 40% 70% 70% 72%	TOTAL		0	8.5	39	21	38	31	- 26	- 16	21	37	38		
AddREE 53 44.5 14 32 17 22 27 37 32 16 15 DISAGREE 0 8.5 39 21 38 31 26 16 21 37 38 Agree % 100% 84% 26% 60% 32% 42% 51% 70% 60% 30% 28% Disagree % 0% 16% 74% 40% 72% 58% 40% 30% 40% 70%		1000													
DISAGREE 0 8.5 39 21 38 31 26 16 21 37 38 Agree % 100% 84% 26% 60% 32% 42% 51% 70% 60% 30% 28% Disagree % 0% 16% 74% 40% 72% 58% 40% 30% 40% 70% 72%		AUKE	53	44.5	14	32	17	22	27	37	32	16	15		
Agree % 100% 84% 26% 60% 30% 28% Disagree % 0% 16% 74% 40% 72% 58% 40% 70% <t< td=""><td></td><td>DISAGREE</td><td>0</td><td>8.5</td><td>39</td><td>21</td><td>38</td><td>31</td><td>26</td><td>16</td><td>21</td><td>37</td><td>38</td></t<>		DISAGREE	0	8.5	39	21	38	31	26	16	21	37	38		
Disagree % 09% 16% 74% 40% 72% 58% 49% 30% 40% 70% 72%		Agree %	100%	84%	26%	60%	32%	42%	51%	70%	60%	30%	28%		
		Disagree %	0%	16%	74%	40%	72%	58%	49%	30%	40%	20%	72%		

Figure 1

2.1. Eleven Comment Letter Questions

- Question 1: Should eligible implementation costs of a hosting arrangement that is a service contract be capitalized using the guidance on internal-use software, recognized in profit or loss over the term of the hosting arrangement as defined in this proposed Update, and presented in the same line item in the statement of income as the fee associated with the hosting arrangement? If not, what accounting is more appropriate and why?
- Question 2: This proposed Update includes an amendment to the definition of hosting arrangement in the Master Glossary. Do you agree with the amendment, and do you have any other concerns with the definition, as amended?
- Question 3: Is additional guidance needed to determine whether the amendments in this proposed Update apply to arrangements that include a minor hosting arrangement?
- Question 4: Can the guidance for determining the project stage (that is, preliminary project stage, application development stage, or post-implementation stage) in Subtopic 350-40 be consistently applied to a hosting arrangement? Why or why not?
- Question 5: Should an entity apply an impairment model to implementation costs of a hosting arrangement that is a service contract that is different from the impairment model included in Subtopic 350-40? Why or why not?
- Question 6: Do you agree with the disclosures included in the proposed amendments? If not, what additional disclosures do you recommend, or what disclosures should be removed and why?
- Question 7: Should the disclosures included in the proposed amendments be applied to internal use software and hosting arrangements that include a software license? Why or why not?
- Question 8: Should an entity be permitted to elect prospective transition or retrospective transition? If not, please explain what transition method should be required and why. If an entity elects prospective transition, should the entity apply the transition requirements to each hosting arrangement, each module or component within a hosting arrangement, or costs of the hosting arrangement?
- Question 9: Should an entity be required to provide the transition disclosures specified in the proposed amendments? If not, please explain what transition disclosures should be required and why.
- Question 10: How much time would be needed to implement the proposed amendments? Should early adoption be permitted? Do entities other than public business entities need additional time to apply the proposed amendments? Why or why not?
- Question 11: Should the proposed amendments be more broadly applied to similar transactions beyond hosting arrangements or be limited to transactions based on the scope of the proposed amendments? If more broadly applied, what transactions are similar to those included in the scope of the proposed amendments?

3. References

- i. A brief history of Cloud Computing (2019, April). Taylored Systems. Retrieved from https://www.taylored.com/blog/a-brief-history-of-cloud-computing/
- ii. Achbarou, O., El Kimar, M. A.&Elbouanani, S. (2017, January). Securing Cloud Computing from different attacks using intrusion detection systems. International journal of interactive multimedia and artificial intelligence 4(3): 61-64. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311947281_
- iii. Allouche,G. (2013, September 17). 7 well-known companies who have moved to the cloud. Smart Data Collective. Retrieved from https://www.smartdatacollective.com/7-well-known-companies-have-moved-cloud/
- iv. Blaskovich, J., & Mintchik, N. (2011). Information technology outsourcing: A taxonomy of prior studies and directions for future research. Journal of Information Systems, 25(1), 1-36. Retrieved from ProQuest.
- v. Computer Weekly (2012, December). Audits and compliance requirements for Cloud Computing. The Institute of Internal Auditors (TheIIA). Retrieved from https://na.theiia.org/training/courses/CourseOutlines/Auditing-the-Cloud.pdf
- vi. CWPS. (2018, April 12). 6 most common Cloud Computing security issues. CWPS. Retrieved from https://www.cwps.com/blog/cloud-computing-security-issues.
- vii. Dignan, L. (2018, December 11). Top cloud providers 2018: How AWS, Microsoft, Google, IBM, Oracle Alibaba stack up.Znet.com. Retrieved from https://www.zdnet.com/article/top-cloud-providers-2018-how-aws-microsoft-google-ibm-oracle-alibaba-stack-up/
- viii. Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB). Accounting standards Codification (ASC) 350.(2019). FASB ASU 350 Intangibles—Goodwill and Other. FASB. Retrieved from the FASB ASC.
- ix. FASB. (ASC) 350-40-65. (2019). FASB 350 Intangibles— Goodwill and Other40 Internal-Use Software65 Transition and Open Effective Date Information. FASB. Retrieved from the FASB ASC.
- x. FASB. (ASC) 350-20-35. (2019). FASB ASU 350 Intangibles—Goodwill and Other20 Goodwill35 Subsequent Measurement. FASB. Retrieved from the FASB ASC.
- xi. FASB. (2018, August). Accounting standards update (ASU) 2018-15 Intangibles-Goodwill and other-internal-use software (Subtopic 350-40) Customer's accounting for implementation costs included in a Cloud Computing arrangement that is a service contract. FASB .Retrieved from https://www.fasb.org/jsp/FASB/Document_C/DocumentPage?cid=1176171138858&acceptedDisclaimer=true

Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB). (2018). Understanding cost and benefits. GASB. Retrievedfrom https://www.gasb.org/jsp/GASB/Document_C/DocumentPage&cid=1176169857 899

- xii. Internal Tax. (2018, April). Tax treatment of Cloud Computing transactions in Malaysia. BNA.
- xiii. Retrieved from https://www.bna.com/tax-treatment-cloud-n57982091469/
- xiv. Liu, C. L., Chen, W. H., & Tung, D. K. (2011). Identification of critical security issues for cloud computing. Applied Mechanics and Materials, 145, 272.
- xv. Mearian, L. (2013, April 2). Know the key legal and security risks in a Cloud Computing contract. Computer World. Retrieved from https://www.computerworld.com/article/2496128/know-the-key-legal-and-security-risks-in-a-cloudcomputing-contract.html
- xvi. Moorgate, H. (2011, November 11). Fraud advisory panel. Fraud Facts-Cloud Computing Retrieved from https://www.fraudadvisorypanel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Fraud-Facts-15B-Cloud-Computing-Nov11.pdf
- xvii. Ozdemir, S. & Elitas, C. (2015). The risks of Cloud Computing in accounting field and solution offers: The case of Turkey. Journal of Business Research 7 (1) 43-59. Retrieved from http://isarder.org/isardercom/2015vol7issue1/vol.7_issue.1_article03_full_text.pdf
- xviii. Stefanou, C. J., & Skouras, A. (2015). E-government: Applications in the labor and social security regulatory area. Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, 9(4), 448-464. doi:http://dx.doi.org.prx-keiser.lirn.net/10.1108/TG-11-2014-0051
- xix. Sunarni, C. W. (2015). Management accounting practices at hospitality business in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, 4(1), 380-396. Retrieved from ProQuest
- xx. The Institute of Internal Auditors (TheIIA). (2017). Auditing the clouds.TheIIA. Retrieved from https://na.theiia.org/training/courses/CourseOutlines/Auditing-the-Cloud.pdf
- xxi. Vertex. (2019). Software in the Cloud: What are the tax implications? Vertex Inc. Retrieved from https://www.vertexinc.com/resources/insights/software cloud-what-are-tax-implications