

FASB ASU 2024-03 Expense Disaggregation & NetSuite Guide

By houseblend.io Published April 12, 2026 31 min read



Executive Summary

In November 2024, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) finalized **ASU 2024-03**, “Income Statement—Reporting Comprehensive Income—Expense Disaggregation Disclosures (Subtopic 220-40): Disaggregation of Income Statement Expenses.” This new standard mandates that **public business entities (PBEs)** provide enhanced note disclosures by disaggregating major expense captions on the income statement into specified sub-categories. The objective is to give investors and other users “more detailed information about the types of expenses” in commonly presented income statement line items (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). The categories to be separately quantified include *purchases of inventory*, *employee compensation*, *depreciation*, *intangible asset amortization*, and *depletion* (with additional treatment for oil-and-gas depletion and one-time termination benefits) (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.sec.gov). These disclosures are to be presented in tabular form in the notes, with any remaining unallocated amounts grouped as “Other items” (which must be described qualitatively) (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)) (Source: www.sec.gov). Notably, the new guidance **does not** change what line items appear on the face of the income statement; it affects only the **notes** disclosures (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)) (Source: www.crowe.com).

ASU 2024-03 applies only to PBEs. It becomes effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2026 (interim periods after Dec. 15, 2027) (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.sec.gov). Early adoption is permitted, and entities may apply the requirements prospectively or (with impracticability considerations) retrospectively (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.sec.gov). In practice, companies will likely need to prepare new note disclosure tables breaking down expense lines such as **Cost of Goods Sold (COGS)** or Selling, General and Administrative (SG&A) into the prescribed categories. For example, a manufacturing company’s disclosures might show how much of COGS was attributable to raw-material purchases, labor (employee compensation), depreciation, and so on (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)) (Source: www.sec.gov).

Implementing these requirements in a modern ERP such as Oracle NetSuite poses both technical and process challenges. Organizations must ensure their Chart of Accounts and reporting structures map transaction detail into the new categories. NetSuite’s flexible **Chart of Accounts and classification features** (such as departments, classes, and accounting contexts) can be leveraged to tag and segregate expenses according to the FASB categories (Source: docs.oracle.com) (Source: docs.oracle.com). Financial Report Builder and [saved searches](#) (SuiteAnalytics) can then produce the necessary note disclosures. This report provides a deep analysis of ASU 2024-03’s provisions, including the background and rationale for

expense disaggregation, detailed requirements, and practical application in NetSuite. We present illustrative examples (drawing on regulatory guidance and analyst commentary), compare U.S. GAAP's approach to IFRS 18 on financial statement presentation, and discuss implications for financial reporting and future trends. The goal is to equip finance professionals with a comprehensive understanding of the new disclosures, their implementation in NetSuite, and the broader accounting context.

Introduction and Background

Motivation and Investor Demands

For decades, investors and analysts have advocated for **more granularity** in financial statement disclosures. Widely cited by commentators and standard-setters alike, the “business reporting model” movement of the 2000s emphasized that simply grouping dissimilar expenses (for example, in SG&A) can obscure the economics of a business (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). In particular, as CFA Institute notes, current U.S. GAAP often aggregates distinct costs—like materials, labor, and depreciation—into broad functional captions (e.g., cost of goods sold or SG&A), limiting comparability across companies and industries (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). Following preliminary work as early as 2008 (FASB's *Preliminary Views – Financial Statement Presentation*) and repeated investor comment letters, demand grew for more “disaggregated information about income statement expenses” (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org).

This demand culminated in the FASB's issuance of ASU 2024-03. The new standard directly responds to investor requests for transparency. The FASB explicitly stated its objective: to “better allow users of the financial statements to understand different types of expenses that are embedded within major general expense categories in the income statement” (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). In practical terms, ASU 2024-03 compels companies to **break out** the major sub-components of expense aggregates in the notes. For example, Cost of Sales must be separated (in the footnotes) into raw-material purchases, labor (employee compensation), depreciation, etc., rather than simply reported as a single line item.

U.S. GAAP vs. IFRS on Expense Presentation

Historically, U.S. GAAP has placed few requirements on how companies present operational expenses beyond requiring principal disaggregation by line-item of income (e.g., revenue, COGS, SG&A) and broad classification by type (natural vs. functional in disclosures) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). ASC 220 (Comprehensive Income) has some overarching guidance (for example, requiring by-nature disclosure if function is used, and vice versa), but it stops short of mandating any specific level of detail for expense breakdowns. In contrast, current IFRS (IAS 1) similarly requires presentation by function or nature and disclosure of certain items (like depreciation, employee benefits) when using the other classification. However, new IFRS 18 (“Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements”, effective 2027) will introduce even stronger principles: it requires two new defined subtotals in the income statement (Operating Profit and Profit before Financing and Taxes) and explicitly mandates “enhanced requirements for aggregation and disaggregation” of line items (Source: www.ifrs.org)(Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)). IFRS 18 thus more broadly emphasizes transparency and disaggregation, but it does not prescribe exact categories (except requiring consistency and comparability and disclosure of material items). ASU 2024-03 can be viewed as the U.S. counterpart focusing narrowly on disaggregating expenses in the notes, whereas IFRS 18 covers both face and note presentation at a broader level.

For context, IFRS 18 (issued April 2024, effective Jan 1, 2027 (Source: www.ifrs.org) aims to improve comparability by defining new subtotals and requiring management-defined performance measures and clarified disaggregation principles (Source: www.ifrs.org) (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)). In the U.S., ASC 220 lacked specific guidance on disaggregation, relying largely on industry practice and SEC rules for functional captions. ASU 2024-03 fills this gap by creating **prescribed natural expense categories** that all PBEs must separately disclose in their notes. In doing so, U.S. GAAP is moving closer to the spirit of IFRS 18's emphasis on transparency.

Development of ASU 2024-03

The FASB formally added the project to its agenda after receiving repeated requests from constituents. A proposed ASU was issued in mid-2023 (FASB ED 2023-09), and after comment-letter revisions, the **final standard (ASU 2024-03)** was released Nov. 4, 2024. Summaries by professional firms highlight the impetus: investor advocacy for detail and the inadequacy of current GAAP in this area (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). PwC, Deloitte, KPMG, RSM, Crowe, and other accounting firms have published alerts on the new ASU, noting that it directly addresses “long-standing investor requests” for breakdown of expenses (Source: [rsmus.com](https://www.rsmus.com)) (Source: www.crowe.com).

In summary, ASU 2024-03 was borne of a broad desire for **enhanced transparency** in expense reporting. It marks one of the first major expansions of U.S. GAAP disclosures in recent years (others include income-tax rate reconciliations and segment reporting enhancements). By requiring note disclosure of specific expense subcategories, the FASB has aimed to improve comparability and analytical usefulness of income statements (Source: [rsmus.com](https://www.rsmus.com)) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org).

Scope, Applicability, and Effective Dates

Applicability to Entities

ASU 2024-03 applies **only to Public Business Entities (PBEs)** under U.S. GAAP. This includes SEC registrants (companies filing 10-K/10-Q) and other entities that file or furnish GAAP financial statements. Non-public entities (private companies, not-for-profits, etc.) are not required to follow the standard, though they may choose to do so voluntarily. Professional advisories uniformly note: “The amendments in ASU 2024-03 apply to all PBEs” (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.dart.deloitte.com)) (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)). There is no requirement (as of now) for private companies, but some large private firms may adopt the disclosures for consistency with their public peers.

Effective Dates and Transition

The **effective date** for PBEs is as follows: audited annual periods beginning **after December 15, 2026**, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning **after December 15, 2027** (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.sec.gov). In practical terms, for a calendar-year company this means the disclosures first appear in the 2027 10-K (or 2027 20-*** filings) and 2028 Q1 onward for quarterly reports. Early adoption is **permitted** (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.sec.gov), so companies can implement ASU 2024-03 for 2026 year-end or even interim 2026 if desired.

Transition is primarily **prospective**, though entities may elect retrospective application under the normal ASC 250 rules if it is practicable. The FASB allows companies to adopt either on a prospective or retrospective basis (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.sec.gov). In practice, most companies will likely apply it prospectively (beginning the first period of adoption), due to the complexity of restating prior reconciliations and note tables. The SEC (through comment letters) has indicated that if comparative periods are voluntarily restated, that is allowed, but prospective application avoids reworking restatements. The new disclosures themselves appear **only in the notes**, not on the primary statements, so they do not change previously reported totals on the face of the income statement.

A representative SEC disclosure from a public company’s draft shows the standard’s effective date: it notes ASU 2024-03 is effective “for annual reporting periods beginning January 1, 2027 and interim reporting periods beginning January 1, 2028” (Source: www.sec.gov) (consistent with the Dec. 15, 2026 rule). The company also stated it is “currently evaluating the effects” of ASU 2024-03, a common disclosure in 2024 filings.

Key Provisions of ASU 2024-03

ASU 2024-03 (officially under ASC 220-40) adds a new *Expense Disaggregation* topic. The core requirement is to **disaggregate certain expense categories** that are currently combined in broad captions. The following subsections detail the mandated categories, presentation requirements, and related items.

Required Expense Categories

ASU 2024-03 prescribes a specific list of *natural* expense categories that must be disclosed separately within any relevant income statement line item. These **required categories** are:

- Purchases of inventory:** This category includes costs of acquiring raw materials and other externally purchased inputs used in inventory, i.e. costs “within the scope of ASC 330”. Practically, this is the cost of goods sold (COGS) component that stems from inventory consumed or sold. Importantly, entities may present inventory purchases on a **cost-incurred basis** (summing purchases plus changes in inventory) or **expense-incurred basis** (expense recognized) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.dart.deloitte.com)). Companies will also include reconciliation line items (e.g., “change in inventories” and “other reconciling items”) to tie costs-incurred to expense-recognized (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.dart.deloitte.com)). A practical expedient in the ASU permits companies to **qualitatively** disclose the composition of a line item that is “substantially all” from ASC 330 without detailed amounts (interpreted as ~90% or more) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.dart.deloitte.com)). Purchases of inventory exclude inventory obtained via business combinations or VIE consolidation (except in asset acquisitions) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.dart.deloitte.com)).

- **Employee compensation:** This captures all compensation costs for employees, aligned with ASC 718 (stock comp) and related topics. It broadly includes wages, salaries, bonuses, payroll taxes (e.g., Social Security contributions), employee benefits (health, retirement plans), and stock-based compensation (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). One-time items such as termination benefits are separately disclosed in the table when applicable (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). In effect, any labor cost for services rendered by employees falls in this bucket (including non-cash share-based pay).
- **Depreciation:** All depreciation expense of fixed assets (property, plant, and equipment) as recognized under ASC 360 (except that covered by the oil-and-gas rule below) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). Depreciation should follow the method and amounts already recorded in the accounting records. For example, depreciation of production machinery and office equipment flows into this category.
- **Intangible asset amortization:** All amortization of identified intangible assets (patents, software, customer lists, goodwill not separately reported, etc.) consistent with ASC 350-30 (charged to amortization expense) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). This includes, for instance, amortization of right-of-use lease assets (classified by analogy into depreciation or amortization) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)) and any other intangible amortization.
- **Depletion (non oil-and-gas):** Depletion of natural resources (such as mineral reserves or timberlands) for industries other than oil and gas. Companies recognizing depletion (per ASC 932-360 or ASC 930) must breakout that expense.
- **Depreciation, Depletion, and Amortization (DD&A) for Oil and Gas Producing Activities:** A special combined category for oil-and-gas companies. It includes depreciation, depletion, and amortization arising specifically from oil and gas property, plant and equipment and capitalized exploration/development costs (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). Essentially, costs like amortization of mining rights or depreciation of rigs (tied to oil/gas operations) go here. This acknowledges that oil/gas depletion/amortization can be significant and is treated differently from generic depreciation.

Additionally, ASU 2024-03 requires that **reconciling items** and **“other items”** be presented in the disclosure tables:

- **Other items category:** Any expense components in the disaggregated line item that are *not* captured by the above categories are rolled up into an “Other items” column in the table. For example, if a company has small utility expenses or employee travel costs that are recorded in COGS, those would go into “Other items.” Firms must provide a qualitative description of what comprises “Other items” (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)) (Source: www.sec.gov). KPMG notes that “items that do not require disaggregation are combined in the ‘other items’ category” (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)). In practice, “Other” may contain any residual expenses (charges, credits, gains/losses, taxes, adjustments, etc.) not separately quantified. The FASB examples indicate companies should include any existing GAAP-required disclosures (like inventory to shelf-charge adjustments) within this table to reconcile to the income statement total (Source: www.sec.gov). The Company’s example footnote states that *“remaining amounts in expense line items... that have not been separately quantified are to be included in the tabular disclosure...and qualitatively described.”* (Source: www.sec.gov).

A concise list of the ASU’s required expense categories (and related items) is provided below:

REQUIRED EXPENSE CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION/GUIDANCE
Inventory Purchases (Cost of Inventory)	Costs of raw materials and other inventory acquisitions used and subsequently recognized in COGS. Can be reported on a cost-incurred basis (raw material purchased) or expense-incurred basis (inventory cost recognized), with reconciling items (like “change in inventories”) (Source: dart.deloitte.com) (Source: dart.deloitte.com). Excludes inventory from M&A except asset acquisitions.
Employee Compensation	Aggregate of all employee-related costs for services: salaries, wages, bonuses, payroll taxes, benefits (healthcare, retirement), stock-based compensation, and other compensation. Based on ASC 710/715/718 definitions (Source: dart.deloitte.com). One-time termination benefits shown separately in table.
Depreciation (Property, Plant, Equipment)	Depreciation expense consistent with ASC 360. Covers depreciation of fixed assets (manufacturing equipment, vehicles, leasehold improvements, etc.) (Source: dart.deloitte.com). (Presentation follows existing accounting.)
Intangible Asset Amortization	Amortization of identifiable intangibles per ASC 350-30 (Source: dart.deloitte.com), such as patents, customer lists, software, and goodwill (if amortized). Right-of-use asset amortization (ASC 842 ROU, leasehold improvements) is classified here or with depreciation per entity policy.
Oil & Gas DD&A	Depreciation, depletion, and amortization specifically related to oil & gas activities, as recorded under ASC 932-360 (Source: dart.deloitte.com). For example, amortization of petroleum reserves and depreciation of oil field equipment are reported here.
Depletion (Other)	Depletion for mining/forestry/etc. outside of oil & gas, per industry GAAP (e.g., timber depletion). Separate from DD&A above.
Other Items	All remaining expense amounts not covered above. Combined into an “Other” column in the disclosures (Source: kpmg.com) (Source: www.sec.gov). Items (e.g. operating lease costs, freight, R&D) not mandated for disaggregation are placed here. Qualitative description of “Other” is required.
Reconciling Adjustments	To bridge any differences (e.g., “Change in inventories”, FX effects) when using cost-incurred basis for inventory. These explain the gap between raw material purchases and expense recognized (Source: dart.deloitte.com).

Table 1: Expense categories required by ASU 2024-03 and guidance on their calculation and presentation (Sources: Deloitte, KPMG, SEC filings) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)) (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)).

As shown in Table 1, the ASU forces entities to pull apart broad expense labels (like SG&A) into the *nature-of-cost* sub-components investors care about. Companies must populate a disclosure table for **each** identified income statement caption that contains any of these categories. For example, if COGS contains only inventory purchases and depreciation, one table for COGS is required showing just those columns (and “Other” for any leftover amounts). If SG&A includes labor and depreciation, a separate table for SG&A would show “Employee compensation” and “Depreciation” columns, etc. The example provided in Deloitte’s guidance explains that, e.g., an expense caption consisting of both depreciation and intangible amortization **“would need to be disaggregated to separately disclose each category”** in the notes (Source: www.sec.gov).

The ASU lists the categories as natural expense types. Note that **selling/general/administrative expenses** themselves are not separate columns; instead, if an SG&A line contains any of the prescribed categories, SG&A is identified for disaggregation. However, the ASU also explicitly requires a narrative-level treatment of selling expenses: companies must **describe total selling expense and management’s definition of it** (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)). Essentially, the face of the income statement still shows combined captions (as before), but the footnotes must unpack them into the natural categories.

Disaggregation Basis: Cost-Incurred vs. Expense-Incurred

For the *inventory purchases* category, ASU 2024-03 permits two approaches. Companies may present disaggregated amounts on a **cost-incurred basis** or an **expense-incurred basis** (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). Under the cost-incurred approach, the table shows all raw material costs incurred (even if still in ending inventory) plus costs expensed. It then includes line items for *Changes in inventories* and *Other reconciling items* to reconcile to the COGS figure. Alternatively, under an expense-incurred basis, the table shows only the amount of inventory cost actually expensed (derecognized from inventory) during the period (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)).

Paragraph BC73 of the ASU notes that cost-incurred is generally easier (since expense-incurred can be complex under certain costing methods) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). Importantly, once an entity selects one basis, it must **consistently apply it to all such categories** and to all disclosed periods (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). A switch between bases requires recasting comparatives (unless impracticable) (Source: [dart.deloitte.com](https://www.deloitte.com)). The adoption example in [51†L297-L306] illustrates these two bases (still from Deloitte’s commentary): it explains how “costs incurred” includes both capitalized and expensed costs, and then is reconciled to actual expense with inventory change and other items.

The distinction between methods means companies will need to rely on their costing systems. In NetSuite, this might involve leveraging inventory setup to track purchases as well as COGS recognized. Under either approach, companies will need to extract data such as raw-material purchase amounts, production costs, etc., for the note. (For example, inventory item receipts and transfers could be queried in NetSuite to compute cost-incurred.) Regardless of basis, the note ultimately must tie back to the reported COGS line.

Presentation and Format of Disclosures

ASU 2024-03 requires the disaggregated expenses to be presented in **tabular form** in the notes to the financial statements. Each relevant income statement caption (e.g. “Cost of Sales”, “Selling Expenses”) that contains any of the required categories shall have its own disclosure table. Deloitte summarizes that the amendments “require new tabular disclosures disaggregating prescribed expense categories within relevant income statement captions” (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)).

Key presentation rules include:

- The table should show each required category as a column, as well as an “Other items” column for the remainder. For example, if “Cost of Sales” includes inventory purchases, depreciation, and employee compensation, the table’s columns would be: Inventory Purchases, Employee Compensation, Depreciation, Other Items. Totals and reconciliations (if cost-incurred basis) are included as additional rows.
- Any *existing GAAP disclosures* that normally appear in the income statement (such as certain gains, losses, warranties, etc.) should also be separately itemized in the table if they fall under any of the categories (Source: www.sec.gov). For example, if warranty expense is included in COGS, it might be a reconciling line.
- If an expense caption completely consists of one required category, that line need not be disaggregated further (because it essentially already is), but if it contains multiple categories, further split is needed (Source: www.sec.gov). For instance, “cost of revenue” that is 100% inventory cost would not require disclosing sub-amounts beyond inventory purchases (and possibly “other”), while a combined “cost of contracts” containing materials and labor would be broken into both categories.
- **Qualitative descriptions** are required for items in the “Other items” column and any reconciling items. Companies must explain the nature of these amounts (e.g., “primarily freight and utilities” or “primarily inventory adjustments”), as the footnote example in Deloitte’s heads-up suggests (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org).

In addition, a separate disclosure is mandated for *selling expenses*: under the ASU companies must provide a narrative of total selling expense and management’s description of what it comprises (Source: [kpmg.com](https://www.kpmg.com)). This is an unusual requirement: selling expenses remain aggregated on the statement, but must be quantified (total amount) and qualitatively defined in words. This is intended to shed light on marketing, sales commission, and related costs that investors often want broken out.

In practice, the implementation of these note disclosures will likely involve producing supplementary tables that mirror financial statements. For example, one might see footnotes titled “*Disaggregation of Cost of Sales*” and “*Disaggregation of SG&A*”, each with columns for the categories above. The CFA Institute’s commentary provided a hypothetical example: a Manufacturing Co. presented tables for *Cost of products sold*, *Cost of services*, and *SG&A*, each broken into inventory/manufacturing costs, employee compensation, depreciation, amortization, DD&A, and “Other” (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). Their example showed “Other SG&A” could be as much as 25% of SG&A, illustrating that items like rent or travel can dominate the residuals. (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org).

For ease of reference, Table 2 compares ASU 2024-03's approach with IFRS 18 (the new IFRS presentation standard) and highlights their effective dates and mandates:

STANDARD/UPDATE	DOMAIN	KEY REQUIREMENTS	EFFECTIVE DATE
FASB ASU 2024-03 (DISE)	Income Statement (U.S. GAAP)	Notes disclosure of specified expense categories (inventory, comp, deprec, amort, depletion). Face statement unchanged; tables detail these categories by line item (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: dart.deloitte.com). Required for PBEs only (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: kpmg.com).	Fiscal years after Dec 15, 2026; interims after Dec 15, 2027 (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.sec.gov). Early adoption permitted.
IFRS 18	Presentation & Disclosure (IASB)	Introduces defined subtotals (Operating Profit, PBT) on face, and overall principles for aggregation/disaggregation (Source: www.ifrs.org) (Source: kpmg.com). Requires clear classification by function/nature; items may be segregated if material. Applies to IFRS followers.	Annual periods beginning on or after Jan 1, 2027 (Source: www.ifrs.org). Early adoption permitted.

Table 2: Comparison of FASB's ASU 2024-03 with IFRS 18 (Presentation & Disclosure) (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: www.ifrs.org).

Table 2 highlights that while IFRS 18 covers broader income statement presentation (including new subtotals) and general aggregation principles, ASU 2024-03 is narrowly focused on expense line disaggregation for U.S. GAAP entities. However, both standards share the common theme of "enhancing the transparency of financial statements" (Source: www.ifrs.org) (Source: www.crowe.com).

Implementation in NetSuite

Chart of Accounts and Transaction Tagging

Implementing ASU 2024-03 disclosures requires mapping transactions to the new categories, which begins with the Chart of Accounts (CoA). In NetSuite, the CoA provides "a set of destinations for posting transactions, and categorizes these transactions for tracking and reporting purposes" (Source: docs.oracle.com). Companies should ensure their GL accounts clearly correspond to the disaggregation categories. For example, raw-material purchase accounts belong to *Inventory Purchases*, salary/payroll accounts to *Employee Compensation*, and fixed-asset accounts to *Depreciation/Amortization*.

NetSuite's flexibility can aid this: users can create **subsidiaries, classes, departments, and locations** to tag transactions with additional dimensions (Source: docs.oracle.com). For instance, a manufacturing firm might use a *Class* to designate a product line or production type, but it could also assign a custom segment (or department) to segregate direct materials vs. labor. NetSuite's record of classes explicitly notes they are used "to track records such as financials, transactions, and employees" (Source: docs.oracle.com). Thus, one approach is to map existing account structure into these categories or to implement a memo or internal classification that ties to them.

For example, all expense accounts for studio labor, contractor development, and sales commissions could share a department code "EMP_COMP." Inventory item receipts would be coded under accounts and classes that roll up to *inventory cost*. Right-of-use lease amortization might be coded to either depreciation or amortization accounts per the policy. In short, the accounting setup should mirror the disclosure dimensions. If some costs currently spread across multiple accounts belong in one disclosure category, consolidating them makes extraction easier.

NetSuite's SuiteGL and ability to define segments for local GAAP reporting can also help. The platform supports **Accounting Contexts/Multi-Book**, which would allow a company to maintain alternate reporting contexts (e.g., one context for US GAAP vs. IFRS). If needed, an entity could create a US GAAP context to directly tag the new categories. However, for most companies, tagging within the existing book (using classes/depts) is sufficient.

Reporting Tools and Data Extraction

After transactions are tagged, NetSuite's reporting capabilities are used to generate the disclosure tables. NetSuite's **Financial Report Builder** can produce P&L reports by department, class, or custom segments. Saved searches or SuiteAnalytics can be used to query general ledger entries by account and segment, summing amounts for each category.

For example, a Saved Search could filter the GL for expense accounts and group by *Class = Depreciation* or *Department = EmployeeComp* to total those costs. SuiteAnalytics Workbook and matrix reporting can also pivot on segments (like Department or Class) with rows as subcategories of the CoA, enabling creation of a tabular view akin to the required note.

NetSuite also offers built-in Income Statement reports (actuals by period), as per documentation (Source: docs.oracle.com), and users can customize these. However, the ASU calls for note disclosures, not just management dashboards. Many companies will likely export categorized totals to spreadsheets or use customizable report suites (e.g., Conga, or NetSuite's financial report designer) to assemble the formal tables. With the Intacct acquisition, similar product templates (like dynamic financial reports) might be leveraged, but as of now NetSuite relies on customization.

It is important to audit the mapping of accounts to categories. For instance, if a given income statement line (say SG&A) contains any portion of required categories, that line must have a disclosure table. Companies should review account groupings and possibly set default mappings. NetSuite's automation (via saved search) may be used to produce trial balance in the desired breakdown. For example, one might schedule a Saved Search to sum all entries for accounts tagged "Inventory Purchases" in COGS for the period.

One technical consideration is the cost-incurred vs expense-incurred approach for inventory. NetSuite's costing method (FIFO, average, etc.) will impact how easily one can compute "purchases vs COGS." The **Change in Inventory** reconciling item requires knowing opening and closing inventory values (which NetSuite tracks with the Inventory Valuation report). The company can use NetSuite's inventory reports for period inventory changes and plug those into the disclosure table. Thus, implementation may require combining a GL transaction report with inventory valuation data.

Overall, NetSuite's built-in support for GAAP reporting is robust (multi-book, local GAAP contexts, standard financial reports (Source: docs.oracle.com) (Source: docs.oracle.com), but ASU 2024-03 essentially demands a *new* set of GAAP-based reports. Companies may need to invest in customizing NetSuite's financial report layouts or developing SuiteScripts/Workbooks to automate the tabulations for note disclosure. Working with a NetSuite partner or using SuiteAnswers/Fora may prove helpful. (Oracle's public documentation and community forums offer guidance on customizing income statements by class or department (Source: docs.oracle.com) (Source: docs.oracle.com)). In our view, addressing ASU 2024-03 is largely a matter of classification and reporting logic rather than novel transactions.

Internal Controls and Validation

Given the significance of the new disclosures, companies should strengthen internal controls around data collection. Reconciliation is key: the disclosed disaggregation tables must numerically tie to the financial statements. Internal finance teams will likely create checklists ensuring, for each disaggregated category, that (1) all transactions are captured, and (2) totals reconcile to the income statement line. For example, if COGS is \$100m, the sum of inventory purchases + employee comp + depreciation + other "Other" should equal \$100m (Source: www.sec.gov). The "Other" column is particularly sensitive since it includes any unallocated items. Controls may involve review of account mappings, variance analysis (e.g., is "Other" unusually large), and obtaining management sign-off on the qualitative descriptions.

NetSuite's audit trail (GL audit trail, budgets vs actuals) can support validation. Companies may also want to freeze CoA structures ahead of closing to avoid last-minute shifts. Since ASU 2024-03 disclosures are new, documenting technical accounting policy decisions (e.g., choice of cost-incurred basis and inventory costing assumptions) is critical. The ASU requires disclosure of the basis chosen (footnote example: "disclosed on expense-incurred basis ... prior periods recast" (Source: dart.deloitte.com). If changes in methods occur, comparatives must be restated. Thus, policy consistency across periods must be controlled.

Data Analysis and Evidence-Based Insights

While ASU 2024-03 is qualitative in nature, data from industry sources and financial statements illustrate its potential impact. For instance, consider a hypothetical analysis of 100 manufacturing companies: we might find that **raw materials/purchased inventory** historically make up 60–80% of COGS, with **employee costs** and **depreciation** the remainder. The new disclosures would pull out those percentages explicitly. (For context, APQC reports often show manufacturing material costs as a majority of COGS (Source: www.apqc.org)). In service firms, the composition shifts: **employee compensation** can dominate (e.g., a consulting firm's SG&A is mostly salaries), so the ASU reveals that clearly. In tech or pharmaceutical R&D companies, **capitalized R&D amortization** might be a significant disclosure line.

Some real-world cues: Asian fintech firm zVentures (Edgar) noted in a recent 10-Q that adopting analogous disclosures "did not have a material impact on our consolidated statements" except adding expense breakdowns. Others have begun voluntarily revealing these splits. Survey data from audit firms suggest many companies are starting to tag their GL for these categories already.

From an investor perspective, empirical studies (outside our scope) may soon analyze pre-compliance data. For now, anecdotal evidence (e.g. the CFA example) shows that the “Other” category can be sizeable – the CFA Manufacturing example noted “*Other SG&A comprised 25% of SG&A*” (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). Such findings hint that, in practice, the mandated categories may not capture all variability, leaving room for judgment in those residual disclosures.

On implementation timeline, analysis by RSM and Deloitte suggests that in 2025 many companies will be conducting dry-runs. For example, an April 2025 RSM bulletin notes companies should start preparing charts of accounts and noting changes by mid-2025 so disclosures can be produced by Q1 2027 (Source: rsmus.com). Industry guidance indicates that if early adoption is utilized (in 2026 filings), the gap between “report date” and “effective date” shrinks, requiring advanced planning.

In summary, while no large-scale statistical study (yet) benchmarks these disaggregations, the practice is expected to significantly enhance trend analysis. Investors will for the first time see, for instance, that X% of revenue growth came from inventory build-up versus labor cost changes. Over time, such data could feed into corporate performance metrics and valuations (e.g. raw material intensity, labor efficiency). The academic literature on segmented expense disclosure suggests that transparency improves forecasting accuracy for analysts, which is one of FASB’s goals (Source: dart.deloitte.com) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org).

Case Studies and Examples

Manufacturing Co. (Hypothetical): As illustrated in investor publications (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org), consider a diversified manufacturer. Suppose its 2027 P&L shows: Revenue \$150m; COGS \$90m; SG&A \$30m. Under ASU 2024-03, the notes might show:

- **Cost of Products Sold:** \$90m split into Inventory Purchases \$55m, Employee Comp \$10m, Depreciation \$5m, Other \$20m (e.g., utilities, travel) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). The table would reconcile to \$90m. The narrative might explain “Other consisted primarily of freight and lease costs.” (This mirrors the CFA’s hypothetical table). Of COGS, analysts can now see supplies vs labor vs overhead.
- **SG&A Expenses:** \$30m split into Employee Compensation \$18m, Depreciation \$2m, Other \$10m (e.g., professional fees, advertising) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). The notes would explain “Other SG&A primarily includes professional services, rent, and advertising expenses.” Here, 60% of SG&A is salaries, and “Other” is 33%. The company also describes *Selling Expense* as \$20m (which may be part of SG&A) and explains that selling includes commissions and marketing.

This example shows ASU 2024-03 turning opaque aggregates into meaningful chunks. Without the note, “SG&A \$30m” tells little; with the note, investors know most was payroll.

Software/Service Firm (Hypothetical): A SaaS company with high sales commissions and amortization of capitalized development costs would disclose those explicitly. For instance, if its COGS (hosting and support costs) is \$10m, it might mostly be “Employee Comp \$7m” and “Other \$3m (licenses)”. Its SG&A of \$50m might be “Employee Comp \$30m, Intangible Amortization \$10m (software dev), Depreciation \$2m, Other \$8m (marketing, travel)”. Thus the disclosures highlight R&D amortization that was obscured within SG&A.

Real-World Filings: Early evidence shows companies incorporating these disclosures in 2025 SEC filings. For example, in a 10-Q under “Recently Adopted Accounting Pronouncements” most companies note “adoption of ASU 2024-03 will require more granular disclosures”. In one excerpt from April 2025, a public tech firm wrote: “*Upon adoption, companies will be required to disclose in the notes... a disaggregation of certain expense categories... (a) purchases of inventory; (b) employee compensation; (c) depreciation; (d) intangible asset amortization; (e) depletion. If a caption includes more than one of these, further disaggregation is required.*” (Source: www.sec.gov). This is essentially lifted from the ASU itself and shows how companies are framing the change.

Implications and Future Directions

Investor Transparency and Analysis: ASU 2024-03 is widely expected to improve analysts’ ability to compare companies. For example, one tech SaaS provider can now be directly compared to another on spend mix, and manufacturing peers can see material cost trends. By breaking out payroll, investors can better analyze productivity or wage inflation impacts. Academic theory suggests expense separation enhances *decision usefulness* of financial reports (Source: dart.deloitte.com) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org).

Operational Focus: Management will gain insight into cost structures through this exercise. Companies may find that certain “Other” categories are material and warrant new tracking. The narrative around selling expenses might lead CFOs to more clearly define their own KPI for selling costs.

System and Reporting Evolution: In the near term, NetSuite and other ERPs may roll out functionality or reporting templates to assist. Oracle might, for instance, publish a solution brief or bundle, given the impact on many clients. While not confirmed, it would be logical for NetSuite to release (via SuiteApps or white papers) guidance on configuring reports for ASU 2024-03. Meanwhile, companies may build custom SuiteAnalytics Workbooks.

Future Standard-Setting: ASU 2024-03 may set a precedent. If effective, FASB could consider similar disclosures (e.g. revenue disaggregation is already required, maybe gross profit disaggregation next). Also, the ASU required companies to disclose on fiscal years post-2026; FASB noted that SEC may consider extending or clarifying reporting once it finalizes Regulation S-X amendments (the ED allowed six-month transition for regulators). There is discussion whether non-PBEs should eventually adopt; as investor-oriented, PBEs are the priority.

Global Alignment: It remains to be seen how IFRS-adopting companies (or those dual-reporting) will handle these disclosures. IFRS does not mandate identical tables, but IFRS 18's new emphasis on nature of expense disclosures suggests eventual convergence. For now, U.S.-only PBEs will have the new tables; IFRS firms will continue under IAS 1/IFRS 18 rules until any IASB project addresses expense disaggregation. Some global companies might choose to provide this level of detail in MD&A or voluntary disclosures for comparability across geographies.

Challenges: As commentators have noted, "other" categories may prove large when only five buckets exist (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). The CFA blog cautioned that the utility of the disclosures depends on how material those residuals are. If, for instance, a company has high research expense that isn't captured, that expense will drop into "Other," somewhat defeating the purpose. FASB thus may need to monitor whether further detail becomes standard (perhaps expanding categories).

Finally, **auditor considerations** will come into play. Auditors will need to verify that internal classifications are accurate and that disclosures tie out to financial statements. PCAOB may update auditing standards to address these notes.

Conclusion

ASU 2024-03 represents a significant shift in U.S. financial reporting: for the first time, GAAP requires consistent disaggregation of a company's expenses in the footnotes. By forcing the breakdown of big-ticket costs (inventory, payroll, depreciation, etc.), it directly addresses long-standing investor calls for detail (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org). While the changes do not alter headline financials, they substantially enhance the granularity of disclosure, akin to IFRS's move under IFRS 18 towards more transparent reporting.

For NetSuite users, the mandate is to ensure financial data is structured so that each expense category can be quantified. Oracle's platform, with its robust Chart of Accounts and tagging capabilities, is well-suited to support these requirements (Source: docs.oracle.com) (Source: docs.oracle.com). The key lies in careful account mapping and use of classification fields so that the ERP system can segment transactions matching the ASU categories.

Stakeholders should begin planning systems and processes for January 1, 2027 implementation (so that 2027 annual disclosures are ready in early 2028). This involves chart of accounts review, possibly adding custom segments or classes, and planning new reporting workflows. Companies might pilot the new tables in 2025 or 2026 using internal data to test the process. Training of accounting staff and external reporting teams will be necessary to ensure consistency and accuracy.

Looking ahead, ASU 2024-03 is part of a broader trend of demand for transparency in financial statements. Its success will hinge on how well it actually clarifies costs and what happens with the "Other" buckets. Over time, we expect a robust body of analysis on these disclosures. But for now, the new rule already gives investors and analysts a richer view into expense structures, and companies using NetSuite can leverage their system's flexibility to meet the challenge.

References: Claims and figures above are supported by authoritative sources including the FASB ASU text and FASB staff's ASU support materials (Source: www.crowe.com) (Source: dart.deloitte.com), major accounting firms' published guidance (Source: dart.deloitte.com) (Source: dart.deloitte.com), and regulatory filings. (Source: www.sec.gov) (Source: blogs.cfainstitute.org) These sources provide detailed descriptions of ASU 2024-03's provisions and context, ensuring all points are grounded in credible research.

Tags: fasb asu 2024-03, expense disaggregation, netsuite reporting, us gaap, income statement, financial reporting, public business entities, asc 220-40

DISCLAIMER

This document is provided for informational purposes only. No representations or warranties are made regarding the accuracy, completeness, or reliability of its contents. Any use of this information is at your own risk. Houseblend shall not be liable for any damages arising from the use of this document. This content may include material generated with assistance from artificial intelligence tools, which may contain errors or inaccuracies. Readers should verify critical information independently. All product names, trademarks, and registered trademarks mentioned are property of their respective

owners and are used for identification purposes only. Use of these names does not imply endorsement. This document does not constitute professional or legal advice. For specific guidance related to your needs, please consult qualified professionals.