HOUSEBLEND

Why Most Mid-Market NetSuite Setups Will Not Survive IFRS 18 (and How to Tell If Yours Is One of Them)

September 20, 2026

01. Exposure isn't evenly distributed

Our diagnostic on where NetSuite exposure actually lives established that your NetSuite instance is exposed to IFRS 18, not just your accounting policy. What it didn't tell you is where that exposure clusters. It isn't random. It shows up in a small set of nameable configuration patterns, and most mid-market setups carry at least one of them, for a simple reason: IFRS 18 didn't exist when these systems were built.

02. The three diagnostic categories, named up front

Three configuration patterns account for most of the exposure we see in mid-market NetSuite instances: revenue recognition timing (driven by Advanced Revenue Management, or ARM), multi-entity consolidation, and management reporting presentation. Each one ties to a specific IFRS 18 requirement, not just to general “modernize your systems” advice.

PwC names four practical-implementation workstreams for IFRS 18, and “Evaluating ERP systems” is one of them, specifically “Chart of accounts definition and mapping” and re-evaluating financial master data, alongside updating internal processes and controls, changes to other reporting systems, and communication.[1] That’s a Big Four firm, in its own words, describing this as a systems remapping exercise, not an accounting-policy update.

The consolidation category has its own named vulnerability. PwC separately flags “Reclassification adjustments required for group consolidation” as an area of exposure, because “assessment of main business activity at group and subsidiary level may differ, reclassification adjustments are required on consolidation.”[2] If your subsidiaries don’t all classify income the same way at the group level, that’s not a hypothetical.

And the chart of accounts itself is the throughline. BDO’s own readiness guidance states that organizations “may need to review, re-evaluate, and potentially restructure” their chart of accounts, since “some organizations will need to split accounts that are reported in multiple places, and current systems may not support this” - and that any resulting changes “may require reconfigurations in enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems or business intelligence tools.”[3] Most mid-market charts of accounts were never built to make that split.

Here’s how each category actually ties to the standard, not just to good IT hygiene. Revenue recognition timing determines which category an amount lands in on the new income statement in the first place - a recognition date that’s wrong doesn’t just misstate the total, it misclassifies revenue across the operating and financing lines IFRS 18 now requires you to separate. Multi-entity consolidation feeds directly into the reclassification requirement PwC names above: if a subsidiary’s main business activity differs from the group’s, its income has to be reclassified on consolidation, which means your consolidation process has to know that distinction exists before it can act on it. And management reporting presentation is where the standard’s new disclosure obligation lives directly - any internally tracked metric that functions as a management-defined performance measure (MPM) now needs a reconciliation to the nearest IFRS-defined subtotal, which means the system producing that metric has to be traceable back to the categories above, not just internally consistent.

03. Case one: the recognition asymmetry, revisited for IFRS 18 stakes

Nearly every team tests that a termination stops billing. Almost nobody tests that it stops recognition.

We at Houseblend recently worked through this for a subscription client. A termination script updated the revenue recognition end date to match the cancellation date but never touched the start date, so recognition kept posting past termination - quietly, with no billing error to flag it. We’ve written up the full technical postmortem of this defect, including the sandbox deployment failure that preceded it, in **Two NetSuite Defects, One Termination Script**.

Two things worth checking that the postmortem didn't dwell on:

Partial terminations on multi-element arrangements. If you run bundled or multi-element orders, a termination closing out only part of a bundled order can still reverse against the full order, not just the terminated line. If you run these arrangements, ask whether a partial termination on one line ever touches the reversal math on lines that weren't terminated.

Credit memo reconciliation failure. In the case above, credit memos never fully reconciled against what recognition had already posted. That's worth treating as its own signal: a credit memo that balances against billing but not against the revenue recognition sub-ledger is a second, independent tell that this defect family is present, even when the recognition dates look fine on casual inspection.

Self-check: when a subscription cancels mid-term in your instance, does recognition stop at the same moment billing does? If you're not sure, check the two sub-topics above next - Advanced Revenue Management's (ARM) allocation and reversal behavior is configuration-driven, per Oracle's own product documentation, which is exactly why this is worth checking systematically rather than treating it as a one-off bug.[4]

It's worth getting specific about what "configuration-driven" actually means here, since it's the reason this pattern repeats across instances instead of staying a one-off. Oracle's own item-level documentation for ARM shows how many separate settings govern a single item's revenue behavior: which event triggers plan creation (arrangement creation, billing, fulfillment, or a subscription event), which allocation type applies to it (normal, exclude, or software), and whether rule-based recognition treatments are layered on top to override the item's default rule under specified conditions.[4] None of that is a bug. It's exactly how the system is supposed to work - but it also means a termination script has to correctly account for every one of those settings to reverse recognition cleanly, and Oracle's own documentation is explicit that changing an item's configuration doesn't retroactively affect revenue elements already created. That's precisely the asymmetry this case exposes.

The stakes here aren't just a misstated revenue line. A recognition-date error like this corrupts the operating-category subtotal IFRS 18 now requires you to present cleanly - recognition that keeps posting after termination inflates the operating income figure your income statement is built around, in the same category PwC and BDO both flag above. If you're also tracking an MPM built on top of that same recognition data, the error propagates into the very reconciliation IFRS 18 requires you to disclose.

04. Case two: the leap year that broke revenue recognition

A Houseblend services client's multi-year contracts weren't allocating revenue correctly. Native Advanced Revenue Management (ARM) stumbled on leap years and price ramps, forcing manual adjustments across a meaningful share of orders. The distortion clustered on multi-year deals spanning a leap day, and on contracts with scheduled price increases. The fix ended up being a custom script that allocates revenue directly from the contract dates rather than relying on native allocation logic - and it had a real deadline behind it: the team targeted it to land before that month's August close, not as a someday cleanup project.

The uncomfortable part of this case: how would you even know? There's no error. Just a number that quietly drifts from what the contract terms require.

Self-check: pull your multi-year deals that span a February 29, and any contract with scheduled price increases, and compare recognized revenue against what the contract terms actually require. This is the same allocation behavior flagged in Case One - Oracle's own ARM documentation confirms it's configuration-driven, not self-correcting.[4] For more on how NetSuite ties recognition to the contract record itself, see our own explainer on subscription revenue plan records.

05. Case three: the fixed-fee budget-change trap

A Houseblend professional-services client discovered that how NetSuite handles a fixed-fee project budget change depends entirely on one thing: whether the project has already completed. Before completion, a budget change triggers a recognition catch-up with no billing impact. After completion, the same change requires new sales order lines or milestones just to generate any billing capacity at all.

Walk through what that actually looks like in each state. Pre-completion, a budget increase flows straight into the existing recognition schedule - the system recalculates and catches up recognition to reflect the new total, and nothing needs to happen on the billing side because the sales order and milestones are still open. Post-completion, that path is closed. The project record no longer has an open schedule to recalculate against, so the only way to capture the additional value is to create new sales order lines or milestones from scratch, essentially treating the budget increase as a new, separate unit of billable work rather than an adjustment to the existing one. A finance team that assumes the pre-completion behavior applies everywhere will approve a budget change, see no billing impact, and only discover the gap weeks later when the additional revenue never shows up anywhere.

That difference has real consequences. Milestones need to be linked to service items for invoicing to work cleanly. Milestone modifications need to be locked after billing, to prevent an unauthorized change from reopening a recognition schedule that's already closed. And for complex engagements - like IP work - sub-projects become the tracking unit, because a single fixed-fee project record isn't granular enough to hold the distinction between what's billed under the original scope and what belongs to a later change.

Diagnostic question: if a project manager increased a fixed-fee budget today, do you know what that does to your revenue schedule and your billing capacity? NetSuite's own chart-of-accounts and item structure determines what a report can actually show here - this isn't an edge case, it's a structural property of how the system is configured.[5] For how NetSuite's revenue plan record drives milestone-based recognition in general, see the same explainer referenced above. A fuller technical breakdown of this exact case is coming in a later piece in this series.

06. Why these are default state, not edge cases

None of the three cases above are rare. They're the default outcome of implementations that predate IFRS 18 - because the standard didn't exist when these systems were configured. IFRS 18 is the forcing function that turns each of them from a quiet inefficiency into a presentation and disclosure problem.

BDO's own readiness guidance, already cited above, is blunt about the chart-of-accounts consequence: "current systems may not support" the kind of account-level split IFRS 18's categories require.[3] That's not a NetSuite-specific claim - it's a statement about legacy chart-of-accounts design generally, and NetSuite instances are no exception.

The scale of what's affected is bigger than most finance teams expect. At a KPMG-led IFRS 18 panel with more than 1,200 webcast participants, one panelist reported that more than 2,500 general ledger accounts in their organization could potentially be affected by IFRS 18.[6] KPMG's own panel of preparers also found that companies "with numerous consolidated entities, diverse IT systems, or a non-standardized chart of accounts will likely face heightened challenges" - which describes a large share of mid-market NetSuite instances built up through acquisition or multi-entity growth.[6]

Grant Thornton's own advisory service listing independently names the same remapping work as PwC and BDO: "Translation of technical requirements to changes required to Chart of Accounts, ERP and reporting tools," alongside a "Gap analysis across existing accounting policies, systems, reporting packs, dashboards, tax and internal controls."[7] Three firms - PwC, BDO, and Grant Thornton - independently naming the same ERP-and-chart-of-accounts remapping work is a stronger signal than any one of them alone.

The consolidation category has its own structural wrinkle. Oracle's own documentation on NetSuite's multi-subsidiary and consolidation module, OneWorld, confirms that "NetSuite uses the base currency of the parent subsidiary" and that consolidated reports translate child subsidiaries' amounts using a Consolidated Exchange Rates table to roll up into parent subsidiary amounts.[8] That table is a maintained object - the kind of thing that can quietly drift out of date. Elimination subsidiaries work the same way: Oracle's documentation confirms you must create them manually for balancing consolidated financials, and they can only be selected for journal entries, not other transaction types.[9] Consolidation correctness depends on setup decisions made - or not made - at implementation time, not on NetSuite behaving correctly by default.

This is also the one area where even the practitioners running IFRS 18 implementations right now don't have a settled answer. At the same KPMG panel, auditors reported that "the treatment of foreign exchange differences on intercompany transactions remains an area of ongoing discussion."[6] That's worth sitting with: if your own consolidation setup involves the kind of foreign-exchange adjustment accounts and intercompany elimination settings Oracle's documentation above describes, you're not just implementing a settled requirement, you're implementing one where the guidance itself is still being worked out between preparers and auditors. That's a reason to engage your auditor early on this specific point, not a reason to wait for clarity that may not arrive before the 2027 effective date. For more on how subsidiary hierarchy and eliminations actually work, see how NetSuite handles subsidiary hierarchy and eliminations.

One thing this evidence doesn't support, and it matters to say so plainly: nothing here suggests most NetSuite customers are non-compliant, that NetSuite can't support IFRS 18, or that NetSuite's ARM commonly produces errors. Neither the KPMG panel data nor Grant Thornton's material supports a prevalence statistic specific to NetSuite. Both describe implementation and remapping work as normal and expected - not as evidence of unusually bad configuration. The question isn't whether your system is broken. It's whether any of this sounds familiar.

For the underlying category definitions themselves, see our own breakdown of IFRS 18's income statement categories.

07. Self-assessment

1. Does your chart of accounts currently distinguish operating, investing, and financing income, or does everything still route through a small number of catch-all accounts?
2. If a project's fixed-fee budget changed today, could your team say with confidence what that does to the revenue schedule, without pulling in IT?
3. Do your multi-year or price-ramp contracts get spot-checked against what native ARM actually recognized, or is the allocation trusted by default?
4. If a subsidiary's main business activity differs from the group's, does your consolidation process already know to reclassify that income differently at each level?
5. If two of these came back "not sure," what's the actual cost difference between finding that out now versus finding it out mid-audit in 2027, once restatement is no longer optional?

If you answered "not sure" to more than one of these, **talk to us about a NetSuite rescue assessment**.

08. FAQ

Is this only a risk for companies with multiple subsidiaries?

No. The fixed-fee case above involves a single-entity services firm, and the recognition-asymmetry and leap-year cases both concern revenue mechanics that have nothing to do with subsidiary count. Multi-entity structures add the consolidation-level version of the problem on top - the reclassification and elimination work described in Section 06 - but the underlying chart-of-accounts and recognition-timing gaps show up regardless of how many subsidiaries you run. A single-entity company that assumes IFRS 18 is a multi-entity problem is still exposed through the other two categories.

Doesn't a clean audit opinion mean we're fine?

Not for this specific question. An unqualified opinion under IAS 1 says your financial statements fairly present your results under the standard that currently applies. It says nothing about readiness for a different standard's different presentation requirements, because those requirements don't exist yet under the framework your auditors have been testing against. The chart-of-accounts and recognition-timing patterns in this piece can sit underneath a perfectly clean audit for years, simply because nothing in the current audit scope was designed to surface them.

What's the difference between this article and the CFO roadmap?

This piece is a diagnostic, meant to help you identify whether your specific instance carries one of these exposure patterns before you've committed to a project. The CFO roadmap, covered later in this series, picks up from the opposite direction: it assumes you already know something needs to change, and it's about building the internal case for that work - getting budget, getting IT's attention, getting the project greenlit - rather than about finding the problem in the first place.

09. Where this goes next

If one or more of these patterns sounds like your instance, the next question is what a structured fix actually looks like: covered in our **roadmap for recovering a stalled or misconfigured NetSuite implementation**.

This content may be AI-generated and may contain inaccuracies. It is not professional, legal, or financial advice. Verify independently before relying on it.

Sources

1. PwC, "IFRS 18 - Redefining financial performance reporting." **pwc.com** ↩
2. PwC, "IFRS 18 - Redefining financial performance reporting" (consolidation vulnerability). **pwc.com** ↩
3. BDO Canada, "Is your organization ready for the new IFRS 18 standard?" **bdo.ca** ↩ ↩
4. Oracle NetSuite Applications Suite, ARM item configuration documentation. **docs.oracle.com** ↩ ↩ ↩
5. Oracle NetSuite Applications Suite, Chart of Accounts Management documentation. **docs.oracle.com** ↩
6. KPMG, "IFRS 18 implementation: insights from preparers." **kpmg.com** ↩ ↩ ↩
7. Grant Thornton Singapore, IFRS 18 advisory. **grantthornton.sg** ↩
8. Oracle NetSuite Applications Suite, "Consolidated Reporting in OneWorld." **docs.oracle.com** ↩

9. Oracle NetSuite Applications Suite, “Elimination Subsidiaries.” **docs.oracle.com** ↩