

## ENTRUST consultation results: Reporting forms (closed 23 March 2003)

ENTRUST invited interested parties to comment on proposed new reporting forms to take into account the immediate effects of reform to the landfill tax credit scheme announced in the Chancellor's pre-Budget report November 2002, to be implemented from 1 April 2003.

### The responses

Form	Typical Comments	ENTRUST's Conclusions
3	Page 1, 2nd line: Insert 'in black ink' after 'Please complete'.	Accepted.
	Question 5a does not require a response if the donation is entirely 'old' or entirely 'new' scheme money. The status of money should be clear from the date of the donation.	Question 5a brings added clarity. Some landfill operator quarter ends straddle 1 April 2003 and this can lead to confusion.
	We don't know if our landfill operator has attached conditions or whether a contributing third party is involved at the time of donation, so cannot answer question 6 or 7.	EBs should be aware of any conditions attached to a donation at the time it is given. If conditions are imposed after the donation has been made there is a possibility that the money will have already been spent and, in any case, a retrospective condition is unlikely to be binding in law. Question 7 has a 'not yet known' option to be used in cases where contributing third parties are not yet known.
	Question 6 part 2 does not take account of the fact that EBs may spend a small percentage of the monies received on their own administration and not as an object of project.	An 'EB administration' box has been added.
4	It is good to have forms 4 and 5 combined.	No respondent objected to this or thought the absence of a form 5 would cause confusion.
	Question B12: delete, 'Please see our information sheet on VAT' as information sheets are to be replaced with EB Manual	Accepted.
	Include payment of the ENTRUST fee as a separate expenditure heading.	EBs are now advised to include this in section B, question 8.

Form	Typical Comments	ENTRUST's Conclusions
	EBs should be reminded that ENTRUST is only interested in landfill tax money and the need to make a return even when no money has been spent or received during the year.	Accepted.
	Interest received - as an EB we only have one bank account for landfill tax contributions. Although we can account for income of new and old scheme money, interest will be calculated on the total amount in the bank account. The only way to split the interest generated on the account will be to calculate the ratio of new to old scheme funds in the account and apply that ratio to the total amount of interest generated. Will this be acceptable to Entrust?	If an EB does not maintain separate accounts for old and new funds then they would be expected to make a best estimate of interest earned on old/new funds held in the same way as if they did not have any separate account(s) for LTCS funds. The example given would be acceptable to ENTRUST.
	We provide what was the Form 5 electronically to project promoters. Would we be able to supply old form 5 along with the form 4 information electronically, providing it differentiates between new and old money?	ENTRUST suggests that EBs provide section E of the new form 4 to project promoters.
	It seems odd to have the signature block in the middle of the form.	This maximises space for part E (table of projects) by allowing it a page to itself.
	EB number is requested twice.	Will be removed from authority section
	Can there be a column for Capital Expenditure items to be entered against specific projects on section E?	Accepted with additional adjustment to section B, question 10.
	The column 'committed, but not spent' (old form 5) has been deleted, why?	ENTRUST will no longer measure commitment.
7	Receiving and giving EB details should be reversed <u>OR</u> the idea of designing forms for use with a window envelope where possible is a good one	More respondents favoured a design favourable to window envelopes than found the design confusing. However, an addition note has been added.
	Place black lines between receiving and giving EB details	Accepted.
	Swap position of third party box with object and project detail boxes	Accepted.
	It would be better if all third party contributor details were on a separate sheet. A lot of our projects have more than one so it would be simpler to put them all on one sheet.	Guidance replaced with a tick box to be provided to indicate third parties listed separately.
	A separate section for comments on conditions is unnecessary.	Reference to possibility of a covering letter added here.
	Additional page for guidance notes wasteful.	Guidance notes are designed to be printed on the back of the form. Those using electronic versions, need only print the first page.
	May we continue to use the form 7, that we have developed ourselves with ENTRUST's prior approval, provided we differentiate between 'old' and 'new' money?	Yes. However, ENTRUST's audit team will be contacting those D-EBs using their own forms shortly with a view to standardising the layout of information.
All	More space required to enter figures.	Adjustment has been made to maximise the size of these boxes.

Form	Typical Comments	ENTRUST's Conclusions
	'Old' and 'new' scheme money boxes to be shaded differently.	Accepted.
	Have you considered using separate forms for the 'old' and 'new' schemes?	Yes, but in the short term most environmental bodies will be handling 'old' and 'new' scheme money. As 'old' scheme monies run down 'old scheme' may be removed from the forms (in form 3's case this could happen as early as the end of summer 2003).
	Why can't I complete forms online?	ENTRUST is seriously considering options for this.

Thanks also go to those respondents who discovered typing errors or inconsistencies with the glossary of terms published within the EB Manual. These have been corrected.

## Respondent profile

137 interested parties have registered to be notified by e-mail when ENTRUST consults on issues related to its regulation of the LTCS, of whom around 70 per cent are, or represent, environmental bodies.

### *List of respondents*

Responses were received from the following by the deadline:

Organisation	Contact	Stakeholder Type
Berwickshire Community Councils' Forum	Ian Jarvie	Local authority
Groundwork Thames Valley	Michael Walton	Environmental body
Northumberland County Council	David Brookes	Local authority
RMC Environment Fund	Catherine Russell	Environmental body
Royal Society for Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Julia Barker	Environmental body
ShanksFirstFund	Steven Hargreaves and Anne England	Environmental body
Viridor Credits Environmental Company	Susan Churchill	Environmental body
WREN	James Taylor	Environmental body

### *Further enquiries*

Further comments and queries related to the reporting forms and this consultation process should be sent, preferably by e-mail, to:

Stephen Newton  
ENTRUST  
Acre House  
2 Town Square  
Sale  
M33 7WZ

[stephennewton@entrust.org.uk](mailto:stephennewton@entrust.org.uk)