



ENTRUST review of the user experience of ENTRUST Online (EOL) - implementation update

November 2018

1. Background

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the implementation of improvements identified following our review of the user experience of ENTRUST online (EOL) which took place between January and February 2018. In line with our corporate plans for 2017-2020 and 2018-2021, ENTRUST is seeking to reduce the administration burden of our regulatory activities on Environmental Bodies (EBs), as part of this, a three-year plan is currently in place to move to full digital delivery of services via EOL. The review looked to aid this move by identifying areas where EOL could be further improved for users.
- 1.2 The review took the form of an online survey, which all EBs were invited to complete via a news item on the website, in addition to a number of larger EBs being contacted directly to encourage their participation.
- 1.3 The survey sought EBs' views on EOL's functionality and covered each of the main functions of EOL in turn. For each function, EBs were asked if they had been able to use EOL efficiently and without difficulty and also to rate EOL on a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being hard to use and 5 being highly useable). If the EB rated a function as hard to use they were asked to explain why and finally all EBs were asked if they had any suggestions for improvement.
- 1.4 Overall respondents were very positive about the usability of EOL with only 1 instance of a respondent giving a rating of 2 for one function and no respondents giving a rating of 1 for any function. The overall averaged rating for all aspects was 4.15 out of 5.

2. Summary changes to EOL

- 2.1 Following our analysis of the responses, we identified a number of improvements that could be made to EOL or needed further review and an action plan was created and [published](#). This plan has now been completed and this report provides further detail of this work.
- 2.2 The following changes were implemented as a result of the review:
 - Reduction in the number of forms where assets need to be identified;
 - Improvement to the project end date extension process;
 - Validation of dates entered on the Annual Return; and
 - Clarification that some questions on the completion form are object specific.
- 2.3 Further details of the changes made and considered are provided in more detail in the body of the report.

3. Suggestions implemented

3.1 Project registration form and transfer notification form - requirement to identify assets

- 3.1.1 One of the improvements suggested as part of the review was that the requirement to identify assets within the cost breakdown of the project registration form (Form 2)

could be removed as EBs are also required to include these within the Form 9 (project completion form).

3.1.2 Following further consideration it was decided that the requirement to identify assets on the project registration form should be retained as it helps to ensure the compliant expenditure of funds (by providing detail on what LCF monies are to be spent on) and that any assets purchased or created as part of a project are correctly listed on an asset register and monitored as per our guidance.

3.1.3 It was decided instead to remove a similar requirement from the Form 7 (transfer of funds notification) which previously asked EBs to list any assets which the transferred funds would be used to purchase. The survey responses had also included a suggestion to remove this element of the Form 7. It was agreed that asking for asset information on the Form 7 was now unnecessary with the establishment of the Form 9 over recent years.

3.2 Project extension requests - confirmation message

3.2.1 Previously when users entered a valid project extension request on EOL to amend a project's estimated end date it was not immediately clear whether their request had been successful. One of the proposed improvements was to resolve this by providing a clear confirmation message that the request has been actioned.

3.2.2 EOL has been updated such that there is a clear confirmation message to confirm that the end date of a project has been extended.

3.3 Statutory Annual Return - date validation

3.3.1 It was suggested that EOL could benefit from the validation of dates being entered onto the Annual Return (Form 4). We have now updated EOL such that when marking projects complete on the Annual Return users are only able to add final payment dates which fall within the relevant financial year. Previously users were able to enter incorrect final payments dates falling outside of the relevant financial year which had consequences for the Annual Return and project records and caused unnecessary administration for both ENTRUST and the EB to resolve the issue

3.4 Project completion form - specific to objects

3.4.1 Certain questions on the project completion form (Form 9) are not relevant to all objects and it was noted that this can cause confusion, for example visitor numbers for projects with no public access requirement. We have amended the wording of the project completion form to make it clear that some questions only need to be completed if relevant.

4. Suggestions not possible to implement

4.1 Project summary page - display of start and end dates

4.1.1 Following a suggestion, we have reviewed adding a project's estimated start and end dates to the project summary page of EOL; however, for technical reasons this is not possible. The project's actual start date has instead been added to the project

completion form (Form 9) as we believe this will be a useful addition for EBs. The Form 9 has always contained the final payment date and now will contain both actual start and end dates, taken from the Annual Return

5. Suggestions not implemented

5.1 Statutory Annual Return - split over multiple pages

- 5.1.1 It was suggested that the Statutory Annual Return (Form 4) could be separated out onto multiple pages. Given that the Annual Return is already split out into different sections we have decided that this would not be cost effective and might further complicate the completion of the form for users.

6. Improvement of guidance and training resources

- 6.1 We have reviewed our guidance and training resources and updated them where necessary. In addition, we have created a guide which explains to EBs how they can use EOL to access information about their organisation's LCF related activities for reporting purposes and provides general advice on how to navigate and use EOL.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 Wherever technically possible and appropriate we have now implemented all improvements identified as part of the 2017/2018 review into the usability of EOL. We believe that these changes combined with the internal review of all forms on EOL in 2017/2018 (which occurred prior to the survey) has greatly improved EOL and will aid EBs in using the platform.
- 7.2 We continue to seek feedback from stakeholders and any suggestions for improvement to EOL should be emailed to helpline@entrust.org.uk.

ENTRUST
November 2018