Invitation to Comment on Exposure Draft Charities SORP

Do you consent to personal data you provide being held, in accordance with UK GDPR and the Privacy Policy of the Charities SORP making body and its delegated parties? If you sel ect 'no' your name and email address will not be stored, but your organisational data (if rele vant) and all consultation responses will be collected.
Yes
Name:
Olly Minton
Email address:
Role (for example, Chair, Trustee, Accountant, Treasurer etc):
СБО
Are you happy for the SORP-making body to contact you if needed to discuss your respons es?
Yes
Do you want your response to be treated confidentially by the SORP-making body and not published?
No
Are you responding:
On behalf of an organisation/body
Responding on behalf of an organisation/body
If responding on behalf of an organisation or body, please provide its name :
Fight for Sight
Please select what best describes the organisation:
A charity applying FRS 102 and the Charities SORP

A charity applying FRS 102 and the Charities SORP

What was the last reported gross income as set out in the charity's last annual accounts?

Over £5M

A user of accounts prepared under FRS 102 and the Charities SORP

In which capacity were you using accounts prepared under FRS102 and the Charities SOR P?

No Response

An accounting firm / auditor

How many charity clients do you supply your services to?

No Response

An accounting firm providing independent examination services to charities

How many charity clients do you supply your service to?

No Response

A sector body

How many member charities does your organisation have?

No Response

Responding as an individual

Which of the following describes you?

No Response

Question 1: Do you support the move to three tiers?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 2: Do you consider that the proposed thresholds have been set at an appropriate monetary level in order to support a proportionate approach to reporting?

No

- 1) We have a dormant subsidiary charity that has zero turnover. Whilst the Tier 1 requirements are not extensive, they nonetheless would create a bit of an industry in writing up the additional disclosures, which doesn't seem to add much value
- 2) If a charity has a year where due to one off events (e.g. receipt of assets through a merger / a single one-off donation) - their income increases and they are pushed into the next Tier, but they expect to remain in the lower Tier moving forwards, this could cause significant one-off workload to meet the higher requirements. Perhaps there could be something to acknowledge the "expectation of income levels moving forwards" that helps inform the Tier?
- 3) will the Tiers be linked to inflation? Depending on how long the new SORP remains in place, more and more charities will be pulled into higher Tiers even though the real value of that income has decreased

Question 3: Do you agree that the Exposure Draft SORP clearly sets out the proposed reporting requirements for each tier?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 4: Do you agree that charities within the largest income threshold should be referred to as 'tier 3' charities, or should they be referred to as 'tier 1' charities?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 5: Do you have any additional comments in relation to the proposed tiered reporting structure in the Exposure Draft SORP?

No Response

Question 6: Do you agree that including prompt questions will help trustees to develop their Trustees' Annual Report?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 7: Do you consider the requirements for impact reporting for each tier to be proportionate?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 8: Do you consider the requirements for sustainability reporting for each tier to be proportionate?

No

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

For Tier 1 and 2 - I think they are fine. For Tier 3, I think it suffers two problems:

- 1) I think £15m turnover is still too low of a threshold for a charity to be required to report in an effective (and meaningful) way on sustainability
- 2) I think the wording of 1.61 to 1.63 gives so much wiggle room that it could simply make it a tickbox exercise. 1.61 requires "how the charity is responding to ESG", which could be interpreted, and responded to, in many ways including generic placeholder comments. Given my point above (£15m is still not very big to have the infrastructure in place to effectively report on sustainability) this may actually be fine, since it allows the smaller charities (e.g. £20m turnover) to make contained and generic statements, and allows the bigger ones (e.g. £200m) to "do it properly", however I'm guessing that's not really in the spirit of what was intended

Question 9: Do you consider the disclosures for volunteers to be proportionate?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 10: Do you consider the explanation of reserves in the glossary helpful?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 11: Do you consider the disclosures for reserves are proportionate?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 12: Do you consider the requirement for tier 1 charities to provide a summary of their plans for the future is proportionate?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 13: Do you consider that the additional disclosure will help to explain the treatmen t of legacies in the accounts?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 14: Do you have any other comments on module 1 and the proposals for the Trus tees' Annual Report?

No Response

Question 15: Is the example table helpful?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 16: Do you have any other comments on module 4?

No Response

Question 17: Does the module explain the relevant requirements of the five-step model in F RS 102 in a clear and understandable way?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 18: Do you find the module easy to navigate as drafted?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 19: Do you consider that the guidance on exchange and non-exchange transactions should be set out in separate modules of the SORP rather than separate sections of the same module?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 20: In the Exposure Draft SORP, all the disclosure requirements are listed at the end of the module. Would it be clearer instead to set out the relevant disclosures at the end of each section within the module?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 21: Do you consider this clarification a helpful addition to the SORP?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 22: Does the module set out the accounting requirements for legacy income clear ly?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 23: Accounting for legacies can be a complex area for charities to navigate. Is the re a need for further guidance on this topic outside of the SORP?

No

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 24: Do you have any other comments on module 5?

No Response

Question 25: Do you find the module easy to navigate as drafted?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 26: Does the module explain the relevant requirements of FRS 102 in a clear and understandable way? Please select all options that apply.

Yes

No Response

Question 27: Does the section (paragraphs 10B.68 to 10B.84) on arrangements that are si gnificantly below market value provide clarity on how to account for such arrangements?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 28: Are the additional disclosure requirements set out in paragraphs 10B.95 and 10B.129 reasonable for charities with such arrangements?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 29 - please provide any other comments you have on module 10B:

No Response

Question 30: Do you agree with the proposal in the Exposure Draft SORP that only tier 1 a nd tier 2 charities, that do not meet the small entity threshold, and all tier 3 charities are required to prepare a statement of cash flows?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 31: Do you have any other comments on module 14?

No Response

Question 32: Do you agree that the additional disclosures are helpful?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 33: Do you agree that the additional disclosures are proportionate?

No opinion

No Response

Question 34: Do you have any other comments on module 20?

No Response

Question 35: Do you agree with the new approach to using the generic term 'social investments' instead of referring to 'programme related' and 'mixed motive' investments?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 36: Do you agree that the simplification of how gains and losses on social invest ments are reported is beneficial?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 37: Is the Exposure Draft SORP clear on the requirements for comparative figure s and disclosures?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit appli es)

No Response

Question 38: Do you think there is a need for further guidance on the treatment of compara tive figures and disclosures in this area?

No opinion

Please provide any reasons for your answer here, if you wish to do so: (250 word limit applies)

No Response

Question 39: Do you have any other comments on module 21?

No Response

Question 40: Do you agree that the drafting, structure and proposals in the Exposure Draft SORP support the needs of smaller charities whilst addressing the needs of users of charit y reports and accounts?

No opinion

With the exception of my earlier point around dormant charities (and on reflection, the same principle presumably applies to micro entities), yes

Question 41: Do you agree with the SORP-making body's decision to continue to disallow the application of Section 1A?

Do not understand the position enough to comment

Please provide reasons for your answer or suggestions on how you think Section 1A could be applied differently: (250 word limit applies)

No Response

Question 42: Do you have any other comments on the Exposure Draft SORP?

Generally speaking, I think it's a great piece of work and a huge credit to those involved. Whilst I only had a few comments, I'd be grateful if they are considered