

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 select 'no' your name and email address will not be stored, but your organisational data (if relevant) and all consultation responses will be collected.

Yes

Name:

David Hawes

Email address:

[REDACTED]

Role (for example, Chair, Trustee, Accountant, Treasurer etc):

Director

Are you happy for the SORP-making body to contact you if needed to discuss your responses?

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 :

Institute of Legacy Management

Please select what best describes the organisation:

A sector body

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?

No Response

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 SORP?

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?

More than 100 member charities

Responding as an individual

Which of the following describes you?

No Response

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

No opinion

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

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 opinion

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

No Response

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

No opinion

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

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 applies)

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 applies)

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 applies)

No Response

Question 8: Do you consider the requirements for sustainability 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 applies)

No Response

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

No opinion

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

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 applies)

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 applies)

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 applies)

No Response

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

Yes

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

The ILM would like a unified approach to allow significant efficiencies for charities and provide clarity for executors, but interpretation and application of accounting standards and the SORP is likely to leave a range of approaches so any additional clarity is welcomed. However, there is a risk of duplicating the accounting policy.

The wording will need to be done well – explaining that it will be recognised before cash is received is essentially defining a debtor so a poor wording could confuse a user who would be unclear around how this differs from other income streams. So while well worded accounts may improve as the concept is applied to the context of the specific charity, weaker accounts risk becoming less clear.

Question 14: Do you have any other comments on module 1 and the proposals for the Trustees' 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 applies)

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 FRS 102 in a clear and understandable way?

No opinion

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

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 applies)

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 applies)

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 applies)

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 applies)

No Response

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

Yes

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

Requirements clear on broad level, but lack of detail risks inconsistent application – additional guidance will be required. With the removal of 'entitlement' an important element of asset recognition has been removed so a direct reference to control or entitlement is important to add clarity and encourage consistency of application.

5.89 to 5.94 is strong and an improvement on the prior SORP. The last two sentences of 5.95 are strong but the start of that paragraph is unclear - the references around donor's intentions could be perceived negatively and doesn't reflect common practice. Reference to the wills notification service could refer to the net assets value being able to assist in calculating the valuation.

Comfortable with the thought process behind 5.97 but the wording is complex and retains the reference to 'portfolio approach' which is not defined. 5.98 uses the same phrase but in the context appears clearer.

5.99 and 5.100 provide good clarity aside from if a portfolio approach can be applied to 5.99 or if discounting should only be applied to individual significant legacies.

Clarification could be provided around the estimation of estate administration expenses (distinct from pre death liabilities) -these can be based on information from executors, historic data from the charities portfolio or sector data.

Information received after year-end is treated inconsistently with time consuming discussions between our members and auditors, so the signposting included will hopefully improve this.

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

Yes

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

Further guidance is a way to limit the length of the main document and provide suggestions and we would welcome anything that encourages a common approach .

A SORP fact sheet could be helpful in clarifying some of the terms and approach, particularly for smaller charities with very occasional legacy income who will not use Smee & Ford or have knowledge or experience of accounting for legacies.

More detailed guidance to establish consistent application is also very important, although this could potentially sit with sector bodies to establish. A reference to this in the SORP would provide weight and value as this guidance is developed, with signposting by the SORP committee.

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?

No opinion

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

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.

No opinion

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

No Response

Question 27: Does the section (paragraphs 10B.68 to 10B.84) on arrangements that are significantly 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 applies)

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 applies)

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 and 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 applies)

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 applies)

No Response

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

No opinion

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

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 applies)

No Response

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

No opinion

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

No Response

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

No opinion

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

No Response

Question 38: Do you think there is a need for further guidance on the treatment of comparative 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 charity reports and accounts?

No opinion

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

No Response

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

No opinion

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?

The practicality of 9.26 is concerning with the requirement for all ex gratia payments to be separately disclosed. For charities with high levels of legacy income this could generate significant levels of disclosure (some of it potentially sensitive, while extending the length of the annual report and diminishing clarity. We would suggest that there is a minimum limit incorporated, for example in line with the new Charities Act power. This would require only payments over £20k to be reported for a charity with income over £1m (and smaller limits for smaller charities). The practicalities of applying this requirement as drafted is a significant concern to our members.