



HM Revenue  
& Customs

## Plastic Packaging Tax

Consultation response submission form

Publication date: 11 March 2020

Closing date for comments: 20 August 2020

<b>Subject of this consultation:</b>	The Plastic Packaging Tax which from April 2022 will apply to plastic packaging manufactured in or imported into the UK containing less than 30% recycled plastic.
<b>Scope of this consultation:</b>	At Budget 2020, the government announced key decisions it had taken for the design of Plastic Packaging Tax in light of stakeholder responses to the previous consultation in 2019. This document provides more information on these announced areas, as well as asking for views on areas of the tax design which have been further refined as we move closer to the implementation date.
<b>Who should read this:</b>	The government would like to hear from businesses, individuals, tax advisers, trade and professional bodies and other interested parties.
<b>Duration:</b>	11 March 2020 to 20 August 2020 (23 weeks).
<b>Lead official:</b>	Alex Marsh, HM Revenue and Customs.
<b>How to respond or enquire about this consultation:</b>	Responses or enquiries should be sent by 20 August 2020, by email to <a href="mailto:indirecttaxdesign.team@hmrc.gov.uk">indirecttaxdesign.team@hmrc.gov.uk</a> or by post to: Alex Marsh, 3rd Floor Ralli Quays, Stanley Street, M60 9LA.
<b>Additional ways to be involved:</b>	In order to engage with businesses and individuals who would be affected by the proposals in this consultation, the government will be consulting key stakeholders and interested parties on the proposals through meetings. If you would like to be included in a consultative meeting, please contact us via the email above.
<b>After the consultation:</b>	The government will aim to analyse responses and publish a formal responses document within 12 weeks after the end of the consultation period.
<b>Getting to this stage:</b>	The responses to the government's Call for Evidence on single-use plastic waste in 2018 highlighted that using recycled plastic is often more expensive than using new plastic. At Budget 2018, the government proposed to use a new tax to encourage the use of recycled plastic and has taken the responses from the first consultation, published in 2019, into consideration to develop the proposals presented here.
<b>Previous engagement:</b>	During the first consultation period, the government had meetings with various stakeholders to discuss the impact of the initial proposals. The government also conducted market research to improve understanding of the packaging industry.

## Consultation

This response form is to be used for responding to HMRC's consultation on a Plastic Packaging Tax. The consultation in full can be found on the following link -

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/plastic-packaging-tax-policy-design>.

## Confidentiality

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes. These are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 2018, General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that under FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals with, amongst other things, obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on HM Revenue and Customs.

## Consultation privacy notice

This notice sets out how we will use your personal data, and your rights. It is made under Articles 13 and/or 14 of the General Data Protection Regulation.

## Your data

### The data

We will process the following personal data:

Name  
Email address  
Postal address  
Phone number  
Job title

### Purpose

The purpose for which we are processing your personal data is: The Plastic Packaging Tax Consultation.

### Legal basis of processing

The legal basis for processing your personal data is that the processing is necessary for the exercise of a function of a government department.

### Recipients

Your personal data will be shared by us with HM Treasury.

## **Retention**

Your personal data will be kept by us for six years and will then be deleted.

## **Your rights**

- You have the right to request information about how your personal data are processed, and to request a copy of that personal data.
- You have the right to request that any inaccuracies in your personal data are rectified without delay.
- You have the right to request that any incomplete personal data are completed, including by means of a supplementary statement.
- You have the right to request that your personal data are erased if there is no longer a justification for them to be processed.
- You have the right in certain circumstances (for example, where accuracy is contested) to request that the processing of your personal data is restricted.

## **Complaints**

If you consider that your personal data has been misused or mishandled, you may make a complaint to the Information Commissioner, who is an independent regulator. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire  
SK9 5AF  
0303 123 1113  
[casework@ico.org.uk](mailto:casework@ico.org.uk)

Any complaint to the Information Commissioner is without prejudice to your right to seek redress through the courts.

## **Contact details**

The data controller for your personal data is HM Revenue and Customs. The contact details for the data controller are:

HMRC  
100 Parliament Street  
Westminster  
London SW1A 2BQ

The contact details for HMRC's Data Protection Officer are:

The Data Protection Officer  
HM Revenue and Customs  
7th Floor, 10 South Colonnade  
Canary Wharf, London E14 4PU  
[advice.dpa@hmrc.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:advice.dpa@hmrc.gsi.gov.uk)

## About you

### Your name

The Chartered Institute of Taxation (CIOT)

### Your email address

[technical@ciot.org.uk](mailto:technical@ciot.org.uk)

### Who are you submitting this response on behalf of? (Please only tick one)

Business representative organisation/trade body

In the case of representative bodies please provide information on the number and nature of people you represent

Packaging designer

Packaging manufacturer / converter

Product manufacturer / pack filler

Distributor

Online marketplace

Fulfilment house operator

Retailer

Plastic packaging importer

Plastic packaging exporter

Waste Management Company

Re-processor

Local government

Community group

Non-governmental organisation

Charity or social enterprise

Consultancy

Academic or research

Individual

Other - Professional body for tax advisers

If you answered 'Other' above, please provide details

**Please provide the name of the organisation/business you represent (if applicable)**

**If you are in business, where is your business established?**

England  
 Scotland  
 Northern Ireland  
 Wales  
 Isle of Man  
 Other EU - please state  
 Non EU - please state

**If you are in business, how many staff do you employ across the UK?**

Fewer than 10  
 10 - 49  
 50 - 249  
 More than 249  
 Prefer not to say

**Are you an obligated packaging producer under Producer Responsibility (Packaging Waste) Regulations in the UK?**

**If you are a business that manufactures or imports plastic packaging, how many tonnes of plastic packaging do you manufacture or import annually?**

**Please provide any further information about your organisation or business activities that you**

**think might help us put your answers in context.**

The CIOT is the leading body in the UK for taxation professionals dealing with all aspects of taxation. Our primary purpose is to promote education in taxation. One of the key aims of the CIOT is to work for a better, more efficient, tax system for all affected by it – taxpayers, their advisers and the authorities. Our comments and recommendations on tax issues are made solely in order to achieve this aim; we are a non-party-political organisation.

Our stated objectives for the tax system include:

- A legislative process which translates policy intentions into statute accurately and effectively, without unintended consequences.
- Greater simplicity and clarity, so people can understand how much tax they should be paying and why.
- Greater certainty, so businesses and individuals can plan ahead with confidence.
- A fair balance between the powers of tax collectors and the rights of taxpayers (both represented and unrepresented).
- Responsive and competent tax administration, with a minimum of bureaucracy.

**Would you like your response to be confidential? Why? (please note the information on confidentiality on page 3)**

Our submission does not need to be kept confidential as our response will be published on our website: <https://www.tax.org.uk/policy-technical/submissions>

### The scope of the tax – chapter 3

This chapter sets out the government’s updated proposals on how to define key terms that will be used in the tax, as well as the scope of the tax and whether it is feasible to create a limited exemption for some of the plastic packaging used for licensed human medicines.

**Question 1. Do you agree with the revised definition of plastic, which removes the ‘main structural component’ test and limits the exclusion to ‘cellulose-based’ polymers? Please outline your reasoning.**

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

**Question 2. Do you agree that packaging-type products that do not fulfil a packaging function until they are used by the end consumer should be included in the tax unless they are for longer term storage? Please outline your reasoning.**

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

**Question 3. Do you have any observations on the government’s proposed approach to excluding plastic packaging used to facilitate the transport of imported goods?**

We welcome that this specific packaging has been initially excluded from the tax as it could cause disproportionate administrative burdens for the taxable person if the imported goods have several overseas suppliers and outsourced logistics providers in the supply chain. We agree that the position should remain under review, though if the current proposed approach to the tax may be subject to change, appropriate consultation should take place in advance of changes taking effect.

**Question 4. Do you think it is feasible to provide evidence that packaging has been commissioned for use as immediate packaging for licensed human medicines at the time the tax is chargeable? If not, please explain why.**

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

**Question 5. Would the proposed exemption cause any market distortion or other unintended consequences? If yes, please provide more details.**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

The nature of packaging for licenced human medicines and whether an exemption causes market distortion is outside the area of our expertise. However, if this exemption is implemented, there would be an increased risk of administrative errors where a taxpayer has to make a decision on whether a product is subject to tax or exempt from it, particularly where they have a mixed portfolio of exempt and taxable purchases. Businesses will need to carry out staff training or rely on outsourced professional assistance, both of which will have a cost to the business.

## Liability for the tax – chapter 4

Businesses who manufacture in the UK, or import plastic packaging into the UK will be liable to pay the tax, subject to relevant exemptions and the small operator threshold explained in chapter 5. This chapter outlines the government’s proposals for when the tax will be chargeable and who the chargeable person will be.

**Question 6. Do you agree the proposed charging conditions will ensure that the UK manufacturer of plastic packaging is liable for the tax? If not, please explain why.**

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Manufacturers of plastic packaging, or those within the supply chain where multiple stages of manufacturing take place, would be best placed to confirm whether the proposed conditions are clear for manufacturers or whether further instances are required; this part of the question is outside of our expertise. We welcome that a clear set of charging conditions will be published for affected taxpayers. Our preference is that these conditions are included in the legislation, with supporting clear guidance on gov.uk so that they are accessible.

**Question 7. Do you foresee any issues for specific packaging components due to the proposed approach of disregarding further ancillary processes for the purposes of the tax? Please explain what these issues are.**

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Manufacturers of plastic packaging, or those within the supply chain where multiple stages of manufacturing take place, would be best placed to confirm whether the proposed conditions for disregarding ancillary processes will raise further issues; this part of the question is outside of our expertise.

Where we anticipate confusion could possibly arise is where several manufacturers produce components of packaging that themselves could meet the charging conditions, but such components are to be incorporated into a final packaging product, if such examples arise. It should be made clear whether each manufacturer is liable to account for the tax or if the final manufacturer (who also assembles the components) must account for tax on the whole final packaging product or merely its own component.]

**Question 8. Do you have any observations on the proposed treatment of imports of plastic packaging, particularly linking the tax point to “first commercial exploitation” i.e. when it is controlled, moved, stored, is subject to an agreement to sell, or otherwise used in the UK in the**

**course or furtherance of business?**

We welcome that the point of taxation for imported plastic packaging that will be subject to the tax is the point at which the packaging enters free circulation, as suggested in paragraph 2.4 and section 6 of our earlier submission on plastic packaging tax.

We further welcome that plastic packaging that is subject to customs arrangements will not be subject to the tax unless it is put to some future use that requires it to enter free circulation.

**Question 9. Do you agree the “consignee” on import documentation is likely to be the taxable person for imports of plastic packaging? In what scenarios might someone else be the person on whose behalf the plastic packaging is commercially exploited?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

We agree that it is likely that the consignee will mainly be the taxable person for imports. For examples of the consignee not being the person liable to tax, this question will be better answered by those in industry, as it is outside of the area of our expertise.

**Question 10. Do you agree that packaging that is damaged after the tax has become due should not be relieved? If not, please explain why you think this packaging should be relieved.**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

The yes and no responses apply to different statements below:

It is not stated, though is assumed, that if a taxable person has to re-order new packaging to replace the damaged goods, that the tax will also be due on the replacements where it meets the qualifying criteria, so effectively the taxable person would be taxed twice on the damaged and replacement products.

There is an element of unfairness to this policy where the purchaser is not to blame for the damage and further, where they are unlikely to be able to ascertain if there is any damage until the product has been imported into free circulation and created a tax point. This would be at odds with those importers who are able to access the product whilst it is still under customs suspension status and who have the opportunity to re-export damaged product to the supplier prior to an arising tax point. There are reliefs available in other indirect taxes for damages/spillages/spoilt product, so this policy would be at odds with the position for some other taxes. If the damaged product could be sold at a reduced price, we agree that the tax should be charged.

We appreciate that if a relief for damaged product was available after the tax point, this could be open to fraudulent abuse, though conditions such as evidence of insurance claims, refunds by seller may be able to substantiate an adjustment.

**Question 11. Do you foresee any difficulty or added costs with the proposal for the taxable person to incorporate the amount of Plastic Packaging Tax onto the sales invoice, and if so, could this information be provided to customers in any other way?**

Yes

No

Don't know

There will be costs for the supplier to have its accounting and invoice production software adapted to account for the tax and incorporate the tax details on the invoices. This may need to involve an upgrade by the software supplier, though users of large bespoke packages may need to have bespoke amendments made.

Further there will be costs attributable to its finance staff who administer the tax in-house, or costs to outsource this administration.

We anticipate that businesses' finance teams would be able to provide more information on specific difficulties and suggestions for the most convenient way to deliver the tax information as they will be familiar with the constraints of their software.

**Question 12. Are the proposals for joint and several liability reasonable? If not, please say why?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Different responses apply to each paragraph.

As stated in our earlier submission, we support action to tackle the avoidance and evasion of tax and although we remain cautious on the introduction of joint and several liability, we welcome that HMRC has stated that it will only apply in certain limited situations (where a business knew/had reasonable grounds to suspect evasion). We note that the scenarios highlighted in paragraph 4.18 and 4.19 are fairly broad in scope which we understand to be limited by the phrase 'businesses who knew, or had reasonable grounds to suspect that the tax had not been accounted for'. From numerous historic tribunals for VAT and missing trader fraud challenging the 'reasonable grounds to suspect' position has been open to interpretation and challenge. Whilst we consider it reasonable for HMRC to have such criteria, we would like to see very clear guidance on what steps a business must take to demonstrate its commitment to compliance (see below).

We agree that, per the scenario described in paragraph 4.22, it is reasonable for joint & several liability to apply where HMRC notify a fulfilment house/online marketplace that a supplier has not paid the tax, and that the joint & several liability should only apply after the date of receipt of that notification if the fulfilment house/online marketplace knowingly fails to act to prevent tax evasion.

We welcome confirmation that businesses conducting sufficient due diligence will not be jointly liable for the tax and agree that, in principle, this is reasonable. The obligations for a business to demonstrate the required minimum standard must be made clear by HMRC to both businesses and HMRC enforcement staff, to reduce the likelihood of arising disagreements and legal redress.

We agree that it is reasonable for members of a tax group to have joint and several liability.

**Question 13. Do you envisage any problems with extending joint and several liability to online marketplaces and fulfilment house operators who knew, or had reasonable grounds to suspect that the tax had not been accounted for on sales made through their platform?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

We consider that online marketplaces/fulfilment houses are best placed to answer this question.

**Question 14. Will extending joint and several liability to third-party fulfilment house operators and online marketplaces be sufficient to deter overseas sellers from non-compliance with the tax? If not, what other steps should HMRC consider?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

In principle, the joint and several liability rule will provide a deterrent for most overseas sellers as the online marketplace or fulfilment house should have sufficient due diligence procedures (as guided by HMRC) to deter opportunists.

Where overseas sellers are more determined to evade tax, perhaps in instances of organised crime, they may provide more convincing but fraudulent information to an online marketplace or fulfilment house, and businesses in this sector would be better placed to provide examples of experiences and the steps taken to prevent such activities from happening again.

## Excluding small operators ('de minimis') – chapter 5

The government wants to ensure that the administrative burdens for businesses manufacturing and/or importing small amounts of plastic packaging, and the costs of administering and collecting the tax, are not disproportionate to the environmental harms the tax seeks to address. To achieve this, the government proposed in the previous consultation that only businesses over a minimum threshold, or a 'de minimis', would be in scope of the tax. This chapter sets out more detail on the government's de minimis proposals.

**Question 15. Do you agree with the proposed guidance and tools to help business determine if they are above or below the de minimis? What other help could the government provide?**

Yes

No

Don't know

We support that there is a clear threshold set as the de minimis limit for the tax. Industry representatives would be best placed to confirm whether the ten tonnes in 12 months threshold is appropriate.

Many businesses who wish to remain below the VAT registration threshold are able to manage their business activities in a compliant way to remain unregistered without an unreasonable burden. We anticipate that businesses in this sector would also be able to manage their affairs to remain under the tax threshold if that is what their business model requires. Industry representatives would be better placed to comment on whether the proposed tools will be straightforward for smaller operators to manage. Whilst the proposed guidance appears to be reasonable, this may change if there are suggestions from industry about better tools.

**Question 16. Do you agree with the approach to record keeping for businesses below de minimis? If you disagree, please suggest what alternative approaches would be more appropriate and why.**

Yes

No

Don't know

We support that record-keeping requirements for excluded businesses are minimal, though appreciate that those businesses that are nearing the threshold will have an increased requirement to monitor purchases. This is comparable to the record-keeping required for businesses not yet registered for VAT so is reasonable.

**Question 17. Do you agree with the proposed forward and backward look test to apply the 10 tonne threshold? If you disagree, please suggest what would be more suitable and provide**

**evidence to support your view.**

Yes

No

Don't know

We support that the testing method has clear criteria; a similar calculation basis has been used successfully for many years in VAT which will be familiar to businesses and indirect tax consultants.

## Evidence requirements – chapter 6

This chapter sets out the government's updated proposals to help businesses fulfil their Plastic Packaging Tax obligations and safeguard the tax from avoidance and evasion.

**Question 18. Do you agree with the government's proposal to restrict calculations of recycled plastic content to approved methods? If not, please explain why. What methods other than the proposed mass balance approach should be considered?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

**Question 19. Where businesses are importing plastic packaging with at least 30% recycled content, will it be feasible for them to obtain the mass balance evidence from overseas manufacturers? What other ways could importers demonstrate the proportion of recycled plastic?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

**Question 20. Do you agree with the government's proposed method for calculating the weight of the packaging? If not, please explain why and how you would calculate it.**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

**Question 21. Are the types of evidence within the government's list appropriate for proving recycled plastic content and the other information required by HMRC? Are there any additional sources of evidence which could be used? If so, please provide details.**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

**Question 22. What further due diligence could businesses reasonably conduct to ensure their products meet the relevant specifications for tonnage and recycled plastic?**

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

## Exports – chapter 7

This chapter sets out the government’s updated approach for exports of plastic packaging. As set out in the government’s initial consultation, UK manufacturers will not be disadvantaged because exported plastic packaging will be relieved from the tax.

**Question 23. Are there any observations or issues you can see with the government’s proposals to provide relief for exported plastic packaging through direct exports, REPs and tax credits? Please provide details of any alternative methods of relieving exports you would recommend.**

There are significant obligations for taxpayers in order to apply a zero-rate of VAT to exports of product from the UK; if the obligations for this tax are aligned as far as possible to the direct and indirect export evidence requirements for VAT, which they should already be complying with, this would reduce the administrative burden for businesses and also be based on procedures already familiar to exporters.

For VAT, there are time limits for export evidence to be obtained in order to support zero-rating, otherwise VAT must be charged then recovered at a later time when the export can be evidenced. We would like to see the conditions for a tax credit aligned as far as possible with the position for VAT to reduce administrative burden for businesses and also be based on procedures already familiar to exporters.

The position for REPs would be better answered by industry representatives, though in principle, where the scheme is operated on a broadly similar basis to customs or excise arrangements, this may be familiar to businesses already using those arrangements.

**Question 24. Do you agree with the proposed information requirements to evidence the proposed export reliefs? If not, please explain how you could evidence the export.**

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

We agree with the condition in paragraph 7.5 that requires that the product must be exported in order to be relieved from the tax.

For the bullet point that states that the contract must be with an overseas customer, we would like to see the definition of overseas customer be further clarified, for example by stating that an overseas customer must not have any establishment in the UK.

Another example where there could be confusion is where a UK manufacturer invoices its UK customer for product, but that manufacturer is also contracted to directly export the product to the UK customer's overseas customer (i.e. the product is never delivered to the UK customer). If the export is unable to gain a tax credit (which currently can only be claimed by the UK manufacturer if it has a contract with an overseas customer - which it doesn't), it could make UK exporters with more complex supply chains less competitive. For VAT, the UK customer would be able to zero-rate the export and also claim back the VAT charged to it by the UK manufacturer, but under the current rules, the tax credit for direct exports is not available.

**Question 25. Do you agree with the proposal not to relieve transport packaging used on exports? If not, do you have any suggestions on how transport packaging could be offered relief?**

Yes

No

Don't know

This question is outside the area of our expertise.

## Registrations, returns and enforcement – chapter 8

This chapter sets out the registration and returns requirements for the tax, and the compliance and enforcement regime HMRC will operate to ensure a level playing-field for all.

**Question 26.** Do you consider these registration requirements to be appropriate? If not, please specify why.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

There is no commentary on how the transfer of a business, or part of a business, should be dealt with, if the seller was registered for the tax in the period after the launch date. Should the buyer become immediately registrable for the tax or does it have the benefit of a new threshold period before being obliged to register? For businesses that breach the ten tonne limit on a monthly basis, this is less of an issue but for those businesses that breach the threshold over a rolling twelve months, this should be considered and guidance provided (the VAT equivalent would be a transfer of a going concern).

**Question 27.** Do you agree that the group eligibility criteria are appropriate? If not, please specify why.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

The grouping conditions state that they are based on grouping for other indirect taxes, but the requirement for a group member to be a corporate body for VAT grouping [was changed](#) by Schedule 18 Finance Act 2019, which extended it to individuals and partnerships (including Scottish partnerships) that control the other bodies in a VAT group, with effect from 1 November 2019. It isn't clear why these updated rules should not apply to this tax.

**Question 28.** In your view, are businesses eligible to form a group likely to make use of this facility? If so, please estimate the value of savings that may be offered by registering and reporting as a group.

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Our experience with other taxes is that eligible businesses will use a grouping facility where this reduces administrative burdens. The value of savings information will need to be addressed by industry representatives.

**Question 29. Do you agree that these deregistration requirements are appropriate? If not, please specify why.**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

The deregistration requirements are more punitive than for VAT, as they require businesses to remain registered for the tax for 12 months after the date they consider that they will fall under the threshold, including where nil returns apply. In circumstances where a business could clearly demonstrate that they will be under the registration threshold during the 12 month period e.g. permanent loss of a contract that was subject to the tax, closing down part of the business, or permanently changing certain business practices, the reasons for enforcing a minimum 12 month registration period are not clear.

There is no commentary on how the transfer of a business, or part of a business, should be dealt with.

**Question 30. In your view, will the reporting requirements be straightforward to comply with? If not, please provide details of any issues you expect.**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

In principle, the requirements for reporting in the returns appear to be straightforward. However industry representatives would be better placed to comment on whether it is straightforward to obtain the information for the returns.

**Question 31. Do you intend to use a third-party agent to help meet your obligations for the tax or are you an agent expecting to provide this service? Would you expect their responsibilities to include filing your returns?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

This is a question for impacted businesses rather than the CIOT.

**Question 32. Please provide details of the expected costs to your business of registering for the tax, and any expected one-off and on-going costs of completing, filing and paying the return, excluding any expected tax liability.**

This is a question for impacted businesses rather than the CIOT.

**Question 33. Do you consider that HMRC's approach to powers and penalties is appropriate? If not, please specify why.**

Yes

No

Don't know

The proposed approach to powers and penalties is broadly similar to other indirect taxes, so in principle appears reasonable. As this tax is new, we would like to see a light touch approach in the initial period following implementation of the tax with a focus on assisting businesses that are trying to be compliant but making genuine mistakes, with enforcement penalties reserved for deliberate non-compliant behaviour during this period.

## Understanding commercial practices – chapter 9

**Question 34.** Unless already covered in your responses to other questions within this document or the previous consultation, please tell us about the plastic packaging manufactured or imported by your business and how you think your business would be impacted by the tax, including additional administrative burdens?

This is a question for impacted businesses rather than the CIOT.

## Assessment of impacts – chapter 10

**Question 35.** Do you have any comments on the assessment of equality and other impacts in the Tax Impact Assessment?

None

## Submitting your response

Your response should be sent by 20 May 2020, by email to [indirecttaxdesign.team@hmrc.gov.uk](mailto:indirecttaxdesign.team@hmrc.gov.uk) or by post to: Alex Marsh, 3rd Floor Ralli Quays, Stanley Street, M60 9LA.

Paper copies of this document or copies in Welsh and alternative formats (large print, audio and Braille) may be obtained free of charge from the above address. This document can also be accessed from [HMRC's GOV.UK pages](#). All responses will be acknowledged, but it will not be possible to give substantive replies to individual representations.

When responding please say if you are a business, individual or representative body. In the case of representative bodies please provide information on the number and nature of people you represent.