Response ID ANON-CEQC-5NF2-Q

Yes

Comments:

Abandon the aim of digital or electronic registration

Submitted to Digital Transformation: Next Steps Submitted on 2017-02-01 22:08:11 Part 1 - New digital services in the Keeper's registers 1 Do you agree that transition to a digital first service should be the next step? Nο Comments: 2 Do you agree with the proposed timescale of 1 April 2018 for prescribing that advance notices over part be fully digital? No Comments: 3 Do you agree with a notice period of six months? No Comments: 4 Do you agree the initial focus for digital registration, following launch of the digital discharge service, should be provision of channels aimed at standard securities and dispositions? No Comments: 5 What deed types do you consider we should prioritise for new services subsequent to securities and dispositions? Comments: None 6 Do you consider that for the limited purpose of dual recording, it should be permissible to record an electronic deed in the sasine register or should be permissible to record a paper copy of the digital deed? Comments: No. 7 Do you agree that ten working days from the date of digital submission is an appropriate period to allow the prior deeds to be submitted? Comments: 8 Do you have a view on alternative ways you would like to present supporting documents accompanying a digital application? No Comments: Part 2 - Digital application form and submission process 9 Do you agree with the main changes that we propose to make to the application form? No Comments:

10 Are there any other changes you suggest we should make with a view to simplifying it and making it easier to follow?

land registration application form on an administrative basis so that it can be amended from time to time, following consultation and due notice, without the need for changes to be made to the rules?
No
Comments:
12 Do you agree that this approach should be adopted for both applications submitted on paper and applications prepared through a digital service provided by the keeper?
Yes
Comments:
About You
What is your name?
Name:
What is your email address?
Email:
Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?
Individual
What is your organisation?
Organisation:
The Scottish Government would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate your publishing preference:
Publish response only (without name) - Individuals only
We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?
Yes
Evaluation
Please help us improve our consultations by answering the questions below. (Responses to the evaluation will not be published.)
Matrix 1 - How satisfied were you with this consultation?: Very dissatisfied
Please enter comments here.: This proposal has been rushed out with an improbable time scale and with minimal consultation as to how it would work in practice.
It should be deferred or abandoned until a valid case has been made for its implementation - particularly if this is to be mandatory, fro which thee is no justification in logic.
Matrix 1 - How would you rate your satisfaction with using this platform (Citizen Space) to respond to this consultation?: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Please enter comments here.:

11 Do you agree that instead of prescribing the content of the application form in the Land Register Rules, the keeper should publish the