

Q1: Still some experiencing cases over 12 months without prior applications. A live example was lease application in April 2024 and only just had requisitions on it. This was a plain occupational lease. So, we need to go back on assurance that cases over 12 months are only in cases of prior apps or outstanding requisitions etc. [The preceding text is picked out of Mike's summary of the points that came up at the meeting, so I suggest we summarise those on the following lines: *"Unactioned registration applications over 12 months old."*]

Answer: There are some applications that are over 12 months old, but these will relate to cases where we have needed to raise requisitions that for whatever reason have not yet been resolved and where there are prior pending applications that we cannot complete. There are also rarer scenarios where there is a process or issue external to the registration process that is holding things up. The most common example of this will be dispute cases that have been referred to the tribunal or the courts for determination.

Q2: Good discussion on strings. Example given of case waiting 3 years and still not processed, because of prior applications. We need to pass this back to Emma E. There is a strong case for looking at these cases as a priority for proactive management. Having things hanging around that long is not healthy and regardless of who is waiting on whom, we will get the blame for it and we will know that we can do more to chivvy them on. I said we were looking at concentrating effort on strings. If we can get a note back to Warren about what to expect, that would be great. [Proposed summary: *"Strings of attached applications."*]

Answer: In the case of strings of applications, we understand the benefits of completing all applications in the chain so that we can release all at the same time. We are reviewing how we could process this internally and we are at present running a test and learn for register create applications (i.e. first registrations, transfers apart and new leases). The principle being trialled is when one of our caseworkers picks up multiple applications in same parent title, they attempt to process all of that string together. This can be a challenge where requisitions are raised on some of the applications. This trial will finish at the end of August and outcomes and recommendations will be collated in early September.

Q3: We need to know what happens in more detail. They are convinced it doesn't happen quickly enough to hit the bill. Can we get chapter and verse from finance. Is it that we debit their account as soon as the application is received but then add it to a bill for the law firm that we then send monthly or quarterly? It didn't seem to relate to miscalculated fees. [Proposed summary: *"Debiting of fees for registration applications."*]

Answer: We operate a Variable Direct Debit scheme, and we debit a customer's account when the fee exceeds the threshold for collection, which we have currently set at £50. We lower that threshold on Thursday after we have receipted for the day to £0.01 in order that we may collect any fees to the customer has been charged within that working week. This approach was agreed by the Law Society when the Variable Direct Debit scheme was introduced. A copy of the Scheme booklet is attached by way of background. We do not issue monthly or quarterly invoices. Debits are triggered automatically on exceeding of the threshold on a given day.

Fees are intended to be taken at the point of delivery of the application. EDRS relies on the customer telling us and inputting what the fee for the application should be. If they enter zero, then we do not automatically debit the fee. With the current backlogs, there may be a delay before a caseworker picks up the application for processing and detects the need to raise the requisite fee.

Within DRS, the fees are calculated for customers and other third-party platform providers of support and fee calculations too.

Q4: On the daylist, they were aware of application enquiry, but they say sometimes you get full information, sometimes it nothing but 'dealing' and a lawyer's reference. This is the most serious of all the points. If you see something last minute on the daylist like this it can hold up completion and that may be out of hours, so you can't even phone. So, we need to know if we are not completing the details in some cases for either habit or systemic reasons. [Proposed summary: *"Identification of prior pending applications before completion."*]

Answer: When a customer applies via DRS, e-DRS or Business Gateway to register a transfer of part or new lease, this appears on the daylist information available from Application Enquiry as a 'Transfer of Part' or 'Depositionary First Lease'. A register update application appears on the daylist information as a 'Dealing'.

The terms transfers of part and depositionary first leases are self-explanatory as to the nature of the application, although an official search or official copy application will be required for any further details (i.e. the dates and parties). The term 'Dealing' only denotes the existence of a register update application but not what it actually is, so again an official search or official copy application would be needed to obtain further information.

When transfers of part and depositionary first leases are first captured, there will not be any information relating to the property description as this information is not entered by customers during the submission process. Our current practice is to triage these applications, usually within three working days, at which point we add a brief property description for the land affected by the application.

The following image shows how these different application types appear in Application Enquiry. The lease applications from 2024 both include property descriptions. The transfer of part application was only received on 17th July 2025 and so had not been triaged at the time this screenshot was taken.

The screenshot shows the 'Application Enquiry' page. At the top, it says 'Application list' and 'Enquiry time: 18 JUL 2025 at 06:51:20'. Below this, the 'Title Number: MX279312' is displayed, along with links for 'Discharge Activity', 'New enquiry', and 'Printer-friendly version'. A list of applications follows, each with a date, title, and customer reference, and a 'Show details' link. Annotations with colored arrows point to specific entries: a blue arrow points to the 'Transfer of Part, 17 JUL 2025' entry with the note 'Transfer of Part application with no property description'; a green arrow points to the 'Dealing, 14 JUL 2025' entry with the note 'Dealing application'; and two yellow arrows point to the 'Dispositional First Lease' entries (dated 03 JUL 2024 and 26 FEB 2024) with the note 'Dispositional First Lease applications with property descriptions'.

Application	Date	Title	Customer Reference	Action
Transfer of Part	17 JUL 2025	New Title: AGL650965 No property description recorded for this application	2010627.00034/MM25/SC21	Show details
Dealing	14 JUL 2025		2010627.00034/MM25/SC21	Show details
Dispositional First Lease	03 JUL 2024	New Title: AGL625493 GF and basement, 24 The Avenue	KS/STEP.38385	Show details
Dispositional First Lease	26 FEB 2024	New Title: AGL644763 22 The Ave	01/1966/N.ALAVI/L&T	Show details

The point about prior applications only been discovered at the last minute before completion, it is not good practice to be checking for this and indeed lodging priority searches so close to that critical date. In the case of searches, the vast majority are processed and the certificate of results issued either within a minute or two of submission or within 24-48 hours in the case of those requiring manual work by our people. But on busy titles, there may be applications and complexities relating to strings of applications which mean it may take longer than usual to issue a search result.

Q5: Liked the idea of QES but pointed to the current practice around WES as too complicated. Nothing we need to do specifically, except get out there and talk to them about using QES, which I will follow up on. They asked if QES can be used in mixed mode – one part wet-signed and the other QES. Can we confirm, please. [Proposed summary: *“Can QES be used in mixed mode – one part wet-signed and the other QES?”*]

Answer: With QES, we cannot accept counterparts because this is not compliant with the Land Registration Act 2002.