

- Surname: **cramer**
- Forename(s): **neville**
- Name of the organisation (if applicable): **n/a**
- Your email address:
- :
- :
- As an individual (please indicate): **Member of the public**
- :
- For an organisation (please indicate):
- :
- Question 1: Do you agree with the principle of using indicators and examples of evidence as guidance to applicants and the PRP in determining applications?: **Yes**
- Give reasons if you wish.: **I cannot think of a better way to proceed.**
- Question 2: Do you agree with the indicators and evidence we propose?: **Yes**
- Give reasons if you wish. For specific comments on the criteria, use the comments box on the matrix.:
- Question 3: Do you agree with our proposed approach to dealing with applications?: **Yes**
- Give reasons if you wish.: **It seems both fair and appropriately time constrained.**
- Question 4: Do you agree with our proposed approach to discussions with applicants?: **Yes**
- Give reasons if you wish.:
- Question 5: Do you agree with our approach to granting recognition?: **Yes**
- Give reasons if you wish.:
- Question 6: Do you consider that our proposals will have any impacts, either positive or negative, including on our compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty?: **Yes**
- Give reasons if you wish.: **A positive impact in helping the establishment of independent regulators. In turn, these will provide a better chance of achieving an improved press. Improved in the sense that its positive outcomes will continue unhindered, while its negative outcomes will be reduced. Compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty is just normal decency.**