Tabled by Mr Stubbs 26/8/09



JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE INQUIRY ON ELECTORAL MATTERS - INTRODUCTORY NOTES

1. Proposals for group compulsory postal voting

- Compulsory postal should be investigated as an option;
- Previously implemented by Colin Barry in Victoria and he recommended the system to the NSW Local Government and Shires Association (unsuccessfully)
- Already works very well in Victoria and Tasmania and possibly other states;
- Strong voter participation;
- Declaration of results are timely in the 2008 Wodonga election, the poll closed at 5.00 pm on the Friday evening before election day, the count was completed over the weekend and the results were formally declared at 9.00 am on the Monday morning;
- Offers voters better convenience, time and flexibility to consider the candidates and cast their votes;
- Comparisons with northern Victorian Councils show that it is cost effective, more so for higher population areas;
- Councils should have discretion to adopt postal voting perhaps a community decision by referendum;

2. Above the line group voting

- Difficulty of compiling teams of minimum of five, few of whom have much chance of being elected;
- System can confusing to voters, with groups above the line and other individual candidates below the line at possibly at a disadvantage;
- Above the line voting ballot papers go directly to Sydney for counting restricts opportunities for scrutineers and could be done locally;
- Councils should have discretion whether or not to adopt group voting perhaps a community decision by referendum.

3. Competitive tendering of election services

- Currently the NSW Electoral Commission is legislated to conduct the process, which creates an uncontested and protected monopoly;
- Councils are legally obliged to pay whatever price is dictated by the Electoral Commission;
- Councils have no control over determining the appropriate level of services required;
- The increased costs for the 2008 election were enormous even thought the final accounts from the Electoral Commission were in some cases substantially less that the cost estimate

- provided to Councils in May. No explanations for the lesser than estimate final costs have been given by the Electoral Commission to Councils;
- An updated RAMROC Councils summary, comparing Electoral Commission and Council costs for both the 2004 and 2008 elections, is tabled for information of the Standing Committee;
- Councils are required in their operational activities to conform to strict tendering and procurement procedures and contestability principles. The election process should be no different;
- Currently the Electoral Commission over-services in some areas, such as the length of time
 that the Returning Officer is engaged, whereas in other areas there are concerns about underservices, such as the lack of appropriate advertising and better communications with the
 public and information for candidates and voters;
- National Competition Policy principles should apply the Local Government election process should be market tested by open tender.

4. Experiences of having a shared Returning Officer

- Candidates in locations other that the RO's base were frustrated at not being able to meet face to face with the Returning Officer;
- The RO's ability to meet the needs of candidates and communities were restricted by location;
- Counting for a number of Councils in the RO's base location or in Sydney restricted accessibility for scrutineers;
- Difficulties of having a remote location for shared Returning Officers are exacerbated by the lack of public transport; in country areas;
- The shared Returning Officer's cost to Councils were still high appeared not to reflect the savings that were anticipated to be achieved by using a shared RO;
- Councils were often called upon to provide assistance to the Returning Officer based in another centre, e.g. in clarifying matters to prospective/participating candidates and/or to residents. These costs were generally absorbed internally and do not show up as a specific cost centre;
- Fortunately in our region, some shared Returning Officers were former senior Local Government officers and were therefore very experienced in the role and were able to provide quality service to the Councils.
- In our region, it is not necessary to have a full time Returning Officer for 10 weeks to conduct the election.

5. Time taken to declare results

- This is a matter of particular concern to the larger urban Councils in our region. Two examples highlight the issue, as follows;
- Griffith City in 2004 the final count concluded on the Monday evening following the election.
 In 2008, the Electoral Commission final count for popularly elected Mayor finished on the Thursday evening, with the final count for Councillors on the Friday;
- Albury City in 2008 the final result declaration of the poll was not made until the following Sunday (counting finalised on the Saturday) - compared to the 2004 declaration when the declaration was made on the Friday and in 1999 when the declaration was made on the

Wednesday following the election. In 2004 and 2008 the final count was actually completed some two days before the formal declaration, so the counting timetable was in fact far quicker;

 An example at the small Shire level - Murrumbidgee Shire indicated that it took 5 or 6 days to count some 1500 votes. Under previous arrangements, the result in that Council would have normally been known on the Saturday evening of the election or on the Sunday.

6. Election Funding Authority issues

- The requirements relating to the appointment and registration of an official agent are considered to be over-onerous and unnecessary;
- Candidates and groups who do not appoint and register an official agent cannot accept more
 than \$1000 in political donations and cannot incur more than \$1000 in electoral expenditure
 during the "election period" these amounts are unrealistic and should be somewhat higher to
 justify the difficulty and expense in having an agent to administer receipts and disbursements
 and open special bank accounts etc;
- Agents must also "be on the NSW electoral roll" this again seems unnecessary particularly
 in our region along the NSW/Victoria border. For example, one Albury group wanted to
 appoint an excellent agent who resides in Wodonga Victoria, but was unable to do so;
- Similarly the requirement to appoint an Auditor for political donations and/or election expenses in excess of \$2500 is at an unrealistic figure;
- No limit amounts are specifically proposed for both agent and auditor compliance but perhaps at least \$5000 in each case would be much more realistic - our comment is that a review should be undertaken.

| Moira Shire Gannawarra Shire Rural City of Mildura | Wodonga City Indigo Shire Towong Shire Campaspe Shire | Northern Victorian Councils Postal Ballot System - estimated cost per elector | Wurray Shire 2007 bi-election Greater Hume Shire 2005 bi-election Wentworth Shire 2007 bi-election | Notes 1. Griffith City 2006 bi-election | TOTALS | Wentworth Shire | Wakool Shire | Urana Shire | Narrandera Shire | Murrumbidgee Shire | Murray Shire Note 2 | Leeton Shire | Jerilderie Shire | Hay Shire | Griffith City Note 1 | Greater Hume Shire | Deniliquin Council | Corowa Shire | Conargo Shire | Carrathool Shire | Berrigan Shire | Balranald Shire | Albury City | | COUNCIL | | RAMROC SCHEDULE OF 2004 AND 2008 ELECTORAL COSTS |
|--|--|---|--|--|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--|
| | | t System - es | 18700 | 64198 | 196280 | <u>10170</u> | 6578 | 5005 | 7793 | 6184 | 7662 | 18000 | 7739 | 7119 | 14752 | 26954 | 8679 | 12006 | 4000 | 6973 | 8885 | 7145 | | Commiss C | Electoral C | 2 | ELECTORA |
| | | timated co | 6/64 16930 | 8632 | <u>281053</u> | 28781 | 15469 | 8383 | 10817 | 3386 | 11965 | 16000 | 10261 | 4363 | 34885 | 24304 | 10692 | 17021 | 0 | 14906 | 10081 | 10506 | $\tilde{\omega}$ | Council C | Other C | 004 ELECT | L COSTS |
| | | st per elector | 30656 35630 38129 | 72830 | 477333 | <u>38951</u> | 22047 | 13388 | 18610 | 9570 | 19627 | 34000 | 18000 | 11482 | 49637 | 51258 | 19371 | 29027 | 4000 | 21879 | 18966 | 17651 | 79869 | Costs | Overall | 2004 ELECTION COSTS | |
| | | | | | | Note 6 | | | | | | | | | | Notes 4&5 | | | | Note 3 | | | | | | | |
| | · 1 | ı r m | ·** | | 935000 | 60700 | 34700 | 13600 | 34700 | 15300 | 41300 | 62500 | 13000 | 18400 | 137000 | 63200 | 45000 | 59600 | 22600 | 22,100 | 51,700 | 15,400 | 0 | May est f | Elec.Com I | ESTIMATE | |
| 120,000 68,288 154,895 | 124,000 85,000 54,450 130,000 | EO Cost | | ÷ | 734035 | 48500 | 24495 | 5200 | 27700 | 11700 | 28000 | 53430 | 8600 | 17300 | 47900 32000 50700 121000 | 4510 | 7300 | 15400 34000 7300 | _ | Final acc C | Elec.Com Elec.Com Council | ESTIMATED FOR 2008 | | | | | |
| | | | | | 57405 | 3800 | 2752 | 1495 | 2683 | 1866 | 3865 | 5450 | 1800 | 453 | 9000 | 4549 | 1380 | 6926 | 0 | 1996 | 1000 | 1790 | 600 | | | ; | |
| | • | | | | 791440 | 52300 | 27247 | 6695 | 30383 | 13566 | 31865 | 58880 | 10400 | 17753 | 130000 | 55249 | 33380 | 54826 | 4510 | 9296 | 35000 | 17190 | 202900 | Costs | Total 08 | | |
| 22,477 9,014 (est) 36,906 | 25,331 12,409 5,416 30,000 (est) | Population | | | 107,850 | 4,262 | 2,926 | 875 | 4,321 | 1,550 | 4,642 | 7,301 | 1,196 | 2.246 | 15.607 | 6,983 | 5.321 | 8 029 | 1.181 | 1.915 | 5,799 | 1,594 | 32,102 | Electors | No.of | | |
| \$5.34 \$7.57 \$4.20 | \$4.90 \$6.85 \$10.05 \$4.33 | | | _ | | \$12.27 | \$ 9.31 | 1 ward only | \$7.03 | \$8.75 | \$6.86 | \$8.06 | \$8.70 | \$7.90 | \$8.33 | \$7.91 | \$6.27 | \$6.83 | No election | No election | \$6.04 | \$10.78 | \$6.32 | per Elector | EC Cost | | |

Tabled by Hr Stubbs 26/8/09 JR.