

The 2001

ACT Legislative Assembly Election

Review of the Electoral Act 1992



Elections ACT



Australian Capital Territory

ISBN 0 642 60143 7

© Australian Capital Territory, Canberra 2002

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission from Information Planning and Services, Department of Urban Services, ACT Government, GPO Box 158, Canberra City ACT 2601.

Produced by Publishing Services for the
ACT Electoral Commission
PO Box 272, Civic Square ACT 2608.

Email: elections@act.gov.au

Phone: 6205 0033

Publication No 02/1170

<http://www.elections.act.gov.au>

<http://www.act.gov.au>

Telephone: Canberra 13ACT1 or 132 281

Mr Jon Stanhope MLA
Attorney-General
ACT Legislative Assembly
London Circuit
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Attorney-General

This report on the review of the operation of the *Electoral Act 1992* in relation to the conduct of the 2001 ACT Legislative Assembly Election is presented to you under section 10A of the Electoral Act.

Subsection 10A(2) of the Electoral Act requires you to cause a copy of this report to be laid before the Legislative Assembly within 6 days of receiving the report.

Yours sincerely



Graham Glenn
Chairperson

14 August 2002

Phillip Green
Electoral Commissioner

14 August 2002

Christabel Young
Member

14 August 2002

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3
LEGISLATION CHANGES SINCE THE 1998 ELECTION.....	4
NOMINATIONS.....	5
REVIEW OF DECISIONS.....	7
PARTY REGISTRATION	9
AUTHORISATION OF ELECTORAL ADVERTISEMENTS.....	12
ELECTION FUNDING AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE SCHEME.....	13
REDUCTION OF THE IMPACT OF THE LINEAR VOTE.....	15
SURVEY OF NUMBERING ON FORMAL BALLOT PAPERS	18
INFORMAL VOTING.....	20
POSTAL VOTING.....	22
TABLES	26
Explanation of tables.....	26
Table 1(a) – Paper linear votes – Brindabella.....	29
Table 1(b) – Paper linear votes – Ginninderra.....	30
Table 1(c) – Paper linear votes – Molonglo.....	31
Table 2 – Linear votes – Summary 1995-2001.....	32
Table 3 – Distribution of linear votes between selected candidates.....	33
Table 4(a) – Length of sequence – Brindabella.....	35
Table 4(b) – Length of sequence – Ginninderra.....	36
Table 4(c) – Length of sequence – Molonglo.....	37
Table 5 – Length of sequence – Summary 1998-2001	38
Table 6 – Sequence breaks.....	39
Table 7 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers by reason for informality.....	40
Table 8 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers containing ticks, crosses or some numbers, but no unique first preference.....	40
Table 9 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers with 2 or more figure 1s, ticks and crosses	41
Table 10 – Postal vote outcomes	42

The 2001 ACT Legislative Assembly Election: Review of the *Electoral Act 1992*

Executive summary

This review examines the operation of the *Electoral Act 1992* in relation to the conduct of the ACT Legislative Assembly election held on 20 October 2001.

The 2001 ACT Legislative Assembly election represented a major milestone in the conduct of elections in Australia with the first use of electronic voting at polling places for parliamentary elections. This election also saw the first use of an electronic counting system in the ACT using the Hare-Clark electoral system and Robson rotation.

Another significant change was the introduction of increased numbers of Robson rotation variations, intended to reduce the impact of the linear vote.

This review can be read in conjunction with the following reports:

- *The 2001 ACT Legislative Assembly Election: Electronic Voting and Counting System Review*, tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 27 June 2002;
- *The Elections Statistics* for the election, published in December 2001; and
- The Commission's *Annual Report 2001/2002*, to be published in September 2002.

This review examines aspects of the operation of the Electoral Act during the conduct of the 2001 election, other than those issues raised in the electronic voting and counting system review. The issues considered in this review are limited to areas where changes had occurred since the 1998 election, or where the Commission considers that changes may be needed to the Electoral Act. A general report on the conduct of the 2001 election will be included in the Commission's Annual Report for 2001/2002.

Specific issues covered by this review include:

- **Legislation changes since the 1998 election** – listing the changes that were made to the Electoral Act since the previous election.
- **Nominations** – examining the operation of the changes made to the nominations requirements, and questioning the right of candidates to be listed on ballot papers in non-party groups.
- **Review of decisions** – looking at the decision-making process related to requests for recounts of ballot papers.
- **Party registration** – discussing the process of determining whether a political party is eligible for registration, and suggesting that there be a fixed date by which applications for party registration must be submitted before an election;
- **Authorisation of electoral advertisements** – examining the operation of the changes made to the authorisation requirements after the 1998 election.
- **Election funding and disclosure scheme** – suggesting that thresholds for disclosure of donations and expenditure for candidates and other political participants be brought into line with thresholds that apply to political parties.

- **Reduction of the impact of the linear vote** – analysing the effect of increasing the number of Robson rotations of ballot papers printed to determine whether the changes succeeded in reducing the impact of the linear vote.
- **Numbering of formal ballot papers** – looking at the results of the survey of numbering behaviour on ballot papers.
- **Informal voting** – analysing the results of the survey of informal ballot papers.
- **Postal voting** – examining those postal votes that were not able to be included in the election count, and suggesting an earlier deadline for submission of applications for postal votes from overseas.

Summary of recommendations

The Commission recommends that the Electoral Act be amended to provide that:

- Only candidates belonging to registered political parties be able to be listed in groups on ballot papers; the provision of non-party groups be removed; and all non-party candidates be listed in the “ungrouped” columns on the ballot papers.
- The Commissioner not be permitted to be present during any deliberation of the Commission in relation to a review of a decision of the Commissioner not to conduct a recount, and that the Commissioner not be permitted to take part in making any such decision, unless the original decision was made by a delegate of the Commissioner.
- An additional requirement be imposed on parties applying for registration, such that the party must provide a list of members with its application for registration, and that this list must contain the names and addresses of at least 100 members who are electors.
- The Commissioner must refuse an application to register a political party if the Commissioner believes on reasonable grounds that the party did not have at least 100 members who were electors on the date on which the party applied for registration.
- The latest date on which an application for party registration may be made is 30 June in the year in which an election is due to be held.
- The disclosure thresholds set out in sections 217, 218, 221 and 224, that currently specify \$200, be increased to \$1500.
- The threshold at which anonymous gifts received by candidates, non-party groups, parties, ballot groups and associated entities may not be received be increased to \$1500.
- Broadcasters and publishers be required to provide the address of those people who have placed election advertisements when submitting returns under section 226.
- Postal vote applications from electors who are overseas must be received before the last mail delivery on the Friday the week before polling day.
- Postal votes must be issued for the electorate for which the elector is enrolled, or, if the issuing officer cannot determine whether the elector is currently enrolled, the vote is to be issued for the electorate in which the elector claims to be entitled to vote.

Legislation changes since the 1998 election

A number of changes were made to the Electoral Act after the 1998 election and implemented for the first time at the 2001 election. The main changes were:

- Allowing for the use of electronic voting and computerised vote counting;
- Raising the threshold for the receipt of public funding from 2% to 4% of first preference votes in an electorate;
- Altering the party registration scheme to require all political parties to demonstrate that they have 100 members on the ACT electoral roll and introducing a scheme of registration of ballot group names for non-party MLAs;
- Increasing the number of nominees required to nominate a non-party candidate from 2 electors to 20 electors;
- Requiring the Electoral Commissioner to reject nominations of candidates using names that are obscene, frivolous or assumed for a political purpose;
- Enabling an elector to vote immediately outside a polling place where the elector is unable to enter the polling place because of a physical disability, illness, advanced pregnancy or other condition;
- Removing the prohibition on inducing electors to return completed postal vote application forms to an address other than an address authorised by the Electoral Commissioner, and instead providing that an application for a postal vote may be included in material issued by any person or organisation;
- Modifying the definition of electoral matter to limit its application to matter more directly concerned with Legislative Assembly elections (this definition is used to identify published matter that needs to carry an authorisation statement);
- Increasing the number of variations of ballot papers to be printed for Legislative Assembly elections;
- Limiting the length of columns of candidates on ballot papers to the number of vacancies in the electorate; and
- Closing nominations one day earlier to allow more time between the close of nominations and the commencement of pre-poll voting for typesetting and printing the more complex ballot papers.

The above amendments were successfully implemented at the 2001 election.

Nominations

Nomination of independent and non-party group candidates by 20 nominators

Prior to the 2001 election the Electoral Act was amended to require independent candidates and non-party group candidates to have 20 nominators who were on the ACT electoral roll rather than the 2 nominators required at previous elections. This increase did not cause any difficulties for the Commission during the nomination process.

However, the increase in nominators required did appear to cause difficulties for some candidates. Several nominations were submitted that did not have 20 enrolled electors listed as nominees. All but one of these were resubmitted before nominations closed with at least 20 enrolled electors as nominees. One person who wished to run as a candidate, who arrived at the Commissioner's office less than half an hour before nominations closed, did not have his nomination form accepted as 2 of the 20 people listed as nominators on his nomination form were not enrolled electors. This person was not able to obtain the required number of nominees before nominations closed.

This experience highlighted the desirability of candidates submitting their nominations well in advance of the closing time for nominations, to allow time for defects in the nominations to be corrected. The need to submit nomination forms early will be stressed by the Commission in its Candidates Handbook for the 2004 election.

Non-party groups

There was a marked increase in the number of non-party groups contesting the election in 2001. In both the 1995 and 1998 elections, there were 2 non-party groups across all electorates. In 2001 there were 5 non-party groups, with 3 in Molonglo and 1 in each of Brindabella and Ginninderra.

Non-party groups can be formed by 2 or more non-party candidates requesting that their names appear together on the ballot paper. A non-party group is entitled to a column on the ballot paper. This column is identified only by a column letter such as "A", "B" etc. The position of the non-party group on the ballot paper is determined in the same draw that determines which column a party is to appear in.

Non-party groups were included in the model Hare-Clark system described in the *Referendum Options Description Sheet* that was published at the time of the referendum to choose the electoral system in 1992. Non-party groups were subsequently included in the Hare-Clark system adopted by the Legislative Assembly in 1994.

The legislative history of non-party groups in the ACT can be traced back to the introduction of registration of political parties by the Commonwealth prior to the 1984 Commonwealth elections. At Senate elections prior to the 1984 election (at the 1983 Senate election, for example), all columns of candidates listed on Senate ballot papers did not carry party affiliations. Consequently all columns of grouped candidates appeared as non-party groups do today. When party affiliations were introduced for the 1984 election, groups standing for Senate elections were given the option to stand either as registered party groups or as non-party groups. The model Hare-Clark electoral

system proposed for the ACT in 1992 essentially followed the Senate ballot paper layout, insofar as groups of candidates were concerned.

The Commission considers that it is appropriate to review the provision of the opportunity for candidates to be listed on ballot papers in non-party groups.

In its original conception, a non-party group was a collection of like-minded candidates campaigning on a common platform. Before registration of political parties was introduced, non-party groups were commonly all members of the same political party.

It is now arguable that the facility for candidates to stand in non-party groups is most commonly used as a vehicle for 2 or more candidates to distinguish themselves on the ballot paper by being listed in a separate group. There is no requirement or expectation that candidates listed in a non-party group have anything in common other than a desire to be listed together in a separate column. Indeed, it is possible that 1 of the 2 candidates listed in the column may only have agreed to be nominated in order to allow the other candidate to be listed in a non-party group on the ballot paper. Therefore it is arguable that the existence of non-party groups does not assist voters by providing them with any meaningful information about why such candidates are grouped together.

By contrast, candidates who are grouped under a registered party name have gone through a public registration process, which includes a requirement to make party constitutions available for public inspection. Consequently, voters can inform themselves about the policies and ideals of registered political parties and use that information to make judgments about candidates grouped together on the ballot paper in a party group.

The facility that allows 2 candidates to form a non-party group could have significant consequences for the size of Legislative Assembly ballot papers. As each column on the ballot paper increases the width of the ballot paper, a relatively small number of candidates forming several non-party groups with as few as 2 candidates in each group could result in a ballot paper that was unmanageably wide. At the 2001 election, with 3 non-party groups, the Molonglo ballot paper was 560 mm wide. If those 3 groups (comprising 6 candidates) had instead been included in 1 “ungrouped” column, the ballot paper would have been 88 mm narrower.

Wider ballot papers impose significant costs. They cost more to print, they use more paper, they are more difficult to store and handle, and they are more difficult and time-consuming to count and data-enter. With electronic voting, the more columns listed on the ballot paper, the more difficult it is to list all columns on screen so that they are all visible at a readable point size.

The non-party group facility could be used by a relatively small number of mischievous persons to frustrate the electoral process by causing ballot papers to be over large and difficult to manage, at considerable cost to the public purse. By contrast, persons wishing to run in party columns have to prove a significant level of public support in order to register a political party.

For these reasons, the Commission **recommends** that the provision of non-party groups should be removed, and that only candidates belonging to registered political parties should be able to be listed in groups on ballot papers. All other candidates should be listed in the “ungrouped” columns on the ballot papers.

Review of decisions

In his submission to the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs in relation to its inquiry into the size of the Legislative Assembly of 8 April 2002, Ginninderra candidate Mr Harold Hird made 2 recommendations in relation to reviews of decisions made by the Electoral Commission:

- *the Electoral Act should be amended to ensure the integrity of the decisions that the full commission makes by exempting the Electoral Commissioner from hearing appeals against his own rulings, and*
- *the Electoral Act be amended to allow the Administrative Appeals Tribunal to make a ruling in cases of dispute over an election issue.*

In the Committee's report on this inquiry, the Committee recommended adopting the first recommendation listed above. The Committee did not comment on the second recommendation.

Under section 187 of the Electoral Act, the Electoral Commissioner may, if the Commissioner thinks fit, conduct a recount of some or all ballot papers for an electorate. A candidate may ask the Commissioner to conduct a recount. If the Commissioner does not accede to a request for a recount by a candidate, the candidate may ask the Commission for a recount. The Commission is not obliged to grant a recount on request. However, the Commissioner must conduct a recount if the Commission directs the Commissioner to do so.

In effect, section 187 provides for a 2-step appeal process, whereby a candidate can ask the Commissioner for a recount and, if the Commissioner refuses, the candidate can appeal to the Commission for this decision to be reversed.

A similar appeal process for other decisions made by or on the authority of the Commissioner is provided for under part 15 of the Electoral Act. Under this part, a person affected by a reviewable decision may apply to the Commission for a review of a decision made by the Commissioner or the Commissioner's delegate. Under section 247(8), the Commissioner is required not to be present during any deliberation of the Commission in relation to a review under part 15, and not to take part in any decision of the Commission in relation to a review under part 15, unless the original reviewable decision was made by a delegate of the Commissioner.

By contrast, section 187 does not prohibit the Commissioner from taking part in deliberations or decisions on a request for a review of the Commissioner's decision not to conduct a recount. The Commission accepts that section 187 is inconsistent with the general principle that a person should not hear appeals against his or her own decision. Accordingly the Commission **recommends** that section 187 be amended to provide that the Commissioner not be permitted to be present during any deliberation of the Commission in relation to a review of a decision of the Commissioner not to conduct a recount, and that the Commissioner not be permitted to take part in making any such decision, unless the original decision was made by a delegate of the Commissioner.

However, the Commission notes that adopting this principle would not prevent the Commission from consulting the Commissioner in order to inform itself of the facts of the case being considered.

As indicated above, the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs did not comment on Mr Hird's recommendation that "*the Electoral Act be amended to allow the Administrative Appeals Tribunal to make a ruling in cases of dispute over an election issue*". The Commission strongly opposes this recommendation.

Section 256 of the Electoral Act provides that the validity of an election shall only be disputed by application to the Court of Disputed Elections, which is a special jurisdiction conferred on the ACT Supreme Court. A number of matters are listed in section 256 that clarify the meaning of matters relating to disputed validity of an election. One of those items listed is "any matter connected with the issue, or scrutiny, of ballot papers by an officer".

Since 1997, there has been no avenue of appeal against a decision of the ACT Supreme Court sitting as the Court of Disputed Elections. This was the result of an amendment made by the Commonwealth to the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976*, which removed appeal rights to the Federal Court and the High Court. This brought the ACT into line with other Australian jurisdictions that do not allow appeals from their equivalent courts.

By providing that there are no appeals from the Court of Disputed Elections, the ACT's electoral legislation ensures that decisions relating to the validity of ACT elections can be dealt with quickly, with finality and with certainty. In turn, this would serve to minimise the amount of uncertainty and disruption that could be caused to the operation of the Legislative Assembly and government in the ACT by any challenge to an election result.

Allowing the Administrative Appeals Tribunal to have any jurisdiction over election disputes, while still conferring jurisdiction on the Supreme Court sitting as the Court of Disputed Elections, would add an unnecessary step in the process of challenging an election that would serve to delay the process of finalising election disputes, for no apparent benefit.

Allowing the Administrative Appeals Tribunal to have sole jurisdiction over election disputes would not, in the Commission's view, be appropriate. The Commission considers that a senior court should be given the responsibility for hearing election disputes. The Commission considers that a candidate who wishes to challenge a decision not to conduct a recount is effectively challenging the result of an election, and that the appropriate method of appeal to follow in this case is by application to the Court of Disputed Elections.

Party Registration

In June 2001, the Electoral Act was amended to ensure that all political parties registered in the ACT have 100 members on the ACT electoral roll. Following these amendments, the Commission reviewed all existing registered parties to determine if they had 100 members on the roll, and as a result of notifying parties of the new requirements, 4 parties sought cancellation of their registration. One other party did not respond to enquiries regarding its membership, and consequently its registration was cancelled. The remaining parties were found to meet the new membership requirements.

New parties seeking registration prior to the 2001 election were also required to meet the new membership requirements. While it is not an immediate requirement of the application process that a party provide membership details to the Commissioner, the Commissioner may, by written notice, request these details. In practice, the Commissioner always requests this information and most political parties wishing to register provide a membership list with their application.

The Electoral Act provides that the Commissioner must refuse an application to register a political party if the Commissioner believes on reasonable grounds that the party does not have at least 100 members who are electors. The Electoral Act is unclear as to when during the registration process the party must meet the membership criteria in the Electoral Act. In particular, it is not clear whether a membership list that meets the criteria must be provided with the application for registration, or whether the party must prove it has 100 members on the electoral roll sometime after the application date, but before the date on which it is registered.

In order to determine if a political party does in fact have 100 members on the electoral roll, the Commissioner compares the list provided with the electoral roll, and then writes to a sample of those electors on the roll seeking confirmation of party membership.

In practice, in some cases in 2001 the membership lists provided by parties did not contain 100 names that were on the electoral roll. In these cases the Commissioner contacted the party and sought additional names of party members in order to determine if the party had 100 members. If the Commissioner was satisfied at the time of registration the party had 100 members, and all other requirements had been fulfilled, then the party was registered.

The difficulty with this approach is that it allows a party to submit an application for registration before it has secured 100 members, at a time when it is arguable the party was not entitled to apply for registration, but still allows the party to secure registration if it is able to recruit more members before the Commissioner makes a decision on the application.

This difficulty arises in part because the Electoral Act imposes the membership requirement in a negative fashion, rather than as a positive requirement. That is, rather than say “to be registered, a political party must have at least 100 members who are electors”, section 93 of the Electoral Act states that the Commissioner must refuse an application to register a political party if the Commissioner believes on reasonable grounds that the party does not have at least 100 members who are electors.

In order to clarify this requirement, and to prevent a party applying for registration before it is eligible, the Commission **recommends** that an additional requirement be imposed on parties applying for registration, such that the party must provide a list of members with its application for registration, and that this list must contain the names and addresses of at least 100 members who are electors. Further, the Commission **recommends** that section 93 of the Electoral Act be amended to provide that the Commissioner must refuse an application to register a political party if the Commissioner believes on reasonable grounds that the party did not have at least 100 members who were electors on the date on which the party applied for registration.

Another difficulty with the party registration scheme is that there is no specified deadline before which a party must submit an application for registration before an election. There is a constraint on the latest possible date for submitting an application for party registration, in the sense that section 96 of the Electoral Act provides that no action may be taken in relation to the registration of a political party during the pre-election period for an election. This means that the Commissioner may register a party no later than the day before the start of the pre-election period, which starts on the Friday the 36th day before polling day. However, there is no fixed “latest date” on which an application must be submitted.

The relevant periods in the party registration process are:

Receipt of application to register a party to publication of notice.....	unspecified
Public objection period from date of publication of notice	14 days
Consideration of objections (if any) by Commissioner	unspecified
Objections (if any) forwarded to applicant for response	up to 14 days
Decision to register party notified	unspecified
Further period in which review of decision can be sought.....	28 days
Decision on requests for review (if any) by Commission	unspecified
Pre-election period commences.....	36 days before polling day

If each of the unspecified time periods in this process takes about 4 days to complete, around 108 days before polling day is needed to allow all of these processes to take place. In practice, an application received around 60 days before polling day can lead to registration of a party before the election by the Commissioner, since party registration takes effect from the date the Commissioner decides to register the party.

However, this minimum period is not fixed and could vary depending on how long it takes to organise a public notice in a newspaper, how long it takes an applicant to respond to an objection, and on how long is needed for the Commissioner to consider any objections. This level of uncertainty is not desirable, and can lead to confusion as to when an application for registration must be made.

Another concern with this minimum timetable is that it does not allow time for a person to appeal to the full Commission against a decision made by the Commissioner.

If a party leaves its application until the latest possible date, and the Commissioner decides to register the party just before the start of the pre-election period, this would effectively prevent another person or organisation from objecting to the registration of the party under the appeals provisions in the Electoral Act, until after the election was over. This is also not desirable, as it could be seen to be circumventing due process.

In order to remove the current uncertainty about the latest date on which an application for party registration may be made, and in order to allow sufficient time for an appeal to be made to the full Commission against a decision of the Commissioner, the Commission **recommends** that the Electoral Act be amended to provide for a latest date on which such an application can be made, set at 30 June in the election year.

Authorisation of electoral advertisements

Before the 2001 election, the Electoral Act was amended to modify the definition of electoral matter to limit its application to matter more directly concerned with Legislative Assembly elections. The definition was also amended to make it clear that it applied to matter in printed or electronic form. This definition is used to identify published matter that needs to carry an authorisation statement.

Under section 292 published material containing electoral matter is required to show the name and address of the person who authorised the matter, or its author, subject to some exceptions. This requirement is generally aimed at preventing “irresponsibility through anonymity”.

In the course of the election, several complaints were made to the Commissioner about material that was not correctly authorised. In most cases the material, while technically in breach of the authorisation statement requirement, was not anonymous. In these cases, the Commissioner issued a warning and requested that any future dissemination of the material be properly authorised. No cases were identified where unauthorised material was distributed after a warning was issued.

Two cases that involved material that was distributed anonymously were referred to the Australian Federal Police.

The experience of dealing with the authorisation requirements using the revised definition of electoral matter indicated that the revised definition was effective in narrowing the range of material encompassed by the definition to matter more directly related to campaigning for elections.

Election funding and financial disclosure scheme

The Commission notes that the Legislative Assembly rejected the Commission's recommendation, made in its review of the Electoral Act after the 1998 election, to break the nexus with the Commonwealth's funding and financial disclosure scheme, so as to close an apparent loophole in the current scheme. This apparent loophole allows parties to avoid disclosing the identities of donors who give more than \$1500, by not requiring parties to take account of individual donations that amount to less than \$1500 in determining whether a donor has given more than \$1500.

The Commission's views on this apparent loophole were addressed in its 1998 review, and they will not be repeated here.

On a separate issue, the Commission considers that an amendment to the disclosure provisions for candidates is warranted. Under the Electoral Act at present, candidates must disclose details of donors who give the candidate \$200 or more. By contrast, parties have to disclose details of donors who give the party \$1500 or more.

After the 2001 election there was confusion among some party candidates about whether amounts received during the election should be reported by the party or by the candidate. The Electoral Act provides that campaign committees for party candidates are considered part of the party for reporting requirements and amounts received or raised by party candidates' fundraising committees should be included in the party's annual return. In other words, provided a party candidate receives donations through a campaign committee, the Electoral Act obliges all donations to party candidates to be treated as donations to the party.

This means that the effective disclosure threshold for donors to be disclosed by a party candidate is \$1500, while the threshold for non-party groups and independent candidates is \$200. This is not an equitable situation.

On the other side of the disclosure equation, donors who give more than \$200 to candidates are obliged to submit donors' returns. However, this can also give rise to confusion, as donors who give to a party candidate's campaign committee are effectively making a donation to the party. In this case the disclosure threshold is \$1500. Again, this is not equitable.

Other electoral participants (known as "third parties") who incur electoral expenditure of more than \$200 are also required to submit an expenditure return. Again, it is arguable that this low threshold is not equitable, compared to donors to party candidates.

In order to make these provisions equitable, to remove confusion and to provide consistency the Commission **recommends** that all the relevant disclosure thresholds that currently specify \$200 be increased to \$1500. This would make the disclosure scheme equitable to both party candidates, non-party candidates and third parties. It would also recognise the relative insignificance of donations and expenditure of less than \$1500.

The Electoral Act also provides that anonymous gifts to candidates and non-party groups of \$200 or more cannot be received, while anonymous gifts to parties, ballot groups and associated entities of \$1000 cannot be received. For consistency, the Commission **recommends** that this amount be set at \$1500 for candidates, non-party groups, parties, ballot groups and associated entities.

After an election, returns are also required to be lodged by people who make donations to candidates, by people or groups who take part in the election, such as lobby groups and by broadcasters and publishers. These returns are cross matched to determine if anyone who should have lodged a return has not done so.

It is not a requirement of the Electoral Act that broadcasters and publishers provide the address of those people who have placed advertisements in relation to an election advertisement. However, this information would be helpful in the cross matching process and in contacting those people who are required to lodge a return under the Electoral Act. Therefore, the Commission **recommends** amending the Electoral Act to require Broadcasters and Publishers to supply this information.

Reduction of the impact of the linear vote

In June 2001, the Electoral Act was amended to increase the number of versions of Robson rotated ballot papers. This amendment was made after an analysis of ballot papers from the 1995 and 1998 elections showed that the “linear vote” had the potential to influence outcomes at the elections. (See the Commission’s *The 1998 ACT Legislative Assembly Election – Review of the Electoral Act 1992*.)

A “linear vote” is a ballot paper where all the candidates in the column including the voter’s first preference are numbered consecutively from the top down (that is, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 etc straight down the column).

While some linear votes can be expected to reflect the considered view of the voters with regard to the merits of the individual candidates, it is probable that a sizeable proportion of linear votes are cast by voters without regard to the merits of the individual candidates. In other words, in these cases the particular order of names printed on the ballot papers determines the order in which some voters mark their preferences.

The practical significance of linear votes can be seen in cases where, during the distribution of preferences, 2 candidates from the same political party are contesting the last seat to be won by that party. In these cases, particularly where the difference in the vote totals between the last 2 candidates is small, the distribution of the linear vote can determine which of the last 2 candidates wins the seat.

Under the rules applying at the 1995 and 1998 elections, only one Robson rotation variation was printed for each case where a particular candidate was listed at the top of the column. This meant that, at the point where only 2 candidates remained in the count in a party column vying for the last seat for that party, all of the linear votes from another candidate from that party excluded from the count would go to only one of the remaining candidates. As the Robson rotation orders are determined by lot, this meant that the luck of the draw would determine which candidate received the linear vote in this situation. In turn, if the linear vote was high enough to influence which of these last 2 candidates won the last seat, the luck of the draw could therefore determine which candidate won that seat.

To reduce the influence of linear votes, the number of Robson rotation versions printed for the 2001 election was increased to 60 in the 5 Member electorates and to 420 in the 7 Member electorate. These Robson rotation versions are set out in Schedule 2 of the Electoral Act.

The introduction of the increased numbers of Robson rotation versions was intended to share the linear vote more equally between all candidates at each stage of the count. In particular, the intention was that, in situations where the last 2 candidates left standing in a party column were vying for one seat, the linear vote would be shared as close as possible equally between the 2 candidates.

Because all preferences on all ballot papers were recorded electronically, the level of linear voting apparent at the 2001 election was able to be accurately measured for all formal paper ballots. (This was not possible for electronic votes, as the Robson rotation version number was not recorded for each electronic vote – this data will be stored in future versions of the electronic voting system.)

Table 1 – Paper Linear Votes shows, for each electorate, the proportion of votes marked on paper ballots that were party linear votes, as well as various types of non-linear votes. *Table 2 – Linear votes – Summary 1995-2001* shows that, compared to the sample of ballot papers surveyed from the 1995 and 1998 elections, linear voting has stayed at roughly the same level – around 21% to 30% of all votes, depending on the electorate.

Analysis of the preferences recorded on the data-entered paper ballots indicates that any disproportionate effects of linear voting were not a major factor in any of the 2001 election outcomes. The analysis also confirms that the increase in the number of Robson rotations has succeeded in sharing the linear votes close to equally between candidates.

In order to judge the effectiveness with which the increased number of Robson rotations distributed the linear vote equally to pairs of candidates, a range of unsuccessful Australian Labor Party, Liberal Party and Australian Democrats candidates were selected, chosen from candidates who were excluded during the distribution of preferences at a point at which at least 2 candidates in the same party remained in the count.

Apparent linear votes from these candidates were assigned to pairs of other candidates in the same party who were still in the count at the point at which the candidate was excluded, to determine how evenly the linear vote was being shared between these pairs of candidates. These candidates were chosen to represent cases where there were relatively close contests between candidates in the same party in the race for the last seat won by that party. Not all of these preferences would have actually been distributed to these candidates in this way – this data simply shows which of the two listed candidates was highest in the ranking of preferences for each of the linear votes counted to the excluded candidate.

Table 3 – Distribution of linear votes between selected candidates shows that the distribution of the linear vote was close to 50-50 between these pairs of candidates, ranging from a minimum variation from 50% of +/- 0.04% to a maximum variation of +/- 6.5%.

Of course, it cannot be assumed that all apparent linear votes can be attributed to voters marking their preferences in descending sequence with no regard to the candidates concerned. It is possible that at least some of these linear votes were indicative of deliberate choices made by voters between these candidates.

It is also not reasonable to expect that all linear votes will be exactly split 50-50 between each pair of candidates. Random elements, such as the relatively small number of linear voters and the particular ballot paper versions given to those voters, can be expected to result in deviations from an exact 50-50 split.

Even if it is assumed that all of the identified linear votes were made without regard for the merits of each candidate, table 3 indicates that the variations from a straight 50-50 split were not large enough to have affected any election outcome, compared to what would have been the case if these linear votes had split exactly 50-50.

On the other hand, the level of linear voting listed in table 3 indicates that, had the changes to the Robson rotation variations not been made, linear voting could have changed the results of the election in some cases, had the linear votes been distributed in favour of candidates who were narrowly defeated by other candidates in the same party. (Remembering that, under the previous Robson rotation rules, all of the linear votes from an excluded candidate went to only one other candidate in that party at any one stage of the count.)

For example, in Ginninderra, Australian Democrats candidate Roslyn Dundas out-pollled Australian Democrats candidate Dan McMillan by 190 votes, at the point at which Mr McMillan was excluded from the count. Had the 272 linear votes that were distributed to Ms Dundas when Anthony David was excluded all gone instead to Mr McMillan, the latter candidate would probably have been elected in Ms Dundas' place.

This analysis indicates that the changes to Robson rotation successfully removed the "luck of the draw" element of the previous Robson rotation rules.

Survey of numbering on formal ballot papers

The fact that the preferences shown on all formal ballot papers were recorded electronically for the 2001 election meant that, for the first time in the ACT, it has been feasible to tabulate a range of statistics that show how all electors have numbered preferences on their ballot papers. This was a considerable advance on the surveys conducted using the 1995 and 1998 ballot papers, which looked at a random sample of 5% of ballot papers from those elections.

Table 4 – Length of sequence shows for each electorate in 2001 the length of sequence of each ballot paper, recording how far each elector indicated preferences in an unbroken sequence. *Table 5 – Length of sequence – Summary 1998-2001* shows summary details comparing the results for the 1998 and 2001 elections.

Around 98% of all formal voters in 2001 followed the instructions on the ballot papers and indicated at least as many preferences as there were vacancies in the electorate. This result indicates that the instructions provided to voters were effective. Around 62.7% - 67.5% of formal voters (depending on the electorate) indicated only as many preferences as there were vacancies in the electorate. That is, 5 preferences in Brindabella and Ginninderra and 7 preferences in Molonglo.

Between 31.4% and 34.9% of formal voters showed more than the instructed minimum number of preferences. Between 5.5% (in Molonglo) and 9.2% (in Ginninderra) of formal voters marked preferences for every candidate (with 7.6% in Brindabella). These results indicate that, while around two thirds of voters are inclined to cast “the recommended minimum” number of preferences, another third of voters take the opportunity to show more preferences than the recommended minimum.

The current formality rules accept as formal ballot papers that indicate at least a unique first preference, even if the instructed minimum number of preferences is not shown. Around 2.4% of formal voters in Molonglo and 1.4% of electors in Brindabella and Ginninderra failed to number at least as many preferences as there were vacancies in the electorate. It is impossible to know how many of these votes were cast in the knowledge that these votes were not complying with the recommended minimum, but were nevertheless formal votes, and how many of these votes were the result of a failure to understand or follow the instructions. Whatever the reason, the number of ballot papers concerned is significant enough to make it worth keeping the current formality rules, while maintaining the general instruction to number at least as many candidates as there are vacancies in the electorate.

Table 6 – Sequence breaks shows the number of formal ballot papers that omitted a preference number or duplicated a preference number, thereby breaking the sequence of preferences that can be taken into account in a Hare-Clark count. A total of 1725 ballot papers contained a repeated number, and a total of 1141 ballot papers missed a number in the sequence. Under the ACT’s Hare-Clark system, these ballot papers are still counted as formal, as they had a unique first preference. However, they could not be given full effect, with regard to any preferences shown after the break in sequence.

Most breaks in sequence occurred early in the sequence, with the number of mistakes tailing off as the number of preferences increases. This is to be expected, since two-thirds of all formal voters only showed the recommended minimum number of preferences.

It is possible that some of these breaks in sequence were deliberate, as some people may have thought “Langer style” voting applied in the ACT – that is, that a minimum number of preferences had to be shown, but that a deliberate break in sequence would render later preferences inoperative (for example, voting 1, 2, 2, 2, 2). However, the large variation in the points where sequence breaks occur would appear to indicate that most of these sequence breaks were unintentional.

These results, and the level of unintentional informal voting, point to the inherent problem with paper ballots – some voters have difficulty in marking sequential preferences without making mistakes. As the Commission noted in its report on the electronic voting and counting system, a solution to this problem would be to maximise the use of the electronic voting system, which automatically constrains preferences chosen by the voter to ensure that they follow a correct sequence.

Following this analysis, the Commission supports the retention of the existing ballot paper instructions and the existing formality rules.

Informal voting

The 2001 election continued the trend started at the 1998 election, with the number of informal votes counted at the 2001 election being the lowest in both percentage and absolute terms of any of the 5 ACT Legislative Assembly elections. Around 3.97% of all votes admitted to the count, or 7881 out of 198721 ballot papers, were informal in 2001 (compared to 4.32% in 1998; 6.2% in 1995; 6.5% in 1992 and 5.7% in 1989).

One factor influencing the low informal rate in 2001 was the introduction of electronic voting. See the discussion on informal voting in the Commission's *Electronic Voting and Counting System Review*.

Table 7 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers by reason for informality shows the total number of informal ballot papers, broken down by main reasons of informality.

A total of 29 ballot papers were counted as informal because they were declaration ballot papers issued for the wrong electorate. This is generally attributable to polling official error. While the Commission has emphasised the importance of correctly issuing declaration votes in its training and procedures, this result indicates improvements can still be made. The Commission intends to examine its training and procedures with a view to improving performance in this area.

Almost half of all informal votes were either blank, included a “written in” candidate (for example, “Vote 1 Mickey Mouse”) or contained marks, writing, lines, scribbles, slogans or stickers only – 3869 out of 7881, or 49.1%. While it is impossible to judge how many of these were deliberately cast as informal votes, it is likely that most of these were deliberate. Certainly many of the ballots containing writing clearly indicated a desire to vote informal, expressed in varying degrees of politeness. Around 140 ballots included the words “No Self Government”.

Deliberate informal voting in some quantity is expected under a compulsory voting system, where voters who do not want to vote for any candidates are compelled to attend a polling place. There is little the Commission can do to reduce the number of deliberate informal votes.

However, the Commission considers it important to reduce, and ideally eliminate, the number of unintentional informal votes. A total of 3971 ballot papers contained ticks, crosses or some numbers, but no unique first preference. While some of these were probably deliberately informal, it is likely that a sizeable proportion of them were cast by voters who were trying to cast a formal ballot.

Table 8 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers containing ticks, crosses or some numbers, but no unique first preference shows that over 90% of these ballots were informal because they contained 2 or more figure 1s, ticks or crosses. The number of ballot papers that were informal because voters used a single tick or a cross was relatively low – only 132 ballot papers. Only figure 1s are counted as valid first preferences under the Electoral Act.

Table 9 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers with 2 or more figure 1s, ticks and crosses shows the most common mistake in Molonglo (22.4%) was to list 2 first preferences. This was the second most common mistake in Brindabella (18.3%) and Ginninderra (24.4%). The most common mistake in Brindabella (29.7%) and the third most common mistake in Ginninderra (21.8%) and Molonglo (16.7%) was to list as many first preferences as there were columns in the ballot papers – mostly by attempting to number the candidates by starting at 1 in each column. The most common mistake in Ginninderra (25.1%) and the second most common mistake in Brindabella (24.9%) and Molonglo (19.4%) was to list as many first preferences as there were vacancies in the electorate.

These results indicate that, while the overall reduction in the informal vote would indicate that the Commission's voter information campaign is having some effect on reducing the rate of informal voting, more can be done to reduce the number of voters who unintentionally vote informal by using incorrect number combinations.

One particularly effective method for reducing the number of unintentional informal votes cast at the 2001 election was electronic voting. It can be expected that greater use of electronic voting at future elections will lead to a reduction in the number of unintentional informal votes. This is discussed in more detail in the Commission's *Electronic Voting and Counting System Review*.

Postal voting

An elector who expects to be unable to attend a polling place on polling day or whose address is suppressed on the electoral roll is entitled to vote by post or at a pre-poll voting centre. In 2001, 6410 postal votes were admitted to the count, compared to 24599 votes cast at pre-poll centres. *Table 10 – Postal vote outcomes* – shows the number of postal vote ballot papers issued and the numbers of postal votes admitted or not admitted to the count for a range of reasons.

Electors can obtain a postal vote by completing an application form. Postal vote application forms were made available in the ACT at all Post Offices and at the ACT Electoral Commission office. The application form was also available from the Commission's website. Australian overseas missions provided application forms to electors overseas. Postal vote application forms have to contain signatures of electors and witnesses, so they could not be sent by email or internet. However, they could be faxed, and many overseas applications were returned by fax. Electors who were registered declaration voters were automatically sent postal ballot material without the need for an application form.

Following an amendment to the Electoral Act passed in 2001, political parties and others were permitted, for the first time since the introduction of Hare-Clark in the ACT, to induce electors to return completed postal vote application forms to an address other than an address authorised by the Electoral Commissioner. In the lead up to the October 2001 election, both the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party distributed leaflets to households that included a postal vote application form. The return address on these leaflets was an address of the relevant party. Completed postal vote application forms were received by the party and then delivered to the Commission for processing.

Out of a total of 8192 postal vote applications processed, 1106 were made on forms distributed by the Australian Labor Party, and 867 were made on forms distributed by the Liberal Party.

In its 1998 election review, the Commission had cautioned against legalising this practice, which has become common in some other jurisdictions. The Commission is still of the view that this practice gives political parties an inappropriate administrative role in the conduct of an election.

The drawbacks of postal voting

Postal voting in ACT elections is the voting method most likely to see an elector's vote not counted. There are 3 main reasons why a postal vote will not be counted:

- It has not been marked on or before polling day and/or has not been returned to Elections ACT by the Friday after polling day;
- The elector is not correctly enrolled; or
- The postal vote declaration has not been correctly signed by the voter and/or the witness.

Postal ballots not counted because they were marked after polling day and/or were not returned to Elections ACT by the Friday after polling day

At the 2001 election, 1036 postal ballots were not counted because, most commonly, the postal ballots were not returned to Elections ACT (651 cases), or because they arrived after the cut-off date (264 cases), or because the voter signed the declaration after polling day (121 cases).

Of these, around 740 postal ballot packs had been sent to overseas addresses. Around 240 had been sent to ACT addresses, with the remaining 50 or so going to other Australian States or the Northern Territory.

Feedback from some overseas electors indicated that international mail of postal voting material was delayed by the tightened security measures that followed September 11 terrorist attacks. However, the proportion of postal votes that was returned in time to be counted in 2001 (78%) was similar to the return rate from the 1995 (74%) and 1998 (78%) elections.

The date on which electors applied for postal ballot material was also a factor. In 174 of these cases, the application for the postal ballot material was received in the last week before polling day – 94 of them from overseas. While postal ballot material received before 4 pm was despatched to the post office on the same day during this last week, it would appear that, for those applications received in the last week, there was not enough time for postal ballot material to be sent to electors, completed and returned in time to be counted, particularly given the overseas mail delays. In fact, none of the postal ballot packs sent in response to applications received from overseas in the last week before polling day were returned in time to be included in the count. This points to the need for electors to apply for postal votes as early in the election period as possible. In the case of overseas electors, this points to the need to apply at least a week before polling day.

Section 136A(5)(a) of the Electoral Act provides that postal ballot papers are not to be posted where an application for a postal vote is received after the last mail clearance at the nearest post office on the last Thursday before polling day. This provision recognises that it would be impractical to mail postal ballot papers on the Friday before polling day, as electors would be unlikely to receive the ballot papers in time to vote before the polls closed on polling day.

However, in the case of electors who are overseas, the 2001 election experience showed that it would be very unlikely that postal ballot material mailed at any time in the last week before polling day would be received by an elector on or before polling day at an overseas location. Therefore the Commission considers that it would be preferable to provide – and to inform electors – that postal vote applications submitted by electors overseas must be received by no later than the last mail clearance on the Friday in the week before polling day.

Imposing this deadline on overseas electors may serve to ensure that more electors will apply for postal votes in time for their ballot papers to be sent, returned and counted.

Accordingly, the Commission **recommends** that section 136A of the Electoral Act be amended to provide that postal vote applications from electors who are overseas must be received before the last mail delivery on the Friday the week before polling day.

Postal votes not counted because they were submitted by electors not correctly enrolled

A total of 62 postal votes were rejected from the count because they were submitted by people who were not on the ACT electoral roll as at the close of rolls for the election. In these cases, these people would not have been able to vote even if they had attended a polling place, as they were not entitled to vote.

A further 14 postal votes were rejected because the applicants claimed to be enrolled for a particular electorate but were in fact enrolled for a different electorate as at the close of rolls. Section 136A(3) of the Electoral Act provides that postal voting papers must be issued to electors for the electorate for which the person claims to vote. It does not permit ballot papers to be issued for the electorate for which the person is actually enrolled, even where the issuing officer is aware that the person has claimed a vote for an electorate for which they are not enrolled but that the elector is enrolled for another electorate.

If such an elector had attempted to vote at a polling place, he or she would have been issued with a vote for the electorate for which he or she was enrolled, rather than for the electorate for which the elector claimed a vote. This is because, under section 128(1) of the Electoral Act, a person is entitled to cast a vote for an electorate for which they are enrolled. Standard procedure at all ACT polling places for cases where an elector is not found on the roll for the electorate for which they claim a vote, is for the certified lists for all 3 electorates to be searched to check whether the person is enrolled for another electorate. If the person is found on the roll for another electorate, a ballot paper is issued for that electorate.

The postal voting procedure as specified in the Electoral Act does not allow polling officials to apply the same rules to postal voters, so that votes must be issued even where the polling official knows that the vote will have to be rejected, because the elector has claimed a vote for an electorate for which he or she is not enrolled. In order to bring postal voting into line with polling place procedure, the Commission **recommends** amending section 136A of the Electoral Act to provide that postal votes must be issued for the electorate for which the elector is enrolled or, if the issuing officer cannot determine whether the elector is currently enrolled, the vote is to be issued for the electorate in which the elector claims to be entitled to vote.

Postal votes not counted as the postal vote declaration had not been correctly signed by the voter and/or the witness.

A total of 178 postal votes were rejected because they were not properly signed by the voter and/or the witness. Where postal votes not correctly signed were received before polling day, Commission staff phoned the elector concerned, if a phone number had been provided, and advised the elector that the postal vote had not been signed and, if possible, arrangements were made to enable the person to vote. Some of these voters were able to cast a pre-poll vote in person. The 178 cases that were rejected were all electors who were unable to resubmit their votes.

Failure to correctly sign forms is a relatively common problem that unfortunately, in the case of postal vote forms, can lead to votes not being counted. By comparison, if these voters had attended a polling place, their votes would have been counted. Around 145 of these 178 electors had their ballot papers sent to ACT addresses.

These cases point to the desirability of encouraging electors to attend a pre-poll voting centre rather than encouraging electors to vote by post. The Commission recognises that some people will only be able to vote by post, either because they are unable to travel to a pre-poll centre or because they are outside the ACT. However, for the 2004 election, the Commission intends to encourage voters unable to get to a polling place to attend a pre-poll centre rather than vote by post where that is possible.

Tables

Explanation of tables

Table 1 – Paper linear votes – [For each electorate]

This table shows, for each electorate, the proportion of votes marked on paper ballots that were party linear votes, as well as various types of non-linear votes. Results are shown for each party, for each ballot paper group and for the electorate in total. These results for the 2001 election are based on a survey of all formal paper ballots (not electronic ballots).

All ballot papers were divided into two categories: where the candidate of first choice was at the top of the column; and where the candidate of first choice was not at the top of the column. These two categories were subdivided into the following subcategories:

- Candidate of first choice at top of column:
 - ▶ Linear vote (all candidates in the column numbered sequentially from the top down)
 - ▶ Party non-linear vote (all candidates in the column numbered higher than any other candidates for any other columns, but not numbered sequentially from the top down)
 - ▶ Non-party non-linear vote (not all candidates in the column numbered higher than at least one candidate in another column)
- Candidate of first choice not at top of column:
 - ▶ Party non-linear votes (all candidates in the column numbered higher than any other candidates for any other column)
 - ▶ Non-party non-linear vote (not all candidates in the column numbered higher than at least one candidate in another column)

Table 2 – Linear votes – Summary 1995-2001

This table shows the proportion of votes counted in the categories used in table 1, for each of the electorates and for the ACT in total for the 1995, 1998 and 2001 elections.

Note that the results for 2001 are based on a survey of all formal paper ballots (not electronic ballots) and the results for 1995 and 1998 are based on a random sample of around 5% of the formal ballots cast in each electorate.

Table 3 – Distribution of linear votes between selected candidates

This table shows the distribution of linear votes from selected candidates to pairs of candidates in the same party. These results for the 2001 election are based on a survey of all formal paper ballots (not electronic ballots).

In order to judge the effectiveness with which the increased number of Robson rotations distributed the linear vote equally to pairs of candidates, a range of unsuccessful Australian Labor Party, Liberal Party and Australian Democrats candidates were selected, chosen from candidates who were excluded during the distribution of preferences at a point at which at least 2 candidates in the same party remained in the count.

Apparent linear votes from these candidates were assigned to pairs of other candidates in the same party who were still in the count at the point at which the candidate was excluded, to determine how evenly the linear vote was being shared between these pairs of candidates. These candidates were chosen to represent cases where there were relatively close contests between candidates in the same party in the race for the last seat won by that party. Not all of these preferences would have actually been distributed to these candidates in this way – this data simply shows which of the two listed candidates was highest in the ranking of preferences for each of the linear votes counted to the excluded candidate.

Table 4 – Length of sequence – [For each electorate]

This table shows the length of sequence of each ballot paper, recording how far each elector indicated preferences in an unbroken sequence. These results for the 2001 election are based on a survey of all formal ballots (including electronic ballots).

This survey ascertained the last consecutive number marked on each ballot paper. The results are listed for each candidate that received the first preference vote, with totals for each column showing the last number marked in each electorate expressed as percentages. Progressive totals and progressive percentages are also shown.

Table 5 – Length of sequence – Summary

This table shows summaries for each electorate and for the ACT in total, showing key results from the 2001 survey listed in table 4, with the results for the 1998 election.

This table shows:

- The proportion of ballots marked with a single first preference only;
- The proportion of ballots marked with less than 5 preferences (for Brindabella and Ginninderra) and marked with less than 7 preferences (for Molonglo);
- The proportion of ballots marked with exactly 5 preferences (for Brindabella and Ginninderra) and marked with exactly 7 preferences (for Molonglo);
- The proportion of ballots marked with more than 5 preferences (for Brindabella and Ginninderra) and marked with more than 7 preferences (for Molonglo);
- The proportion of ballots where every square was numbered correctly.

Note that the results for 2001 are based on a survey of all formal ballots and the results for 1998 are based on a random sample of around 5% of the formal ballots cast in each electorate.

Table 6 – Sequence breaks

This table shows the number of formal ballot papers that omitted a preference number or duplicated a preference number, thereby breaking the sequence of preferences that can be taken into account in a Hare-Clark election count. These results for the 2001 election are based on a survey of all formal paper ballots (sequence breaks were not possible with electronic ballots).

Table 7 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers by reason for informality

This table shows the total number of informal ballot papers, broken down by reasons of informality, for each electorate and for the ACT in total for 2001.

Table 8 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers containing ticks, crosses or some numbers, but no unique first preference

This table shows the breakdown of those ballot papers that contained ticks, crosses or some numbers, but no unique first preference, for each electorate and for the ACT in total for 2001.

Table 9 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers with two or more figure 1s, ticks and crosses

This table shows the breakdown of those informal ballot papers that contained 2 or more figure 1s, ticks or crosses, for each electorate and for the ACT in total for 2001.

The results for ballots with 9 first preferences in Brindabella and Ginninderra are further broken down to show the number of ballots on which consecutive numbering from 1 was attempted within each column. There were 9 columns of candidates in each of these electorates.

The results for ballots with 12 first preferences in Molonglo are further broken down to show the number of ballots on which consecutive numbering from 1 was attempted within each column. There were 12 columns of candidates in this electorate.

Table 10 – Postal vote outcomes

This table shows the number of postal vote ballot papers issued and the numbers of postal votes admitted or not admitted to the count for a range of reasons.

Table 1(a) – Paper linear votes – Brindabella

	Candidate of first choice at top of column						Candidate of first choice not at top of column				Total	
	Party linear		Party non-linear		Non-party non-linear		Party non-linear		Non-party non-linear			
Australian Democrats												
JOLLEY Jeannette	530	34.3%	52	3.4%	294	19.0%	362	23.4%	308	19.9%	1546	
MICO Domenic	450	36.9%	25	2.1%	251	20.6%	264	21.7%	229	18.8%	1219	
WELCH Mike	395	53.7%	32	4.3%	157	21.3%	84	11.4%	68	9.2%	736	
Total for Australian Democrats	1375	39.3%	109	3.1%	702	20.1%	710	20.3%	605	17.3%	3501	
Australian Labor Party												
HARGREAVES John	1340	17.0%	683	8.7%	765	9.7%	3402	43.1%	1698	21.5%	7888	
MACDONALD Karin	982	26.5%	288	7.8%	422	11.4%	1250	33.8%	761	20.6%	3703	
SANTI Trevor	899	32.8%	186	6.8%	385	14.0%	854	31.1%	421	15.3%	2745	
WILLIAMS Athol	904	41.7%	174	8.0%	298	13.7%	502	23.1%	291	13.4%	2169	
WOOD Bill	1224	19.7%	511	8.2%	703	11.3%	2353	37.8%	1426	22.9%	6217	
Total for Australian Labor Party	5349	23.5%	1842	8.1%	2573	11.3%	8361	36.8%	4597	20.2%	22722	
Kaine Independent Group												
BROOKE Sandie	46	45.5%	0	0.0%	30	29.7%	8	7.9%	17	16.8%	101	
KAINE Trevor	116	24.3%	0	0.0%	132	27.6%	104	21.8%	126	26.4%	478	
Total for Kaine Independent Group	162	28.0%	0	0.0%	162	28.0%	112	19.3%	143	24.7%	579	
Liberal Democratic Party												
BROWN Bradley	83	61.0%	0	0.0%	41	30.1%	8	5.9%	4	2.9%	136	
KENNEDY Darren	82	59.0%	0	0.0%	30	21.6%	14	10.1%	13	9.4%	139	
Total for Liberal Democratic Party	165	60.0%	0	0.0%	71	25.8%	22	8.0%	17	6.2%	275	
Liberal Party												
DOSZPOT Steve	516	28.5%	146	8.1%	215	11.9%	551	30.5%	380	21.0%	1808	
O'CONNOR Megan	517	30.5%	136	8.0%	203	12.0%	468	27.6%	371	21.9%	1695	
PRATT Steve	623	17.2%	297	8.2%	365	10.1%	1364	37.6%	974	26.9%	3623	
ROSSER Winnifred	447	38.8%	101	8.8%	132	11.5%	297	25.8%	175	15.2%	1152	
SMYTH Brendan	960	11.8%	627	7.7%	662	8.1%	3821	46.9%	2081	25.5%	8151	
Total for Liberal Party	3063	18.6%	1307	8.0%	1577	9.6%	6501	39.6%	3981	24.2%	16429	
Non-Party Group 1												
LEVANTIS May	21	32.8%	0	0.0%	16	25.0%	7	10.9%	20	31.3%	64	
MACKENZIE Bob	13	25.0%	0	0.0%	15	28.8%	5	9.6%	19	36.5%	52	
Total for Non-Party Group 1	34	29.3%	0	0.0%	31	26.7%	12	10.3%	39	33.6%	116	
Paul Osborne												
BUSH Donna	70	49.6%	0	0.0%	31	22.0%	12	8.5%	28	19.9%	141	
OSBORNE Paul	678	19.9%	0	0.0%	1134	33.3%	613	18.0%	983	28.8%	3408	
Total for Paul Osborne	748	21.1%	0	0.0%	1165	32.8%	625	17.6%	1011	28.5%	3549	
The ACT Greens												
ELLERMAN Sue	802	71.3%	0	0.0%	149	13.2%	120	10.7%	54	4.8%	1125	
KELLY Kathryn	1001	62.8%	0	0.0%	227	14.2%	251	15.7%	116	7.3%	1595	
Total for The ACT Greens	1803	66.3%	0	0.0%	376	13.8%	371	13.6%	170	6.3%	2720	
Ungrouped												
ALAMEDDINE Danny	7	12.5%	1	1.8%	16	28.6%	8	14.3%	24	42.9%	56	
MUNDAY Len	17	7.4%	2	0.9%	52	22.5%	16	6.9%	144	62.3%	231	
SUTHERLAND Bruce	22	5.2%	3	0.7%	100	23.6%	16	3.8%	283	66.7%	424	
TRUDINGER Maria	23	2.6%	2	0.2%	220	25.3%	47	5.4%	578	66.4%	870	
Total for Ungrouped	69	4.4%	8	0.5%	388	24.5%	87	5.5%	1029	65.1%	1581	
Grand total	12768	24.8%	3266	6.3%	7045	13.7%	16801	32.6%	11592	22.5%	51472	

Table 1(b) – Paper linear votes – Ginninderra

	Candidate of first choice at top of column						Candidate of first choice not at top of column				Total
	Party linear		Party non-linear		Non-party non-linear		Party non-linear		Non-party non-linear		
Australian Democrats											
DAVID Anthony	566	55.2%	19	1.9%	257	25.0%	102	9.9%	82	8.0%	1026
DUNDAS Roslyn	654	34.2%	51	2.7%	369	19.3%	456	23.9%	380	19.9%	1910
McMILLAN Dan	702	39.2%	51	2.8%	327	18.2%	433	24.1%	280	15.6%	1793
Total for Australian Democrats	1922	40.6%	121	2.6%	953	20.2%	991	21.0%	742	15.7%	4729
Australian Labor Party											
BERRY Wayne	810	22.3%	295	8.1%	392	10.8%	1379	38.0%	757	20.8%	3633
DOWNEY Judith	548	34.3%	156	9.8%	258	16.2%	370	23.2%	265	16.6%	1597
McCARTHY Susan	612	25.7%	197	8.3%	308	12.9%	741	31.1%	521	21.9%	2379
REBIKOFF Vic	565	32.8%	121	7.0%	211	12.3%	498	29.0%	325	18.9%	1720
STANHOPE Jon	1280	10.2%	1002	7.9%	1003	8.0%	6196	49.1%	3129	24.8%	12610
Total for Australian Labor Party	3815	17.4%	1771	8.1%	2172	9.9%	9184	41.9%	4997	22.8%	21939
Dave Rugendyke											
BROWN Ian	60	46.5%	0	0.0%	41	31.8%	15	11.6%	13	10.1%	129
RUGENDYKE Dave	492	18.2%	0	0.0%	877	32.4%	465	17.2%	871	32.2%	2705
Total for Dave Rugendyke	552	19.5%	0	0.0%	918	32.4%	480	16.9%	884	31.2%	2834
Gungahlin Equality Party											
JONES Gail	70	45.5%	0	0.0%	49	31.8%	11	7.1%	24	15.6%	154
SIMMONS John	87	55.8%	0	0.0%	33	21.2%	23	14.7%	13	8.3%	156
Total for Gungahlin Equality Party	157	50.6%	0	0.0%	82	26.5%	34	11.0%	37	11.9%	310
Liberal Democratic Party											
HUMPHREYS John	247	34.6%	0	0.0%	233	32.6%	88	12.3%	146	20.4%	714
MORRISSEY Susan	112	46.9%	0	0.0%	66	27.6%	28	11.7%	33	13.8%	239
Total for Liberal Democratic Party	359	37.7%	0	0.0%	299	31.4%	116	12.2%	179	18.8%	953
Liberal Party											
DUNNE Vicki	507	27.6%	147	8.0%	242	13.2%	527	28.6%	417	22.7%	1840
FRASER Ilona	497	25.5%	173	8.9%	255	13.1%	606	31.1%	419	21.5%	1950
HIRD Harold	568	25.3%	197	8.8%	269	12.0%	722	32.2%	488	21.7%	2244
SARRI Andrew	423	32.7%	99	7.7%	177	13.7%	343	26.5%	250	19.3%	1292
STEFANIAK Bill	869	12.6%	546	7.9%	653	9.5%	2844	41.2%	1991	28.8%	6903
Total for Liberal Party	2864	20.1%	1162	8.2%	1596	11.2%	5042	35.4%	3565	25.1%	14229
Non-Party Group 2											
CLARKE Geoff	31	29.8%	0	0.0%	31	29.8%	17	16.3%	25	24.0%	104
HENRY Darcy	82	24.4%	0	0.0%	101	30.1%	59	17.6%	94	28.0%	336
Total for Non-Party Group 2	113	25.7%	0	0.0%	132	30.0%	76	17.3%	119	27.0%	440
The ACT Greens											
RATTENBURY Shane	1127	41.8%	0	0.0%	529	19.6%	669	24.8%	373	13.8%	2698
WOODCROFT-LEE Patricia	726	59.7%	0	0.0%	205	16.8%	192	15.8%	94	7.7%	1217
Total for The ACT Greens	1853	47.3%	0	0.0%	734	18.7%	861	22.0%	467	11.9%	3915
Ungrouped											
GARVIE Chris	20	3.5%	0	0.0%	199	35.1%	16	2.8%	332	58.6%	567
GOOD Shaun	23	16.1%	1	0.7%	44	30.8%	13	9.1%	62	43.4%	143
JAMES Rhonda	32	5.0%	6	0.9%	183	28.6%	64	10.0%	355	55.5%	640
Total for Ungrouped	75	5.6%	7	0.5%	426	31.6%	93	6.9%	749	55.5%	1350
Grand total	11710	23.1%	3061	6.0%	7312	14.4%	16877	33.3%	11739	23.2%	50699

Table 1(c) – Paper linear votes – Molonglo

	Candidate of first choice at top of column						Candidate of first choice not at top of column				Total
	Party linear		Party non-linear		Non-party non-linear		Party non-linear		Non-party non-linear		
Australian Democrats											
BRAY Eric	456	53.8%	17	2.0%	196	23.1%	83	9.8%	95	11.2%	847
ERREY Jane	603	30.7%	94	4.8%	339	17.2%	547	27.8%	383	19.5%	1966
JONES Stella	556	44.2%	54	4.3%	282	22.4%	171	13.6%	196	15.6%	1259
WALTERS Isabel	542	45.2%	41	3.4%	272	22.7%	152	12.7%	191	15.9%	1198
Total for Australian Democrats	2157	40.9%	206	3.9%	1089	20.7%	953	18.1%	865	16.4%	5270
Australian Labor Party											
CORBELL Simon	1096	14.2%	433	5.6%	738	9.6%	3126	40.6%	2312	30.0%	7705
GALLAGHER Katy	849	26.5%	201	6.3%	436	13.6%	914	28.5%	803	25.1%	3203
LEFTWICH Fred	763	35.4%	130	6.0%	260	12.0%	535	24.8%	470	21.8%	2158
O'KEEFE John	867	28.0%	192	6.2%	397	12.8%	977	31.5%	668	21.5%	3101
QUINLAN Ted	999	14.7%	464	6.8%	601	8.8%	2971	43.6%	1772	26.0%	6807
REILLY Marion	869	31.6%	183	6.6%	376	13.7%	727	26.4%	599	21.8%	2754
RYAN Christina	848	28.8%	181	6.1%	374	12.7%	803	27.3%	738	25.1%	2944
Total for Australian Labor Party	6291	21.9%	1784	6.2%	3182	11.1%	10053	35.1%	7362	25.7%	28672
Canberra First Party											
JAMES Claire	45	45.9%	1	1.0%	27	27.6%	12	12.2%	13	13.3%	98
McCULLOUGH Nancy Louise	28	19.9%	8	5.7%	25	17.7%	37	26.2%	43	30.5%	141
PASTERNAK Joel	25	25.8%	5	5.2%	25	25.8%	12	12.4%	30	30.9%	97
SPIER Lucinda	51	17.5%	4	1.4%	44	15.1%	82	28.1%	111	38.0%	292
Total for Canberra First Party	149	23.7%	18	2.9%	121	19.3%	143	22.8%	197	31.4%	628
Gungahlin Equality Party											
REYNOLDS Jonathon	197	64.8%	0	0.0%	49	16.1%	39	12.8%	19	6.3%	304
RUECROFT Ian	205	62.9%	0	0.0%	57	17.5%	36	11.0%	28	8.6%	326
Total for Gungahlin Equality Party	402	63.8%	0	0.0%	106	16.8%	75	11.9%	47	7.5%	630
Kaine Independent Group											
CARTWRIGHT Colin	59	57.3%	0	0.0%	26	25.2%	7	6.8%	11	10.7%	103
PARKER Alan	78	61.4%	0	0.0%	30	23.6%	11	8.7%	8	6.3%	127
Total for Kaine Independent Group	137	59.6%	0	0.0%	56	24.3%	18	7.8%	19	8.3%	230
Liberal Democratic Party											
GRAHAM Brett	50	32.5%	1	0.6%	48	31.2%	17	11.0%	38	24.7%	154
PURNELL-WEBB John	62	44.6%	0	0.0%	36	25.9%	12	8.6%	29	20.9%	139
SPENDER Duncan	48	26.2%	4	2.2%	56	30.6%	46	25.1%	29	15.8%	183
Total for Liberal Democratic Party	160	33.6%	5	1.1%	140	29.4%	75	15.8%	96	20.2%	476
Liberal Party											
BURKE Jacqui	352	22.1%	124	7.8%	209	13.1%	485	30.4%	425	26.6%	1595
CORNWELL Greg	424	28.5%	120	8.1%	178	12.0%	449	30.2%	317	21.3%	1488
CROSS Helen	425	19.8%	142	6.6%	225	10.5%	803	37.5%	547	25.5%	2142
HUMPHRIES Gary	958	6.6%	922	6.3%	802	5.5%	8028	55.0%	3895	26.7%	14605
MATHESON Amalia	391	27.9%	98	7.0%	136	9.7%	433	31.0%	341	24.4%	1399
SPILL Mark	356	29.4%	101	8.3%	132	10.9%	370	30.5%	253	20.9%	1212
XYRAKIS Manuel	370	16.5%	119	5.3%	215	9.6%	809	36.2%	723	32.3%	2236
Total for Liberal Party	3276	13.3%	1626	6.6%	1897	7.7%	11377	46.1%	6501	26.3%	24677
Non-Party Group 3											
AYSON Pamela	56	31.1%	0	0.0%	47	26.1%	40	22.2%	37	20.6%	180
GELONESI Tania	26	31.0%	0	0.0%	30	35.7%	10	11.9%	18	21.4%	84
Total for Non-Party Group 3	82	31.1%	0	0.0%	77	29.2%	50	18.9%	55	20.8%	264
Non-Party Group 4											
BACK Hilary	117	15.9%	0	0.0%	270	36.7%	99	13.5%	249	33.9%	735
MARSHALL Melanie	36	32.1%	0	0.0%	33	29.5%	24	21.4%	19	17.0%	112
Total for Non-Party Group 4	153	18.1%	0	0.0%	303	35.8%	123	14.5%	268	31.6%	847
Non-Party Group 5											
BLACK Ian	71	17.7%	0	0.0%	139	34.6%	48	11.9%	144	35.8%	402
BLACK Marnie	16	31.4%	0	0.0%	14	27.5%	8	15.7%	13	25.5%	51
Total for Non-Party Group 5	87	19.2%	0	0.0%	153	33.8%	56	12.4%	157	34.7%	453
Nurses Good Government Party											
HICKOX Phillip	241	75.5%	0	0.0%	44	13.8%	27	8.5%	7	2.2%	319
STANIFORTH Robyn	343	48.7%	0	0.0%	146	20.7%	138	19.6%	78	11.1%	705
Total for Nurses Good Government Party	584	57.0%	0	0.0%	190	18.6%	165	16.1%	85	8.3%	1024
The ACT Greens											
FOSKEY Deb	294	49.2%	34	5.7%	111	18.6%	88	14.7%	70	11.7%	597
NOLAN Michael	262	48.5%	20	3.7%	101	18.7%	78	14.4%	79	14.6%	540
TUCKER Kerrie	895	12.3%	181	2.5%	1065	14.7%	2377	32.8%	2740	37.8%	7258
YOUNG Victoria	304	47.6%	34	5.3%	124	19.4%	76	11.9%	100	15.7%	638
Total for The ACT Greens	1755	19.4%	269	3.0%	1401	15.5%	2619	29.0%	2989	33.1%	9033
Grand total	15233	21.1%	3908	5.4%	8715	12.1%	25707	35.6%	18641	25.8%	72204

Table 2 – Linear votes – Summary 1995-2001

Election	Candidate of first choice at top of column			Candidate of first choice not at top of column	
	Party Linear	Party non- linear	Non-party non-linear	Party non- linear	Non-party non-linear
1995 – Brindabella	26.3%	7.6%	12.7%	31.2%	22.2%
1995 – Ginninderra	30.3%	6.5%	10.7%	35.5%	17.0%
1995 – Molonglo	20.7%	5.0%	8.6%	41.6%	24.2%
1995 – Total	25.2%	6.2%	10.4%	36.7%	21.4%
1998 – Brindabella	24.4%	6.4%	16.8%	32.8%	19.7%
1998 – Ginninderra	24.2%	4.4%	13.4%	32.8%	25.1%
1998 – Molonglo	20.3%	3.6%	12.1%	35.7%	28.4%
1998 – Total	22.6%	4.7%	13.9%	34.0%	24.9%
2001 – Brindabella	24.8%	6.3%	13.7%	32.6%	22.5%
2001 – Ginninderra	23.1%	6.0%	14.4%	33.3%	23.2%
2001 – Molonglo	21.1%	5.4%	12.1%	35.6%	25.8%
2001 – Total	22.8%	5.9%	13.2%	34.1%	24.1%

Table 3 – Distribution of linear votes between selected candidates

FROM excluded candidate . . .	TO continuing candidate . . .	Ballots	%
Electorate of Brindabella			
Doszpot, Liberal Party	O'Connor	256	49.6%
	Pratt	260	50.4%
<i>Total</i>		516	
Rosser, Liberal Party	O'Connor	212	47.4%
	Pratt	235	52.6%
<i>Total</i>		448	
Santi, Australian Labor Party	MacDonald	430	47.8%
	Wood	469	52.2%
<i>Total</i>		899	
Williams, Australian Labor Party	MacDonald	476	52.7%
	Wood	428	47.3%
<i>Total</i>		904	
Electorate of Ginninderra			
David, Australian Democrats	Dundas	272	48.1%
	McMillan	294	51.9%
<i>Total</i>		566	
Downey, Australian Labor Party	Berry	276	50.4%
	McCarthy	272	49.6%
<i>Total</i>		548	
Fraser, Liberal Party	Dunne	242	48.7%
	Hird	255	51.3%
<i>Total</i>		497	
Rebikoff, Australian Labor Party	Berry	291	51.5%
	McCarthy	274	48.5%
<i>Total</i>		565	
Sarri, Liberal Party	Dunne	239	56.5%
	Hird	184	43.5%
<i>Total</i>		423	
Electorate of Molonglo			
Burke, Liberal Party	Cornwell	192	54.5%
	Xyrakis	160	45.5%
<i>Total</i>		352	
Matheson, Liberal Party	Cornwell	202	51.7%
	Xyrakis	189	48.3%
<i>Total</i>		391	

The 2001 ACT Legislative Assembly Election

FROM excluded candidate . . .	TO continuing candidate . . .	Ballots	%
O'Keefe, Australian Labor Party	Gallagher	456	52.6%
	Ryan	411	47.4%
Total		867	
Reilly, Australian Labor Party	Gallagher	429	49.4%
	Ryan	440	50.6%
<i>Total</i>		869	

Table 4(a) – Length of sequence – Brindabella

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	Total	
Australian Democrats																													
JOLLEY Jeannette	4	2	27	1	1061	68	62	74	26	103	23	31	11	11	12	10	8	4	5	2	3	4	0	1	1	3	197	1754	
MICO Domenic	5	5	26	0	710	47	41	81	35	116	34	22	7	6	12	2	10	5	1	3	2	1	1	1	5	2	189	1369	
WELCH Mike	4	4	12	1	494	29	31	41	13	44	6	14	7	1	12	0	3	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	4	2	86	815	
Australian Labor Party																													
HARGREAVES John	36	21	15	19	5843	352	451	283	158	349	104	95	39	39	29	17	20	7	9	9	6	12	8	7	29	16	636	8609	
MACDONALD Karin	19	10	11	5	2680	180	204	145	78	219	65	58	22	12	13	12	2	8	5	5	6	5	3	3	12	8	284	4074	
SANTI Trevor	16	11	10	9	2208	106	134	74	46	104	16	32	6	12	10	8	4	1	3	1	4	5	1	5	5	1	207	3039	
WILLIAMS Athol	15	2	12	4	1667	82	110	69	37	98	13	25	6	13	6	6	4	2	5	4	5	2	1	2	11	0	140	2341	
WOOD Bill	31	25	15	9	4492	306	365	247	118	319	73	88	30	28	31	19	18	6	13	12	5	6	7	8	23	12	522	6828	
Kaine Independent Group																													
BROOKE Sandie	0	1	0	1	68	4	8	5	4	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	8	112	
KAINE Trevor	8	3	3	1	338	32	31	13	12	13	3	8	1	1	2	0	3	3	2	0	1	1	1	0	3	1	40	524	
Liberal Democratic Party																													
BROWN Bradley	2	4	0	4	93	4	9	4	2	4	0	2	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	144
KENNEDY Darren	3	3	1	2	99	4	7	2	3	1	2	4	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	153	
Liberal Party																													
DOSZPOT Steve	2	1	7	6	1483	80	102	34	44	43	7	23	3	4	6	3	4	3	3	0	3	1	2	1	5	2	116	1988	
O'CONNOR Megan	9	3	1	1	1425	78	94	26	38	39	9	10	4	8	9	0	3	2	0	4	1	1	2	0	1	6	116	1890	
PRATT Steve	18	5	6	6	2906	193	205	88	66	84	27	31	13	20	15	9	8	7	5	13	2	6	6	8	6	8	220	3981	
ROSSER Winnifred	9	5	0	4	888	49	72	26	18	32	4	15	7	10	3	3	3	2	0	7	1	0	2	4	2	3	81	1250	
SMYTH Brendan	23	17	8	22	6465	439	472	194	170	208	54	96	24	29	33	14	14	7	11	9	10	5	7	15	28	13	539	8926	
Non-Party Group 1																													
LEVANTIS May	0	0	0	0	50	2	3	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	71	
MACKENZIE Bob	1	0	0	1	37	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	57	
Paul Osborne																													
BUSH Donna	3	2	0	0	105	7	9	3	4	4	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	156	
OSBORNE Paul	39	33	12	6	2402	234	268	94	85	70	31	32	22	15	16	6	12	5	6	3	2	6	3	2	13	7	308	3732	
The ACT Greens																													
ELLERMAN Sue	6	13	2	2	712	61	76	35	27	99	32	18	11	8	13	7	5	2	1	4	0	1	2	1	5	6	141	1290	
KELLY Kathryn	9	10	5	6	904	67	130	57	44	139	38	30	6	13	23	9	10	4	4	6	1	5	5	1	4	3	251	1784	
Ungrouped																													
ALAMEDDINE Danny	1	1	0	0	32	5	3	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	60	
MUNDAY Len	2	1	3	3	158	17	6	4	6	4	6	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	28	252	
SUTHERLAND Bruce	9	2	1	2	316	23	16	14	8	6	1	4	3	1	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	36	455	
TRUDINGER Maria	13	4	7	8	560	70	30	20	13	28	27	11	8	10	7	5	4	5	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	5	108	950	
Totals																													
Percentage	0.51	0.33	0.33	0.22	67.48	4.49	5.20	2.89	1.87	3.76	1.03	1.17	0.42	0.43	0.45	0.24	0.25	0.14	0.14	0.16	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.29	0.18	7.62		
Progressive totals																													
Progressive percentage	100.00	99.49	99.16	98.84	98.62	31.14	26.65	21.45	18.56	16.69	12.92	11.90	10.73	10.32	9.88	9.43	9.19	8.94	8.80	8.66	8.50	8.41	8.29	8.20	8.09	7.80	7.62		

Table 4(b) – Length of sequence – Ginninderra

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	Total	
Australian Democrats																												
DAVID Anthony	5	3	12	3	660	44	41	61	28	65	11	22	11	5	10	5	3	4	1	2	3	2	1	4	4	165	1175	
DUNDAS Roslyn	10	4	23	4	1203	103	82	108	52	170	22	33	13	22	18	8	10	5	0	5	5	1	2	4	6	285	2198	
McMILLAN Dan	9	4	19	2	1121	85	77	97	44	155	35	44	23	9	19	9	8	2	5	5	5	3	2	5	8	240	2035	
Australian Labor Party																												
BERRY Wayne	35	14	6	7	2853	159	170	125	40	179	41	30	12	6	14	5	11	1	8	2	6	2	2	5	5	235	3973	
DOWNNEY Judith	11	5	3	2	1147	59	79	69	26	113	20	22	10	5	9	6	5	1	4	3	6	1	1	4	6	137	1754	
McCARTHY Susan	16	6	3	6	1701	119	124	90	49	135	42	33	16	6	10	4	8	3	4	2	7	2	1	4	4	222	2617	
REBIKOFF Vic	15	4	6	4	1305	76	89	57	23	104	12	19	11	6	7	4	4	2	2	1	3	0	2	3	3	106	1868	
STANHOPE Jon	38	23	12	20	8692	589	643	526	193	934	207	165	69	54	76	32	38	16	30	16	33	7	11	30	25	1161	13640	
Dave Rugendyke																												
BROWN Ian	1	2	1	1	73	5	14	4	1	8	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	136
RUGENDYKE Dave	21	25	5	9	1880	215	180	77	61	68	23	42	15	12	12	7	7	3	3	6	2	0	5	10	6	296	2990	
Gungahlin Equality Party																												
JONES Gail	0	3	2	3	107	6	9	3	6	4	0	4	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	171
SIMMONS John	1	1	0	1	103	5	9	4	8	6	2	4	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	175	
Liberal Democratic Party																												
HUMPHREYS John	4	11	6	3	493	57	52	11	19	22	10	11	3	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	4	0	0	2	1	54	775	
MORRISSEY Susan	3	9	1	2	152	10	20	9	13	13	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	26	270	
Liberal Party																												
DUNNE Vicki	8	3	3	2	1397	102	104	46	32	54	15	29	8	10	9	3	2	3	3	3	4	0	1	4	4	164	2013	
FRASER Ilona	11	7	4	4	1434	96	115	54	33	58	17	22	10	8	5	6	2	2	3	1	6	1	0	12	5	195	2111	
HIRD Harold	10	7	6	5	1752	107	149	52	44	60	11	16	8	9	11	7	6	2	4	2	4	3	1	7	5	155	2443	
SARRI Andrew	12	4	1	4	1030	64	79	31	20	27	8	15	5	11	3	1	1	2	0	0	5	0	3	5	1	84	1416	
STEFANIAK Bill	37	11	11	17	5144	416	487	187	145	197	50	64	27	25	35	17	12	10	7	1	12	4	7	26	11	609	7569	
Non-Party Group 2																												
CLARKE Geoff	3	1	0	0	69	5	7	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	113	
HENRY Darcy	6	8	1	0	252	17	15	5	5	5	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	28	356	
The ACT Greens																												
RATTENBURY Shane	7	30	9	11	1315	143	192	89	57	350	95	68	34	21	33	15	18	7	9	8	7	0	5	9	10	503	3045	
WOODCROFT-LEE Pat	5	13	6	3	754	57	90	30	35	135	28	14	7	6	12	2	6	4	4	2	2	1	0	5	3	157	1381	
Ungrouped																												
GARVIE Chris	7	5	3	5	356	45	21	29	17	14	9	9	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	81	620	
GOOD Shaun	2	1	1	1	104	7	5	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	23	160	
JAMES Rhonda	12	3	1	3	405	45	22	22	15	23	16	7	6	3	4	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	1	3	104	704	
Totals																												
Percentage																												
Progressive totals																												
Progressive percentage																												

Page 37

Table 5 – Length of sequence – Summary 1998-2001

Election	Only 1 preference	Less than 5/7 preferences	Exactly 5/7 preferences	More than 5/7 preferences	Every square numbered
1998 – Brindabella	0.6%	1.7%	65.4%	32.9%	9.2%
1998 – Ginninderra	0.5%	1.3%	62.5%	35.1%	8.1%
1998 – Molonglo	0.8%	2.7%	64.6%	32.7%	4.8%
1998 – Total	0.6%	2.0%	64.4%	33.6%	7.1%
2001 – Brindabella	0.5%	1.4%	67.5%	31.1%	7.6%
2001 – Ginninderra	0.5%	1.4%	63.7%	34.9%	9.2%
2001 – Molonglo	0.5%	2.4%	62.7%	34.9%	5.5%
2001 – Total	0.5%	1.8%	64.4%	33.8%	7.2%

Table 6 – Sequence breaks

Highest preference counted	Missing next consecutive number				Repeated next consecutive number			
	Brin	Ginn	Molo	Total	Brin	Ginn	Molo	Total
1	26	19	32	77	53	47	88	188
2	29	17	45	91	48	56	87	191
3	19	15	55	89	42	28	127	197
4	14	13	61	88	35	35	101	171
5	42	72	31	145	33	27	68	128
6	12	7	25	44	37	42	65	144
7	20	7	62	89	29	32	32	93
8	8	6	11	25	14	18	51	83
9	15	4	15	34	16	21	33	70
10	20	13	27	60	9	11	42	62
11	4	5	26	35	6	15	16	37
12	5	3	8	16	2	10	10	22
13	6	4	22	32	7	5	19	31
14	11	6	14	31	2	4	14	20
15	8	3	16	27	5	5	23	33
16	8	2	9	19	4	6	13	23
17	3	2	13	18	6	8	7	21
18	3	4	8	15	3	2	6	11
19	9	17	19	45	4	6	15	25
20	3	2	3	8	8	13	16	37
21	9	14	9	32	4	2	7	13
22	1	3	7	11	2		4	6
23	5	8	11	24	3	6	8	17
24	5	8	5	18	3	1	10	14
25	7	3	5	15	4		9	13
26	3		2	5			13	13
27			3	3			5	5
28				0			11	11
29			3	3			6	6
30				0			9	9
31			3	3			4	4
32			6	6			3	3
33			7	7			9	9
34			5	5			2	2
35			6	6			3	3
36				0			3	3
37			5	5			1	1
38			2	2			1	1
39			6	6			5	5
40			2	2				0
Totals	295	257	589	1141	379	400	946	1725

Table 7 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers by reason for informality

Reason for informality	Brindabella		Ginninderra		Molonglo		ACT Total	
	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%
Declaration ballot papers issued for the wrong electorate	9	0.3%	12	0.5%	8	0.3%	29	0.4%
Ballot papers that identify the elector	0	0.0%	8	0.3%	4	0.1%	12	0.2%
Ballot papers totally blank	754	28.9%	625	27.0%	827	28.0%	2206	28.0%
Ballot papers informal because the voter has "written in" a candidate	7	0.3%	36	1.6%	64	2.2%	107	1.4%
Ballot papers containing marks, writing, lines or scribbles/slogans/stickers only	501	19.2%	476	20.6%	579	19.6%	1556	19.7%
Ballot papers containing ticks, crosses or some numbers, but no unique first preference	1341	51.3%	1157	50.0%	1473	49.8%	3971	50.4%
Total informal ballot papers	2612		2314		2955		7881	

Table 8 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers containing ticks, crosses or some numbers, but no unique first preference

	Brindabella		Ginninderra		Molonglo		ACT Total	
	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%
Ballot papers where a single tick has been used instead of a figure 1	29	2.2%	29	2.5%	32	2.2%	90	2.3%
Ballot papers where a single cross has been used instead of a figure 1	11	0.8%	11	1.0%	20	1.4%	42	1.1%
Ballot papers with 2 or more figure 1s, ticks and crosses, consisting of ballot papers (treating a 1, tick or cross as a first preference)	1250	93.2%	1043	90.1%	1349	91.6%	3642	91.7%
Others not included in the above categories (including numbers other than 1s, ticks or crosses)	51	3.8%	74	6.4%	72	4.9%	197	5.0%
Total	1341		1157		1473		3971	

Table 9 – Breakdown of informal ballot papers with 2 or more figure 1s, ticks and crosses

	Brindabella		Ginninderra		Molonglo		ACT Total	
	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%	Votes	%
Ballot papers:*								
with 2 first preferences	229	18.3%	254	24.4%	302	22.4%	785	21.6%
with 3 first preferences	83	6.6%	82	7.9%	99	7.3%	264	7.2%
with 4 first preferences	63	5.0%	50	4.8%	78	5.8%	191	5.2%
with 5 first preferences	311	24.9%	262	25.1%	46	3.4%	619	17.0%
with 6 first preferences	52	4.2%	37	3.5%	65	4.8%	154	4.2%
with 7 first preferences	39	3.1%	34	3.3%	262	19.4%	335	9.2%
with 8 first preferences	50	4.0%	33	3.2%	46	3.4%	129	3.5%
with 9 first preferences	371	29.7%	227	21.8%	48	3.6%	646	17.7%
consisting of:								
ballot papers on which consecutive numbering from 1 has been attempted within each column	339	91.4%	199	87.7%				
others	32	8.6%	28	12.3%				
with more than 9 first preferences	52	4.2%	64	6.1%			116	3.2%
with 10 first preferences					38	2.8%	38	1.0%
with 11 first preferences					42	3.1%	42	1.2%
with 12 first preferences					225	16.7%	225	6.2%
consisting of:								
ballot papers on which consecutive numbering from 1 has been attempted within each column					205	91.1%		
others					20	8.9%		
with more than 12 first preferences					98	7.3%	98	2.7%
Total	1250		1043		1349		3642	

* Treating a 1, tick or cross as a first preference

Table 10 – Postal vote outcomes

Persons issued with a postal vote	8192
Postal vote ballot papers admitted to the count	6410
Postal vote envelopes admitted to the count without ballot papers enclosed	30
Persons applying for a postal vote who voted at an ordinary polling place or pre-poll centre	399
Postal votes received but not admitted to the count because the voter was not correctly enrolled	62
Postal votes received but not admitted to the count because the voter claimed a vote for the wrong electorate	14
Postal votes received but not admitted to the count because the voter did not sign the declaration	129
Postal votes received but not admitted to the count because the witness did not sign the declaration	15
Postal votes received but not admitted to the count because the voter's signature did not match the signature on the application	34
Postal votes received but not admitted to the count because the voter marked his or her vote after polling day	121
Postal votes received too late to be counted	264
Postal votes returned to sender unclaimed	58
Postal vote cancelled and ordinary vote NOT issued	5
Total number of postal votes returned to Elections ACT	7541
Total number of postal votes not returned to Elections ACT	651