

# Supporting Electoral Registration Officers in planning for and delivering well run electoral registration services

Consultation on proposed new performance standards for Electoral Registration Officers

**October 2015**

## Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Electoral Commission:

Tel: 020 7271 0500

Email: [publications@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:publications@electoralcommission.org.uk)

We are an independent body set up by the UK Parliament. We regulate party and election finance and set standards for well-run elections. We work to support a healthy democracy, where elections and referendums are based on our principles of trust, participation, and no undue influence.

# Contents

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Developing new performance standards for Electoral Registration Officers (EROs)</b> ..... | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>The proposed new framework</b> .....  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Letting us know what you think</b> .....  | <b>11</b> |
|          | <b>Appendix A – New performance standards for Electoral Registration Officers</b> .....      | <b>14</b> |

# 1 Developing new performance standards for Electoral Registration Officers (EROs)

## Purpose

1.1 We want people across the UK to be confident that electoral registration services are well run, in that the service is managed in a way which maximises opportunities for people to register, enabling them to participate effectively in the electoral process should they wish to do so.

1.2 The current standards, which were introduced in September 2013, were designed to support EROs in planning for and delivering the transition to Individual Electoral Registration (IER). As transition to IER will end in December 2015, we have developed a proposed new set of standards for EROs which aims to support them in planning for and delivering well-run electoral registration services, across the whole of the UK, as Northern Ireland is included for the first time.

1.3 Additionally, we recognise that the performance standards need to be flexible enough to reflect any improvements to support the changing landscape in which electoral registration services are taking place, both in terms of anticipated system change – such as simplifying and digitising the process of electoral registration – and to improve efficiency in light of the continued pressure on budgets for all those involved in the process.

1.4 This paper seeks views on the proposed new performance standards framework and how it will work.

## Background

1.5 The Electoral Administration Act 2006 (EAA) gave the Electoral Commission powers to set and monitor performance standards for electoral services. Under these provisions, the Commission may:

- determine and publish standards of performance for relevant electoral officers in Great Britain (EROs, Returning Officers and Counting Officers)
- direct relevant officers to provide the Commission with reports regarding their performance against the published standards

- publish its assessment of the level of performance by relevant officers against the published standards

1.6 Performance standards for EROs were first introduced in July 2008 with the key objective of delivering a greater consistency of practice across Great Britain. Since 2008 there has been continuing improvement in performance against the standards, with a significant increase in the number of EROs meeting the standards over the past seven years through producing and implementing formal documented plans designed to ensure that their electoral registration processes are managed effectively and lead to the best possible outcomes for electors. The current framework, which was introduced in September 2013, was designed to support EROs in planning for and delivering the transition to IER<sup>1</sup>. The current standards are:

- Performance Standard 1: Understand the particular challenges in your registration area and develop a plan for engaging with residents which responds to these challenges
- Performance standard 2: Deliver your implementation plan, monitoring progress and making amendments where necessary

1.7 In October 2013, all EROs were required to submit a copy of their local public engagement strategy and through our risk-based monitoring, 25% of EROs were also required to submit copies of their implementation plan and risk register. Reviewing EROs' strategies and plans at this stage gave us an early indication of the progress being made by EROs in planning for IER and enabled us to identify where additional support might be needed, and the nature of that support, so that this could be provided in a timely way.

1.8 Initially we identified issues with around a quarter of all EROs, although in the main these were minor issues, with fewer than 10% of EROs giving us cause for more significant concern or requiring additional support at that stage. In all of these cases we worked with the EROs in question to ensure that a detailed analysis of their confirmation dry-run<sup>2</sup> results and other available local information was undertaken and that their strategies were revised to take the results into account. This work included providing regular e-mail and verbal feedback to the electoral services teams and one-to-one meetings with EROs and their teams where required, particularly in the case of those whose planning was less advanced. In some cases we also facilitated workshops between EROs facing similar challenges, which gave

---

<sup>1</sup> The current performance standards for EROs can be found at: <http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/find-information-by-subject/performance-standards/performance-in-running-electoral-registration>.

<sup>2</sup> The confirmation dry-run was a test of the confirmation process, carried out in summer 2013. The confirmation process checked which entries on the electoral registers are matched against the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) database as well as locally held data, in order to identify which records could be automatically transferred to the IER registers.

EROs and their teams the opportunity to discuss their challenges and develop ways of addressing them.

1.9 Following our work with those whose strategies, as initially submitted, demonstrated that further work was required, we reported in March 2014 that we were confident that all EROs were meeting the first of the two performance standards.

1.10 Since March 2014, we have been monitoring the delivery of the public engagement strategies and implementation plans used by EROs to manage the transition to IER. We will provide a final assessment of ERO performance against the second standard in spring 2016, following conclusion of the 2015 canvass and analysis of the December 2015 registers.

1.11 The introduction of IER marked a considerable change to the registration system in England, Scotland and Wales. As transition to IER will end in December 2015, we have developed a proposed new set of standards for EROs which aims to support them in planning for and delivering well-run electoral registration services in 2016 and beyond, but at the same time recognising, and being flexible enough to reflect, the changing landscape and vision for electoral registration services as they develop.

1.12 The Commission is not required to set and monitor performance standards – we have a statutory power to do so, not a duty – but we intend to continue with this work, particularly in light of the continuing improvements seen since 2008, by developing a new set of standards which aims to support EROs and which is capable of embracing change.

## Target-based standards

1.13 In March 2015 the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee recommended that targets for registration should be included in performance standards for EROs.

1.14 We currently collect and analyse data from EROs to identify areas of concern and we will continue to do so. This data is valuable in helping the Commission and EROs to understand the scope and scale of the challenges and the effectiveness of the mechanisms employed by each ERO. However, we do not believe that fixed numerical targets such as response rates to issued forms, numbers of electors added to the registers or the number of electors deleted would improve the effectiveness of the monitoring we already carry out.

1.15 In addition, individual targets would run the significant risk of being misleading or inappropriate for many areas. Our analysis of data in previous years suggests that figures on response rates etc. will vary depending on a wide range of factors including the demographics of the local authority area. ERO activities should be tailored to these local challenges and targets based on, for example, a response to a particular form may fail to capture that. Online registration could also complicate measurement against any targets, for example many people will not respond to a form but go online immediately.

Systems would need to be further developed to accurately capture and count these types of interactions in order to properly measure activity against specific targets.

1.16 Therefore, in developing our approach to monitoring any new standards we have again considered the appropriateness of individual targets for EROs but have reached the view that we will not be proposing targets as part of our approach.

**1.17 However, as part of this consultation, we are keen to hear views about target-based standards, in particular where these have been used to drive performance improvements in electoral registration services.**

## Accuracy and completeness

1.18 We have also considered specifically whether it is feasible to set targets in relation to levels of accuracy and completeness of the registers.

1.19 Our previous work on accuracy and completeness has shown us that the only reliable method for reaching a regular and comprehensive assessment of registration rates is house-to-house surveying. There would be a very significant cost associated with using this method to produce regular, local authority level statistics. This is because the surveying needs to be done using large samples and face-to-face interviewing. Non-response to the surveys is likely to be highest among those who are eligible but not registered – particularly where telephone or internet based surveys are used – and face-to-face surveying helps to mitigate that issue.

1.20 Using census data to match against electoral register entries is an effective method for assessing accuracy and completeness but is only available following each census, once every ten years. This work also needs to be carried out by one of the national statistical agencies (Office for National Statistics, National Records of Scotland or Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency) directly as access to the raw census data required is restricted. It does not therefore offer a useful approach for regular monitoring of performance. It is less expensive than house-to-house surveying (as the exercise is primarily desk-based analysis rather than data collection) but there would still be a substantial cost to produce local authority level estimates.

1.21 Comparing ONS mid-year population estimates ('population estimates') with the total number of entries on the register is often cited as a possible method for estimating completeness (although it cannot be used to assess accuracy). However, there are significant issues with using this approach to reach a reliable estimate of completeness. Under this method, the registration rate is calculated by using ONS statistics for the total entries on the electoral registers as the numerator and dividing this by the ONS estimate for the population aged 16/17 and above as the denominator.

1.22 While these estimates can be used between Census periods to highlight broad trends and possible under-registration, there are two main problems. Firstly, it is not possible to derive a figure from population estimates for the

proportion of the population whose nationality means they would be ineligible to vote. Secondly, it is not possible to quantify the number of register entries which are duplicates or which relate to ineligible people. The number of register entries therefore overstates the number of correctly registered electors.

1.23 Therefore, we remain of the view that setting and measuring these targets for individual EROs is entirely unfeasible.

**1.24 However, we are keen to receive and explore suggestions for other methods of calculating the accuracy and completeness of the registers and as part of this consultation we would welcome any views on this issue.**

## 2 The proposed new framework

2.1 In developing the new set of standards and our future approach to monitoring we have taken into account the following factors:

- While IER continues to fully embed there remains more that can be done to further improve the electoral registration process across the UK, both in terms of simplification and efficiency. There is on-going work to explore options for additional improvements to current processes, including solutions that utilise new technology, and it is likely that some aspects, possibly key aspects, of the system will change. We feel that these new standards will provide a good understanding of what does and does not work and recognise revisions to the standards in the future may be necessary to support change.
- Work relating to the effective delivery of electoral registration will take place in the context of significant **pressures on central and local government budgets as well as on the Commission's**.
- Recognising **individual challenges faced by each ERO** – we want the new framework to be flexible and able to take account of the differing circumstances across local authority areas.
- The current performance standards framework does not apply in **Northern Ireland**, but it is our intention that the Chief Electoral Officer should be included within it. Our aim, in drafting the standards, was therefore to allow them to be applied to Northern Ireland without requiring further revision. We will continue to work with the Chief Electoral Officer for Northern Ireland to ensure that this is accomplished, recognising that the approach to embedding the standards, our support and monitoring will have to be adapted to reflect the differing practices to the rest of the UK.

2.2 The proposed standards are therefore designed for use with the current system of electoral registration. Nevertheless, while they have a good degree of flexibility, we are prepared to revisit how we set, monitor and report on performance as the system continues to evolve.

### Objectives of the new framework

2.3 The performance standards framework is a key element of the Commission's guidance and support package for EROs and their staff and is designed to ensure that those EROs who need additional support can be identified and provided with appropriate targeted support.

## The proposed new performance standards

2.4 The approach of the current standards, which focus on planning and delivery, has worked well. The structure of the new standards therefore follows the approach taken with the existing standards.

2.5 There are two proposed standards, which have been developed around key outcomes. The standards set out what EROs will need to do and know in order to effectively deliver these key outcomes, and what information EROs and the Commission will need in order to determine whether these outcomes have been met.

2.6 The importance of delivering a well-run electoral registration service throughout the whole year is a key element of the standards. We think that this is an important part of ensuring that all eligible people are able to participate in the electoral process, should they wish to do so, and of achieving electoral registers that are as accurate and complete as possible.

2.7 We propose that the new standards focus on the following two key areas:

- **Framework for the delivery of registration activity**  
EROs will need to employ robust project management methodology to enable the delivery of activity to maintain accurate and complete electoral registers – not just during key periods of registration activity, but throughout the year. It will remain important for EROs to have a clear understanding of the particular challenges in their registration area, including in relation to integrity issues, and have in place a strategy for responding to these challenges.
- **Delivery of registration activity to maintain accurate and complete registers**  
EROs will need to deliver the registration activity effectively as set out in their project planning documentation to ensure their registers are accurate and complete and local residents and stakeholders can have confidence in them. In doing so, they will need to ensure that they track progress against their plans, evaluate their effectiveness and update them as necessary. It is important that EROs use the types of data as set out in the standard to understand their local challenges, including any integrity concerns, and to inform their strategy, assisting in monitoring and evaluating the progress made and identifying where amendments are required.

2.8 We will also continue to collect data from all EROs as in previous years. The proposed performance standards set out the type of data which we would expect to collect. The data set out in the new framework helps us to understand the scope and scale of the challenges facing each ERO and what progress is being made in response to these. It is important that EROs are also using this data to understand their local challenges and to inform their public engagement strategy, assisting in monitoring and evaluating the

progress made and identifying where amendments to plans are required. We also expect that EROs would be able to use the data set out in the framework to report locally.

**2.9 As part of this consultation we are interested in seeking views on whether the documentation and data set out in the framework is going to be useful to EROs and if not, what would be more useful. In addition, we are keen to hear whether there would be any difficulties in supplying any of the documentation and data and how often would it be useful to review.**

2.10 The Commission will also continue to produce comprehensive guidance for EROs and their staff to support them in delivering well-run electoral registration services, which will reflect the agreed standards and the legal responsibilities of the ERO.

## Our approach to monitoring performance

2.11 The standards are part of a framework which also includes our approach to monitoring them. This monitoring mechanism needs to be able to identify where there may be issues and to drive improvements, particularly for those EROs who are found to be in need of more close focus or support. The proposed framework, which we feel appropriate for the current time and which contains some scope to flex and respond to external factors and changes in the political landscape of electoral registration, may need revisiting should this landscape change significantly and we will adapt our approach to best support this change.

2.12 Our current monitoring follows a risk-based approach with the aim of being able to provide targeted support where it is most needed, making the most effective use of our resources. EROs are identified, using available data, our knowledge of key factors such as the experience of the ERO and their staff and any known integrity concerns. These EROs are asked to provide their detailed plans and other supporting documentation to us for our review to help us shape our support.

2.13 Whilst we expect all EROs to be aware of the need to work to combat electoral fraud, we also work closely with those EROs in the 18 areas identified as higher risk in relation to integrity, to monitor their work relating to the plans they have in place to minimise the risk of electoral fraud.

2.14 The standards and our monitoring are based on determining if EROs are well placed to deliver an effective registration service. As part of this we review whether EROs have clear, workable and evidence based plans in place which they subsequently use to deliver electoral registration in their area.

2.15 In addition, the data set out in the standards helps us understand the scope and scale of the challenges and inform views on the effectiveness of the mechanisms employed by the ERO.

2.16 Our monitoring of EROs during the 2015 canvass is following this risk-based approach with some EROs asked to provide their detailed plans for us to review, with feedback and support provided where appropriate. We then continue to monitor EROs in their delivery of their plans throughout the canvass by providing feedback and support through structured conversations (either by telephone or as part of a face-to-face meeting) as well as discussing in local and regional meetings as applicable.

2.17 In addition to this, in October 2015, we asked all EROs to provide an update on their progress with the delivery of the 2015 canvass and follow-up processes. This involved asking all EROs to complete a short survey, designed to help us to understand how the canvass is progressing in each area. Particularly, what work has already been completed, what the impact of this work has been and what remaining actions are still to be carried out. The results of this survey will also help to indicate if there are any emerging issues or performance concerns which would benefit from the provision of targeted guidance and support.

2.18 This also means that we will have an opportunity to identify any EROs who were not originally highlighted as requiring focussed support but where the available information highlights risks to delivery.

2.19 We propose that the approach to monitoring against the new standards in 2016 will be based on our current risk-based approach, working with EROs highlighted through risk assessments to ensure that support can be provided where it is most needed. EROs identified through this process will be required to submit information as set out in the standards, including copies of their planning documentation, which will then be reviewed, and feedback and support subsequently provided to each ERO as appropriate. We will then continue to monitor EROs in their delivery of their plans throughout the period. However, we will keep our approach to monitoring in 2016 under regular review. 2015 sees the first full IER canvass and we will want to build on any lessons learnt from our experience of monitoring ERO performance this year. This includes a review of the quality of the data collected after publication of the 1 December 2015 revised register. In addition, many of the processes under IER are new and while we think we have identified the most relevant data it will be important to review that following the canvass.

2.20 We also want to consider other mechanisms through which we identify issues, provide support and share practices that we know work. For example, we will continue to work with bodies such as the Association of Electoral Administrators (AEA), the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE) and the Electoral Management Board in Scotland. Should any regional or sub-regional structures be established in England and Wales we would want to explore what role they could play in the effective delivery of electoral registration.

**2.21 As part of this consultation we would welcome any views on our approach to identifying issues and delivering support and whether there are any other mechanisms for doing so that should be explored.**

2.22 In line with our current assessment and reporting procedures for Returning Officers, we will establish a panel of representatives from the Electoral Advisory Board (EAB) to consider assessments, particularly in those cases where it appears that an ERO does not meet one or more elements of the standards. Following this, we will write to EROs setting out our assessment of their performance against the standards, as agreed with the panel of members of the EAB, giving each ERO an opportunity to comment. As is current practice, any representations received will be considered on a case-by-case basis and responded to before a final decision is made ahead of publication. As with previous years, we will then report on the performance of EROs.

# 3 Letting us know what you think

3.1 Under Section 9A(3) of the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (PPERA), the Commission is required to consult the Secretary of State and any other appropriate person before determining or publishing standards of performance for EROs.

3.2 We have written seeking the Secretary of State's views on the proposed performance standards outlined in this paper. This consultation paper has also been sent to all EROs in Great Britain, the Chief Electoral Officer in Northern Ireland and to a number of agencies, professional bodies, and representative organisations including:

- Cabinet Office
- Department for Communities and Local Government
- Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE)
- Association of Electoral Administrators (AEA)
- Electoral Management Board for Scotland
- Scottish Assessors Association (SAA)
- Society of Local Authority Lawyers and Administrators in Scotland (SOLAR)
- Scottish Government
- Welsh Government
- Political parties
- Local government associations
- Electoral management software suppliers

3.3 We will be happy to arrange meetings with any of the groups above and any other interested individuals or groups on request.

3.4 We are committed to ensuring that EROs and their staff have the opportunity to input into the development of the new performance standards framework with a view to ensuring that it reflects a shared understanding across the electoral community of what well-run electoral registration services look like and a shared ownership of the framework.

3.5 We welcome your views and comments on the proposed new framework. Comments can be provided by email to [performancestandardsinbox@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:performancestandardsinbox@electoralcommission.org.uk) or by telephone to your local Commission team.

3.6 The deadline for responses to this consultation is **Friday 15 January 2016**. Although we may take into account responses received after this date, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

3.7 If you anticipate any difficulties responding to this consultation, please do not hesitate to contact us. As discussed above, we will be happy to meet individuals and groups who wish to express their views to us in person, and this may also provide an option for those who are pressed for time in responding.

3.8 To assist us to analyse the results of this consultation, it will be helpful for respondents to make clear in what capacity or on whose behalf their response is submitted. We may therefore contact respondents for further information as to the status of their submission if it is not immediately clear in the response. In addition, we may wish to publish or make available for inspection responses to this consultation paper.

3.9 We aim to publish the final standards in March 2016.

## Guidelines for responses

3.10 We are seeking views on the new performance standards framework and our proposed approach to how it will work. Respondents may wish to consider the following questions as part of their response:

- Does the framework focus on the right outcomes?
  - Is what the framework lists as being what the ERO needs to do the right indicator of whether the key outcomes can be delivered?
  - Will the information outlined in the framework indicate whether the key outcomes can be delivered?
- Will the framework help to ensure a consistency in service for electors while still recognising varying local circumstances?
- Is the documentation and data going to be useful to EROs?
  - Will it help EROs to monitor progress?
  - If not, what would be more useful?
  - Would there be any difficulties in supplying any of the documentation/data?
  - How often would it be useful to review the documentation/data?
  - Would collection of the documentation/data represent an additional cost for the ERO?
- Considering the issues set out in Chapter 1, are there any alternative methods of calculating the accuracy and completeness of electoral registers or examples of using target-based standards to drive improvements in electoral registration services?
- Do you have any views on our proposed approach to monitoring performance?
  - Is a risk-based approach to monitoring and supporting EROs the right one?
  - If so, are there specific factors that should be taken into account in assessing risk?
  - Are there other options that should be explored?
- Will the framework help to identify EROs that need support, and what are the best mechanisms for delivering this support?

- Do you have any views on our proposed approach to making assessments of performance?

## What happens next

3.11 After this consultation has finished, we will review the responses received, and consider any amendments as a result of those responses. We will then consult with the EAB on any amendments or revisions before publication of the new performance standards for EROs in March 2016, alongside our guidance, tools and templates to support EROs.

# Appendix A – New performance standards for Electoral Registration Officers

| Performance standard 1: Framework for the delivery of registration activity                                 |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Outcome   | What does the ERO need to do to achieve the outcome?   | What will demonstrate how the outcome has been met?   |
| <b>Clear understanding of the particular challenges in your registration area</b>                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and utilise data sources, as well as any other information you have, to highlight potential groups of electors who are less likely to be registered and develop a clear picture of the challenges in your area</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public engagement strategy that includes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a ward level data analysis of the area</li> <li>priority areas identified by the ERO to target registration activity</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |
| <b>Strategy for responding to the challenges in your registration area</b>                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify suitable internal and external partners who you believe can assist with ensuring all eligible electors are encouraged to register to vote</li> <li>Develop a strategy to respond to the challenges identified and incorporate into your registration plan</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public engagement strategy that includes how the ERO will use the channels available to reach identified groups and existing electors. Including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct contact routes</li> <li>Local partners</li> <li>Media and advertising</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>Robust project planning methodology employed to enable delivery of activity to maintain accurate and</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate and update your registration plan as appropriate to deliver your strategy</li> <li>Review the resources available to you taking into consideration:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the activities required and the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall project planning documentation, including a risk register, which is kept under regular review, and which includes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives and success</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p><b>complete registers</b></p> | <p>ownership of these</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the timescales within which they need to be carried out</li> <li>- opportunities in the electoral calendar to maximise registration</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the training requirements of the different staff involved in delivery are met</li> <li>• Plan activities with the internal and external partners you have identified as being helpful to meeting the challenge in the area</li> <li>• Put monitoring and evaluation measures in place to ensure the maximum effectiveness of all activities</li> <li>• Develop and maintain processes to identify any patterns of activity that might indicate potential integrity problems, including what steps are to be taken to deal with any such problems</li> </ul> | <p>measures to be used to monitor the impact of activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The resource requirements of the activity you plan to carry out</li> <li>- A timetable of deliverables and tasks for year round activity</li> <li>- The partnership activity you have planned</li> <li>- The evaluation measures you have in place for all activities carried out</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning documents which clearly address potential integrity issues, how they would be identified and the actions to be taken in each case.</li> </ul> |
|----------------------------------|---|--|

## Performance standard 2: Delivery of registration activity to maintain accurate and complete registers

| Outcome  | What does the ERO need to do to achieve the outcome?  | What will demonstrate how the outcome has been met?  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Effectively deliver your registration plan to ensure your register is as accurate and complete as possible</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using information sources available identify existing electors who may no longer be eligible and ensure that all necessary steps are taken to remove that elector from the register</li> <li>• Using information sources available to you identify and target new electors, and ensure that all necessary steps are taken to add them to register including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- putting measures in place to encourage applications to register from identified new electors</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure a full and effective canvass of properties is carried out including making personal visits by trained canvassers where voter registration material has not been responded to.</li> <li>• Utilise available direct contact methods to determine the accuracy of entries on the register and encourage applications from new electors</li> <li>• Maintain an audit trail to demonstrate the registration activity you have carried out</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data that demonstrates local challenges have been met including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall electorate figures</li> <li>- Number of attainers</li> <li>- Total number of electors deleted</li> <li>- Number of electors added to the register</li> <li>- Number of household enquiry form issued and responded to and applications made as a result</li> <li>- Number of reviews of registration undertaken and total number of electors deleted as a result</li> <li>- Number of applications and registrations made through the exceptions</li> <li>- Number of electors registered through attestation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Summary of activities carried out with partnership organisations and their impact</li> </ul> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Delivering a service in which residents and other stakeholders can have confidence</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and investigate patterns of activity that might indicate potential risks to the integrity of the register and take appropriate steps to deal with any such problems.</li> <li>• Ensure there is provision of comprehensive, accessible information on how to register</li> <li>• Ensure there are clear response mechanisms in place for electors to use if assistance is required</li> <li>• Timely supply of the register to those entitled to receive it</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of how the approach to preventing and detecting electoral fraud is communicated to voters, candidates and other local contacts</li> <li>• Details of how feedback from electors is managed, including action taken and any changes to plans in response.</li> <li>• Date[s] supplied (including date[s] requested) for those entitled to receive the register on request</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|