
From: FOI
Sent: 08 April 2021 19:41
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FOI 028-21 - Response
Attachments: YPP internal correspondence_Redacted.pdf; 2021-01-21-Young People's Party-Change of name_Redacted.pdf

Dear [REDACTED]

Our Ref: FOI 028-21

Thank you for your request under the Freedom of Information Act dated 08 March 2021 and received by the Commission on 09 March 2021.

The Commission aims to respond to requests for information promptly and has done so within the statutory timeframe of twenty working days.

Your request is shown below followed by our response.

Please send me all the documents that you hold relating to our application to change our name (received 23 December 2020) and any internal notes or correspondence relating thereto. Request applies to the Young People's Party's request to change its name to Common Ground.

Our response is as follows:

We hold the information you have requested and it is attached to this correspondence.

We will respond to further correspondence of 08 March separately.

We are disclosing to you the information you have requested. Your request relates to 'internal notes or correspondence'. It was unclear to us whether you were requesting only internal correspondence or all correspondence. I can confirm however that there is no external correspondence other than between the Commission and the party itself, which we are treating as exempt from disclosure under section 21 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Section 21 provides for an exemption where the information requested is reasonably accessible to the applicant by other means. We consider we can have a reasonable expectation that you already have correspondence between you and the party.

Exemptions under section 40(2)

You will notice that certain personal details have been redacted from the documents we are releasing. Section 40(2) provides exemption where the information requested constitutes personal data as defined by the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA), and where release of the information requests would breach one of the data protection principles. Some of the information contained in the requested information falls within the description of personal data as defined by the DPA because the

information relates directly to an identifiable living individual. This includes names and contact details of individuals in some instances. The individuals in some cases are junior staff members and they would not reasonably expect their information to be \

If you are not satisfied with this response, please note that the Commission operates a review procedure, details of which can be found on the Commission website at:

www.electoralcommission.org.uk/freedom-information/make-a-freedom-information-request

Please also note that if you have exhausted all internal Commission review procedures and you are still not satisfied you have the right to appeal to the Information Commissioner.

Details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <https://ico.org.uk>.

Yours sincerely,

Information Team
The Electoral Commission
electoralcommission.org.uk

YOUNG PEOPLE'S PARTY YPP

CHANGE OF PARTY NAME

Contents

Decision and Approval Board comments	2
Recommendation of Registration Team member	3
Registration Team member assessment.....	5
Applicant party information	5
Application history	5
Consideration of the Welsh Language Measure	5
Name	6
Descriptions.....	9
Description 1	9
Existing descriptions	10
Description 1	10
Description 2	11
Description 3	12
Description 4	13
Description 5	14
Register searches	15
Table 1: Similarity score results	15
Table 2: Identity marks that contain words in the proposed identity marks	16

Decision and Approval Board comments

Applicant party name: Young People's Party YPP

Application type: Change of name

Relevant register: GB (England, Scotland, Wales)

Application details and recommendation	Decision and Approval Board comments
<p>Common Ground (R)</p> <p>Proposed descriptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Common Ground formerly Young People's Party (R) <p>Registered descriptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Young People's Party YPP (R) Young People's Party (R) YPP Young People's Party (R) The Young People's Party (R) Young People's Party UK (R) 	<p>Initial view (please add initials and date):</p> <p>LE – 15/02/21 – I am minded to refuse the name on the basis that a voter is likely to confuse it with Common Good. I am less convinced by confusion with Centreground Party, which is more distinct both visually and contextually.</p> <p>I am minded to approve the proposed description whether or not the name is approved, although if the name is refused we should check first whether the party wants to proceed. I can't see that it fails to identify the party – the full name is included for one thing – or fails any of the legal tests. I can see an argument that it is misleading but only as to the current name of the party, which would not have an effect on the impact of a vote. It's still a vote for that party.</p> <p>I am also not convinced that we should remove any existing descriptions, at least until – should the name be approved – the party has had a say in the matter. The assessment says that a voter would not be likely to be aware this was the former name of the party (assuming the name had changed). What evidence are we basing that on? There is an 'in principle' argument that at least for a period of time both names would identify the party. To determine one way or the other will need more analysis, and input from the party.</p> <p>Approval Board comments (please add initials and date):</p> <p>CH 18/02/21: I agree with the initial view.</p> <p>NN 19.02.2021: I agree with the recommendation. I would refuse the proposed description, because if the party can't be called Common Ground, but no longer want to be called the 'Young People's Party' this description seems not to adequately identify the party.</p>

Application details and recommendation	Decision and Approval Board comments
	<p>Essentially I would defer all decisions on identity marks that are dependent on a name, until the name is settled.</p> <p>AAM 19.02.2021: I do not agree with the recommendation and initial view to reject the proposed name. In my view, the proposed name Common Ground is different enough from the existing party Common Good both in terms of the wording but also ideology. I do agree however with the comments made about deferring decisions on descriptions etc until a decision has been made on name.</p> <p>TH 22.02.2021: I agree with the initial view to reject the proposed name on the basis that a voter would be likely to confuse it with Common Good, but I would also reject the proposed description on the same grounds. I agree that the current descriptions should not be removed until/unless the party name is changed.</p> <p>AON: 22/2/21 I agree with the views of TH above.</p> <p>Decision (please add initials and date):</p> <p>LE – 02/03/21 – I refuse the name on the grounds of confusion with ‘Common Good’. I am persuaded also to refuse the description as without the name being changed it is misleading as it mis-describes the party’s name. The question of the remaining descriptions therefore does not arise as they all continue to identify the party.</p>

Recommendation of Registration Team member

1. In making my recommendations I have considered the requirements and statutory tests set out in the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (PPERA).
2. I recommend that the Commission **reject** party’s application.
3. My recommendations in relation to each aspect of the application are set out as follows:

Name	Common Ground	R	Likely to cause confusion
Description 1	Common Ground formerly Young People’s Party	R	Likely to cause confusion

Registered description 1	Young People's Party YPP	R	If the proposed name is approved, the registered description should be removed as it no longer identifies the party.
Registered description 2	Young People's Party	R	If the proposed name is approved, the registered description should be removed as it no longer identifies the party.
Registered description 3	YPP Young People's Party	R	If the proposed name is approved, the registered description should be removed as it no longer identifies the party.
Registered description 4	The Young People's Party	R	If the proposed name is approved, the registered description should be removed as it no longer identifies the party.
Registered description 5	Young People's Party UK	R	If the proposed name is approved, the registered description should be removed as it no longer identifies the party.

09 February 2021

Registration Team member assessment

Applicant party information

Link to party's registered entry	Link
Link to party accounts	Website , Twitter , Facebook

4.

Application history

Link to application docs	Application	
Part of the register	GB (England, Scotland, Wales)	
Date first lodged	Date considered complete	Date published for comment
23 December 2020	23 February 2021	12 February 2021

Consideration of the Welsh Language Measure

5. As a public body operating in Wales, we are required to carry out our functions in line with the Welsh Language (Wales) Measure 2011 and the Welsh Language Standards. We are required to treat the Welsh language no less favourably than English in performing our functions in Wales.
6. I have considered these requirements insofar as they relate to our assessment of this registration application, including the application of the statutory tests under Part II of PPERA.
7. To this end, as the party has applied to contest elections in Wales, I have sought Welsh translations of all proposed English identity marks (and vice versa), including text contained in emblems. I have considered those translations and their relevance to each of the relevant statutory tests.
8. [Tracked comments from translator](#).

Type	ID Mark – English Version	ID Mark – Welsh Version	Translators comments
Name	Common Ground	Tir Cyffredin	
Description	Common Ground formerly Young People's Party	Tir Cyffredin, Plaid y Bobl Ifanc gynt	

Name

Proposed name	Common Ground
Recommendation	Reject
Summary reason	Likely to cause confusion

9. In making my recommendation I have considered the factors set out in the following paragraphs.
10. As explained [above](#), in considering the requirements of the Welsh Language (Wales) Measure 2011 and the Welsh Language Standards, I have sought a translation for this proposed name: Tir Cyffredin. I have considered the relevance of the translation to each of the relevant statutory tests.
- The record of the translation can be found [here](#).
 - These words in Welsh do not appear on the register.
11. The proposed identifier **is not the same** as another identifier on the register.
12. I am of the view that registration of the identifier **is likely** to result in electors confusing the applicant party with another registered party.

OAK, Mary

(address in the Constituency)

Centreground Party

ASH, James

(address in the Constituency)

Common Ground

PINE, Susan

(address in the Constituency)

Common Good

-
- Set out above are the two registered names that in my view the proposed name is most similar too.
 - Centreground Party – I have considered that the proposed name and the registered name both contain the key word ‘Ground’. Both names start with a word beginning with c.
 - There are obvious visual differences. The registered contains the word ‘Party’ and the words ‘Centre’ and ‘Common’ are not the same.

- d. 'Centre' in this context most likely refers to centrist politics. It appears on face value that the registered party's name is stating that they are position in the 'centre ground' of politics.
 - e. 'Common' in this context likely has a similar meaning. On face value, it appears to refer to 'Common' as values held by all. The inclusion of the word 'Ground' gives the context of a 'political' ground. Combined with the word 'Common' appears to suggest ground that appeals to all, most likely the centre.
 - f. There is a contextual link between the proposed and the registered.
 - g. Whilst there is visual similarity, I am not satisfied that this is sufficiently close to meet the threshold of likely, however with the addition of the context I am minded on balance that the proposed name does meet this threshold and *is* likely to cause a voter confusion.
 - h. Common Good – I have considered that the proposed name and the registered name both contain the key word 'Common'. Both names have another word beginning with 'g'.
 - i. It is my view that that the proposed name is more visually similar to this registered name that 'Centreground Party', particularly at a glance.
 - j. Contextually, there are also similarities. Whilst 'good' and 'ground' have different meanings, in the context of the inclusion of the word 'Common' they both appear to find commonalities between groups. One could say that the common 'ground' is the common 'good'.
 - k. It is clear that there is not a particularly strong contextual difference.
 - l. Whilst there are similarities, it could be argued that there is enough difference between the words 'Good' and 'Ground' so as to avoid confusion. But it is my view that this is not strong enough to avoid it being likely to cause confusion.
 - m. On balance, I consider the proposed name to be likely to cause confusion with this registered name as well.
13. The proposed identifier **is not more** than six words.
14. The proposed identifier, in my view, **is not** obscene or offensive.
15. The proposed identifier, in my view, if published is **not likely** amount to the commission of an offence.
16. The proposed identifier, in my view, is **not likely**, were it to appear on a ballot paper, to result in an elector being misled as to the effect of their vote.
- a. I am aware of a [charity by the same name](#). Their focus is on community conservation and environmental education. Their website notes that "We are a small grassroots organisation".
 - b. Whilst the name is the same as the proposed name, I do not think that a voter is likely to be misled. This is on the basis that the charity does

not appear to operate particularly in the 'political' sphere and appears to have a relatively low profile online.¹

- c. I think it would difficult for a voter to associate the proposed party with this charity, or wrongly assume that the two are connected. Were a voter familiar with the charity it is my view that they would not expect them to have ha connection given their lack activism.
17. The proposed identifier, in my view, is **not likely**, were it to appear on a ballot paper, to contradict, or hinder an elector's understanding of, any directions for their guidance in voting.
18. The proposed identifier **does not** include any script other than Roman Script.
19. The proposed identifier **does not** include a word or expression prohibited by order made by the Secretary of State.

¹ <https://twitter.com/commongroundlab>

Descriptions

Description 1

Proposed description	Common Ground formerly Young People's Party
Recommendation	Reject
Summary reason	Likely to cause confusion.

20. In making my recommendation I have considered the factors set out in the following paragraphs.

21. I am **satisfied** that the proposed description amounts to a description under PPERA.

- a. The proposed description contains the entire party name within the description.
- b. The description contains the currently registered, but to be change name. The way that this description has been formatted and set out, I am not of the view that this obscures the identity of the party within the description. If anything, it would help identify it to those who were previously aware of the party's 'old' name.
- c. I am satisfied that the description makes clear the identity of the party.

22. Where I have recommended to **reject** the proposed name, I similar am of the view that the description should be rejected where it contains the entire party name. I am of the view that the proposed description would also be confusing.

23. However, if the delegated decision maker is minded to approve the name, then this description should also be approved where it similarly does not fail any statutory tests. I have not identified any additional considerations to be made that have not already been made for the proposed name.

Existing descriptions

Where the party have proposed to change their name, I have considered whether, were we to approve the change of name, the existing registered descriptions continue to identify the party.

If we approve the proposed name, I have recommended to retain or remove the following descriptions.

Description 1

Registered description	Young People's Party YPP
Recommendation	Remove
Summary reason	No longer makes clear the identity of the party within the description.

24. In making my recommendation I have considered the factors set out in the following paragraphs.

25. I am **not satisfied** that the proposed description amounts to a description under PPERA.

- a. Where the party has proposed to change its name, I have considered whether or not the registered descriptions continue to identify the party, particularly where the party's core identity (its name) is being changed.
- b. The existing description does not contain any part of the new name.
- c. Were this description to remain, it is likely to appear to a voter to be a name/description for an entirely different party.
- d. I have considered that this is the 'former' identity of the party, but am satisfied that a voter is unlikely to be aware of this and is not likely to associate the description with the party.

26. Where the description no longer identifies the party, I recommend that under our duty to maintain the register, we **remove this description** if the name is to be approved.

27. I note that we are currently recommending to remove this description via the description review as it is the same as the 'old' name.

Description 2

Registered description	Young People's Party
Recommendation	Remove
Summary reason	No longer makes clear the identity of the party within the description.

28. In making my recommendation I have considered the factors set out in the following paragraphs.

29. I am **not satisfied** that the proposed description amounts to a description under PPERA.

- e. Where the party has proposed to change its name, I have considered whether or not the registered descriptions continue to identify the party, particularly where the party's core identity (its name) is being changed.
- f. The existing description does not contain any part of the new name.
- g. Were this description to remain, it is likely to appear to a voter to be a name/description for an entirely different party.
- h. I have considered that this is the 'former' identity of the party, but am satisfied that a voter is unlikely to be aware of this and is not likely to associate the description with the party.

30. Where the description no longer identifies the party, I recommend that under our duty to maintain the register, we **remove this description** if the name is to be approved.

31. If the proposed name is rejected, I recommend that this description is retained.

Description 3

Registered description	YPP Young People's Party
Recommendation	Remove
Summary reason	No longer makes clear the identity of the party within the description.

32. In making my recommendation I have considered the factors set out in the following paragraphs.

33. I am **not satisfied** that the proposed description amounts to a description under PPERA.

- i. Where the party has proposed to change its name, I have considered whether or not the registered descriptions continue to identify the party, particularly where the party's core identity (its name) is being changed.
- j. The existing description does not contain any part of the new name.
- k. Were this description to remain, it is likely to appear to a voter to be a name/description for an entirely different party.
- l. I have considered that this is the 'former' identity of the party, but am satisfied that a voter is unlikely to be aware of this and is not likely to associate the description with the party.

34. Where the description no longer identifies the party, I recommend that under our duty to maintain the register, we **remove this description** if the name is to be approved.

35. If the proposed name is rejected, I recommend that this description is retained.

Description 4

Registered description	The Young People's Party
Recommendation	Remove
Summary reason	No longer makes clear the identity of the party within the description.

36. In making my recommendation I have considered the factors set out in the following paragraphs.

37. I am **not satisfied** that the proposed description amounts to a description under PPERA.

- m. Where the party has proposed to change its name, I have considered whether or not the registered descriptions continue to identify the party, particularly where the party's core identity (its name) is being changed.
- n. The existing description does not contain any part of the new name.
- o. Were this description to remain, it is likely to appear to a voter to be a name/description for an entirely different party.
- p. I have considered that this is the 'former' identity of the party, but am satisfied that a voter is unlikely to be aware of this and is not likely to associate the description with the party.

38. Where the description no longer identifies the party, I recommend that under our duty to maintain the register, we **remove this description** if the name is to be approved.

39. If the proposed name is rejected, I recommend that this description is retained.

Description 5

Registered description	Young People's Party UK
Recommendation	Remove
Summary reason	No longer makes clear the identity of the party within the description.

40. In making my recommendation I have considered the factors set out in the following paragraphs.

41. I am **not satisfied** that the proposed description amounts to a description under PPERA.

- q. Where the party has proposed to change its name, I have considered whether or not the registered descriptions continue to identify the party, particularly where the party's core identity (its name) is being changed.
- r. The existing description does not contain any part of the new name.
- s. Were this description to remain, it is likely to appear to a voter to be a name/description for an entirely different party.
- t. I have considered that this is the 'former' identity of the party, but am satisfied that a voter is unlikely to be aware of this and is not likely to associate the description with the party.

42. Where the description no longer identifies the party, I recommend that under our duty to maintain the register, we **remove this description** if the name is to be approved.

43. If the proposed name is rejected, I recommend that this description is retained.

Register searches

Table 1: Similarity score results

1. The following table lists identifiers that are similar to the proposed name or descriptions according to an electronic matching process. The higher the value, the higher the similarity.
2. I undertook the search on the GB (England, Scotland, Wales) register.

Proposed ID Marks	ID Mark	Type	Party registered to	Register	Protected until	Similarity
Common ground	Common Good	Name	Common Good	Great Britain	-	0.5400
Common ground	The Common People	Name	The Common People	Great Britain	-	0.5400
Common ground	Common Sense Party	Name	Common Sense Party	Great Britain	-	0.5305
Common ground	Common sense flood defence	Description	National Flood Prevention Party	Great Britain	-	0.5040
Common ground	Common Sense. Common Purpose.	Description	Life	Great Britain	-	0.5040
Common ground	Common sense coastal defence	Description	National Flood Prevention Party	Great Britain	-	0.5026
Common ground	The Priority Party. Common sense thinking.	Description	The Priority Party	Great Britain	-	0.5013
Common ground	Common Good: Remain In The EU	Description	Common Good	Great Britain	-	0.4990
Common ground	Foundation Party - Openness and common sense	Description	Foundation Party	Great Britain	-	0.4990

Table 2: Identity marks that contain words in the proposed identity marks

3. I have conducted a search to identify where words contained in the proposed descriptions and emblems appear on the registers.
4. I undertook the searches on the GB (England, Scotland, Wales) register.
- 5.

Word searched for: Common		
ID Mark	Type	Party registered to
Common Good	Name	Common Good
Common Good: Remain In The EU	Description	Common Good
Common sense coastal defence	Description	National Flood Prevention Party
Common sense flood defence	Description	National Flood Prevention Party
Common Sense Party	Name	Common Sense Party
Common Sense. Common Purpose.	Description	Life
Foundation Party - Openness and common sense	Description	Foundation Party
Production, distribution, communication - owned in common	Description	Direct Democracy (Communist) Party
The Common People	Name	The Common People
The Cromwell Commonwealth Republican Party	Name	The Cromwell Commonwealth Republican Party
The Priority Party. Common sense thinking.	Description	The Priority Party

Word searched for: Ground		
ID Mark	Type	Party registered to
Centreground Party	Name	Centreground Party

[Go to contents](#)

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 02 March 2021 10:56

Cc: Registration team <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: PR21-06 - final decision requested by 3 March CCM:0389456

Hi

Mine are all done.

Thanks

Louise

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 February 2021 09:12
To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED] >; Andy O'Neill
<[REDACTED]>
Cc: Registration team [REDACTED] >
Subject: PR21-06 - final decision requested by 3 March CCM:0389456

Hi Louise and Andy,

Please could you provide final decisions on the following applications (Andy's highlighted) by Wednesday 3 March, or let us know if you require more time?

Party name	Type of assessment
Northern Independence Party	New party application
Propel	New party application
Saving Scotland Party	New party application
Shevington Independents	New party application
The Phoenix Political Party	New party application
Wigan Independents	Change of party name
Young People's Party YPP	Change of party name

Thanks

[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 February 2021 18:35
To: Party Registration Approval Board [REDACTED] >
Cc: Partyreg <Partyreg@electoralcommission.org.uk>
Subject: PR21-06 comments due by noon Monday 22nd February CCM:0553162

Dear all,

Louise/Andy has come to an initial view on 7 applications (links below) and we would now be grateful for your views by **noon Monday 22nd February**.

Party name	Type of assessment
Northern Independence Party	New party application
Propel	New party application

Saving Scotland Party	New party application
Shevington Independents	New party application
The Phoenix Political Party	New party application
Wigan Independents	Change of party name
Young People's Party YPP	Change of party name

Below is a list of resources for approvals board members:

Approvals Board resources	
Briefing paper – The party registration approval board	This document sets out the registration process, role of the board and the legislative tests and policy framework.
Party Registration Decision Database	This document contains a number of historic or complex decisions (2015 onwards) that have helped define our approach to the statutory tests.
Party registration Legal Advise Log	A log of legal advice requested by the registration team, including advice relevant to the interpretation of the statutory tests and for assessments.
Finalised Decisions	Our published registration decisions from 2018 onwards.

If you are unable to provide your views by the deadline due to other commitments, please inform the party registration team and make arrangements with your delegate listed in the table below.

Board Member	Delegate
Director of Regulation (delegated decision maker)	Director of Electoral Administration
Senior Lawyer (Regulation)	Head of Legal
Head of Policy	Head of Research
Head of Registration and Reporting	Head of Enforcement and Monitoring
Head of External Communications	Director of Communications
Head of Commission, Scotland	Manager, Scotland
Head of Commission, Northern Ireland	Manager, Northern Ireland
Head of Commission, Wales	Manager, Wales

Thanks,

[Redacted signature]

The Electoral Commission
electoralcommission.org.uk

From: Louise Edwards [Redacted] >

Sent: 15 February 2021 14:58

To: [Redacted] >

Cc: [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: PR21-06 application summary initial view CCM:0288518

All done thanks bar Saving Scotland, which is for Andy I think.

There's a couple of comments on the Shevington one.

Thanks

Louise

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 12 February 2021 20:14

To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED] >

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: PR21-06 application summary initial view CCM:0288518

Hi Louise,

Here is the latest application summary:

Party name	Type of assessment	Comments or decision required
Northern Independence Party	New party application	Initial view
Propel	New party application	Initial view
Saving Scotland Party	New party application	Initial view
Shevington Independents	New party application	Initial view
The Phoenix Political Party	New party application	Initial view
The Workers Party	Amended constitution	Decision
Wigan Independents	Change of party name	Initial view
Young People's Party YPP	Change of party name	Initial view

Could I have your initial comments by Wednesday or let me know if you will require more time?

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The Electoral Commission
electoralcommission.org.uk