



SENATOR SCOTT LUDLAM
AUSTRALIAN GREENS
SENATOR FOR WESTERN AUSTRALIA

3 October 2013

Australian Electoral Officer
Peter Kramer
200 St Georges Terrace
Perth

Dear Mr Kramer,

Further information in support of a request for recount

I refer to your correspondence of 2 October 2013 requesting further information in relation to my request for a recount.

1. Shifting tallies for Shooters and Fishers lead

Our scrutineers identified that there were shifts in the tallies for Shooters and Fishers and the Australian Christians, which were not consistent with the trends from the divisions.

There appears to be a large jump in the lead for the Shooters and Fishers party over the Australian Christians (including parties that preference both via the GVT, i.e. No Carbon Tax Climate Sceptics for the Australian Christians, Australian Independents and Australian Fishing & Lifestyle for the Shooters and Fishers) visible on the 23rd of September, with bundles from five divisions added (Forrest, Brand, Canning, Curtin and Tangney). Analysis of the total votes for the above five parties in each of these five divisions suggests that the expected trend should favour the Australian Christians, such a large jump towards the Shooters and Fishers on this date seems to be out of trend with the division averages. The attached spreadsheet ("AnalysisToSupportRecount_SR_V2") demonstrates the expected trend from those 5 divisions, showing net movement towards the Australian Christians total.

2. Potential for human error to impact the outcome

Given that the critical point determining the outcome of the election of the last two senators in Western Australia is only 14 votes, the result could have been impacted by

human error in counting. In my earlier letter of request I highlighted the issue of the potential for error in below the line tallies. There is however a greater potential for human error in tallying the above the line votes (given that below the line votes are double entered, whereas the above the line votes are counted by hand in bundles). We therefore request a recount of the relevant above the line votes as well as the below the line votes. I am unsure of the rationale for an automatic recount of a House seat on a margin finer than 100 votes, but no automatic provisions for a recount of a much larger Senate ballot that hinges on a much finer margin.

3. Difference between Senate and House of Reps tallies

There is a considerable difference in the number of votes cast in the House of Representatives and the Senate in each division. The total difference is 11,044 votes. The cause if the difference in total votes for each house is unclear - but we hold some concern that this results from errors in counting or bundling. In a count where the outcome turns on 14 votes, this reflects a very substantial prospect for error. In these unusual circumstances I therefore request a total recount of the senate ballots.

4. Multiple non-standard ballots; analysed and sorted by type

<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/10671102/senatecount/report.html>

These are critical ballots that appear to be non-standard in one way or another. We have sorted them by the types of issues we've detected (for example multiple duplicate below the line preferences; blank or illegible papers; see link above) which we strongly propose should be analysed by the AEC and scrutineers.

Thankyou for your attention to this matter. I am available on 0417 123 774 or by senator.ludlam@aph.gov.au if you require any further information.

sincerely,

[Signature redacted.]

Scott Ludlam