

LS5329 Released Document No. 23

From: Phil Diak

Sent: Friday, October 03, 2014 3:48 PM

To: Tom Rogers

Cc: Pablo Carpay; Nicole Taylor; Andrew Gately

Subject: RE: Indi points for discussion with Hedley [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Attached: JSCEM Sub 2013 Close seat analysis section(s) SECUNCLASSIFIED.msg

For-Official-Use-Only

Hi Tom

Cc Pablo

I will send this to you now to indicate the shape it is taking as a support script in talking to him. **Nicole is close with the data but may need to bring that up with her separately when we meet at 4pm.

1. **Roll growth and data** - Hedley with respect your statistical observations are not a correct picture of the patterns of growth in Victoria, several points:

- o Firstly please note that Indi was on different boundaries in 2010 compared to 2013, with a Victorian federal redistribution occurring in between - so that is an apples and oranges comparison.

The new boundary for Indi was [completed and gazetted at the end of 2010](#).

The seat was quite different for the 2013 federal election, having grown by 559 sq km and picking this up from the Division of McEwen. McEwen had experienced the fastest growth leading up to the redistribution. For example it acquired Kinglake – still a growth area.

- o I've noted you mentioned at the end of your article last Saturday that economic development influences enrolment growth in the seats where it is occurring.
- o Secondly, when comparing Indi growth to other Victorian seats going to the 2014 federal election the following stats should assist you better.

These are from 30 June 2013 to close of rolls 2013. That provides an accurate picture of roll growth up to when rolls closed for those entitled to vote in Indi and other seats.

Your data in last Saturday's paper suggested the comparison was up to 31 August (?) which would have included enrolments by people not entitled to vote in the election that had missed the close of rolls deadline.

It is quite common for enrolments to continue up to and including election day that do not make it onto the certified list.

[INSERT DATA FROM NICOLE](#)

2. **Referral, Roll integrity work and EIU** - Your other questions suggested to us there might be an assumption we are not doing roll integrity work more broadly and were confined to referring the 27 electors.

- Taking the issue of the 27 referrals first. We have naturally wanted to act expeditiously as it was a specific allegation(s). As you know we have examined those and referred them to the AFP.
- We also undertake ongoing roll checks at all times and other work.
On background, we always look at closer seats, and we did in fact contact a small number of Indi electors as part of our approach. There was nothing untoward there found.

In our JSCEM submission of 2013 we included commentary our roll checking.
SEE ATTACHMENT INFO TO BE PASTED AND SENT TO HIM ?

- **Again on background**, I can say that, following an internal directive from the A/G EC, the Electoral Integrity Unit, is examining roll information with a very broad remit including Indi. That will take a considerable period time.

FYI, this work was foreshadowed at a hearing of JSCEM on 31 July 2014, when Tom Rogers, A/g Electoral Commissioner said:

“I have also made the decision to establish an «electoral» integrity unit, which will be focused on ensuring the integrity of all of our «electoral» processes not just those implemented during the election period itself. As you know, we have introduced some significant new processes with enrolment over the past two years. While the ANAO will provide us with feedback on the role in an upcoming audit, I am keen to proactively consider the integrity of our enrolment processes and to provide ourselves with additional assurances that they are robust and dependable, and in line with our drive on integrity. This will be the «electoral» integrity unit's first task and it will be driven by First Assistant Commissioner Carpay and the Assistant Commissioner Roll Management, Mr Andrew Gately.”

We can't be on the record about this with you now as it just makes it harder for us to do that work effectively.

However we can talk about that with you when there is something to say later but meantime that work is continuing. ????

Phil Diak | Director

Education & Communications Branch Executive | Education & Communications Branch
Australian Electoral Commission
T: +61 2 6271 4415 | M: 0413 452 539



AEC

Australian Electoral Commission

Make sure you're **enrolle**

Visit www.aec.gov.au

For-Official-Use-Only

From: Phil Diak

Sent: Friday, 3 October 2014 1:28 PM

To: Tom Rogers

Cc: Pablo Carpay; Tim Courtney; Kevin Kitson; Andrew Gately; Kathy Mitchell; Tess Kerr

Subject: FW: Indi media release [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

For Official Use Only
Tom/ELT
Cc all

Email refers for consideration our response. Looks like Hedley is planning an article for Sat paper.

Happy to discuss.

Cheers Phil

For Official Use Only

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

-----Original Message-----

From: Thomas, Hedley [thomash@theaustralian.com.au]

Sent: Friday, October 03, 2014 12:58 PM AUS Eastern Standard Time

To: Phil Diak

Subject: Re: Indi media release [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Phil

In relation to the Indi enrolment issues, the acting Commissioner's statement yesterday referred to 27 electors.

As the AEC knows, these 27 came to prominence because of their enrolments in Indi, and - in a number of cases - the contradictory information in social media and mainstream media about their actual principal places of residence.

The AEC's monthly enrolment figures highlight the increases in the numbers on the roll in Indi before the election. I reported on the increases on Saturday, and noted that the growth rate was significantly higher than other rural Victorian seats with one exception. Not reported was the fact that the growth rate was higher in Indi in the lead-up to the 2013 election than it was in the 2010 election.

My questions concern why the AEC has apparently not attempted to ascertain anything about the legitimacy of those voters who enrolled in Indi and who are not on the list of those who were brought to the attention of the AEC by The Australian.

On face value, it appears that the AEC - and its referral to the AFP - has confined its interest to 27 instead of a few hundred.

Given the public interest and the need for integrity and public confidence in the electoral roll, I would appreciate responses from Mr Rogers about why this restrictive approach has been adopted.

Can you please follow this up and reply with responses by 4.30pm today. If you need to discuss any of this, on background or on the record, please do not hesitate to call me.

Regards

Hedley

On 2 October 2014 10:58, Phil Diak <Phil.Diak@aec.gov.au> wrote:
For-Official-Use-Only

Hi Hedley

As discussed, here is a media release to be issued shortly.

Regards

Phil

Phil Diak | Director

Education & Communications Branch Executive | Education & Communications Branch

Australian Electoral Commission

T: [+61 2 6271 4415](tel:+61262714415) | M: 0413 452 539



For-Official-Use-Only

DISCLAIMER:

If you have received this transmission in error please notify us immediately by return email and delete all copies. If this email or any attachments have been sent to you in error, that error does not constitute waiver of any confidentiality, privilege or copyright in respect of information in the email or attachments.

--

HEDLEY THOMAS

National Chief Correspondent
Level 1, Cnr Mayne Road & Campbell Street Bowen Hills QLD 4006
T +61 7 3666 7463 M +61 417 797 419
E thomash@theaustralian.com.au W theaustralian.com.au

Subscribe to The Australian Follow us online

Proudly supporting [1 degree](http://1degree.com.au), A News Corp Australia initiative.

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee, you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments which does not relate to the official business of the sending company must be taken not to have been sent or endorsed by that company or any of its related entities. No warranty is made that the e-mail or attachments are free from computer virus or other defect.

Released under Freedom of Information Act 1982