Voter ID Pilot Review

3 May 2018

1.0   Background

1.1   The Government's manifesto in 2017 committed to introducing identification in polling stations, following the publication of Sir Eric Pickles' review of electoral fraud in the UK.

1.2   The Cabinet Office offered all local authorities in Great Britain the opportunity to pilot voter identification in their May 2018 local elections to enable the Cabinet Office to identify the best way to implement voter ID nationally. There were five pilot authorities, including Woking, which trialled different ID schemes (both photographic and non-photographic). The individual ID schemes were drawn up by local authorities, working collaboratively with the Cabinet Office, Electoral Commission and Association of Electoral Administrators, who provided expert support and scrutiny as the pilots were developed. The other pilot authorities were: Bromley, Gosport, Swindon and Watford. Two postal vote pilots were also run.

1.3   The Council agreed at its meeting on 20 July to support an application to participate in the Cabinet Office's pilots to trial ID in polling stations at the May 2018 elections. On 28 September, the Council considered a report setting out Woking's ID pilot proposal and agreed to proceed with the pilot. The scheme was based the requirements in Northern Ireland, where all voters must provide photographic ID. The proposed scheme required all electors voting in person at a polling station or acting as a proxy for another elector to show one form of agreed photo ID before being issued with a ballot paper. If no permitted photo ID could be presented, the electors would not be issued a ballot paper and be unable to vote.

1.4   Following suggestions from members of the Elections and Electoral Registration Review Panel, the suggested ID list presented to Council was expanded to include rail season ticket photocards and 16-25 year olds photo railcards, as Councillors considered that these additions would be helpful for electors. Council agreed the scheme proposed, with the amendments to the acceptable ID list, and the Cabinet Office was notified accordingly.

1.5   The list was further expanded to include three types of ID at the request of the Electoral Commission and Cabinet Office (European Economic Area photo ID cards, UK Biometric Residence Permits and Northern Ireland Electoral Identity Card.) Therefore the final list of ID to be accepted in the polling stations was:

- Passport – UK and Crown Dependency, EU and Commonwealth
- Photo Driving Licence - UK and Crown Dependency, EU
- EEA Photographic Identity Card
- UK Biometric Residence Permit
- Northern Ireland Electoral Identity Card
- Surrey Senior Bus Pass
- Disabled People's Bus Pass
- Surrey Student Fare Card
- 16-25 Railcard
- Rail Season Ticket Photocard
- Local Elector Card

1.6 The ID required and the processes for administering the pilot in the polling station were set out in the Woking Borough Council (Identification in Polling Stations) Pilot Order 2018. The Order was drafted in consultation with Officers and the Electoral Commission, and the final Order was signed by the Minister for the Constitution on 14 January 2018, which enabled the pilot to run on 3 May 2018.

2.0 Planning and Engagement

2.1 From August 2017 onwards, Officers worked closely with the Cabinet Office (CO) and the Electoral Commission (EC) to finalise the arrangements for the pilot.

2.2 Officers attended meetings of the Cabinet Office Pilot and Reference Group (PRG) on a monthly basis from August 2017 to February 2018. There were also additional meetings with the pilot authorities, as well as individual meetings with officers from WBC to scrutinise the proposals and detailed plans for the pilot.

2.3 Additionally, fortnightly telephone conference calls were held to discuss the communications plans, which were held every week in the run up to polling day.

2.4 Several plans were put in place, to ensure different elements of the pilot could be monitored. A detailed project plan, the integrity plan and risk register for the election was strengthened to reflect the additional risks associated with the pilot, particularly with regard to the Local Elector Cards, and communicating the correct ID that electors were required to bring.

2.5 The training plan for polling station staff was also expanded to ensure all the requirements for the pilot were included and that staff would be confident in the processes to be followed in the polling station.

2.6 Officers drafted an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) for the pilot, identifying groups who could be affected by the ID pilot and what action should be taken to minimise the impact on electors in these groups. A copy of the final EIA is set out at Appendix A. The EIA was circulated to PRG colleagues at the Electoral Commission, who provided valuable feedback to strengthen the EIA.

2.7 On 25 January 2018, Officers attended a panel interview at the Cabinet Office. The aim of this exercise was to assure all involved in the delivery of the pilot of the quality of Officer's preparations, as well as challenging the plans to highlight further risks and mitigations. The panel's main focus was to review key elements of the pilot plans: the Equalities Impact Assessment, the pilot risk assessment, staff training plan and media strategy. This interview went very well, and the panel commended the approach Officers had taken towards project planning and risk management.

2.8 On 8 March 2018, the Returning Officer, the Leader of the Council, the Chair of the Elections and Electoral Registration Review Panel, the Electoral Services Manager and the Electoral Services Officer met with the Minister for the Constitution to discuss the ID plans.

3.0 ID Checking Process

3.1 The provision of photo ID applied to all electors voting in person at the polling station, both electors and proxies. In the case of proxies, they would be required to bring their own ID, not ID for the voter on whose behalf the proxy was voting.

3.2 The process to be followed in the polling station was amended to add the ID checking stage. The stages to be followed are set out below:

1. Electors hand over their ID to polling station staff; *[the ID is not checked at this stage]*

2. Electors confirm their name and address *[this is normal practice in the polling station; even where electors bring their poll card, they are still required to state their name and address]*

3. Staff check the register and confirm that the elector is eligible to be issued with a ballot paper

4. Elector's ID is checked to verify their identity.

5. Staff issue the ballot paper to the elector, marking the register, the data collection form and the Corresponding Numbers List with the elector's elector number.

3.3 The checking of the ID after confirmation of the elector's name and address was planned as an extra measure against personation, as the elector would not be able to read out the details of the elector on the ID provided.

3.4 Where there were queries regarding the ID provided, poll clerks were instructed to refer the elector to the Presiding Officer (PO), who would discuss the situation with the elector and decide whether a ballot paper could be issued.

3.5 In line with the ID requirements already in place in Northern Ireland, it was specified that out of date/expired documents could be used, as long as the photo on the ID was still of a good likeness. However, digital images would not be accepted; the original document had to be produced in the polling station.

3.6 Where electors forgot to bring their ID, or brought incorrect ID, this would be recorded in the polling station. Electors would be able to return later in the day with the correct ID; they would not be prohibited from re-entering the polling station. In such instances, electors were given a card setting out the permitted forms ID, to ensure they returned with the correct form of ID.

3.7 With the requirement to check an elector's identity, provision was required for electors who may need to have their ID checked in private rather than in public in the polling station e.g. female electors who wear a niqab. Additionally there could have been circumstances when an elector needed to explain differences between their official ID and how they present at the polling station e.g.transgender electors. As such, a private area within the polling station was required. Rather than using a separate room in the polling place, screens were used within the polling station, to create a private area where ID could be checked, without a significant delay to the voting process. A mirror was also provided to enable the elector to re-adjust their niqab/covering, following the identity check, if required.

3.8 The list of acceptable IDs was varied and examples were given to polling station staff at training and in the polling station. Working the colleagues at the CO and EC, it was clear that a practical approach to checking ID in polling stations would be needed. Having been advised by the CO that examples of all passports from Commonwealth and EU countries were not available to be distributed to polling station staff, it was clear that polling station staff would have to work on a 'face-value' approach to unfamiliar documents (e.g.

passports from commonwealth countries) and unless there were clear suspicions of a document being fraudulent, would have to accept the document.

3.9   Where poll clerks referred queries to the PO, POs were instructed to be 'reasonable' in their dealings with electors whose ID had been queried. Where there was a name discrepancy, POs were advised to discuss the discrepancy with the elector to determine the reason for the difference. In such situations, the POs were advised that they had to be satisfied with the explanation before issuing a ballot paper.

3.10   Guidance for staff was circulated giving suggestions on what action to take in a variety of circumstances, depending on the type of query. In some cases, for example, where electors had changed their name, perhaps due to marriage, electors were able to provide additional ID, e.g. bank cards/marriage certificate, if they so wished. Whilst not on the official list of ID, these other forms of ID could be used to confirm the veracity of the elector's explanation. There was no requirement to ask for additional, supporting evidence, nor could electors be forced to provide it, but if the elector offered it, this could be used.

3.11   POs were also able to contact Electoral Services, to check the details against the Electoral Register, which has name change details and other records which POs, do not have access to in the polling station.

4.0   Data Collection

4.1   As part of the evaluation of the pilot, staff at polling stations were required to record what forms of ID were presented at polling stations. Staff were required to mark when the elector had been issued with a ballot paper, as normal, and also mark what type of ID was provided. To track the journey of an elector bringing ID, staff were also required to mark where an elector brought no ID or incorrect ID, to trace how many of these electors later returned with the correct ID.

4.2   Staff were also required to mark how many queries were referred to the PO (instances where there was an issue/query about the ID provided). These instances did not necessarily mean that the elector would be refused a ballot paper, but that there was not a straight match between the ID details and the electoral register details.

4.3   Officers developed a data collection form to record what ID was provided. To limit the scope for recording error, Officers suggested the use of an adapted version of the electoral register. Next to the register details, a grid was printed to mark the ID provided by each elector. This grid was separated from the register after polling day, as this would not form part of the official Marked Register.

4.4   Working with Xpress, the Elections Management System supplier, the polling station registers were adapted to incorporate the data collection form. Rather than use A3 versions of the register in the polling station, which were considered too unwieldy, Officers opted to use an A4 version. As a result, the registers for the polling stations were much larger than in previous years. However this was considered the best approach for the collection of accurate data rather than having a separate form for staff to complete.

4.5   At times it took longer to find electors on the register and polling station staff had concerns that this could cause significant delays at a parliamentary election. As the data collection form was only required as this was pilot, if the provision of ID became mandatory in the polling station, there would not be a need for a data collection form, and subsequently the registers would be printed in their usual, more manageable, format.

4.6   After the election, the ID data from the polling stations was collated. Unfortunately there were 65 instances of recording errors on the data collection forms. If the pilot is run again, this will be emphasised in staff training, to reduce the risk of it occurring again.

5.0   Local Elector Card

5.1   Where electors did not have one form of the specified ID, they would be able to obtain a Local Elector Card (LEC) from the Returning Officer. This would be locally produced photographic ID, which the elector would have to show at the polling station.

5.2   The proposals for the LEC were discussed at length to ensure that the process could be accessible, whilst still having a level of rigor at the application stage to reduce the risk of fraudulent applications. The supporting documents required for the LEC initially mirrored those required for electoral registration applications; this requirement was amended at the request of Councillors tor reduce the number of documents required. However, it was still agreed that supporting documents would needed to be provided to link the elector to the property as well as confirm the identity of the elector. Details of all the supporting evidence required was included on the LEC application form.

5.3   Where an elector did not have any supporting documents to accompany the LEC application, an attestation could be completed by another registered elector in the Borough. Again, this process is in line with the requirements for registration. Electors were directed to contact Electoral Services in these circumstances so that officers could advise electors on the best action to get their elector card. As such, when drafting the LEC application form, the attestation form was not included to keep the application form as simple as possible.

5.4   Electors were also required to provide a witnessed photo, confirming their likeness, similar to the process required for passports. Although a list of suitable people able to do this was attached the application form, this was not an exhaustive list, and other people could witness the photo. Although this information was included on the application form, this element of the LEC process would be reviewed in future.

5.5   Hard copies of photos were not required and the Electoral Services team were able to take photos of electors if requested at the Civic Offices. Where the Electoral Services team took photos at the Civic Offices, hard copies where given to the electors to be witnessed, and the digital image used to create the LEC once the completed application had been received. Photos were also taken at the roadshows in the Borough, and copies sent to the electors for witnessing.

5.6   LEC application forms were offered and supplied to political parties, to pass on to electors they identified when canvassing who informed canvassers that they did not have any of the required ID. These were made available following the Candidates and Agents briefing in March 2018. Electronic copies could also be downloaded from the WBC website. Candidates and Agents were also asked to pass details of electors who required additional assistance to obtain a LEC to Electoral Services so that this could be followed up prior to the election.

5.7   Electors were able to submit applications electronically, with copies of the supporting documents. Photos could be sent electronically also, provided that the person confirming the elector's identity submitted the photo, rather than coming directly from the elector.

5.8   The deadline for applications for LEC was 5pm, Wednesday, 2 May 2018. It was agreed that the day before polling day would provide electors, including newly registered electors, sufficient time to apply for the card. From a risk management perspective, there was the

possibility that many electors would wait until the 2 May to apply. To ensure there would be capacity to deal with a late rush of applications, two card printers were purchased, all applications were processed on the day of receipt so that there was no backlog of applications, and all staff were trained on the issuing process. In the event, there were only four applications received on 2 May, which were processed and issued before the deadline.

5.9   Analysis of the website visitor statistics show that between 1 February and 2 May there were 752 visits to the LEC information webpage, and 630 visits to the LEC application form webpage. No data is available on how many applications were subsequently downloaded for completion.

5.10   Copies of LECs were provided at the polling stations, in case electors lost/forgot their LEC when they attended the polling station. These were destroyed following the election.

5.11   In total, 63 local elector cards were issued. Six photos were taken by Electoral Services for whom a completed application was not received. Additionally, one completed application for a LEC was received from a registered postal voter. The elector confirmed that they still required a postal vote for the election, and as such the LEC was not issued.

5.12   Of the 63 LECs issued, twelve applications were supported with an attestation, as the elector did not have the necessary supporting documents. The remaining applications were submitted with the required supporting documents. All applications were accompanied with a suitable witnessed photograph.

5.13   The timescales for the applications is set out below.

Week No.	Date	LECs issued		No. of LECs applications declined
		No.	%	
Week 1	5 February 2018	0	0	0
Week 2	12 February 2018	0	0	0
Week 3	19 February 2018	0	0	1*
Week 4	26 February 2018	7	11	0
Week 5	5 March 2018	4	6	0
Week 6	12 March 2018	7	11	0
Week 7	19 March 2018	4	6	0
Week 8	26 March 2018	2	3	0
Week 9	2 April 2018	2	3	0
Week 10	9 April 2018	5	8	0
Week 11	16 April 2018	16	25	0
Week 12	23 April 2018	7	11	0
Week 13	30 April 2018	9	14	0
TOTAL		**63**		**1**

* Elector registered for a postal vote (see paragraph 5.10).

5.14 The applications were received from electors across the Borough. A breakdown of the ward issue numbers is set out below:

Ward	LECs Issued	
	No.	%
Byfleet and West Byfleet	4	6.35
Canalside	13	20.63
Goldsworth Park	5	7.94
Heathlands	7	11.11
Hoe Valley	6	9.52
Horsell	2	3.17
Knaphill	8	12.70
Mount Hermon	11	17.46
Pyrford	2	3.17
St John's	5	7.94
Total	**63**	

5.15 It can be seen that as LECs were issued from February, electors were prompted from the elections leaflet issued to arrange their ID. The increase in issue around 16 April can be attributed to the success of the promotional work carried out with The York Road Project.

5.16 As result of the publicity for the elections/local elector cards, the Officers were invited to The York Road Project to discuss the elections and electoral registration with service users. On 13 March there was a group discussion with the ESM and Communications Officer, about the elections and how to register, and on 10 April, the ESM returned to the York Road project and successfully registered 10 new electors, most of whom used the Declaration of Local Connection mechanism. These electors also applied for and were issued with LECs.

5.17 The Manager at The York Road Project has subsequently advised that these electors will be able to use their LEC as proof of ID, which means that previous barriers for applying for bank accounts and applying for benefits can be overcome. This was an unexpected but beneficial outcome of the Local Elector Cards, to help vulnerable people in the Borough.

6.0 Media Strategy and Public Engagement

6.1 Officers from the Marketing Communications team and Electoral Services worked closely with the Cabinet Office Communications Team to develop the media strategy and communications plan for the ID pilot. Whilst some elements were consistent across all areas taking part in the pilot, each strategy was tailored to meet local requirements.

6.2 The Cabinet Office Communications Team led on the branding for the pilots and provided basic artwork formats including posters, flyers and digital material. A bespoke suite of promotional materials including badges, pens, flags, business cards and ambient media, was developed by WBC for local use.

6.3 To ensure the ID pilot was successful, the media strategy and communications plan focussed on three main goals:

1. Notify electors that it was necessary to bring photographic ID to the polling station on 3 May and reinforce the message to ensure universal recall.
2. Inform electors of approved forms of photo ID that could be taken to the polling station.

3. Promote the Local Elector Card as an alternative option if the voter had no suitable photographic ID.

6.4 The wording of the materials focussed on 'Live in Woking Borough?', to emphasise that every Ward within Woking Borough would be included in the pilot but electors in other Boroughs would not be affected.

6.5 The EIA was used to inform the objectives for the media strategy and communications plan, to ensure the messages could be adapted to meet the requirements of identified target groups.

6.6 A comprehensive report on how the awareness campaign met objectives and supported the EIA is set out at Appendix B, written by the Lead Marketing Communications Officer working on the project. The report also includes the metrics reported to the Cabinet Office and a brief overview of the post-election campaign survey.

6.7 Set out below are details of key elements of the campaign to promote the ID pilot.

Elections Leaflet

6.8 The Elections Leaflet has been used for over 10 years, and is a useful way to communicate information about the elections to electors. Whilst in previous years, this has been combined with a Household Notification Letter, the leaflet was sent to each registered elector in February 2018, as the first formal Borough-wide promotion of the ID requirements.

6.9 In addition to general information about the election (e.g. key dates for the election, the role of Woking Borough Council, who is eligible to vote, how to vote and electoral offences), specific information relating the pilot was included:

- What ID is required

- How to apply for a local elector card

- ID pilot contact details (new electorcard@Woking.gov.uk email address)

Roadshows

6.10 Five roadshows were held across the Borough in March and April. Officers gave out leaflets and spoke to electors at three Supermarkets (Goldsworth Park Waitrose, Morrisons on Goldsworth Road, Sainsbury's in Brookwood), as well has having a stand in Woking Town Centre and in Woking Park.

6.11 These roadshows gave electors the opportunity to ask questions about the pilot. Additionally, new electors were identified, who were able to register to vote at the stand. Where electors did not have any forms of ID, Local elector card application forms were handed out, and seven electors were photographed for their LEC photo, which was subsequently sent to the elector for witnessing.

6.12 Officers attended the Shah Jahan Mosque on two separate Friday lunchtimes to pass on information to attendees after prayers.

6.13 Officers attended Woking College and St John the Baptist Sixth Form to promote the pilot among students and staff.

6.14 Officers attended Woking Station to handout cards a week before polling day, promoting the pilot to commuters and other train users.

Electoral Registration Communications

6.15 Information about the pilot was included on all registration confirmation letters. This would ensure anyone registering after the initial leaflet mail-out, and prior to the poll cards being issued, would get the information individually. This would also increase the time available for the elector to arrange their ID for polling day.

Digital roadshow

6.16 Officers worked with an external company to produce a 30 second animation which was shown in the Peacocks centre, as part of a digital roadshow in the week of 13 March 2018. This digital presence was supported by a representative from the external company manning the stand on behalf of the Council to hand materials to passers-by, collect data and note individual enquiries, or requests to register or receive a LEC.

Final Household Letter

6.17 In the final two weeks before the election, a final reminder was sent to all households with registered electors, to reiterate the requirements for ID.

6.18 The letter highlighted that the ID could have expired, or for a previous address (in the case of driving licences), but that the photo had to be a current likeness. The letter also reminded electors that postal voters were not affected by the pilot.

Station Ticket Barriers

6.19 Campaign materials were posted on the ticket barriers going into Woking station on both sides of the station, to promote the campaign.

Social Media

6.20 Advertising via social media raised awareness and gave Officers the opportunity to answer elector questions in a forum-style discussion, or debunk myths and misinformation when it arose.

7.0 Public Response

7.1 As shown in the comments reported on social media, there was a variety of opinions from residents about the pilot. The comments posted on the Council's social media accounts have been set out as part of Appendix B. A copy of the queries received directly by Electoral Services is set out at Appendix C. Feedback from electors at the roadshows around the Borough was overwhelmingly positive, with electors aware they needed to bring ID.

7.2 Additionally, the Returning Officer responded to an enquiry from the Shadow Minister for Voter Engagement and Youth Affairs regarding the plans in place to ensure electors would be able to vote. At a national level there were public criticisms of the pilot from national bodies which made assertions about the pilots, without obtaining details of work being carried out locally. The Returning Officer responded to these criticisms robustly

8.0   Election Staff

8.1   Four DROs were appointed with full powers whose main roles were to adjudicate on returned postal vote statements, inspect polling stations and oversee individual count teams. Additionally, the Electoral Services Manager was appointed a DRO specifically for the nomination process and the Democratic Services Manager was appointed a DRO for the postal vote opening process and the count.

8.2   The election was managed by the Electoral Services Manager (ESM), with support from two Electoral Services Officers and two Electoral Services Assistants. An additional Electoral Services Assistant was employed in January 2018 on a fixed term contract to support the additional work generated from the pilot. This provided extra resilience in the team and ensured other officers could focus on the requirements of the pilot, in addition to the 'business as usual' work for the election.

8.3   The issue and opening of postal votes was managed by the Democratic Services Manager, supported by the Democratic Services team.

8.4   In planning the staffing levels for the polling stations, in discussion with the Returning Officer, it was agreed that in principal staffing levels at polling stations would be kept the same as in previous years. Already there were several polling stations with three poll clerks, and to add, particularly at a local election, more may have been unwieldly to manage. After analysing elector numbers from previous elections, it was agreed that an extra poll clerk would be appointed in six polling stations. However, this would be reviewed if ID were required for a parliamentary election.

8.5   With the possibility for checking ID in private, 42 of the 43 polling station teams were mixed, to ensure that a female member of staff was available for checks if required. One polling station, Sutton Green Village Hall, was not a mixed team. A risk assessment was carried out that the size of the electorate did not warrant a second poll clerk and that additional staff could reach the polling station quickly if required.

8.6   Staff were notified that, when accepting an offer of employment to work in a polling station they were consenting to work during the hours of poll without a rest break and in excess of the maximum working hours provided by the Working Time Directive.

8.7   The Electoral Commission provided questionnaires for all polling station staff to complete after 7pm on polling day, to contribute to the evaluation of the pilot.

9.0   Staff Training

9.1   All polling station staff were required to attend a two hour training session to cover the requirements for polling day. The training sessions were split into two one-hour long sessions. All staff were trained together, rather than the historic split between Presiding Officers and Poll Clerks. Training all staff together ensured that there would be extra resilience in the teams, particularly if a Poll Clerk had to take on Presiding Officer duties unexpectedly.

9.2 A breakdown of the session topics is set out below:

Session 1 – Electoral Services Manager	Session 2 – Electoral Services Officer
• Pre-election day checks • Setting up the polling station (with reference to set up and use of private ID checking area; posters (with examples)) • Who can attend the polling station • Accessibility • Special Voting Procedures – proxy voters, assisted electors, spoilt ballot papers • Documentation • Who is eligible to vote? • Marking the CNL • Issuing the Ballot Papers • Postal Votes • Close of Poll Arrangements	• Elector journey in the polling station • What ID is going to be accepted (examples of the different types; requirement for original document; expired/out of date ID) • Checking the ID (face value, in private on request) • How to record the ID on the register • ID scenarios/exceptions queries

9.3 Training sessions were held on 13, 15, 19 and 21 March and 16 April 2018. Training sessions were mandatory and all staff working in the polling station had to attend one of the sessions.

9.4 All staff were issued with a handbook for the elections. This was amended from the Electoral Commission handbook usually issued for elections. Unfortunately there were some delays circulating the final copy of the handbook, as the EC were unable to amend the handbook for each pilot area. Officers amended the handbook locally, to take account of the pilot requirements and circulated this to all polling station staff.

9.5 A final briefing was held on Monday, 30 April 2018. The ESM repeated the key messages for election day, and the Returning Officer emphasised the need for consistency on polling day: checking all electors for ID, being reasonable in their approach to electors and accurately marking the data collection form.

9.6 Count supervisors attended a briefing session on Monday, 24 April 2018. The ESM explained verification and count procedures to be followed.

9.7 Feedback from polling station staff, both from the Electoral Commission paper survey completed by polling station teams on polling day, and the post election survey for Electoral Services, and provided valuable feedback for future training sessions if a further pilot is carried out. Using the experiences from 2018, training for any future pilot will be able to draw on tangible examples to assist staff.

9.8 Overall, staff reported that the training that they received regarding the ID requirements and the process to be followed in the polling station was good and prepared them for polling day.

9.9 Staff reported that they would have preferred more examples of the types of ID and forms of ID being accepted as well as role play scenarios for possible queries. It was also noted that staff would have preferred as well as greater certainty on the processes to follow in the cases of discrepancies with ID. The training materials will be reviewed and incorporated into any future pilot planning.

10.0 Engagement with Surrey Police

10.1 Officers worked closely with Surrey Police in the lead up to the election to ensure the necessary support was available in the lead up to the election and specifically on polling day itself.

10.2 The work with Surrey Police had two components; working with the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) in the Economic Crime Unit if any allegations of electoral fraud were received and working with the Neighbourhood Team to respond to local issues on polling day. A specific concern relating to the pilot was the greater risk of disorder at polling stations being caused by electors who disagreed with the pilot.

10.3 There was very positive engagement with the Neighbourhood Team and the SPOC team, Arrangements were in place on polling day which ensured Presiding Officers had direct numbers to the Neighbourhood Team in case of issues at the polling stations. This was in addition to the usual visits throughout the Borough by Officers and PCSOs.

11.0 Nominations and Candidates

Candidates and Agents' Briefing

11.1 The briefing for Candidates and Agents was given by the Returning Officer and the Electoral Services Manager on Monday, 12 March 2018. All candidates, agents and campaigners were invited to the briefing, and the briefing was very well attended.

11.2 The Borough Inspector, a representative for the Surrey Police Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Electoral Fraud and a Sergeant from the Woking Neighbourhood Team also attended the briefing.

11.3 The presentation outlined:

ID pilot	• the ID required in polling stations • how to get a Local Elector Card • the process to be followed in the polling station • how candidates and their supporters can help
Election Preparations	• the election timetable • the nomination process • the conduct expected of candidates and supporters, including the Memorandum of Understanding • electoral offences • electoral expenses

Examples of the publicity materials as well as Local Elector Card application forms were available at the briefing.

Nominations

11.4 The deadline for nominations for the elections was 4pm on Friday, 4 April 2018. All nominations were received before the 4pm deadline, and all were deemed to be valid nominations.

11.5 A link to an online questionnaire was circulated to all agents for distribution to candidates, to contribute to the evaluation of the pilot.

Election Expenses

11.6 The deadline for the return of candidates' expenses was Friday, 8 June 2018. The completed expenses returns have filed with the Returning Officer and will be stored securely at the Civic Offices for two years.

11.7 One candidate has not submitted an expenses return and this has been referred to Surrey Police.

12.0 Poll Cards

12.1 Poll cards are a key element of the election, to notify electors of the forthcoming election. The poll cards for polling station electors and any appointed proxies were amended to include all the necessary information relating to the pilot. At the request of the CO and EC, coloured text was included to highlight key messages and the font for the ID information was increased. To accommodate the required wording, the poll cards were redrafted in A4 size. The poll cards for postal voters and proxy postal voters were kept at A5 size as they were not affected by the pilot.

12.2 To ensure that these poll cards could be distributed in a cost effective manner, the poll cards were folded and enveloped to A5 size. The covering envelope was printed with 'DO NOT IGNORE THIS ENVELOPE: POLL CARD ENCLOSED' and also included the Voter ID thumbnail logo, to reduce the risk of the envelope being ignored.

12.3 Poll cards were issued to all electors in Woking on 27 March 2018, in order to give sufficient time for electors to change their voting arrangements if they so wished. Maps of the polling places were printed on the cards, as in previous years, to assist electors who were unfamiliar with their designated polling place. No problems were reported regarding the issue of poll cards.

12.4 Although electors are not required to bring their poll card to the polling station, feedback from staff commented that it assisted with locating electors on the larger format register when the elector brought their poll card. If the pilot were run again, consideration could be given to amending the wording on the poll card, to make it clear that it would be helpful if electors brought the card with them.

13.0 Postal Votes

Issue of Postal Vote Packs

13.1 There was no discernible impact on the number of postal votes issued as a result of the ID pilot. The number of postal votes issued in 2018 was similar to those issued in May 2016 and exactly the same as in May 2017.

Year	No. Of Postal Votes Issued
2016	12,236
2017	13,339
2018	13,339

13.2 The first set of postal votes were issued on Friday, 13 April 2018. Additional sets of postal votes were issued on 19 and 26 April 2018. These were for electors who registered to

vote on 17 April (registration deadline) and those who applied for a postal vote on 18 April (postal vote deadline).

13.3 Where any postal votes were cancelled by the 18 April, these postal ballot packs were removed and destroyed.

13.4 The table below sets out the number of postal votes issued for each ward.

Ward	Total
Byfleet and West Byfleet	1,408
Canalside	1,165
Goldsworth Park	1,133
Heathlands	1,543
Hoe Valley	968
Horsell	1,631
Knaphill	1,406
Mount Hermon	1,397
Pyrford	1,575
St John's	1,229
Total	**13,339**

13.5 In total, 33 replacement ballot paper packs were issued, in cases where the elector advised that they had spoilt their ballot papers, lost their postal ballot papers, or had not received them. In such circumstances, the original postal vote ballot paper was cancelled and new postal vote pack issued.

Opening of Postal Votes

13.6 Opening sessions started on Tuesday, 24 April 2018. The opening sessions were held in the Kemp Room at HG Wells Conference and Events Centre, managed by the Democratic Services team. As in previous years, the DROs adjudicated the postal vote scanning. Agents were advised in advance of the dates of the opening sessions.

13.7 In total 11 opening sessions were held. A full breakdown of the opening sessions is set out at Schedule 2. The final opening session was held from 5.00 pm on the evening of the election. The evening session dealt with those postal votes received in the post on the day of the election, those handed in at either the Civic Offices or polling stations and those returned by the Post Office through the final sweep.

13.8 Two collections of postal votes from polling stations were arranged during the election day to minimise the number of postal votes to be opened after the close of polls. The post box at the Civic Offices was checked at 10.00 pm and a final 'sweep' was undertaken by the Royal Mail at their delivery office, which resulted in a further 48 postal votes being received.

13.9 The total number of postal votes received on polling day 854. These postal votes were processed and verified by 12.00am.

13.10 Set out below is a summary of the returned postal vote envelopes returned. The overall return rate for the Borough was 71.4%.

Ward	Total
Byfleet and West Byfleet	948
Canalside	781
Goldsworth Park	792
Heathlands	1,106
Hoe Valley	634
Horsell	1,215
Knaphill	958
Mount Hermon	1019
Pyrford	1,122
St John's	916
Total	**9,491**

Initial Verification of Returns

13.11 Postal votes are opened and the contents checked prior to the checking of the postal vote statement. At this stage, a postal vote can be rejected for the following reasons:

- Ballot Papers Numbers do not match – ballot papers cannot be accepted where the number on the ballot paper envelope does not match the number on the postal vote statement.

- Ballot Paper Envelope missing.

- Postal Vote Statement was absent.

13.12 The number of statements rejected at this stage was:

Ward	Total Envelopes Received	Total Statements Rejected/Absent	Total Sent to Scanner
Byfleet and West Byfleet	948	27	921
Canalside	781	8	773
Goldsworth Park	792	13	779
Heathlands	1,106	22	1,084
Hoe Valley	634	13	621
Horsell	1,215	22	1,193
Knaphill	958	11	947
Mount Hermon	1019	14	1,005
Pyrford	1,122	22	1,100
St John's	916	15	901
Borough Total	**9,491**	**167**	**9,324**

Verification of Postal Vote Statements

13.13 After the initial checks, postal vote statements are verified, to ensure the signature and date of birth provided on the statement matches those on the original postal vote application.

13.14 The reasons for rejecting a postal vote at this stage are:

- Date of Birth Rejected – either the date of birth has not been entered on the postal vote statement, or it does not match the date of birth provided on the postal vote application.

- Signature Rejected – either the signature has not been entered on the postal vote statement, or it does not match the signature provided on the postal vote application.

- Signature and Date of Birth Rejected - either the voter did not complete the postal vote statement or both the signature and date of birth provided on the postal vote statement did not match the signature and date of birth provided on the postal vote application.

13.15 The table below sets out the rejection rates at the scanner for the postal vote statements:

Ward	Valid	Rejected		Rejected		
		No.	%	DOB & Sig	DOB	Sig
Byfleet and West Byfleet	911	10	1.09	3	3	4
Canalside	746	27	3.49	3	7	17
Goldsworth Park	768	11	1.41	0	3	8
Heathlands	1,070	14	1.29	1	5	8
Hoe Valley	607	14	2.25	0	4	10
Horsell	1,180	13	1.09	7	6	0
Knaphill	937	10	1.06	0	5	5
Mount Hermon	997	8	0.80	0	3	5
Pyrford	1,083	17	1.55	4	2	11
St John's	891	10	1.11	2	2	6
Borough Total	**9,190**	**134**	**1.44**	**20**	**40**	**74**

13.16 The overall rejection rate for postal votes was 1.44%. This is a similar rejection rate for 2017 which was 1.45%.

Post - Scanning Checks

13.17 Following the scanning of the postal vote statements, the contents of the ballot paper envelope are checked. A postal vote can be rejected at this stage for the following reasons:

- Ballot Papers Numbers do not match – ballot papers cannot be accepted where the number on the ballot paper does not match the number on the ballot paper envelope.

- Ballot Papers were absent

13.18 The number of postal votes rejected at this stage is set out below:

Ward	Total accepted at the scanner	Rejected at post scanning stage	Total Postal votes accepted
Byfleet and West Byfleet	911	0	911
Canalside	746	4	742
Goldsworth Park	768	0	768
Heathlands	1,070	0	1,070
Hoe Valley	607	0	607
Horsell	1,180	1	1,179
Knaphill	937	0	937
Mount Hermon	997	0	997
Pyrford	1,083	1	1,082
St John's	891	3	888
Borough Total	**9,190**	**9**	**9,181**

13.19 The overall rejection rates are set out below:

Ward	Postal Votes Accepted	Ballot Papers Rejected	% of Ballot Papers rejected
Byfleet and West Byfleet	911	37	3.90
Canalside	742	39	4.99
Goldsworth Park	768	24	3.03
Heathlands	1,070	36	3.25
Hoe Valley	607	27	4.26
Horsell	1,179	36	2.96
Knaphill	937	21	2.19
Mount Hermon	997	22	2.16
Pyrford	1,082	40	3.57
St John's	888	28	3.06
Borough Total	**9,181**	**310**	**3.27**

13.20 The overall rejection rate at 3.27% was lower than in 2017, which was 3.79%

13.21 Any errors relating to personal identifiers were recorded at the scanners. Where electors needed to update their identifier, they were contacted following the election. Any clerical errors were also corrected.

14.0 Polling Stations

14.1 43 polling stations were used for the elections in 29 venues. There was one change to the normal polling station arrangements, relating to Oaktree Infant School, which is set out below.

14.2 All polling equipment, including the privacy screens were delivered prior to polling day and Presiding Officers were asked to record any issues that occurred or were reported on polling day in a log book. This included possible errors on the register, visits from Police Officers and cases where electors were marked as an absent voter and claimed not to have asked for a postal vote. This information has been analysed and, where appropriate, electors have been contacted.

14.3 Additional vinyl signs were provided to all polling stations to be put up out the polling stations reminding electors to bring their ID. Fliers were also available in the polling stations to be given to electors who brought the wrong or no ID. Translations in eight languages were also provided: Bengali, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish and Urdu. A large print copy of the details were also available.

14.4 Polling stations were also issued with a hard copy of the pilot Order, for instances where electors queried the validity of the pilot. Although the CO only issued the signed copy from the Minister, and this was also queried as being valid, it has been reported that having the Order was helpful for staff.

14.5 From feedback from polling station inspectors, although staff were instructed to ask for ID first without checking it, it has been reported that in some instances staff carried out an initial check of the ID at this stage before checking the elector details on the register.

St John's Cornerstone Centre

14.6 There was one incident where elector refused to confirm their name and address. There was a further incident where an elector challenged the validity of the election and caused a disturbance at the polling station. The validity of the signed Order available in the polling station was challenged. A DRO attended polling station as well as an Officer from Surrey Police. The DRO explained the position to the elector, however the elector was not able to vote, as they were not registered to vote.

14.7 The prospective elector has been contacted to register to vote, although no registration has, to date, been completed. He has also been sent a copy of the pilot order with the official date of implementation included.

The Lightbox

14.8 Comments were received that staff in the polling station should be wearing ID.

Red Cross

14.9 One query was received as to why taxi/hackney carriage licences were not accepted. This issue was reported by the Press Association, with comments from a local Councillor. This matter was not raised with the Returning Officer prior to polling day nor on polling day itself.

<u>Goldsworth Park Guides and Scouts Headquarters</u>

14.10 One incident was recorded with an elector who caused a disruption at the polling station when she would not produce ID, and was not issued with a ballot paper. Police arrived for a routine check and following discussions with the elector, the elector left the polling station.

<u>Woking Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club</u>

14.11 There was one report of some electors bringing their poll card, mistakenly thinking it was their Local Elector Card. Of these, one person was not able to provide one of the valid forms of ID.

<u>Horsell Evangelical Church</u>

14.12 One incident occurred where an elector demanded to vote without showing the necessary ID. The elector obstructed the ballot box for other electors and refused to move. The elector had a lengthy conversation with the ESM, during which time he also caused an obstruction in the polling station and refused to end the call. The police were called at 7.50pm, and arrived at 8.05pm. Officers spoke to the elector and he left the polling station.

<u>Trinity Methodist Church</u>

14.13 It was reported that an elector showed a rail season ticket photocard, which he had obtained using a different name, to demonstrate that this was not a suitable form of ID for the pilot. The elector then produced his real, valid ID to vote legitimately.

<u>The Vyne</u>

14.14 One elector requested that it be recorded that it was stressful getting her son's Local Elector Card.

<u>Alpha Road Community Hall</u>

14.15 The Presiding Officer reported an issue with the electoral register shortly after the opening of the polling station. We are aware that one elector and was unable to remain at the polling station whilst this issue was resolved due to time pressures and left the polling station. However the other affected electors were able to stay and cast their vote as normal once the situation had been rectified.

<u>Knaphill Scouts Headquarters</u>

14.16 At previous elections, there were reports of congestion on the narrow access road to the site. This year, parking areas were coned off, and no issues were reported.

<u>Oaktree Infant School</u>

14.17 The Headteacher of Oaktree Infant School made representations prior to the election regarding the use of the school as a polling station, as Oaktree Infant School is the only school that is used as a polling place in the Borough. Officers investigated the use of possible alternative venues within the polling district, but there were no other suitable venues that can be used as a polling place and that could accommodate the number of electors within the polling district.

14.18 At the school's suggestion, Officers investigated the option of using part of the school on 3 May, whilst keeping the rest of the school open. The Headteacher considered that this arrangement would be preferable for parents and pupils, rather than the full closure of the school. The school advised Officers that this would be manageable from their point of view and arrangements were drawn up to ensure the safeguarding of the pupils at the school. These arrangements were agreed with the Headteacher and enacted on polling day.

14.19 Disabled electors had to be escorted through the school by staff to access the polling station, and in the interim arrangements there were no spaces for tellers.

14.20 Representations regarding the use of the school as a polling station have been made to the local MP. Whilst the arrangements in place were manageable for a local election, however could not be sustained for a general election. Therefore, Officers will be prioritising St Johns West in the forthcoming review of polling districts and polling places which will be conducted in the autumn.

Observers

14.21 Observers from the Electoral Commission and Cabinet Office attended all polling stations in Woking to observe proceedings. Other accredited observers are also known to have visited the polling stations, including academics studying the impact of the pilot.

15.0 ID Provision in the polling stations

15.1 As previously reported, the polling station staff recorded the form of ID provided by electors when marking the register. This information was then separated to form the marked registers for the polling station.

15.2 A full breakdown of the types of ID provided at the polling station is set out at Appendix D.

Ward	Verification Total	Referred	ID Presented Total	Driving Licence	Passport	Surrey Senior	Season Ticket	Biometric Residence	EEA ID Card	Surrey Disabled	Local Elector Card	16-25 Rail Card	Northern Ireland	Surrey Student
Byfleet and West Byfleet	1,979	2	1,966	1,217	406	316	15	1	6	3	2	0	0	0
Canalside	1,963	0	1,950	1,126	563	160	20	42	29	2	7	1	0	0
Goldsworth Park	1,688	4	1,672	949	451	239	12	3	7	7	1	2	1	0
Heathlands	1,790	3	1,784	1,109	455	199	10	3	1	0	5	2	0	0
Hoe Valley	1,631	6	1,628	991	428	159	11	20	8	4	5	2	0	0
Horsell	2,060	7	2,055	1,193	529	284	31	5	6	2	3	2	0	0
Knaphill	1,619	0	1,619	996	327	265	8	2	8	5	7	1	0	0
Mount Hermon	2,027	3	2,023	1,216	577	146	27	31	6	7	7	6	0	0
Pyrford	2,114	1	2,112	1,356	482	246	11	3	8	3	2	1	0	0
St John's	1,929	9	1,926	1,129	466	283	15	1	16	10	4	1	0	1
Total	**18,800**	**35**	**18,735**	**11,282**	**4,684**	**2,297**	**160**	**111**	**95**	**43**	**43**	**18**	**1**	**1**

15.3   This data was published on 21 May 2018, with a press release from the Returning Officer, noting the positive engagement from local electors in the pilot. This set out at Appendix E.

15.4   It is clear that photo driving licences and passports were the most popular form of ID used in the polling station. It is positive to see that the Senior Bus Pass was a popular ID type, with just over 12% of electors opting to use this form of ID.

15.5   Data from Surrey County Council showed that in November 2017, 13,361 Surrey Senior and Surrey Senior plus companion bus passes had been issued in the GU21, GU22 and KT14 postcodes. The 2,297 electors who used this bus pass equates to 17.2% of the know bus pass users.

15.6   Although 160 people did use their rail season ticket photocard, following feedback from electors and also polling station staff, this would not be proposed for future use, due to the lack of scrutiny on its issue.

15.7   Unfortunately, there were 65 recording errors in the polling stations on the data collection. The need for accuracy will be picked up in future staff training sessions.

15.8   The details of the electors who provided incorrect ID or no ID is set out below:

Ward	Wrong ID - Returned with Correct	No ID - Returned with Correct	Wrong ID - No Return	No ID - No Return
Byfleet and West Byfleet	3	3	0	1
Canalside	2	3	3	1
Goldsworth Park	3	0	4	1
Heathlands	1	7	4	6
Hoe Valley	1	2	2	2
Horsell	6	1	3	2
Knaphill	1	2	1	2
Mount Hermon	1	0	3	0
Pyrford	0	1	0	10
St John's	1	0	3	3
Total	**19**	**19**	**23**	**28**

Ballot Refusal Forms

15.9   Where Presiding Officers were unable to issue a ballot paper, and the elector made it clear that they would not be returning with the correct form of ID, the Presiding Officer was required to complete a Ballot Refusal Form (BRF).

15.10 In total 30 BRFs were completed; BRFs were not completed at 25 polling stations. A breakdown of their completion by ward is set out below with reasons for issue.

Ward	BRF issued	No ID	Wrong ID	Refuse on Principle	Other
Byfleet and West Byfleet	2	2	0	0	0
Canalside	4	0	4	0	0
Goldsworth Park	5	1	3	1	0
Heathlands	3	0	2	0	1
Hoe Valley	7	2	4	0	1
Horsell	3	0	2	1	0
Knaphill	0	0	0	0	0
Mount Hermon	3	1	2	0	0
Pyrford	1	0	1	0	0
St John's	5	0	2	3	0
	33	6	20	5	2
Electors Returning with ID	3				
TOTAL BRF	30				

15.11 The reasons for completing the BRF marked 'other' were one elector not being aware of the ID requirements and one elector refusing to confirm their name and address on the register.

16.0 ID Types Evaluation

16.1 Comments have been received regarding the types of ID included in the pilot, and what would be suitable for inclusion for future pilots.

Rail Season Ticket Photocards

16.2 As stated previously, representations have been received regarding the inclusion of rail season ticket photocards, as these are relatively easy to obtain without sufficiently rigorous checks at application stage. Feedback was also received that in some instances, images on season ticket photocards could be 20 years old, and may not be a true likeness.

16.3 One elector visited the Civic Offices with a season ticket photocard which he had applied for under the name of his neighbour, to demonstrate the ease in which fraudulent photocards could be obtained. The elector tore up the photocard in the presence of Electoral Services staff, and advised that he would be voting using his correct ID.

16.4 Although the season ticket was used by 160 electors, if the scheme were to be used again, these would not be proposed to be included.

Alternative ID for inclusion

16.5 To assist disabled electors, if the pilot is run again, Blue Badges would be proposed to be included.

16.6 There would also be further discussion regarding other local authority issued photo IDs (e.g. taxi licences) and government issued occupational passes (such as MOD ID passes and police warrant cards).

16.7 Consideration would also be given to alternative ID for students, such as NUS cards, local college ID badges, or other national youth ID schemes. Advice will be sought from the CO and EC on the best forms of ID to include.

16.8 Representations were also received that the photo ID scheme did not prove that electors were resident at the address where they were registered, therefore documents proving residence should also be provided at the polling station. However, the issue of residency is dealt with at the registration stage, rather than when voting, therefore was not within the scope of the pilot.

17.0 Verification and Count

17.1 All polling station documentation and ballot boxes were returned to HG Wells on Thursday, 3 May following the close of polls. These were stored in the Wells Room overnight with additional security guard presence.

17.2 The verification and count was held on Friday, 4 May 2018 at HG Wells Conference and Events Centre from 9.30am.

17.3 There were five count teams consisting of a count supervisor, an assistant count supervisor and twenty count assistants. Three Count teams were located in the Wells Room and two teams were located in the Kemp Room.

17.4 The count in the Wells Room was completed and teams released by 2pm. However following close results, the count in the Kemp Room continued until 2.30pm.

17.5 During the count, security staff were in place at the entrances to the Wells Room and the Kemp Room. CCTV cameras were installed at HG Wells which covered the document sorting area, the counting areas and the entrances to the rooms.

17.6 Colour coded badges were issued to attendees, to differentiate between levels of security access for all those in attendance. The Candidates and their agents, together with a guest, were invited to attend the Count and all Borough Councillors were invited to attend as guests of the RO.

17.7 'Elect IT' was used to manage the count invites and count badges. This was used to send out count invites and badges. No issues were reported with the delivery of the badges and where additional badges were required, generated at the Count.

17.8 A live television feed to the Griffin Bar from the Count Hall was provided to accommodate any individuals not included on the invitation lists. BBC news coverage was also provided in the Griffin Bar.

Storage of Documents

17.9 All documents returned from polling stations and counted ballot papers were sorted into crates in the Wells Room and these were sealed and removed to a secure store on Friday, 4 May.

Media Coverage

17.10 Representatives of the local press attended the count. The Marketing Communications Manager co-ordinated the press activities before and during the count, to ensure that

there was a smooth supply of information. The results were made available on the website straightaway.

<u>Turnout</u>

17.11 The average turnout for the elections was 37.7% A comparative turnout report for local elections is attached as part of Appendix D.

18.0 Costs

18.1 The costs for the pilot have been submitted to the Cabinet Office, which will be covering the additional costs incurred. A breakdown of the costs is set out below:

<u>Staffing Costs</u>

18.2 Six additional poll clerks were employed in polling stations, which had been highlighted as potentially having the highest volume of electors. Additionally, all polling station staff were paid an increased fee for training, as they were required to attend more training, and also the fee for the day was increased, to reflect the additional responsibilities in the polling station.

Role	Number	Normal fee per staff member (£)	Pilot fee per staff member (£)	Additional cost of pilot (£)
Presiding officer fee	43	199.00	250.00	**2,193.00**
Poll clerk fee	91	119.00	150.00	**2,821.00**
Presiding officer training	43	40.00	60.00	**860.00**
Poll clerk training	91	20.00	30.00	**910.00**
Additional poll clerk:				
Fee	6	n/a	150.00	**900.00**
Training	6	n/a	30.00	**180.00**
Travel	6	n/a	7.00	**42.00**
TOTAL				**7,906**

<u>Poll Card Costs</u>

18.3 As stated previously, the poll cards for polling station electors were printed on A4 paper, in colour, and were enveloped. Therefore there was additional printing and enveloping costs for the poll cards.

Item	Number	Additional Costs for Pilot (£)
Poll card printing	61,488	**3,591.00**
Poll Card Envelope and Fulfilment	61,488	**4,728.00**
Poll Card Postage	61,488	**7,470.88**
TOTAL		**15,789.88**

<u>Polling Station Equipment Costs</u>

18.4 Two ID card printers were purchased for the generation of the Local Elector Cards. Two were purchased to ensure there was resilience within the card production process. Additionally, 35 privacy screens were purchased, to be placed at each polling place, with spares if required.

Item	Number	Cost (£)	Additional cost of pilot (£)
Privacy Screen	35	48.95	1,713.25
Mirrors	29	1.00	29.00
Vinyl Banners for Outside Polling Station	50		1,170.00
TOTAL			2,912.25

Local Elector Card Costs

18.5 The costs below set out the total outlay for equipment to generate the Local Elector Cards. Once generated, unless collected in person, the Local Elector Cards were sent to electors using Royal Mail Recorded Delivery to the elector.

Item	Number	Cost (£)	Additional cost of pilot (£)
ID Card printers	2	1,260.00	2,520.00
Print cartridges (250 images)	4	168	84.00
PVC Cards (pack of 500)	1	46.80	46.80
Cleaning Kits	2	57.60	57.60
ID Card Design Software	1	Free	0.00
ID Card Postage	57	1.77	100.89
TOTAL			2,809.29

Publicity

18.6 The table below sets out the costs for the publicity for the pilot. This includes direct mailings to electors, as well as generic marketing materials.

Item	Description/Content	Cost (£)	Additional Cost of Pilot (£)
Household Leaflet	Leaflet distributed to every elector and household with no registered electors, to outline the details of the election and ID pilot in February 2018. This leaflet is usually sent to every household before each election.	13,872.41	6015.75
Household Leaflet Postage		25,543.86	11,316.90
Council Tax Flier	A5 Flier included in Council Tax mailing, March 2018.	635.04	635.04
Final Household Reminder	Letter sent to every household with registered electors to remind about ID pilot in April 2018. This was an additional element of the campaign.	4,947.36	4,947.36
Final Household Reminder Postage		23,794.13	23,794.13
Car Park Banner Installation	Banner for Car Park in Woking	120.00	120.00
Car Park Banner		270.00	270.00

Production			
Digital Film Production	Digital Roadshow in Woking Peacocks Shopping Centre for a week in March; content then available for WBC website	4,188.00	**4,188.00**
Floor Sticker Artwork	Floor Stickers promoting Voter ID for Various locations in Wolsey Place and Peacocks Shopping Centre	90.00	**90.00**
Floor Stickers Printing		900.00	**900.00**
Floor Sticker Installation		856.30	**856.30**
Floor Sticker Removal		420.00	**420.00**
Newspaper Advertising	Woking News and Mail, Surrey Advertiser content promoting ID	3,711.00	**3,711.00**
Woking Train Station Adgates	Adverts placed on automatic ticket barriers at Woking Station	3,859.20	**3,859.20**
Roadside Bus Shelter Posters	Adverts place on bus shelters around the Borough.	5,640.00	**5,640.00**
Round and About' Magazine advertising	Locally distributed magazine	1,260.00	**1,260.00**
Supermarket Advertising	Adverts place on bus shelters at supermarkets	1,350.00	**1,350.00**
Facebook Advertising	Reminder to bring ID post, video awareness campaign and survey distribution	679.10	**679.10**
Radio Woking Advertising	Reminder to bring ID	270.00	**270.00**
Artwork Design	Artwork Design for additional items of publicity	1,593.00	**1,593.00**
Translation Costs	Translation of key documents into 8 languages	320.00	**320.00**
Voter ID A3 Posters	Polling station posters	110.40	**110.40**
Voter ID Posters	Drive-by board posters	235.34	**235.34**
Voter ID Posters	Promotional materials	195.60	**195.60**
Voter ID A5 Fliers	Promotional materials for roadshow, front line staff and political parties	466.00	**466.00**
Voter ID Badges	Promotional materials for roadshow, front line staff, Centres for the Community and political parties	510.00	**510.00**
Voter ID Business Cards	Promotional materials for roadshow, front line staff and political parties	352.80	**352.80**
Voter ID Flags	Promotional materials for roadshows and front line staff	660.00	**660.00**
Voter ID Pens	Promotional materials for roadshows, front line staff, Centres for the Community	528.00	**528.00**

Voter ID Posters and Roll Top Banner (15)	Additional print run of promotional materials and roll top banners for roadshows, Civic Offices, front line staff and Centres for the Community	1,507.84	**1,507.84**
Voter ID T-shirts	Promotional materials for roadshows, Civic Offices and Centres for the Community	400.50	**400.50**
TOTAL		**99,285.88**	**77,202.26**

19.0 Electoral Integrity

19.1 The Returning Officer reviewed the provision of a permanent police presence at the polling stations at Maybury and Sheerwater. Given that no allegations of fraudulent behaviour had been reported at these stations at recent elections, the RO decided not to employ additional police officers in these areas on the basis that any problems would be reported immediately and that this could be reinstated at future elections, if required.

19.2 One allegation of electoral fraud was reported to the RO relating to treating. This allegation was referred to the SPOC for further investigation. The SPOC and Returning Officer wrote jointly to the agent of the candidate concerned, advising that the matter had been noted and that subject to no further allegations being received, no action would be taken at that point.

19.3 One instance of a candidate not submitting Electoral Expenses has also been referred to Surrey Police. No further information is available at this point.

20.0 Going forward

20.1 The Cabinet Office and Electoral Commission have not yet published their formal evaluations of the pilots run on 3 May 2018. The Cabinet Office has indicated, however that from the preliminary data from the piloting authorities, it is likely that there will be a second round of pilots to be run on 2 May 2019.

20.2 It is therefore proposed that, given the success of the pilot locally on 3 May 2018, Woking participate in any pilots run in May 2019. It is proposed that a similar ID scheme be run for the local elections, with some changes to the agreed photographic ID list (including the inclusion of the Blue Badge and removal of the Rail Season Ticket photocard) and refining the process for the Local Elector Card.

20.3 The results from May 2018 indicate that electors were able to arrange the necessary ID for voting in the polling station. Running the pilot again would provide additional data for the Cabinet Office to support a more secure voting process in the polling station.

REPORT ENDS