

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Resolution**

**Report to:** Finance Scrutiny Committee – 23 July 2015  
Executive - 29 July 2015

**Subject:** Electoral Registration and the 2015 canvass

**Report of:** The Chief Executive

**Purpose of Report**

This report outlines approaches to the 2015 annual electoral registration process, including opportunities to capitalise on progress made to improve the completeness and accuracy of the register maintaining the momentum gained during the transition to Individual Electoral Registration and in the pre election period. The report examines the impact of emerging trends, delivery options and how evaluation of this activity will inform optimum medium to long term approaches to registration for the future.

**Recommendations**

Finance Scrutiny Committee and the Executive are requested to:-

1. endorse the approaches agreed by the Elections and Registration Members' Working Group regarding proposals for delivery of the 2015 annual registration process and doorknock canvass including resources, priorities for community engagement and options to embed integration opportunities into business as usual processes going forward; and
2. note that a full review of the cost and efficiency of delivery will be undertaken immediately after the conclusion of the canvass to identify value for money approaches to registration for the future.

**Wards Affected** All

Community Strategy Spine	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
Performance of the economy of the region and sub region	Electoral Registration contributes to every spine of the Community Strategy.  Only citizens who are registered to vote can vote at elections and referenda, which in a representative democracy is the principal
Reaching full potential in education and employment	
Individual and collective self esteem – mutual respect	

Neighbourhoods of Choice	<p>mechanism through which the majority of citizens can express their views regarding who represents them and to influence decision makers.</p> <p>The Electoral Register is also a key dataset used by credit reference agencies to confirm residence and citizens who are not on the electoral register may therefore experience difficulty obtaining credit.</p> <p>The Electoral Register is also used by the Boundary Commission for England and Local Government Boundary Commission to determine electoral arrangements i.e. the number of Councillors and MPs to represent each area.</p>
--------------------------	---

**Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for**

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

---

### **Financial Consequences – Revenue**

None arising directly from this report.

Manchester has been allocated £254,576 additional funding by the Cabinet Office to support the delivery of individual electoral registration in 2015/16. Officers are working with Cabinet Office officials to seek additional justification led funding bid.

From the 2016/17 financial year onwards, Individual Electoral Registration will be entirely funded by the Council. It is therefore critical that options to make registration more cost effective and to achieve the volumes required for registers to be complete and accurate are considered as part of this final funded canvass.

### **Financial Consequences – Capital**

None

---

### **Contact Officers:**

Sir Howard Bernstein  
Chief Executive  
0161 234 3006  
h.bernstein@manchester.gov.uk

Liz Treacy  
City Solicitor  
0161 234 4098  
l.treacy@manchester.gov.uk

Kate Brown  
Head of Electoral Services  
0161 234 3147  
kate.brown@manchester.gov.uk

Lesley Spencer  
Canvass & Registration Programme Manager  
0161 234 3814  
l.spencer@manchester.gov.uk

## **1.0 Overview**

1.1 The 7 May polls were the first elections delivered since the introduction of Individual Electoral Registration (IER) in June 2014. A report outlining the planning and governance arrangements for the implementation of IER in Manchester was considered by Finance Scrutiny Committee on 12 December and the Executive on 18 December 2013. Subsequent reports on progress towards the transition and implementation were considered by Finance Scrutiny Committee on 6 March and 25 September 2014.

1.2 It was recognised from the outset that IER would be challenging for cities such as Manchester with such a significant population churn and that it would have a disproportionate impact on certain under registered groups such as young people and those living in private rented accommodation.

1.3 There was significant activity therefore to encourage registration and to support effective transition between June 2014 and February 2015. As a result of this, the register used for the 7 May polls contained 365,200 electors, 16,574 fewer than at the start of implementation in June 2014. The 1 December registers have traditionally been considered an accurate gauge of registration levels. However, since December 2014, levels have fluctuated before stabilising prior to the 7 May polls.

1.5 As part of the Electoral Registration Officer's (ERO) ongoing duty to take all necessary steps for the purpose of maintaining the register, there is a requirement to undertake a full household canvass from July 2015 prior to publication of the electoral register on 1 December, 2015. Currently, legislation provides that this register should be used by the Boundary Commission for England to inform its forthcoming review of parliamentary boundaries.

1.6 This report outlines how it is proposed to capitalise on progress made to improve the completeness and accuracy of the register during this canvass, by maintaining the momentum gained during the IER transition and in the pre election period, and taking into account lessons learned and building on the skills and specialisms developed.

1.7 The report focuses on delivery in the short term including resourcing and funding considerations. A full review of costs and the efficiency of new approaches will be undertaken immediately after the canvass to identify the impact of emerging trends, value for money and to develop an optimum approach to registration in the future.

## **2.0 Registration and the 7 May polls**

2.1 An evaluation of the Parliamentary General and Local Elections on 7 May has been completed. Overall the election was administered to a high standard and feedback from stakeholders was overwhelmingly positive. However as always there are lessons that can be learned and an evaluation of delivery of these polls has focused in particular on registration, given that these polls were the first delivered since the introduction of IER.

2.2 In Manchester, there has been a significant change in registration patterns which appears to be a direct consequence of online registration, with tens of thousands of electors waiting until close to the deadline to register online to be able to vote on 7 May. This is despite comprehensive canvass activity, including letters, engagement and communication with residents, particularly under registered groups. 46,901 people were added to the register from December 2014, of which nearly 50% (20,018) were added between 30 March and 7 May 2015. It is estimated that additions represent three fifths of the total applications made with the remaining two fifths being duplicate applications. Annex 1 shows the monthly electorate and changes made from December.

2.3 There was also a major channel shift for new applicants in advance of the elections with 97.3% of unsolicited applications being made online.

2.4 The impact of these emerging trends on this and future annual canvasses and optimum investment of resource into registration post December 2015 will be considered to assure accurate and complete registers going forward.

### **3.0 The 2015 Canvass**

3.1 As part of the duty to take all necessary steps to maintain the electoral register, the household canvass aims to establish the names and addresses of unregistered people who are entitled to be included on the register and invite them to register; and to establish those people who are registered but are not entitled to be, to commence the process of deletion.

3.2 The prescribed legal steps for the first full annual canvass under Individual Electoral Registration include:-

- Sending a Household Enquiry Forms (HEFS) to every address, followed by two reminders and a household visit if no response.
- Sending Invitations to Register to any person named on a HEF who is not currently registered, followed by two reminders and a household visit if no response.
- Making contact by such other means as the ERO thinks appropriate with persons who do not have an entry on the register
- Inspecting records held by any persons which the ERO is permitted to inspect

3.3 HEFs will therefore be sent to all 220,000+ properties in Manchester to confirm who is resident at an address. Any person added to a HEF must be sent an ItR followed by two reminders and at least one personal visit. Any person whose name is removed from a HEF cannot be deleted from the register without secondary evidence or a separate statutory review of their entitlement to remain registered.

3.4 Owing to the different demographics and spatial profile of polling districts across the city, it is proposed that a range of different approaches are adopted to the canvass, with Polling Districts with higher churn and historically low response rates receiving direct visits on the doorstep earlier in the process to gather information and encourage registration.

3.5 This canvass will be significantly larger and more complex than the 2014 transitional canvass, which focused solely on seeking responses from individuals whose details had not matched as part of the confirmation live run data matching exercise and had not responded to their ItR. 48,290 individuals were included in this door knock canvass (excluding students). The 2015 canvass will have multiple overlapping stages, with the HEF and ItR chase up processes coming together.

3.6 Based on response rates to HEFs and ItRs nationally during the 2014 transition, it is anticipated that response rates to both will be lower than in the household canvasses held pre IER. This is likely to be compounded by 'registration fatigue' given the proximity to the parliamentary general election and the lack of a clear incentive for people to register.

#### Non IER registered electors

3.7 One of the key safeguards put in place to mitigate the fall in elector levels for the the transition to IER was that any elector who did not match against DWP records in June 2014 would remain registered unless they registered elsewhere, or relevant legal steps had been taken to remove their entry (based on evidence that they had moved for example). At present, there are 23,737 non IER registered electors on Manchester's electoral register, all of whom have been sent multiple letters and received household visits over the past 16 months. Annex 2 shows current registration figures by Polling District.

3.8 The law currently provides for these non IER registered individuals to remain registered until the transition to IER ends on 1 December 2016, unless the government decides to bring forward this transition date to 1 December 2015, after the 2015 canvass has finished. The government is required to make its decision on whether to end the transition early by no later than the end of August and must have regard to the Electoral Commission's recommendation regarding the timing of this transition.

3.9 On 18th June, the Electoral Commission published its recommendation on when the transition to IER should end. This report was informed by an analysis of electoral registers used for the May 2015 polls and found:

- Registers increased by 1% between December 2014 and May 2015
- 4% of entries nationally - or 1.9 million entries - are non IER registered individuals
- There are a number of important polls in 2016, including Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly elections, and the December 2015 registers will be used as the basis of the parliamentary boundary review
- The transition to IER should not therefore end in December 2015 due to the risk of these individuals having no entry on any electoral register, albeit that the majority of these entries are likely to be redundant.

- The Order bringing forward the end of the transition must be made by August 2015 and the Commission considers that the government would have no reliable data upon which to base this decision given it is at the start of the annual canvass
- Attainer registration is significantly lower under IER – since February 2014, there has been a 47% drop in the number of attainers registered to vote nationally, a group which was already under-registered. The Commission attribute this to the absence of a comprehensive household canvass in 2014. Manchester currently has 1,714 attainers compared to 2,178 in June 2014, a smaller reduction (21%) than the national average largely attributable to work undertaken since June with Schools, Colleges and Manchester Youth Council.
- The government must consider how the system can be improved, including better use of central government data and working with EROs to explore opportunities to integrate IER into other transactions i.e. when registering for a GP, applying for a passport and driving licence etc

3.10 The 2015 Annual Registration process includes a clear strategy for engaging with these 23k non IER registered individuals, including invitations to register and personal visits. The number of non IER registered electors should reduce significantly during this canvass. However, if the government does decide to bring forward the end of the transition, up to 23,737 entries will automatically be removed from the register on 1 December 2015.

#### Comparison and Analysis of numbers on registers

3.11 A comparison and analysis of the impact of IER comparing the register in June 2014 (used for the start of implementation) with the register in May 2015 (used for the 7 May polls) is attached at Annex 4. This includes analysis of levels of churn; the average number of electors per property; zero elector properties; attainers and student data. The analysis confirms the risk based assumption used in planning for IER, highlighting which wards will be most challenging to canvass.

#### Intelligence from previous IER canvasses

3.12 As this is the first full household canvass under IER, there is little information or intelligence either locally or nationally on the most effective way to conduct the activity. Limited empirical evidence is available from the 2014 transitional canvass due to software issues. The data that is available has been considered alongside national evaluations conducted by the Electoral Commission and Cabinet Office, and MCC demographic data, particularly relating to churn.

3.13 Pre IER canvassing (under the household registration system) typically resulted in a 50% response rate to the first communication and a similar response rate to the first reminder, leaving approximately 50,000 properties to be canvassed. HEF canvassing of zero elector properties in July 2014 drew an average 39% response rate. Response rates to 2014 ItR canvass (shown in **Annex 3**) demonstrates the challenges in encouraging responses, with an average 12%

response rate to initial ItRs, a 13% response rate to the first reminder and a 26% response rate to the personal visit.

3.14 It is estimated that in addition to responses to the HEFs, each year over 90,000 individuals (a third more than in 2014) will be required to reregister. This is based on ONS Census statistics, which show that in the year before the 2011 census, circa 110,000 people in Manchester moved house, just less than a third of our current electorate. However, the electoral register is currently more accurate than any time since 2010 due to the number of people who registered for the May polls. Consequently, the number of invitations to register to be issued during the 2015 canvass may be lower than would otherwise be the case.

### Communication and Engagement

3.15 Comprehensive communications, public awareness and engagement strategies have been in place from the outset to increase awareness and maximise registration opportunities. Generic activity was supported by specific approaches to target under registered groups such as students, young people and BME communities as well as in particular areas where registration levels remained low.

3.16 General engagement activity was successful in raising awareness but did not achieve the volume of registrations anticipated. Activities which successfully encouraged people to register to vote included recruitment of IER Ambassadors from the Manchester Youth Council; direct work with colleges and schools; joint working with Universities; and activity to support National Register to Vote Day.

3.17 Based on experience from 2014/15, there will be a continued focus on under registered groups where longer term opportunities to integrate registration in a systematic way can be explored, in settings where raising awareness can have most impact. The embedding of the IER Young Ambassador scheme into structures such as the Manchester Youth Council so that activity can continue year on year will be explored to enable peer to peer engagement around registration.

### Students

3.18 One of the largest under-registered groups in the city are University Students. A separate student canvass was undertaken from September 2014 targeting Council Tax exempt private properties and Halls of Residence with limited success. Subsequent activity where the University provided names of students in Halls enabled individually addressed ItRs to be sent and elicited improved response rates. This was particularly helpful in Halls where door to door canvassing is not allowed for security reasons. It is proposed that this approach is adopted again for the 2015 canvass, and that correspondence is not issued until the middle of September at the earliest when students return to University.

3.19 Registration levels significantly increased as the 7 May polling day approached, confirming that for this group, the incentive of an impending election was a significant driver to take action. 53% of eligible students were included on the register for these polls.



3.20 Contact will be made with all FE and HE institutions to evaluate activity and discuss how relationships can be further developed and embedded to encourage registration particularly outside an election period.

### Integration

3.21 The current statutory registration process provides limited scope for integration opportunities to be easily harnessed, and Officers are continuing to work with Cabinet Office to explore opportunities to make registration part of as many other transactions as possible to minimise the burden on citizens to register separately every time they move. Wherever possible, the integration of registration at local level through customer facing transactions, at neighbourhood locations and via partner engagement will be developed further. This will be particularly critical from the 2016/17 financial year, when no additional funding will be available.

3.22 Based on national research regarding under registration, this integration work will seek to target home movers, so that every individual is aware of the requirement to re register to vote every time they move. Links with Council Tax communications and transactions will be explored as a key channel to making this link, including website messages; sending information out with Council Tax demands; adding registration messages to email and paper correspondence; and encouragement to register being provided on the phone. Links with letting agents are being pursued to encourage them to register new tenants at the point of signing up a new tenancy, and to explore whether a pilot involving a nominal payment made based on the numbers that register in this way. This work will also explore the feasibility of more innovative ways of working with partners and providing financial incentives to register tenants, especially where such incentives could clearly provide savings in terms of printing, postage and canvassing,

## **4.0 Outline plan for the 2015 Annual Registration process**

4.1 The current legislation does not appear to have taken into account the need to view each household holistically, particularly in areas of high churn, and a linear approach of sending HEFs, reminder HEFs and then ITRs, and canvassing each activity separately, would lead to duplication of effort and repeat visits to properties, However, there is a degree of flexibility in how the canvass can operate, providing that the prescribed steps are met as a minimum – so the statutory steps of sending forms and visiting properties can be undertaken in any order. Previous canvasses have shown that a targeted approach, with bespoke activity to address the particular challenges in certain areas could be most effective. Given the added complexity of this canvass, it is proposed that evidence based, area specific approach is adopted, rather than using traditional canvassing methods across the whole of the city.

4.2 It is suggested therefore that initial HEFs are posted to all properties with different subsequent approaches being adopted in polling districts based on levels of churn. This approach is informed by the Ward based analysis of the impact of IER which will be broken down to Polling Districts level, to identify specific neighbourhoods where levels of churn are particularly high.

4.3 ItR canvassing will take place at the same time and during the same visit, to encourage individuals to register on the doorstep.

4.4 The approach used during the 2014 canvass utilising mobile devices to register people on the doorstep through the Government on line portal will be adopted again. In addition for the first time an on line HEF will be available feeding directly into the new Electoral Management System (Xpress) therefore canvassers will also be trained to complete this on the doorstep as well as following up any subsequent ItRs. This will enable significant savings in print and postage costs to be realised, although the same level of channel shift to online as was seen with unsolicited applicants in advance of the elections will not be achieved during the canvass period. An on line / paper ratio of 75 / 25% is anticipated.

4.5 Whilst the canvass has to be delivered between 1 July and 20 November leading to publication of the register on 1 December, the format of activity, the order in which steps are taken and key dates are left to local discretion. Due to the scale of the canvass in Manchester, the following timetable begins activity early, to enable all steps to be undertaken culminating in delivery of a large combined HEF and ItR canvass throughout October and November.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date (2015)</b>
1 <sup>st</sup> HEF (posted to all except student properties)	Sent week commencing 6 July 2015
ItRs posted weekly on an ongoing basis	Weekly from 14 July
Reminder HEF ( posted to low churn Polling Districts)	From 29 July
Reminder HEF (hand delivery to high churn Polling Districts)	From 11 August
Reminder ItRs to be posted weekly on an ongoing basis	From 25 August
Door knock canvass, outstanding HEFs (all properties including students)	8 October – 19 November
Door knock canvass, outstanding ItRs	8 October – 19 November
Door knock canvass for late ItRs (add into existing canvass)	11 November – 19 November
Publication of the Electoral Register	1 December

## 5.0 Finance and Funding

5.1 Due to the anticipated lower response rates, this canvass will be considerably more expensive to run than the 2014 transitional canvass simply to discharge the basic statutory duties to send HEFs and ITRs.

5.2 The Government has committed to fund the additional cost of IER for 2015/16 and has provided an indicative funding allocation of £254,576. This is £140,724 less than the funding provided for activity in 2014/15 which comprised an initial transition grant of £324,699 plus additional justification led funding of £70,631.

5.3 As this is the first full household canvass since the introduction of IER, it is difficult to predict costs with any accuracy as print, postage and canvass costs depend on response rates at each stage. However, based on initial modelling, the anticipated shortfall for delivery of activity is likely to be between £70,000 and £110,000. Officers are working with Cabinet Office officials to seek additional justification led funding for 2015/16 once response rates and therefore any shortfall has been confirmed and contingency arrangements in the event this funding is not obtained.

5.4 From April 2016, IER will be entirely funded by the Council. It is therefore critical that options to make registration more cost effective and to achieve the volumes of registration required for registers to be complete and accurate, are considered as part of this canvass.

## **6.0 Boundary Reviews**

6.1 Legislation currently provides for the delayed review of parliamentary boundaries to start again in December 2015 and the Boundary Commission for England is required to use the electoral registers published on 1 December 2015 as the basis for this review.

It should be noted that the methodology used by the Local Government Boundary Commission is different and the forthcoming review of Manchester's ward boundaries will be based on the projected electorate in 2022.

## **7.0 Next steps**

7.1 Proposals for delivery of the 2015 canvass including funding, resourcing needs, community engagement and integration opportunities will continue to be developed, capitalising on the progress made during the transition to IER and in the pre election period.

7.2 A full review of the cost and efficiency of Individual Electoral Registration will be undertaken from December 2015.

## **8.0 Key policies and considerations**

### **(a) Equal Opportunities**

National research into underregistration has historically identified certain demographic groups as less likely to register, in particular young people and people who move house frequently. Communication, engagement and public awareness strategies seek to minimise the impact of the change and encourage registration. Systematic integration with other Council services, customer contact points and those of partner organisations also help to ensure that opportunities to register are maximised.

### **(b) Risk Management**

A detailed risk register containing both strategic and operational risks has been in place from the outset of IER. The register is constantly under review and updated as part of governance arrangements for the project.

### **(c) Legal Considerations**

Under IER, Electoral Registration Officers have a duty to maintain the electoral register and under Section 9A of the Representation of the People Act must take all steps necessary to maintain the register for the purpose of ensuring that persons entitled to be registered, are registered on it. This includes the requirement to undertake a full household canvass with HEFs being sent to all properties to confirm who is resident at an address, followed up with two reminders and a household visit. Any person added to a HEF must be sent an ItR followed by two reminders and a personal visit. Any person whose name is removed from a HEF cannot be deleted from the register without secondary evidence or without a separate review of their entitlement to remain registered.

Local authorities have a legal duty to provide Electoral Registration Officers with the requisite resources to enable them to discharge their legal functions.

**Annex 1**

**Monthly electorate and alterations**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Deletions</b>	<b>Additions</b>	<b>Electorate</b>
1 Dec 2014 – 1 Jan 2015	35,467*	2,049	368,494
1 Jan – 1 Feb	3,569	2,156	338,559
2 Feb – 1 March	4,277	11,839	335,434
2 March – 1 April	3,759	9,616	341,019
2 April – 1 May	4,696	20,018	365,200
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51,768</b>	<b>45,678</b>	

\*These deletions from the register identified during the annual canvass could not be made until after 1 December due to software issues

**Annex 2**

Ward	Polling District	Electorate June 2015	Electorate total by Ward	Unconfirmed electors June 2015	Unconfirmed electors total by Ward
Ancoats and Clayton	ACA	436		28	
	ACB	1793		125	
	ACC	1407		112	
	ACD	1284		84	
	ACE	1289		149	
	ACF	1727		328	
	ACG	2539		358	
	ACH	1463		113	
	ACJ	2027	13965	325	1622
	Ardwick	ARA	1967		177
ARB		1292		104	
ARC		982		63	
ARD		1927		163	
ARE		536		37	
ARF		1942		124	
ARG		166		13	
ARH		1395	10207	104	785
Baguley		BAA	2818		90
	BAB	793		37	
	BAC	1366		55	
	BAD	1433		49	
	BAE	1622		60	
	BAF	1522		49	
	BAG	1556	11110	88	428
	Bradford	BDA	1848		155
BDB		1509		98	
BDC		1687		107	
BDD		1895		142	
BDE		2470		127	
BDF		3159	12568	317	946
Brooklands		BKA	2317		82
	BKB	1862		57	
	BKC	1852		51	
	BKD	2943		88	
	BKE	1851	10825	59	337
Burnage	BUA	2025		100	
	BUB	2917		150	
	BUC	1906		71	
	BUD	1882		102	
	BUE	1427		66	
	BUF	924	11081	37	526
City Centre	CCA	1566		123	
	CCB	2535		165	

Ward	Polling District	Electorate June 2015	Electorate total by Ward	Unconfirmed electors June 2015	Unconfirmed electors total by Ward
	CCC	1477		158	
	CCD	3242		418	
	CCE	1404		155	
	CCF	108	10332	1	1020
Chorlton	CLA	2489		115	
	CLB	2342		200	
	CLC	903		36	
	CLD	878		16	
	CLE	2760		129	
	CLF	1927	11299	90	586
Charlestown	CNA	2002		57	
	CNB	1023		21	
	CNC	1937		63	
	CND	2016		56	
	CNE	836		31	
	CNF	1229		63	
	CNG	1366	10409	64	355
Chorlton Park	CPA	1964		90	
	CPB	2734		201	
	CPC	2392		177	
	CPD	1513		40	
	CPE	1435		41	
	CPF	1852	11890	68	617
Crumpsall	CRA	2119		129	
	CRB	2376		84	
	CRC	1308		93	
	CRD	836		29	
	CRE	1435		98	
	CRF	1315		159	
	CRG	2109	11498	54	646
Cheetham	CTA	3051		366	
	CTB	1090		142	
	CTC	1352		123	
	CTD	1133		140	
	CTE	1609		187	
	CTF	2131		249	
	CTG	2860		262	
	CTH	2468	15694	311	1780
Didsbury East	DEA	2598		120	
	DEB	2116		119	
	DEC	1822		81	
	DED	1268		74	
	DEE	1613		76	
	DEF	1803	11220	91	561
Didsbury West	DWA	2632		281	
	DWB	1842		215	

Ward	Polling District	Electorate June 2015	Electorate total by Ward	Unconfirmed electors June 2015	Unconfirmed electors total by Ward
	DWC	958		75	
	DWD	2188		112	
	DWE	2995	10615	115	798
Fallowfield	FAA	3411		149	
	FAB	2004		173	
	FAC	1388		88	
	FAD	1871		133	
	FAE	2037	10711	368	911
Gorton North	GNA	1667		123	
	GNB	2143		185	
	GNC	2890		180	
	GND	1368		70	
	GNE	1783		131	
	GNF	1547	11398	102	791
Gorton South	GSA	1606		172	
	GSB	2065		97	
	GSC	1417		53	
	GSD	1522		144	
	GSE	3116		155	
	GSF	1820		134	
	GSG	1675	13221	116	871
Harpurhey	HAA	655		48	
	HAB	2141		153	
	HAC	1647		123	
	HAD	1968		98	
	HAE	1470		94	
	HAF	800		21	
	HAG	1059		112	
	HAH	2135		110	
	HAJ	536	12411	19	778
Higher Blackley	HBA	1743		81	
	HBB	1899		73	
	HBC	2598		106	
	HBD	741		31	
	HBE	1886		63	
	HBF	1150		98	
	HBG	844	10861	57	509
Hulme	HUA	3713		263	
	HUB	1972		112	
	HUC	2584		184	
	HUD	1240		52	
	HUE	1451	10960	130	741
Levenshulme	LEA	2116		185	
	LEB	1612		88	
	LEC	1374		134	
	LED	2226		180	



Ward	Polling District	Electorate June 2015	Electorate total by Ward	Unconfirmed electors June 2015	Unconfirmed electors total by Ward
	LEE	2195		161	
	LEF	1345	10868	51	799
Longsight	LOA	1599		127	
	LOB	2003		214	
	LOC	1987		147	
	LOD	1576		253	
	LOE	1565		156	
	LOF	1937	10667	245	1142
Miles Platting & Nheath	MNA	1436		88	
	MNB	1381		67	
	MNC	692		34	
	MND	1395		77	
	MNE	2879		116	
	MNF	2958	10741	135	517
Moston	MOA	965		50	
	MOB	995		45	
	MOC	1869		80	
	MOD	1762		34	
	MOE	2422		68	
	MOF	1036		15	
	MOG	1274		27	
	MOH	1132	11455	90	409
Moss Side	MSA	1124		76	
	MSB	1554		169	
	MSC	1766		156	
	MSD	2502		229	
	MSE	2034		173	
	MSF	2497		243	
	MSG	1194	12671	23	1069
Northenden	NOA	2188		68	
	NOB	2602		146	
	NOC	1942		70	
	NOD	1256		60	
	NOE	2384		49	
	NOF	1120	11492	17	410
Old Moat	OMA	1248		51	
	OMB	3041		168	
	OMC	2921		219	
	OMD	3759	10969	263	701
Rusholme	RUA	2043		156	
	RUB	1534		73	
	RUC	2304		188	
	RUD	1334		77	
	RUE	2653	9868	266	760
Sharston	SHA	2166		143	

Ward	Polling District	Electorate June 2015	Electorate total by Ward	Unconfirmed electors June 2015	Unconfirmed electors total by Ward
	SHB	1858		50	
	SHC	1806		37	
	SHD	1584		43	
	SHE	2451		63	
	SHF	1008		34	
	SHG	972	11845	66	436
Woodhouse Park	WPA	2451		61	
	WPB	2669		70	
	WPC	917		28	
	WPD	1152		53	
	WPE	3204		164	
	WPF	73	10466	16	392
Whalley Range	WRA	1607		139	
	WRB	3123		211	
	WRC	2899		199	
	WRD	2132		147	
	WRE	1871	11632	140	836
Withington	WTA	2977		222	
	WTB	2698		151	
	WTC	1782		134	
	WTD	2578	10035	92	599
	<b>Total</b>	<b>364984</b>	<b>364984</b>	<b>23678</b>	<b>23678</b>

**Annex 3**

Ward	Ward Initial ITR's (non student properties)	% Response	Reminder ITR's (non student properties)	% Response	Personal Canvass ITR's (non student properties)	% Response	ITR's remaining	Total ITR's returned	Total % response (from initial form to the end of the personal canvass)
Ancoats and Clayton	2656	10.13%	2387	3.73%	2298	21.76%	1798	858	32.30%
Ardwick	2286	10.54%	2045	27.78%	1477	27.22%	1075	1211	52.97%
Baguley	1284	11.53%	1136	3.87%	1092	32.23%	740	544	42.37%
Bradford	2099	12.81%	1830	-2.10%	1869	25.95%	1384	715	34.06%
Brooklands	1087	16.10%	912	6.69%	851	32.20%	577	510	46.92%
Burnage	1392	15.37%	1178	7.64%	1088	32.07%	739	653	46.91%
Charlestown	1043	12.65%	911	4.28%	872	31.19%	600	443	42.47%
Cheetham	3175	11.34%	2815	2.06%	2757	22.99%	2123	1052	33.13%
Chorlton	1750	15.83%	1473	6.24%	1381	30.34%	962	788	45.02%
Chorlton Park	1900	14.95%	1616	7.55%	1494	32.33%	1011	889	46.79%
City Centre	4105	6.67%	3831	45.50%	2088	19.54%	1680	2425	59.07%
Crumpsall	1791	12.39%	1569	-1.44%	1592	31.85%	1085	706	39.42%
Didsbury East	1612	16.50%	1346	7.50%	1245	27.63%	901	711	44.11%
Didsbury West	2302	11.25%	2043	12.14%	1795	22.78%	1386	916	39.79%
Fallowfield	1703	9.86%	1535	15.11%	1303	29.70%	916	787	46.21%
Gorton North	1759	12.45%	1540	3.76%	1482	25.44%	1105	654	37.18%
Gorton South	2051	13.02%	1784	0.90%	1768	23.36%	1355	696	33.93%
Harpurhey	1979	12.38%	1734	-2.29%	1775	25.63%	1320	659	33.30%
Higher Blackley	1108	14.71%	945	2.43%	922	29.06%	654	454	40.97%
Hulme	2070	11.79%	1826	6.52%	1707	25.25%	1276	794	38.36%
Levenshulme	2457	8.30%	2253	28.63%	1608	25.06%	1205	1252	50.95%
Longsight	2639	8.37%	2418	16.66%	2015	25.21%	1507	1132	42.89%
Miles Platting and Newton Heath	1307	11.78%	1153	0.69%	1145	25.07%	858	449	34.35%
Moss Side	2517	10.05%	2264	14.93%	1926	25.49%	1435	1082	42.99%
Moston	1185	13.42%	1026	5.07%	974	32.24%	660	525	44.30%
Northenden	1263	15.60%	1066	4.41%	1019	31.50%	698	565	44.73%

Ward	Ward Initial ITR's (non student properties)	% Response	Reminder ITR's (non student properties)	% Response	Personal Canvass ITR's (non student properties)	% Response remaining	ITR's returned	Total ITR's returned	Total % response (from initial form to the end of the personal canvass)
Old Moat	2274	8.71%	2076	19.99%	1661	18.78%	1349	925	40.68%
Rusholme	2504	9.70%	2261	31.09%	1558	30.04%	1090	1414	56.47%
Sharston	1334	15.67%	1125	3.47%	1086	32.14%	737	597	44.75%
Whalley Range	2394	12.20%	2102	14.51%	1797	27.32%	1306	1088	45.44%
Withington	2268	6.48%	2121	22.16%	1651	16.84%	1373	895	39.46%
Woodhouse Park	1154	12.39%	1011	1.68%	994	32.80%	668	486	42.11%
Total	62448	11.40%	55332	12.73%	48290	26.33%	35573	26875	43.03%

Note: The % ItR response rate at each stage includes those arising from HEFs that were being sent out on an ongoing basis. The figures at each stage therefore are not directly comparable as additional ItRs will have been added throughout the process.

**Annex 4**

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Electoral Registration – Analysis of the impact of IER in Manchester</b>
<b>From:</b>	<b>Research and Intelligence Team, Chief Executives Dept</b>

- 1) This paper outlines the results of an analysis of the Electoral Register in June 2014 used for the start of implementing IER against the register used in May 2015 for the general election.
- 2) The figures derived need to be considered as approximate rather than precise because the Council needed to change its electoral software application in November/December 2014 which created some minor anomalies between the data held in each system. However, they represent a very small percentage of records for comparison purposes.
- 3) The Register forwarded to DWP at the start of IER implementation contained 381,774 electors whereas the register used for the election contained 364,973, a reduction of 4.4%. However, this masks much more fundamental change in the data which is the subject of this assessment.
- 4) The assessment covers
  - The extent to which people have stayed at the same address and, by inference, the extent of churn.
  - The average number of Electors per property,
  - The profile of properties with zero Electors,
  - The extent of registration by “attainers”,
  - The extent of registration by Students.

**Staying at the same residence**

- 5) The percentage of registered electors shown at the same address in May 2015 as in June 2014 was 74.5% or 284,421. By inference this means that 25.5% (97,352) or a quarter of electors moved or didn't register under IER. The amount of churn will actually be higher because some addresses will have had multiple moves during the year.
- 6) Broken down by Ward the following can be seen:-

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Percentage still on Register</b>
CITY CENTRE	42.3%
WITHINGTON	46.8%
ARDWICK	53.1%
HULME	55.5%

Ward	Percentage still on Register
RUSHOLME	57.5%
FALLOWFIELD	58.1%
OLD MOAT	61.2%
MOSS SIDE	63.2%
LEVENSHULME	69.8%
LONGSIGHT	70.6%
DIDSBURY WEST	70.6%
ANCOATS AND CLAYTON	75.7%
WHALLEY RANGE	76.6%
CHORLTON PARK	77.0%
CHORLTON	78.4%
BRADFORD	81.6%
HARPURHEY	81.7%
CHEETHAM	81.8%
DIDSBURY EAST	81.9%
GORTON SOUTH	82.3%
CRUMPSALL	82.6%
GORTON NORTH	83.7%
BAGULEY	85.0%
SHARSTON	85.6%
MILES PLATTING AND NEWTON HEATH	85.9%
BURNAGE	86.1%
BROOKLANDS	86.2%
NORTHENDEN	86.2%
CHARLESTOWN	86.5%
WOODHOUSE PARK	86.8%
MOSTON	88.2%
HIGHER BLACKLEY	88.7%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>74.5%</b>

- 7) The RAG rating shows those Wards identified in July 2014, during the planning for IER, as at highest risk of under registration because of relative levels of data matching with DWP. There is a clear correlation between these results suggesting that churn is the major factor at work.
- 8) The following table shows the percentage of Electors who have remained at the same address and were matched either by DWP or locally so could be passported onto the May 2015 register.

Ward	% DWP	% LDM	Overall %
CITY CENTRE	42.5%	36.0%	78.4%
WITHINGTON	70.9%	14.1%	85.0%
ARDWICK	73.6%	11.9%	85.6%
HULME	66.0%	20.6%	86.6%
RUSHOLME	73.1%	10.1%	83.2%

Ward	% DWP	% LDM	Overall %
FALLOWFIELD	74.1%	9.2%	83.3%
OLD MOAT	75.3%	11.6%	86.9%
MOSS SIDE	73.2%	10.8%	84.0%
LEVENSHULME	75.6%	10.5%	86.1%
LONGSIGHT	71.4%	9.8%	81.2%
DIDSBURY WEST	64.7%	21.2%	85.9%
ANCOATS AND CLAYTON	64.1%	17.5%	81.6%
WHALLEY RANGE	73.2%	13.5%	86.7%
CHORLTON PARK	76.2%	13.6%	89.8%
CHORLTON	76.0%	13.6%	89.6%
BRADFORD	73.8%	13.7%	87.5%
HARPURHEY	82.0%	8.2%	90.2%
CHEETHAM	70.1%	12.6%	82.7%
DIDSBURY EAST	78.7%	11.5%	90.3%
GORTON SOUTH	80.3%	9.0%	89.2%
CRUMPSALL	79.3%	10.8%	90.0%
GORTON NORTH	82.2%	7.4%	89.6%
BAGULEY	87.1%	7.1%	94.3%
SHARSTON	86.2%	7.5%	93.7%
MILES PLATTING AND NEWTON HEATH	84.8%	7.8%	92.6%
BURNAGE	84.1%	7.4%	91.5%
BROOKLANDS	85.9%	8.5%	94.4%
NORTHENDEN	85.3%	8.4%	93.7%
CHARLESTOWN	87.4%	6.7%	94.1%
WOODHOUSE PARK	85.6%	8.2%	93.8%
MOSTON	86.9%	7.1%	94.0%
HIGHER BLACKLEY	85.9%	7.2%	93.1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>76.7%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>

- 9) As can be expected for this lower churn population, a high proportion could be passported through data matching.
- 10) Following data matching the Council was required to send "Invitation to Register" forms to all remaining electors shown on the June 2014 Register. This was 91,627 ITR's which also needed to be followed up by postal reminders and a door knock canvass if the elector did not respond.
- 11) By comparing registers we can determine how many of these Electors, not matched with DWP or locally, later confirmed registration at the same address. The overall number registered at the same address was 31,986 or 34.9% of the ITRs. The remainder will comprise students and those who are still not confirmed as individually registered or those who registered at a new address.
- 12) Possible reasons for a failure to match include incorrect information held by DWP or MCC, DWP holding historical information or lags in data update processes.

13) The breakdown by Ward is as follows

WARD	On May 2015 Register	Total ITR's	% still at address
WITHINGTON	793	4729	16.8%
ARDWICK	1030	6112	16.9%
CITY CENTRE	1270	6936	18.3%
HULME	977	5028	19.4%
RUSHOLME	1061	4601	23.1%
FALLOWFIELD	1135	4908	23.1%
OLD MOAT	927	3703	25.0%
MOSS SIDE	1390	5075	27.4%
LEVENSHULME	1098	3387	32.4%
BAGULEY	549	1407	39.0%
DIDSBURY WEST	1069	2728	39.2%
LONGSIGHT	1519	3870	39.3%
WHALLEY RANGE	1204	2820	42.7%
CHORLTON PARK	929	2167	42.9%
SHARSTON	648	1485	43.6%
HARPURHEY	1024	2329	44.0%
CRUMPSALL	958	2162	44.3%
BROOKLANDS	527	1185	44.5%
CHARLESTOWN	532	1183	45.0%
NORTHENDEN	628	1363	46.1%
CHORLTON	905	1964	46.1%
WOODHOUSE PARK	570	1215	46.9%
MILES PLATTING AND NEWTON HEATH	699	1480	47.2%
GORTON SOUTH	1187	2471	48.0%
MOSTON	614	1266	48.5%
GORTON NORTH	1023	2082	49.1%
DIDSBURY EAST	877	1771	49.5%
BRADFORD	1257	2369	53.1%
BURNAGE	813	1517	53.6%
ANCOATS AND CLAYTON	1893	3431	55.2%
HIGHER BLACKLEY	664	1199	55.4%
CHEETHAM	2216	3684	60.2%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>31986</b>	<b>91627</b>	<b>34.9%</b>

14) Here the pattern is more variable. There was a significant increase in registration just prior to the legal deadline for registration in certain wards – for example Ancoats and Clayton.

### Registered Electors per Property

15) For this analysis it is necessary to exclude outliers (which predominately relate to nursing homes and student halls). Analysis shows that 95% of addresses have 6 or less Electors and these properties are the basis of this analysis. The overall breakdown is as follows

Registered per property	June 2014 register	May 2015 Register
1 Elector Household	24.2%	24.3%



2 Elector Household	39.6%	39.1%
3 Elector Household	15.3%	17.3%
4 Elector household	9.5%	9.7%
5 Elector Household	4.1%	4.1%
6 Elector Household	2.1%	1.9%
<b>Total % of electorate</b>	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>96.4%</b>

- 16) There is no real significant shift in these proportions suggesting that there is not a significant increase in people within households who are not registering.

### Properties with Zero Electors

- 17) Properties can have no registered Electors because they are vacant or because they are occupied by foreign nationals not entitled to vote.
- 18) In June 2014 there were 19,108 properties with zero electors, 12,864 of which continued to have no registered electors in May 2015. However, the overall number of properties with zero electors in May 2015 has risen to 26,896 an increase of 26.9% suggesting that it is whole households who have opted out from IER, and because there has been no full household canvass for over 12 months.
- 19) Comparison of property counts at a Ward level are misleading because of variance in the number of addresses in each Ward. The following breakdown by Ward shows the relative percentage of zero properties compared with total properties in each Ward for both registers and the change between the two registers.

Ward	% of properties with Zero Electors June 2014	% of properties with Zero Electors May 2015	change
CITY CENTRE	22.2%	34.6%	12.3%
ARDWICK	19.8%	29.2%	9.4%
HULME	10.5%	17.8%	7.3%
RUSHOLME	10.8%	15.4%	4.6%
MOSS SIDE	12.2%	16.7%	4.4%
LONGSIGHT	10.2%	14.6%	4.4%
BAGULEY	3.6%	7.2%	3.6%
DIDSBURY WEST	7.4%	10.9%	3.5%
WITHINGTON	9.4%	12.8%	3.4%
ANCOATS AND CLAYTON	13.8%	17.1%	3.3%
WHALLEY RANGE	9.7%	12.9%	3.3%
GORTON SOUTH	7.2%	10.4%	3.2%
FALLOWFIELD	8.1%	11.2%	3.0%
CHORLTON PARK	4.7%	7.7%	3.0%
GORTON NORTH	7.4%	10.3%	2.9%
HARPURHEY	9.1%	11.8%	2.7%
CHEETHAM	10.1%	12.8%	2.7%
OLD MOAT	6.7%	9.3%	2.6%
WOODHOUSE PARK	3.6%	6.1%	2.5%
MILES PLATTING AND NEWTON HEATH	7.7%	10.2%	2.5%

Ward	% of properties with Zero Electors June 2014	% of properties with Zero Electors May 2015	change
BURNAGE	3.5%	5.9%	2.4%
CHARLESTOWN	5.2%	7.6%	2.4%
SHARSTON	3.2%	5.5%	2.2%
HIGHER BLACKLEY	4.1%	6.1%	2.0%
CRUMPSALL	11.6%	13.6%	2.0%
LEVENSHULME	9.5%	11.4%	1.9%
BROOKLANDS	3.5%	5.3%	1.8%
CHORLTON	5.4%	7.2%	1.8%
NORTHENDEN	3.6%	5.0%	1.5%
MOSTON	5.9%	7.3%	1.4%
DIDSBURY EAST	4.7%	6.1%	1.4%
BRADFORD	11.3%	12.5%	1.1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>

Here the position is not as clearly correlated to previous risk based assessment of Wards and there may be local factors involved.

### Attainers

- 20) The number of attainers flagged in the system in June 2014 was 2176 and this had fallen to 1705 in the May 2015 register, a reduction of 21% which is significantly lower than the overall drop of 4.3%.
- 21) It could be speculated that giving 16 and 17 years old responsibility to register rather than the head of the household has had a contrary effect to that intended. These results would need to correlate with other electoral registers to confirm such a conclusion.

### Students

- 22) The Council has some, but not all, information about properties wholly occupied by Students (student halls or student houses exempt from Council Tax). Other students live at home either within or outside of the Manchester boundary and this data is not available for comparison purposes.
- 23) In June 2014 the register contained 24,356 Electors registered in these Council Tax student exempt properties. In May 2015 this had changed to 15,663, a reduction of 36.4% which is significantly lower than the overall reduction between registers. However, significant efforts in conjunction with the Universities to encourage registration led to an overall a student registration rate of 51% being achieved (based on data matching University enrolment records with the electoral register) a significantly higher that was seen in other areas.
- 24) The breakdown between the two registers and the change in numbers is as follows

Ward	Jun-14			May-15			change		
	Student Halls	Student Houses	total	Student Halls	Student Houses	total	Student Halls	Student Houses	Total
ANCOATS AND CLAYTON	84	430	514	16	360	376	-68	-70	-138
ARDWICK	1787	1784	3571	326	1012	1338	-1461	-772	-2233
BAGULEY		34	34		29	29		-5	-5
BRADFORD		260	260		205	205		-55	-55
BROOKLANDS		34	34		26	26		-8	-8
BURNAGE		60	60		45	45		-15	-15
CHARLESTOWN		62	62		58	58		-4	-4
CHEETHAM		360	360		263	263		-97	-97
CHORLTON		52	52		52	52		0	0
CHORLTON PARK		94	94		80	80		-14	-14
CITY CENTRE	1069	1526	2595	203	824	1027	-866	-702	-1568
CRUMPSALL	4	108	112		87	87	-4	-21	-25
DIDSBURY EAST		79	79		69	69		-10	-10
DIDSBURY WEST	3	263	266	2	226	228	-1	-37	-38
FALLOWFIELD	211	1369	1580	215	1094	1309	4	-275	-271
GORTON NORTH		87	87		82	82		-5	-5
GORTON SOUTH	2	154	156	2	133	135	0	-21	-21
HARPURHEY		101	101		86	86		-15	-15
HIGHER BLACKLEY		60	60		48	48		-12	-12
HULME	711	910	1621	286	560	846	-425	-350	-775
LEVENSHULME	21	993	1014	33	772	805	12	-221	-209
LONGSIGHT	457	742	1199	108	615	723	-349	-127	-476
MILES PLATTING AND NH		81	81	1	67	68	1	-14	-13
MOSS SIDE	1067	1776	2843	606	998	1604	-461	-778	-1239
MOSTON		35	35		29	29		-6	-6
NORTHENDEN		23	23		18	18		-5	-5
OLD MOAT	13	2027	2040	3	1623	1626	-10	-404	-414
RUSHOLME	788	1288	2076	685	997	1682	-103	-291	-394
SHARSTON		41	41		24	24		-17	-17
WHALLEY RANGE	30	141	171	3	111	114	-27	-30	-57
WITHINGTON		3275	3275	1	2540	2541	1	-735	-734
WOODHOUSE PARK		40	40		40	40		0	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6,247</b>	<b>18,289</b>	<b>24,536</b>	<b>2,490</b>	<b>13,173</b>	<b>15,663</b>	<b>-3757</b>	<b>-5116</b>	<b>-8873</b>

- 25) This analysis suggests particular attention needs to be given to Ardwick, City Centre and Moss Side in considering student registration.