

**Question 1:**  
**Do you agree that the deadline for the close of nominations should be moved back to the 23rd day before polling?**

**Question 2:**  
**Do you have views on any other aspects of the timetabling of elections?**

**Question 3:**  
**Do you agree or have comments on the proposed design of the ballot paper for the 2012 local government elections as outlined above?**

**Question 4:**  
**Do you have any views as to how the production and design of ballots could be made more effective for the voter?**

**Question 5:**  
**What do you think about the positioning of candidates names on the ballot paper and the**

The present situation has led to an unfair advantage for those candidates whose surnames put them higher up the ballot paper. It has also created confusion because candidates from the same party might be at different ends of the ballot paper. Candidates are selected and promoted by parties and should be grouped accordingly. This could be done without any threat to independents. The present system is not only confusing for those who may wish to support two or more candidates from their party of choice but it also makes it difficult for local political parties fielding more than one candidate to deselect their sitting councillors or a new candidate. These are entirely reasonable things which local parties should be able to do in a healthy party democracy. The present system means that a councillor placed higher up the alphabet will always win where there is an expectation that the party will win at least one or more councillors. Councillors in this

***process by which this should be decided?***

position have no incentive to work hard in their wards knowing instead that their alphabetic advantage will see them through. While lotteries for order might be superficially attractive they would in reality be confusing and fail to resolve the problem if they are based on candidate surnames with no attention to party groups. Instead Parties should be entitled to field more than one candidate but list them on the ballot paper in the order which they would wish to see them elected. This can still be done using an open list system. I. E. The electors would not have to vote for the party's candidates in the order they were listed, just as at present but simply that the advantage of prominence could be used by parties to ensure their candidates work hard and serve the constituents well.

***Question 6:  
Which of the three options to increase the security of the ballot described above do you prefer and why?***

**Question 7:**  
**Do you have any other views or further comments as to how voting secrecy could be maintained or enhanced?**

**Question 8:**  
**Should the count take place as soon as possible after the close of the polls or the next day?**

**Question 9:**  
**Do you agree that there should be no automatic adjudication of blank ballot papers?**

asap

**Question 10:**  
**Do you support the introduction of advance voting as a means to increase turnout and make the process of voting easier?**

**Question 11:**  
**Would the introduction of advanced voting have any disadvantages?**

**Question 12:**  
**Do you have any comments or suggestions on how to improve the relatively low turnouts in elections?**

**Question 13:**  
**What are your views on the possible measures outlined above designed to increase turnout?**

**Question 14:**  
**Do you agree that the voting age should be lowered to 16?**

no

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

\*\*\*\*\*

This email has been received from an external party and

has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*