

## Issues on which we seek comment

- 1 Do you agree with IPART's proposed approach for this review? Are there any alternative approaches that would better meet the terms of reference, or any other issues we should consider?

**Council Response:** Yes Council agrees with IPART's proposed approach to this review.

- 2 When would a council prefer to use a private provider, rather than the NSWEC, to conduct its elections?

**Council Response:** Provided the Private Provider had a good record for conducting Council elections and of course was cheaper.

- 3 What scope is there for private providers to offer councils:
  - The full range of election services currently provided by the NSWEC?
  - A more limited range of election services?

**Council Response:** 100% of the full range of election services currently provided by the NSWEC.

Should provide 100% of election services.

- 4 To what extent would the range of services offered by private providers vary by a council's geographic location (ie, metropolitan, regional or rural) or size (ie, small, medium or large)?

**Council Response:** No difference.

- 5 What are the barriers to competition in the provision of election services to councils?

**Council Response:** Not known.

- 6 What factors might lead to changes in the costs incurred by the NSWEC, and over what time period are these changes likely to occur?

**Council Response:** Salaries

- 7 Is a base level of service provision to all councils appropriate? For what types of election services offered by the NSWEC might councils opt for a different level of service?

**Council Response:** Only base level required for rural Councils.

- 8 How should we assess the efficient costs of providing election services to local councils? Do stakeholders support our use of a 'building block' approach to calculate the NSWEC's efficient costs and revenue requirement? If not, what alternative method would be appropriate?

**Council Response:** Use of building block.

- 9 What firms or industries are comparable to the NSWEC in terms of their exposure to market risk? What percentage of debt rather than equity would an efficient provider of election services be able to sustain to finance its assets (ie, the gearing level)?

**Council Response:** Not known.

- 10 Do you agree that NSWEC's direct costs should be allocated between the State Government and councils using the impactor pays principle (ie, those that create the need for the cost to be incurred should pay the cost)?

**Council Response:** Yes.

- 11 Should NSWEC's indirect costs be allocated:
- Using the impactor pays principle

**Council Response:** No

- With a focus on putting NSWEC on an even footing with private providers (ie, ensuring its indirect costs are allocated to councils where they would be incurred by an efficient competitor to the NSWEC), or

**Council Response:** Yes

- On some other basis (and if so, what)?

**Council Response:** N/A

- 12 Do you consider the allocation of NSWEC's costs to councils should be made with reference to incremental costs (lower bound), standalone costs (upper bound), or somewhere in between this range?

**Council Response:** Incremental.

- 13 How should indirect costs (eg, centralised locations for collating ballots ready for data entry and councils' share of the costs that are common to State and local government elections) be shared between councils? For example, should they be allocated on a 'per elector', or some other basis?

**Council Response:** Per elector.

14 Are the costs involved in conducting elections substantially different for metropolitan, regional and rural councils? If yes, what are the drivers for those differences?

**Council Response:** Yes, cost should be based on per elector.

15 Do you agree with our proposed approach for assessing the impact of our recommendations on stakeholders? Are there any other issues we should consider?

**Council Response:** Yes.

