

## Introduction

The following is a proposal for the implementation of the below gender, BAME, disability and LGBT+ quotas in the event of the STV option for NCG elections being carried in the Refounding Momentum ballot.

- 13/26 women
- 6/26 BAME
- 3/26 Disabled
- 3/26 LGBT+

The quotas will be implemented in 2 stages: a primary regional stage for the women and BAME quotas, and a secondary national stage should the results after the primary stage not meet the quotas for disabled or LGBT+ members.

## Primary Stage (Gender and BAME quotas)

The primary stage will be carried out in the initial count, with quotas applied at the regional level.

Regional quotas will alternate from one electoral cycle to the next in an A/B system.

### A)

London & Eastern (6)

- 3 women
- 2 BAME

South East (3)

- 1 woman
- 1 BAME

South West (3)

- 2 women
- 0 BAME

Midlands (4)

- 2 women
- 1 BAME

Northern (5)

- 2 women
- 2 BAME

Yorkshire/Nl/world (3)

- 2 women
- 0 BAME

Scotland (1)

- 0 women
- 0 BAME

Wales (1)

- 1 woman
- 0 BAME

### B)

London & Eastern (6)

- 3 women
- 2 BAME

South East (3)

- 2 women
- 0 BAME

South West (3)

- 1 woman
- 1 BAME

Midlands (4)

- 2 women
- 1 BAME

Northern (5)

- 3 women
- 1 BAME

Yorkshire/Nl/world (3)

- 1 woman
- 1 BAME

Scotland (1)

- 1 woman
- 0 BAME

Wales (1)

- 0 women
- 0 BAME

Implementing these quotas at the counting stage will unfortunately require an unavoidable degree of complexity.

There are three reasonable ways to elect candidates while ensuring diversity quotas are met:

1. Separate elections (e.g. South East would have separate Women's, BAME and Open election races)
2. Top-up members (Run unmodified STV and then elect additional candidates via some mechanism to meet any unmet quotas)
3. Use a counting method that ensures the quota is met

Separate elections are problematic because candidates and slates would be forced to make tactical choices about which election(s) to run in and because voters would be unable to articulate their preferences between candidates running in separate races.

Top-up members are problematic because if they are assigned at the regional level some regions may end up very overrepresented at the NCG, and in any case the NCG could become much larger than intended.

We propose a novel counting method that ensures that the quotas are met. This will allow all candidates to compete with each other; allows voters to express their preferences about all candidates on the same ballot; and means that the elected candidates will only differ from a normal STV count if normal STV would not meet the quotas.

This system is a variant of [Scottish STV](#) where candidates may be eliminated for diversity reasons and where candidates are protected from elimination if we need them to meet the diversity quotas.

Here is a summary of the system:

In each round of the election we will do the first of these that we can, then start a new round:

1. If any unelected candidates can no longer be elected for diversity reasons, eliminate them and transfer their votes at full value
  - a. e.g. if 2 seats remain and we still need to elect 2 women, then all unelected non-women candidates will be eliminated.
  - b. e.g. if 3 seats remain and we still need to elect 2 women and one BAME candidate then all unelected white men candidates will be eliminated.
2. If the number of elected candidates + unelected candidates is less than or equal to the number of seats, elect all remaining candidates and end the election
3. If any candidate has more votes than the STV winning threshold, elect the candidate with the most votes and redistribute their surplus votes at fractional value
4. Otherwise, eliminate the candidate with the fewest votes and redistribute their votes at full value
  - a. You may not eliminate a candidate if doing so would make it impossible to meet the diversity quotas (e.g. if we still need to elect 2 women and there are only 2 women left unelected then neither of them may be eliminated). If this is the case, try to eliminate the candidate with the next fewest votes.

## Secondary Stage (Disability and LGBT+ quotas)

Quotas for Disabled and LGBT+ NCG members will be assessed at the national level. In the unlikely case that the regional elections do not elect enough candidates to meet either of these quotas we have two options:

1. We can elect additional NCG members to meet these quotas
2. We can unelect some regional candidates and replace them with Disabled or LGBT+ candidates from the same region who did not win

Additional members are fairly easy for us to implement in a transparent and fair way, but may lead to overrepresentation of some regions or a larger NCG. We can elect additional members by running another election or by assigning each candidate a score based on how well they did in their regional elections and then electing the N highest scoring candidates.

Unelecting some regional candidates will avoid enlarging the NCG, but any system that we devise to do this risks unelecting popular candidates and replacing them with candidates who have a much weaker regional mandate.

In the Secondary Stage, high-scoring 'losing' candidates from the Primary Stage who are Disabled and/or LGBT are chosen for 'promotion' to replace low-scoring 'winning' candidates who are 'demoted'.

Disabled and/or LGBT candidates are chosen for promotion on the basis of the strength of their result and how close they came to being elected at the Primary Stage. This is determined according to the distance, in percentage terms, between the winning threshold and a candidate's final tally of votes. For example, a candidate who receives a final tally of 150 votes in a region where the winning threshold is 200 votes (eg 75% of threshold) would be promoted before a candidate who receives a final tally of 200 votes in a larger or less contested region where the winning threshold is 400 votes (eg 50% of threshold).

The highest ranking Disabled and/or LGBT+ 'losers' from the Primary Stage are selected for promotion in order of the strength of their vote (as defined above) as necessary until both the Disabled and LGBT+ quotas can be satisfied.

The candidates who are demoted to make way for the promoted candidates are determined on the basis of being the lowest ranked candidate in the same region as the promoted winner *who it is permissible to demote without violating another of the quotas*. The ranking of candidates for demotion within a region is determined by the round in which they were elected (earlier is higher) or, if more than one candidate is elected in a single round, then the size of their final tally (eg prior to surplus being redistributed).

### Fallback procedure:

If any circumstances arise in the count not foreseen by this proposal, the Returning Officer will be empowered to determine the fairest way of resolving the issue.