

# Computing the Margin of Victory in Preferential Parliamentary Elections

Michelle Blom\*, Peter J. Stuckey, Vanessa J. Teague  
 {michelle.blom, vjteague, pstuckey}@unimelb.edu.au  
 Department of Computing and Information Systems  
 The University of Melbourne  
 Parkville, Australia

## Abstract

We show how to use automated computation of election margins to assess the number of votes that would need to change in order to alter a parliamentary outcome for single-member preferential electorates. In the context of increasing automation of Australian electoral processes, and accusations of deliberate interference in elections in Europe and the USA, this work forms the basis of a rigorous statistical audit of the parliamentary election outcome. Our example is the New South Wales Legislative Council election of 2015, but the same process could be used for any similar parliament for which data was available, such as the Australian House of Representatives given the proposed automatic scanning of ballots.

## 1 Introduction

It is obvious that the party that wins a majority of seats in a parliamentary election may not be the party that wins a majority of votes. This has been examined extensively in the United States [Tuf73, Yan08]. In Australian parliamentary elections, even the notion of a popular majority is poorly defined because Australian voters rank their candidates in order of preference. But similar results occur: sometimes in practice the Parliamentary winner is not the popular majority winner and there are even some systematic biases [Jac94]. Nevertheless it is often assumed by the public and the media that a party that wins a comfortable overall margin will comfortably win the parliamentary election. Of course, this is not necessarily true.

In this paper we focus on computing the Parliamentary election margin: the minimal number of votes that need to be changed, in a particular election outcome, to switch the Parliamentary winner. This may be much less than the margin between the popular votes of the two major parties.

There are two ways that an Australian parliamentary election may be closer than it seems. First, there may be many seats held by a very small margin. Second, even within one seat, the margin may be smaller than it appears: Australia’s preferential voting system proceeds by iteratively eliminating candidates until only two remain, then selecting the one with a larger total. A naive observer might think that the margin of victory is the number of votes that need to be switched to reverse the winner in this last step (*i.e.* half the difference in the final tallies)—we call this the *last-round margin*. However, the true margin may be much smaller, because changing an early elimination step may cascade into a completely different elimination order and elect a different candidate. Computing the correct margin for preferential voting is, in general, a computationally difficult problem, but we have demonstrated an efficient solution [BSTT16].

In this paper we show how to automate both computations to compute the Parliamentary election margin. This requires a slight modification to our previous work to compute the winning margin *with respect to a specific set of alternate winners* in each seat, combined with a simple process of adding the margins in the necessary number of seats.

---

\*Corresponding author.

As an example, we use data from the 2015 NSW state election to compute exactly the margin by which the Liberal/National coalition won. The popular margin was high—the Liberal/National coalition won 46% of formal first-preference votes compared with 34% for the Labor parties and 10% for The Greens.<sup>1</sup> The coalition won 54 seats compared to Labor’s 34. We find, however, that the number of votes necessary to switch the parliamentary outcome is less than 0.1%.

In prior work on US elections, we found that the true margin is almost always the last-round margin, though exceptions did occur. This is also true of the NSW 2015 election where, for example, the Lismore seat has a last-round margin of 1173, but the true margin of victory is only 209.

The source code used to compute our results is at <https://github.com/michelleblom/margin-irv>.

The same techniques and code could be easily applied to any parliamentary outcome for which complete vote data was available. This sort of analysis could become standard procedure for any parliamentary election with automated ballot scanning.

## 1.1 Summary of results

Of the 4.56 million votes cast in the NSW state election, it would take:

- 22,746 vote changes for the ALP/CLP to gain the 13 additional seats they need to win government (with 47 seats),
- 16,349 vote changes for a Labor/GRN coalition to gain the 10 additional seats they need to win government, and
- 10,398 vote changes to lose the Liberal/National coalition 8 seats and hence produce a hung parliament.

## 1.2 Application to auditing and accuracy testing, including Australian federal elections

The same program could be used, whenever data was available, to check automatically whether a known problem in an election was large enough to change the outcome. Similarly, when a known number of votes were received over an insecure or unscrutinisable channel, this could be used to decide whether that might have been enough to alter the outcome.

Conversely, it could be used to generate evidence that the election outcome is right.

These calculations could be used as the basis for a rigorous risk-limiting audit to confirm (or overturn) the announced election outcome. Risk limiting audits [LS12] take an iterative random sample of the paper ballots to check how well they reflect the announced outcome. An audit has *risk-limit*  $\alpha$  if a mistaken outcome is guaranteed to be detected with a probability of at least  $1 - \alpha$ . Either the audit concludes with a certain confidence that the outcome is right, or it finds so many errors that a full manual recount is warranted. The audit process is parameterised by the margin of victory in the election. Kroll *et al.* [KHF] have devised audits for parliamentary outcomes but, like most US research, they focus on simple first-past-the-post elections in which the margin is obvious.

This is particularly important now that the Australian Parliament’s Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters has recommended automated scanning of the ballot papers [JSC17]. The overall House of Representatives margin could be quickly calculated using our methods. Rigorous risk-limiting audits could then be performed for each electorate, immediately after the election, in order to provide evidence that the overall election outcome was correct.

In a time where outside influencing of elections is a constant source of news, and where more and more elections systems involve electronic systems, either for voting or counting votes, it is critical that we have mechanisms in place to generate evidence of accurate election results, and indeed to check what degree of manipulation must have taken place for the election result to have been altered.

---

<sup>1</sup>This is from <http://pastvtr.elections.nsw.gov.au/SGE2015/la/state/formal/index.htm>

Initially, all candidates remain standing (are not eliminated)  
**While** there is *more than one* candidate standing  
  **For** every candidate  $c$  standing  
    Tally (count) the votes in which  $c$  is the highest-ranked  
    candidate of those standing  
  Eliminate the candidate with the smallest tally  
The winner is the one candidate not eliminated

Figure 1: An informal definition of the IRV counting algorithm.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Background on Australian election counting

The lower houses of parliaments in the Australian federal and state elections are the result of a number of independent Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) elections for a set of single-member electorates (seats). Each seat has a number of candidates, and each vote consists of an ordered list of the candidates for that seat.<sup>2</sup>

The tallying of votes in an IRV election proceeds by a series of rounds in which the candidate with the lowest number of votes is eliminated (see Figure 1) with the last remaining candidate declared the winner. All votes in an eliminated candidate’s tally are distributed to the next most-preferred (remaining) candidate in their ranking.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of candidates in an IRV election  $\mathcal{B}$ . We refer to sequences of candidates  $\pi$  in list notation (e.g.,  $\pi = [c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4]$ ), and use such sequences to represent both votes and elimination orders. We will often treat a sequence as the set of elements it contains. An election  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined as a multiset<sup>3</sup> of votes, each vote  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  a sequence of candidates in  $\mathcal{C}$ , with no duplicates, listed in order of preference (most preferred to least preferred). Let  $first(\pi)$  denote the first candidate appearing in sequence  $\pi$  (e.g.,  $first([c_2, c_3]) = c_2$ ). In each round of vote counting, there are a current set of eliminated candidates  $\mathcal{E}$  and a current set of candidates still standing  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}$ . The winner  $c_w$  of the election is the last standing candidate.

Each candidate  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  has a *tally* of votes. Votes are added to this tally upon the elimination of a candidate  $c' \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{c\}$ , and are redistributed from this tally upon the elimination of  $c$ .

**Definition 1. Tally  $t_{\mathcal{S}}(c)$**  Given candidates  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  are still standing in an election  $\mathcal{B}$ , the tally for candidate  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , denoted  $t_{\mathcal{S}}(c)$ , is defined as the number of votes  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  for which  $c$  is the most-preferred candidate of those remaining. Let  $p_{\mathcal{S}}(b)$  denote the sequence of candidates mentioned in  $b$  that are also in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

$$t_{\mathcal{S}}(c) = | [b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}, c = first(p_{\mathcal{S}}(b))] | \tag{1}$$

**Definition 2. Margin of Victory (MOV)** The MOV in an election with candidates  $\mathcal{C}$  and winner  $c_w \in \mathcal{C}$ , is the *smallest* number of votes whose ranking must be modified (by an adversary) so that a candidate  $c' \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{c_w\}$  is elected.

Often the last round margin (LRM) is used as a proxy for the margin of victory.

**Definition 3. Last Round Margin (LRM)** The last round margin of election, in which two candidates  $\mathcal{S} = \{c, c'\}$  remain with  $t_{\mathcal{S}}(c)$  and  $t_{\mathcal{S}}(c')$  votes in their tallies, is equal to half the difference between the tallies of  $c$  and  $c'$  rounded up.

$$LRM = \lceil \frac{|t_{\mathcal{S}}(c) - t_{\mathcal{S}}(c')|}{2} \rceil \tag{2}$$

<sup>2</sup>Most Australian elections require all preferences to be filled in, but some allow partial lists or several equal-last candidates. Our analysis extends to all these cases.

<sup>3</sup>A multiset allows for the inclusion of duplicate items.

In this paper we will be interested in a more restricted version of margin of victory, which is the margin of victory over a subset of the non-winning candidates.

**Definition 4. Margin of Victory over Candidates  $\mathcal{A}$  (MOVC)** The MOVC in an election with candidates  $\mathcal{C}$  and winner  $c_w \in \mathcal{C}$  over the alternate candidates  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \setminus \{c_w\}$ , is the *smallest* number of votes whose ranking must be modified (by an adversary) so that a candidate  $c' \in \mathcal{A}$  is elected.

While the MOV calculates the number of votes required to be changed to alter the winner, the MOVC calculates the number of votes required to alter the winner to one of a set  $\mathcal{A}$ . We will require this finer information in order to calculate the smallest number of votes for a different party or coalition to win the election.

**Example 1.** Consider an election between 3 candidates  $a, b$ , and  $c$  with election  $\{a : 55, ca : 25, bc : 41, c : 15\}$ . The initial tallies for the candidates are  $\{a : 55, b : 41, c : 40\}$  hence  $c$  is eliminated. The resulting votes are then  $\{a : 80, b : 41\}$  and with tallies  $\{a : 80, b : 41\}$  giving  $a$  the victory with a last round margin of victory of 20. But consider changing 1 vote from  $bc$  to  $c$ . Then the initial tallies are  $\{a : 55, b : 40, c : 41\}$  and  $b$  is eliminated. The resulting votes are  $\{a : 55, ca : 25, c : 56\}$ . Then  $c$  is the winner of the election. Clearly the MOV is 1 vote. The MOVC for  $\{b\}$  is 10, which is achieved by changing 5 votes from  $a$  to  $bc$  and 5 from  $a$  to  $c$  giving first round tallies  $\{a : 45, b : 46, c : 45\}$  where an adversary can choose to eliminate  $a$  leaving votes  $\{ca : 25, bc : 46, c : 20\}$  with tallies  $\{b : 46, c : 45\}$  and  $b$  winning the election.  $\square$

## 2.2 Automated margin computation for an IRV election

(author?) [BSTT16] present a branch-and-bound algorithm (denoted *margin-irv*) for efficiently computing the margin of victory in an IRV election. This algorithm improves upon an existing method by (author?) [MRSW11]. Given an IRV election with winning candidate  $c_w$ , this algorithm traverses a tree defining all possible *alternate* orders of candidate elimination (that result in a candidate other than  $c_w$  winning the election). As the algorithm explores these alternate elimination sequences, it solves a linear program (LP) to determine the minimum number of vote manipulations required to realise each elimination order. The ultimate goal is to find an elimination sequence, in which an alternate winner is elected, that requires the smallest number of vote changes to realise. Searching through the entire space of alternate elimination sequences would be too combinatorially complex, however, and so *margin-irv* incorporates rules for pruning sections of this tree from consideration. The result is an efficient algorithm for computing electoral margins.

Given an IRV election with candidates  $\mathcal{C}$  and winner  $c_w \in \mathcal{C}$ , the *margin-irv* algorithm starts by adding  $|\mathcal{C}| - 1$  partial elimination sequences to the search tree, one for each of alternate winner  $c'_w \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{c_w\}$ . These partial sequences form a frontier  $F$ . Each of these sequences contains a single candidate – the alternate winner in question. Following the basic structure of a branch-and-bound algorithm, we compute, for each partial sequence  $\pi \in F$ , a lower bound on the number of vote changes required to realise a elimination sequence that *ends* in  $\pi$ . These lower bounds are used to guide construction of the search tree. The partial sequence  $\pi$  with the smallest lower bound is selected and *expanded*. For each candidate  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  that is not already present in  $\pi$ , we create a new sequence with  $c$  appended to the front. For example, given a set of candidates  $c_1, c_2$ , and  $c_3$ , with winning candidate  $c_3$ , the partial sequence  $\pi = [c_2]$  will be expanded to create two new sequences  $[c_1, c_2]$  and  $[c_3, c_2]$ . We evaluate each new sequence  $\pi'$  created by assigning it a lower bound on the number of votes required to realise any elimination order ending in  $\pi'$ .

While exploring and building elimination sequences, *margin-irv* maintains a running *upper bound* on the value of the true margin. This upper bound is initialised to the last round margin of the election. When a sequence  $\pi$  containing all candidates is constructed, our LP computes the exact number of vote manipulations required to realise it. If this number is lower than our current upper bound, the upper bound is revised, and all orders on our frontier with a lower bound greater than or equal to it are pruned from consideration (removed from our frontier). This process continues until our frontier is empty (we have considered or pruned all possible alternate elimination sequences). The value of the running upper bound is the true margin of victory of the election.

Its easy to extend our *margin-irv* algorithm to also calculate MOVC for a set of alternate winners  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the first step of the algorithm, rather than adding a node for each alternate winner in  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{c_w\}$  we add then only for the alternates we are interested in  $\mathcal{A}$ . The remainder of the algorithm is unchanged.

### 3 Calculating the Number of Votes to Change a Parliamentary Election Outcome

Given a set  $S$  of seats in a parliament, a winning coalition of parties  $P$  is a set of parties such that the number of seats won by that coalition is at least some defined threshold  $T$ . Usually  $T = \lceil \frac{|S|+1}{2} \rceil$ , that is the coalition wins more than half the seats. In the NSW Legislative Assembly there are 93 seats overall, so 47 are required to win government.

We can use this to calculate the number of vote changes required to change a parliamentary election result as follows. Assume the coalition won  $W \geq T$  seats. We calculate the MOVC for each seat  $s$  won by the coalition  $P$  for the set of alternate candidates in that election of parties different than  $P$ . We then sort the MOVC values, and choose the  $W - T + 1$  seats  $O$  with the least MOVC values. The sum of the MOVC of these seats  $O$  is the number of changes in votes required to remove the victory of the winning coalition  $P$ , and hence change the outcome of the election.

Note that if the coalition is a single party  $P = \{p\}$ , or more generally if no seat has two candidates from the coalition, then the MOVC values required are identical to MOV values. This is the case for the NSW Legislative Election where no seat has both a LIB and NAT candidate.

We can use a similar approach to calculate the number of vote changes required to change a parliamentary election outcome so that another coalition  $P'$  would win instead. Assume  $P'$  won  $W' < T$  seats. We calculate the MOVC for each seat  $s$  not won by coalition  $P'$  for the set of alternate candidates in that seat with parties in  $P'$ . We then sort the MOVC values, and choose the  $W' - T$  seats  $O'$  with the least MOVC values. The sum of the MOVC of these seats  $O'$  is the number of changes in votes required to give a parliamentary victory to the coalition  $P'$ .

Again if the coalition  $P'$  was always the alternate winner in the calculation of the MOV, then the MOVC and MOV calculations will coincide, and indeed if  $P'$  is a strong existing coalition it is likely that it is the alternate winner in most seats with the lowest MOV.

## 4 Results

The NSW Legislative Assembly Parliamentary Election of 2015 was contested by major parties: Liberal (LIB), National (NAT), Green (GRE), Labor (ALP) and Country Labor (CLP); as well as a number of minor parties and independents (IND).

We found 5 seats in which the true margin was not the last-round margin:

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner
Lismore	6	1173	209	NAT
Balina	7	1267	1130	GRE
Heffron	5	5835	5824	ALP
Maitland	6	5446	4012	CLP
Willoughby	6	10247	10160	LIB

The Liberal/National coalition won 54 seats to have a winning majority. In order to lose this majority, then need to lose  $54 - 47 + 1 = 8$  seats. Since no seat ran both a Liberal and National candidate, we can use the MOV values to calculate the number of votes required to lose 8 seats. The 8 LIB/NAT seats with the lowest MOV are below. Note that for Lismore, the MOV differs substantially from the last-round margin.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner
East Hills	5	189	189	LIB
Lismore	6	1173	209	NAT
Upper Hunter	6	866	866	NAT
Monaro	5	1122	1122	NAT
Coogee	5	1243	1243	LIB
Tweed	5	1291	1291	NAT
Penrith	8	2576	2576	LIB
Holsworthy	6	2902	2902	LIB

Hence the total number of votes required to lose the majority is 10,398.

For the Labor and Country Labor coalition to win the election we need them win to  $47 - 34 = 13$  more seats. The 13 seats with the lowest MOVC for a change to ALP/CLP are:

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	MOVC (ALP/CLP)
East Hills	5	189	189	LIB	189
Lismore	6	1173	209	NAT	209
Upper Hunter	6	866	866	NAT	866
Monaro	5	1122	1122	NAT	1122
Balina	7	1267	1130	GRE	1130
Coogee	5	1243	1243	LIB	1243
Tweed	5	1291	1291	NAT	1291
Balmain	7	1731	1731	GRE	1731
Penrith	8	2576	2576	LIB	2576
Holsworthy	6	2902	2902	LIB	2902
Goulburn	6	2945	2945	LIB	2945
Oatley	5	3006	3006	LIB	3006
Newtown	7	3536	3536	GRE	3536

The total number of votes required to give an ALP/CLP victory is hence 22,746. In this case we can see, since the ALP/CLP is a strong alternate coalition, that all the MOVC calculations agree with the MOV calculations. Note that this is not true for all seats. For example in the NSW data Sydney is the first seat where the MOVC (= 5583) for the ALP and CLP coalition is different from the MOV (=2864). This is because the runner-up was an Independent. Note that if we used MOV instead of MOVC we would incorrectly treat Sydney as one of the seats to change, and incorrectly calculate the number of votes required for an ALP/CLP coalition to win.

The full results for all seats are in the Appendix. The total numbers for changing the parliamentary outcome are computed by simply adding together the smallest margins for the necessary number of seats.

## 5 Conclusion

We have shown an efficient method of automated margin computation that can be used to identify the minimum number of vote changes (or errors) necessary to alter a parliamentary election outcome using single-member preferential voting. Our example was the NSW Legislative Assembly election of 2015, but the same tools and techniques could be immediately applied to any other parliament constructed in the same way for which full voting data was available, such as the Australian House of Representatives.

All the necessary code is openly available at <https://github.com/michelleblom/margin-irv>.

Accurate electoral margins can form the basis of rigorous statistical auditing of paper ballot records to check the official election result. This would be valuable in any scenario, but is particularly important when an electronic (and hence unobservable) process such as automated ballot scanning is part of the count. Since these are exactly the scenarios that tend to produce detailed vote data, this work provides the basis for a count that is automated and fast (because of automated ballot scanning) and also transparent and verifiably accurate, because of rigorous auditing given an accurately computed election margin.

## References

- [BSTT16] M. Blom, P. J. Stuckey, V. Teague, and R. Tidhar. Efficient Computation of Exact IRV Margins. In *European Conference on AI (ECAI)*, pages 480–487, 2016.
- [Jac94] Simon Jackman. Measuring electoral bias: Australia, 1949–93. *British Journal of Political Science*, 24(3):319–357, 1994.
- [JSC17] Parliament of australia joint standing committee on electoral matters, third interim report on the inquiry into the conduct of the 2016 federal election: AEC modernisation, june 2017. [http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary\\_Business/Committees/Joint/Electoral\\_Matters/2016Election/](http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Electoral_Matters/2016Election/)
- [KHF] Joshua A Kroll, J Alex Halderman, and Edward W Felten. Efficiently auditing multi-level elections. *Ann Arbor*, 1001:48109.
- [LS12] Mark Lindeman and Philip B Stark. A gentle introduction to risk-limiting audits. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 10(5):42–49, 2012.
- [MRSW11] T. R. Magrino, R. L. Rivest, E. Shen, and D. A. Wagner. Computing the margin of victory in IRV elections. In *USENIX Accurate Electronic Voting Technology Workshop: Workshop on Trustworthy Elections*, USENIX Association Berkeley, CA, USA, 2011.
- [Tuf73] Edward R Tufte. The relationship between seats and votes in two-party systems. *American Political Science Review*, 67(2):540–554, 1973.
- [Yan08] Winston C Yang. Democracy, minimized-given various election scenarios, what is the minimum percent of the popular vote required to win the white house? *OR MS Today*, 35(5):34, 2008.

## A Full list of election margins for NSW 2015 state election

Table 1 records the last-round and true victory margins for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house elections. In most seats, the last-round margin – the difference between the two last candidates in the elimination order – is the true margin. Exceptions to this rule are marked with an asterisk. The 8 Liberal/National coalition seats with the smallest margins are shown in bold. The total of the margins of these 8 seats gives the smallest number of vote changes required to produce a hung parliament, 10,398.

Table 1: Last-round and true margins for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner
Gosford	6	102	102	ALP
The Entrance	5	171	171	ALP
<b>East Hills</b>	5	189	<b>189</b>	<b>LIB</b>
<b>*Lismore</b>	6	1173	<b>209</b>	<b>NAT</b>
Strathfield	5	770	770	ALP
Granville	6	837	837	ALP
<b>Upper Hunter</b>	6	866	<b>866</b>	<b>NAT</b>
<b>Monaro</b>	5	1122	<b>1122</b>	<b>NAT</b>
*Balina	7	1267	1130	GRE
<b>Coogee</b>	5	1243	<b>1243</b>	<b>LIB</b>
<b>Tweed</b>	5	1291	<b>1291</b>	<b>NAT</b>
Prospect	5	1458	1458	ALP
Balmain	7	1731	1731	GRE

Continued

Table 1: Last-round and true margins for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner
Rockdale	6	2004	2004	ALP
Port Stephens	5	2088	2088	CLP
Auburn	6	2265	2265	ALP
<b>Penrith</b>	8	2576	<b>2576</b>	<b>LIB</b>
Kogarah	6	2782	2782	ALP
Sydney	8	2864	2864	IND
<b>Holsworthy</b>	6	2902	<b>2902</b>	<b>LIB</b>
Goulburn	6	2945	2945	LIB
Oatley	5	3006	3006	LIB
Campbelltown	5	3096	3096	ALP
Newcastle	7	3132	3132	ALP
Wollongong	7	3367	3367	ALP
Macquarie Fields	7	3519	3519	ALP
Newtown	7	3536	3536	GRE
Heathcote	6	3560	3560	LIB
Blue Mountains	6	3614	3614	ALP
Myall Lakes	6	3627	3627	NAT
Bega	5	3663	3663	LIB
Wyong	7	3720	3720	ALP
Londonderry	5	3736	3736	ALP
Seven Hills	7	3774	3774	LIB
Summer Hill	7	3854	3854	ALP
Kiama	5	3856	3856	LIB
*Maitland	6	5446	4012	CLP
Terrigal	5	4053	4053	LIB
South Coast	5	4054	4054	LIB
Clarence	8	4069	4069	NAT
Lake Macquarie	7	4253	4253	IND
Mulgoa	5	4336	4336	LIB
Oxley	5	4591	4591	NAT
Tamworth	7	4643	4643	NAT
Maroubra	5	4717	4717	ALP
Swansea	8	4974	4974	ALP
Ryde	5	5153	5153	LIB
Barwon	6	5229	5229	NAT
Riverstone	5	5324	5324	LIB
Wagga Wagga	6	5475	5475	LIB
Parramatta	7	5509	5509	LIB
Charlestown	7	5532	5532	ALP
Bankstown	6	5542	5542	ALP
Blacktown	5	5565	5565	ALP
Coffs Harbour	5	5824	5824	NAT
*Heffron	5	5835	5824	ALP
Albury	5	5840	5840	LIB
Miranda	6	5881	5881	LIB
Mount Druitt	5	6343	6343	ALP
Canterbury	5	6610	6610	ALP
Fairfield	5	6998	6998	ALP

Continued

Table 1: Last-round and true margins for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner
Epping	6	7156	7156	LIB
Bathurst	5	7267	7267	NAT
Hawkesbury	8	7311	7311	LIB
Wollondilly	6	7401	7401	LIB
Shellharbour	7	7519	7519	ALP
Cabramatta	5	7613	7613	ALP
Lane Cove	6	7740	7740	LIB
Drummoyne	6	8099	8099	LIB
Keira	5	8164	8164	ALP
Camden	5	8217	8217	LIB
Lakemba	5	8235	8235	ALP
Liverpool	5	8495	8495	ALP
North Shore	7	8517	8517	NAT
Murray	8	8574	8574	NAT
Hornsby	6	8577	8577	LIB
Dubbo	7	8680	8680	NAT
Port Macquarie	5	8715	8715	NAT
Cessnock	5	9187	9187	CLP
Cootamundra	5	9247	9247	NAT
Wallsend	5	9418	9418	ALP
Cronulla	5	9674	9674	LIB
Vaucluse	5	9783	9783	LIB
Baulkham Hills	5	10023	10023	LIB
Orange	5	10048	10048	NAT
Ku-ring-gai	5	10061	10061	LIB
*Willoughby	6	10247	10160	LIB
Wakehurst	6	10770	10770	LIB
Manly	5	10806	10806	LIB
Pittwater	5	11430	11430	LIB
Northern Tablelands	6	11969	11969	LIB
Davidson	5	12960	12960	LIB
Castle Hill	5	13160	13160	LIB

Table 2 lists the number of vote changes necessary to elect an ALP or CLP candidate. This is at least the true margin (from the previous table), but may be strictly more, for example if an independent candidate was the runner-up. The rows inside the double lines are the 10 seats with the smallest changes necessary to give the labor parties 47 seats. The combined total number of votes needed to produce this is the sum of those rows: 22746.

Table 2: Last-round margins, true margins, and the number of vote changes required to elect an ALP or CLP candidate for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	Changes to Elect ALP or CLP
Auburn	6	2265	2265	ALP	0
Bankstown	6	5542	5542	ALP	0

Continued

Table 2: Last-round margins, true margins, and the number of vote changes required to elect an ALP or CLP candidate for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	Changes to Elect ALP or CLP
Blacktown	5	5565	5565	ALP	0
Blue Mountains	6	3614	3614	ALP	0
Cabramatta	5	7613	7613	ALP	0
Campbelltown	5	3096	3096	ALP	0
Canterbury	5	6610	6610	ALP	0
Cessnock	5	9187	9187	CLP	0
Charlestown	7	5532	5532	ALP	0
Fairfield	5	6998	6998	ALP	0
Gosford	6	102	102	ALP	0
Granville	6	837	837	ALP	0
Heffron	5	5835	5824	ALP	0
Keira	5	8164	8164	ALP	0
Kogarah	6	2782	2782	ALP	0
Lakemba	5	8235	8235	ALP	0
Liverpool	5	8495	8495	ALP	0
Londonderry	5	3736	3736	ALP	0
Macquarie Fields	7	3519	3519	ALP	0
Maitland	6	5446	4012	CLP	0
Maroubra	5	4717	4717	ALP	0
Mount Druitt	5	6343	6343	ALP	0
Newcastle	7	3132	3132	ALP	0
Port Stephens	5	2088	2088	CLP	0
Prospect	5	1458	1458	ALP	0
Rockdale	6	2004	2004	ALP	0
Shellharbour	7	7519	7519	ALP	0
Strathfield	5	770	770	ALP	0
Summer Hill	7	3854	3854	ALP	0
Swansea	8	4974	4974	ALP	0
The Entrance	5	171	171	ALP	0
Wallsend	5	9418	9418	ALP	0
Wollongong	7	3367	3367	ALP	0
Wyong	7	3720	3720	ALP	0
East Hills	5	189	189	LIB	189
Lismore	6	1173	209	NAT	209
Upper Hunter	6	866	866	NAT	866
Monaro	5	1122	1122	NAT	1122
Balina	7	1267	1130	GRE	1130
Coogee	5	1243	1243	LIB	1243
Tweed	5	1291	1291	NAT	1291
Balmain	7	1731	1731	GRE	1731
Penrith	8	2576	2576	LIB	2576
Holsworthy	6	2902	2902	LIB	2902
Goulburn	6	2945	2945	LIB	2945
Oatley	5	3006	3006	LIB	3006
Newtown	7	3536	3536	GRE	3536

Continued

Table 2: Last-round margins, true margins, and the number of vote changes required to elect an ALP or CLP candidate for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	Changes to Elect ALP or CLP
Heathcote	6	3560	3560	LIB	3560
Myall Lakes	6	3627	3627	NAT	3627
Bega	5	3663	3663	LIB	3663
Seven Hills	7	3774	3774	LIB	3774
Kiama	5	3856	3856	LIB	3856
Terrigal	5	4053	4053	LIB	4053
South Coast	5	4054	4054	LIB	4054
Clarence	8	4069	4069	NAT	4069
Lake Macquarie	7	4253	4253	IND	4253
Mulgoa	5	4336	4336	LIB	4336
Oxley	5	4591	4591	NAT	4591
Ryde	5	5153	5153	LIB	5153
Barwon	6	5229	5229	NAT	5229
Riverstone	5	5324	5324	LIB	5324
Wagga Wagga	6	5475	5475	LIB	5475
Parramatta	7	5509	5509	LIB	5509
Sydney	8	2864	2864	IND	5583
Coffs Harbour	5	5824	5824	NAT	5824
Albury	5	5840	5840	LIB	5840
Miranda	6	5881	5881	LIB	5881
Epping	6	7156	7156	LIB	7156
Bathurst	5	7267	7267	NAT	7267
Hawkesbury	8	7311	7311	LIB	7311
Wollondilly	6	7401	7401	LIB	7401
Lane Cove	6	7740	7740	LIB	7740
Drummoyne	6	8099	8099	LIB	8099
Camden	5	8217	8217	LIB	8217
Hornsby	6	8577	8577	LIB	8577
Dubbo	7	8680	8680	NAT	8680
Port Macquarie	5	8715	8715	NAT	8715
North Shore	7	8517	8517	NAT	8798
Cootamundra	5	9247	9247	NAT	9247
Murray	8	8574	8574	NAT	9483
Cronulla	5	9674	9674	LIB	9674
Baulkham Hills	5	10023	10023	LIB	10023
Orange	5	10048	10048	NAT	10048
Ku-ring-gai	5	10061	10061	LIB	10061
Willoughby	6	10247	10160	LIB	10160
Vaucluse	5	9783	9783	LIB	10581
Wakehurst	6	10770	10770	LIB	10770
Tamworth	7	4643	4643	NAT	11283
Northern Tablelands	6	11969	11969	LIB	11969
Manly	5	10806	10806	LIB	12106
Pittwater	5	11430	11430	LIB	12181
Davidson	5	12960	12960	LIB	13065

Continued

Table 2: Last-round margins, true margins, and the number of vote changes required to elect an ALP or CLP candidate for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	Changes to Elect ALP or CLP
Castle Hill	5	13160	13160	LIB	13160

Table 3 records the margins for a Labor-Green coalition. In this case the total number of vote changes required to produce this outcome is 16349.

Table 3: Last-round margins, true margins, and the number of vote changes required to elect an ALP, CLP, or Greens (GRN) candidate for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	Changes to Elect ALP, CLP, or GRN
Auburn	6	2265	2265	ALP	0
Balina	7	1267	1130	GRE	0
Balmain	7	1731	1731	GRE	0
Bankstown	6	5542	5542	ALP	0
Blacktown	5	5565	5565	ALP	0
Blue Mountains	6	3614	3614	ALP	0
Cabramatta	5	7613	7613	ALP	0
Campbelltown	5	3096	3096	ALP	0
Canterbury	5	6610	6610	ALP	0
Cessnock	5	9187	9187	CLP	0
Charlestown	7	5532	5532	ALP	0
Fairfield	5	6998	6998	ALP	0
Gosford	6	102	102	ALP	0
Granville	6	837	837	ALP	0
Heffron	5	5835	5824	ALP	0
Keira	5	8164	8164	ALP	0
Kogarah	6	2782	2782	ALP	0
Lakemba	5	8235	8235	ALP	0
Liverpool	5	8495	8495	ALP	0
Londonderry	5	3736	3736	ALP	0
Macquarie Fields	7	3519	3519	ALP	0
Maitland	6	5446	4012	CLP	0
Maroubra	5	4717	4717	ALP	0
Mount Druitt	5	6343	6343	ALP	0
Newcastle	7	3132	3132	ALP	0
Newtown	7	3536	3536	GRE	0
Port Stephens	5	2088	2088	CLP	0
Prospect	5	1458	1458	ALP	0
Rockdale	6	2004	2004	ALP	0
Shellharbour	7	7519	7519	ALP	0
Strathfield	5	770	770	ALP	0
Summer Hill	7	3854	3854	ALP	0
Swansea	8	4974	4974	ALP	0
The Entrance	5	171	171	ALP	0

Continued

Table 3: Last-round margins, true margins, and the number of vote changes required to elect an ALP, CLP, or Greens (GRN) candidate for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	Changes to Elect ALP, CLP, or GRN
Wallsend	5	9418	9418	ALP	0
Wollongong	7	3367	3367	ALP	0
Wyong	7	3720	3720	ALP	0
East Hills	5	189	189	LIB	189
Lismore	6	1173	209	NAT	209
Upper Hunter	6	866	866	NAT	866
Monaro	5	1122	1122	NAT	1122
Coogee	5	1243	1243	LIB	1243
Tweed	5	1291	1291	NAT	1291
Penrith	8	2576	2576	LIB	2576
Holsworthy	6	2902	2902	LIB	2902
Goulburn	6	2945	2945	LIB	2945
Oatley	5	3006	3006	LIB	3006
Heathcote	6	3560	3560	LIB	3560
Myall Lakes	6	3627	3627	NAT	3627
Bega	5	3663	3663	LIB	3663
Seven Hills	7	3774	3774	LIB	3774
Kiama	5	3856	3856	LIB	3856
Terrigal	5	4053	4053	LIB	4053
South Coast	5	4054	4054	LIB	4054
Clarence	8	4069	4069	NAT	4069
Lake Macquarie	7	4253	4253	IND	4253
Mulgoa	5	4336	4336	LIB	4336
Oxley	5	4591	4591	NAT	4591
Ryde	5	5153	5153	LIB	5153
Barwon	6	5229	5229	NAT	5229
Riverstone	5	5324	5324	LIB	5324
Wagga Wagga	6	5475	5475	LIB	5475
Parramatta	7	5509	5509	LIB	5509
Sydney	8	2864	2864	IND	5583
Coffs Harbour	5	5824	5824	NAT	5824
Albury	5	5840	5840	LIB	5840
Miranda	6	5881	5881	LIB	5881
Epping	6	7156	7156	LIB	7156
Bathurst	5	7267	7267	NAT	7267
Hawkesbury	8	7311	7311	LIB	7311
Wollondilly	6	7401	7401	LIB	7401
Lane Cove	6	7740	7740	LIB	7740
Drummoyne	6	8099	8099	LIB	8099
Camden	5	8217	8217	LIB	8217
North Shore	7	8517	8517	NAT	8517
Hornsby	6	8577	8577	LIB	8577
Dubbo	7	8680	8680	NAT	8680
Port Macquarie	5	8715	8715	NAT	8715
Cootamundra	5	9247	9247	NAT	9247

Continued

Table 3: Last-round margins, true margins, and the number of vote changes required to elect an ALP, CLP, or Greens (GRN) candidate for each seat in the 2015 NSW lower house election.

Seat	Candidates	Last-round margin	True margin	Winner	Changes to Elect ALP, CLP, or GRN
Murray	8	8574	8574	NAT	9483
Cronulla	5	9674	9674	LIB	9674
Vaucluse	5	9783	9783	LIB	9783
Baulkham Hills	5	10023	10023	LIB	10023
Orange	5	10048	10048	NAT	10048
Ku-ring-gai	5	10061	10061	LIB	10061
Willoughby	6	10247	10160	LIB	10160
Wakehurst	6	10770	10770	LIB	10770
Manly	5	10806	10806	LIB	10806
Tamworth	7	4643	4643	NAT	11283
Pittwater	5	11430	11430	LIB	11430
Northern Tablelands	6	11969	11969	LIB	11969
Davidson	5	12960	12960	LIB	12960
Castle Hill	5	13160	13160	LIB	13160