



Celtic Club Election Report 2021

Index

SUMMARY..... 3

RECOMMENDATIONS..... 9

NOMINATIONS.....14

RESULTS..... 15

DECLARATION..... 16

Summary

Appointment

Above Quota Elections Pty Ltd (AQE) were approached on June 7th to tender to run the 2021 Celtic Club elections and informed on June 11th we had been successful.

Stephen Luntz was appointed Returning Officer. AQE understands a motion was passed at the last Celtic Club AGM to have the VEC appointed Returning Office for these elections. However, the VEC, which has become more selective in the non-government clients they service in recent years, were unavailable, leading to the approach to AQE. Inevitably this created delays that led to AQE being appointed after it would have been ideal for nominations to open.

Nominations

Nominations were opened on Wednesday 16th June with emails to club members, written copies to members without emails (or who had not supplied them to the club) and notification on the Celtic Club web site. The wording was discussed between the Returning Officer and club administration, and sent out by the club using the email system the Club has established.

Nominations closed on June 30 in accordance with the Club's rules. Although some members claimed to have not received the notification directly, no attempts were made to lodge nominations late, nor did any members otherwise show signs of missing their opportunity to nominate.

Thirty nominations were received, one for president, three for secretary, two each for Vice President and Treasurer and 22 for the ordinary committee members. All were filed by up-to-date members and nominated and seconded by people eligible to do so; consequently, all nominations were accepted.

Patrick McGorry was declared elected President unopposed.

Members had until August 31 to renew their memberships (a requirement to run and vote) and candidates also had until this date to withdraw.

Withdrawals were received prior to 5pm August 31 from one of the secretary candidates and seven candidates for ordinary member.

All but one remaining candidates provided photographs and 200 word statements which, as specified in the rules, were collated and posted to accompany the ballot papers.

In consideration of the exceptionally narrow time frame for printing and posting the ballot papers, the Returning Officer decided it would be best to hold a draw for the order of the ballot prior to the close of nominations, with candidates who chose to withdraw after this time being removed.

It was intended to hold the draw at a Club event so candidates could observe, but lockdown made this impossible. Instead, the draw was conducted on August 22nd over Zoom. Around a dozen candidates observed. Some technical problems were experienced, which made the draw take longer than intended and prevented at least one candidate from witnessing it properly. Nevertheless, overall we consider the process a success, satisfying those who attended that the draw was fair, and providing an opportunity for the Returning Officer to put the draw in context and take questions about this and related matters.

Polling

In light of the short timescale available, the ballot paper, instructions and the candidate statements/photographs were laid out prior to August 31, with those who withdrew removed as appropriate. Immediately after 5pm on August 31, having confirmed that all withdrawals had been removed, materials were sent to the printers. It had been hoped printing could be done by the end of the evening, allowing materials to be packed in envelopes prior to post offices closing on September 1.

Unfortunately lockdown once again interfered, with printing services closed earlier than usual, so the printing could not be collected until midday on September 1. Lockdown also prevented a large team assisting with the mailout. Even with all envelopes printed and addresses stuck on previously, only about 60% of the ballots were delivered to the post office on September 1, with the rest posted on September 2.

Under ordinary circumstances a single day delay might not have been an issue. However, with such a short time for ballots to be posted and received, each lost day threatened to prevent some members from voting, so considerable efforts had to be undertaken to avoid this.

All ballots were sent priority paid in order to increase the chance they would be received and returned by the closing date. The reply-paid envelopes provided with the ballots were ordinary mail, as the alternative would have been expensive and hard to arrange at short notice, but some members chose to post back their ballots using express post.

After the main block of ballots was posted around 40 requests were received for additional ballot delivery. These fell into four categories:

- Members who had inadvertently been left off the voting roll provided to the Returning Officer through being renewed outside normal processes.
- Members who believed they had been left off in error. The precautionary principle dictated it was important to send ballot papers to them as quickly as possible, rather than waste time checking if their belief was correct, as resolving this question might leave it too late to allow them to vote.
- Members whose address had changed, or were currently staying at an address other than their normal one, and needed ballots sent to their current address.
- Members who had not received their ballot paper and requested a replacement be express posted.

In addition, half a dozen members whose ballots had not been received on time asked to have a replacement ballot emailed out, which they printed and posted back, paying for the mailing themselves.

Despite the difficult circumstances, 371 members voted, a significant increase on the previous

election. Although the number of votes cast is lower than in some past elections, at 76% it reflects a higher proportion of the club's membership than any previous Celtic Club election of which AQE has been informed. It is also an unusually high turnout for a voluntary association of this size, where 60% participation is usually considered fairly healthy.

Proposed Polling Extension

During the election it was proposed by several candidates that the voting period be extended, either by simply delaying the closing date, or by counting votes postmarked by September 17, but received thereafter.

Such an approach would have offered many advantages, and had the rules allowed for it AQE would certainly have supported its adoption. Unfortunately, however, such an extension does not appear to be consistent with the rules. Had it been enacted, any narrowly losing candidate could have challenged the result in court, arguing that they might have won had the rules been followed.

In a circumstance where a large proportion of members were denied the opportunity to vote through slowness of mail delivery, a defense of necessity could have been argued against such a case. Based on precedents I am aware of it is far from certain this would have succeeded, but success would have been plausible. However, with turnout having exceeded the previous election it would have been almost impossible to justify such a decision to a court. Therefore, an extension in contravention of the rules would run the risk that any declaration made on the basis of counting the additional votes would lead first to an expensive court case, and then to the need to rerun the entire election.

An additional problem is that not all letters are now marked with readable postmarks, preventing confirmation in many cases that a vote was indeed cast before September 17.

AQE have checked the ballots returning after September 17, without opening them:

17 were postmarked before the close of polls, and therefore would have been eligible under the proposal.

5 were postmarked afterwards, and would not, although it is possible some of these were posted before, with delays in the original processing.

9 do not appear to carry a postmark with a date on them, making the timing of their postage uncertain.

Another 9 have postmarks with dates, but the date cannot be read with certainty.

Consequently, any effort to include votes received post September-17 would either be limited to a minority of those received, or would include some that are undated or unreadable, potentially including votes posted after the initial count had been conducted.

Complaints During Election Period

So many complaints were received that to go into detail on all of them would make this report unproductively long, so only those that were common, or we consider to be particularly important, have been discussed.

A substantial number of complaints related to the failure to receive ballot papers, or an envelope having been left out of the ballot pack. Almost all of these were able to be dealt with successfully.

An even larger number of complaints however related to campaigning that the complainant thought should be against the rules. The rules do not specify any of these matters to be breaches, however, let alone whether the Returning Officer had any power to deal with them.

In particularly many people complained that they had received campaign material at their postal or email addresses or on a phone number where the sender should not have had access. The complainants alleged, with varying degrees of certainty, that the author of the message must have had access to the club membership list and used it inappropriately.

In most cases those making the complaint appeared to believe such breaches were coming only from one, or occasionally two, of the teams* running in the election. However, multiple complaints were received against all three teams.

All candidates denied misusing access to the roll, but many of the complainants maintained there was no other way their contact details could have been obtained.

Although many complainants insisted the Returning Officer do something about this campaigning, it was very unclear what could be done. For a start, establishing that an abuse had occurred was obviously difficult given denials by the campaigners. Secondly, even if it was possible to prove to a satisfactory level of confidence that contact details had been obtained inappropriately, taking action would be questionable when nothing in the Club's rules bans such campaigning. Finally, even if action was to be taken, no power is given to the Returning Officer by the rules – it is at least arguable that this is a matter for the club's internal disciplinary procedures.

Given that allegations were made against all three teams, there appears to be little basis to conclude that certain candidates gained advantage over others - although there were no allegations against a majority of candidates individually, many received recommendations on how to vote cards distributed in questionable fashion, even if they themselves were blameless.

A specific complaint, coming from many sources, related to the email sent by the President thanking the membership for his re-election unopposed. The message contained brief endorsements of candidates for all other positions. Many members objected to this, not entirely limited to candidates who had not received endorsements, and expected the Returning Officer to take action, although the nature of this action was often vague. AQE has provided recommendations in the hope of preventing a reoccurrence of this controversy, but did not believe the Returning Officer had the power to act in this case, and it was debateable whether the email represented a breach at all. It is also our view that a message sent 2 months before the voting was unlikely to sway many voters compared to campaigning occurring when the ballot papers were actually in voters' hands.

Other complaints related to emails sent out by the Club with extended campaign statements. AQE believes there were several ways in which these emails were less than ideal. However, where the complainants saw bias and conspiracy, we are much more inclined to blame honest mistakes made under the pressure of limited time, or unanticipated technical constraints. We could not see any suitable remedy once these mistakes had been made.

*The Celtic Club rules do not include formal recognition of tickets, but most publicity aside from the 200 word statements included endorsements across all contested positions, and this material clearly grouped them into three teams, along with a few non-aligned candidates.

Finally, one complaint, repeated many times over in often highly abusive terms, related to the Club's decision to not include one statement in the email on the basis that it was potentially defamatory. The complainant alleged the decision was made out of bias, and that it was the responsibility of the Returning Officer to order the Club to include the relevant statement. As discussed in the Recommendations section, our view is that not only was this not the Returning Officer's responsibility on this occasion, but it should not be in future, at least without major qualifications.

Count

Considerable efforts were made to find a venue that would allow the count to occur while scrutineers observed in compliance with COVID safety rules at the time. No such location could be found, so in the end the count was conducted at the Returning Officer's house, with two cameras showing it over Zoom where scrutineers could observe. Although far from ideal, this worked better than expected. Consultation with the VEC revealed that something similar had been done for a count they had conducted under lockdown.

Several candidates appointed scrutineers, most of whom were very diligent in observing the count closely although a lot of distracting noise came from the computer of at least one scrutineer (we struggled to identify who). Several scrutineers also made helpful suggestions on how to conduct the count under such unusual circumstances.

The margins for Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer were very large, and three candidates were comfortably elected as ordinary members. However, a further three candidates were tightly bunched for the last two positions on the committee. The margin between them was small enough it could easily be overturned either through a recount, or by the nine votes that had been set aside as provisional owing to questions over the voters' eligibility.

Consequently, a recount of these three candidates only was conducted the following day. This, however, only made the count closer between the three. Following consultations with the Committee five provisional votes were accepted, and a third count was conducted where these votes were added in.

Many of the original scrutineers watched one or both of the recounts and were again helpful and constructive in their feedback. AQE would like to express its gratitude for this.

The votes recorded in the results section are the numbers after provisionals were added for all candidates and the recount run for the three in question.

General Observation

When bidding for this job Above Quota Elections greatly underestimated the work involved. Some of the additional work was a consequence of Melbourne being in lockdown while voting was underway. We all hope this will not be necessary again. Other underestimates reflect mistakes we made in our haste to submit a bid given how urgently the nomination period was approaching. In this case that haste benefited the Club at AQE's expense, since we conducted the job for the quoted price, but it might have gone the other way – we could just as easily have overestimated, burdening the Club with excess costs when there was no time to seek other bids. We've addressed this in recommendation 9).

However, the major factor that led to a greatly increased workload turned out to be what might be described as club culture and disagreements over the interpretation of the Club Rules.

It is probably not controversial to observe there is a great deal of suspicion and mistrust among some active members of the Club, and this spilled over into the election. AQE had no previous involvement with the Club. Our only connection to any candidate was having run elections a decade ago for a student organization in which one member of the Committee had been a candidate. In this context we expected our impartiality to be acknowledged. No doubt this was the case for most members, but it was far from universal. Decisions made by the Returning Officer attracted not only disagreement – it's seldom possible to please everyone – but allegations of bias and corruption. Even when this did not occur, almost every action we took was treated with suspicion by at least some people involved with the election, and we spent many hours explaining quite standard procedures. Usually these explanations succeeded in allaying the concerns, but future Returning Officers need to be aware they are likely to face the same suspicions. Unless they are willing to allow concerns to fester they need to be ready to spend many hours responding to them.

Moreover, the Rules currently give the Returning Officer no power over many aspects of the election, such as campaign materials sent out by candidates and interested parties. Consequently, we did not allow for time spent policing these, as we would for organizations where these issues are the Returning Officer's responsibility. However, quite a few people, both candidates and ordinary members, apparently take the view that a Returning Officer is responsible for all aspects of an election, irrespective of what the rules say. As long as this view remains widespread, the Returning Officer needs to be ready to deal with many complaints and demands and to expect to spend much time responding.

Acknowledgements

The Returning Officer would like to thank:

- His fellow directors at Above Quota Elections,
- Rebecca Saltmarsh for graphic design of the ballot paper and candidate statements under unusually trying circumstances.
- Michaela Hart for tech support, assistance with the count and emotional support.
- Catriona Hutchinson for assistance with the count.
- Catherine Grogan, Conrad Corry and Barry Corr of the Celtic Club for their assistance with the roll. Although conflict between the latter two delayed aspects of the election, both were unfailingly polite and supportive to me, sometimes offering to perform extra work others might have argued were not their responsibility.
- Brian Shanahan for performing the roll of liaison between the Committee and the Returning Officer. This proved quite time consuming for him, but prevented a number of communication breakdowns which might otherwise have occurred and would have made the election a considerably worse experience for everyone.

Recommendations

The Celtic Clubs rules regarding elections are deeply deficient. Fixing this will not solve the division and hostility that plagues the club. Even the best rules are subject to interpretation in ways that will provide an arena for distrust and tribal loyalties to play out. However, creating a good set of rules, and modifying them regularly in response to experience, will almost certainly help.

We suggest priorities for such election rules should be:

1) Clear rules on the counting method.

Nowhere in the Celtic Club's rules does it say whether voting is to be preferential or First Past The Post (FPTP), let alone spelling out finer details of these systems. Upon inquiry AQE learned that all elections in living memory had been conducted using FPTP. AQE decided it would be inappropriate for the Returning Officer to make a change to this system of their own accord.

Nevertheless, this should in no way be seen as an endorsement of FPTP. AQE recommends preferential voting for almost all clients: the only exception would be for a body with a high proportion of members lacking reading or numeracy skills, something definitely not applicable here. Moreover, it is particularly strange for a club that celebrates Irish culture to be using FPTP.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the seeding of FPTP worldwide has been one of the worst consequences of British Imperialism. No nation has resisted it more fiercely than Ireland, with optional preferential voting used for elections at all levels of government in the Irish Republic. Even in Northern Ireland preferential proportional voting has been adopted for the assembly and local council and was in place for European elections prior to Brexit. This has occurred not (or at least not only) as part of throwing off British influence, but because preferential voting is a more democratic system.

I personally had the pleasure of scrutineering at a local government/European Parliament count in Dublin in 1999, and was struck by the greater familiarity and understanding of the Irish population of preferential voting than among Australians. A club with a high proportion of Irish immigrants should be leading the way in the use of preferential voting, not trailing. Scotland has now also adopted preferential voting for local government elections.

Since there are a number of subtly different sets of counting rules for optional preferential proportional votes, we recommend the club not only write preferential voting into its rules, but spell out the specific form to be used. AQE would be pleased to provide examples of the wording of the form we consider best.

2) Adjustments to timing:

Many of the problems associated with this election were a result of the timing set out in the rules. The roll cannot be finalized until August 31, and candidates have until this date to withdraw. On the other hand, voting is specified to close on the second last Friday of September. We are somewhat surprised that this period proved adequate even in the days when

the postal service was quicker. This year such a tight timeline made it essential that ballots be laid out, printed and posted in the space of 24 hours, a hugely demanding task, made worse by lockdown preventing a number of people working closely together.

Although it is true the situation would not normally be quite this bad – it was sheer misfortunate that this year the second last Friday fell on the earliest possible date – rules should be written to allow for such situations.

It is not obvious why the voting period should not be extended to the last Friday of September, but if this is thought to be too long in years where this is September 30, a rule such as “The first Friday after September 21” would resolve the problem.

3) Consideration of online voting:

Some of the problems experienced this election, particularly in relation to timing, could be resolved by a switch to online voting. However, there are also drawbacks to such a move, at least if made universal. Consequently, AQE recommend considering online voting, but we do not have a position on whether the Club should actually adopt it or not. Instead, we provide what we see as the main pros and cons of a shift to a primarily or exclusively online election.

Online elections can be run more quickly and cheaply than elections by postal vote. On balance fewer votes are likely to not reach voters, and where this does occur there should be more time for replacements to be sent.

Some of the disadvantages are obvious: some members either do not have email addresses, or have refused to supply them to the club. Alternative arrangements would need to be made in these cases, and where the numbers are substantial this would undermine the benefits.

Moreover, online elections are effectively impossible to scrutinize. Voters simply need to take it on trust that the votes reported are those that were actually cast. It is clear from this election that trust is a resource in short supply within the club. Circumstances prevented normal scrutineering in this election, leading to allegations of misconduct despite the considerable efforts undertaken to make offer online scrutineering. The situation would presumably be much worse for an online election. It is also true that no election is completely immune to abuse, particularly online. For less heatedly contested contests, the idea that someone would find a way to hack an established online voting system is not a consideration. Based on this year’s experience this may not be the case for the Celtic Club, but even if such an event did not occur, the perception it might have could be just as damaging.

A further drawback is less obvious, but still potentially real. Online elections make it particularly difficult to discipline candidates for misbehaviour that does not warrant disqualification. This issue is discussed in more depth under recommendation 8), but it is fair to say that many of the suggestions made there are moot for online elections.

Even if elections are not moved online as a general rule, it is worth including a clause that allows people to vote online where no alternative method is practical. With one club member living long-term in Ireland, another temporarily overseas and several travelling in remote parts of Australia, the postal system is simply not geared to allowing them to vote. I imagine that in non-Covid times the number of members in such situations would be much higher. There was controversy as to whether a vote cast by email should be included. I believe that if postal voting is maintained it would be helpful to state that email can be used, but only where other options have failed or are likely to.

4) Fall-back options or get out clauses in case of another crisis coinciding with the timing of the election.

One thing the pandemic has highlighted is that life is not as predictable as we thought. Consequently, election rules in general would benefit from let-out clauses. These might put “where possible” ahead of items like the dates or reference to the in-person polling place. More generally there could be a clause stating, “In exceptional circumstances these rules may be modified after nominations have opened.”

Such a clause risks being abused, so it is important that checks be included to make sure the circumstances really are exceptional, rather than an incumbent committee simply deciding to make changes it thinks will benefit candidates seeking re-election. There are a number of ways to do this, although the most effective come at a price, by establishing an independent appeals tribunal who would need to be paid if their services are required. Such a committee would, however, carry the advantage they could also hear appeals against decisions of the Returning Officer.

5) Establishment of guidelines for campaign opportunities such as “meet the candidate” meetings.

Two meet-the-candidate meetings were held this year, along with additional mail-outs by email and hard copy to better inform voters. Overall, we believe these were helpful to voters in making their decisions, but serious problems arose. Most of these problems were a consequence of the timing of the decision to run these events, although a communication breakdown between the committee and the Returning Officer (for which we accept part of the blame) exacerbated things. However, we doubt the communication breakdown would have occurred, were it not for the short timeline under which events were occurring.

This emphasizes that such events should be planned well in advance. It is not necessary or desirable for the rules to spell out exactly what will take place – events appropriate for one year may not be for another when there are very different numbers of candidates. However, part of the reason for the delay was the belief by at least one member of the committee that any events not mentioned in the rules were in breach of it. It would therefore be helpful to include a line such as, “Meet the candidate meetings and mass mailouts by email may be organized, provided all candidates for a position are given an equal opportunity to participate, and are given at least a week’s notice prior to the event.”

Additional time would also provide an opportunity for items prepared by the club to be run past the Returning Officer. Under the circumstances, the Returning Officer had no capacity to put together the email out of candidates’ campaign material, and this was done by staff of the club. We appreciate the effort. However, the format of the email appeared to some people to be biased. It is very unlikely this actually affected the vote, certainly not to an extent which would have changed the outcome for office bearers, it created another point of division. Having the Returning Officer look over a draft before it went out could have avoided this. A draft was sent to the Returning Officer, but he was focused on other matters and did not see it until after it had been sent out. A more relaxed timeline would have avoided this.

Such rules should also apply to the use of emails to club members during the period between opening of nominations and close of voting. The President’s email after being re-elected unopposed proved very controversial, but currently there are no rules regarding messages such as this, aside from a very broad interpretation of one section of the Act, which was rejected in

legal advice provided to the President. If powers in this situation were specified, a substantial portion of the conflict in this election might have been avoided.

6) Processes for handling potentially defamatory or illegal material submitted for publication by the club.

- The 200-word statements submitted by candidates were overwhelmingly positive. The only one that included negative statements spoke in generalizations about the past and did not explicitly, or even implicitly on our reading, accuse any individual. Unfortunately, this was not the case once candidates were given greater space, as in the email that was sent out on September 7. Two of the statements contained sections that were considered potentially defamatory by the member of the Committee appointed to assess these. One was resolved fairly easily, but the other proved much more difficult.

The candidate responsible refused to make changes that would make this statement acceptable to the committee, and therefore their statement was not sent out. Following this the candidate sent numerous abusive and threatening emails to the Returning Officer, alleging responsibility for the decision. In AQE's view this was most definitely not the Returning Officer's call to make for several reasons:

- It was not part of the job we signed up for, and had we anticipated such a role would have fallen to us we would have charge much more money.
- The timing of the process coincided with the need to get envelopes out urgently, which we considered to be very much the priority.
- The Returning Officer is not qualified as a lawyer, let alone a defamation specialist. The one lawyer in Above Quota (also not a defamation specialist) was in hospital at the time.
- The question of whether the statement was defamatory or not related in large part to events from several years before, of which no member of AQE had any knowledge – finding out would have been a long and arduous process.
- Finally, and most importantly, it would be exceptionally risky for the club to outsource a decision like this to the Returning Officer. If we approved the publishing of a statement that was defamatory it could cost the club hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees and payments. We do not believe it would be in the club's interests to outsource such a role to someone hired for a different purpose and with whom the club had no on-going relationship. Had we been contracted to make the decision we would certainly have put great care into the process, but it can't be assumed everyone in my position would act the same way – a snap judgement could be financially disastrous for the club, and harm only the reputation of the Returning Officer, which might not concern someone who didn't plan to stay in the industry.

In these circumstances it is vital the club establish a process for deciding such things in future. In this election one member of the committee was not running again and was handed the responsibility. This may not always be the case. Ideally it might be outsourced to an independent lawyer with experience in defamation law, but if this is judged to be too expensive, we suggest the establishment of a committee. The Returning Officer could be one member of the committee, but should certainly not have the entire decision resting on their shoulders.

7) The creation of rules regarding campaigning not distributed by the club

While process is lacking for campaign material distributed by the club, there is even less control over material published by candidates in text messages, emails or letters. Many organizations specify that such material must not be misleading or deceptive. This is far from a cure-all. It can be difficult for the Returning Officer to determine if something is true or not. Moreover, such material may end up being circulated anonymously so that even if it is definitely deceptive there is little that can be done unless the author can be identified.

Nevertheless, such rules can act as a deterrent, and may be used to weed out a portion of the inappropriate campaign material. Solving a quarter or a third of the problem is not what we might hope for, but it is still better than nothing.

8) Codification of the powers of the Returning Officer where other rules have been breached.

Rules are of limited value if there is no power to enforce them. Currently it is unclear whether the Returning Officer could do anything in the case of clear breaches. Consequently, we suggest remedies be set out in the rules the Returning Officer can use where they are deemed appropriate.

In the most extreme cases these may involve stopping the election and starting again, or disqualifying a candidate. However, it needs to be understood that these can be used only for particularly egregious cases. In this election some candidates demanded the election be restarted for actions that would be considered quite minor even if there had been rules against them at all.

Therefore it is important to have a variety of intermediary actions between reprimand and disqualification. These could include:

- The Returning Officer placing a statement on the website that one or more candidates have acted inappropriately.
- The Returning Officer sending an email to all members reporting a breach, possibly including a reprimand.
- The Returning Officer temporarily or permanently removing a candidate's statement from the website of the club and/or the online voting provider if the election is
- The Returning Officer issuing a ban on campaigning by one or more individuals for a period of time.

9) Timing of appointment

In addition to the changes in the rules, we recommend that the process for the appointment of the Returning Officer be conducted substantially earlier in future, This would mitigate several risks and problems referred to previously.

Nominations

The following nominations were received

Patrick McGorry	President
Helene McNamara	Vice President
Ronan McDonald	Vice President
Jennifer O'Brien	Treasurer
Carl Walsh	Treasurer
Conrad Corry	Secretary
Marita Dunbar	Secretary
Siobhan Lavin	Secretary
Sean McKeon	Committee Member
James Dunne	Committee Member
Peter Donnellan	Committee Member
Michael O'Meara	Committee Member
Eamon Spillane	Committee Member
Alison Mulhallen	Committee Member
Mary Healy	Committee Member
William Burke	Committee Member
Richard Warren	Committee Member
Niall Walsh	Committee Member
Karen Kennelly-Fogarty	Committee Member
Jim Cusack	Committee Member
Peter Hudson	Committee Member
Clare Murphy	Committee Member
Anne Murphy	Committee Member
Grace Edgar	Committee Member
Michael Cooney	Committee Member
Deirdre Gillespie	Committee Member
Rosemary Sheehan	Committee Member
Eoin Killackey	Committee Member
Bernard Dunn	Committee Member
Nial Finegan	Committee Member

Withdrawals

Withdrawals were received from
Conrad Corry
Sean McKeon
James Dunne
Michael O'Meara
Karen Kennelly-Fogarty
Jim Cusack
Peter Hudson
Nial Finegan
before the ballot was produced.

Results

Vice President

Helene McNamara 107

Ronan McDonald 262

Informal 2

Secretary

Siobhan Lavin 283

Marita Dunbar 88

Informal 0

Treasurer

Carl Walsh 223

Jennifer O'Brien 145

Informal 3

Ordinary Committee Members

William Bourke 70

Clare Murphy 177

Alison Mulhallen 72

Bernard Dunn 91

Deirdre Gillespie 220

Rosemary Sheehan 219

Eoin Killackey 5

Mary Healy 58

Eamon Spillane 175

Anne Murphy-Cruise 180

Grace Edgar 152

Peter Donnellan 88

Michael Cooney 204

Niall Walsh 76

Richard Warren 64

Informal 0

Provisional Declaration:

The following candidates were declared provisionally elected:

President

Patrick McGorry

Vice President

Ronan McDonald

Secretary

Siobhan Lavin

Treasurer

Carl Walsh

Ordinary Members

Deirdre Gillespie

Rosemary Sheehan

Michael Cooney

Anne Murphy-Cruise

Clare Murphy

Declaration

I hereby declare that the 2021 Celtic Club Biennial Election was conducted and administered with impartiality by myself and the directors and staff of Above Quota Elections Pty Ltd.

Stephen Luntz
Returning Officer
31/10/2021