



Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe
Congrès des pouvoirs locaux et régionaux de l'Europe

Strasbourg, 29 January 1997
s:\delai.md\bureau3\ecgbur.73

BUREAU OF THE CONGRESS

**OBSERVATION OF THE LOCAL ELECTIONS
IN ARMENIA - 10 and 24 November 1996**

Rapporteur: Mrs Olga Bennett (Ireland)

*Report approved by the Bureau of the Congress
on 21 January 1997*

Members of the Congress delegation¹:

1st round: Mrs Bennett (Ireland), Mr Cavini (Italy), Mr Eng (Norway), Ms Koczy (Germany), Mr Paour (France), Mr Sonesson (Sweden), Mr Suaud (France) Mrs Tolonen (Finland)

Expert: Mr Ascheri (Switzerland)

Secretariat: Mr Chetwynd (LODE Programme) and Mr Silvestrini (CLRAE Secretariat)

2nd round: Mrs Bennett (Ireland), Mr Casagrande (France), Mr Sonesson (Sweden)

Secretariat: Mr Chetwynd (LODE Programme) and Mrs L'Hyver Yesou (CLRAE Secretariat)

¹ The delegation was augmented by Mr Miller, British Ambassador to Armenia, and by Mr Dubost from the French Embassy for the first round of elections, and by Mr Morin from the French Embassy for both the first and second rounds of the election.

CONTENTS LIST

	Page N°
SUMMARY	3
I. INTRODUCTION	5
II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	6
III. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS	7
IV. LAW ON LOCAL ELECTIONS	8
a) Type of vote	
b) The Electoral Commissions	
c) Registration of candidates	
d) The right to vote and voter's lists	
e) The voting procedure	
V. THE CAMPAIGN	12
VI. OBSERVATION OF THE FIRST ROUND OF VOTING	13
VII. OBSERVATION OF THE FIRST ROUND OF COUNTING	16
VIII. PRESS CONFERENCE AFTER FIRST ROUND	18
IX. OBSERVATION OF THE SECOND ROUND OF VOTING	19
X. OBSERVATION OF THE SECOND ROUND OF COUNTING	22
XI. PRESS CONFERENCE AFTER SECOND ROUND	23
XII. CONCLUSION	24
XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS	25

Appendices to first round of local elections, 10 November 1996

- APPENDIX I	Press Statement issued by delegation	28
- APPENDIX II	Observations of delegation	29
- APPENDIX III	List of participants and regions observed	32
- APPENDIX IV	Results	33

Appendices to second round of local elections, 24 November 1996

- APPENDIX V	Press Statement issued by delegation	37
- APPENDIX VI	Observations of delegation	38
- APPENDIX VII	List of participants and regions observed	41
- APPENDIX VIII	Results (19.12.1996-not yet available)	42

SUMMARY:

First Round of local elections, 10 November 1996

1. Upon the reception of an invitation, on 15 October 1996, from the Armenian authorities to observe their first local elections on 10 November 1996, and taking into account the various reports following the observation of the Presidential elections of 22 September 1996, the Council of Europe recognised the importance of sending a delegation to observe the local elections.
2. In undertaking the observation, the delegation divided into seven teams of two and focused on the regions of Aragatzotn, Ararat, Armavir, Kotaik, Shirak and the city of Yerevan.
3. In carrying out its observation on election day, the delegation visited 110 polling stations representing almost 215,000 registered voters in the six regions cited above.
4. The delegation noted that the polling stations visited were well organised and that the voting and counting was carried out in conformity with the law. Nevertheless, the delegation believes that a number of amendments to the current electoral system should be adopted to improve both the efficiency and impartiality of the process.
5. *While a few anomalies were recorded and passed on to the Central Electoral Commission, the delegation considered that, from its observation, the first round of the local elections were free and fair.*

See Appendix I for a copy of the Press Statement.

SUMMARY cont.

Second Round of local elections, 24 November 1996

6. On 14 November 1996 the Council of Europe was invited by the Armenian authorities to observe the second round of local elections.
7. The delegation divided into three teams of two and focused on the regions of Aragatzotn, Kotaik, Shirak and the city of Yerevan.
8. In carrying out its observation on election day, the delegation visited 49 polling stations representing approximately 106,500 registered voters in the four regions cited above.
9. *The delegation recorded certain anomalies and abnormal behaviour during the observation. The problems concerned the inadequate respect of certain articles of the law pertaining, in particular, to the composition of the electoral commissions and the security of the counting process.*
10. In general, in the vast majority of the polling stations observed the voters were able to express their choice freely and fairly.

See Appendix V for a copy of the Press Statement.

-
11. In the light of the experience of these first local elections in Armenia, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe has made a number of Recommendations (Section XIII) aimed at improving the electoral law, in order to guarantee a true pluralism and a real neutrality of the electoral commissions, as well as improving the electoral procedures.

I. INTRODUCTION:

1. On 15 October 1996 the Secretary General of the Council of Europe received a letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia inviting the Council of Europe to send a delegation to observe the first local elections to take place in the country on 10 November 1996.
2. The invitation was forwarded to the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, being the competent organ within the Council of Europe for observing local elections. The Bureau of the Congress decided to send a delegation. Thereupon, following a request to the heads of the 39 national delegations to the Congress for nominations for the observer mission, the above-named delegation was formed.
3. While the Armenian authorities had sent invitations to the CIS Parliamentary Assembly and to the OSCE to observe the local elections, the latter were not in a position to send any observers and thus the Congress delegation represented the only international observers.
4. The interlocutor for the Congress delegation on the Armenian side was the President of the Central Electoral Commission, Mr Khatchatour Bezirjian, who assisted the delegation in carrying out its task.
5. An advance party of the delegation, Mr Chetwynd and Mr Ascheri, arrived in Armenia on 5 November in order to prepare the groundwork for the delegation proper. Prior to election day, members of the delegation held meetings with the Central Electoral Commission, the Minister responsible for local government, the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) and Ambassadors of Council of Europe member States² as well as with the Embassy of the United States of America.
6. Following the first round of local elections on 10 November 1996, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe received a further letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia inviting the Council of Europe to send a delegation to observe the second round of local elections on 24 November 1996.

² The Ambassador of France kindly hosted an exchange of views between the delegation and the Ambassadors of Germany, the Russian Federation, Ukraine and the United Kingdom, and the Chargé d'Affairs of Greece.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND³:

7. The first autonomous Armenian kingdoms emerged before the Christian era. Despite its subsequent history Armenians have always managed to maintain a strong national identity founded in particular on their Christian religion, adopted early in the 4th century, and on their Indo-European language with its own alphabet since the 5th century. This national identity is preserved by the Armenian diaspora whose numbers are equal to the current 3 million population in Armenia.
8. In the 18th and 19th centuries Armenia suffered from first Russian and then Turkish expansion, respectively. In 1915 the new Turkish dictatorial regime launched a veritable genocide exterminating 1 to 1.5 million Armenians. In December 1920 Armenia was incorporated into the Soviet Union.
9. The Republic of Armenia declared its independence on 23 September 1991 following a nation-wide referendum.
10. The principal obstacle to the country's economic development is its land-locked situation, with all its roads, railways and, oil and gas pipelines running through either Georgia or Azerbaijan. Furthermore, the country suffered a devastating earthquake on 7 December 1988.
11. Armenia's recent history has been marked by the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh, an autonomous region incorporated into Azerbaijan by Stalin in 1921. Tension over this enclave provoked an armed conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, resulting in numerous casualties and the occupation of 20% of Azerbaijan. A cease-fire has now been in force since 12 May 1994.
12. In 1990 the first Parliament was elected and the country embarked upon a process of economic reform, notably concerning agrarian reform and privatisation. In 1995 at the same time as the Parliament was elected, the Constitution was adopted, giving the President large powers. The Constitution foresaw the establishment of local self-governing bodies with councils and mayors (Art. 105) to be elected every three years.
13. On 22 December 1991 the Armenian Parliament applied for special guest status with the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, and on 26 January 1996 it was granted.

³ See Parliamentary Assembly reports AS/NM (1995) 27 and AS/NM (1996) 15

III. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS:

14. On 22 September 1996 Armenia held its second Presidential elections in which the out-going incumbent Mr Ter-Petrossian, backed by the ruling Republican Bloc, was declared the winner with 51.75% of the votes cast. The opposition National Alliance headed by Mr Manoukian obtained 41.29% of the votes and the Communist Party candidate, Mr Badalian 6.34%.
15. The opposition National Alliance accused the government of fraud and the OSCE Observer Mission report added substance to the charge by noting that *"those irregularities observed do raise questions about the integrity of the election process"*⁴.
16. Mr Manoukian seized the Constitutional Court on 30 October 1996 which had to render its judgment on the validity of the elections prior to 23 November 1996⁵.
17. The opposition parties that had rallied around Manoukian to form the National Alliance bloc for the Presidential elections, then declared that they would boycott the local elections, though in reality they did not put any pressure on their candidates to withdraw from the local elections, but rather all their candidates stood as "independents".
18. The Congress delegation was informed that there was cynicism among voters about the value of voting since on the one hand the government party would win anyway, and on the other hand local government was not considered to be important - democratic change has to come from above! - and thus the turnout would be extremely low.
19. The Congress delegation was therefore only too aware of the political climate within which the first local elections were taking place in Armenia.

⁴ See Parliamentary Assembly report AS/NM (1996) 15 of 14 October 1996

⁵ At 03h30 in the morning of 22 November 1996 the Constitutional Court issued its decision upholding the validity of the Presidential election results.

IV. THE LAW ON LOCAL ELECTIONS:

20. It should perhaps be noted in the co-operation programme between the Council of Europe and Armenia, it had been agreed that expert assistance would be provided in the drafting of the law on local elections. The Congress therefore regrets that the Council of Europe's expertise was not called upon prior to the adoption of this law.

a) Type of vote

21. The Law on Local Elections concerns the election of the community leader (mayor) and the community council for a period of three years for 930 separate local authorities, including 12 districts in the capital city of Yerevan⁶.

22. The community leader is elected by majority vote and must obtain 50% plus one of the votes cast in order to be elected in the first round of voting. If no outright winner emerges then a second round of voting takes place two weeks later between the two candidates who obtained the most votes in the first round.

23. The community councils are made up of:

- 8 members for community populations of under 5,000 and are elected by one multi-ballot majoritarian voting district;
- 10 members for community populations of 5,001 to 20,000 and are elected by multi-ballot in two majoritarian voting districts each electing 5 members;
- 15 members for community populations of 20,001 to 45,000 and are elected by multi-ballot in three majoritarian voting districts each electing 5 members;
- 15 members for community populations over 45,001 and are elected by multi-ballot in five majoritarian voting districts each electing 3 members;

b) The Electoral Commissions

24. The Electoral Commissions for the local elections were the same as those set up for the Presidential elections of 22 September 1996.

⁶ Yerevan is considered as a province and the mayor is nominated by the President of Armenia, while the other 10 provincial governors (*marzpets*) are appointed by the government. The Yerevan Council is composed of the elected mayors of each of the 12 districts of the capital.

25. The electoral commissions are politically appointed. The **Central Electoral Commission (CEC)** is currently composed of 20 members, with each party within the National Assembly⁷ appointing two members. The CEC is responsible for the interpretation and implementation of the law, and can issue Resolutions to the subordinate electoral commissions on matters pertaining to the organisation of the local elections.
26. Below it, are the **Regional Electoral Commissions (REC)**, one for each of the 11 provinces (including one for the city of Yerevan). Each party within the National Assembly appoints two members to the REC, thus the current composition is 20.

The 11 RECs possess substantive administrative powers relating to the running of the local elections such as the formation of the subordinate electoral commissions, the drawing up of the boundaries of the electoral districts and precincts, as well as providing the subordinate electoral commissions with the materials necessary for conducting the election.

27. For the purposes of the local elections, the 930 **Community Electoral Commissions (CoEC)** assume a greater responsibility for the smooth running of the local elections than is the case for the Presidential elections. The CoECs are nominated by the REC of their province, and are currently composed of 10 members since one member is appointed by every two members of the REC.

The CoECs are responsible for registering all candidates in the local elections, accrediting candidates proxies and representatives of mass media, for overseeing the implementation of the law by the Precinct Electoral Commissions and for announcing and approving the results of the elections for the community leader and the community council.

28. The **Precinct Electoral Commissions (PEC)** are where the registered voters cast their vote. Members of the PECs are nominated directly by the REC of their province, with each member of the REC choosing one member of the PEC. Each of the 1,650 PECs, therefore, is composed at present of 20 members, and the number of registered voters per PEC cannot exceed 3,000.

The PEC must ensure that the voters can freely acquaint themselves with the list of voters at least 15 days prior to the election. The PEC is also responsible for the smooth running of the voting on election day (ensuring that the layout of the polling station is conducive, on the one hand, to facilitating the voting process and, on the other hand, to guaranteeing a free, fair and secret vote). Once the voting stops at 22h00 on election day, the PEC is mandated with counting the votes in its polling station and publicly announcing the results.

⁷ Of the ten parties represented in the National Assembly, six are part of the governing Republican Bloc and another, the "Shamiran" women's party, is closely allied with the government. If more than half of the members of an electoral commission are present then the *quorum* is attained.

c) *Registration of candidates*

29. To stand for the position of **community leader**, a candidate must be a citizen of Armenia, reside permanently in the community for a least one year preceding the election, and be at least 25 years old prior to election day.

Through a process of an application form and the payment of an electoral deposit (10 US\$ to 750 US\$ depending on the size of the population of the community) a candidate can nominate him/herself .

The deposit is returned if the candidate receives more than 15% of the votes; if not it is transferred to the state budget.

30. To stand for a position on the **community council**, a candidate must be a citizen of Armenia, reside permanently in the community for a least one year preceding the election, and be at least 21 years old prior to election day.

Through a process of an application form and the payment of an electoral deposit (1 US\$ to 50 US\$ depending on the size of the population of the community) a candidate can nominate him/herself .

The deposit is returned if the candidate receives more than 5% of the votes; if not it is transferred to the state budget.

31. For local elections it is the competence of the Community Electoral Commission (CoEC)⁸ to pronounce the validity of any application. Refusal to register a candidate is taken by a two-thirds majority of the Commission. The candidate may then appeal to the courts within 2 days and the latter must pronounce judgment within 3 days of being seized.

32. For those community councils where the number of registered candidates does not exceed 50% of the number of mandates available on the council then the election is rescheduled to a future date allowing time for more candidates to nominate themselves.

d) *The right to vote and voter's lists*

33. As noted above, the CoEC is responsible for drawing up the voter registration list for each PEC which should then be displayed in the relevant PEC 15 days prior to the election in order to allow time for any changes to the list to be made, where necessary.

⁸ There is one CoEC for every one of the 930 local authorities. There are then 1650 Precinct Electoral Commissions (PEC) or voting stations. While most rural areas have only one PEC per CoEC, the number increases in the towns; for example Gyumri has 53 PECs for one CoEC and Yerevan has 303 PEC's for 12 CoECs.

34. The lists were based on those used during the Presidential elections of 22 September 1996, and the complementary lists drawn up on this day. Information received by the delegation from different sources confirmed that the lists were displayed in time.
35. In the Presidential election the compilation of military voting lists and the manner in which the military voted proved controversial. For the local elections the law forbids military persons from participating in the elections, which the CEC interpreted by allowing military officers to vote in their place of permanent residence while denying ordinary soldiers the right to vote.
36. While the question of refugees is not treated in the law, the criterion for voting being based upon the possession of Armenian citizenship, the CEC adopted a Resolution whereby it allowed Armenian refugees living in the country to vote in the local elections if they could prove their residence in a locality for three years. This led to certain PECs compiling large supplementary voting lists on the day of the election to accommodate the refugees. In certain cases the Chairman of the CEC instructed the Chairman of a REC on election day to intervene in a particular locality to enforce the decision of the CEC. For example in Kotaik region concerning PEC 52/1 in Tzaghkadzor; the Chairman of the CEC also wrote directly to certain PECs instructing them to allow refugees to vote upon the presentation of the correct documentation, as laid down in Article 24.3 of the law.

e) The voting procedure

37. The voting procedure is relatively complicated. The voter, upon entering the polling station, is directed to a table with a voter registration list where the name of the voter is verified on the list upon the production of passport identification by a member of the PEC. If the voter's name is registered then the voter is supplied with a ballot paper for the community leader and a ballot paper for the community council. The voter also receives a coupon with the number of the voter as noted on the registration list.
38. The voter then goes into one of the voting booths to vote by making a simple cross next to the name of the candidate for whom they wish to cast their vote.
39. Having made their choice the voter then leaves the voting booth and is directed to a different table with another copy of the registration list. The voter's name is then found on the registration list using the data on the coupon and, upon verification of the voter's identity, the voter then signs the registration list against his/her name. Having done this, the voter has the two ballot papers validated by the ballot stamp and can then put them into the ballot box.
40. If the voter's name does not appear on the registration list then, upon the production of the passport and evidence proving residence in the locality for the previous three years, the person is registered on a supplementary list which should be signed by the voter before casting the ballot.

V. THE CAMPAIGN⁹:

41. The ability to campaign depended on the amount of money that an individual candidate could raise to buy television time, print leaflets and posters or take out adverts in the newspapers.
42. While the delegation could not follow the pre-electoral campaign directly it was informed during a meeting with the Yerevan Press Club which brings together 30 media organisations, that there was little national media coverage or interest in the local elections. However, the interest of local media was much greater. The majority of regional newspapers are only printed once a week or even less frequently, and therefore it was the emerging role of regional television which provided the most complete coverage of the local election campaign.
43. Naturally, the ability to pay for electioneering time on television favoured those candidates with sufficient funding.
44. The only anomaly noted by the delegation was a 45 minute talk broadcast on the local television by the Chairman of Abovian CoEC in favour of the incumbent community leader. This activity is forbidden under Article 22.2 of the Law on Local Elections which says that members of the electoral commissions are not allowed to campaign for or against a candidate.
45. On the positive side, the Yerevan Press Club had used the local elections as an opportunity for organising a conference with the local media on the role of the local media during the local elections.

⁹ The delegation was not present in Armenia for a sufficient period of time to monitor the pre-electoral campaign.

VI. OBSERVATION OF THE FIRST ROUND OF VOTING:

46. The delegation was divided into seven groups¹⁰. Given the limited size of the delegation, it was decided to concentrate on the urban areas where it would be possible to visit more polling stations in the course of the day and also because the urban areas were considered politically more important.
47. While two groups remained to observe the election in the various districts of Yerevan the other five teams observed the election in the regions of Ararat, Aragotzotn, Armavir, Kotaik and Shirak concentrating on the main towns (notably Ararat, Artashat, Ashtarak, Armavir, Hrazdan, Abovian and Gyumri) but also paying random visits to polling stations in the countryside.
48. The choice of polling stations was completely random and was left up to each team to decide as the election day proceeded.

Opening of the PECs

49. Each team was present in a polling station prior to its opening and thus was able to observe the Chairman of the PEC removing the validating stamps from the sealed envelopes in the presence of the whole commission and the proxies, and likewise the sealing of the ballot box.
50. While the majority of polling stations opened on time, delays were recorded and observed by the delegation in several stations. One reason lay in the fact that the candidates' proxies wanted to have a clear view of the ballot box at all times since they had little trust in the impartiality of the PECs. This presented an organisational problem of where to put the proxies; the matter was properly regulated by the relevant PEC in those polling stations observed by the delegation - for example PEC 6/30 in Yerevan.
51. The other main reason for delay was the fact that the validating stamps already had ink on them, when they were taken out of the sealed envelopes by the Chairmen of the PECs prior to the opening of the polling station. The proxies therefore believed that the stamps had been used to validate ballots beforehand. In certain polling stations agreement was reached to cut the corner off the validating stamp and that therefore any ballots not conforming to the altered shape of the validating stamp would be considered invalid.
52. When one team of the delegation visited the CEC at 11h00 of election day, the Chairman of the CEC explained that the reason for the ink on the stamps was because each stamp had been tested at the factory to ensure they worked, and had not subsequently been cleaned. At the same time the Chairman explained that the CEC agreed to practical solutions introduced by the PECs, such as cutting the corners off the validating stamps, in order to allay fears of any fraud.

¹⁰ See Appendix III for composition and deployment of teams

53. The delegation finds the explanation of the Chairman of the CEC reasonable and believes that the complementary measures taken by the PECs, such as the sealing of the empty ballot box in full view of the proxies, the presence of the proxies to ensure that each voter did not put more than two ballot papers in the ballot box and most crucially the fact that the number of ballot papers corresponded to the number of voters signatures in those polling stations observed, ensured that no unaccounted for ballot papers were cast and declared valid.

Observation of the voting

54. In the vast majority of the polling stations visited by the delegation the voting proceeded smoothly and the PECs were well organised¹¹. The greatest problem witnessed by the delegation was either a lack of space or a poor layout of the polling station. With 20 members on the PEC and the right for each community leader candidate and community councillor candidate to have a proxy in the polling station, there were often 40 or more persons in the polling station, without counting the voters. With the voters having to go back and forth checking their identity, if the polling station lacked space or was poorly laid out or possessed too few voting booths, then a confusion arose with a mass of persons milling around. This was the case for PECs 1/1 and 1/2 in Aparan.
55. The delegation concluded that of the 110 PECs visited the voting procedures were carried out well in 89%, satisfactorily in 9% and badly in 2%. In general the PECs carried out their duties efficiently and in total accordance with the law.
56. It was noted that in certain cases the PECs did not contain a pluralist composition because some of the members were absent, but in all cases they were in *quorum* and thus were acting in accordance with the law. In those areas where there was not a *quorum* of PEC members the election did not take place.
57. A supplementary voting list was opened in 82% of the polling stations visited, with most of those being put on the list either Armenian refugees or persons who had recently turned 18 years of age. Passport identification and proof of residence were required in order to be inscribed on the supplementary list. The numbers on the supplementary voting lists noted by the delegation were 3,944 out of 214,727 registered voters in the 110 polling stations visited.
58. Other relevant information observed by the delegation was that in 92% of the polling stations candidates proxies were present, and the percentage was higher in the cities. The media on the other hand was rarely observed in the

¹¹

In many polling stations the observers noted members of the PECs possessed copies of the IFES training pamphlet which explained the law on local elections and the various tasks that the PECs had to undertake in order to ensure the proper conduct of the elections.

polling stations although two mobile television crews were encountered in Centre District of Yerevan and in the Kotaik region, and the two relevant teams of observers did give short interviews about what they were doing.

VII. OBSERVATION OF THE FIRST ROUND OF COUNTING:

59. The various teams of the delegation followed through the counting process in the PEC they ended up in at 22h00.

The first thing to note is the incredibly long and drawn out process of counting the votes.

60. In the PECs that the delegation observed the counting procedure was carried out in strict accordance with the law, to the extent that the Chairperson of the PEC read directly from the law.

61. The observation teams noted that the doors to the polling station were locked at 22h00 after which no-one was allowed access to the polling station even if they were candidates' proxies or members of the commission or international observers!

The validating stamps were then sealed and the number of voters was counted from the signed registration form and announced out loud before being wrapped up and sealed.

62. After that, the long process of validating and counting the ballots began with every member of the commission present being able to examine each ballot after the Chairperson had declared its validity or invalidity out loud. In case of disagreement over a ballot the PEC voted. The process continued until all the ballots had been declared, and then the different piles - invalid and votes for the various candidates - were counted.

63. The results of the count were declared out loud by the Chairperson of the PEC who then filled out a PEC summary protocol, signed by all members of the PEC. The different piles of ballots were then packaged separately, and along with the voters list, validating stamp and protocols were transported to the CoEC. Once the CoEC had received the results from all the PECs within its community, it would announce the result.

64. The delegation's observations on the counting process showed that in 99% of the PECs the number of voters who signed the list was equal to the number of ballot papers. The problem concerning the 1% was where the Chairperson of PEC N°19 in Haytagh (Armavir region) did not think that the ballot papers of two voters had been validated before being put into the ballot box, so he let them vote again. Thus, these two voters voted twice.

65. While there were more than 5% of invalidated ballot papers in 45% of the PECs observed, and more than 15% in 10% of the PECs observed, in no case was it considered unacceptable. The number of invalidated ballots can be explained by two factors, (i) the introduction of a new voting procedure with two separate ballots and (ii) the strict application of the law by the Chairperson and members of the PEC, who did not attempt to find out the expression of the voter before declaring a ballot paper invalid.

66. The delegation was aware of the problems that had occurred in the counting process during the Presidential elections but from its limited observations the count was conducted efficiently, considering the procedure, and there were no problems of security. The one exception was in Abovian PEC 1/13 where it was noted that the Chairperson seemed to be conducting the counting process in an arbitrary way declaring ballot papers invalid on spurious grounds while the other members of the PEC sat idly by.
67. Once the PEC Chairperson had announced the results and provided a copy of the summarising protocol to the foreign observers or candidate's proxy, the packaged ballot papers, stamp and voters list, as well as the protocols were then taken to the CoEC where the results were noted and the packages stored. The procedures observed were correct and in conformity with the law. Certainly the counting procedure could be made more efficient.
68. See Appendix IV for the results of the voting of 10 November 1996.

VIII. PRESS CONFERENCE AFTER FIRST ROUND OF VOTING

69. In taking note of the confusion caused by issuing press statements too early the delegation agreed to wait until Tuesday morning to make a statement. This allowed sufficient time for a proper debriefing of the observer groups as well as the opportunity to hear the reaction of the Central Electoral Commission on how they perceived the outcome of the elections.
70. Having considered the reports of all the observer groups it was possible to draft a press statement. This was then read out and distributed at a press conference held at 12h00 on Tuesday, 12 November 1996.
71. The most important points made during this conference by the CLRAE delegation in response to the various questions were:
- the comments and opinions of the CLRAE delegation only regard the 110 polling stations visited, but it should be borne in mind that these polling stations were selected on a completely random basis with no prior knowledge by anyone, even the observers themselves!
 - voting should not be compulsory and minimum thresholds are not necessary since the right to vote is a free choice; even if the voter turnout is low, a mayor or councillor possessed more legitimacy if elected by 20% of the registered voters than if appointed;
 - in referring to the opposition's boycott of the local elections, the delegation believed the boycott to be more formal than real in that individual members of the opposition still presented themselves in the elections, though not under a party banner; the delegation considered that the boycott did not influence the electoral process itself but merely denied the opposition the opportunity to participate in local government; their action to boycott the election was considered unfortunate since the effect was only to disenfranchise themselves;

IX. OBSERVATION OF THE SECOND ROUND OF VOTING¹²

72. Following the reception of the invitation letter on 14 November 1996 to observe the second round of local elections on 24 November 1996, it was decided to send a small observer delegation to Armenia.
73. The second round of elections concerned a run off for the position of mayor in 23 towns, 6 districts of Yerevan and 230 villages. There was also a first round election in one of the districts of Yerevan (Nork Marash) because the first round on 10 November 1996 had been cancelled due to the PECs not being in *quorum*.
74. The delegation was divided into three groups¹³. It was decided to follow the second round of voting in Yerevan, Gyumri (the second city of Armenia) and in a few of the towns around Yerevan (Abovian, Aparan). The day before the election the delegation visited the Regional Electoral Commissions in the regions of Yerevan, Aragotzotn and Kotaik and a Community Electoral Commission in the respective regions to observe the collection of the validating stamps, and to ensure that the necessary preparations for election day were ready. The delegation was informed that the validating stamps from the first round had not been cleaned but they were distributed randomly. In some PECs the colour of the inkpad was changed to provided an additional security against fraud.

Opening of the PECs

75. As with the first round of voting, each team was present in a polling station prior to its opening and thus was able to observe the Chairman of the PEC removing the validating stamps from the sealed envelopes in the presence of the whole commission and the proxies, and likewise the sealing of the ballot box.
76. While the majority of polling stations opened on time, delays were recorded and observed by the delegation in several stations. The most serious delays occurred in PEC 9/2 in Nork Marash district and in PEC 1/19 in Ajapnyak district in Yerevan which started voting at 11h15 and 11h45 respectively. In both cases the delay was caused by the fact that the proxies were not convinced that the ballot boxes were empty prior to being sealed.
- In PEC 9/2 the problem was only resolved once the PEC were instructed by the CEC to open the ballot box and then re-seal it in the presence of the candidates' proxies. A team of the delegation was present at this polling station from 08h45 to 09h20 and then briefly at 09h55 and the

¹² See Appendix V for the Press Statement issued by the delegation on the second round of voting of the local elections, 24 November 1996.

¹³ See Appendix VII for composition and deployment of teams.

atmosphere in and around the polling station was extremely tense. The PEC had taken a decision not to re-open the sealed ballot box and according to the law they did not have to. However, in taking that decision they fuelled the suspicions of the candidates proxies and instead of defusing the tension around the polling station by re-opening the ballot box they exacerbated it through their in-action.

- In PEC 1/19 the problem was resolved when the CoEC brought a second ballot box to replace the original one. The original ballot box was sealed and stored in a back room of the polling station to be opened later in the day by the CoEC in the presence of the candidates' proxies. Three members of the PEC including the Chairman and Vice-Chairman then left the voting station leaving the number of members of the PEC at only 7 (one short of the minimum required by the law).

Observation of the voting

77. In the vast majority of the polling stations visited by the delegation the voting proceeded smoothly and the PECs were well organised. In general the comments made in paragraphs 54-58 above concerning the observation of the first round of voting remain relevant for the second round of voting. The problem of space in the polling stations was less evident due to the fact that there were only a couple of candidates proxies in the PEC compared to the greater numbers for the first-round of voting.
78. The delegation concluded that of the 49 PECs visited the voting procedures were carried out well in 82%, satisfactorily in 10% and badly in 8%. The latter being PEC 1/19 in Ajapnyak district; PEC 9/2 in Nork Marash district; PEC 1/16 in Abovian; PEC 1/44 in Gyumri. In general the PECs carried out their duties efficiently and in total accordance with the law.
79. It was noted that in certain cases the PECs did not contain a pluralist composition because some of the members were absent, but in all cases they were in *quorum* and thus were acting in accordance with the law. The question of the composition of the electoral commissions represents one of the main recommendations of the delegation for any future amendment of the electoral law. Please refer to Point a) of Section XI on Recommendations below.
80. While the law allows for changes to the composition of the PECs five days prior to the election, the delegation was informed that in a particular case the changes had been undertaken only a couple of days prior to the election and even on the eve of the second round [for example PEC 2/2 in Aparan]. The delegation observed many changes in the composition of the PECs in Yerevan generally and noted in particular that in Nork Marash district, the PECs were largely made up of persons who had been members of the PECs in the Centre district in Yerevan for the first round of voting on 10 November.
81. A supplementary voting list was opened in 92% of the polling stations visited. Passport identification and proof of residence were required in order to be

inscribed on the supplementary list. Overall the numbers on the supplementary voting lists noted by the delegation were 2,940 out of 106,478 registered voters in the 49 polling stations visited, though this figure was probably much higher by the time polling stations closed. In PEC 9/4 in Nork Marash district the supplementary list represented 16% of the number of registered voters [400 persons out of a registered list of 2400 voters] half an hour prior to the close of voting, which the delegation considered extremely high.

82. Other relevant information observed by the delegation was that in 100% of the polling stations candidates proxies were present. However, media coverage of the elections was only observed in the city of Gyumri, where the independent television station "T.V. Shant" provided live coverage of the voting and counting. Later on "T.V. Shant" relayed the results as announced by the different PECs.
83. The delegation was informed that the voting in Kanaker-Zeytun district in Yerevan was cancelled early in the morning of election day because the ballot paper was incorrect. One of the two candidates had the name of a party to which he did not belong written next to his name. The CEC took the decision to cancel the election rather than hold the election and then invalidate the vote afterwards.

X. OBSERVATION OF THE SECOND ROUND OF COUNTING:

84. The three teams of the delegation followed through the counting process in the PEC they ended up in at 22h00.
85. For two of the three teams [PEC 1/16 in Gyumri and PEC 1/5 in Ashtarak] reference should be made to the general comments noted in paragraphs 59-68 above. The counting was carried out in strict conformity with the law. The only anomaly noted was that PEC 1/16 in Gyumri did not announce or post the results in the polling station but at the CoEC.

Once again the incredibly long and drawn out process of counting the votes was observed.

86. The third team observed the counting process in **PEC 9/2** in Nork Marash district in Yerevan from 21h50 to 05h15, and the conclusion of the team was that **the ballot count procedure was unacceptable**. This verdict was supported by the whole delegation later.

While the whole conduct of the count and the lack of professionalism and poor management of the PEC gave the impression that the count was not fair, it was the final decision of the PEC which rendered the count totally unacceptable.

- At 05h15 with the votes counted the PEC decided to abandon the polling station with all the packaged materials before having completed the protocols. While the protocols had been signed and stamped by all the members of the PEC, the number of votes for each candidate had not been filled in. The reason for the sudden flight was that the Deputy-Minister of Interior had entered the polling station and apparently informed the PEC that there were a couple of fights going on at the other polling stations in Nork Marash district, and that security could be better guaranteed at the CoEC.
- At the CoEC the Chairman of the PEC attempted to hand over the results but since they were not written down, he and the Secretary of the PEC went into the hallway where they conducted some calculations and registered the number of votes per candidate in the protocols.

For a full account of the proceedings of the count of PEC 9/2 see Appendix IX.

87. The CEC was informed of the delegation's observations the following day¹⁴.
88. See Appendix VIII for the results of the voting on 24 November 1996.

¹⁴ The election in Nork Marash district in Yerevan was declared invalid by the court on 13 December 1996.

XI. PRESS CONFERENCE AFTER SECOND ROUND OF VOTING

89. A Press Conference was held on the Tuesday following the election. This allowed sufficient time for a proper debriefing of the observer groups as well as the opportunity to hear the reaction of the Central Electoral Commission on how they perceived the outcome of the elections.
90. Having considered the reports of all the observer groups it was possible to draft a press statement. This was then read out and distributed at a press conference held at 11h00 on Tuesday, 26 November 1996¹⁵.
91. The most important points made during this conference by the CLRAE delegation in response to the various questions were:
- the comments and opinions of the CLRAE delegation only regard the 49 polling stations visited, based on random selection.
 - the electoral commissions are composed of too many persons which does not facilitate the electoral process; furthermore, they were in many cases not truly pluralist;
 - the elections in Nork Marash district of Yerevan were badly managed and the Central Electoral Commission was informed of our observations.

A copy of the Press Statement is in Appendix V.

¹⁵ The press conference was organised by Boris Navasardian, President of the Yerevan Press Club, and was attended by approx. 25 journalists from different media organisations.

XII. CONCLUSION:

92. For the first round of local elections, the good organisation of the voting and the counting observed by the delegation in the 110 randomly selected polling stations hopefully were representative of the procedures throughout the country. In this case the first round of the local elections will have achieved a great deal in restoring confidence in the integrity of the electoral process. Furthermore, the fact that the voter turnout was 60-90% in rural areas, 40-60% in the urban areas and between 25% and 60% in Yerevan proves that the people of Armenia value highly their right to vote and their right to determine who should be elected to local self-governing bodies.
93. For the second round of the local elections, besides the serious anomalies raised and upon which the delegation hopes that the necessary action shall be taken, the voting and counting was in general free and fair. Once again turnout was very high in the rural areas, roughly 40-60% in the towns and between 20-30% in Yerevan except in Nork Marash district where the voter turn out was 84%.
94. The delegation can only regret the decision of the opposition parties not to have officially participated in the first local elections in Armenia.
95. The delegation hopes that the Armenian authorities shall take into consideration the recommendations contained in this report and that they shall call upon the expertise of the Council of Europe when considering any future amendments to the local electoral law.

XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following recommendations are put forward in the light of the observations made by the delegation, and it is recognised that some of them have been raised previously:

a) Composition of the electoral commissions:

(i) The composition of the electoral commissions by nomination of each political party represented in the National Assembly means that, if further political parties were created within the National Assembly the number of persons on the electoral commissions would correspondingly increase. This system is heavy, unmanageable and does not necessarily lead to a pluralist representation.

- Another method of forming the electoral commissions needs to be found to ensure it is truly pluralist. For example, it might be considered that the Chairperson of the electoral commission be a representative of the ruling party (or bloc of parties) and the Vice-Chairperson be a representative of the opposition party (or bloc of parties). The Secretary could either be nominated by the ruling party (or bloc of parties) or independent. The rest of the commission would be nominated by the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the electoral commission either by mutual agreement or by each one nominating an equal number of persons. The electoral commissions should not be too large.

(ii) All Chairpersons, Vice-Chairpersons and Secretaries of the electoral commissions should be provided with ongoing professional training. Part of this training might include a more flexible interpretation of the law concerning the invalidation of ballot papers. At the same time consistent criteria for the invalidation of ballots must be established.

b) Opening hours of the polling stations:

One simple factor that can lead to errors in the counting is that of human fatigue. By the end of the counting process the members of the PECs are exhausted. There does not seem to be a valid reason for keeping the polling stations open so long. Voting hours should be reduced to either 08h00-18h00 or 0800-20h00¹⁶. This is ample time for voting. It would then enable the counting to be completed by 24h00 at the latest.

c) Simpler voting procedure:

(i) A simpler voting procedure needs to be introduced; in particular the use of two voting lists ensuring a double identity check on the voters seems to complicate the procedure for voting - one register would suffice.

¹⁶ In some countries there are shorter voting hours in rural districts than in urban districts.

- (ii) The use of different coloured ballot papers for community leader and community council would facilitate the verification of the voting and counting procedures.

d) The counting procedure:

- (i) The counting procedure can be made more efficient and less cumbersome. Tasks should be divided up among the electoral commission members rather than the Chairperson doing most of the work with the rest of the commission verifying her/his work. Broad outlines for the division of labour among commission members could be defined in regulations issued by the CEC.

- (ii) The results of the count as announced by the PECs should be final. All PECs should post the results of their polling station in an accessible place for the electors to consult. The CoECs should collect the results of the different PECs in their area, make the necessary additions and announce the overall results for their community. Therefore, the official results would be announced rapidly ensuring a transparency of the process rather than the current 5 day time delay.

- Many of the problems that arose in the local elections occurred during the counting process, and the major issues of contention concern the role of the Community Electoral Commissions (CoEC). Once all the PECs hand their results into the CoEC, the latter then is responsible for going through the various complaints filed during the election day and for reviewing the results as submitted by the PECs.

For example, in Nor Nork district in Yerevan the CoEC went through the PEC results after the first round of voting of 10 November and invalidated an additional 8,000 ballots out of a total of 22,855 voters thus radically altering the result. This particular result is now before the courts.

- (iii) PECs should be provided with strong envelopes for sealing the counted ballot papers, validating stamp and voters list. A lot of time was wasted fabricating makeshift envelopes from carton paper!

e) Equal access to campaign funding:

- (i) All candidates for community leader or community council should have equal access to government funding. The delegation did not understand why some candidates were eligible to receive financial advances from the government while others did not.

- (ii) Furthermore, the question of campaign financing should be carefully examined so that all citizens of Armenia can have the opportunity to stand for public office rather than just those with enough money to buy advertising in the newspapers and on televisions.

Appendices to first round of local elections, 10 November 1996

- APPENDIX I Press Statement issued by delegation
- APPENDIX II Observations of delegation
- APPENDIX III List of participants and regions observed
- APPENDIX IV Results



Local Elections in Armenia

YEREVAN, 12.11.96 - A Delegation of the Council of Europe Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE) observed the first local elections in Armenia on 10 November 1996 at the invitation of the Armenian authorities. In carrying out the observation, the delegation visited 110 polling stations, representing more than 210,000 registered voters, in the regions of Yerevan, Aragatzotn, Ararat, Armavir, Kotayk and Shirak.

The observers noted that the polling stations visited were well organised and that the voting and counting was carried out in conformity with the law.

Taking into account certain anomalies that were recorded and passed on to the Central Electoral Commission, the delegation considered that, from its observations, the local elections were free and fair.

The delegation would like to express its gratitude to the electoral commissions for their co-operation and assistance.

The establishment of local elected authorities is a fundamental step towards the consolidation of democracy, and the challenge now is to ensure their proper functioning.

A full report on the observation of these elections will be drawn up by the Council of Europe and transmitted to the Armenian authorities.

List of delegates :

Members of the Congress:

Mrs Olga Bennett (Ireland)
Mr Bruno Cavini (Italy)
Mr Jakob Eng (Norway)
Ms Ute Koczy (Germany)
Mr François Paour (France)
Mr Carl Sonnesson (Sweden)
Mr Bernard Suaud (France)
Ms Lea Tolonen (Finland)

Expert:

Mr Patrick Ascheri (Switzerland)

Secretariat of the Council of Europe:

Mr Hugh Chetwynd, LODE Programme Adviser
Mr Gianluca Silvestrini, CLRAE Secretariat

Consolidation of the Results of the Observers

First Round of the Elections

A	GENERAL INFORMATION				
1.	Number of polling stations visited	110			
2.	Total number of electors registered in the polling stations visited	214,727			
3.	Total time given to the observation	114 hours			
B	ORGANISATION AND VOTING PROCEDURE	Replies in %			
1	Were the opening hours of the ballot respected?	Yes	No		
		96	4		
2	Were the opening hours of the ballot well-known (8 am - 10 pm)?	Yes	No		
		100	0		
3	Was the polling station easily located for the electorate?	Yes	No		
		100	0		
4	Was the polling station well adapted (size, materials, etc)?	Yes, sufficient	Yes, insufficient	No	unacceptable
		95	3	2	0
5	Were there police in the vicinity of the polling station?	Yes	No	sometimes	
		62	36	2	
6	Were there police present inside the polling station?	Yes	No	sometimes	
		23	73	4	
7	Was the electoral commission formed by multi-party delegates (majority/opposition, for minimum)?	Yes	No		
		97	3		
8	Have you witnessed the presence of any political party observers?	Yes	No		
		92	8		
9	Have you witnessed any intimidating actions towards the electorate and to what degree?	Yes, mild	Yes, average	Yes, heavy	No
		2	0	2	96
10	Have you noticed any electoral propaganda?	Yes, mild	Yes, average	Yes, heavy	No
		1	0	0	99
11	Have you witnessed any agitation or disturbance ?	Yes, mild	Yes, average	Yes, heavy	No
		3	4	0	93

12	Was the poll interrupted?
----	---------------------------

Yes	No
0	100

13	Were ballot booths available?
----	-------------------------------

Yes sufficient	Yes insufficient	No
88	12	0

14	Was the ballot box officially sealed?
----	---------------------------------------

Yes sufficient	Yes, insufficient	No
97	3	0

15	Was the electorate listed in electoral rolls?
----	---

Yes	No
100	0

16	Were there supplement rolls, if so, how many?
	How many electors were registered on them?

Yes	No
82	18
3,944	

17	Was the identifications of electors verified?
----	---

Yes, always	Yes, majority	Sometimes	
98	0	2	0

18	What identification papers were requested?
----	--

Official document with photo	Other document with photo	Non-official document without photo
82	16	2

19	Did a commission member write the details (eg: N*) of identification papers on the electoral roll?
----	--

Yes	No	Sometimes
97	1	2

20	Was the electoral roll signed by the electors?
----	--

Yes	No	Sometimes
100	0	0

21	Was there a control on the distribution of ballot-papers on the premises?
----	---

Yes	No
100	0

22	Was there one elector per ballot booth?
----	---

Yes, always	Yes, majority	No
75	23	2

23	Was the security adequate?
----	----------------------------

Yes	No
99	1

24	Conclusion: you consider the procedure of the ballot?
----	---

GOOD	SATIS-FACTORY	BAD	UN-ACCEPTABLE
89	9	2	0

C	BALLOT COUNT
---	---------------------

1	Were the seals safely put aside, in order that they may not be used after the ballot closure?
---	---

2	Preceding the ballot count, did a member of the commission count the number of voters?
---	--

3	Who was present during the ballot count?
---	--

4	Regarding the number of voters, the quantity of ballot-papers found in the ballot box were?
---	---

5	In case of a difference in point 4, can it be justified?
---	--

6	The amount of spoilt ballot papers was?
---	---

7	Were the annullments of ballot-papers justified?
---	--

8	Have the observers witness any irregularities?
---	--

9	You consider the ballot counting system as?
---	---

10	Was the security of the ballot count sufficient?
----	--

11	Were the ballot results rendered public?
----	--

12	Was the official report containing ballot results signed in accordance with the law?
----	--

13	Conclusion: you consider the ballot counting procedure as?
----	--

Breakdown of the replies (observations limited to the 2nd round)

Yes	No
100	0

Yes	No
100	0

Commission members only	Comm. members + party observers	Comm. members + party observers + public
0	100	0

Inferior	Equal	Superior
0	99	1

Yes	No
100	0

Normal	Reasonable	Important	Un-acceptable
45	45	10	0

Yes	No
95	5

Yes, mild	Yes, important	Yes, unacceptable	No
10	0	0	90

simple	complicated	Very complicated	impracticable
10	80	10	0

Yes	No

Yes	No

Yes	No
100	0

GOOD	SATIS-FACTORY	BAD	UN-ACCEPTABLE
90	10	0	0

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Observation of local elections in Armenia 10 November 1996

Team N° 1: City of Yerevan

Mr Hugh CHETWYND
LODE Programme Adviser
Council of Europe
France

Mr Patrick ASCHERI
Head of the Department for polling
and elections
Canton of Geneva, Switzerland

Team N° 2: City of Yerevan

Ms Olga BENNETT
Dublin City Council
Ireland

Mr David MILLER
Ambassador of the United Kingdom
Yerevan, Armenia

Team N° 3: Region of Ararat

Mr Bruno CAVINI
Consigliere, Provincia di Firenze
President of UNCEM
Italy

Mr Gianluca SILVESTRINI
CLRAE Secretariat
Council of Europe
France

Team N° 4: Region of Kotayk

Mr François PAOUR
Maire de Saint-Bernard
France

Mr Jean-Claude MORIN
Embassy of France
Yerevan, Armenia

Team N° 5: Region of Aragotzotn

Mr Bernard SUAUD
Conseil Régional des Pays de la Loire
France

Mr Sebastian DUBOST
Embassy of France
Yerevan, Armenia

Team N° 6: City of Gyumri

Mr Carl SONNESSON
Malmöhus läns landsting
Sweden

Ms Lea TOLONEN
Mayor of Ahtäri
Finland

Team N° 7: Region of Armavir

Mr Jakob ENG
Skudeneshavn
Norway

Ms Ute KOCZY
Landtag Nordrhein-Westfalen
Germany

REFERENCE

Summary results of the 10 November 1996 local elections as issued
by the Central Electoral Commission (20 November 1996)

1.	Number of communities (local authorities) in Armenia	930
	- N° of towns	47
	- N° of districts in Yerevan	12
	- N° of villages	872
2.	Number of elections that took place	863
	- N° of towns	46
	- N° of districts in Yerevan	10
	- N° of villages	807
3.	Number of heads of community elected	606
	- N° of mayors of towns	23
	- N° of heads of communities of districts in Yerevan	6
	- N° mayors of villages	577
4.	Number of elections for heads of community to be decided in second round of voting	257
	- N° of mayors of towns	23
	- N° of heads of communities of districts in Yerevan	4
	- N° mayors of villages	230
5.	Number of elections for heads of community which did not take place	59
	- N° of mayors of towns	1
	- N° of heads of communities of districts in Yerevan	2
	- N° mayors of villages	56
6.	Results for heads of community not known following a request for judicial review	8
7.	Number of community councils elected	638
	- N° of town councils elected	44
	- N° of districts councils of Yerevan elected	11
	- N° of village councils elected	583

8.	Number of community councils not elected	292
	- N° of town councils	3
	- N° of districts councils of Yerevan	1
	- N° of village councils	288
9.	Results in which both the mayor and council were elected in the first round	500
	- N° of towns	23
	- N° of districts of Yerevan	6
	- N° of villages	471

Results of the first round of voting in the local elections of Armenia, 10 November 1996

VOTER TURN-OUT IN THE CAPITAL CITY OF YEREVAN					
	DISTRICTS	Registered Voters	N° who voted	% of voters	2nd Round, 24 Nov.96
.1	AJAPNYAK	70 749	20 261	28,64%	Yes
.2	AVAN	33 341	8 363	25,08%	No
.3	ARABKIR	94 040	21 483	22,84%	No
.4	DAVITASHEN	22 428	8 353	37,24%	No
.5	ZREAUMI	77 528	20 136	25,97%	Yes
.6	CENTER	99 946	29 401	29,42%	No
.7	MALATIR-SEBASTIA	89 557	26 499	29,59%	No
.8	NOR NORK	90 495	22 855	25,26%	Yes
.9	NORK MARASH	-	-	-	First Round
.10	NEW BARASHAN	5 714	3 423	59,91%	No
.11	SHENGAVIT	106 916	24 757	23,16%	Yes
.12	KANAKER-ZEYTUN	51 111	13 867	27,13%	Yes

Appendices to second round of local elections, 24 November 1996

- APPENDIX V Press Statement issued by delegation
- APPENDIX VI Observations of delegation
- APPENDIX VII List of participants and regions observed
- APPENDIX VIII Results



Local Elections in Armenia

YEREVAN, 27.11.96 - After observation of the first round, a reduced delegation of the Council of Europe's Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE) observed the second round of local elections in Armenia on 26 November 1996 at the invitation of the Armenian authorities. In carrying out the observation, the delegation visited 49 polling stations, representing more than 105,000 registered voters, in the regions of Yerevan, Aragatzotn, Kotayk and Shirak.

The observers noted that the vast majority of polling stations visited were well organised and that, generally, the voting and counting were carried out in conformity with the law.

However, certain anomalies and abnormal behaviour were recorded. These have been passed on to the Central Electoral Commission.

The problems raised concern the inadequate respect of certain articles of the law pertaining, in particular, to the composition of the electoral commissions and the security of the counting process.

In the light of the experience of these first local elections in Armenia, the Council of Europe will make a number of recommendations aimed at improving the electoral law, in order to guarantee a true pluralism and a real neutrality of the electoral commissions, as well as improving the electoral procedures.

Besides the above-mentioned areas of concern, which should not be underestimated, the delegation considers that, in the vast majority of polling stations, the voters were able to express their choice freely and fairly.

The delegation would like to express its gratitude to the electoral commissions for their co-operation and assistance.

A full report on the observation of these elections will be drawn up by the Council of Europe and transmitted to the Armenian authorities.

List of delegates:

Members of the Congress:

Mrs Olga Bennett (Ireland)
Mr Claude Casagrande (France)
Mr Carl Sonnesson (Sweden)

Secretariat of the Council of Europe:

Mr Hugh Chetwynd, LODE Programme Adviser
Mrs Marie-Aude L'Hyver-Yésou, CLRAE Secretariat

Press Contact: Cathie BURTON, Council of Europe Press Service

Tel. +33/(0)3 88 41 28 93 - Fax +33/(0)3 88 41 27 89/90
e-mail: cathie.burton@dircom.coe.fr

Consolidation of the Results of the Observers

Second Round of the Elections

A		GENERAL INFORMATION			
1.	Number of polling stations visited	49			
2.	Total number of electors registered in the polling stations visited	106,478			
3.	Total time given to the observation				
B		ORGANISATION AND VOTING PROCEDURE			
		Replies in %			
1	Were the opening hours of the ballot respected?	Yes	No		
		88	12		
2	Were the opening hours of the ballot well-known (8 am - 10 pm)?	Yes	No		
		100	0		
3	Was the polling station easily located for the electorate?	Yes	No		
		100	0		
4	Was the polling station well adapted (size, materials, etc)?	Yes, sufficient	Yes, insufficient	No	unacceptable
		94	4	2	0
5	Were there police in the vicinity of the polling station?	Yes	No	sometimes	
		73	26	4	
6	Were there police present inside the polling station?	Yes	No	sometimes	
		38	53	9	
7	Was the electoral commission formed by multi-party delegates (majority/opposition, for minimum)?	Yes	No		
		96	4		
8	Have you witnessed the presence of any political party observers?	Yes	No		
		100	0		
9	Have you witnessed any intimidating actions towards the electorate and to what degree?	Yes, mild	Yes, average	Yes, heavy	No
		0	0	2	98
10	Have you noticed any electoral propaganda?	Yes, mild	Yes, average	Yes, heavy	No
		0	2	0	98
11	Have you witnessed any agitation or disturbance ?	Yes, mild	Yes, average	Yes, heavy	No
		2	6	6	86

12	Was the poll interrupted?
----	---------------------------

Yes	No
2	98

13	Were ballot booths available?
----	-------------------------------

Yes sufficient	Yes insufficient	No
89	11	0

14	Was the ballot box officially sealed?
----	---------------------------------------

Yes sufficient	Yes, insufficient	No
98	2	0

15	Was the electorate listed in electoral rolls?
----	---

Yes	No
100	0

16	Were there supplement rolls, if so, how many?
	How many electors were registered on them?

Yes	No
92	8
2,940	

17	Was the identifications of electors verified?
----	---

Yes, always	Yes, majority	Sometimes	No
100	0	0	0

18	What identification papers were requested?
----	--

Official document with photo	Other document with photo	Non-official document without photo
93	0	7

19	Did a commission member write the details (eg: N*) of identification papers on the electoral roll?
----	--

Yes	No	Sometimes
100	0	0

20	Was the electoral roll signed by the electors?
----	--

Yes	No	Sometimes
100	0	0

21	Was there a control on the distribution of ballot-papers on the premises?
----	---

Yes	No
100	0

22	Was there one elector per ballot booth?
----	---

Yes, always	Yes, majority	No
53	47	0

23	Was the security adequate?
----	----------------------------

Yes	No
100	0

24	Conclusion: you consider the procedure of the ballot?
----	---

GOOD	SATIS-FACTORY	BAD	UN-ACCEPTABLE
82	10	8	0

C	BALLOT COUNT
1	Were the seals safely put aside, in order that they may not be used after the ballot closure?
2	Preceding the ballot count, did a member of the commission count the number of voters?
3	Who was present during the ballot count?
4	Regarding the number of voters, the quantity of ballot-papers found in the ballot box were?
5	In case of a difference in point 4, can it be justified?
6	The amount of spoilt ballot papers was?
7	Were the annullments of ballot-papers justified?
8	Have the observers witness any irregularities?
9	You consider the ballot counting system as?
10	Was the security of the ballot count sufficient?
11	Were the ballot results rendered public?
12	Was the official report containing ballot results signed in accordance with the law?
13	Conclusion: you consider the ballot counting procedure as?

Breakdown of the replies (observations limited to the 2nd round) ¹⁷			
Yes	No		
2	1		
Yes	No		
2	1		
Commission members only	Comm. members + party observers	Comm. members + party observers + public	
	3		
Inferior	Equal	Superior	
	1		
Yes	No		
Normal	Reasonable	Important	Un-acceptable
2			
Yes	No		
2			
Yes, mild	Yes, important	Yes, unacceptable	No
		1	2
simple	complicated	Very complicated	impracticable
1	2		
Yes	No		
2	1		
Yes	No		
	2		
Yes	No		
1	1		
GOOD	SATIS-FACTORY	BAD	UN-ACCEPTABLE
2			1

¹⁷ Data incomplete since in PEC 9/2 in Nork Marash district, Yerevan, it was not possible to answer the questions due to the fact that the information was not provided by the precinct electoral commission.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Observation of local elections in Armenia 24 November 1996

Team N° 1: City of Yerevan

Mr Hugh CHETWYND
LODE Programme Adviser
Council of Europe
Strasbourg, France

Ms Olga BENNETT
Dublin City Council
Ireland

Team N° 2: Regions of Aragotzotn and Kotayk

Mr Claude CASAGRANDE
Mayor of
President of French Delegation to the CLRAE
France

Mr Jean-Claude MORIN
Embassy of France
Yerevan, Armenia

Team N° 3: City of Gyumri and Region of Shirak

Mr Carl SONNESSON
Malmöhus läns landsting
Sweden

Mrs Marie-Aude L'HYVER YESOU
Secretariat of the CLRAE
Council of Europe
Strasbourg, France