

VERSION 2.2 (SEP. 22, 06)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CODING ELECTION MONITORING REPORTS:

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

If the report covers both an election and a run-off election, or in other ways cover more than one election day, separate the report out into two different coding sheets, trying to keep information separate for the different elections. Depending on the format of the report, this may not be possible, but if the report is written in a segmented format, do separate the information.

If there are multiple reports from one organization from the same election, fill out only one coding sheet in which the most final evaluations override earlier evaluations if they were conflicting. Note any conflicts in the notes at the bottom of page 1.

CODE THE LAST PAGE OF THE CODING SHEET FIRST. THIS ALLOWS YOU TO READ JUST THE CONCLUSION AND INTRODUCTION AND ANY PRESS STATEMENTS AND CODE ONLY THOSE MATERIALS AS THE BASIS FOR THE OVERALL OBSERVER ASSESSMENT.

YOU MUST REREAD THIS CODING MANUAL AT REGULAR INTERVALS TO REFRESH YOUR MEMORY OF IT. ALWAYS KEEP IT HANDY WHEN CODING.

REMEMBER THROUGHOUT THE CODING THAT YOU ARE NOT RECORDING YOUR PERSONAL OPINION OF THE ELECTION. YOU MUST SHED YOUR PRIORS ABOUT A GIVEN COUNTRY IF YOU HAVE ANY. YOUR JOB IS TO RECORD WHAT THE REPORT SAYS, NOT WHAT YOU THINK IT SHOULD SAY.

THROUGHOUT THE REPORT, PUT IN THE PAGE NUMBER OF THE REPORT FROM WHICH CERTAIN INFORMATION IS GARNERED (for final reports that are sizable enough to have page numbers) so that it makes it easier for myself and others to find out quickly where I've gotten the information. Some examples include:

- Where the word 'transitional' is written
- Where the margin of victory for the presidential elections is stated
- Where the number of parties contesting and the number of viable parties is / are stated
- Where the observer organizations are stated (both domestic and foreign)
- Where the number of domestic observers is stated
- Where the dates of short term and long term delegations are stated
- Where the number of short term and long term observers are noted
- Where the activities of the observation team is noted
- Where other special activities are noted
- Where the source of the 'comments' were obtained
- Any references in the MAIN SPECIFIC CRITICISMS page
- Any references in the ELECTION OBSERVER ASSESSMENT page

Further, **highlight** in the report itself information which you are using to make your assessment. Please do not write comments in the margins in pen, but only use a light highlighting color for marking text.

HOUSE KEEPING:

Documents coded: check type of document (write number of total pages, including attachments, in parenthesis)

- ___ Pre-election statement ()
- ___ Post-election statement ()
- ___ Press release ()
- ___ Interim report ()
- ___ Final ()
- ___ Other:

Date: write the data of issuance of the document (Day/Month/Year)

ELECTION OBSERVER ASSESSMENT

1. Identify any overall assessment the organization provides. This should be found either in an executive summary, in the introduction, or in a summary or conclusion. It may also be found in press statements or other ways the organization projects an overall assessment. NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT DOES NOT DRAW ON THE FINAL REPORT. IT IS NOT YOUR PERSONAL ASSESSMENT of the mission based on reading the whole report. It draws ONLY on the text of the introduction, summary, conclusion and press statements.
2. Determine which of the descriptions in the left columns below most resemble the overall assessment. Highlight or otherwise mark that description. You may mark multiple comments if that applies. You may write in a particular phrasing if you cannot find an approximate match. Write on the sheet or HIGHLIGHT the sentences in the final report that are the most representative for your conclusion.
3. Circle a coding in the scale of assessment in the two right columns (must circle as existing pair as illustrated)
4. Note: if an organization is ambiguous and does NOT say whether an election represented the will of the people, you may code this as ambiguous. IF HOWEVER, it is possible to code the extent of the problems, do put a number for that in the box, ranging from 1-3 (though 0 would presumably not be relevant)

<i>Comment</i>	<i>Does NOT Represent will of people</i>	<i>Extent of problems</i>
Free and fair, no criticisms in conclusion or overall assessment (may be in report) Reflects the will of the people Free and Fair Properly/Impartially carried out Met or exceeded all requirements Elections were held in compliance with international standards Elections were transparent Elections were not marred by disturbances Witnessed no evidence of fraud <i>Other:</i>	0	0
Free and Fair, minor issues	0	1

Conducted with only minor difficulties Assertions of fraud were negligible Did not affect the outcome of the election Absence of major problems Generally adequate manner Some minor issues , but represents the will of the people <i>Other:</i>		
Reflected the will of the people, major issues Reflected the will of the people, but marred by serious problem/irregularities Fell short of internationally accepted norms/ commitments, but... (proceeds to list some positive features). Elections constitute significant progress, but... (some negative aspects)...	0	2
Fraudulent, but moderate criticism Serious concerns about the existence of an environment of democratic institutions Does not represent the will of the people Calls into question the validity of the elections Fell short of internationally accepted norms/ commitments, and...(proceeds to list negative features). Not free and fair/ Fraudulent <i>Other:</i>	1	2
Fraudulent, strong criticism <i>as above, but in addition:</i> (list of criticisms in actual conclusion or summary is very long and grave in nature) (The conclusion lists few redeeming values of the election at all) Marred by gross/grave/blatant violation, manipulation etc/ substantial bias....etc. <i>Other:</i>	1	3
Ambiguity/ no clear conclusion /unsure if it represented the will of the people (Issues no overall assessment on whether or not the will of the people was represented, or whether fraud it tipped the election) (Organization enumerates multiple problems, but it issues no clear judgment of the elections) We are unable to access the validity of the elections/ it is uncertain if these problems tipped the outcome of the election... Describe:	N/A	Problems: Circle: 1, 2 or 3

COUNTRY: Name of the country

DATE: Date of election observed (Day/Month/Year) (write abbreviated name of month to be clear)

PRESIDENTIAL: was the election to a president?

LEGISLATIVE: was the election legislative?

Note, if both legislative and presidential elections were held on the same day, check BOTH but fill out only ONE coding sheet.

RUN- OFF: was the election a run off election? If so, note date? Normally the report will use the language of a run-off election. If it does not but you never the less have reason to believe it is a run-off election, place a question mark and page reference so the information can be double checked.

TRANSITIONAL ELECTION: does the report state that this as a transitional election? Unless you can find the word transitional in there, it does not get coded as a transitional election here. This is because we are looking for the monitors' own assessment of whether this was transitional.

FIRST FREE MULTI PARTY ELECTION: does the report state that this was the first multi-party election. This will also be checked if the report states that this is the first multi-party elections in a considerable time, even if that country had multi party elections in a much earlier era. Rule: if the report STATES it was a first multi-party election, code it as such, if not, don't. This is because we are looking for the monitors' own assessment of whether this was a first multi-party election.

HIGH PROFILE: was there a significant amount of international attention on this election? Only check this box if the report uses language like "landmark" or highly significant, or notes that the "eyes of the world" was following the election, or otherwise stresses that this election was not ordinary. If you mark this box, you should note the page number and the sentence that prompted you to mark it.

CHANGE of presidential party/prime ministerial party: YES _____ NO _____ No information _____

According to the report, did the election result in a change of presidential party or prime ministerial party? Head of state refers not to the person *per se*, but to the party affiliation of the head of state. Underline or circle which were or were not changed.

MARGIN OF VICTORY IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS: The percentage points lead of the winning candidate over the runner-up. If loses, then negative.

NUMBER OF PARTIES/VIABLE PARTIES: For legislative elections a party gets counted if it is mentioned, but only gets counted as VIABLE if it wins at least one seat. For presidential elections: Parties get mentioned if they field a candidate, but they are not rated as VIABLE unless they receive min. five percent of the vote. The number of parties is determined by participation in the first round of an election. Voting blocks are coded as a one party as long as voters choose that block on the ballot rather than individual parties that are members of that block.

OBSERVER ORGANIZATION: write the name

For DELEGATION 1 through 3: write down the start and end dates of each group and the number of members in the delegation. Delegations are groups that are present on Election Day, but they may have different arrival times. For example, for elections held on Oct 6, 2005, they following may occur:

Visits:

- March 5-April 19 – this is an assessment visit since the group leaves before the election is held. It therefore does not get marked as a delegation, but gets counted under assessment visits later. That is, for visits that arrive and depart before elections, we do not actually record the dates but merely mark it as an incidence of a pre-election visit later under the coding of activities undertaken by the organization the pre-election period.

- August 10- Oct 10 – this is delegation 1. In the space for DELEGATION 1 you would enter the number of people in this delegation, the dates and calculate the total number of days spend by that one delegation
- Sept 9- Oct 10 – this is delegation 2
- Oct 3- Oct 8 – this is delegation 3

When counting dates, include both start and end date. A convenient way to count the total days can be found at the website: <http://www.timeanddate.com/date/duration.html> - For example, this counter allows you to determine that August 10 to October 10, 2002 would constitute “It is 62 days from the start date to the end date, end date included.”

A member of a delegation *is anyone officially participating in the mission*. Thus staff and official observers get counted equally as long as they are working for the organization.

See Appendix for Observer Organization specifics on delegations. The appendix often contains itineraries with helpful dates.

Total number of observers: This number should be the number specifically reported in the document, but many times they do not give a total, in which case you can sum delegations that were present on the day. If they give a total that varies from what would otherwise be the sum of the delegations that they have indicated are present, note the discrepancy by taking down that number but indicating that it does not cohere with the summing of the delegations.

Mention of other observers: This refers to other INTERNATIONAL observers. Write in any mention of other observers, including names or organizations and numbers

DOMESTIC OBSERVERS: Note # if possible or just whether present, and names of organizations if given.

DOMESTIC CAPACITY BUILDING:

Pre-election day (all time before election, not including the Election Day itself):

PRE-ELECTION ASSESSMENT VISIT: note the number of such visits described in report

MEDIA MONITORING: Does the report say that the organization in any way systematically paid attention to the content of the media? Code as follows:

0= not much attention to media (can be a brief one or two line mention, but no effort at assessing or evaluating,

1= informal overview/meetings with media/attention paid to the role of the media/made and assessment. To receive this coding there must be at least a paragraph somewhere in the report that focuses exclusively on the media. There may be more than one paragraph, but the distinguishing difference from a 2 coding here is that there is NOT any numbers, counts, percentages that would indicate a systematic analysis.

2 = extensive, formal overview/quantitative, systematic analysis. To receive this coding, the analysis must report results of a more academic analysis of the content of media. To receive a coding of '2' on media monitoring there must be a specific 'sub-section' of the report devoted to the media, with its own heading. Several interviews with media people is not systematic. There must be emphasis on systematic analysis of content either in the form of space provided in the press, or time on the

television or radio, as well as analysis of biases and access to media outlets. To receive this coding there should be quantitative analysis, indicating share of coverage, percentages, counts or other ways of breaking down the coverage into numbers that were then clearly analyzed. This coding is likely to require at least two pages and frequently more of a discussion.

TRAINING OF DOMESTIC MONITORS: Does the report note that the organization trained domestic monitors? If the report itself uses the word training, then the activity qualifies as such. If the report discusses official sessions in which domestic monitors are taught skills, then it qualifies as training. Do NOT tick this mark if the election observing organization e.g. the Carter Center, provided training for its own monitoring team (usually recruited from locals, especially medium and long term monitoring staff). The training refers to observers OTHER THAN the Carter Center's own employed monitoring staff.

LEGAL ADVICE REGARDING ELECTION ADMINISTRATION:

Note: this activity must involve recommendations to change laws and regulations pertaining to the election, not just discussions of how to improve the running or implementation of the election.

Note further: advice given as recommendations after the election does not qualify. It must be engagement on these legal and administrative issues *before* the election. An example would be the Council of Europe making specific recommendations before the election to change the provisions of the election law, or an organizations recommending before the election that the legal rules underpinning the independence of the electoral commission be changed.

Examples:

- Did the organization work with the authorities to change election related laws and administration leading up the election?
- Did they give legal advice in pre-election statements? To code this, look in the pre-election statements or summaries of pre-election visits included in a final report and see if these make recommendations as to certain legal changes or if there is discussion in these pre-election reports of the organization providing such advice to the government.
- Any recommendations before the election as to legal changes to the administrative framework qualify.

CIVIC EDUCATION: Did the organization conduct voter education or other forms of civic education? Mark this if the report itself uses words like civic education or voter education, or information campaigns. Also note this if the organization reports that it undertook activities that clearly fall into the above categories:

Held meetings for voters, produced media (TV, radio, newspaper) programs, or printed and distributed leaflets to voters about:

- where to vote or how to read the ballot,
- the offices for which the election would be held, about the importance of voting,
- what is proper procedures for voting (secrecy, not marking name on ballot etc),
- not having group or family voting,
- not taking money for votes and so on.

OBSERVING CAMPAIGN RALLIES: does group note having specifically observed campaign rallies. A great way to see this is on the itinerary in the appendices, but it may also merely be discussed in the text.

Election and post election (day of election and post election):

QUICK COUNT: Does the report discuss a quick-count and if so, was the organization in charge of it? Only mark this if the report uses the word QUICK COUNT and if the organization was in charge of it. If the organization was not in charge of it, simply note the presence of the quick count in the comment but do NOT give it a 1 here. Only give a one if the organization itself conducted the quick count.

LOGISTICAL SUPPORT:

- Did the organization provide support such as ballot printing/design?
- Did they help in the transport of ballots or provide any other logistical support that normally would be done by the electoral administration of a country?
- Did they provide technical support?

This means that only activities that are operationally/practically part of the election are considered logistical support. Naturally, merely observing and election or even meeting with officials to discuss the election is secondary and not part of the administrative process. Logistical support only gets marked as 1 if the organization actually provided practical support.

PRESS STATEMENTS ISSUED: Number of press statements the organization issued? Look in the appendix for such statements or discussion of them in the text. Pre and post election statement that are brief and presumably directed at the press for distribution should be coded as press statements.

OBSERVE COUNTING: oversee the counting of ballots. Did the organization observe the counting of ballots in some districts?

MEDIATION: Is there discussion in the report of the organization or an official from the organization performing mediatory functions to calm tensions and resolve problems during and especially after the election. An example would be Jimmy Carter stepping in to convince a loosing incumbent to step down from power or an observer mission helping to provide a solution on the day of elections to a group of protesting people who claim they have been prevented from voting.

OTHER: Write in any other special activities

Examples:

- Organized a forum on comparative democratic experiences, which included candidates, human rights activists, and members of the military
- Consulting with parties to develop conflict resolution committees
- Provided funding to local organizations

COMMENTS: Here you should note any of the following:

Conditionality? – does the report mention that there was external pressure to hold free and fair elections? Describe the type of pressure if known.

Boycotts? – does the report mention any boycotts. If so, does it say they were few or widespread?

Funding? – does the report mention the budget of the observer mission? If so, note it down. Does the report mention any additional sources of funding for the election monitoring initiative?

Note any other significant comments you may have after reading the report. Did something particularly interesting about the effects (good or bad) of monitors strike you? Any extraordinary circumstances?

MAIN SPECIFIC CRITICISMS: Note in this table the type of violations highlighted in the report or any accompanying material such as pre-election reports. This includes all sections of the report, including the introduction, conclusion and the main body. (See below for specific wording for each category)

BEWARE OF DOUBLE COUNTING. FOR EXAMPLE: IF A GOVERNMENT MISUSES THE MEDIA, THIS GETS COUNTED AS MISUSE OF THE MEDIA, BUT NOT AS A MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT RESOURCES. IF THE MEDIA IS RESTRICTED, THIS CLEARLY INFLUENCES THE FREEDOM TO CAMPAIGN, BUT GETS CODED AS A MEDIA PROBLEM.

REMINDER: IN EACH BOX IN THIS TABLE, IF YOU INDICATE A CERTAIN VIOLATION OCCURRED, PLEASE PUT PAGE NUMBERS IN PARENTHESIS TO REFERENCE THE SOURCE OF YOUR OBSERVATION AND HIGHLIGHT THE TEXT.

REMINDER: YOU ARE RECORDING WHAT THE REPORT EXPLICITLY STATES, NOT YOUR PERSONAL VIEW OF THE ELECTION.

Overview of this table:

Note, these 3 categories are not mutually exclusive, and it may be common to find problems both prior to and on the day of an election. The table provides for an opportunity to record that. For example, you may observe violence in both periods. However, we want to indicate the periods during which the problems were present.

PRESENT: In this column, make a checkmark or “x” if the violation was observed. Leave black otherwise.

MAIN SPECIFIC CRITICISMS: (SAMPLE CODINGS)

MAIN SPECIFIC CRITICISMS:

Structural Complaints	Rating				Overall
	Good	Low	Mod.	High	
Legal framework not up to standards/problematic	x				Low
Limiting scope and jurisdiction of elective offices	x				
Unreasonably limits of who can run for office		x			
Other:	na				

Pre-election	Rating				Overall
	Good	Low	Mod.	High	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of explicit cheating 					medium
Improper use of public funds/ Unfair use of government resources				x	
Lack of freedom to campaign	x				
Restrictions on media	x				
Intimidation: opposition candidates/opposition supporters/international observers/etc	x				na
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of insufficient capacity 					
Voter registration problems	na				
Complaints about electoral commission conduct	na				
'Voter information' problems and 'procedural problems' in the pre-election capacity (i.e. failure to provide info about electoral rules, failure to provide info about polling places, etc)	na				good
voter technical/procedural difficulties in pre-election capacity box (e.g. misprinted ballots)	na				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Violence and unrest 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other: 					

Election period (day and after)	Overall rating				Overall
	Good	Low	Mod.	High	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of explicit cheating 					High
Vote padding: inflated vote count/ballot stuffing/ tampering with ballot box/etc		x			
Voter fraud: voter impersonation/ double voting /vote buying/etc				x	
Intimidation: opposition candidates/opposition supporters/international observers/etc			x		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints of insufficient capacity 					Medium
Informational insufficiencies: voters don't understand rules/confusion about where to vote/etc		x			
Administrative insufficiencies: lax polling booth officials/long waits/faulty procedures/faulty equipment/etc	x				
Problems in voters list/registration		x			
Complaints about electoral commission conduct			x		Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Election day Violence and unrest 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other: 					

Examples of text for Specific Concerns:

STRUCTURAL COMPLAINTS

NOTE: THESE ARE NOT EXHAUSTIVE LISTS, BUT OR INDICATIVE TYPES OF CRITICISMS BY MONITORS.

Legal framework not up to standards/ problematic

- Vague wording that can be interpreted in multiple ways
- 'Constitutional issues': Uncertainty in the role of a caretaker government, when or who can call elections or dissolve parliament etc.
- Some citizens, such as women, are not allowed to vote
- Any restrictions on who can vote that are not in the standard range of 18-21 years of age and citizen.
- Clauses that are clearly questionable- - prohibition against campaigning through the private media 30 days before, etc.
- Giving full authority to a group that is obviously tied to the incumbent
- Law promotes ethnic divides
- Held under old laws that had been proven to be flawed
- Serious omissions
- Composition of electoral commissions – for example: members of the election commission are political appointees which takes opposing sides when the rules of the game are at stake.
- Does not provide the necessary conditions for free elections if applied
- Setting high minimum % of votes needed and therefore affecting minority parties
- High threshold for parties to get registered
- Law makes people identify themselves by their ethnic group in order to participate in election
- Undemocratic legal provisions
- Allowing for multiple repeated elections
- Can elect people who have been charged with war crimes

Limiting scope and jurisdiction of elective offices

Note: this pertains to the office for which elections are being held. If presidential: does the president really have any power. If legislative elections, do the elected politicians really have any power once in office? This does NOT pertain to the election commission or other administrative offices that are appointed positions.

- Legislatures or heads of states are elected, but the legal framework effectively limits the power they will have once in office
- Some seats in the legislature are appointed. Decisions cannot be made without the consent of these officials.
- The elected head of state is a figure head with no real implementation powers

Unreasonable limits of who can run for office

- Certain subgroups of the population such as women or minorities are not allowed to run for office
- Certain skills, such as language requirements or literacy skills, prevent some citizens for running for office

- Law has ambiguous requirements such as a prerequisite being that a citizen is honorable, or of good character, or patriotic
- There are official tests or educational requirements for running for office

PRE-ELECTION

Improper use of public funds/ unfair use of government resources

This category is sometimes difficult to assess given that all incumbents have certain advantages. However, the issue is whether the organization points out this particular category as an area of concern.

- Substantial public campaign funding enjoyed by the party in power compared to other parties
- Misuse of public infrastructure for campaigning
- Distribution of humanitarian aid for campaigning purposes
- Interference by executive authorities – refusal to allow public meetings
- 'Promises of funding / development that is contingent on incumbent winning'
- Use of public employees in campaign activities

Lack of freedom to campaign

- Constraints on freedom of movement
- Disruption of party meetings
- Political pressure on candidates
- Abuses of rules on freedom of association
- Representatives have not been allowed freedom of movement
- Limiting candidates possibilities for public debates, meetings and demonstrations
- Not allowing opposition to rent office

Restrictions on media/ Misuse of the media

Note: all violations pertaining to the media should be coded under this heading. Thus, if an incumbent misuses his resources to influence or curtail the media freedom, this goes under this coding.

- Imprisonment of journalists
- Candidates had no direct contact with the press
- Newspapers closed
- Only permitted media outlets are biased
- Journalists being sued for libel during elections or legal action being taken against journalists
- Can only use state owned media
- Not fair, not clean and not honest media coverage
- Harassment from tax inspectors and safety inspectorates
- Threats of losing privileges, including media licenses

Intimidation

- Aggressive behavior of some party representatives
- Political pressure on voters
- Extraordinary tax inspections
- Administrative fines
- Dismissal from employment
- Declaration of martial law on day of election

- Threats made by some parties to voters in general or to groups in particular villages etc.
- Intimidation of candidates- trying to get them to drop out of the race
- Detention of election commission members/ police interference
- Arrest or detention of voters taking political initiatives

Problems in voter lists/ registration

- Many people had to add their names to special lists- tendered ballots
- Missing names
- Dead people still on lists
- Duplicate voter cards issued
- Not delivering voter cards in time
- Incomplete/ inaccurate
- Out of date
- Voters unable to get their names on the list

Complaints about electoral commission conduct

- Irregularities in nomination of district election commission
- Composition/ Appointment unfair or questionable
- Exclusion of political party participation
- Fail to establish a credible and consistent procedure to verify signatures
- Arbitrary decision making
- Uneven enforcement
- The commission does not function in a transparent manner

Voter Information problems and procedural problems

- Failure to provide information about the electoral rules
- Failure to provide information about polling places

Voter technical/procedural difficulties in pre-election capacity

- Misprinted ballots
- Misinformation
- Bad paper used to make the ballots and led to invalidation of ballots
- Falsifying signatures in order to qualify a party/candidate

Violence and Unrest

- Security concerns
- Grenades
- Murders
- Physical Assaults/abuse
- Mentions of protests turned violent
- Ongoing civil conflict or war in isolated areas

ELECTION PERIOD (DAY AND AFTER)

Vote padding/Inflated Vote Count/ Ballot stuffing / tampering with ballots or ballot box

This category is different from voter fraud, in that this relates to the PROCESSING of the vote and count. These are acts that primarily involve the participation of officials.

- Falsification of election protocols
- Voter turn out higher than 100%
- Suspicious high turn out figures
- Evidence of attempts to tamper with the ballot boxes
- Problems in the counting, invalidated too many ballots for simple reasons
- problems in vote tabulation

Voter Fraud: Voter Impersonation/ Double Voting/ Vote buying

This category is different from the above Vote padding etc, in that it relates to the CASTING of the votes. These are acts that involve the participation of actual voters.

- Vehicles were observed taking voters to multiple polling places
- Voters reported having been offered payments
- Parties were observed distributing favors
- Voters had fake IDs
- Voters were physically obstructed from reaching the polling booths (note, not intimidated, but actually prevented)
- Voters were denied access to polling station (again, not intimidated, but actually just denied entry)
- Forbid or Limit # of domestic observers allowed

Intimidation

- Aggressive behavior of some party representatives
- Having to show ballots to prison/military/hospital staff
- Political pressure on voters in the vicinity of the polling booth
- Presence of unauthorized people at the voting station (particularly police, secret police, military, militia)
- Detention of election commission members/ police interference
- Arbitrary arrests

Informational insufficiencies

- Large Crowds
- Long Waits
- Not enough information
- Confusion
- Failure to inform voters how to use the ballot of equipment
- Polling places poorly marked
- Complicated ballots- numerous, long, etc.
- Not bilingual ballots

Administrative insufficiencies

- Lax polling booth officials/ procedures
- Inadequate lighting at polling stations

- Polling booths opening late
- Fictitious polling places
- Defective organization, inadequate provision of voting cabins
- Family voting (widespread) / husband voting for the rest of the family
- Unfamiliarity with elections laws by officials present
- Officials do not look at people's IDs
- Some lack of supervision of ballot boxes, not properly sealed (but no sign that this is systematic or intentional as much as it is neglect)
- Not signing/ stamping all ballot papers properly (non-intentional)
- Lack of training
- Incompetence
- Insufficient number of polling stations
- General issues of secrecy - ballot paper too thin, ballot papers not put into envelopes in clear ballot boxes, numbering ballots according to how people enter the polling station
- Electronic voting causes problems such as the lack of a paper trail
- Too many party observers leads to overcrowding
- Quality of materials, e.g. ink

Problems in voter lists/ registration

- Missing names
- Dead people still on lists
- Not delivering voter cards in time
- Lists Not in polling stations on time
- Incomplete/ inaccurate
- Out of date
- Voters turned away because they were not on the lists

Violence and unrest

Note: this differs from intimidation which is based on threats. It has to involve physical abuses, overall violent clashes, or manhandling of persons.

- Security was a concern
- Grenades
- Murders
- Physical Assaults/abuse
- Mentions of protests turned violent

RATING: Rank each of the violation from low to high. **MAKE SURE TO MARK PAGES THAT ARE RELEVANT AND HIGHLIGHT RELEVANT TEXT.** Again, this is as the report describes it, not as you perceive the violations. See discussion of low, medium and high below.

Examples of what may constitute different level ratings:

Low: The reports mentions problems once or twice in passing but do not voice the issues in terms of a complaint. Words like rare, uncommon, unusual, exceptional, singular, “few and far between,” sporadic, or infrequent may be used. The report does not dwell on it or elaborate or direct criticism of this towards the government. They note that the incident or violation only occurred in some limited or isolated cases of minor proportion. The report does not indicate that this was something

the organization was concerned about. There is no sense that this was a ubiquitous practice. Important: under low, also include problems that were discussed in the report but the organization dismisses as unfounded or stresses that they have not been able to substantiate. *However, if the only reason for a low coding is unsubstantiated allegations, note this in the margin of the coding sheet.*

Medium: The report provides some detailed discussion of the particular problem and expresses some dissatisfaction and concern about the effect on the complaint on the election. The report does not go so far as to say that these were serious problems or that they threw into doubt the validity of the elections. It does not use terminology like serious, widespread, prevalent, rife, pervasive, common, extensive, severe, grave or similar words that would indicate the magnitude of the violation was of a high level. Rather, the report tends to use terms like several, “more than a few”, “in a considerable number of cases,” “it was not uncommon,” or other phrases that indicate that the situation was not negligible, but that it was also not egregious.

High: The report elaborates and substantiates extensively on the problem. It expresses serious concerns that the violations mar the election. It uses terminology such as serious, widespread, prevalent, rife, pervasive, common, extensive, severe, grave or similar words that would indicate the magnitude of the violation was of a high level. It notes that the observers are very concerned, troubled, uneasy, worried or disturbed about the issue.

OVERALL: Make an overall assessment about the umbrella category. Write the word LOW, MEDIUM or HIGH in the box. For example, you may check “lack of freedom to campaign” and “improper use of government funds” each as low in the ratings box, and then assess the pre-election fraud for the category “**Complaints of explicit cheating**” as overall low, or even moderate if you judge that although each item was low in level, it amounts to a moderate level in aggregate. If none of the categories mentioned occur, there should be no mark anywhere in the box, not even in the overall rating. The overall rating is for the composite of the individual complaints in a given sub-category. That does not mean that even if there was only one category of complaint that the overall assessment cannot be coded as medium or high -- that will depend on the severity of the issue overall. For example, if the only **Complaints of explicit cheating on the election day** is that a soldier held a gun to the head of every voter, then intimidation may have been the only complaint, but this would still be rated as high if it was done extensively. Thus, if there is a category where the complaint is really high, even if it is the only type of violation in that sub-category, it will be coded high for that entire subcategory. However, high codings may also represent multiple sub categories and oftentimes multiple low ratings may be assessed to add up to a higher level of violations than low.