

Transparency Maldives commends the Elections Commission for a well administered election

PRESS RELEASE

Date: September 7, 2013

Transparency Maldives deeply appreciates and thanks the 400+ observers and volunteers in our network, based in 20 atolls and a number of foreign countries. Without them this domestic observation would not have been a success. They have ensured increased public participation in and the transparency of electoral processes.

Our observers collected both qualitative and quantitative data on election day. The methodology used is a systematic one based on random sampling. That approach allows us to reliably generate results from the sample to the entire population within a known margin of error. In this case our margin of error is less than +/- 1%.

Transparency Maldives believes that an independent observation effort promotes greater levels of trust in our electoral processes.

The observer network performed magnificently. 95% of the sample was reported within 3 hours of the scheduled time for closing of polls. The following are the key findings we would like to highlight.

99.5% of polling stations closed by 5:00 p.m.

There were reports that people were not able to vote because their names were not on the voter registry, but this affected very few cases (less than 0.2% of all voters). We note that only 0.05% complained at the polling stations that they were unable to vote at that location.

Voting was temporarily halted in 3.8% of polling stations. Half of these cases were interventions at the direction of the Presiding Officer. The remaining instances involve an unruly voter or two, or an enthusiastic political party member. The scale of these problems are minor.

Despite a few isolated cases of reported violence in (1.4%) of the polling stations, we are happy to report that this election has been peaceful. The incidents of violence were reported to the relevant authorities and we will be closely monitoring any further developments.

We note that the police entered 18.8% of polling stations. But in 80% of these cases, interventions were at the invitation of the Presiding Officer as the rules allow.

Candidates were well-represented during the counting, making the process transparent and adding to its credibility. Gasim Ibrahim was represented at 73.7% of polling stations during the vote count. Mohamed Waheed Hassan Manik was represented at 29.6% of polling stations during the vote count. Abdulla Yameen was represented at 74.2% of polling stations during the vote count. Mohamed Nasheed was represented at 91.5% of polling stations during the vote count.

While only 0.22% of ballot papers were disputed by the candidate/party observers during counting, in the vast majority of polling stations (85.5%), the counting concluded without any controversy.

82.6% of polling stations reported assisted voters.

From our elections observation we are confident to announce that Mr. Mohamed Nasheed made it to the second round. However, the differences in the vote counts between the second and third candidates were so close that, for statistical reasons we cannot reliably distinguish between who was second and who was third. The margin of error (+/-1%) was larger than the difference between the votes of Abdulla Yameen and Gasim Ibrahim. It is now for the Elections Commission to tally all of the votes and on the basis of a complete count to declare who will be the candidates for the second round.

We once again thank the stakeholders for maintaining a conducive environment for a peaceful election.

ENDS

For media inquiries please contact Aiman Rasheed, Advocacy and Communications Manager on 00 960 7908967.