Final Report

External Voting for East Timor
Popular Consultation
Conducted: 30 August 1999
Index

INDEX .......................................................................................................................... 2
ACRONYMS ....................................................................................................................... 3
TABLES ............................................................................................................................. 3
1. EAST TIMOR - INTRODUCTION ........................................................................ 4
2. THE TRIPARTITE AGREEMENT ............................................................................. 4
3. ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAM .......................................................................... 5
   AUSTRALIAN ELECTORAL COMMISSION - AEC ................................................. 6
4. ESTIMATED VOTER POPULATION ........................................................................ 6
5. OFFICE STRUCTURE AND SETUP ..................................................................... 7
   COORDINATION OFFICE ....................................................................................... 7
   IOM HEADQUARTERS – GENEVA ........................................................................ 8
   COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES ............................................................................. 8
   DISTRICT ELECTION OFFICERS – ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES .................. 9
   REGIONAL OFFICERS ........................................................................................... 9
6. FINANCIAL STRUCTURE REPORT ..................................................................... 9
   ALLOCATION OF A PROJECT CODE ................................................................... 9
   COORDINATION OFFICE - DARWIN .................................................................... 9
   INDONESIA ............................................................................................................ 10
   MOZAMBIQUE AND MACAU ............................................................................... 10
   PORTUGAL AND UNITED STATES ...................................................................... 10
   BUDGET ................................................................................................................. 10
   IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS .................................................................................... 11
7. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS ....................................................................... 11
   PRELIMINARIES AND OVERVIEW ...................................................................... 11
   IOM PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN ............................................................. 11
   THE REGISTRATION PERIOD ............................................................................. 13
   EXHIBITION AND CHALLENGES ....................................................................... 15
   POLLING ................................................................................................................ 15
   COUNTING ............................................................................................................. 16
8. IOM DEO ACTIVITY IN EAST TIMOR ................................................................. 16
9. CONCLUSION AND LESSONS LEARNED ............................................................ 17

EXTERNAL VOTING FOR EAST TIMOR FINAL REPORT – SEPTEMBER 1999
**Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEC</td>
<td>Australian Electoral Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRT</td>
<td>National Council for Timorese Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Election Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>United Nations Electoral Assistance Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV</td>
<td>External Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVET</td>
<td>External Voting for East Timor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMET</td>
<td>United Nations Mission in East Timor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIC</td>
<td>United Nations Information Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNV</td>
<td>United Nations Volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Registration Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Estimated Voter Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Total Registrations per Registration Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Voter Turnout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. East Timor - Introduction

The Eastern half of the island became a Portuguese colony in the 16th century. East Timor sought independence from Portugal in 1974 and a civil war erupted between different political groups. Portugal soon evacuated the island, while Indonesian forces prepared to take control.

On 7 December 1975, the Indonesian military assumed control of Dili, citing Portugal’s neglect in the post-colonial transition. The following July, with the approval of Indonesia’s President Suharto, East Timor was declared as the 27th Province of the Republic of Indonesia.

During May 1998, Indonesian President Suharto resigned as President and named Dr. B.J. Habibie as his successor. The new President revised the previous Government’s policies towards East Timor and in January 1999, Dr. Habibie publicly held out the possibility of independence for East Timor.

2. The Tripartite Agreement

A Tripartite Agreement was signed on 5 May 1999, between Indonesia, Portugal, and the UN. It was agreed that the UN would administer a popular consultation over the question of East Timor. Under the terms of the Agreement, eligible East Timorese residing outside of East Timor were also afforded the opportunity to participate in the consultation by registering and voting in person in Australia, Indonesia, Portugal, Mozambique, Macau, or the United States. The United Nations requested that the International Organization for Migration (IOM) organise the external voting process in all these areas except Australia, where balloting was conducted through the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC). The following cities were specifically identified:

Table 1 – Registration Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Macau</th>
<th>Mozambique</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>Denpasar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>Macau</td>
<td>Maputo</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Ujung Pandang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yogyakarta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several rules for the popular consultation were outlined in the agreement, including voter eligibility. For the purposes of the popular consultation, an eligible voter was defined by the following criteria:

- aged 17 years or above; and
- born in East Timor; or
- born outside East Timor but with at least one parent having been born in East Timor; or
- having a spouse who falls under either of the two categories above.
It was determined that registration would take place for a minimum of 20 continuous days, registration lists would be exhibited for 5 days at the end of the registration period, and challenges to the registration lists could be filed and forwarded to an Electoral Commission for adjudication. All voters were required to cast their ballot in person, in the same centre where the voter had registered.

Indonesia and Portugal were entitled to send an equal number of representatives to observe all operational phases of the consultation process for the External Vote outside East Timor.

3. Organization of Program

IOM met with UN Electoral Assistance Division (EAD) officials in New York between 19-26 May 1999, to discuss the modalities of the external voting process. A brainstorming session was held at EAD and included EAD, AEC, the UNAMET Chief Electoral and Legal Officers, as well as IOM. It was during this occasion that the structure of the Supplementary Arrangement (hereafter referred to as the Arrangement) between the UN and IOM evolved.

The Arrangement stipulates that IOM would cooperate in the organization of the popular consultation at locations of major concentration of East Timorese external to East Timor. Moreover, it is stated that IOM would operate in Indonesia, Mozambique, Macau, Portugal and the United States. A separate agreement was made with the AEC to conduct the same process of external voting in Australia.

The Arrangement outlines IOM’s responsibilities in conducting the popular consultation. Article 1 notes that IOM was responsible for conducting external voting only for the aforementioned locations subject to agreements concluded between the United Nations and the host country concerned. When small groups of East Timorese identified themselves in Ireland, the United Kingdom, Canada, the Philippines, and new locations within Indonesia, UNAMET followed a policy that only the locations mentioned in the May 5 Tripartite Agreement were to be designated as registration and polling centres. Recalling that the agreement notes that all registration and voting would be conducted in person and at the same location, some people were required to travel great distances to register and vote. There was strictly no provision for vote by mail or proxy.

Article 2 stipulates that the “overall responsibility for the conduct of the consultation process resides with the UN,” while IOM was made “responsible for the organisation of the external voting process, including voter registration and balloting, and related information dissemination activities as may be agreed upon between the parties.” IOM was not made responsible for civic education activities or the political campaign. Rather, UN counterparts were identified in all external voting locations, apart from Macau. In each location IOM served to support the information campaign while the UN counterpart maintained the lead responsibility. Additionally, the UN maintained complete responsibility for the political campaign in each location, which enabled IOM to remain politically neutral and technically oriented.

During the New York meetings, it became apparent that the most logical site for the stewardship of external voting would be in Darwin, Australia. A coordination office was established in Darwin for the following reasons:
• Proximity to Dili and availability to travel to Dili on UNAMET flights.
• Ability to co-locate in UNAMET Darwin office building.
• Excellent communication infrastructure to facilitate contact to country offices located on five different continents.
• Ability to easily coordinate external voting operational plans with the AEC.
• Facilitate transportation of registration and polling materials from warehouses located in Darwin to country offices.

The structure of the EV program was envisioned to mirror the rules and procedures in place for the popular consultation in East Timor to the maximum extent possible. Therefore, External Voting followed the same rules and regulations as East Timor, and District Election Officers (DEOs) were envisioned for each registration/polling centre. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) contributed one million Canadian dollars to fund international DEOs in each registration centre in Indonesia, Macau, Mozambique and Portugal. The two DEOs in the United States were recruited locally.

**Australian Electoral Commission - AEC**

As the AEC and IOM were responsible for parallel structures, a high degree of coordination was necessary to implement the external voting program in a complementary manner. Additionally, the AEC assisted the electoral process in drafting rules and regulations, designing electoral forms and procuring electoral material. Working with the AEC, IOM was able to directly make arrangements so that materials for external locations would be provided at the earliest possible time in order to send to the country offices. Additionally, the AEC included IOM in brainstorming sessions prior to drafting rules and regulation for polling and counting specifically, and registration informally. This provided the opportunity to get different perspectives on the operational ability to implement rules and regulations not only in East Timor, but in the external locations as well. The sessions were considered highly valuable by IOM.

The open channels of communication between the AEC and IOM facilitated fluidity in the EV process. IOM is truly thankful for the advice, support, and high level of team spirit afforded by the AEC, and commends their high level of professionalism.

**4. Estimated Voter Population**

While the Tripartite Agreement included external voting locations, it was necessary to determine the approximate number of East Timorese in each location in order to properly prepare for the consultation. During initial meetings with EAD in early May, IOM received approximate numbers based on information from the countries and groups involved. These numbers served as a basis to determine staffing levels as well the number of registration centres to locate in any given city. While only the UN could establish new registration stations in cities not mentioned in the Tripartite Agreement, it was foreseen that multiple registration centres could be added in those already mentioned cities based on information on potential voter concentration.

The East Timorese voter population for Indonesia was not known prior to the popular consultation. EAD was informed by the CNRT that between 5,000-10,000 East Timorese resided in Indonesia, however, they were also informed that the majority of these people...
would travel to East Timor itself to participate in the popular consultation. There were also reports of displaced people in West Timor, an “external location” not included in the May 5 Agreement, with as many as 5,000-10,000 potential voters. Other informal estimates varied between a potential of a couple thousand to fifty-thousand eligible voters.

With this lack of concrete information, it was decided with EAD and the Chief Electoral Officer (CEO) in Dili, that twenty DEOs would be sent to Indonesia. This provided for proper coverage of five stations with the ability to cover an additional five if IOM was asked to set up stations in West Timor, or with the lack of any concrete numbers, if greater numbers showed up to register. Up until registration began, IOM was prepared to open additional registration centres if instructed by EAD and the CEO.

Table 2 – Estimated Voter Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Centres</th>
<th>Estimated Potential Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20,000-25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,300-2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of the EV program, IOM CRs were requested to make estimates on the voter population in their areas of responsibility. Table 2 denotes the estimated voter population in the five IOM locations, based on these estimates. Of the East Timorese population in Indonesia, it is estimated that between 10,000-18,000 registered to vote in East Timor itself. Therefore, it is believed that a substantial number of eligible East Timorese in Indonesia participated in the popular consultation by travelling to East Timor directly. However, it is not possible to verify these estimates. The majority of this number were transported by bus to East Timor from West Timor, while a significant population of East Timorese students from Java, Kalimantan, Bali and other islands took boats to East Timor. All of these statistics are educated estimates, from August 1999, in the absence of a census of the East Timorese living abroad.

5. Office Structure and Setup

Coordination Office

An office in Darwin, Australia, coordinated IOM-supervised external voting for East Timor. The Coordination Office was staffed with a Coordinator, Deputy Coordinator, a part-time Information Officer, and two local staff. The office acted as a central point of contact for all other authorities related to the project. The primary function of the office was not only to establish the country structures, but also to be the central point of dissemination of all rules and regulations for the IOM external locations. As the rules and regulations emanated from the CEO, close linkage was established with the Electoral Office in Dili in order to coordinate the modalities of implementation of the project. Instructions were subsequently compiled, organised and disseminated to Country Representatives, who headed the country structures.
To best complete this task, training for Country Representatives was conducted in Darwin at the end of June 1999. Their training coincided with the training of DEOs for East Timor itself, which they attended. As the cost of bringing external DEOs to the same training was prohibitive, the Country Representatives were responsible to train the DEOs assigned to their area of responsibility. Additionally, the Country Representatives assumed the roles tasked in East Timor to the Regional Electoral Officers, and therefore required additional training. Due to the close relationship and open flow of information with UNAMET and the AEC, the IOM CRs benefited from what was generally considered to be a more complete training exercise than was afforded in East Timor. As such, the CRs were well prepared to impart their knowledge to the DEOs and implement the process with a full understanding of the processes they were implementing.

The Darwin Office also made sure that registration and polling kits were delivered on time to all country offices. As this material was prepared in Australia by the AEC, IOM staff liaised with the AEC not only to harmonise external procedures but also to access electoral material. Most importantly, this meant that Darwin was able to keep country offices up to date with electoral procedures, as IOM was among the first to see approved voting materials.

**IOM Headquarters – Geneva**

IOM Geneva provided logistical and administrative assistance to Darwin. Due to the time differences involved in the process, Geneva was often responsible for collecting information on specific and practical arrangements with the Country Representatives for on-forwarding to the Coordinator. This assistance reached its peak when 26 Canadian DEOs funded by CIDA were deployed early July to the different registration centres in Indonesia, Macau, Mozambique and Lisbon. This deployment implied an extensive administrative preparation within a very short timeframe, and involved a high level of coordination between the different Geneva based departments including the Human Resources Division, Medical Services, and Staff Travel Centre. During a three-week period, 8 Headquarters staff members, including the Assistant to East Timor EV worked intensively to deploy the DEOs. Between 3 and 10 July 1999, all 26 were flying to their assignment location and were immediately on site to start the registration period. The reverse of this process occurred during repatriation of the DEOs.

**Country Representatives**

Each country was assigned a Country Representative (or in the case of Macau, a Territorial Representative). Country Representatives were responsible for the conduct of registration, list exhibition, challenges, polling and counting within their country of assignment. They were also responsible for the general administration of their respective offices, and for training and administering DEOs. CR’s acted under the direction and supervision of the Coordination Office to ensure consistent application of procedures (see annex ‘Summary of final reports from CRs’).

IOM’s Permanent Observer to the United Nations provided extensive policy and administrative liaison with interested parties in UN Headquarters on the whole process in addition to performing the duties of Country Representative for the United States of America. He also played a substantial and essential role in the relationship with CIDA.
District Election Officers – Role and Responsibilities

Through a generous CDN $1,000,000 contribution which covered salary, DSA, and international air travel, funding for 26 DEOs was provided to EVET by CIDA. The 26 DEOs, all experienced electoral officers recruited by IOM from Elections Canada, were sent to all countries except the USA, where two DEOs were hired locally. From the total, twenty were selected for Indonesia, and two DEOs each were sent to Portugal, Mozambique and Macau.

All DEOs reported directly to the Country Representative in their assigned countries of operation. DEOs were responsible for ensuring that all aspects of the consultation process were conducted according to United Nations certified rules and regulations, and guidelines which were provided to them by their respective CRs.

DEOs were responsible to implement the electoral process and interface directly with the voter population. The centres were supervised by the DEOs with assistance from local interpreters and drivers. Any questions that might have arisen needing clarification or direct assistance were directed to their Country Representative.

Regional Officers

EVET sought to utilise regional IOM structures and expertise to support the electoral process. Regional Officers at IOM Offices already established in various parts of the world, provided support as follows:

- IOM Pretoria: Financial administration and logistic support to Mozambique.
- IOM Hong Kong: Financial administration and logistic support to Macau.
- IOM Manila: Financial administration support to Darwin and Jakarta.

Their experience and effort facilitated the establishment of new offices as well as provided IOM banking and financial tracking mechanisms. Additionally, utilisation of the Senior Regional Officers on a part-time basis reduced costs, as there was not a need to hire a full-time employee to provide the functions they were performing.


Allocation of a Project Code

A discrete ‘Project Code’ was allocated for the External Voting East Timor (EVET) project. The code was ‘668-800’. A discrete account code was also allocated to capture expenditure associated with the DEOs.

Coordination Office - Darwin

Bank accounts in both American and Australian dollars were established. Funds were transferred from IOM HQ’s in Geneva to the USD account and, as required, transferred to the local currency account.
Accounting records were maintained using field cashbooks via Microsoft Excel. The books were closed, balanced and reconciled at the end of each month and electronically transmitted to the Sub Regional Office in Manila for checking and data entry to the IOM accounting software. Original copies of vouchers and invoices/receipts were forwarded to Manila by post with a duplicate copy kept at the Darwin office.

**Indonesia**

Banking facilities were difficult to arrange in Indonesia, as IOM did not have a pre-existing account. Therefore, an IOM accountant was loaned to EVET for finance duties in Indonesia from Angola. Several weeks after IOM's arrival in Indonesia, and despite several inquiries, the government bureaucracy had not given approval for the opening of a bank account. This setback was alleviated by transferring funds by hand and by an International Moneygram sent from Darwin to Jakarta, enabling urgent payments to be made. Eventually banking arrangements were established with Citibank for the office of the Country Representative.

Payments for expenditure at the centres outside of Jakarta were made by issuing advances to DEOs and acquiring these advances when DEOs returned to Jakarta. One DEO in each team was given responsibility to maintain IOM financial structures for their registration centre.

**Mozambique and Macau**

IOM offices already established in countries located near Mozambique and Macau facilitated financial administration. As IOM already had offices established in Pretoria and Hong Kong, the EVET project was able to draw on the human resources at these offices. A percentage of the salaries of the IOM personnel involved with the EVET project at Pretoria and Hong Kong was attributed to the EVET project and this proved to be a more cost effective option than engaging staff within Mozambique and Macau for duties solely dedicated to the project.

**Portugal and United States**

As there were already IOM offices established in Lisbon and New York, finances were facilitated through existing infrastructure. Like Pretoria and Hong Kong, a percentage of the salaries of IOM personnel involved with the EVET project in Lisbon and New York was attributed to the EVET project.

**Budget**

The budget was originally set at $US1.715m. This budget included the amount of $US0.33m for DEOs and $US1.385m for other expenditure. After the decision was made, in coordination with EAD, to recruit international DEOs rather than UNVs, salaries and allowances were reviewed and a discrete DEO budget was prepared. The “new” DEO budget amounted to $US0.667m, which was funded by the Government of Canada. The “other expenditure” budget remained at $US1.385m. The entire project budget was therefore revised to allow for expenditure up to a maximum of $US2.052m.
In-kind Contributions

The Northern Territory Government donated furnished office space in Darwin by utilising a bank building that had been unused since late 1997. The Australian government, through AusAID provided computers, office machines and security guards.

The local government in the Bali province provided office space for a Registration Centre in Denpasar for a two month period as well as for a Polling Station for two days. Local police in Jakarta, Yogyakarta, Surabaya, Ujung Pandang and Denpasar provided security services at the Registration Centres/Polling Stations for a two-month period. The UN Information Centre allowed IOM to use a press hall as a Registration Centre in Jakarta and the Resident Representative of the UNDP provided assistance with the arrival, customs clearance, storage and delivery of materials consigned.

The Portuguese Government provided office space for the Registration/Polling Centre in Lisbon. In Mozambique, the United Nations Development Program provided office space for the Registration/Polling Centre.

7. The Consultation Process

Preliminaries and Overview

The overall procedures to be used in the consultation process were defined in the Tripartite Agreement and in the Electoral Directions (published on 18 June 1999). A conscious decision was made by the United Nations for EV to follow as far as possible the same procedures as were being followed in the Consultation process in East Timor.

Registration and voting had to be in person – it was not allowed to register or vote by post or proxy. Many people travelled long distances to register, sometimes taking many days to do so, and then repeated the journey in order to vote. The possibility of mobile registration centres was mooted in East Timor, but it was decided that since, with one-day polling and only in-person voting, there could be no mobile polling stations, there was no point in having mobile registration centres.

The CRs attended training sessions conducted by the AEC for the UNV DEOs who were in Darwin en route to East Timor, and this was supplemented by training conducted by the IOM Deputy Coordinator. The AEC, had written the registration procedures, which were excellent, clear and precise. However, the time-scale for the organisation of the Consultation was very short, and as a result, during the first DEO training session unanswered questions about registration remained. IOM was able to inform the CRs of the answers to these questions, such as eligibility documentation, through email after they returned to their areas of responsibility.

IOM Public Information Campaign

According to Annex II of the Basic Agreement the United Nations would conduct an information campaign:

1. To “make available the text of the main Agreement and the autonomy document..."
to be voted on in the following languages: Tetum, Bahasa Indonesian, Portuguese and English”.

2. The UN “will disseminate and explain the content of the main Agreement and the autonomy document in an impartial and factual manner inside and outside East Timor.”

3. The UN will “explain to voters the process and procedure of the vote, and the implications of an “accept” or “reject” vote.”

4. “The radio stations and the newspapers in East Timor as well as other Indonesian and Portuguese media outlets will be utilised in the dissemination of this information. Other appropriate means of dissemination will be made of as required."

EAD identified UN counterparts to take the lead in the information campaign including UNIC in Jakarta and Lisbon, UNDP in Maputo, and EAD in New York.

Given that in accordance with the Basic Agreement the primary responsibility for the information campaign clearly rested with the UN, IOM decided to:

- Contact the relevant UNAMET Public Information section to evaluate the relevancy of their programs and materials for external voting locations.
- Coordinate public and civic education programs with AEC.
- Contact external voting locations to evaluate if they had access to any nationally produced materials and to assist them in coordination of their public information campaigns.
- Request information from external locations (via their weekly reports) concerning existence of public information and civic education programs.

IOM Darwin’s dealings with the Deputy Spokesperson in UNAMET established that UNAMET’s Information Campaign had started on 14 June with daily radio broadcasts and informative articles in local newspapers. It was indicated, however, that in their view this material was inappropriate for use outside of East Timor. A videotape, of the Secretary-General’s address on East Timor (in English) was available and was sent to IOM. IOM was also informed that a UNAMET web site (http://www.un.org/peace/etimor/etimor.htm) would soon be available and would be constructed in the four relevant languages.

Initially all the information on the above web site was in English. The Coordinator then met with the UNAMET Chief Election Officer and UNAMET Public Information Office in Dili to assess the course of the information campaign and to better establish IOM’s role in the campaign. UNAMET agreed to forward, by e-mail, all public information files to the Darwin IOM office. IOM Darwin would peruse all files and decide which files were relevant to the external voting sites. These files would then be formatted in Word and forwarded via e-mail to the CRs.

IOM Darwin appraised all the CRs on the status of the Public Information campaign. They were advised to contact their local UNIC offices to establish a working relationship that would facilitate the public information campaign. IOM produced a template in Word format that could be used to announce the registration process and forwarded it via e-mail to the CRs. IOM Darwin in effect operated as a clearinghouse between UNAMET and the
external voting centres. Approximately half-way through the registration process, UNAMET's web site offered significant information in all of the relevant languages. Published brochures and posters produced by UNAMET were sent to Darwin and distributed to all the appropriate external voting locations.

The Registration Period

IOM was well prepared for the registration period with the excellent flow of information and support from EAD, the AEC and Electoral/Dili. For the most part, registration was conducted in a smooth, transparent, and professional manner.

Some difficulties arose concerning the eligibility criteria for registering to vote and how a person could prove her/his identity and eligibility to vote. The possible types of acceptable documentation were discussed at length, and were announced in Notification 1 (issued shortly before the start of registration, see annex) and supplemented by various Clarifications (see annex). However, it became clear even before the start of registration that there were substantial numbers of people who did not possess any such documentation. It was therefore decided (Notification 5, see annex) that it would be possible for a person to swear an affidavit before an authorised religious leader or village chief, stating that s/he had a given identity and had been born in East Timor. The process was amended slightly for External Voting, so that the affidavit should be sworn before a notary public or other such legal authority. The affidavit was primarily intended as an eligibility document (although only for people born in East Timor), but was also allowed to be used as an identity document if necessary. In Indonesia, the affidavit was widely used, but it was felt that, despite its being such an obvious opening for fraud, it was not generally misused.

Registration was due to start on Tuesday 13 July 1999. Preparations had been made to ship registration materials to IOM's various countries on Tuesday 6 July, using Ansett Air Freight as the cargo handler. However, on that day UNAMET asked IOM to hold its shipment, pending negotiations in Jakarta on security issues. On Thursday 8 July, IOM was given the go-ahead to ship the materials, but shipping considerations meant that they could not leave Australia until Friday 9 July. Through the considerable efforts of Ansett, four out of five consignments arrived at their destinations that weekend; the fifth consignment, to Lisbon, was stranded in London due to an error on the part of Air Portugal. In the course of events, not related to cargo movements, there was a decision by UNAMET to delay the start of registration until Friday 16 July, by which time all was in place and all IOM registration centres were fully prepared.

Registration was scheduled to last for 20 days, but was extended for 2 days in East Timor and for 4 days for external voting. In Portugal, there were large numbers of registrants from Day 1; in all other centres registration started slowly. This may have been due to the initial paucity of public information. However, the numbers in other centres gradually increased, and by the end of the extended registration period, IOM centres had registered:
Table 3 – Total Registrations per Registration Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Centre</th>
<th>Registrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Indonesia</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denpasar</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujung Pandang</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogyakarta</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>3802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macao</em></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mozambique</em></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Portugal</em></td>
<td>2204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>USA</em></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registration was conducted entirely by the international DEOs, with the assistance of their interpreters. Applicants had to produce documents to prove their identity and eligibility; the registration form itself was filled in by the DEOs, and then successful registrants were given a laminated voter registration card. The registration forms were self-carbonating; the copies were filed alphabetically by the DEOs, against the possibility of using one on polling day to verify the registration of a person who had lost their registration cards. The unique serial number pre-printed on the card was the same as that pre-printed on the registration form.

It was possible for the DEOs to refuse to register a person on the grounds that s/he could not produce appropriate documents, or that the DEOs were not satisfied that the documents were genuine, or for some other such reason. A mechanism existed for anyone who was refused registration to appeal to the Regional Electoral Officer (in IOM’s case, the Country Representative), who would forward the appeal to the Electoral Commission in Dili with a recommendation as to whether to accept or reject the appeal. Probably due to the widespread use of affidavits, there were only 4 appeals in *Indonesia* (of which 3 were accepted), and none in any of IOM’s other areas of operation.

After the end of registration, all books of original brown copies of registration forms were sent to the Computer Centre in Sydney, where all voter registration data was entered into a database for production of the voter list. In the short period of 9 days after the end of registration, voter lists were produced in 2 sorts; in order of voter registration serial number, for polling day, and in alphabetical order for the exhibition and challenges period.

The security situation was calm for the duration of the process with a few exceptions. On the second day of polling, registration was disturbed for an hour in Ujung Pandang, *Indonesia* when protesters holding Indonesian flags entered the registration centre. A number of the protesters were East Timorese without any form of documentation. The majority of these East Timorese registered through the affidavit process. A local staff member at Ujung Pandang, recruited from Jakarta, was provided with commercial accommodation after he received threats of being kidnapped. Additionally, a DEO in
Yogyakarta was warned by an anonymous telephone caller that violence might ensue if registration requirements were not more lenient. No violence took place in any location.

In Portugal there was a complaint by Indonesian official observers that 600 non-Asians had registered to vote. These voters fell into the category of spouse of a person born in East Timor or child of a person born in East Timor. The Indonesian Observers later recognised that everyone was registered within the rules and regulations based on eligibility criteria, and registration was not based on ethnic origin.

Exhibition and Challenges

For a period of 5 days, voters' lists for any given centre were available in that particular centre for viewing by observers and registered voters, and all lists for a given region were available in each regional office. Registered voters (but not observers) were allowed to challenge the inclusion of any given name on the voters' list, on the grounds that the registrant did not fulfill identity, age or eligibility criteria. Proof had to be provided by the challenger, and any such challenges were sent to the Electoral Commission in Dili for adjudication. All lists had to be delivered to the Country offices by fax, as there was insufficient time to get the voters list to the CRs in time for the Challenge period by post. In External Voting, no challenges were issued.

Polling

All voters were required to vote in the same registration/polling centre where they registered, and needed to produce both their voter registration card and some form of identity document in order to be allowed to vote. There was scope for allowing someone without a voter card to vote, if it could be shown from the DEO copies of the voter registration forms that s/he had in fact registered. However, anyone without an identity document was forbidden from voting. This was to prevent theft and usage of the voter card by another person. In fact, only very few people in external voting did not bring their identity document.

Table 4 – Voter Turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Registrants</th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>Voter Turnout (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>3802</td>
<td>3664</td>
<td>96.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>97.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macau</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6220</strong></td>
<td><strong>6004</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The polling procedures flowed smoothly. Many polling stations appointed an extra polling official to assist the ballot paper issuer. The voter turnout in the External Voting countries was extraordinarily high, with 96% of the registered voters. In all countries the atmosphere was peaceful – and even festive – and the voting passed smoothly. The happiness of the people at having the opportunity to participate in the popular consultation was evident.

UNAMET gave special consideration to facilitate the participation of special groups, such as detainees.
Counting

Counting was held separately in each country. In all countries except Indonesia this meant that the counting was carried out in the same city as the polling. In Indonesia this entailed the transportation of uncounted ballots from the four polling centres outside Jakarta to the counting centre in Jakarta. After polling, ballot boxes were kept overnight under international supervision before being transported to the local airports under police escort. Aircraft seats were bought for the ballot boxes, so that they remained under continual international supervision, and following on-tarmac meeting from the planes, they were transported to the Jakarta counting centre under police escort. The counting procedures, although a little complex because they were written for the large numbers of ballots to be counted in Dili, were in fact very clear and logical. IOM streamlined the procedures for smaller numbers in each count and the counts proceeded very smoothly.

In Indonesia, the Indonesian Observers complained that the count was not transparent, on the basis that they could not view the final tallied results. Although the procedures worked extremely well, the rights of observers at the counting centre were ambiguous. It was clear that UNAMET wanted to maintain the secrecy of the results, pending their announcement as a global total in Dili. As a result of trying to maintain this secrecy, and despite every other effort being made to maintain the transparency of the process, the Indonesian Observers in particular felt that they had been given insufficient access to the process.

8. IOM DEO Activity in East Timor

Initially it was not planned that IOM DEOs would be stationed in East Timor. However, as the registration process progressed UNAMET realised that large numbers of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and External Voters living in West Timor were trying to register in the western part of East Timor. UNAMET staff could not handle this volume of potential voters at the existing registration centres in western East Timor. UNAMET Dili therefore requested the loan of IOM DEOs from Indonesia, which both CIDA and IOM supported. IOM consequently asked for volunteers to go to East Timor from the existing DEO staff in Indonesia.

Seven DEOs volunteered to go to East Timor to participate in the last five days of the registration period. As the number of registration centres in Indonesia was less than expected, operations in Indonesia were not seriously affected by the decrease in staff there. The seven DEOs operated out of three Regional Centres located in the western part of East Timor. Each was assigned to Registration Centres where the volume of people registering was very high. Because the IOM DEOs were trained specifically for the registration of external voters, their assistance was invaluable to UNAMET Registration Centres where they were assigned because of the large number of registrants who came from West Timor. All DEOs returned to their duty stations in Indonesia once the registration period was finished.

As a result of the high number of IDP’s and External Voters who registered in the western part of East Timor, UNAMET realised that they would not have enough DEOs to supervise the high number of Polling Centres in this area. Again IOM Jakarta was asked by UNAMET to supply DEOs from their Indonesian operations to assist existing UNAMET staff in the western part of East Timor, and again both CIDA and IOM agreed to respond.
positively. Five IOM DEOs volunteered to act as supervisors in the polling in East Timor. All five worked out of two Registration Centres in western East Timor. All were assigned to individual Polling Centres where they assisted in the training of local staff who would be acting as election officers on the day of the poll. As well they supervised the conduct of the polling process on the day of the popular consultation.

9. Conclusion and Lessons Learned

The objective of IOM was to conduct the External Voting exercise for the East Timor Consultation according to UN criteria in a free, transparent and neutral manner. The project contributed directly to afford the greatest possible number of East Timorese living outside East Timor to take part in these elections.

The IOM External Voting exercise benefited from actively participating in coordinated efforts with EAD, UNAMET Electoral and the AEC. This synergy facilitated the flow of information necessary to smoothly conduct such a technical exercise. The predominant lessons learned is that this type of coordinated efforts should be a consideration for the organization of future exercises.

Nonetheless, all projects can benefit from hindsight, and EVET is no exception.

- Logistical planning and shipping of materials to EVET required a longer period of time than to East Timor. Time considerations of External Voting need to be considered when working out logistical timing.

- UN counterparts were identified to lead the information and political campaign for all areas (other than Macau). However, apart from Portugal and the United States, those UN offices did not take an active role in the process. In the absence of a pro-active information campaign, it is viewed that IOM should have maintained a greater role. Nevertheless, if a similar division of labor is agreed in the future, the role of the UN information counterpart should be clearly laid out in writing and understood by both parties from the outset.

- Procedures for requesting funds and receiving transfers from the Secretariat were very cumbersome and it is doubtful that the short time frames foreseen in the Arrangement could have been kept, even in a perfect world. More realistic deadlines should have been clearly and mutually agreed.

- Essential rules and regulations were clarified late in the process, which made it difficult to implement an information campaign. Rules such as proper identity and eligibility documentation, and the dates of the registration period, should have been identified earlier.

- Too much emphasis was placed on the secrecy of registration statistics, which should have been shared with the press at the completion of registration. While External Voting was required to request the assistance of the press to facilitate the information period, EV was not able to share registration statistics with those same individuals.
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SUPPLEMENTARY ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (IOM)

The United Nations and the International Organization for Migration (IOM),

Recalling the Cooperation Agreement concluded between them on 25 June 1996 by which they have agreed to act in close collaboration and hold consultations regularly on all matters of common interest;

Recalling also Article VI of the Cooperation Agreement by which the parties have agreed to act jointly in the implementation of projects that are of common interest, through special arrangements defining the modalities for their participation and the expenses payable by each Organization;

Recalling further the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Portuguese Republic on the question of East Timor concluded on 5 May 1999, and the Agreement regarding the modalities for the popular consultation of the East Timorese through a direct ballot, annexed thereto,

Have agreed to conclude the present Supplementary Arrangement, hereinafter the Arrangement, with a view to establishing modalities of cooperation in the organization of a popular consultation on the status of East Timor on the basis of a direct, secret and universal ballot.

Article 1

The United Nations and IOM shall cooperate in the organization of the popular consultation to be held on 8 August 1999 at locations of major concentration of East Timorese outside East Timor (in Indonesia, Mozambique, Macau, Portugal and the United States) (hereinafter “external voting”), subject to agreements concluded between the United Nations and the host country concerned.

Article 2

Overall responsibility for the conduct of the consultation process resides with the United Nations. IOM shall be responsible for the organization of the external voting process, including
voter registration and balloting, and related information dissemination activities as may be agreed upon between the parties.

Article 3

The United Nations shall bear all costs relating to the external voting process and other services provided by IOM hereunder, in accordance with the budget agreed upon for this purpose by the Parties and attached to this Arrangement as an Annex.

The budget may be amended by mutual written agreement.

Upon the expiration or termination of this Arrangement, IOM shall submit financial reports to the United Nations, which shall include detailed information on all services and activities provided by IOM hereunder.

Article 4

IOM shall be responsible for the procurement of goods and services required to support the external voting process. These and related operating costs, including overheads, shall be reimbursed by the United Nations in accordance with the budget agreed by the Parties which may be amended by mutual agreement.

Within ten days following the signature of this Arrangement, the United Nations will deposit 50% of the budget in an IOM-designated account; a further 40% will be deposited within 1 month following the signature and the remaining 10% within 30 days following submission of the final financial reports.

Article 5

The United Nations shall seek the agreement of each host country for the provision of adequate premises free of charge for registration centres and polling stations.

Article 6

Pursuant to Article VI of the Cooperation Agreement, a United Nations Certificate shall be issued to staff of IOM performing functions or travelling on official business for the United Nations.
The United Nations shall seek the agreement of the host country for the applicability, mutatis mutandis, of the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations to IOM, and for any other facilities necessary for the conduct of the voting process.

**Article 7**

The Secretariat of the United Nations and the Administration of IOM shall consult each other regularly on matters relating to the implementation of this Arrangement.

**Article 8**

Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to the Agreement, including its invalidity, breach or termination shall be settled amicably through discussion and negotiation.

**Article 9**

This Arrangement shall enter into force on the date of its signature by the duly authorized representatives of the two Organizations and shall remain in force until the completion of the voting process and the settlement of all pending issues related thereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned representatives of the Secretariat of the United Nations and the Administration of the International Organization for Migration have signed the present Arrangement.

Signed this 3rd day of June 1999 at New York in two originals in the English language.

For the United Nations:  
Kieran Prendergast  
Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs

For the International Organization for Migration:  
Robert G. Paiva  
Permanent Observer to the United Nations
NOTIFICATION I: GUIDELINES ON ASSESSMENT OF DOCUMENTS

Direction I (4) on Documents

Whereas Direction I (4) of the Directions Relating to The Popular Consultation of the People of East Timor Through a Direct Ballot empowers the Chief Electoral Officer by way of notification to determine a class of documents for use in establishing eligibility for registration as a voter in the consultation, it is hereby notified that the Chief Electoral Officer has made the following rules to apply with respect to documents.

Section A

Eligibility to vote

1. According to the Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia, the Portuguese Government and the Secretary-General of the United Nations regarding the modalities for the popular consultation, four categories of persons are eligible to vote. These are:

(a) persons born in East Timor;
(b) persons born outside East Timor but with at least one parent having been born in East Timor;
(c) persons born outside East Timor but whose spouse was born in East Timor; and
(d) persons born outside of East Timor but is a spouse of a person whose mother or father was born in East Timor.

2. Before a person can be registered as a voter, the elements indicated below under each category of eligibility shall be proved. Such proof shall be established by the use of two or more documents.

3. Category A: Persons born in East Timor:

(a) proof of identity; and
(b) proof of birth in East Timor.

4. Category B: Persons born outside East Timor but with at least one parent having been born in East Timor:

(a) proof of identity;
(b) proof that the relevant parent was born in East Timor; and
(c) proof of family relationship.
5. **Category C:** Persons not born in East Timor but whose spouse was born in East Timor:
   
   (a) proof of identity;
   (b) proof that husband or wife was born in East Timor and
   (c) proof of marriage relationship

6. **Category D:** Persons born outside East Timor but are a spouse of a person whose mother or father was born in East Timor:
   
   (a) proof of identity;
   (b) proof of marriage to relevant person;
   (c) proof that one of the husband’s or wife’s parents was born in East Timor; and
   (d) proof of husband’s or wife’s family relationship.

**Documents recognized by the Chief Electoral Officer**

As a general rule, each applicant for registration will be required to present two forms of documentation in order for the District Electoral Officers to determine his or her eligibility to vote. The first category of document is an identity document. The function of this document is to establish individual identity (documents listed in section B). The second kind of document is a document, which verifies the criteria of eligibility as defined in Section A given in any one of the categories of eligibility (documents listed in section C).

**Section B**

**Identity Documents**

(1) Registrants are required to present at least one of the following documents to establish identity.

   (a) Indonesian passport;
   (b) National Identity Card;
   (c) Refugee Identity;
   (d) National Passport;
   (e) Daftar Penduduk (village list);
   (f) Kartu Pelajar;
   (g) Kartu Mahasiswa;
   (h) Driving Licence.

**Section C**

**Documents proving other eligibility criteria**

(1) Registrants are required to present at least one of the following documents to establish eligibility criteria—birth in East Timor, marriage to an East Timorese, or daughter or son relationship to a person born in East Timor, marriage to a person whose mother or father was born in East Timor.
(a) Baptism Certificate  
(b) Birth Certificate  
(c) Marriage certificate  
(d) Parents birth certificate  
(e) Family certificate  
(f) Parents baptism certificate  
(g) Cedula Da Vida Crista  
(h) Cedula Pessoal

(2) Where one document contains both identity information (picture and name) and details which satisfy the eligibility criteria relating to a person being born in East Timor, e.g. National Identity Card and National Passport, the District Electoral Officer shall nevertheless require the applicant to present one additional document from Section C.

Section D

Special Rules Relating to Persons Without Documentation: Affidavits of Birth

(1) Where a person is not in possession of sufficient documentation to support his or her application to register, the District Electoral Officer shall require such an individual to:

Produce an affidavit sworn before a religious leader or Kepala Desa (village chief) and witnessed by a person who knows the applicant. In addition to the affidavit, the application for registration must be witnessed by a fully documented registered voter. Where the District Electoral Officer is satisfied that the applicant has met these conditions, he or she shall register the applicant.

For the purposes of this provision, a “religious leader”, means any person who has been designated by his or her religious organisation as a person with the authority to swear/affirm affidavits.

(2) Where a person has been registered pursuant to the production of an affidavit, the District Electoral Officer shall note the use of the affidavit on Form ETR02.

(3) Any registration made pursuant to an affidavit may be challenged. Where an objection has been lodged, the Regional Electoral Officer shall forward the objection to the Electoral Commission.

(4) The Electoral Commission shall, as soon as is practicable, after it has received a notice of objection from the District Electoral Officer, consider the objection and either uphold it or reject it.

See attached Annex for Affidavit.

Issued this 8th day of July 1999

Signed ..................................................

Chief Electoral Officer
AFFIDAVIT OF BIRTH

I ........................................................................................................... (full name)

take oath (affirm/promise) and state as follows:

1. My Full Name is: .................................................................

2. I was born on the .......... day of ...................................... 19......

3. I was born in the village/town of ...........................................

in the District of ........................................ in the Province of East Timor.

4. I hereby solemnly swear (affirm/promise) on this ........... day of

........................................ 1999, that the facts I have stated in this affidavit are the truth and nothing but the truth.

Signed: .................................................. Signed: ........................................

Authority Applicant

Official Stamp of Village/Parish/Church

WITNESS

I, the undersigned, having no personal interest in the subject matter of this affidavit, directly or indirectly, hereby certify that this instrument was sworn/affirmed in my presence by the applicant on the .... day of ............. 1999.

........................................ Signature of witness ........................................

Address of witness .................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Relates to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DOCUMENTS, AFFIDAVITS, SPOUSE DEFINITION AND OBSERVERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DOCUMENTS, AFFIDAVITS AND SPOUSE RELATIONSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DOCUMENTS, SPOUSE RELATIONSHIPS, AFFIDAVITS AND RELIGIOUS DOCUMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ELECTORAL MALPRACTICE AND AFFIDAVITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DOCUMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>QUALIFICATIONS FOR REGISTRATION AND APPEALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>REGISTRATION PERIOD – TIMES AND DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VOTERS WHO CANNOT READ OR WRITE, VOTERS WITH DISABILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CANCELLATION OF REGISTRATIONS AND ILLITERATE AND PHYSICALLY DISABLED VOTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VOTER EDUCATION DURING THE COOLING OFF PERIOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTIFICATION NUMBER 5: AMENDMENT TO NOTIFICATION NO. 1: TO PROVIDE THAT FOR EXTERNAL VOTING THE AFFIDAVIT SHALL BE SWORN BEFORE A NOTARY PUBLIC OR AN INSTITUTION OF SIMILAR AUTHORITY IN THE JURISDICTION WHERE THE REGISTRATION/POLLING CENTRE IS SITUATED

Whereas Direction 52 of the Directions Relating to the Popular Consultation of the People of East Timor Through a Direct Ballot empowers the Chief Electoral Officer to amend the Directions and it has become necessary to amend Notification Number 1 in order to provide that in case of external voting affidavits are to be sworn affirmed before a notary public or an authority performing similar functions in the jurisdiction where the external voting is to take place and not before a Village Chief or Religious authority, as shall be the case, with voting within East Timor.

In exercise of the powers entrusted in me, I hereby promulgate the following direction:

1. With respect to Registration to be conducted at Registration/Polling Centres outside East Timor and where the applicant for registration is not in possession of sufficient documentation to support his or her application to register, and the applicant wishes to avail himself or herself of the Special Rules Relating to Persons Without Documentation: Affidavit contained in Notification 1, the affidavit shall be sworn, affirmed before a notary public or any authority that performs similar functions in the jurisdiction where the Registration/Polling Centre is situated.

Issued this 12th day of July 1999

Signed..............................
Chief Electoral Officer
Summary of Final Reports from CRs

A. Administration

The office space dedicated for EVET in New York was provided by the permanent IOM mission. The Portuguese government provided the offices in Lisbon. IOM Maputo was greatly assisted in setting up by the SRO in Pretoria, and UNDP offered premises. IOM Macau was able to find inexpensive office space due to high availability resulting from the economic crisis, and in Indonesia the IOM office was established at Hotel Borobudur.

Establishing governmental contacts varied from country to country. This task was not difficult for countries where IOM already had institutional representation. As there was no IOM presence in Indonesia, establishing contacts there was often frustrating and lengthy.

Logistic support from Darwin to the country offices was facilitated by a good air transport infrastructure and materials were generally consigned without difficulties. A relationship with Ansett International Air Freight developed, and this enabled a high level of service from that provider as well as the ability to keep track of the location of consignments. Additionally, the assistance given with customs clearance by UN agencies and/or governments at the consignments' destinations was greatly appreciated.

Within most countries communications between registration centres and the regional offices was facilitated by the close geographical proximity. Indonesia however, maintained four registration centres remote from the regional office. Fax machines and mobile telephones were generally used successfully.

IOM Lisbon and New York hired international (i.e., non-Timorese) staff on a local basis. IOM Macau mainly hired people from the local East Timorese community, and found these staff members highly committed and helpful. IOM Indonesia hired central office staff based on recommendations from international bodies, and staff members in the sub-offices were contracted from local sources.

B. Finance

Macau and Indonesia reported under-spending against the allocated budget. In Indonesia, the main underspending occurred as a result of establishing less registration centres than anticipated.

In most countries, the cost of office rental was considerably less than foreseen. Office space was provided free of charge in Lisbon by the civil government, in Maputo by UNDP, in Denpasar (Indonesia) by the Bali government and in Jakarta by UNIC. Office equipment was also provided at some sites. IOM New York was able to keep costs down by delaying concluding leases and contracts until the dates for registration were certain. Indonesia was funded for 10 registration centres, but only 5 were established. Also in Indonesia, cars were rented with drivers, and this combination was more cost effective than hiring cars and drivers separately.
In Mozambique, the cost of publicity via local media was high. In Indonesia, high bank charges for withdrawing US dollars contributed a high expense.

Countries where IOM already had an established presence were able to draw on the banking facilities in use at those locations. IOM Maputo required a letter of justification from UNDP Maputo, since it did not have full recognition as a diplomatic mission. IOM Indonesia encountered a cumbersome banking bureaucracy, and it took almost one month to open local currency and USD bank accounts.

C. The electoral process

1. Registration

All countries considered that the registration process was easy to follow, and the explanatory and supplementary materials issued by IOM Darwin drew favourable comment. In general, there was a low turnout of registrants initially, and numbers built up as the registration period proceeded. The exception was in Lisbon, where initial registrations were high. In most countries, applicants presented with appropriate documentation. In Indonesia however, affidavits were more widely used as a result of applicants having no other admissible documentation. A frequent comment concerned the address field in the registration forms, noting that this was designed for use within East Timor.

The locations from which people came to register varied considerably between IOM offices. In Macau, registrants arrived from Hong Kong, Xuihai/China, Philippines and Malaysia as well as Macau.

In Maputo, there were representations about potential registrants living outside Maputo who could not afford to travel from the provinces. However, the IOM office did not receive any confirmation of the number of such Timorese, and believes the majority of eligible people registered and voted.

In Lisbon, there was a fear that eligible people would be disenfranchised owing to the distances needed to travel. However, many people were prepared to make the journey, and registrants included a number of very old and infirm people.

Only one polling station was established for North America. The requirement to be physically present twice during the process was a burden; the one person who registered but did not return to vote was from California and the cost of returning to vote appears to have outweighed the motivation. New York suggested that registration or balloting by mail may have been appropriate for voters in that region at least.

IOM Indonesia believed that ‘in person’ registration disadvantaged some eligible voters living far away from registration centres. Some people needed to travel for two days to arrive at centres and two days to return, with two return journeys required. Several hundred potential registrants from Kalimantan could not be registered as they arrived at the Registration Centres after the end of the registration period. These people claimed that the Indonesian authorities had misinformed them.

In Macau, initial estimates of the eligible population ranged from 25 to 75, but these were rapidly reassessed upwards. Portugal’s actual voter population was close to that estimated.
In all other countries, the estimates started higher and were revised downwards. In the USA it was found that there were only 17 eligible people, of whom 15 were in country, and 13 applied to register.

IOM Macau reported that 71.8% of their registrants were born in East Timor, 16.1% had a parent born in East Timor, 11.4% were the spouse of someone born in East Timor, and only one person was the spouse of someone whose parent was born in East Timor. IOM New York reported that of their 13 registrants, one was a foreign born spouse and one a foreign born child; all others were born in East Timor. IOM Maputo reported that 40% fell within category 2, and 15% within category 3; the remaining 45% were born in East Timor.

IOM Portugal mentioned with admiration the determination of people to register; quoting the example of two people who arrived by ambulance, and one in prison who made astounding efforts to register. IOM Indonesia reported that a bus with registrants from the north of Sumatra had an accident and a number of potential voters ended up in hospital rather than in the Registration Centre in Jakarta.

2. Appeals, Exhibition and Challenges

The only country to receive any appeals was Indonesia, where four appeals were filed of which three were upheld. In all countries the exhibition and challenges period was extremely quiet, with very few voters (in all cases less than ten) coming to check the list. There were no challenges. IOM New York suggested that the five-day challenge period, including a weekend, which may have been necessary in country, might have been reduced for overseas registration centres.

3. Polling

All countries reported that the polling process was clear and logical, and favourably commented on the supplementary material produced by IOM Darwin. A steady flow of voters was reported, although in all countries many voters arrived early in the morning. The atmosphere was uniformly reported as being calm but festive, happy and moving. Portugal reported that all voters arrived with their correct documentation, and there were no lost voter cards.

The turnout was high in all countries, with Macau reporting 94%, Maputo 92%, New York 92%, Portugal 97% and Indonesia 96%. The voters were all highly motivated and many had travelled long distances to vote.

Macau reported some initial confusion with the wording of the ballot, though this was overcome through voter education. IOM New York also suggested that instructions should have been sent out with the cardboard voting booth stating how to construct it. Indonesia reported a peaceful, though intrusive, demonstration in Ujung Pandang by a pro-integration group. There were also some problems with the media trying to take photographs in Yogyakarta polling centre, and New York reported that it was difficult to refuse access to media when images of polling within East Timor had already been shown on television and in the press.
4. Counting

All countries said that the counting process was relatively straightforward and that the guidelines produced by IOM Darwin were clear. In Macau, USA and Mozambique the counting took place immediately after polling, while in Portugal and Indonesia counting commenced on the following day. Only in Indonesia was any movement of ballot boxes necessary; their ballot boxes were transported in the morning following voting day under strict security to the Counting Centre. The counting took place in the afternoon of the same day.

Although the process of counting was intensively explained to official observers in Indonesia, they feared the process was not transparent enough as the counting result was not made available to them, or any other observers.

5. The overall process

All countries considered that the process was well organized and the different phases formed a coherent step by step sequence.

IOM Indonesia commented on three main issues:

a) The distances involved compared with the locations of the registration centres, caused inconvenience to voters who lived outside Java and southern Sulawesi and may have disenfranchised some potential voters.

b) Production of appropriate documentation was insisted upon, yet this could be overcome by using an affidavit. Additionally, while only notaries were authorised to sign an affidavit, a number of notaries refused to sign, being prepared to sign them only in the capacity of a witness.

c) Although efforts were made to keep the counting process transparent, the instruction not to let the result of the count be known on a country basis caused some observers to lose confidence in the process.

6. The public information campaign in the various phases of the operation

IOM Maputo and Macau considered that the public information campaign was well organised and that the UNAMET information sheets were useful. However, IOM Portugal commented that although they were of reasonable quality, they needed to be adapted to local conditions; IOM Macau stated that they arrived too late to be effective, and IOM Indonesia considered that UNAMET did not pay diligent attention to the needs of external voting in Indonesia. They also felt that other information material obtained from UNAMET was of little use in the specific circumstances of external voting where the electorate is widely spread through a vast territory.

'Home-grown' activities varied considerably based on the local circumstances. IOM Macau made a concerted effort to hold regular town hall type meetings where they explained the process of registration and polling. They were also able to immediately translate any documents received into Chinese, Tetum, Portuguese and Bahasa Indonesia. IOM Maputo reported that informative material from the Internet was downloaded and adapted to their needs. The office regularly published announcements for general
information, and media coverage of the operation was very good. IOM New York focused their efforts mainly on publicising the office's location and key dates. They also used websites to publish information not only about the New York operation but also about other IOM EVET locations. IOM Indonesia, in cooperation with UNIC, advertised in the national radio and television, and registration numbers immediately showed the results of this. IOM Lisbon reported that UNIC produced materials based on material coming from Dili. IOM Lisbon was not convinced that this information had been transmitted to the Timorese community in a clear and precise format.

IOM Lisbon cited that co-ordination with the United Nations and the information content produced by them could have been improved. IOM New York suggested that for future missions, beginning in the initial planning phase, a designated person should be tasked with drafting notices, etc., so as to produce materials which could be used, with adaptations, by all offices.

7. The Observers

In most countries the observers performed their functions without disrupting the processes. IOM Macau commented that "The Indonesian observer to our office was an absolute delight. He was very kind, non-obtrusive and never made the voters feel uncomfortable for one minute..." IOM Maputo said that "two observers from Portugal and one from Indonesia were present and followed all the activities". IOM New York said "the observers, whose very presence might have made people very uncomfortable on polling day, handled themselves with great discretion, almost to the point of being self-effacing". However, IOM Portugal said that their international observers "had to be given a second briefing on the Code of Conduct to ensure their role was one of 'observing'".

IOM New York reported an incident where "an elderly voter did not mark the ballot he cast, and only came back five minutes later to say he had not understood what he should have done. Clearly, there was no way he could be allowed to cast another ballot (even though he was both mortified by his mistake and totally crushed by our telling him so). The interesting aspect of this, however, was how it brought together the observers (who otherwise stayed very distant in their actual "observer" role during polling) to try to find a way for the man to be given another chance. Given who he was, it was clear to everyone in the room how he would have voted, but the official observer who would have appreciated his vote the least was the most active in seeking a way to allow him to cast another ballot."

D. The Press

The press was, for the most part, helpful and cooperative. However, there was speculation by representatives from some countries that the rules on dealing with the media were inadequate. The emphasis on secrecy prevented offices from giving out registration statistics even at the polling stage, and the fact that photos and film of voting came out of Dili made it difficult to maintain the required distance of media from the polling stations. Some DEOs in Indonesia considered that cooperating with the press was essential in external voting for the success of the public information period, but that there was little cooperation from IOM to them on issues which they wished to report.

E. Security
Security was only an issue in Indonesia, where the international staff were not at any risk, but local staff in both Ujung Pandang and Denpasar had cause to be concerned with their personal security. Protective measures were taken by the DEOs locally and regular communication was kept between the DEOs and the central office in Jakarta.

IOM Indonesia stated that cases of intimidation were reported from Yogyakarta, although the IOM team lacked the means to confirm these reports. In Ujung Pandang, pro-integration demonstrations were staged at several occasions and individuals leaning towards independence expressed their fear in conversations with the international staff.

F. The DEOs

All countries were highly complimentary about the DEOs.

IOM Maputo said that “the DEOs played a very effective and crucial role in the overall operation, and all difficulties were duly overcome thanks to their knowledge, initiative and capacity to deliver”.

IOM Indonesia said that the DEOs “were the core of the whole operation. Their experience – and some had gained a lot in overseas assignments – and their professionalism contributed essentially towards the success of EVET in Indonesia”.

IOM Portugal reported that they were “…invaluable. Their contribution to the whole process was critical to the external vote operation, which was run in a professional and straightforward manner. DEO’s performed exceptionally during the entire process”.

IOM Macau said that “the DEOs contribution to the process was vital… Both DEOs were hard workers and had relevant experience”.

IOM New York hired a Brazilian national with a legal background and fluent English, to act as team leader and DEO. The CR commented that she had a superb feel for the work and a meticulous mind, combined with both the language and interpersonal skills to work on this type of project.

G. Lessons learned

IOM Indonesia commented that:

1. An IOM deployment in a host country requires consultation with the government of that country prior to the deployment of staff.

2. The organization dealing with External Voting should also be entrusted with the related information campaign. The information needs of EVET were quite different from those for East Timor itself.

3. The deployment of the Canadian DEOs, within IOM’s international structure, worked very well. Governmental “in kind” contributions could be a suitable formula for future operations.

IOM Portugal stated that:
1. Co-operation received from the local authorities was essential to the success of the project.

2. Team cohesion is necessary to ensure success.

3. Timely and clear communications both written and verbal are essential for a project of this magnitude.

H. Other Comments

IOM Macau:

The CR commented that the training in Darwin was important to understanding the process better, while giving the CRs not only the opportunity to meet Darwin staff, but allow synergy amongst the CRs as well. She also made special mention of the assistance from IOM Hong Kong, and of the supplemental electoral materials produced in IOM Darwin.

IOM Maputo:

The CR commented that it was impressive how all the team could so quickly jump into the business and organize an electoral process with a so high level of acceptance all over the world. He feels that this is one of the fields that the organization should further develop in the future.

IOM New York:

The CR commented that secrecy regarding the number of registrants was not fully understood. He also speculated that the creation of a polling station in New York may have been inappropriate and that this polling station would have served more East Timorese people if created in the UK or New Zealand.

IOM Indonesia:

The CR felt that there were added difficulties unique to Indonesia.