Deployment Methods
2004 Indonesian Presidential Election
Observer Team Instructions

This document describes the methodology that Carter Center teams will use to observe the balloting and initial vote counting on election day. Our approach will add an element of random sampling to established international election observation methodology to enhance our ability to generalize about the information observers have collected.

1. Each team will be given a list of “deployment zones” (typically, villages or neighborhoods) within their more general deployment regions. The deployment zones have been randomly selected. If possible, please go only to polling stations within deployment zones on the list, although we recognize that for logistical or other reasons you may visit some polling stations that are not listed. On the “Polling Station Observation Form”, record whether each polling station was within one of your team’s deployment zones (an “in-sample” polling station).

Selecting your route within each city or village area

2. Within each deployment zone, use either of the two methods listed below. Select the method that you think best fits the zone you are in.
   a. The Diameter Method: Start on the edge of the deployment zone and make your route through what you think is the center of the deployment zone. (Try to ensure that more than half of the stations visited are in the densest part of the deployment zone.)
   b. The Slice of Pie Method: Alternatively, make a loop in a pie shaped portion of the city and return to one or two of the polling stations later in the day. Try to ensure that you go to a broad selection of the types of urban areas. (Again, try to visit about half of your polling stations in the densest part of the municipality or deployment zone).

3. Because of the small number of voters registered at each polling station, we expect that the stations will be relatively close together within each deployment zone. To the extent that it is possible, go to a diverse sample of polling stations within each assigned deployment zone that you are able to visit. Avoid going to a long string of adjacent polling stations.

4. If possible, return to one or two (no more) polling stations during the day. Only do this if it makes sense logistically—don’t go out of your way to do this. Indicate repeat visits on the polling station reports.

5. At half of the polling stations (i.e. every other one) announce or suggest that you will be likely to return. At the others, do not make any announcement of this type. Write this down in the appropriate place on the form for each polling station. This will help us test whether or not election-day irregularities (if they exist in this election) simply take place after they are sure the observers have left the polling station for the day.
Indonesian Presidential Election 2004
Polling Station Observation Form FORM A

Instructions: Read the questions carefully. Put an “X” in the appropriate box. If you cannot answer the question, or it is not relevant, write N/A. If you answered “No” to any question, or violations or irregularities occurred, please provide details on the back of the form. When possible, ask domestic observers and/or political party agents for their observations during the period prior to your arrival. Record this information at the bottom of the form.

Province: KAL BARAT
City/District (Kota/Kabupaten): PONTIANAK
Village/Neighborhood (Desa/Kelurahan): Sintang Teneg
13 digit ID number from ballot box: # 11

Polling Station (TPS) ID No.: II
Location (sub-district/kecamatan): Sintang Teneg
Arrival Time: 8:19 a.m.
Departure Time: 9:30
In-Sample Voting Station? Yes 6171040003

Observer Names / Team Number: Killar
Coffey

Opening Procedures - Complete for each TPS in which the opening was witnessed:

1. Were the ballots counted and the number recorded in the opening report? Yes No

2. Were the ballot boxes shown empty to all present, then locked and properly sealed? Yes No

3. Did the TPS open on time (7:00 am local time)? List time: 7:10 a.m. first vote opened at 7:20.

General - Complete for each Polling Station (TPS) visited:

4. Was the polling station clear of campaign materials, campaigning, or other attempts to influence voters in or around the TPS? If no, please specify

5. Was the polling station free of intimidation, vote buying, disruption of the voting/counting process, or restrictions to voter access (roadblocks, mobs, etc)? If no, please specify

6. Were all required materials, the voters' list, official ink and ballot papers available? Yes No

7. Did TPS officials appear to be adequately trained and knowledgeable about their role? Yes No

8. Were political party agents (poll monitors) or candidate witnesses from more than one party present? Yes No

9. Were domestic monitors (e.g. JPPR, JAMPPPI, CETRO, Rectors Forum, KIPP) present? If yes, please specify.

10. Was the process free of formal complaints to the TPS officials? If no, please specify

11. Were other international observers (e.g., EU, embassies) present, or, had they visited the polling station? If yes, please specify

The Voting Process - Complete for each TPS:

12. Were voters' fingers checked for signs of ink as they entered the TPS? Yes No

13. Were voter IDs checked against the voters' list and the voter's name crossed off? Yes No

14. Did the Chair sign all ballots before they were given to the voters? Yes No

15. Were all voters able to keep their vote secret during the entire voting process? Yes No

16. Were voters' fingers inked before they left the TPS? Yes No

17. Were there any interruptions or delays of the voting process? Yes No

18. Were you able to adequately observe all aspects of the voting process? Yes No

19. Did the TPS close on time (1:00 pm local time)? Yes No

Overall Assessment of the Polling Station:

Put a “√” next to the statement that best describes your assessment of the election environment and voting process for the area you observed. If your response is “poor” or “very poor”, please provide further explanation in the comment section.

Very Good – No significant incidents or irregularities.

Good – A few incidents or irregularities that had no significant effect on the integrity of the process.

Average – Many incidents or irregularities that may have had a significant effect on the integrity of the process.

Poor – Incidents or irregularities that significantly affected the integrity of the process.

Very Poor – Incidents or irregularities occurred that so affected the integrity of the process as to render the results from one or more TPS objectionable.