

MOLDOVA

Election Observation Mission 2024 Final Report



Summary

Silba has conducted a short-term election observation mission (EOM) to the 2024 Moldovan referendum and presidential election. With the limitations that a short-term election observation holds, Silba concludes that the elections were conducted in a free and fair manner, yet with shortcomings. The findings within this report should also be seen in this light. Silba finds the following:

- **Regarding the set-up of the elections:** The conduct of the election creates barriers to people with disabilities, questioning their access to voting. Furthermore, the set-up of polling booths brings into question the secrecy of the vote, as it is possible to oversee others casting their vote. This is especially a problem with the voting booths for people with disabilities. Likewise, our observers have witnessed problems with voting lists. Lastly, the cameras filming the ballot boxes were also filming the voters.
- **Regarding procedures at polling stations,** there is a difference across polling stations as to whether officials follow procedures.
- **Regarding the application of the Moldovan Electoral Code,** Silba finds that its formulations about control sheets (§80.1) and observer rights (§88.9) can be interpreted in multiple ways. This can also be seen in a lack of practice adherence to the Electoral Code.
- **Silba has furthermore observed breaches of good election practices.** This was done by multiple actors and included group voting, interference by party-affiliated observers, and inappropriate behavior by some polling station officials.

Silba has exclusively conducted a short-term observation, focusing on the electoral practices on election day. Our observations are neither able to confirm nor deny allegations that have been made regarding mass bribery or larger irregularities in the run-up to the elections. Silba has had one observation team, which observed a series of episodes, which could indicate bribery. Yes, that is not evidence of bribery in itself. However, we do take these allegations seriously.

Foreword

Silba - Initiative for Dialogue and Democracy is a Danish non-profit, non-governmental, youth-led organization dedicated to upholding democratic values, whilst promoting dialogue, civic participation, and the defense of civil liberties and equality. This commitment is realized through a combination of domestic initiatives, international partnership projects, and election observation missions (EOMs). Over the past 30 years, Silba has conducted upwards of 60 EOMs in over 20 countries.

In connection to the 2024 presidential elections and the EU referendum in Moldova, Silba deployed 44 Short-Term Observers (STOs) to Moldova from the 15th of October to the 22nd of October. The in-country team was led by a coordinator team consisting of: Head of Mission Kristian N. Jakobsen (Danish); Observer Engagement Coordinator, Emma Klint Hansen (Danish); Comrat Logistical Coordinator Filip J. Foldrup (Danish); Bălți Area Coordinator Albert Otkjær (Danish); Financial Coordinator Nicolae Grozav (Moldovian); Press Coordinator Sofus Rønberg (Danish); and App Coordinator Adrien Von Yuma Olsen (Danish). The in-country team consisted of 44 observers, where 23 of the STOs reside in Denmark, and 21 of the STOs were Moldovan nationals. All observers participated in a training session before the EOM with the coordinator team.

This report serves as a comprehensive record of the observations and concerns related to the 2024 Elections in Moldova that commenced on the 20th of October. **On behalf of the Silba team, we wish to convey our heartfelt appreciation to all partners and stakeholders for their support and contributions to the broader discourse on democratic processes and standards during the deployment.**

Table of Contents

Historical and Political Context	1
Political Polarization	2
2024 Election and EU Referendum	3
Presidential Elections	3
EU Referendum	3
Result of the First Round of the Presidential Election	4
Result of the Second Round of the Presidential Election	5
Post-Election Environment in Moldova: Navigating the Aftermath	6
Limited Presidential Powers and Institutional Constraints	6
Observation Methodology	8
Guidelines and Training	9
Deployment Plan	9
Findings	11
Opening Procedure	11
General Observation	11
Closing Procedures	14
Conclusion and Recommendations	15
Acknowledgments	17
Organizers	19

Historical and Political Context

Moldova is a small, landlocked country in Eastern Europe with a population of approximately 2.5 million people. Its capital and largest city is Chişinău, and the country borders Romania to the west and Ukraine to the north, east, and south.

Religiously, Moldova is shaped by its ties with the Orthodox Church, where a majority are affiliated with the Moldovan Orthodox Church. However societal division reflects that Moldova has historically seen a lot of external influence, with being included under the Ottoman Empire, Tsarist Russia, and the Soviet Union. This has led to a complex political and cultural identity, where societal divisions often reflect linguistic, regional, and political lines. Exemplifying this, we find Romanian to be the official language, however, Russian and other minority languages such as Hungarian and Turkish are also widely spoken – and in some regions like Gagauzia Russian is considered the official language.

Moldova operates as a parliamentary republic with a multi-party system. Declaring independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, it adopted its first constitution in 1994, officially establishing itself as an independent republic. As one of Europe's youngest nations, 2024 marks 30 years of navigating the challenges of democratic transition and economic reform, often struggling against corruption, oligarchic influence, and significant external geopolitical pressures.

Facts about Moldova

- **Moldova declared independence in 1991 from the Soviet Union.**
- **In 1992, the unrecognized breakaway region Transnistria declared independence, following armed conflict. Transnistria lies on the east side of the Dniester River in Moldova's eastern part.**
- **The autonomous region of Gagauzia to Moldova's south is predominantly inhabited by the Gagauz minority.**



The 1994 constitution created a single-chamber parliament composed of 101 members, elected every four years through proportional representation. While some constitutional amendments have been made over the years, the overall framework remains intact. The president holds limited authority compared to the parliament and prime minister. Parliamentary elections also occur every four years, with political parties needing to surpass a 5% threshold (or higher for coalitions) to gain representation.

Political Polarization

Moldova has a somewhat polarized political landscape with two major factions being pro-European and pro-Russian. In 2020, Maia Sandu from the Party of Action and Solidarity (PAS) was elected president. This marked a shift in the country's geopolitical orientation. Since 2020, the PAS party has focused on steering the country towards European integration. Opposition parties, including the Party of Socialists of the Republic of Moldova (PSRM) and the Șor Party, have challenged PAS's recent reforms, citing economic hardships, rising inflation, and declining rural incomes. These parties advocate closer ties with Russia, leveraging populist rhetoric and rural discontent. **The 2023 banning of the Șor Party over its role in organizing anti-government protests and alleged foreign influence was a contentious issue by Moldova's Constitutional Court, reflecting the ongoing struggles to balance security with democratic inclusivity.**

The unresolved conflict with the breakaway region of Transnistria has also highly affected Moldova's modern political landscape. Transnistria, located east of the Dniester River, declared independence in 1992 after an armed conflict but remains internationally recognized as part of Moldova. The region is home to a significant Russian-speaking population and maintains close ties with Russia, including hosting Russian troops as peacekeeping forces. This situation creates ongoing tensions between Chișinău and Tiraspol (the de facto capital of Transnistria). This constellation poses several challenges for Moldova, amongst others Russia's backing of Transnistria serves as leverage over Moldova, limiting its geopolitical autonomy and complicating its aspirations for EU membership. **To this day, Transnistria remains a frozen conflict, reflecting the unresolved divisions from Moldova's Soviet past.** These regions illustrate the challenges of maintaining sovereignty, fostering national unity, and navigating external pressures in one of Europe's most geopolitically sensitive areas.

2024 Elections and EU Referendum

On October 20, 2024, Moldova held a significant dual vote that highlighted the nation's political crossroads: the first round of the presidential elections and a referendum on amending the constitution to enable Moldova's accession to the European Union. As a country at the crossroads of Eastern and Western spheres of influence, these elections underscored the deep divisions within Moldova and highlighted the geopolitical tug-of-war the country finds itself in.

Presidential Elections

The president is elected directly for a four-year term, with an absolute majority needed to win. If no candidate secures this majority in the first round, a runoff election is held between the top two candidates. Presidential candidates can be nominated by a party, coalition, or independently, with at least one-third of voter turnout required to validate the election.

The presidential election was highly polarized, reflecting broader societal divisions over Moldova's future direction. The electoral campaign saw intense debates on topics such as anti-corruption measures, economic reforms, and the country's foreign policy alignment. Moldova's political landscape has grown increasingly polarized in recent years, with the ruling PAS advocating for democratic reforms and European integration, while opposition parties emphasized closer ties with Russia and expressed concerns over the many EU-related reforms and economic hardships of many Moldovans.

EU Referendum

The constitutional referendum posed the following question to voters:

"Do you support the amendment of the Constitution with a view to the accession of the Republic of Moldova to the European Union?"

Voters were presented with the options "yes" (Romanian: da) and "no" (Romanian: nu).

The referendum represented a culmination of Moldova's and the PAS' push for EU alignment, which began with visa liberalization in 2014, the signing of an Association Agreement in 2016, and the granting of EU candidate status in 2022. The campaign for the referendum emphasized the benefits of EU integration, including economic growth, security cooperation, and stronger democratic institutions, while opposition voices raised concerns about the potential loss of sovereignty and the socio-economic disruptions of a faster integration process.

Result of the Referendum

The result of the referendum became clear only the morning after the election. While the domestic vote suggested a narrow defeat, the strong support from the diaspora ultimately secured a victory for the "Yes" side, with a narrow margin of 10,564 votes. As voter turnout exceeded the required threshold of 1/3 of registered voters (50.72%), the referendum was deemed valid, and the constitutional amendment was to be enacted.

	Voted YES	Voted NO
Number of votes	749 719	739 155
Percentage of votes	50.35 %	49.65 %

Source: CEC.md

Result of the First Round of the Presidential Election

The first round of the presidential election saw the incumbent president, Maia Sandu, take an early lead during the night of the election. While securing the highest number of votes in the first round Sandu was not able to acquire more than 50% of the votes required to win outright, necessitating a second-round runoff against the runner-up Alexandr Stoianoglo.

Candidate (Party)	Percentage of votes	Number of votes
Maia Sandu (PAS)	42.49 %	656 852
Alexandr Stoianoglo (PSRM)	25.95 %	401 215
Renato Usatîi (PN)	13.79 %	213 169
Irina Vlah (Independent)	5.38 %	83 193
Victoria Furtună (Independent)	4.45 %	68 778
Vasile Tarlev (PVM)	3.19 %	49 316
Ion Chicu (PDCM)	2.06 %	31 797
Octavian Țicu (Împreună)	0.93 %	14 326
Andrei Năstase (Independent)	0.64 %	9 946
Natalia Morari (Independent)	0.61 %	9 444
Tudor Ulianovschi (Independent)	0.52 %	7 995

Source: CEC.md

Result of the Second Round of the Presidential Election

The **runoff election** saw heightened voter engagement, with 54.34% of eligible voters casting a ballot. As with the referendum, the outcome was significantly influenced by votes from the diaspora, which overwhelmingly favored Maia Sandu. Although Stoianoglo had a slight lead in the votes cast within the country, the diaspora's support led to Sandu's victory in the second round.

Maia Sandu (PAS)	55.35%	930 139
Alexandr Stoianoglo (PSRM)	44.65%	750 430

Source: CEC.md

Post-Election Environment in Moldova: Navigating the Aftermath

The period following Moldova's recent presidential election has highlighted both the challenges and opportunities that define its current political landscape. As displayed earlier in this report the presidential elections were carried on to the second round of voting

The atmosphere surrounding the second round of the presidential election was marked by tension and uncertainty, as the country was looking at a paper-thin divide in voter preferences. The narrow "yes" vote in the referendum revealed not only a divided constituency but also emphasized the geopolitical and ideological challenges influencing Moldova's political landscape. Experts state that the results of the referendum, combined with the first-round presidential vote, were seen as both a mandate for change and a signal of widespread dissatisfaction and distrust. Thus, the second round of elections was perceived as a direct stand-off between Maia Sandu and Alexandr Stoianoglo. Sandu's campaign continued to emphasize pro-European reforms and combating corruption, whilst Stoianoglo tried to appeal to voters who were frustrated with what they perceived as overreach by Sandu's government and Western-aligned policies.

Limited Presidential Powers and Institutional Constraints

Though Maia Sandu came out victorious in the second round of the elections and can officially say she is once again elected for president; her role is constitutionally constrained. As the head of state in Moldova's parliamentary system, Sandu has limited authority over domestic policy and legislative matters. The responsibility for

implementing reforms and addressing Moldova's socio-economic challenges primarily lies with Prime Minister Dorin Recean's government and the Parliament. This means that the success of Sandu's vision for Moldova heavily depends on the actions and cooperation of Prime Minister Dorin Recean's government and a Parliament that must align with her priorities. This division of power emphasizes the importance of strong coordination between Sandu's presidency and the pro-European government coalition.

However, one might already see challenges ahead. Any perceived wavering in reforms or failure to address pressing issues could lead to public distrust in the coalition and be potentially harmful to the coalition's position ahead of the 2025 parliamentary elections. This is further challenged by an expected cabinet reshuffle in relation to the upcoming 2025 elections. Both add elements of uncertainty to the political landscape Moldova is looking towards for the next nine months.

The coming years will certainly be crucial for Moldova's domestic politics and international aspirations. Possible EU integration will require the government to deliver improvements in governance, economic conditions, and public trust. Maintaining international partnerships, particularly with the EU, while addressing internal discontent will be a fragile but necessary balancing act.

Observation Methodology

Election observers are essential to ensuring the integrity and transparency of electoral processes. Our observers help build public confidence in the electoral system by providing an independent oversight of the election day and conduct of the election. Their presence is instrumental in ensuring that the electoral process is fair, free, and free from irregularities. Within Silba, we have developed a comprehensive election observation methodology that enables us to conduct our observations as international observers in a highly professional manner.

Historically Silba has mainly worked within the realm of international observers, but for this particular EOM, we have introduced a new collaborative approach by partnering with local observers. We paired international observers with national observers, creating teams of two that blend the impartiality of international monitors with the local expertise and cultural understanding of national observers.

- National observers act as local experts who possess a deep understanding of their country's political context, cultural norms, and electoral landscape. Their familiarity with the local environment allows them to interpret the nuances of the electoral process, catch cultural references, and understand their surroundings in a way that is harder for an international observer.
- International observers, on the other hand, offer a certain degree of impartiality. Their presence underscores international standards for free and fair elections, and their assessments are perceived as unbiased, adding an extra layer of credibility to the electoral process.

Thus the composition combines the strengths of both national and international observation methods. International observers from Denmark were recruited by Silba and the Danish Youth Council (DUF), while the Moldovan delegation was provided by the National Youth Council of Moldova (CNTM). By combining national and international expertise, Silba remains committed to promoting democratic values and transparency in electoral processes worldwide.

Guidelines and Training

Our Election Observation approach is built on the OSCE guidelines and the OSCE's comprehensive [Election Observation Handbook](#). Adding to the approach, Silba makes use of our partner Kloop's observation tool, their monitoring app, to facilitate real-time efficient and reliable data collection from the field. Our observers undergo extensive training, including Silba's training program and a requirement to complete the OSCE/ODIHR observer courses for both long-term and short-term monitoring, a training seminar course before the election, as well as our training leading up to election day. This comprehensive preparation ensures that our teams are well-equipped to perform their duties with the highest level of professionalism.

Our data is composed of observations from election day on the 20th of October, which covers the following critical phases of the election: the opening of polling stations, continuous monitoring of voting activities at different polling stations, to the closing and vote counting procedures. Our observers operate under a strict code of conduct that emphasizes impartiality, non-interference, and ethical behavior, reinforcing the credibility and integrity of our assessments. These methods enable us to conduct a thorough evaluation of key aspects of the electoral process, including the performance of election officials, the conditions at polling stations, and the voter processing. Silba firmly believes that upholding these methodologies is essential for promoting democratic values and transparency in electoral processes worldwide

Deployment Plan

In line with our comprehensive methodology, Silba deployed a total of 44 STOs for this mission, organized into 21 teams. As stated each team was composed of one international observer, one national observer, and, in some cases, a translator. The teams were strategically deployed across three key municipalities in Moldova: Chişinău, Bălţi, and Comrat. This targeted approach allowed us to maximize our coverage and ensure a diverse assessment of electoral conditions in different regions within Moldova. Each of the municipalities holds particular significance in the political and cultural landscape of the country and thus helps us understand the electoral dynamics within the different regions.

Chişinău	Bălţi	Comrat
18 STOs Mission Headquarters Data Center	18 STOs 2 Coordinators	9 STOs 2 Coordinators

Our teams conducted observations throughout the entire election day, systematically covering the opening, voting, and closing procedures at polling stations. Specifically, the mission achieved a robust data set, with a total of 165 observations: 21 opening procedures, 124 voting procedures, and 20 closing procedures.

Within these three municipalities, our observers visited a diverse range of cities and voting districts. This approach ensured coverage across various urban, semi-urban, and rural contexts, capturing a broad spectrum of voting conditions and local electoral practices. This deployment plan provided a well-rounded and comprehensive view of the electoral process, enabling us to deliver an in-depth and credible assessment of election day activities.

Findings

Opening Procedure

Silba has observed 21 opening procedures across Moldova, where we have observed 9 opening procedures in Chișinău, 8 in Bălți, and 4 in Comrat. During the opening procedures, Silba observed the following:

There was an inconsistency as to whether the signed control sheets were inserted into every ballot box or just one of them. In our 21 observations, signed protocol sheets were put into every ballot box 10 times, while a signed protocol was put into only one of the ballot boxes 11 times. The Moldovan Election Code states that a control sheet should only be inserted into one of the ballot boxes [§80.1]. However, the paragraph can be interpreted both as if it should be inserted into every ballot box and just one. Silba has received guidance on the correct interpretation of the paragraph from a representative of the Center for Continuing Education in the Electoral Field. We believe that this unclear interpretation of the Election Code's §80.1 is reflected in the difference in practice at the polling stations.

In two cases, the packages with ballots were only partially intact or not intact at the opening procedure. In one case, our observers did not have a clear view to see if the ballots were intact or not. The Moldovan Electoral Code [§80.2] states that ballot papers should be *“stored in a secure place inside the polling station, in packages of 100 and, where necessary, [should, edt.] be distributed by the Chairperson of the Precinct Electoral Bureau to the members of the Bureau to be issued to the voters. [our underlining, edt.]”*. However, as it was only in two cases, we cannot say that it has been a general trend.

General observations

During the day Silba observed 124 polling stations in total, 25 in Comrat 46 in Bălți, and 53 in Chișinău. During the general observation, our STOs observed the following:

Issues regarding the ballot box camera. Some STOs reported that the cameras were not filming the ballot box. At times the camera was angled in such a way that it

was recording the whole room and thereby also recording the people inside the polling station.

Trouble with the voting list. There were several reports of issues regarding the voting list. These issues were often related to people either missing from the list or people who were added to the list that should have been. One team in Chişinău reported that at one polling station, 47 people were missing from the voter list.

Family or group voting. We had 29 reports of group voting or family voting. On most occasions, this was done mostly by elderly couples. During these group voting, two or more people were standing in the same voting booth and coordinating what to vote.

Secrecy of the vote. The most reported thing by our observers was that on several occasions they could see straight into the voting booth. This compromised the secrecy of the vote because the observers and possibly others had the opportunity to see what the voters voted for. On other occasions, the observers reported that the voting booths were standing so close to each other that it was possible for one voter to see what other voters standing next to them were voting. Besides this there were reports of the voting booth for disabled people, standing in such a way that this too where compromising the secrecy of the vote.

One team also reported the following: *"A voter had left his ballot paper at the booth, and a PSO went up and put it in the ballot box, announcing it to the polling station that she did. She Said the person didn't vote for anything on one of the ballot papers, thus sharing the person's vote with the rest of the polling station."*

In this case, the action of the PSO compromised the secrecy of the vote for this one voter. A few other instances where the secrecy of the were compromised, was when our observers reported that they had seen several people taking pictures of their vote inside the voting booth.

Inappropriate behavior by party observers or Polling station officials. We had several reports regarding the behavior of the party observers. In some instances the party observers were communicating with voters, commenting on the election, counting the number of people voting, and coming very close to the voting booths. These actions can be considered inappropriate since they might have an influence on or interfere with the electoral process itself. Observers should in all cases refrain from interfering with the electoral process since this would be considered a breach of their impartiality. A team reported that *"Voters folding the ballots with the text out so it was visible to observers, where one nodded to the partisan observers while voting"*. On one accusation, two people were present in the polling

station observing, but with no visible official accreditation. A few teams reported that they felt that they were being followed or watched very closely by the polling station officials. One team in Comrat reported upon arriving at the polling station for the closing procedure, they were met with questions by the police such as “Who is from Silba?”, “Why did you come here?”.

Afterward, the same team overheard polling station officials asking each other questions like *“Why did they come again?”* and *“Aren’t they supposed to be done with this?”*. Questions like these create an unfriendly atmosphere and hard working conditions for the observers. One team in Chişinău also sent in a report on the unfriendly atmosphere, this occurred during the closing procedure. In this case, a polling station official had tried to launch a vote on whether the Danish observer was allowed to stay during the closing procedure. The reason for this vote was that the one polling station official wasn’t satisfied with the observer’s official accreditation, granted by the Central Election Commission. This was however shut down due to that the other polling station officials did not want to participate in such a vote.

National observers, as with other accredited observers, *do* have the right to *“report any irregularities observed to the Chairperson of the election bureau”* (§88.9 of the Moldovan Electoral Code). This could be interpreted as though party observers were entitled to interfere as they did in the above examples. However, the article also states that the reporting should be *“without interfering with the voting process or in other election procedures”* (§88.9 of the Moldovan Electoral Code). In this regard, the behavior written above is a breach of the Moldovan Electoral Code.

Indication of bribery. Moldovan authorities have made accusations of meddling with the election, including mass bribery. Under Silba’s methodology of short-term observations focused on the polling station, it can be hard to catch bribery, which can take place in many other places and at many other times than at the polling station on election day. Silba’s observers did, however, encounter a series of episodes, which could indicate bribery.

As one observer team in Chişinău describes it, *“We arrived at the polling station before lunch, around 10 a.m. The first thing we encountered upon stepping out of the car in the parking lot was a woman explaining that someone had just tried to bribe her in front of the polling station. The woman spoke Romanian. She pointed out two elderly women walking around in front of the polling station’s entrance. (...) When we arrived at the polling station a few hours later, we quickly spotted the same elderly women from earlier...”* (Observer-team, Chişinău)."

This illustrates an *indication* of bribery, but is not enough to neither suggest nor decline the mass bribery, as seen in the accusations.

Inconsistency in polling station procedures. In the observations reported we noticed an inconsistency in how various procedures were handled in the polling stations. In some polling stations, there was one ballot box for the presidential elections and another for the referendum. At other polling stations, all votes went into the ballot box. At some polling stations, the polling station officials asked the voters whether they wanted both ballots or just one of them. At others, voters were just handed both ballots without being asked if they wanted both. There was also inconsistency as to whether or not the polling station officials signed the protocol on the wall. There was, however, consistency regarding how the chairperson was chosen and consistency in the training of polling station officials. In all cases, the chairperson where chosen through a democratic vote system, where votes were cast by all polling station officials. The training of the polling station officials seemed to be comprehensive enough for them to carry out their tasks.

Political symbols at polling stations. We had at least two reports of political symbols being present inside the polling station. These two symbols were symbols related to the EU and to Russia.

Closing Procedures

Silba has observed 20 closing procedures across Moldova. 4 in Comrat, 8 in Bălți, and 8 in Chișinău. During the closing procedures, all teams stayed during the entire counting process. During this process, our observers reported the following:

The counting of the vote. The process of counting the votes was conducted in an orderly manner. The polling station officials did seem to have a good and thorough understanding of the role and the process of counting the vote. The counting itself was done in a transparent manner where the observers generally had a good overview of the entire process. However, there was one incident in Bălți, where the number of registered voters did not match the number of votes. There were 1601 registered voters and 806 votes. Furthermore, one team reported that the time that the counting of the vote stopped, which was written in the official protocol, did not match the time that they actually stopped. There was a 27-minute difference between what was written and when the counting actually stopped.

Inappropriate actions by polling station officials and party observers. There were several reports of polling station officials and party observers using their phones to communicate with people outside the polling station. One team reported that a party observer had filmed a small part of the counting process. This was however stopped due to a request by the chairperson. A few other teams also reported inappropriate

behavior coming from party observers. This included things such as party observers accusing polling station officials of messing up the counting process deliberately, while another team reported that one party observer had tried to engage one of our observers in a political debate about certain conspiracy theories. During this, the party observer broke his or her impartiality by arguing for set theories and political ideas.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Silba finds that during the election day, there was an overall adherence to democratic practices. The following remarks should also be seen in this light of an overall adherence to democratic practices. There have been some irregularities related to the set-up of the election, the Electoral Code, electoral practices, and breaches of the Electoral Code.

Regarding the set-up of the election, there are barriers to people with disabilities, questioning their accessibility to voting, as well as the set-up of polling booths brings questions to the secrecy of the vote. Furthermore, there have been problems with voting lists, where voters have been turned away, as well as the cameras filming the ballot boxes were at times also filming the voters.

Regarding the Moldovan Electoral Code, its formulations regarding control sheets (§80.1) and observer rights (§88.9) can be interpreted in multiple ways, which can also be seen in a lack of coherence in practice.

There has been a general difference across the polling stations in the practice of the PSOs and whether PSOs have followed procedures. Silba has observed some breaches of good practices regarding elections. This has been in regard to inappropriate behavior by polling station officials and group voting.

Silba has exclusively conducted a short-term observation, focusing on the electoral practices on election day. Our observations are neither able to confirm nor deny allegations that have been made regarding bribery or larger irregularities. However, one observer-team did encounter a series of episodes that could indicate bribery.

Recommendations to the Moldovan Central Electoral Commission as well as relevant Moldovan legislators:

- Amend the Moldovan Electoral Code's §80.1, so that it clearly states whether control sheets should be put into every ballot box or just one.

- For the transparency of the vote, Silba recommends that control sheets be put into every ballot box.
- Make sure that the camera documenting the ballot box only covers that, and is not pointing in the direction of voters in general.
- Ensure that voting lists are updated and that voters know which polling station to vote at, especially if the designated polling stations have changed
- Ensure the accessibility of disabled voters to polling stations by ensuring that voters can access the polling station in a wheelchair.
- To ensure the secrecy of the vote, consider the following:
 - Change the set-up of the voting booths so they stand longer from each other, for voters not to be able to see each other. If this is not possible, depending on the size of the room, consider getting higher sides of the voting booths, so that it is less visible from a distance.
 - Ensure that voters with disabilities can vote in secret by placing the voting booths so that no one can see into them.
- Amend §80.1 to specify that mobile ballot boxes should also be sealed.
- Adjust §88.9 of the Moldovan Electoral Code so it specifies that party observers should not interfere with the electoral process. Furthermore, specify this to political parties and their observers, and consider implementing consequences for party observers that breach the electoral code and interfere with the electoral process.
- Streamline the training for PSO to have consistency in PSO practices.

Acknowledgments

To all who have contributed to the making of this report, from the EOM coordinators, Partners like DUF and CNT, our observers; to the Silba EOM Committee and Silba communications department, a very dear thank you. Our work is made possible by the many volunteers who share our vision of free and fair elections, and thus dedicate their time and skills to building the framework around our EOMs. A special tribute is reserved for the election observers, whose diligence and hard work are at the very core of our EOMs and is of course the foundation for this report.

We express our gratitude to the Kloop Media Foundation for providing us with the app that facilitated the collection of our observations on election day and for their invaluable technical support. We are extremely grateful for their assistance. Lastly, we extend our heartfelt appreciation to all our partners and stakeholders whose insights and support played a crucial role in preparing our observers and making this mission a meaningful and enriching experience for all participants.

Observers:

Ida Langhede
Ekaterina Solholm Jensen
Aksel Emil Ogstrup Houmann
Nicolaj Møllerup Olesen
Tobias Brun Tørngren Nielsen
Vera Ada Langstrup Hartmann
Matthæus Zygmunt Pohl
Jakob Brahe Jespersen
Jasmin Oppelstrup Kølbæk
Jakob Kristmar
Christina Busk Ankersen
Carl Emil Rheinländer Meier
Emma Bang Petersen
Andreas Lumby Hansen
Josephine Amelia Halberg
Nicholas Catt
Simone Broni Kallehauge
Mette Alsing Schwartz
Mikael Pedersen
Laura Antonia Larsen
Mathilde Sophie Heinze
Frederik Pilemand Hansen
Martine Hegelund Bjørnsbo

Andreea Borș
Mohammad Alkasem Abumani
Magdalen Calfa
Andreea Smochină
Nicolae Banari
Daniela Mihalaș
Dan Iacub
Militina Cetulean
Patricia Vlas
Avgustina Alibekova
Serghei Nesteriuc
Vadim Burov
Ana-Maria Chiper
Radu Susarenco
Olga Colesnic
Vera Luța
Anastasia Vieru
Nicoleta Plămădeală
Cristian Vlas
Dorin Hotineanu
Mihaela Cernenchi

Support staff

Translators

Anisorar Siminel
Alina Vasilenco
Bogdan Grițco
Cosmina Alerguș
Diana Ciorici

Kloop

Aizirek Almazbekova
Salamat Shakirov
Khakim Davurov

CNTM

Roman Banari
Anastasia Cebotari
Vadim Banari

DUF

Anders Palstrøm
Majbritt Bæk Dalgaard
Anna Kjær
Julie Lindmann
Charlotte D. Geneser

Justina Macijauskaitė

Editors

Justina Macijauskaitė
Sofus Rønberg

Contributors

Sofus Rønberg
Adrien Von Yuma Olsen
Filip Foldrup
Albert Schou Otkjær
Kristian Nikolaj Jakobsen
Emma Klint Hansen

Organizers



Silba - Initiative for Dialogue and Democracy is a Danish non-partisan and non-profit youth organization which aims to strengthen democratic dialogue, institutions and organizations. Silba organizes local and international activities, with a main focus on election observation missions, long term international projects and local engagement.



The Danish Youth Council (Dansk Ungdoms Fællesråd) is an umbrella organization with 78 children and youth organizations as members. The member organizations of DUF range from scouts to political youth organizations, voluntary social organizations, cultural organizations, environmental organizations, organizations for youth with disabilities and many more.



The National Youth Council of Moldova (Consiliul Național al Tineretului din Moldova) is the associative structure of 36 Moldovan youth organizations, which promotes the rights of young people and represents the interests of youth organizations in the process of elaboration, implementation and evaluation of youth policies.

Contact for inquiries about the mission:

Press Coordinator for the Election Observation Mission 2024 in Moldova
Sofus Rønberg
+373 (78) 569157 or
+45 28 69 68 96
eom@silba.dk

