
The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia

The Parliamentary Elections in Indonesia - 5 April 2004

Report of the Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation

May 2004
Canberra

© Commonwealth of Australia 2004

ISBN 0 642 78465 5

Contents

Membership of the Delegation.....	v
Terms of reference	viii
List of abbreviations	ix

THE REPORT

1	Introduction	1
	The Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation.....	3
	Summary of Delegation's activities.....	5
	Scope and structure of the report	7
2	Summary of observations and findings.....	9
	Pre-election period.....	9
	Election day.....	13
	The count.....	16
	Results tabulation	17
	Conclusion	18
3	The future Presidential election/s.....	21

APPENDICES

Appendix A – List of Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation teams	25
Appendix B – List of election briefings.....	27
Appendix C – Media release on the conduct of Indonesian elections.....	35
Appendix D – Indonesian Parliamentary Elections, 5 April 2004: DPR results....	37



Membership of the Delegation

Leader	Mrs Margaret May MP	
Members	Senator David Johnston	
	Senator Natasha Stott Despoja	
	Senator Ruth Webber	
Officials	Dr Brad Armstrong	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Ms Kirsten Bate	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Ms Lisa Buckingham	Department of Defence
	Ms Kate Callaghan	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Ms Sophia Cason	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Mr Andrew Chandler	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Mr Kirk Coningham	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
	Ms Georgina Harley	AusAID
	Mr Brian Hearn	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Mr Daniel Hunt	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Mr John McGregor	Department of Defence
	Mr Nic Notarpietro	AusAID
	CPO Craig Stanley	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Mr Karl Supit	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Ms Stephanie Werner	Australian Embassy, Jakarta
	Dr Phillip Winn	Office of National Assessments
Delegation Secretary	Ms Beverley Forbes	Australian Parliament



Terms of reference

The objectives of the Australian Election Observer Delegation were:

- to observe in the areas of deployment the process and conduct of the 5 April 2004 parliamentary elections;
- to carry out such observation activities, as much as possible, in partnership with domestic monitoring organisations; and
- to prepare a report on the results of the Delegation's observation activities for both the Indonesian community and the international community.



List of abbreviations

AEC	Australian Electoral Commission
Delegation	Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation
DPR	People's Representative Assembly
DPD	Regional Representative Council
DPRD I & II	Regional People's Representative Assemblies
IFES	International Foundation for Election Systems
JPPR	Jaringan Pendidikan Pemilih untuk Rakyat (People's Election Education Network)
KPPS	polling station staff
KPU	Indonesian General Elections Commission
NDI	National Democratic Institute for International Affairs
Panwas	Elections Supervisory Committee
TPS	Tempat Pemungutan Suara (polling station)
UNDP	United Nations Development Program

x

Introduction

- 1.1 On Monday 5 April 2004 the Indonesian people held one of the largest democratic parliamentary elections in the world. This was a major logistical undertaking involving polling spread across some 6,000 islands, with around 147.3 million eligible voters (20% more voters than in 1999), generally voting on one day between the hours of 7.00am and 1.00pm and selecting four levels of representatives at the national, provincial and regency/city level. The elections were for the national People's Representative Assembly (DPR), the national Regional Representative Council (DPD) and the provincial and regency/city Regional People's Representative Assemblies (DPRD I and II).¹ The dimensions of this massive and complex task should not be underestimated.
- 1.2 For these elections Indonesia had a new electoral system which varied significantly from the system used for the 1999 elections. The new system had been in place for less than one year prior to the April 2004 elections. The system was implemented by a new constitutionally independent, permanent, body – the Indonesian General Elections Commission (KPU) which operates at the national, provincial and regency/city levels. The following key statistics put the size of these elections into perspective. There were:
- 24 political parties contesting the election;
 - 2,057 separate elections;
 - 585,219 voting stations to be correctly equipped for a maximum of 300 voters at each station;

1 The DPR is roughly equivalent to Australia's House of Representatives, the DPD is an upper house to the DPR but with significantly less powers than Australia's Senate. The DPRD I is roughly equivalent to Australia's state governments and DPRD II to Australia's local councils. Under regional autonomy, however, the DPRD IIs have significant powers and have primary responsibility for service delivery, including health and education.

- 660 million ballot papers to print and distribute;
 - 581,000 KPU members and staff to train;
 - 3.9 million polling station staff to train;
 - 1.1 million polling station security staff to train;
 - 15,276 representatives to be elected; and
 - some 448,705 candidates.²
- 1.3 The DPR and DPRD use a list proportional representation voting system and the DPD uses a single non transferable voting system.
- 1.4 These elections were the first component of a two to three part election process to be held this year. Part two - the first ever direct Presidential - Vice Presidential vote in Indonesia will be held on 5 July 2004. If no candidate meets the criteria for election in the first round of the Presidential vote, a run-off between the top two vote-getters will take place on 20 September 2004. The results of the Presidential election and the inauguration of the new President must occur before the legal expiry of the current President's term on 20 October 2004.
- 1.5 The KPU estimated the cost of the elections to be some US\$600 million. This is estimated to be four times the cost of the 1999 elections, but there are efforts at cost saving across the two/three elections to be held this year. This represents a significant commitment to democracy by the Indonesian Government given the other challenges that face the Indonesian people.
- 1.6 Australia has a significant interest in Indonesia, not the least of which is that Indonesia is Australia's most populous neighbour. As such the political and economic stability and prosperity of Indonesia have implications for Australia.
- The relationship between Australia and Indonesia is wide-ranging ..., encompassing political, trade, people-to-people links and cultural exchanges. The breadth of the relationship is one of its strongest attributes, with strong education and tourist links supporting an increased understanding of both countries.³
- 1.7 Like many other members of the international community, Australia's interest in the 2004 Indonesian elections builds on the assistance many nations provided to Indonesia's elections in 1999 - the most democratic election in Indonesia in over 40 years. When the Indonesian Government
-

2 Wall, Alan, April 2004, *Legislative elections in Indonesia, presentation to Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation - copy of slides*, slide 19.

3 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, *Indonesia country brief - September 2003*, viewed 18/03/04, http://www.dfat.gov.au/geo/indonesia/indonesia_brief.htm

requested assistance from the international community to carry out the 2004 elections, Australia again responded generously.

- 1.8 Australia committed up to \$15 million for Indonesia's 2004 elections. This commitment included a \$2.9 million program of assistance through the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) to assist the KPU with training activities and an initial commitment of \$8 million (approximately US\$5 million) to a United Nations Development Program (UNDP) trust fund. The UNDP funds were earmarked for voter education, election monitoring and training. In the lead up to the elections Australia cooperated closely with other donors to assist the KPU in its preparations for the elections. Australia's commitment builds on the \$700,000 provided in 2002-03 to strengthen the capacity of the KPU.
- 1.9 The funds for the 2004 elections matched Australia's contribution of \$15 million for assistance to the 1999 elections.
- 1.10 As Indonesia's planning for the 2004 elections progressed Australia, along with many others in the international community, again welcomed the Indonesian Government's decision to invite international observers to monitor the elections. All applauded the Indonesian Government's decision for continuing transparency and openness of its electoral system to international scrutiny.
- 1.11 In response to that invitation the Minister for Foreign Affairs, in consultation with the Prime Minister, decided Australia would send a delegation made up of parliamentarians and government officials to monitor the elections.

The Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation

- 1.12 The Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation (Delegation), was led by Mrs Margaret May MP, (Liberal Party of Australia) and comprised four members of Parliament (Senators and Members of the House of Representatives) from three of the parties represented in the Federal Parliament (the Liberal Party who are in Government and from two non-Government parties – the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Democrats). They were accompanied by eight officials from Australian Commonwealth departments and agencies and eight officials from the Australian Embassy in Jakarta. In addition, four security officers from the Australian Federal Police and a delegation secretary from the Australian Parliament accompanied the Delegation.
- 1.13 The Delegation was one of the few observer teams with participation by members of parliament. This was seen as a great strength of the

Delegation in that parliamentary representatives were shown to bring a much more community oriented and pragmatic perspective to the observer task. This was clearly evidenced in discussions on the conduct of the elections with other observer teams.

- 1.14 The objectives of the Delegation were: to observe in the areas of deployment the process and conduct of the 5 April 2004 parliamentary elections; to carry out such observation activities, as much as possible, in partnership with domestic monitoring organisations; and to prepare a report on the results of the Delegation's observation activities for both the Indonesian community and the international community. This work was undertaken in a way that is consistent with the *KPU Code of Ethics for Election Observers set out in KPU Decree 104 of 2003, 28 October 2003*.
- 1.15 In observing the elections, the aim of the Delegation was to assist in building confidence in the nascent democratic electoral process in Indonesia – both domestically and internationally.
- 1.16 The decision to work closely with the non-partisan voluntary domestic monitoring organisations again, built on the experience of the Australian Observer Mission to the June 1999 Indonesian elections. Strengths of such an approach that were identified at that time were: the greater capacity in terms of numbers of observers of the domestic monitoring organisations for observing the elections; support that Australia could provide in encouraging and fostering this new role in the operation of Indonesian elections; support of the Australian Government's larger objective of supporting the development of civil society organisations and institutions in Indonesia; coordinating methodology between observer groups; and the advice and assistance that the domestic monitoring organisations could provide to the Australian Observer Mission in the areas where the members of the Mission were deployed.⁴ For all of those reasons, the Delegation again sought to work closely with the domestic monitoring organisations before, during and after the election. These groups included the Peoples' Voter Education Network (JPPR), made up of a coalition of 30 civil society groups that deployed around 142,000 observers; and Rectors' Forum, a university campus -based network that deployed over 100,000 observers.⁵
- 1.17 The Delegation also worked closely with other international observer groups. Examples of these groups are the observers from the United States, Japan and the European Union.

4 *Report of the Australian Observation Mission to the 1999 Indonesian Elections*, June 1999, Parliament of Australia – Senate, Canberra, p 4.

5 People's Voter Education Network, Jaringan Pendidikan Pemilu untuk Rakyat, 31 April 2004, *Presentation to Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation copy of slides*, slides 3 and 7.

Summary of Delegation's activities

- 1.18 The Delegation arrived in Jakarta on 30 March 2004 and left on 8 April 2004. The Delegation was initially led by the Deputy Leader, Senator Ruth Webber, as the Delegation Leader, Mrs May MP, was not able to leave Australia until 2 April 2004 due to the House of Representatives parliamentary sittings.
- 1.19 Initially the Delegation participated in three days of briefings in Jakarta. A list of those briefings is at Appendix B.
- 1.20 During the initial briefings The Asia Foundation provided the Australian Delegation, as well as other international observers, with a copy of the publication *Observing elections: A guide for international observers of the 2004 Indonesian national election*⁶. This publication included a two page Polling Station Observation Form and Vote Counting Results Form which broadly guided the Delegation's recording of its observations. A number of other international observer groups were using this form or slight variations of it. The United States Observer Group used the form with additional questions.
- 1.21 Following the briefings the members of the Delegation were deployed to eight locations, namely: Bandung in West Java; Bandar Lampung in Lampung; Makassar in South Sulawesi; Semarang in Central Java; Balikpapan in East Kalimantan; Denpasar in Bali; Kupang in West Timor, East Nusa Tenggara; and Malang in East Java.
- 1.22 The deployment locations were selected in consultation with the Australian Embassy in Jakarta. The specific locations were chosen to ensure the Delegation covered provinces which would be significant to the outcome of the election, in terms of the number of electors and the number of seats in the province (for example, the three provinces visited in Java account for 252 of the 550 seats in parliament), covered a reasonable geographical spread and were of particular interest to Australia.
- 1.23 A list of the Delegation teams is at Appendix A. The teams with members of parliament had four members and the remaining teams had two members. Each team was provided with a driver to facilitate travel freely to polling stations and each team in arriving in their deployment area made contact with the local police for security reasons.
- 1.24 Prior to polling day, each of the deployment teams had an extensive program of briefings and reconnaissance of the areas in which they were observing. A typical program consisted of meetings with many of the

6 Meisburger, T, March 2004, *Observing elections: A guide for international observers of the 2004 Indonesian national election*, The Asia Foundation, Jakarta, 26p.

following groups: domestic monitoring organisations; long term observers in the area; other international observer teams; Provincial and District branches of the General Elections Committee and the Election Supervisory Committee (Panwas); major political parties; security authorities; and local media (see Appendix B for details).

- 1.25 These meetings provided Delegation teams with: information on local perceptions and attitudes to the elections; the state of preparations for the elections; details of any problems or significant developments that may have arisen during the pre-election period or were anticipated for the elections; information on the most appropriate polling stations to visit on election day; knowledge of polling stations that other observers were likely to visit; and opportunities for coordination with other observer teams to attain a better coverage of polling stations in a particular deployment area.
- 1.26 The decisions on polling stations to visit were generally made prior to polling day based on the information that had been collected in the previous days. Depending on the nature of the deployment area, both rural and urban polling stations were visited. Members of the Delegation visited over 100 polling stations. Each team visited between six and 24 polling stations on the day of the elections with the average number of stations visited being 14. The number varied depending upon whether the team considered it more appropriate, in their circumstances, to focus in detail on a few stations or observe more stations. Observation started prior to the opening of the poll and continued well into the counting. Efforts were made to observe both the voting, and part of the counting, at the same stations for at least some polling stations for each deployment area.
- 1.27 In the days after the elections, the teams followed up on the counting and held additional discussions with a similar range of local organisations to those they met with prior to polling day.
- 1.28 The Delegation thanks the Indonesian communities in the eight deployment areas that received them with such warmth and friendship and gave freely of their time to discuss issues associated with the conduct of the poll.
- 1.29 The Delegation reassembled in Jakarta on 7 April 2004 for further meetings with other observer teams. The details of those meetings also are set out at Appendix B. The Delegation is also grateful to those individuals and groups with whom they met both pre and post election to discuss the observation task and the elections.
- 1.30 On 8 April 2004 the leader and spokesperson for the Delegation issued a statement congratulating Indonesia on the conduct of the elections. The statement complimented the Indonesian community, the KPU and the

Indonesian Government on the execution and success of such a massive and complex logistical undertaking. A full copy of the statement is provided at Appendix C.

Scope and structure of the report

- 1.31 This report represents the views of the Parliamentary members of the Delegation, not necessarily the views of the officials who accompanied them. In this report the Delegation strongly focuses on the process and conduct of the election. The report is restricted to comments on what Delegation members have seen, or what was reported to them by monitors and parties, in their eight deployment areas and selected other locations. Since the Delegation was not present for much of the vote compilation process, this report does not go into detail on that aspect of the elections. As such the report is not, and was never intended to be, a comprehensive assessment of the conduct of the 5 April 2004 Indonesian elections. However, with the forthcoming Presidential – Vice Presidential election/s later this year, the Delegation hopes its comments will be beneficial for the conduct of that election/s and future elections.
- 1.32 Section two of the report outlines the observations and findings of the Delegation and the final section comments on the Presidential – Vice Presidential election/s later this year.

Summary of observations and findings

- 2.1 At the outset it is essential to again stress that the following observations and findings are made based on the Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation's (Delegation) activities in the short time the Delegation was in a small number of locations throughout the Indonesian archipelago. These observations and findings are in no way a comprehensive assessment of the conduct of the 5 April 2004 election process. However, the feedback from the observers and monitoring groups was relatively consistent across the country. This enhances confidence in the comments presented. Similar findings also were obtained by the International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES) *Results from wave X of tracking survey, 28 April 2004*.

Pre-election period

- 2.2 When the Delegation arrived in Jakarta the election campaign was in its final stages just prior to the three day 'quiet time' (that is, 2-4 April 2004) when no campaigning was allowed. The Delegation witnessed two days of lively but peaceful campaigning. The designated days for outdoor rallies by particular parties were over, but the motorcycles and flags and convoys (although not allowed) continued for the two days, as did extensive television advertising. The changing nature of campaigning from a focus on campaigning on the street, to campaigning through the media, was noted by many people. This changing approach is believed to have assisted in minimising the likelihood of violence generally. The openness of the media coverage first seen at the 1999 elections, continued during these elections. The Delegation did not observe any significant violations of election laws by political parties. It should be noted that smaller parties lack resources and funds to campaign.

- 2.3 A similar campaign experience was described by communities in the eight deployment areas. The campaign was considered to be a peaceful and relatively subdued period with only minor infringements of campaign rules. No major security problems were identified. However, protests outside the Lampung Provincial General Election Commission and the Indonesian General Elections Commission (KPU) in Jakarta were reported. These were reported in newspapers to be related to anticipated delays in the delivery of election materials. There were also reports that there was little campaigning in Aceh due to security concerns.
- 2.4 During pre-election meetings in Jakarta, and in the deployment areas, and in the media, there were suggestions that some parties were continuing to engage in 'money politics' in contravention of the election laws. To demonstrate the futility of such an approach the media were encouraging individuals to accept the money, or goods, from anyone and everyone who offered it, but to vote for whomever they wished. In most cases the value of the inducements were small, for example, bags of rice and sugar in rural areas, to payments of rupiah 30,000 – 50,000 (A\$5 – A\$9) in urban areas. Inducements through 'doorknocking' by political parties, and alleged encouragement by local officials and village heads to vote for a particular party, were claimed, but none were evident to the Delegation on the day of the elections as discussed later in this section.
- 2.5 The discussions with political parties revealed they were generally satisfied with the campaign period and the media coverage they had received. Political parties also were reported as feeling the general public understood the voting process.
- 2.6 At the time of the Delegation's arrival in Jakarta, the voter registration card was a sensitive issue. Voter registration is the responsibility of the Central Statistics Agency. To vote both the card and a personal invitation to vote were needed. As there were considered to be a number of people registered to vote who had not received either, it was anticipated that, given the community based nature of the election, any form of personal ID would be accepted at polling stations on the day. To address these matters the KPU issued revised technical guidelines on acceptable identification, but there were concerns whether these filtered down to all polling stations.¹ The KPU estimated that 0.5% of eligible voters were not registered as of 4 April 2004. While this is a small percentage, it still represents a significant number of people in absolute terms.
- 2.7 In the deployment areas of the Delegation these problems were not generally encountered. Few people were reported as being turned away
-

1 National Election Commission, *Procedures for filling in Form C and D series, Number 533/15/111/2004, Jakarta, March 25, 2004*, 13p.

from voting, as it was anticipated that if people did not have the correct documentation, they would just fail to turn up to vote. One of the Delegation teams reported that the lack of registration cards appeared to be more of an issue in rural than urban areas. There were some fears that those who had not received their cards might seek to disrupt the polling, but this did not eventuate in the provinces the Delegation observed.

- 2.8 Another sensitive matter prior to the poll was the printing and timely distribution and availability of ballot papers. At a pre-poll meeting in Jakarta the KPU explained that the distribution of papers to all of the islands takes a long time, involving some 4000 sorties by plane and the need to deliver some ballots to smaller islands by boat. The KPU said their staff were not experienced in dealing with the distribution of such a large volume of material nationally. The KPU also reported that due to delays in distribution, the air force, army and police had been asked to assist with the task. The KPU also explained that ballot papers could not be delivered earlier due to the need for secure storage in the regions, which they did not have.
- 2.9 To address expectations of possible delays in voting due to the lack of availability of the ballots, on the evening of Friday 2 April 2004 the President, Megawati Soekarnoputri, signed a regulation in lieu of law to enable the country to hold the elections as scheduled. The President also authorised the KPU to delay the elections in several remote areas due to logistical problems. The regulation amends Article 45 Part 3 and Article 119 Part 1 in Law No. 12/2003. Article 45 changes the completion of distribution of ballot papers from ten days before the elections, to one day before the elections. The Article 119 amendment adds 'technical and administrative problems in the distribution of election materials' as another reason for the KPU to justify a delay in the elections in several areas. Originally the articles only named natural disasters, riots and insurgencies, as legitimate reasons for a delay. This gave the regional KPU the authority to delay the elections and set new dates for the poll in some locations.²
- 2.10 In the Delegation's deployment areas, the observers reported that there were ballot papers available at all polling stations (Tempat Pemungutan Suara - TPS). The only irregularity detected was in Lampung where some ballot papers were accidentally redirected to North Sumatra. The Delegation believes that the delay in the poll in some areas is related to the logistics of the election system, and the introduction of the regulation

2 See Edict issued to delay poll in remote areas, *The Jakarta Post*, Vol 21, No 331, Saturday April 3, 2004, p1.

adequately addressed this matter to allow the elections to proceed in those areas.

- 2.11 Other reports of minor discrepancies with the ballot papers in some areas were: some problems with holes on some ballot papers due to the impact of the printing process; colour quality of the logos did not always match that of party colours; some ballot papers torn at folds; some smaller or larger size print than expected for some ballots; complexity of the ballot paper for some voters; some difficulty on the part of some older voters with reading the ballot paper; and one team noted reports of five ballot papers found to be pre-marked. On election day none of these issues appeared to cause significant concerns with the conduct of the elections.
- 2.12 Prior to the elections there were concerns about voters knowing what to do when casting a vote at a polling booth. These arose largely because this was the first time the current voting procedure was used, the complexity of the process with four ballot papers to be completed, and the KPU's voter education program largely not being active until the last weeks before the elections. At that time there was extensive voter education through the media, and the political parties became more active in ensuring that their supporters knew and understood the voting process. The IFES noted the most effective form of voter education was through the television, but that this was expensive. IFES questioned whether the KPU had received sufficient funding for this part of the election process.³
- 2.13 Pre-election discussions with local and international observer groups revealed a significant monitoring coverage of the country would be achieved. Peoples' Election Education Network (JPPR) reported it aimed to cover 30% of polling stations with some 141,788 local observers and 3,593 field coordinators nation wide, and Rectors' Forum said they had a presence in 32 provinces with approximately 140,000 observers.⁴ Prior to the elections the KPU and the International Observers Resources Centre, set up by the UNDP, advised that there were about 530 international observers for the parliamentary elections with an extensive coverage of the country. Some international observers planned to focus on minority groups in urban areas such as hospitals, prisons, the blind and prostitutes. The European Union Observers reported that, in their deployment areas, they were directing their attention on urban areas.

3 Wall, Alan, April 2004, *Legislative elections in Indonesia, presentation to Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation - copy of slides, slide 22.*

4 Peoples' Voter Education Network, Jaringan Pendidikan Pemilu untuk Rakyat, 31 April 2004, *Presentation to Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation copy of slides, slides 3 and 7.*

Election day

- 2.14 Despite the aforementioned concerns, in the areas where the Delegation was deployed, polling day was peaceful, calm, friendly and festive and very much a community based event. In many locations there was a large level of community participation in the set up of the voting site, with reports of electoral officials, village administrators and community representatives working well into the night to get centres ready for the poll. At some polling stations there was a view that government funding for establishing polling centres was frittered away 'by too many brokers', and it was only through community efforts that the elections went ahead successfully as planned. The overall sense was very much one of the communities participating in a process they saw as their own.
- 2.15 No obvious signs of voter interference or intimidation were detected by the Delegation teams. However, there were reports in a press release by two observer groups in Aceh (Yappika and Forum LSM Aceh) of incidence of violence such as an armed encounter, a school building burnt, polling booths destroyed, a grenade that exploded and children injured and gunshots fired during the voting period. The press release also noted that '...Although incidents happened, vote-taking and vote-counting processes ran properly according to plan.'⁵
- 2.16 The elections were generally orderly, well coordinated and well run. In all of the Delegation deployment areas, the polling stations were in open neutral territory and the general layout of the polling stations were described as good and largely followed specified procedures. It was reported that a number of polling stations adapted the physical set-up of their station to meet local requirements, leading to technical violations, but the arrangement appeared to have assisted the voting process.
- 2.17 At a couple of polling stations there were reports of inadequate privacy so that voters could cast a secret ballot. Examples of this included: polling station officials (KPPS) behind booths at all times; at other polling stations other voters could see into the booth as they moved to and from casting their vote; at other polling stations some booths were too close to each other for adequate privacy of voting; and at another the use of non-opaque screening material behind the voting booths. These minor deficiencies can easily be addressed at future elections.
- 2.18 The TPS observed were generally described as being fully supplied with requisite materials. At many locations KPU manuals on the conduct of the vote and count, prepared with international donor assistance, including

5 Yappika – Civil Society Alliance for Democracy *press release*, Violence and fraud shaping election in the province of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, 6 April 2004, 3p.

Australia, were in evidence. The aluminium voting booths provided by the Japanese Government were also used at most polling stations.

- 2.19 While most polling stations were reported to have opened on time, at some stations there were delays of about an hour with a resultant delay in the close of the poll, and at other stations voting was prevented due to rain. The importance of the formal opening of polling to the local community and the officials present, was commented on by many of the observer teams.
- 2.20 Polling centre officials were described as acting professionally, following the law, and were welcoming to everyone in their general approach on the day. In most locations TPS staff were perceived to clearly understand their roles and what needed to be done. Observers believed there were indications that polling staff had been trained in undertaking their roles. However, there was concern about the capacity of KPU staff in some isolated rural locations. At many polling stations the polling officials wore matching clothes, or national dress, which was considered to reflect their pride in the role they were undertaking. The professional approach of the polling officials following electoral law and regulations issued by the KPU, appeared to indicate that the training programs for electoral officials, supported by aid donors, including Australia (through the Australian Electoral Commission - AEC), had a significant impact.
- 2.21 At all polling stations observed, local security personnel were present and cooperative, and uniformed police were placed in a regular pattern between polling stations.
- 2.22 The presence of at least some, but not all, political parties observing the conduct of the elections was noted at most polling stations. This is considered a positive sign of the increasing sophistication of the process. If this trend continues in future elections, it bodes well for Indonesian democracy. The team at Lampung said that there were reports by the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) of training for party election witnesses for the province. During pre-poll meetings with political parties, there were discussions about the number of witnesses to be provided. However, in East Kalimantan there was a report of one set of party officials present wearing party colours.
- 2.23 At most polling stations there was good representation by party witnesses and observers. With the exception of two polling stations in Lampung, the Delegation reported being welcomed at all polling stations. At one of those polling stations the observers were made to feel unwelcome and their presence caused some discomfort amongst polling station staff, and at the other polling station the observers were only allowed to stay for five minutes lest they 'disrupt the atmosphere'. Generally, all observers and

party agents were able to observe all aspects of the poll at all times. It was particularly noted by the team at East Nusa Tenggara that in the field Forum Rector had a strong presence. The largest domestic observer organisation, JPPR, released a press statement⁶ the day after the elections reporting its initial findings, which the Delegation believed lent substantial credibility to the electoral process.

- 2.24 As the democratic process in Indonesia consolidates, and the political parties mature, it is expected that the role of domestic monitors and party scrutineers will reduce the necessity for widespread international observation. However, scope should be provided for this transition to take place over the long term, and funding for domestic monitoring organisations should continue to be a priority for aid donors in the interim.
- 2.25 Panwaslu were also reported to be present at some stations. As was noted by the Australian Mission observing the 1999 election, this Delegation also saw merit in the concept of the Supervisory Committee. However, the Delegation reiterates comments made by the 1999 Mission that the Supervisory Committees appear to lack: a clear definition of their responsibilities; authority; and resources.⁷ The Committees clearly are documenting problems quickly and well, and making that information publicly available, but it is yet to be seen if this is backed up by action to resolve disputes and implement changes. This is a matter for continuing observation.
- 2.26 The concerns raised prior to the poll about potential difficulties with presentation of voter cards seemed not to eventuate on the day.
- 2.27 Generally the flow of voters through polling stations was described as smooth. In those stations where there was a delay, voters were observed to be patient, with members of the Delegation who are members of parliament noting that Indonesian voters were much more patient than voters in Australia.
- 2.28 The most frequent problems observed by the Delegation were as follows.
- No checking of the ink on people's fingers before proceeding to vote. At some polling stations the polling officials noted that this was not as necessary as with such a small number of known community voters, no one would try to vote twice. On the other hand, at some stations in East Nusa Tenggara, this matter was taken very seriously and as there was

6 JPPR *press statement*, Initial findings on the election process, April 6, 2004, 2p.

7 *Report of the Australian Observation Mission to the 1999 Indonesian Elections*, June 1999, Parliament of Australia – Senate, Canberra, p 6.

no available ink, polling officials took voters' ID cards until after the election was completed.

- There were some minor violations such as polling officials helping people to cast a ballot, for example, in East Kalimantan at one polling station, voters handed ballot papers to the officials who placed them in the ballot box.
- Some problems with ballot papers continued on election day with some voters, particularly elderly people, encountering difficulty in refolding ballot papers to ensure the KPPS Head's signature was on the outside.
- At many locations there were reports of voters not displaying the KPPS Head signature before putting the ballot paper in the box. This may have just been an oversight on the day.
- Some voters also experienced difficulties in getting the ballot paper in the ballot box as the slot was too small to allow this to occur easily, especially when there were two pages for the full ballot paper. This was addressed by a number of means, such as assistance by polling officials and opening of the lid of the ballot box to allow ballots to be inserted that way. This could be easily overcome by enlarging the size of the slot for future elections.

2.29 All polling stations closed at the appointed time, except where voters were present and waiting to vote.

2.30 Generally speaking, from the observation of the polling, observers were confident voters understood what was expected of them procedurally.

The count

2.31 The Delegation only observed the count at the polling station level, that is, the lowest organisational unit in the electoral process.

2.32 The Delegation was extremely impressed with the openness, transparency and level of community involvement in the initial count at the polling station. KPU and party witnesses worked well together on this in most locations. Everyone was able to observe the validity of votes and the count and generally that votes were accurately recorded. Party agents (and anyone else present) were completely free to record votes. There was a suggestion that the hole from the nail for punching the ballots could have been larger, so that the hole would be more easily seen.

2.33 Despite the complexity of the ballot paper, the number of ballots, and the newness of the election process, the number of invalid votes appeared to be low. A number of invalid votes arose where there were two ballot

- papers for a vote, when the nail accidentally went through both ballot papers instead of just one.
- 2.34 Contrary to some parties encouraging voters to vote only for the party rather than the party and a candidate, a significant number of voters voted for individual candidates as well as parties. This is seen as a reflection of the growing sophistication of the democratic process in Indonesia's elections.
- 2.35 In a number of areas there was no large sheet for recording votes as had been planned. However, as with other aspects of the process, polling officials worked cooperatively with the parties to ensure a satisfactory and open recording system was achieved. This is an important part of the process and efforts should be made to ensure all polling stations have the large recording sheets for the Presidential election/s.
- 2.36 Based on a 95% turnout for the 1999 elections, a high turnout of the order of about 90% was predicted. Actual turnout was estimated to be less than 90% of eligible voters.
- 2.37 There was general agreement that the count was slow, but there were few complaints about this, as the openness and thoroughness of the process seems to justify such an approach.
- 2.38 In pre and post election discussions with the Delegation group as a whole, or individual teams, the Panwas indicated some violations during the campaign and count, but did not believe this undermined the integrity of the election process. In discussions with at least one of the Delegation teams, Panwas indicated that despite the previous comment there were intentions of prosecutions of some individuals.

Results tabulation

- 2.39 As previously outlined, the Delegation teams observed only the early stages of the count and results tabulation, which is believed in urban areas to have gone well into the night. It was reported that rural centres, in the main, discontinued the count after nightfall and started again in the morning. In these cases the security of ballot boxes were assessed as being adequate, with ballot boxes locked and being stored under guard.
- 2.40 Comments on this part of the process are largely based on data from other international groups, such as the European Union long term observers, domestic observers and the AEC, which were in a position to give much greater attention to this part of the process.
- 2.41 The AEC and others reported that the results tabulation was slower than the KPU forecasts anticipated, but ultimately consistent with the time

taken with this part of the process during the 1999 elections. The AEC reported immediately after election day, that information it had obtained suggested factors contributing to this were: the slow count at polling stations due to factors previously outlined; checking undertaken before figures were consolidated; where needed local KPU staff giving priority to repolling rather than compiling results; and KPU staff unable to access the KPU computer system because they had not received the necessary passwords.

- 2.42 Development of a computerised reporting system is an inherently complex and difficult task. It must be borne in mind that the KPU's system has been under development for less than one year. By comparison the AEC's computerised election results system underwent phased development over a period of around five years.
- 2.43 The final election results from the 2004 parliamentary elections from the KPU are set out at Appendix D.

Conclusion

- 2.44 Keeping in mind the constraints set out at the beginning of this section, that the observations and findings are based on the Delegation's activities in a short time in a small number of locations throughout Indonesia, the Delegation makes the following concluding remarks. These observations and findings are in no way a comprehensive assessment of the conduct of the 5 April 2004 election process.
- 2.45 The Australian Parliamentary Election Observer Delegation compliments the KPU and the Indonesian government on the execution and success of such a massive and complex logistical undertaking. The Delegation believes that when the scale of such an event, the logistics, the planning and the participation by so many people is considered – apart from some isolated incidents – it was a very substantial achievement.
- 2.46 The Delegation did not regard minor incidents observed, and reported, as affecting the overall integrity of the election process.
- 2.47 The Australian team also congratulates the Indonesian community at a grassroots level for their energetic participation in holding the elections. The teams saw no sign of organised voter intimidation from any party, or organisation, in the areas in which they observed, and the elections proceeded in an orderly, peaceful, friendly and festive atmosphere.
- 2.48 The Delegation considers it was a privilege to be able to observe the elections which illustrated how proud the Indonesian people are of their democracy.

- 2.49 The Delegation notes that it was clear to them that Indonesians wanted to participate actively in the democratic process and to make their voice heard. This bodes well for the forthcoming Presidential elections in July 2004.
- 2.50 In summary, areas for further development relate to issues of financial administration and control, logistics planning and implementation, and the timely transmission of results. These are important areas for Australia, and other aid donors, to focus on for future support.
- 2.51 Finally, the Delegation thanks the Government and people of Indonesia for the opportunity to observe the electoral process. The Delegation also appreciates the excellent support it received from Ambassador Ritchie and the Embassy in Jakarta. It also appreciates the assistance provided by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade in arranging and preparing the Delegation and the contribution of the Parliamentary Relations Office of the Australian Parliament.

The future Presidential election/s

- 3.1 As outlined in section one of this report, the parliamentary elections are just the first component of the two-three part election process to be held this year in Indonesia. The first direct Presidential – Vice Presidential election in Indonesia will be held on 5 July 2004. If no candidate meets the criteria for election in the first round of the Presidential vote, a run-off between the two top vote-getters will take place on 20 September 2004. This election will be a significant event in Indonesia's development of democracy.
- 3.2 It is clear that those elections are expected to be even more rigorously contested than the 5 April 2004 parliamentary elections. Feelings in the community are expected to be running very high between now and the Presidential elections. Accordingly, there is an even greater need for ongoing transparency and openness of the Indonesian electoral system to international scrutiny.
- 3.3 In late April 2004 the Indonesian Government again opened registration for Australia and other members of the international community to participate as observers for the 5 July 2004 Presidential election.
- 3.4 Given the success of this Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation's (Delegation) monitoring of the parliamentary elections, and the way in which the Indonesian people welcomed the Delegation's presence in their country, the parliamentary members of the Delegation strongly support a further Delegation to observe the Presidential - Vice Presidential poll/s.
- 3.5 Given the depth of knowledge and experience the current Delegation team has developed in the observation task, the valuable contacts already made, the valuable language skills of many of the observers, and the spirit of cooperation developed within the team, the parliamentary members of the Delegation believe there would be considerable benefits and savings in consistency of Delegation members where possible.

- 3.6 As it was originally envisaged that there would be eight members of the Australian parliament participating, the parliamentary members of the Delegation believe that within the constraints of the Australian parliamentary cycle, every effort should be made to achieve that number. The particular strengths of the Australian Delegation in its parliamentary representation have been outlined in section one of this report. Another possibility may be to encourage some of the members of parliament who participated in the Australian Observation Mission to the 1999 Indonesian elections, who are still members of parliament, to also participate again. This would also have the benefits of those members previous experience.
- 3.7 The Delegation notes that there were five international observers in Papua during the parliamentary elections. During discussions, the Japanese Observation Team questioned why the Australian Delegation had not gone to Papua, Australia's nearest province. Australia was encouraged by the Japanese Observer Group to have a presence there for the Presidential election/s. While there are obvious security considerations, the parliamentary members of the Delegation see considerable merit in that suggestion.
- 3.8 A number of observer teams also undertook monitoring in Aceh. This was a location that parliamentary members of the current Delegation believed should have been monitored by Australia. While the parliamentary members of the Delegation appreciated the reasons given by the Government for not deploying observers in Aceh and Papua, they believe that future observer teams should be deployed to these provinces.
- 3.9 Also raised in discussions with the Japanese Observer Delegation were the benefits of further cooperation and coordination between the Australian Delegation and the Japanese Delegation prior to monitoring of the Presidential election/s. A meeting between the two Delegations prior to deployment to the observation areas, as well as after deployment, would be expected to provide considerable benefit for both groups. Bilateral observer group meetings with other observer delegation should also continue.
- 3.10 The Delegation reiterates the great spirit and warmth with which the Delegation was welcomed in all locations where teams were deployed. The Indonesian people welcomed the Australians as neighbours and friends. However, it was not immediately obvious to the Indonesian community where the Delegation was from, as the members were not wearing any distinctive clothing. Discussions with members of the 1999 Observer Mission revealed that t-shirts indicating the Mission as Australian, was a valuable asset to that Mission's work. While the parliamentary members of the Delegation appreciate the possible security

concerns that such clothing may present, there is a strong belief that the benefits of identifying Delegation members, as members of an Australian Observer Delegation, outweigh the risks. Accordingly, the parliamentary members of the Delegation strongly suggest that future Delegations wear clothing, such as t-shirts, that clearly identifies members as Australian.

- 3.11 The parliamentary members of the Delegation believe that the implementation of these suggestions would enhance the performance and effectiveness of a future Delegation/s to the Indonesian Presidential election/s.

Margaret May MP
Delegation Leader
10 May 2004



Appendix A – List of Australian Parliamentary Observer Delegation teams

Team 1 – West Java (Bandung)

Senator Natasha Stott Despoja, Australian Democrats

Mr Nicholas Notarpietro, AusAID

Dr Bradley Armstrong, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Team 2 – Lampung (Bandar Lampung)

Ms Georgina Harley, AusAid

Mr Andrew Chandler, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Team 3 – South Sulawesi (Makassar)

Dr Phillip Winn, Office of National Assessments

Mr Karl Supit, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Team 4 – Central Java (Semarang)

Ms Margaret May MP, Liberal Party of Australia

Mr Kirk Coningham, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Ms Kirsten Bate, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Team 5 – East Kalimantan (Balikpapan)

Ms Lisa Buckingham, Department of Defence

CPO Craig Stanley, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Team 6 – Bali (Denpasar)

Senator David Johnston, Liberal Party of Australia

Ms Kate Callaghan, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Mr Brian Hearn, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Team 7 – East Nusa Tenggara (Kupang)

Senator Ruth Webber, Australian Labor Party

Mr John McGregor, Department of Defence

Ms Stephanie Werner, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Team 8 – East Java (Malang)

Ms Sophia Cason, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Mr Daniel Hunt, Australian Embassy, Jakarta



Appendix B – List of election briefings

Wednesday 31 March 2004

Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Ambassador David Ritchie

Ms Sherina Bahk, Consultant (AusAID)

Mr Mark Briskey, Counsellor (Police Liaison)

Ms Penny Burt, Minister - Counsellor

Ms Michelle Chan, Counsellor (Political)

Mr Robin Davies, Minister - Counsellor (AusAID)

Ms Alison Duncan, Third Secretary (Political)

Group Captain Anthony Jones, Acting Defence Attache

Mr Shayne McKenna, Second Secretary (AusAID)

Ms Liz O'Neill, Counsellor (Public Affairs)

Mr Peter Rowe, Deputy Head of Mission

Mr Graeme Swift, Consul General and Minister - Counsellor (Consular and Administration)

Mr Paul Wojciechowski, Counsellor (Economic)

The Asia Foundation

Mr Tim Meisburger, Director, Elections Program

Peoples' Voter Education Network (JPPR)

Indonesian General Elections Commission (KPU)

Mr Hamid Awal Luddin, Commissioner – Legal Division

Prof Dr Nazaruddin Sjamsuddin, Chairman

Thursday 1 April 2004

International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES)

Mr Phil Whelan, Acting Project Manager

National Democratic Institute and Indonesian NGO's-Education and Information (LP3ES), Rectors' Forum, Yappika

US Election Observer Team

Mr Mark Clark, First Secretary, US Embassy

Friday 2 April 2004**Security Briefing**

Mr Graeme Swift, Consul General and Minister – Counsellor (Consular and Administration)

Australian Federal Police

Australian Defence Force Staff

European Union Electoral Observer Mission

Mr Glyn Ford, Chief Observer

Mr Domenico Tuccinardi, Election Analyst

Wednesday 7 April 2004**Australian Embassy, Jakarta**

Ambassador David Ritchie

Ms Sherina Bahk, Consultant (AusAID)

Ms Penny Burt, Minister - Counsellor

Ms Michelle Chan, Counsellor (Political)

Mr Robin Davies, Minister – Counsellor (AusAID)

Ms Alison Duncan, Third Secretary (Political)

Mr Shayne McKenna, Second Secretary (AusAID)

Japanese Election Observer Team

Mr Katsuhiro Akiyama

Mr Takao Kawakami, Head of Mission

Mr Nobuharu Imanishi

Ms Kumiko Mizuno

Ms Hisako Nakamura

Mr Norio Soga

Mr Yoshimichi Someya

Australian Electoral Commission

Mr Ross Mackay, Country Project Director, Jakarta

Mr Michael Maley, Director of International Services

US Election Observer Team

Mr Mark Clark, First Secretary, US Embassy

Mr David DiGiovanna

Mr Henry Rector

Mr Phillip Schwehm

Panwaslu

Professor Dr Komaruddin Hidayat, Chairman

Thursday 8 April 2004**UNDP Debriefing**

Mr Tim Meisburger, Director, Elections Program, The Asia Foundation

UNDP observer group

JPPR observer group

Individual Team Programs

TEAM 1: WEST JAVA

Saturday 3 April 2004

Mr Paskah Suzetta, Deputy Head Commission IX, DPR (Golkar candidate, West Java II)

National Mandate Party (PAN) West Java, Mr Priyono, Chairman

Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) West Java, Mr Rudy Harsa, Chairman

Sunday 4 April 2004

European Union long-term observers

Narcisse Banz

Ulrike Weissenbacke

West Java Provincial Electoral Commission (KPU), Mr Setia Permana, Chairman

Tuesday 6 April 2004

Justice and Prosperity Party (PKS), Dr Adang Sudrajat, Deputy Chairman

TEAM 2: LAMPUNG

Saturday 3 April 2004

Lampung Provincial Electoral Commission (KPUD), Dr Suwondo, Chairman and colleagues

Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP), Mr Sahzan Syafri, Regional Chairman and colleagues

Sunday 4 April 2004

European Union long-term observer

Taina Jaavinen

Asian Network for Free Elections (ANFREL)

Micheline (Mika) Levesque (Canada)

Jamila Mrjahed (Afghanistan)

Jamila Nooe (Afghanistan)

US Observer mission, Mr Sean Callahan

Golkar Party Lampung

Mr Indra, Regional Deputy Chairman

Deputy SECGEN, Mr Wendi Melwa and colleagues

National Awakening Party (PKB), Mr Syafrin Romas, Regional Chairman and colleagues

Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), Mr Chairudding Tahmid, Regional Chairman and colleagues

Tuesday 6 April 2004

Lampung Provincial Election Supervisory Committee (Panwaslu), Mr Adi Kusno, Chairman

US Observer mission

EU Observer mission

TEAM 3: SOUTH SULAWESI

Saturday 3 April 2004

Muhammadiyah, South Sulawesi Chapter, Mr KH Nazaruddin Rasyad, Chair

Hassanudin University

Professor Dr Ambo Ala, Deputy Rector

Professor Dr Ilham Mahmud, Deputy Rector

Professor Dr Amran Rasat, Deputy Rector

Professor Hamid Padu, Deputy Rector

Sunday 4 April 2004

European Union long-term observers

Thomas Elftmann

Florence Ganoux

Regional Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P), H. Andi Potji

Mr Ibrahim Ambong, Golkar Party and Chairman, DPR Commission 1

United National Democratic Party (PPDK), Mr Ryaas Rasyid, Chairman

Tuesday 6 April 2004

Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P), Mr Stephanus Ando, Regional Chairman

Harian Fajar (local major daily newspaper), Mr Suwardi Taher, Chief Editor

South Sulawesi Election Supervisory Commission (Panwaslu), Dr Aswanto, Chairman

TEAM 4: CENTRAL JAVA

Saturday 3 April 2004

Ms Fitriyah, Chairperson, Chairperson, East Java Provincial Electoral Commission (KPUD) & Lecturer, Political Science, Diponegoro University Semarang

European Union long-term observers

Maria Espinosa

Billie Grete

Desmond John Kieran

Ralf Michael Peters

Sunday 4 April 2004

United Development Party (PPP) Central Java, Mr Acmad Thoyfoer, Regional Chairman

Regional Representatives Council Candidate for Catholic Community, Mr Tukiman Taruna

Golkar Party Central Java, Mr Moh Hasbi, Regional Chairman

Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P) Central Java, Mr Murjoko, Regional Chairman

Tuesday 6 April 2004

National Awakening Party (PKB) Central Java, Mr M. Hanif Muslih, Regional Chairman

Prosperous Justice Party (PKS), Mr Muhammad Harris, Regional Chairman

TEAM 5: EAST KALIMANTAN

Saturday 3 April 2004

Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) Balikpapan, Mr Agus Santoso, Regional Chairman

Sunday 4 April 2004

European Union long-term observers based in Samarinda

Joseph Ganne

Christine Gleeson

East Kalimantan Provincial Electoral Commission (KPUD), Mr Samsu Agang, Chairman

Mr Harona, Head of the Observer Working Group

Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P), Mr H Iman Mundjiat, Regional Chairman

TEAM 6: BALI

Saturday 3 April 2004

Bali Provincial Electoral Commission (KPU), Mr A A Gede Oka Wisnumurti, Chairman

Bali Provincial Election Supervisory Committee (Panwaslu), Mr I Wayan Juana, Chairman

Sunday 4 April 2004

European Union long-term observers

Inge-Maj Lonnqvist

Pedro Vilanova

Tuesday 6 April 2004

Parisada Hindu Dharma Indonesia, Mr I Made Artha, Head

Nahdlatul Ulama Bali, Mr H. Ahmad Jayadi, Regional Chairman

Mr Nyoman Wira Atmaja, **Lecturer, Political Science Faculty, Warmadewa University, Denpasar**

TEAM 7: EAST NUSA TENGGARA

Saturday 3 April 2004

East Nusa Tenggara, Provincial Electoral Commission (KPU), Mr Robinson M Ratukore, Chairman

Bishop of Kupang, Msgr Petrus Turan

Sunday 4 April 2004

European Union long-term observers

Peter Hazdra

Vibeke Klitgaard

Mr Daniel Woda Pale, Regional Chairman, **Golkar Party & DPRD Member, East Nusa Tenggara**,

National Awakening Party (PKB), Mr Ir Yucundianus Lepa, Regional Chairman

Tuesday 6 April 2004

Provincial Election Supervisory Commission (Panwaslu), East Nusa Tenggara, Mr Dominggus, Chairman

TEAM 8: EAST JAVA**Saturday 3 April 2004**

European Union long-term observers (based in Surabaya)

Catherine Clarcke

Cornelis Kooijmans

Malang Regional Election Supervisory Committee (Panwaslu), Mr Oman Sukmana

Sunday 4 April 2004

Malang District Electoral Commission (KPU), Mr Andri Dewanto

Tuesday 6 April 2004

National Awakening Party (PKB) East Java, Mr Arif Djunaedi, Regional Secretary (DPW)



Appendix C – Media release on the conduct of Indonesian elections

Jakarta, 8 April 2004

Australian Election Observers congratulate Indonesia on conduct of elections

The Australian Election Observer team believe that the conduct of the general elections in Indonesia on 5 April 2004 has enabled the vast majority of eligible Indonesians to cast a generally free and fair vote.

The team, which covered a number of polling stations in eight provinces, complimented the KPU and the Indonesian government on the execution and success of such a massive and complex logistical undertaking. The leader and spokesperson of the delegation, Ms Margaret May MP said, “when you think about the scale of such an event, the logistics, the planning and the participation by so many people – apart from some isolated incidents – it was quite an achievement”. The Team did not regard minor incidents observed and reported as affecting the integrity of the election process.

The Australian team also congratulated the Indonesian community at a grassroots level for their energetic participation in holding the elections. The teams saw no sign of organised voter intimidation from any party or organisation and the election proceeded in an orderly, peaceful, friendly and festive atmosphere.

The Australian Election Observer Mission also thanked the Indonesian communities that received them with such warmth and friendship. Ms Margaret May MP said, “It was a privilege to be able to observe these elections which illustrated how proud the Indonesian people are of their democracy”. She noted that it was clear to the team that Indonesians wanted

to participate actively in the democratic process and to make their voice heard. This boded well for the forthcoming Presidential elections in July.

Australia was pleased to provide A\$15 million of assistance for the parliamentary elections. Led by Margaret May MP, the delegation included Democrat Senator Natasha Stott-Despoja, Liberal Senator David Johnston and ALP Senator Ruth Webber, along with nine official observers. Observation of voting centres across the archipelago included Java, Sulawesi, Sumatera, Kalimantan and Bali.

For more information contact: Elizabeth O'Neill, Counsellor, Public Affairs, Australian Embassy, 0811 194 144



Appendix D – Indonesian Parliamentary Elections, 5 April 2004: DPR results¹

PARTY	% OF VOTE	NUMBER OF SEATS
Golkar Party	21.6	128
PDI-P (Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle)	18.5	109
PKB (National Awakening Party)	10.57	52
PPP (United Development Party)	9.15	58
PD (Democratic Party)	7.45	57
PKS (Justice and Prosperous Party)	7.34	45
PAN (National Mandate Party)	6.44	52
PBB (Crescent Star Party)	2.62	11
PDS (Reform Star Party)	2.44	13
PDS (Peace and Prosperity Party)	2.13	12
PKPB (Concern for the Nation Functional Party)	2.11	2
PKPI (Indonesian Justice and Unity Party)	1.26	1
PPDK (United Democratic Nationhood Party)	1.16	5
PNBK (Freedom Bull National Party)	1.08	1
PNI Marhaenism (Marhaenism Indonesian National Party)	0.81	1
Pioneer Party	0.77	2
PPDI (Indonesian Democracy Upholders Party)	0.75	1

1 Official results of the DPR election as announced by the KPU on 5 May 2004. Of the 147 million registered voters, approximately 125 million or 84% voted in the election. Of the votes cast, 11.9 million (9.5%) were invalid.