

STATEMENT

On May 18-19, 2010 the second session of the Election Committee (EC) for the 2010 elections of MCA-Armenia Program's Stakeholder Committee (SC) finally took place occurring in a deplorable environment and with numerous violations. Only two-three days prior to the elections the EC chairman had presented to the EC members the work-plan for EC activities. It turned out that in those few days the Committee should have undertaken works that were planned for 20 days. In fact, the Committee has been forced into inaction since its establishment, and to overcome this inaction the chairman and the secretary of the Committee had applied to the Chief executive Officer of MCA-Armenia. It makes one wonder how the chair of any Committee could require other bodies to restore the Committee's activities.

During the 19 days of this idleness some members of the committee had held working meetings during which they made a number of subjective decisions without a voting at the Committee; the process of addressing the deficiencies in the applications also began during that time. We, the below signing EC members, also attempted to participate in some of these working meetings, during which we witnessed a number of electoral violations.

1. Reviewing in content of the first folder that contained 79 of the received applications we noticed that in 63 of them different deficiencies were present. However, the EC chairperson and secretary as well as some to the EC members considered that on 21 of these were to be qualified as deficient. We tried to remind them that the applications should be filled in fully in order to be considered valid. Anyway, they thought that some of the application items were not that important and could be missing.

2. Following the working meeting the EC chairperson called the applicants whose application he qualified as invalid and made correction in the applications endorsing those by his signature. These actions were not voted for in the Committee, in the same way as the determination of which application was valid and which one-not. I would like to emphasize that the Election Procedure requires sending back the deficient applications. In the past there had also been cases of calling the applicants whose applications had minor deficiencies, however this happened by the consent of all Committee members, using a recorder, and resulting in clarification of some confusing items. Such cases did not have a mass nature and did not occur without a voting at the Committee. One more important circumstance-during the session, the SC assistant Victoria Grigoryan let it known that not all the corrections made by the EC chairperson were based on telephone calls as some of the applicants told V.Grigoryan that they did not receive any calls.

After the working meetings and before the formal session, two of the EC members withdrew from the Committee and refused to continue their involvement in the EC given this massive injustice and expressing their displeasure with the above.

As already mentioned the session started with the approval of the work-plan, which is really amusing.

Following the approval of the so-called action plan some of the EC members started a series of violations:

1. It was decided to consider the partial completion of item 1.3 of the Procedure as acceptable.
2. It was decided that in case item 2.4 was not filled in the application is considered to be fully completed.
3. The same was decided in respect of item 1.6.
4. Then, the clarifications of G.Balayan on late submission of his application were given and we will address this issue in a separate statement. It should be noted that the latter's applications was voted for and the Committee made another illegal decision by accepting an application that was sent late.
5. Then there was another case of violation, when it was decided to accept one of the applications tentatively, something not referred to in any way in the Procedure.
6. It was decided to refuse two more applications that were filled in with deficiencies, but the 5-day period of removing those was not ensured.
7. The last two items on vote were related to accepting the received 282 applications as voter applications and the 19 applications as candidate applications. This was an apparently illegal act as both lists contained several applications with deficiencies.

It should be noted that in the first and the second parts of the minutes there are several quotations that do not match the reality. Facts inconsistent with reality have also been recorded.

Given the above noted facts, we, the below signing EC members, refuse to sign the Minutes of the second EC session.

Signed by

EC member Amalya Balabekyan

EC member Vahagn Asryan

EC member Lilit Kamalyan

EC member Tatevik Avagyan