



Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MID-TERM ELECTIONS

2 November 2010

OSCE/ODIHR NEEDS ASSESSMENT MISSION REPORT

23 – 27 May 2010



Warsaw
13 July 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
III.	BACKGROUND	3
IV.	FINDINGS.....	4
A.	LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND ELECTION SYSTEM	4
1.	<i>Legal Framework</i>	4
2.	<i>Election System</i>	5
B.	ELECTION ADMINISTRATION	5
C.	VOTER REGISTRATION AND IDENTIFICATION	6
1.	<i>Voter Registration</i>	6
2.	<i>Voter Identification</i>	6
D.	VOTING SYSTEMS	7
E.	ALTERNATIVE VOTING ARRANGEMENTS	7
F.	CAMPAIGN FINANCE.....	8
G.	OTHER ISSUES	9
H.	ELECTION OBSERVATION	10
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	10
	ANNEX: LIST OF MEETINGS	11

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MID-TERM ELECTIONS
2 November 2010**

OSCE/ODIHR Needs Assessment Mission Report

I. INTRODUCTION

On 29 April 2010, in accordance with OSCE commitments, the Mission of the United States to the OSCE in Vienna invited the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE/ODIHR) to observe the 2 November 2010 mid-term elections. The OSCE/ODIHR undertook a Needs Assessment Mission (NAM) to Washington DC from 23 to 27 May 2010. The NAM was composed of Nicolas Kaczorowski, Head of the OSCE/ODIHR Election Department, Nicola Schmidt, OSCE/ODIHR Senior Election Adviser, and Konrad Olszewski, Senior Election Expert.

The purpose of the OSCE/ODIHR NAM was to assess the pre-electoral environment and the preparations for the mid-term elections, and to advise on a possible election observation activity. The OSCE/ODIHR NAM met with representatives of the Departments of State, Justice and Defense, the National Association of Secretaries of State, the Election Assistance Commission, the Federal Election Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the US Commission on Civil Rights, the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee and civil society organizations (see annex for list of meetings).

The OSCE/ODIHR would like to thank the Department of State for its co-operation and support in organizing the NAM. The OSCE/ODIHR also wishes to express its appreciation to representatives of other state institutions, election administration, political parties and civil society organizations for their co-operation.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mid-term elections will take place in the United States of America on 2 November 2010. Elections will be held for 36 seats in the Senate and all 435 seats in the House of Representatives. In addition, elections will also take place for various state and local offices.

The OSCE/ODIHR has been following elections in the United States since 2002. Previous elections were assessed by the OSCE/ODIHR as having reflected the long-standing democratic tradition of the United States and meeting most OSCE commitments. The OSCE/ODIHR has nevertheless identified a number of issues and offered recommendations for consideration by the authorities and other election stakeholders.

Elections in the United States are conducted under a system of decentralized government with many responsibilities devolved to the individual states. While federal legislation only establishes minimum standards for the conduct of elections, states are independent in conducting the elections according to their own laws and procedures. In line with the decentralized nature of elections, there is no election administration body

at the federal level. The administration and conduct of elections is the responsibility of the individual states and their counties.

Voter registration and identification continue to be controversial issues in the United States, mostly discussed along party lines. Voter registration requirements vary from state to state but under the 2002 Help America Vote Act (HAVA) all states are required to have state-wide voter registration databases and to match information contained therein with other state and federal records. HAVA does not prescribe matching of databases between the states, leading to the possibility of multiple registrations.

HAVA also introduced photo ID requirements for first-time voters who did not provide identification when registering to vote. In line with long-established tradition in the United States, in many states voters can vote without presenting any form of identification. Several states have introduced photo or non-photo ID requirements for all voters. Some states are also employing or trying to introduce more stringent requirements such as providing proof of citizenship. The debate on voter registration and identification centers on the issues of enfranchisement and integrity of the vote.

To handle the complexity of multiple, simultaneous elections, most states employ some form of electronic systems to simplify voting and counting. The trend noticeable during the 2008 elections of a 'return to paper' continues with many jurisdictions switching from Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting systems to optical scan systems. OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors confirmed that previous concerns about voting systems have overall been dispelled.

During the forthcoming elections, voters will be able to cast their ballots by means of several alternative voting arrangements. Addressing previous concerns, new federal legislation provides that states now have to make ballots available to overseas voters 45 days before election day to facilitate timely return of the marked ballot. Some states continue to allow the electronic transmission, i.e. faxing or emailing, of marked ballots. While this enables voters to participate in an election, voters have to waive their right to a secret ballot which is of concern to the OSCE/ODIHR.

A striking feature of US elections is the high level of campaign spending. Effective legal limits on campaign spending are difficult to introduce based on the fact that the right to spend on campaigning has been equated with the right to free speech. Rulings of the Supreme Court over the past years have reversed several campaign finance regulations introduced by federal laws. Most recently, the Supreme Court ruled in the *Citizens United v. FEC* case that certain prohibitions on campaign spending by corporations and unions are unconstitutional. OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors expressed diverging views on the real impact of this ruling on the upcoming elections.

Over 5 million current and former felons continue to be disenfranchised due to legal regulations or cumbersome procedures to request reinstatement of voting rights. Also, only citizens of states are entitled to vote for members of the House of Representatives with full voting rights, leaving 600,000 citizens in Washington DC alone without full representation in Congress. As in previous elections, legislation in several states still provides for the possibility of so-called 'unopposed candidates' to stand and, in some states, to be elected by default. The OSCE/ODIHR has previously recommended to review these practices.

OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors have, as during previous missions, alleged occurrences of intentional suppression of the vote and the use of so-called deceptive practices. While the OSCE/ODIHR has never received evidence of such practices or was able to corroborate these allegations, it is of concern that these allegations persist.

The United States, in line with OSCE commitments, has regularly invited the OSCE/ODIHR to observe elections for federal office. Access for observers is regulated at state level and not all states ensure or facilitate access for international observers, which is not fully in line with OSCE commitments. A resolution passed in 2005 by the National Association of Secretaries of States (NASS) welcoming OSCE observers was a positive step to address this problem. However, it was assessed that the resolution is unlikely to be reaffirmed during the upcoming NASS summer conference.

All OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors stated that the level of confidence in the election process had increased since the 2008 general elections. However, issues identified in previous OSCE/ODIHR reports remain unaddressed as OSCE/ODIHR recommendations are yet to be implemented. Elections in the United States are under extensive scrutiny provided by thousands of poll watchers, domestic organizations, vibrant and independent media that provide effective checks and balances and play a positive role in ensuring transparency and accountability of the electoral process. They offer detailed and comprehensive analytical reports on elections. In this context, although all OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors welcomed international observers, a large-scale and long-term presence of OSCE/ODIHR observers would not add much value and may lead to similar findings and recommendations as previously.

The OSCE/ODIHR NAM therefore recommends the establishment of an election assessment mission (EAM) for the duration of approximately three weeks before and around election day. The OSCE/ODIHR EAM would focus and report on specific issues such as voter registration and identification, campaign finance regulations, voting rights and voting systems. The OSCE/ODIHR EAM would visit several states to ensure a federal and state-level perspective but would not undertake a systematic and comprehensive observation of election day proceedings.

III. BACKGROUND

The mid-term elections on 2 November comprise elections for 36 seats in the Senate, all 435 seats in the House of Representatives and a number of other elections in various states, counties and other local jurisdictions. State primary elections to determine the candidates for the upcoming Senate and House elections are currently underway in the different states.

The OSCE/ODIHR has been following elections in the United States since 2002. It concluded that previous elections reflected the long-standing democratic tradition of the United States of America and mostly met OSCE commitments. Nevertheless, the OSCE/ODIHR identified some issues and formulated recommendations which should be addressed by the relevant authorities and other election stakeholders in line with OSCE commitments.¹

¹ OSCE/ODIHR reports on previous elections in the United States of America are available at: <http://www.osce.org/odihr-elections/14676.html>.

IV. FINDINGS

A. LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND ELECTION SYSTEM

1. Legal Framework

The legal framework for elections in the United States is decentralized and complex. The Constitution of the United States leaves regulation and conduct of elections to the individual states and counties; federal legislation provides only minimum standards. Details of the election process are regulated by state laws. Decisions by courts interpreting federal and state laws form part of the legal framework. Elections are therefore conducted across the country under different legal frameworks with different impact on voting rights and election procedures.

There is some federal legislation regulating aspects of the election process. The most comprehensive piece of federal legislation is the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002. HAVA stipulates a number of minimum standards and measures aimed at addressing the problems that arose during the 2000 presidential election. It sets standards for voting systems and provides for use of provisional ballots for voters who believe that they were registered but could not find their names on the voter list or who are declared by an election official to be ineligible to vote. HAVA also requires the establishment of state-wide voter registration databases, voter identification for first-time voters who registered by mail, and ensuring access for disabled voters. HAVA set up the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to provide advice, issue guidelines on meeting HAVA requirements and disburse funds for states to bring their procedures in line with HAVA requirements. The specifics of HAVA implementation have been left to the states, resulting in varying interpretations and practices.

The Voting Rights Act (VRA) of 1965 protects the rights of linguistic and racial minorities. It prohibits discriminatory practices, requires provision of electoral materials and assistance in minority languages, and requires pre-approval by the Attorney General or the US District Court for the District of Columbia for changes made to electoral procedures in certain states and jurisdictions.

The Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA) of 1986 requires the Department of Defense to facilitate absentee voting by citizens, including the military, living abroad. In 2009, Congress passed the Military and Overseas Voting Empowerment Act (MOVE) which *inter alia* attempts to address problems encountered in past elections when many overseas ballots were returned too late to be counted.

The National Voter Registration Act (NVRA or Motor Voter Act) of 1993 aimed at facilitating the voter registration process, *inter alia* by linking it to the Department of Motor Vehicles and the process of issuing drivers' licenses.

The 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) and the 2002 Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA, also called McCain-Feingold Law) regulate campaign income and expenditures and provide for disclosure of funds and detailed reporting. Supreme Court decisions have overturned several requirements of the FECA and the BCRA, most recently ruling that prohibition of spending by corporations and unions on campaigning was unconstitutional.

The Department of Justice (DoJ) monitors implementation by states of federal legislation, including compliance with provisions of HAVA, the NVRA and the VRA. It can initiate lawsuits in cases of non-compliance. Deadlines to implement HAVA requirements have passed. States are now overall compliant with HAVA with few exceptions, notably one county in the state of New York which is still involved in a lawsuit with the DoJ for using the old type of lever voting machines.

2. Election System

The US federal legislature, the bicameral Congress, consists of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Senate has 100 seats; Senators are elected for six-year terms. Two members are elected from each state by popular vote, mostly according to the first-past-the-post system. One third of the Senate is up for election every two years; this year, 34 Senators will be elected for their regular term as well as 2 Senators to fill mid-term vacancies.

The House of Representatives has 435 seats. Representatives are elected for two years by popular vote in single-seat constituencies, according to the first-past-the-post system. Electoral districts for each state are updated every ten years, following a census, to ensure equal representation according to a state's population and, at the same time, at least one representative in the House per state. In 2010, a census is undertaken but redistricting will only impact the next general elections in 2012.

B. ELECTION ADMINISTRATION

Due to the decentralized nature of the election system, there is no election administration body at the federal level overseeing the entire election process. Each state has its own election administration with most responsibilities devolved to the counties. Chief election administrators of states, often the Secretary of State, and of counties are frequently elected as party candidates. While OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors generally confirmed the widespread confidence in the election administration, it is of concern that election officials could stand in elections that they themselves administer, leading to potential conflicts of interest. Some states have introduced legislation aimed at preventing such conflicts of interests, in line with previous OSCE/ODIHR recommendations.²

Two federal bodies are responsible for specific aspects of the electoral process. The Federal Election Commission (FEC) is an independent regulatory agency that administers and enforces federal campaign finance legislation. It is a bi-partisan body with six members including the chairperson. Currently, the Commission consists of three Republicans, two Democrats, and one independent member. It reviews and audits campaign finance reports and adjudicates complaints.

The bi-partisan four-member Election Assistance Commission (EAC) was established by HAVA as a national clearinghouse and advisory body. It has no regulatory authority but develops voluntary guidelines and recommendations on meeting HAVA requirements, including on voting systems, polling manuals and information for poll workers in different minority languages.

² See Final Report of the OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission for the 2 November 2004 general elections (page 33).

Members of both commissions are appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. Both the FEC and the EAC take decisions with qualified majority. This ensures bi-partisanship but can also lead to deadlock on specific issues.

C. VOTER REGISTRATION AND IDENTIFICATION

1. Voter Registration

Voter registration and identification requirements remain controversial in US elections. Discussions on these issues are often divided along party lines with debate focusing on the issue of enfranchisement versus integrity of the vote.

Voter registration is regulated by the NVRA, requiring voters to actively register to vote. Deadlines for registration vary from state to state with some states allowing registration on election day and North Dakota not requiring voter registration at all. HAVA required states to compile state-wide voter registration databases and that states should verify voter registration by matching their voter registration database with other state and federal records. HAVA does not, however, require matching of state-wide voter registration databases between states leading to the possibility of registrations in more than one state; nor does it provide a definition of what constitutes a ‘match’ between the voter registration database and other databases. This has led to differing interpretation and matching practices in the states in past elections. Previous recommendations of the OSCE/ODIHR aimed at improving the voter registration process and maintenance of voter registration databases have not yet been addressed.³

OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors have expressed concern about states passing legislation which would enable so-called ‘purges’ of voters from the voter lists. This, together with reportedly low rates of registration among the African-American population, could result in under-representation of this population on the voter register. Other concerns expressed related to potential registration of ineligible voters through voter registration drives; this was a particular concern during the 2008 general elections.

2. Voter Identification

In line with long-established tradition in the United States, in many states voters can vote without presenting any form of identification. HAVA introduced voter identification requirements for first-time voters who registered by mail. Such voters have to show a photo ID on election day. Other ID requirements vary from state to state with some 25 states requiring all voters to show either photo or non-photo ID in polling stations. Arizona requires voters to provide proof of citizenship before being issued a ballot. The 2008 Supreme Court ruling upholding Indiana’s photo ID requirements has been interpreted as supporting the introduction of more stringent ID requirements.

Voter identification is a matter of controversial debate throughout the United States. Republicans generally argue that voter ID requirements are necessary to prevent possible voter impersonation and multiple voting. Democrats are concerned that voter ID requirements could lead to disenfranchisement and intimidation of citizens, particularly affecting lower-income groups, African-Americans, Hispanics and the

³ See Final Report of the OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission for the 2 November 2004 general elections (page 33).

elderly. OSCE/ODIHR interlocutors particularly expressed concern about increased challenges of voters at polling places on election day in relation to voter ID requirements.

D. VOTING SYSTEMS

Electronic voting systems are used to handle the complexity of multiple and simultaneous federal, state-level and local elections and to simplify voting and counting. Two types of systems are mostly used: Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting systems and optical scanning of marked paper ballots. Substantial funds were made available under HAVA to address the issues related to old punch-card and lever voting machines revealed during the 2000 presidential election and to replace mechanical lever and punch card voting systems with DRE and optical scan technology. HAVA specified minimum standards for these systems.

The EAC adopted Voluntary Voting System Guidelines in 2005. These provide specifications and requirements against which voting systems can be tested and on the basis of which voting systems can be certified. Currently, four systems have been certified by the EAC and six are undergoing testing. As these guidelines are voluntary, states can adopt them fully or partially for their own testing and certification procedures. States are not required by HAVA to use voting systems which have been certified by the EAC but all voting systems used must meet the requirements specified by HAVA.

While DRE voting systems were initially favoured, the trend of a 'return to paper' seems to continue. To address possible voting system errors, HAVA requires that voting systems produce a permanent paper record for a manual audit. HAVA does not require, however, that voters are issued with a voter-verifiable paper audit trail (VVPAT). Several states use voting machines with a VVPAT. This has been previously recommended by the OSCE/ODIHR.⁴

In the past two election cycles, many jurisdictions have decided to switch from DRE voting systems to optical scan systems. Other jurisdictions decided that once their current DRE equipment would near the end of its usage cycle, these would be replaced with optical scan equipment. OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors stated that concerns about voting systems expressed during previous elections have been allayed.

E. ALTERNATIVE VOTING ARRANGEMENTS

States provide voters with possibilities to cast their ballots through alternative voting arrangements such as early in-person voting, absentee by-mail voting in-country, and out-of-country voting.

The length of the early voting period varies from state to state. Absentee by-mail voting whereby voters receive a ballot to be mailed to the election administrators and early in-person voting were used by about 30 per cent of the electorate during the 2008 general elections. OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors expect similar high usage of these alternative voting mechanisms for the upcoming mid-term elections.

⁴ See Final Report of the OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission for the 2 November 2004 general elections (page 25).

All states and the five territories are required to provide US citizens living abroad with the possibility to vote. The Federal Voting Assistance Program of the Department of Defense facilitates this process for an estimated 4 to 6 million overseas voters, including armed services personnel. UOCAVA stipulates that voters who have not received their ballot in time can use a Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot to cast their vote. The MOVE Act prescribes that states send the ballot to voters 45 days in advance of a federal election to ensure timely return of the marked ballot. Some states may have difficulties to comply with this new deadline due to the late primary elections during which the federal candidates are determined. Some states, for example Minnesota and Vermont, brought forward their primary dates to comply with the new regulation. MOVE also requires states to enable voters to request a ballot electronically and to transmit the ballot electronically to the voter overseas. States are also required to accept the Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot for all federal elections.

Deadlines for application for absentee ballots and for returning marked ballots and their counting are determined by the states, with some states allowing the late counting of absentee ballots. Some states accept electronic transmission of marked ballots by fax or email. In these cases, the voter waives the right to a secret ballot. The OSCE/ODIHR has previously recommended that this practice be reviewed.⁵

In addition, voters who, upon arrival at the polling station, are not on the voter list should be provided with a provisional ballot. Details for the provision and counting of these ballots are established by the states and again vary widely from state to state.

F. CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Elections in the United States are characterized by a high level of campaign spending. The freedom to spend available resources on election campaigns is equated with the right to free speech enshrined in the First Amendment to the Constitution. This results in essentially unlimited campaign spending. Contributions to candidates' campaigns, political parties or political action committees,⁶ however, are subject to limitations.

Over the past years, rulings of the Supreme Court have reversed several of the campaign finance regulations established by the BCRA. In January 2010, the Supreme Court ruling in the *Citizens United v. FEC* case has reversed a long-standing prohibition for corporations and unions to spend on electoral and political advertising as prescribed by FECA. The Supreme Court ruled that they should enjoy the same rights as natural persons when it comes to campaign spending. It struck down as unconstitutional the prohibitions against spending by corporations and unions on political advertising that explicitly advocates the election or defeat of a candidate as long as such communications are not coordinated with a candidate.⁷ The court upheld the prohibition of corporations and unions to contribute directly to a candidate's campaign or a political party as well as the requirement to report any independent expenditure to the FEC and disclose the sources of the funds.

⁵ See for example the OSCE/ODIHR Final Report on the 2008 general elections (page 17) and the 2006 mid-term elections (page 21).

⁶ PACs are private groups of citizens, organized to elect political candidates. Under the FECA, an organization becomes a "political action committee" by receiving contributions or making expenditures in excess of USD 1,000 for the purpose of influencing a federal election. It then has to register with the FEC. PACs can engage in campaign activity, promote candidates in the media and donate to candidates' and parties' committees.

⁷ These types of spending are referred to as independent expenditures.

OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors held diverging views on the Court's decision. Some expressed concerns about the influence that corporations could exercise on an election. They worried that corporations would spend large amounts, particularly at state and local level elections, in favour or against particular candidates and therefore increase candidates' dependence on private interests. Others did not expect the decision to have large impact on the upcoming elections. They stressed that corporations were able to spend on campaigning before through so-called issue advertisements without directly advocating the election or defeat of a candidate. They did not expect a major increase of campaign spending by corporations in these elections as a result of the ruling.

G. OTHER ISSUES

Restrictions on voting rights are regulated by state laws and vary broadly from state to state. Restrictions for citizens with a felony conviction are often disproportionate to the crime committed. For instance, Kentucky and Virginia permanently disenfranchise persons with felony convictions. Most states (48 states and Washington DC) prohibit incarcerated citizens to vote. With few exceptions, there is no automatic restoration of voting rights for ex-felons. Generally, cumbersome procedures apply for voting rights to be restored. The OSCE/ODIHR has previously recommended that these restrictions should be reviewed to ensure that a restriction is proportionate to the crime committed and that voting rights should be restored automatically once a sentence is served.⁸

It is estimated that over five million citizens are prohibited from voting because of a felony conviction; about two million of these have served their sentence.⁹ Several OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors argued that these laws disproportionately affect minority populations, particularly African-Americans and Hispanics.

US citizens who are not citizens of one of the 50 states are, according to the Constitution, not allowed to vote for members of Congress. An estimated 600,000 citizens in Washington DC alone are permitted to vote in presidential elections, but they can only vote for delegates to the House of Representatives who do not have full voting rights.

Several states' laws continue to allow nomination and election of so-called 'unopposed candidates' as members of Congress in cases where there is only one candidate standing. In some states, such unopposed candidates are deemed elected by default. While the assessment of the chances to be elected may sometimes result in a decision not to stand in an election, an election is supposed to provide voters with a choice between different options. The OSCE/ODIHR NAM was informed that, as in previous elections, unopposed candidates are likely to run in several congressional races.

As on many occasions before, OSCE/ODIHR interlocutors alleged possible cases of intentional suppression of the vote and the use of deceptive practices such as systematic challenges of voters, particularly in minority communities, or dissemination of incorrect information on the date of the election and polling places. The OSCE/ODIHR has never received evidence of such practices during previous election observation activities. However, the fact that such allegations persist is a matter of concern.

⁸ See for example the OSCE/ODIHR Final Report on the 2008 general elections (page 32).

⁹ The Sentencing Project, *Felony Disenfranchisement Laws in the United States*, March 2010, see http://www.sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/fd_bs_fdlawsinusMarch2010.pdf.

H. ELECTION OBSERVATION

Elections in the United States are characterized by an extensive presence of domestic groups that play an active role in elections, including in scrutinizing the election process, voter information and facilitation of voter registration. In addition, candidates and political parties mobilise thousands of lawyers and so-called poll watchers to control the polls. They, combined with a very active and independent media, contribute to transparency and accountability of the process.

The United States have regularly invited the OSCE/ODIHR to observe federal elections. However, despite repeated OSCE/ODIHR recommendations, there are no minimum standards for access of observers to US elections. State laws vary with regard to election observation by domestic observers from political parties and civic organizations. In previous elections, OSCE/ODIHR observers were generally welcomed by the election administration in the different states. The National Association of Secretaries of States (NASS) on 24 July 2005 passed a resolution welcoming “international observers from OSCE member countries to the United States”, providing access for observers and encouraging election administrators to support international election observation. This resolution was valid for five years. The OSCE/ODIHR NAM was informed that it is unlikely to be reaffirmed at the NASS Summer Conference in July 2010. In line with paragraph 8 of the 1990 OSCE Copenhagen Document minimum standards for access of international observers should be established.

In addition to party and candidate representatives whose presence is widely expected at polling stations, the DoJ plans to deploy federal monitors to monitor compliance of states with VRA requirements.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

All OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors stated that the level of confidence in the election process had increased since the 2008 general elections. However, issues identified in previous OSCE/ODIHR reports remain unaddressed as OSCE/ODIHR recommendations are yet to be implemented. Elections in the United States are under extensive scrutiny provided by thousands of poll watchers, domestic organizations, vibrant and independent media that provide effective checks and balances and play a positive role in ensuring transparency and accountability of the electoral process. They offer detailed and comprehensive analytical reports on elections. In this context, although all OSCE/ODIHR NAM interlocutors welcomed international observers, a large-scale and long-term presence of OSCE/ODIHR observers would not add much value and may lead to similar findings and recommendations as previously.

The OSCE/ODIHR NAM therefore recommends the establishment of an election assessment mission (EAM) for the duration of approximately three weeks before and around election day. The OSCE/ODIHR EAM would focus and report on specific issues such as voter registration and identification, campaign finance regulations, voting rights and voting systems. The OSCE/ODIHR EAM would visit several states to ensure a federal and state-level perspective but would not undertake a systematic and comprehensive observation of election day proceedings.

ANNEX: LIST OF MEETINGS

US State Department

Nancy McElDowney, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Europe and Eurasia

Anthony A. Pahigian, Deputy Director/ OSCE Coordinator, Office of European Security and Political Affairs

J. Alexander Hamilton, Deputy Coordinator for OSCE, Office of European Security and Political Affairs

US Department of Justice

Julie A. Fernandes, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Matthew Colangelo, Counsel, Office of the Assistant Attorney General

US Department of Defense

Bob Carey, Director, Federal Voting Assistance Program

J. Scott Wiedmann, Principal Deputy Director, External Relations and Communications, Federal Voting Assistance Program

Federal Election Commission

Steven T. Walther, Commissioner

Election Assistance Commission

Thomas R. Wilkey, Executive Director

National Association of Secretaries of State

Leslie Reynolds, Executive Director

US Commission on Civil Rights

Martin Dannenfelser, Staff Director

David P. Blackwood, General Counsel

Maha Jweied, Senior Attorney-Advisor

United States Senate Committee on Rules and Administration

Veronica M. Gillespie, Majority Elections Counsel

US Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

Ronald J. McNamara, Policy Advisor

Orest S. Deychakiwsky, Policy Advisor

Robert Hand, Policy Advisor

Federal Communications Commission

Mark L. Berlin, Attorney Advisor, Policy Division

Democratic National Committee

Will Crossley, Director – Counsel, Voter Protection

Hannah K. Fried, Deputy Director, Voter Protection

Andrew H. Werbrock, Attorney at Law

Republican National Committee

Scott A. Kamins, Deputy Chief of Staff for Government Affairs

Civil Society Organizations

AEI, American Enterprise Institute (Election Reform Project)

John C. Fortier, Research Fellow

League of Women Voters

Nancy E. Tate, Executive Director

Jeanette Senecal, Director, Elections/e-Democracy

The Pew Center on the States

Doug Chapin, Director, Election Initiatives

Campaign Finance Institute

Michael J. Malbin, Executive Director