



# REFERENCE

**Voting Day Processes of  
RA National Assembly  
Elections**

June 7, 2026

## REFERENCE

### On Election Day Processes during the June 7, 2026 Elections to the National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia

*This is an unofficial English translation prepared for informational purposes. In the event of any inconsistency or discrepancy, the Armenian-language original shall prevail.*

On June 7, 2026, the Akanates Observation Mission observed election day processes during the parliamentary elections of the Republic of Armenia.

Within the framework of the mission, 712 observers were deployed to monitor the voting process throughout Armenia. 520 observers observed the entire election day process in 260 polling stations. The observation was conducted using a random-sample methodology, which makes it possible to assess the quality of election day processes through statistical methods. Although the observation covered only a small share of all polling stations in the country — 13% — the sample-based methodology makes it possible to assess the electoral process at the national level.

In addition, 8 observers monitored voting in 6 penitentiary institutions, and 6 observers observed polling stations organizing voting by mobile ballot box, including by accompanying the mobile ballot box in 3 psychiatric institutions and 3 military medical institutions.

Fifty-four teams of mobile observers visited 456 polling stations outside the sample, representing 23% of polling stations, while also monitoring the situation in community areas.

Seventy observers monitored the work of 38 Territorial Electoral Commissions (TECs).

According to the assessment of the Akanates Observation Mission, election day, overall, took place in a peaceful environment, amid political competition and dynamic and active voter participation. At the same time, tension was observed in some polling stations due to apparent cases of voter guidance, violations and attempted violations of the secrecy of the vote, control and attempted control over voting, and aggressive conduct by certain actors involved in the electoral process. Representatives of various parties and alliances were involved in electoral violations of different types.

The work of electoral commissions, despite certain technical shortcomings, ensured proper processes for voters to cast their ballots and for the results to be summarized. The police also generally performed their legally prescribed functions.

#### Preparatory Stage

The process of preparing for voting was generally organized in accordance with established procedures and without serious violations.

Preparatory sessions mostly started according to the prescribed schedule. In 69.62% of polling stations, or 181 polling stations, the session started at 07:00; in 28.08%, or 73 polling stations, it started between 07:00 and 07:20; and in 2.31%, or 6 polling stations, it started between 07:20 and 07:40.

- In 1.54% of polling stations, or 4 polling stations, preparations began without the required quorum.
- In 0.77% of polling stations, or 2 polling stations, the procedure for drawing lots was violated.
- In 0.38% of polling stations, or 1 polling station, the specialist responsible for the technical device did not ensure the procedure for preparing the device.
- 30.38% of polling stations, or 79 polling stations, were difficult to access for voters with mobility impairments, while 6.15%, or 16 polling stations, were difficult to access for voters with visual impairments.
- In 5.00% of polling stations, or 13 polling stations, the layout of the room violated the secrecy of the vote, while in 0.77%, or 2 polling stations, it made observation of the electoral process difficult.
- In 0.77% of polling stations, or 2 polling stations, voter lists were missing, while in 3.08%, or 8 polling stations, the lists of parties/alliances were missing.
- In 2.69% of polling stations, or 7 polling stations, the number of voters printed by the technical device differed from the number in the main voter lists posted on the wall.
- In 1.92% of polling stations, or 5 polling stations, there were violations of the requirements related to the fireproof safe, and in 0.38%, or 1 polling station, there were violations related to the ballot box.
- In 0.38% of polling stations, or 1 polling station, the presence of unauthorized persons was recorded during the preparatory stage.

### **Incidents During the Preparatory Stage**

Observers deployed at polling stations observed incidents, some of which are presented below.

A problem related to the opening of a polling center was recorded:

- At polling station 8/38, due to the late arrival of the commission chairperson, the polling center opened only at 07:18, as a result of which no one was allowed to enter the polling center before that time. The observer's assessment was recorded in the Precinct Electoral Commission registration journal.

Problems related to the layout manifested themselves, in particular, as follows:

- At polling station 8/61, bathrooms were located behind the voting booths, with people entering and exiting. The commission chairperson did not take measures to resolve the issue.
- At polling station 13/16, the voting booths were placed on tables connected to each other, as a result of which voters in a number of cases passed behind another voting booth. After the observer's remark, the tables were separated.

- At polling station 14/6, there was a curtain behind the voting booths that was not attached to the adjacent walls, which did not eliminate the risk of violating the secrecy of the vote. The PEC chairperson refused to remedy the issue, and the superior commission was informed.
- At polling station 27/3, there was a large area behind the voting booths with glass doors and windows. After the issue was raised, commission members covered them with paper.
- At polling station 27/10, one of the voting booths was positioned in such a way that voting could have been visible from the side. Following the observer's observation, the commission decided to remove that voting booth from the room.
- At polling stations 24/34, 29/20, and 38/26, there were doors behind the voting booths that were not properly closed and sealed, as adhesive tape was missing. At polling station 29/20, at the observer's request, the door was sealed with adhesive tape after some time; however, at polling stations 24/34 and 38/26, the commission chairpersons took no action to remedy the issue.

The number of voting booths installed in polling stations did not comply with the requirements set for the number of voters in those polling stations and created organizational problems for the process.

- At polling station 8/61, with 1,745 voters, only 2 voting booths had been installed. After the observer recorded the issue, around 13:00, one more booth was added.
- At polling station 11/34, with 2,068 voters, only 3 voting booths had been installed. The commission chairperson refused to add a fourth booth, stating that doing so would violate room layout requirements due to the lack of space.

Problems related to the voter list were observed:

- At polling station 25/27, a numerical discrepancy was recorded: the statement printed by the technical device indicated 1,287 voters, while the number in the main list posted at the polling center was 1,273. This was explained by the fact that updated lists had not been posted at the polling center.

Violations of requirements related to voting materials were recorded:

- At polling stations 23/20 and 4/54, the fireproof safe had already been opened before 07:00. At polling station 23/20, at 07:00, it was observed that the signed paper affixed to the safe was torn, while at polling station 4/54, the commission chairperson opened the safe at 06:55, explaining that he had the right to open it from 06:45.

## **Voting**

Voting in the observed sample polling stations was generally organized in accordance with established procedures.

93.85% of polling stations, or 244 polling stations, opened for voting at 08:00. 1.92% of polling stations, or 5 polling stations, opened earlier than scheduled, while 4.23%, or 11 polling stations, opened late, between 08:01 and 08:10.

- In 8.14% of sample polling stations, or 21 polling stations, 1 to 5 cases of technical device malfunction were recorded.
- In 1.16% of polling stations, or 3 polling stations, the rotation of work functions established by the drawing of lots was violated.
- In 8% of polling stations, or 21 polling stations, 24 cases of voter guidance/controlled voting were recorded.
- In 2.69% of polling stations, or 7 polling stations, 7 apparent cases of intentional violation of the secrecy of the vote were recorded, some of which were aimed at controlling the vote.
- In 18.22% of polling stations, or 47 polling stations, there was already another person's signature next to the names of 1 to 3 voters.
- Crowding inside polling stations was recorded in 22.48% of polling stations, or 58 polling stations, while crowding in adjacent areas was recorded in 12.02%, or 31 polling stations.
- Unauthorized persons were present in 5.43% of polling stations, or 14 polling stations.
- In 5.04% of polling stations, or 13 polling stations, the continuous presence of persons allegedly conducting control was observed near the entrance.
- In 0.78% of polling stations, or 2 polling stations, the activities of persons entitled to be present in the polling station were obstructed.
- In 2.71% of polling stations, or 7 polling stations, the PEC chairperson or secretary refused to record the observer's assessment regarding violations.
- In 11.63% of polling stations, or 30 polling stations, cases of hospitality being provided to commission members were recorded, mainly by political parties.

The majority of polling stations, 95.35%, closed for voting at the prescribed time, 20:00.

### **Incidents During Voting**

Observers deployed at polling stations, as well as mobile observers, observed incidents, some of which are presented below.

During election day, there were cases of photographing ballots, or otherwise voting openly, including family voting, and revealing the vote to others.

- At polling stations 10/38, 33/10, and 38/26, voters attempted to photograph or managed to photograph ballots with their phones. At polling station 10/38, three separate cases were recorded at 09:15, 10:05, and 12:21. The commission chairpersons prevented or recorded the process, but the police were not called.
- At polling station 10/38, a voter showed his ballot to his son, who was also a voter.
- At polling station 14/56, a voter voted openly without entering the voting booth, and the chairperson took no action.

- At polling station 33/12, after voting, a voter entered another occupied voting booth, after which the citizens exited together.

There were apparent cases of controlling or attempting to control voters' voting, interference, and voter guidance, including by representatives of political forces and by a PEC member.

- At polling station 4/47, proxies of the Prosperous Armenia Party stood next to the ballot box throughout the process, talked outside, and brought voters inside. At the same polling station, proxies of the Strong Armenia Alliance brought two women inside arm-in-arm, although the women did not appear to need physical assistance.
- At polling station 7/6, a proxy of the Strong Armenia Alliance continuously talked to Russian-speaking voters both in the yard and inside the room.
- At polling station 8/7, a husband and wife approached the proxy of the Civil Contract Party, saying, "We are one of you," and then requested only ballot number 16. After a remark by the proxy of the Strong Armenia Alliance, the woman continued to guide her husband inside the voting booth. The case was recorded.
- At polling station 10/30, a proxy of the Civil Contract Party actively accompanied voters toward the voting booth and the ballot box, moving ahead of the commission chairperson and explaining the voting procedure. The secretary refused to record the observer's assessment in the registration journal.
- At polling station 11/42, proxies of the Civil Contract Party and the Strong Armenia Alliance — two inside and two outside — stood very close to the entrance and actively communicated with voters. The situation was stopped through police intervention.
- At polling station 14/48, proxies of the Strong Armenia Alliance monitored those entering the polling station using special markings in a notebook. Moreover, one of the proxies, upon seeing a voter enter the polling station, loudly asked the voter, "Where is your family?"
- At polling station 21/6, while showing an elderly woman the ballot numbers, a PEC member emphasized number 16 and said, "This is also 16, go and vote," to which the woman responded aloud, "Yes, I will also vote for 16."
- At polling station 29/20, a young man approached the proxy of the Prosperous Armenia Party and said, "Brother, we came later with the family."
- At polling station 30/53, proxies of the Civil Contract Party greeted voters with phrases such as "Vote and go" and "Have you come to vote?" The observer also noticed that when they went outside to smoke, voter flow decreased, and upon their return, it sharply increased.
- At polling station 34/3, a proxy of the Armenia Alliance pointed a phone toward the voting booths, creating a risk of control over voting, while the positioning of the booths did not fully ensure secrecy. The chairperson refused to correct or record the violation.
- At polling station 38/26, a proxy of the Strong Armenia Alliance accompanied and guided voters up to the voting booth.

Campaigning was carried out during voting, including by wearing symbols of political forces.

- At polling station 25/28, a young voter loudly shouted “Samvel — Prime Minister” and declared that he was voting in favor of the Strong Armenia Alliance.
- At polling station 30/7, a proxy of the Civil Contract Party openly campaigned, saying, “Vote so that there is peace.” This action was stopped through the intervention of the proxy of the Armenia Alliance and the chairperson.
- At polling station 35/56, a proxy of the Civil Contract Party wore a symbol associated with the party’s campaign, in the shape of the map of Armenia, claiming that it was a piece of jewelry.

On election day, cases were observed of transportation of voters and possible control by unauthorized persons.

- At polling station 2/13, a proxy of the Strong Armenia Alliance was denied entry due to the absence of an accreditation badge and because the permitted number of proxies had been exceeded. He remained within the 50-meter radius, left and then returned in different clothing, met young people, and later brought food for the PEC.
- At polling station 4/47, two persons monitored the entrance for an extended period. After being photographed by the observer, they left and then returned wearing different clothes. The police and the chairperson did not respond. At the same polling station, an English-speaking person without accreditation was identified; he introduced himself as an international observer. He was removed with police assistance.
- At the entrance of polling station 9/6, four men periodically communicated with the proxy of the Civil Contract Party. After a third warning from a police officer, they left.
- At polling stations 15/27 and 35/57, the Civil Contract Party had more proxies than permitted, some of whom were outside near the entrance.
- At polling station 16/41, the organized transportation of a large number of elderly persons, more than 17, by a Ford Transit vehicle was observed.
- At polling station 29/41, a Range Rover with license plate 49RR888 transported voters to the polling station several times.
- At polling station 35/56, a proxy of the Civil Contract Party remained near the entrance for three hours and communicated with voters. At the same polling station, a police officer remained inside continuously for 1.5 hours and left only after the intervention of the TEC.

In certain problematic cases, the direct involvement of community heads and administrative heads was observed.

- At polling station 16/41, Mher Hartanyan, the head of Baghramyan community, was inside the polling station for an extended period without accreditation, talked to voters, and provided food to the PEC. The commission and an observer from another organization present at the polling station persuaded the observer not to record the case; however, in the presence of OSCE observers, the assessment of the violation was recorded in the registration journal.

- In the area adjacent to the entrance of polling station 22/32, at a distance of 30 meters, Khachik Vardanyan, the head of Gyulagarak community, talked to and guided voters, regarding which a separate protocol was drawn up.
- At polling station 38/32, Andranik Virabyan, the administrative head of Khashtarak, sat near the entrance with a group of more than 10 persons and communicated with voters.

On election day, cases of pressure, disputes, and obstruction of observers' rights were also recorded in some polling stations, creating an atmosphere of fear and pressure.

- At polling station 4/47, proxies of the Prosperous Armenia Party deliberately stood next to observers with the aim of constraining their work.
- At polling station 6/50, a proxy of the Prosperous Armenia Party shouted at and pressured an elderly voter who had lost the voting pass, forcing the voter out. The PEC chairperson did not prevent the incident.
- At polling station 9/22, a proxy of the Strong Armenia Alliance remained for an extended period in the area immediately adjacent to the voting booths and effectively assumed the functions of the PEC chairperson by organizing processes related to voters' voting. When a person with visitor status raised the issue and recorded the violation in the registration journal, the proxy not only did not stop his conduct but began pressuring the visitor by shouting, threatening, and stating that, in response, he would make a false entry against the visitor. The proxy made an obviously false entry in the registration journal alleging voter guidance by the visitor, although those present and a PEC member confirmed that the visitor had not guided any voter. The incident nevertheless created an atmosphere of fear and pressure, as a result of which the visitor was forced to leave the polling station. An international observer was also present during the incident.
- At polling station 12/40, a proxy of the Civil Contract Party argued with an observer from the Youth Clubs Federation NGO because the observer had photographed him.
- At polling station 14/56, a voter threatened an observer by inviting him to "go outside and talk."
- At polling station 30/7, the secretary prohibited the observer from photographing the list of assisting persons, ultimately allowing it only on the condition that passport data be covered.

Violations of the procedure for assisting voters occurred in several polling stations.

- At polling station 10/15, a proxy of the Republican Party of Armenia, on his own initiative and without informing the PEC, guided a person into the voting booth to assist an elderly woman.
- At polling station 34/37, a person introduced as an assistant independently carried out all actions, while the voter stood at a distance. A similar case was recorded at polling station 33/12.

During voting, violations of requirements related to voting materials were observed.

- At polling station 8/46, at 12:00, it was discovered that the ballot box was missing seals. New seals were brought from the TEC at 12:30.
- At polling station 12/12, at around 13:30, it was recorded that the ballot box had not been sealed with seals. After observers raised the issue, commission members immediately sealed the ballot box.
- At polling station 8/7, during a break, a PEC member went to a shop, taking the individual seal with him, lost it, and it was later found by a citizen and returned to the polling station.

Several polling stations had problems related to ballots, voting passes, and stamps.

- At polling station 1/13, in the morning, a PEC member negligently failed to affix the individual seal on at least 20 voting passes.
- At polling station 4/24, the PEC chairperson gave a commission member 100 stamps without counting them or receiving 100 voting passes.
- At polling station 14/56, a PEC member did not provide ballot number 3 to a voter. The issue was corrected through the intervention of a proxy of the Strong Armenia Alliance.
- At polling station 14/56, a case was recorded in which a voter approached the voting booth without signing the list in the prescribed manner, and the individual seal was missing from the voter's pass.

Possible inaccuracies in voter lists emerged in several polling stations.

- At polling station 4/24, two voters stated that two other persons unknown to them were registered at their addresses.

Voting observed in inpatient medical and military medical institutions complied with the procedure for voting by mobile ballot box. Several issues were recorded.

- At the Sisian military medical institution under polling station 34/29, a servicemember receiving inpatient treatment was given all ballots by the commission member providing the ballots, except ballot number 16. The voter himself noticed the missing ballot and informed the commission, after which he received the missing ballot.
- At the Arabkir military medical institution in Yerevan under polling station 4/3, voting was temporarily suspended due to missing ballots. Twice, bundles of ballots — first number 9, then number 11 — were brought to the military medical institution because during voting it became clear that an insufficient number had been brought by the commission member.
- At the same military medical institution under polling station 4/3, the observer noticed that the mobile ballot box had not been sealed with a seal from the beginning. On the instruction of the commission chairperson, one of the members brought a seal from the polling station and sealed the ballot box on site, thereby correcting the issue.

In penitentiary institutions, the voting procedure was generally observed, with certain exceptions.

- Two cases were recorded in which voting did not start at the prescribed time: at polling station 9/61 in the Yerevan-Kentron penitentiary institution and at polling station 10/56 in the Nubarashen penitentiary institution.

### **Summarization of Voting Results**

The process of summarizing voting results was generally organized in accordance with established procedures and without serious violations.

- In 0.39% of polling stations, or 1 polling station, the presence of an unauthorized person was recorded.
- Only in 0.78% of polling stations, or 2 polling stations, were violations recorded by PECs of the actions prescribed under the summarization procedure.
- Only in 0.78% of polling stations, or 2 polling stations, were violations recorded in the procedure for the actual vote count.
- The protocol extract and turnout statement were provided in almost all polling stations, 99.61%.
- Only in 0.39% of polling stations, or 1 polling station, did the commission refuse to provide the technical device statement to a person entitled to receive it.

### **Incidents During the Summarization of Voting Results**

The counting process was generally carried out by commissions in accordance with the prescribed procedure; however, shortcomings were observed.

A gross violation of the prescribed voting time period was observed.

- At polling station 35/65, after the doors of the polling center were closed at 20:00, it became clear that several hundred servicemembers were inside the building, in the corridor. The command stated that they had been late because of the shift change. Although the servicemembers were not in the actual voting room, which was separated by doors, as of 20:00, the PEC allowed them to vote.

Violations of the results summarization procedure were observed.

- At polling station 3/17, during the count, the PEC chairperson removed envelopes from the ballot box not one by one, as prescribed, but several at a time, placing them on the table in front of him.
- At polling station 33/36, the commission chairperson deemed 2 ballots invalid without removing them from the envelopes, due to the trace of a PEC member's individual seal on the envelope, and tore the envelopes. At the observer's request, the matter was put to a vote, and although only 3 out of 7 members voted in favor of declaring them invalid, the chairperson adopted the decision, grossly violating the procedure.
- At polling station 7/6, observers noticed that the upper part of 2 ballots cast in favor of the Strong Armenia Alliance had been intentionally folded in the same manner,

allegedly as a marking for voter guidance. The PEC chairperson refused the observers' request to photograph the evidence, stating that it was accidental, and urged them "not to hinder" the process.

### **Submission of Electoral Documents to TECs**

After the summarization of voting results in polling stations, observers of the Akanates Initiative monitored, throughout the night, the handover and receipt of electoral documents and sacks, as well as the entry of results, in all 38 TECs across Armenia, identifying violations and shortcomings.

The list of identified problems includes the following:

- Cases were recorded in which PECs brought the large sacks to TECs in open, partially open, or damaged condition.
- Many PECs mistakenly placed the small sack containing voter lists inside the large sack, as a result of which TECs had to draw up protocols, open the large sacks, remove the lists or other materials, such as seals, extracts, and Braille templates, and close the sacks again.
- Many PEC chairpersons presented the large sack to the TEC without signing and/or sealing it.
- In some cases, ballots were brought to TECs by hand, without a sack, on the basis of which it was decided to conduct a recount.
- Numerous clerical and arithmetic errors were observed in protocols/extracts submitted by PECs to TECs, which were corrected at the TECs. Cases of data confusion and inaccuracies were recorded.
- Malfunctions of the computerized data-entry software were recorded in a number of TECs, resulting in prolonged interruptions of the process and queues.

Regarding substantial violations observed on election day, the Akanates Observation Mission submitted applications/complaints to electoral commissions, and reports to law enforcement bodies are also being prepared in relation to certain individual cases.

---

The Akanates Observation Mission was established in August 2018. The members of the initiative are the Transparency International Anticorruption Center NGO and the Protection of Rights without Borders NGO. The mission aims to contribute to the conduct of free and fair elections in accordance with Armenian legislation and international standards, to the integrity of electoral processes, and to public oversight over them.

The observation mission for the 2026 National Assembly elections of the Republic of Armenia is implemented with the financial support of the European Union, the German Marshall Fund of the United States — Transatlantic Foundation (GMF TF), the Embassy of Norway, the National Endowment for Democracy, the European Endowment for Democracy, and the Democracy Development Foundation. The content of this document is the responsibility of the Akanates Observation Initiative and does not necessarily reflect the views of the donors.