EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Voters in Newly Merged Districts (NMDs) went to the first-ever elections to the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) Provincial Assembly (PA) seats, marking the completion of their constitutional merger with the province a year after the passage of the 25th Constitutional Amendment. These historical elections in areas that were embroiled in conflict for almost two decades were administratively well-managed, remained peaceful and free from any major controversy over the quality of the electoral process.

The maiden elections to PA followed a peaceful and competitive campaign by contesting political parties and independent candidates with an exception of North Waziristan, where campaigning was affected by security situation. A total of 10 political parties represented by 84 candidates along with 213 independent candidates contested for 16 PA seats. Out of 297 validly nominated candidates, only two were women vying for the General Seats. ROs rejected as many as 51 of 476 candidatures, primarily on technical grounds including incomplete documentation, bank default, different constituencies of proposers and seconders and incorrect statements provided in the affidavits. A majority of rejected nominations were filed for five seats reserved for women and non-Muslims. The ECP had established 1,896 polling stations with an average of 1,476 voters per polling station, which was relatively higher than the legally stipulated 1,200 voters per polling station. For Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), 58 polling stations were established outside of NMDs in Hangu, Kohat and Bannu. Directly supervised by Election Commission of Pakistan’s (ECP) officials as District Returning Officers (DROs) and Retuning Officers (ROs), the election processes before and on Election Day were largely managed in accordance with the provisions of the Elections Act, 2017. The finding reinforces Free and Fair Election Network’s (FAFEN) long-term recommendation that ECP should be legally bound to appoint DROs from within its own cadre of officials to supervise all elections including the General Elections. ECP also appeared to have asserted its authority by timely redressing complaints by political parties and contesting candidates and taking notice of violations of its Code of Conduct such as announcement of development schemes for NMDs.

FAFEN employed its multiphase observation strategy to observe pre-election and Election Day processes. As many as 16 long term observers (LTOs) and 953 trained, non-partisan Election Day observers (858 men and 95 women) duly accredited by the ECP to observe the voting process at 1,617 (85 percent of the total) polling stations and counting at half of them. These citizen observers were trained on the Elections Act, 2017, the Election Rules, and Election Commission of Pakistan’s (ECP) Code of Conduct for Domestic Observers. FAFEN’s pre-election observation phase covered the observation of the local political environment and implementation of election-related laws and rules, while the Election Day observation covered election environment inside and outside polling stations, instances of electoral and political violence, pre-voting preparations at polling stations, and voting and counting processes inside polling stations. Each observer spent nearly an hour at each polling station to observe polling processes. FAFEN LTOs observed the process of finalizing provisional results at the offices of the ROs.

The conduct of the polling staff and security officials was observed to have generally remained in line with the provisions of the law and their respective codes as FAFEN observers noted improvement on 22 counts of procedures relating to transparency, voter identification, ballot processing, and facilitation to voters by election staff during the provincial elections in comparison with General Elections (GE) 2018. Instances of undue influence over voters also decreased. However, FAFEN observers recorded an increase in irregularities on 17 procedures concerning pre-voting processes, secrecy of voters and
counting of ballots. With the exception of two constituencies, the Election Day observers were generally allowed to enter polling stations. Overall, FAFEN observers were not allowed to enter at 14 percent of polling stations. FAFEN observers recorded, at an average, five procedural irregularities per polling station during the provincial elections. The overall environment on Election Day remained peaceful with FAFEN observers reporting three incidents of violence in Khyber, Mohmand and Kurram resulting in interruptions to the voting process and injuries to two persons.

ECP had registered 285,976 more voters in NMDs for provincial elections as compared to GE-2018. Although the registration increased by 11 percent, the voters’ turnout for provincial elections remained at 26 percent as compared to 34 percent in GE-2018. The lowest turnout of 16 percent was witnessed at a constituency in PK-113 South Waziristan, while the highest turnout was at a Kurram constituency where 40 percent turnout was recorded. A significant factor leading to the drop in turnout may be the addition of such voters whose permanent addresses were in NMDs and were previously registered as voters at an address that was not mentioned on their National Identity Cards (NICs). ECP was legally bound to transfer voters registered at an address not mentioned on NICs to their permanent addresses. ECP added 106,382 voters to the electoral rolls in the last month of registration, prior to freezing of the rolls on account of announcement of elections, and a significant portion of these voters might comprise of non-resident NMDs’ voters who could not travel from other parts of the country to exercise their right to vote.

As many as three constituencies recorded above 40 percent turnout of men voters. Lowest male voters’ turnout was recorded in South Waziristan (20 percent). Five constituencies had a male turnout between 21 and 30 percent, while seven constituencies reported a turnout of male voters between 31 and 39 percent. On the other hand, women turnout for NMDs’ elections remained at 19 percent as compared to 24 percent in GE-2018. While all constituencies reported more than 10 percent share of women voters in total polled votes, the disparities in women turnout among constituencies ran high. One constituency each in Khyber and South Waziristan had a turnout of mere seven percent of registered women voters. Six constituencies reported a women turnout between 21 and 29 percent, and seven other constituencies witnessed a turnout between 10 and 20 percent. A constituency in Kurram (PK-109) was an exception as the women turnout (41 percent) was slightly higher than those of men (40 percent) voters. FAFEN’s pre-election interviews with citizens from sampled polling areas had indicated an expected lower women turnout due to multiple reasons including socio-cultural norms, distances and accessibility to polling stations, low literacy rate and lack of electoral and civic education, etc.

The instances of provisional rejection of ballots at polling station level also decreased. The ratio of votes excluded from the count remained at 1.6 percent during the NMDs’ elections in comparison to 1.9 percent during GE-2018. The number of ballots excluded from the count exceeded the Margin of Victory (MoV) at three constituencies – PK-100 Bajaur-I, PK-108 Kurram-I and PK-115 Ex-FRs. Candidates of JUI-F had returned at two of these constituencies, while one seat is won by PTI.

The number of political parties taking part in provincial elections dropped from 19 in GE-2018 to 10. According to Provisional Consolidated Results (Form-47), the independent candidates secured 39 percent of polled votes, while the remaining 61 percent voters were distributed amongst 10 political parties. PTI secured 25 percent, JUI-F 16 percent, JI eight percent, ANP seven percent, PPPP four percent and PML-N one percent of total polled votes. Remaining four parties secured less than one percent of polled votes. When compared with GE 2018, the overall vote bank of ANP, JI, JUI-F and PML-N has surged, while the vote bank of PTI and PPPP decreased during the NMDs’ elections. The winners in 16 constituencies secured a total of 241,335 votes, which are a third of the polled votes, while remaining two thirds did not translate in to any representation. The winner in only one constituency, PK-109 Kurram-II, secured a majority (52 percent) of the polled votes.
SECTION 1:
INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

PA elections for 16 seats of KP Assembly on July 20, 2019 marked the completion of the constitutional merger of tribal districts in the province a year after the passage of the 25th Constitutional Amendment. Promulgated in May 31, 2018, the Constitutional Amendment merged the seven tribal agencies and the Frontier Regions (FRs) with KP. It also provided the Newly Merged Districts (NMDs) and FRs representation in the provincial assembly allocating 21 seats to the region – 16 General Seats, four Reserved for Women and one for Non-Muslims.

FAFEN employed a multi-phased election observation methodology to observe the NMDs’ elections. Citizen observers were trained on the Elections Act, 2017, the Election Rules, and Election Commission of Pakistan’s (ECP) Code of Conduct for Domestic Observers. The scope and focus of each observation phase is described below:

1.1 Pre-Election Observation

Beginning in April 2019, FAFEN’s pre-election observation phase covered the observation of the local political environment and implementation of election-related laws and rules. A total of 16 Long Term Observers (LTOs) one in each constituency were deployed to observe the following processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of Electoral Rolls</td>
<td>FAFEN LTOs interviewed District Election Commissioners (DECs) to assess their efforts for coordination with stakeholders for the voter registration process prior to announcement of election program. FAFEN LTOs also conducted a day-long observation of National Database and Registration Authority’s (NADRA) Registration Centers (NRCs) the districts to assess the capacity of NRCs to facilitate citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Environment</td>
<td>FAFEN’s observation of the political environment included gathering the perceptions of contesting candidates regarding the level-playing field for electoral contestation and the fairness of critical electoral processes, including voter registration, delimitation, establishment of polling stations, nomination and scrutiny processes, and roles of election officials. Moreover, they also observed political gatherings and incidents of political and electoral violence in their respective constituencies. The observation also involved documenting the incidents of political and electoral violence reported in the local press.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Polling Stations</td>
<td>The observation of polling stations aimed to assess the compliance of the process with the timeline provided in the Elections Act, 2017 and the election rules. The assessment was made through observation of the Preliminary List of Polling Stations issued by ROs, hearings of objections on the preliminary list by DROs and voters’ perceptions regarding the fairness of the selection of polling station sites. FAFEN LTOs interviewed ROs and DROs and/or collected relevant information from their offices to assess adherence to the legally stipulated timeline for establishing polling stations. Additionally, LTOs visited the proposed sites of the polling stations and documented the availability of basic amenities including boundary walls, clean drinking water, toilets, and ramps for wheelchair-bound voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny Process of Nominated Candidates</td>
<td>FAFEN LTOs observed the entire scrutiny process of nominated candidates conducted in the offices of ROs during the period specified for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campaigning and Canvassing for Elections

In the sampled electoral areas, LTOs monitored the implementation of the ECP’s Code of Conduct for Political Parties and Contesting Candidates and documented the presence of campaign materials that defied the code. They also interviewed three citizens including one woman in each sampled electoral area, the basic geographical unit comprising of 200-250 households, to gauge their experience and perceptions regarding election processes.

Meetings with Election Officials

CCs observed ECP’s preparations for elections by interviewing DROs and ROs for documenting their perceptions about various election processes. Additionally, they also held meetings with ECP-appointed District Monitoring Officers (DMOs) during the final week of the campaign period.

1.2 Election Day Observation

For Election Day, FAFEN trained 953 nonpartisan citizen Election Day Observers to observe polling day processes at 1,617 polling stations. Each of these observers visited up to three polling stations on Election Day to directly observe and report on the election environment inside and outside polling stations, instances of electoral and political violence, pre-voting preparations at polling stations, and voting and counting processes inside polling stations.

This report is based on the observation from 1,357 polling stations by 859 observers. Of 1,357, observers were allowed entry to 1,170 polling stations including 420 male, 141 female and 609 combined polling stations, while the security officials at 187 polling stations barred them from entering the polling station premises. The observers spent a brief time-period of up to an hour at each polling station to record their observation using a standardized checklist. Inside polling stations, they observed the voting processes at 2,817 polling booths and conducted interviews of 1,080 Presiding Officers (PrO). After the close of polling, FAFEN observers also observed the counting process at 848 polling stations.

1.3 Post-Election Observation

FAFEN LTOs observed the process of finalizing provisional results in the offices of the ROs. Moreover, they would acquire the Statement of Assets and Liabilities (Form B) submitted with the nomination papers of the returned candidates under section 60(2)(d) of the Elections Act, 2017 and the Return of the Election Expenses (Form C) submitted under section 134 of the Elections Act, 2017.
SECTION 2:  
NMDs ELECTION RESULTS’ ANALYSIS

2.1 Voter registration increases, turnout drops

Despite a competitive election campaign with almost all major political parties vying for majority of the 16 PA seats, around 14 percent (116,476) less voters turned out to vote for NMDs’ elections in comparison with the General Elections (GE) 2018 conducted on National Assembly (NA) seats. As many as 735,775 voters turned out to exercise their franchise on July 20, 2019, whereas as many as 852,219 voted on July 25, 2018. The percentage turnout dropped from 34 percent in GE-2018 to 26 percent. The following figure shows the voter turnout in the region since GE-2002, disaggregated by districts and FRs.

Historical Turnout Trends in NMDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-FRs</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orakzai</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Waziristan</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Waziristan</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohmand</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurram</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khyber</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajaur</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plausibly, in addition to warm weather a significant factor leading to the drop in turnout may be the addition of those voters whose permanent addresses were in NMDs but their voters were registered on a third address. In order to comply with Section 27 of the Elections Act, 2017, ECP transferred these votes on the permanent addresses of the voters ahead of NMDs’ elections. Since GE-2018, the total number of registered voters in NMDs grew by 285,976 voters. As many as 179,594 of these voters were added to the electoral rolls during the seven months between August 2018 and April 2019 with an average monthly registration rate of 19,955 voters. The remaining 106,382 voters were added to the electoral rolls in only one month between April 9, 2019 and May 6, 2019 before the finalization of the electoral rolls under Section 39(2) of the Elections Act, 2017. A significant portion of these new voters may be of the NMDs’ diaspora living in other parts of the country but transferred on the electoral rolls due to their permanent addresses.

Historical trends reveal that the inter-election change in the polled votes have remained commensurate to the change in the registered voters since GE-2002 except for the change between GE-2018 and NMDs election. The number of polled votes showed a 14 percent decline despite an 11 percent growth in the number of registered voters. Following figure shows the rate of change in registered voters and polled votes between two consecutive elections since GE-2002.
2.2 Only a third of polled votes translated into representation

Winners in 16 constituencies secured a total of 241,335 votes, which are a third of the polled votes while remaining two thirds did not translate in to any representation.

The winner in PK-109 Kurram-II secured a majority (52 percent) of the polled votes, while the winners in 10 constituencies received between 20 percent and 30 percent of the polled votes. As many as four returned candidates received between 30 percent and 40 percent of the polled votes. One returned candidate secured 43 percent of the polled votes. Following figure shows the percentage of votes translating in representation in each constituency.
2.3 Lower women turnout

Generally, women voter turnout in NMDs elections remained lower than that of men. Overall, only 19 percent registered women voters polled their votes as compared to 31 percent registered men voters. All constituencies exhibited a similar pattern except PK-109 Kurram-II where women voter turnout (41 percent) was slightly higher than those of men (40 percent) voters. Of the remaining 15 constituencies, six recorded a women turnout between 21 percent and 29 percent, while seven constituencies had a turnout between 10 percent and 20 percent. The remaining two constituencies of Khyber and South Waziristan registered a turnout of seven percent. Following figure shows the constituency-wise distribution of gender-disaggregated and total turnouts in recent NMDs elections.

Under Section 9 of the Elections Act, 2017, the ECP may declare polling at one or more polling stations or election in a whole constituency void if the turnout of women voters remains less than 10 percent of the total votes polled in the constituency. Unlike the GE-2018 during which three constituencies including NA-48 North Waziristan had a women turnout below 10 percent of the total polled votes, none of the 16 constituencies in the NMDs’ elections had a turnout of women voters less than 10 percent. The two provincial assembly constituencies falling under NA-48 North Waziristan – PK-111 North Waziristan and PK-112 North Waziristan II – witnessed a turnout of 17 percent and 12 percent of the polled votes, respectively. Following figure shows the gender disaggregation of the polled votes in each constituency.
2.4 Decreased number of ballots excluded from the count

An analysis of Form-45 (Result of the Count) reveals that Presiding Officers (PrOs) excluded 11,747 (1.6 percent) ballots from the count at the polling stations in 16 constituencies. This number may slightly vary downwards in the final consolidated result as the ballots excluded from the count are reviewed by the ROs during the consolidation process, who may either reject them or count them in favor of a candidate, if excluded wrongly. The following figure shows the percentages of ballots excluded from the count in each constituency.
2.5 Margin of victory lower than excluded ballots

The number of ballots excluded from the count exceeded the Margin of Victory (MoV) in only three constituencies – PK-100 Bajaur-I, PK-108 Kurram-I and PK-115 Ex-FRs. Following table illustrates the distribution of these constituencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA Constituency</th>
<th>Winner Vote</th>
<th>Winner Party</th>
<th>Runner-up Vote</th>
<th>Runner-up Party</th>
<th>Margin of Victory</th>
<th>Excluded Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK-100 Bajaur-I</td>
<td>12,951</td>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>11,775</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-108 Kurram-I</td>
<td>11,948</td>
<td>JUI-F</td>
<td>11,517</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-115 Ex-FRs</td>
<td>18,102</td>
<td>JUI-F</td>
<td>18,028</td>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Section 95(5) of the Elections Act, 2017, if the MoV in any constituency is less than five percent of the total votes polled or 10,000, whichever is less, the RO shall recount the ballot papers in one or more polling stations on a request made by contesting candidates or their political agents.

The results from ten out of 16 constituencies warranted the recount under Section 95(5). On the contrary, according to ECP, the runner-up candidates in only three constituencies including PK-108, PK113 and PK-115 requested a recount. Following is a list of constituencies where MoV remained five percent of or 10,000 polled votes:

### Constituencies with MoV less than 5 percent of or 10,000 polled votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Constituencies</th>
<th>Total Polled Votes</th>
<th>Margin of Victory</th>
<th>MoV as Percent of Polled Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PK-100 Bajaur-I</td>
<td>52,298</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PK-101 Bajaur-II</td>
<td>47,187</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PK-103 Mohmand-I</td>
<td>40,048</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PK-104 Mohmand-II</td>
<td>48,052</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PK-107 Khyber-Ill</td>
<td>37,795</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PK-108 Kurram-I</td>
<td>45,504</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PK-111 North Waziristan-I</td>
<td>37,043</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PK-113 South Waziristan-I</td>
<td>35,318</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PK-114 South Waziristan-II</td>
<td>38,044</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PK-115 Ex-Frontier Regions</td>
<td>47,180</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of party vote bank

As many as 84 candidates from 10 political parties including Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI), Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam Fazl (JUI-F), Tehreek-e-Insami (TI), Jamat-e-Islami (JI), Awami National Party (ANP), Pakistan Peoples Party Parliamentarians (PPPP), Pakistan Muslim League Nawaz (PML-N), Qaumi Watan Party (QWP), Pak Sarzameen Party (PSP), Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam Sami (JUI-S) and Pakistan Awami Inquilabi League (PAI-L) contested the elections. The remaining 213 candidates were independents.
The number of political parties taking part in the NMDs’ elections dropped from 19 in GE-2018 to 10. Moreover, JUI-F and JI had taken part in the GE-2018 jointly from Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal Pakistan (MMAP).

According to Provisional Consolidated Results (Form-47), independent candidates secured a total of 284,774 (39 percent) votes while the remaining 439,134 (61 percent) voters were distributed among 10 political parties. PTI secured 182,023 (25 percent) votes, JUI-F 112,999 (16 percent), JI 56,204 (eight percent), and ANP 48,325 (seven percent). Moreover, PPPP got 28,049 (four percent), PML-N 8203 (one percent), while QWP, JUI-S and PSP received 2650, 364 and 317 votes, respectively. PAI-L did not receive any votes from the 16 constituencies.

When compared with GE-2018, the overall vote bank of ANP, MMAP (JI and JUI-F) and PML-N has increased, while the vote bank of PTI and PPPP declined. Following figures illustrates a party-wise analysis of the vote bank in NMDs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Party Vote bank during NMDs Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>PTI vote bank in NMDs declined by 11 percent in comparison with GE-2018 in the region. PTI nominated its candidates in 11 out of 12 NA constituencies during GE-2018, however, the party fielded candidates in all 16 PA constituencies during the NMDs elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANP</td>
<td>ANP vote bank in NMDs increased by nine percent in comparison to GE-2018 in the region. The party had nominated candidates in 10 out of 12 NA constituencies during GE-2018, while it fielded candidates on 14 out of 16 PA constituencies in NMDs’ elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMAP (JI and JUI-F)</td>
<td>The combined vote bank of JI and JUI-F, who contested GE-2018 as a coalition (MMAP) in GE-2018, have increased by 59 percent during NMDs elections. MMAP had nominated its candidates in nine out of 12 NA constituencies GE-2018. JUI and JI fielded candidates on 15 PA constituencies in recent elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PML-N</td>
<td>PML-N vote bank increased by 64 percent in NMDs’ elections in comparison to GE-2018 in the region. The party had nominated its candidates in seven out of 12 NA constituencies during GE-2018 while it fielded candidates in five constituencies during NMDs’ elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPPP</td>
<td>PPPP vote bank decreased by 49 percent in NMDs’ elections as in comparison to GE-2018. The party had nominated its candidates in 11 out of 12 NA constituencies during GE-2018, while it fielded candidates in 13 PA constituencies during the NMDs’ elections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: ELECTION DAY PROCESS ANALYSIS

1. PRE-VOTING PROCEEDINGS

1.1 Presence of Polling Agents at Polling Stations Prior to the Start of Voting

Of the total 1,170 polling stations observed, polling agents of candidates were reported to be present inside polling stations before the start of the voting process in 868 (74 percent) polling stations. Observers noted that polling agents were absent at the start of the voting process at 302 (26 percent) polling stations.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding presence of polling agents inside polling stations before start of polling process.

With regards to type of polling station, polling agents were present at 317 (75 percent) male polling stations, 115 (82 percent) female polling stations and 436 (72 percent) combined polling stations. Polling agents were absent from 103 (25 percent) male stations, 26 (18 percent) female stations, and 173 (28 percent) combined stations.
1.2 Sealing Ballot Boxes in Presence of Polling Agents

Of the total 1,170 polling stations observed, Presiding Officers (PrOs) sealed all ballot boxes in the presence of polling agents at 864 (74 percent) polling stations, but were observed to do so in the absence of polling agents at 306 (26 percent) polling stations.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding sealing of ballot boxes in presence of polling agents.

With regards to polling station type, PrOs sealed ballot boxes in the presence of polling agents at 317 (75 percent) male polling stations, 117 (83 percent) female polling stations and 430 (71 percent) combined polling stations. Conversely, the sealing of ballot boxes took place without the presence of polling agents in 103 (25 percent) male stations, 24 (17 percent) female stations and 179 (29 percent) combined polling stations.
1.3 Inspection of Ballot Boxes by the Polling Agents

Of the total 1,170 polling stations observed, PrOs took the signatures of polling agents on Form-42 (Statement regarding Inspection of Ballot Boxes Before Start of Poll) after showing them empty ballot boxes at 782 (67 percent) polling stations. Conversely, PrOs did not obtain the signatures on Form-42 at 388 (33 percent) polling stations.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding inspection of ballot boxes by the polling agents.
Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station reveals that PrOs acquired signatures of polling agents on Form-42 at 285 (68 percent) male, 108 (77 percent) female and 389 (64 percent) combined polling stations. Whereas, polling was started without the signing of Form-42 by polling agents at 135 (32 percent) male, 33 (23 percent) female, and 220 (36 percent) combined polling stations.

### 1.4 Objections by Polling Agents at Pre-Voting Proceedings

Of the total 1,170 polling stations observed, polling agents did not raise any objections regarding pre-voting proceedings at the majority 1,035 (88 percent) of polling stations. Polling agents raised objections to pre-poll proceedings in 135 (12 percent) polling stations.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding objections raised by polling agents before voting process.
Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station reveals that the polling agents objected the pre-poll process at 41 (ten percent) male, 15 (11 percent) female, and 79 (13 percent) combined polling stations. Polling stations where polling agents did not object to pre-poll proceedings included 379 (90 percent) male stations, 126 (89 percent) female stations, and 87 (530 percent) combined polling stations.

### Presence of Election Staff/Other Relevant Persons prior to Commencement of Voting Process

Of the total 1,170 polling stations observed, polling staff was present at 736 (63 percent), security staff at 746 (64 percent), observers at 664 (57 percent), contesting candidates at 101 (nine percent), and election agents at 529 (45 percent) polling stations prior to the start of the voting process.

The graphs below show the overall and polling station type-wise distribution of observations regarding presence of relevant persons including security staff prior to the commencement of voting process at polling stations.
Whether relevant persons was present prior to commencement of voting process, disaggregated by polling station type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polling Staff Present</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polling Staff Absent</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Official Present</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Official Absent</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Present</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Absent</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contesting Candidate Present</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contesting Candidate Absent</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Agent Present</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Agent Absent</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any Other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ARRANGEMENTS AT POLLING BOOTHs

2.1 Setting up of Polling Booths in Separate Rooms

Of the total 2,817 observed polling booths, 2,455 (87 percent) booths were set up in separate rooms of polling stations while the remaining 362 (13 percent) booths were established in one room at their respective polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about setting up of polling booths in separate rooms.

2.2 Presence of APOs for Provincial Assembly Election inside Polling Booths

Of 2,817 polling booths observed, Assistant Presiding Officers (APOs) were present at 2,558 (91 percent) booths, but absent at 259 (nine percent) booths at the time of visit by FAFEN Observers. Of these 2,558 polling booths, male APOs were present at 1,866 (73 percent) polling booths while female APOs were present at 692 (27 percent) booths.

The graph shows the constituency-wise details about presence of APOs at polling booths during observation time.
2.3 Presence of POs inside Polling Booths

Of 2,817 polling booths observed, FAFEN Observers found polling officers present at 2,539 (90 percent) booths but observed them absent at 278 (ten percent) booths at the time of visit by FAFEN Observers. Of these 2,539 polling booths, male POs were present at 1,840 (72 percent) polling booths while female POs were present at 699 (28 percent) polling booths.

The graph shows the constituency-wise details about presence of POs at polling booths during observation time.
2.4 Presence of Police or Any Other Person inside Polling Booths

Of 2,817 polling booths observed, police were present at 1,305 (46 percent) polling booths while the others security personnel were present at 907 (32 percent) booths. Presence of police or other security personnel was not observed at the remaining 605 (22 percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about presence of Police or any other Security Personnel inside polling booths.

2.5 Availability of Voting Screens at Polling Booths

Of the 2,817 polling booths observed, FAFEN observers reported that voting screens were placed at 2,340 (83 percent) of the booths while the remaining 477 (17 percent) polling booths had no voting screens.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about voting screens installed at polling booths.
2.6 Placement of Voting Screens Ensuring Privacy of Voters

Of the 2,817 polling booths observed, FAFEN observers reported that voting screens were placed at 2,149 (76 percent) polling booths in a manner that protected the privacy of the voter casting his/her vote. At the remaining 668 (24 percent) booths, voting screens were not placed in a manner that preserved the privacy of the vote-casting process.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about installation of voting screens whether ensuring voters’ privacy or not.
2.7 Direction of CCTV Cameras at Polling Booths

Of the 2,817 polling booths, Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras were installed at 542 (19 percent) booths in a manner that maintained the privacy of the vote-casting process but these were positioned at 2,281 (81 percent) polling booths in a way that breached voter privacy.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about installation of CCTV cameras whether compromising voters' privacy or not.

---

2.8 Presence of Polling Agents inside Polling Booths

Of the total 2,817 polling booths observed, one or more polling agents were present at 2,182 polling booths (77 percent). However, polling agents were not present at the remaining 635 (23 percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about presence of polling agents inside polling booths.
Whether polling agents present inside polling booths, disaggregated by constituency:

- PK-100 Bajaur-I: 220 (Yes), 22 (No)
- PK-101 Bajaur-II: 255 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-102 Bajaur-III: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- Mohmand-I: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- Mohmand-II: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- Mohmand-III: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-103 Khyber-I: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-104 Khyber-II: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-105 Khyber-III: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-106 Khyber-I: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-107 Khyber-II: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-108 Khyber-III: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-109 Kurram-I: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-110 Kurram-II: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-111 Kurram-III: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-112 Orakzai: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-113 N.Waziristan-I: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-114 N.Waziristan-II: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-115 N.Waziristan-III: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-116 S.Waziristan-I: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-117 S.Waziristan-II: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-118 S.Waziristan-III: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-119 S.Waziristan-IV: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-120 S.Waziristan-V: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-121 S.Waziristan-VI: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
- PK-122 S.Waziristan-VII: 211 (Yes), 21 (No)
3. VOTING PROCESS

According to the observation methodology, FAFEN observers had to stay at one polling booth in each polling station for a brief period to observe the voting process. Of the total 1,170 polling stations, observers were allowed to stay at 1,150 polling booths of the same polling stations.

3.1 Disorderly Conduct of Polling Process

Polling continued smoothly during the stay of FAFEN observers at 854 (74 percent) polling booths. However, observers reported disorderly situations at 296 (26 percent) of the observed polling booths.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about disorderly conduct of polling process at polling booths during the observation time.

3.2 Breaks during Voting Process

FAFEN observers reported instances of breaks during the voting process at 203 (18 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling booths. No break was observed at the remaining 947 (82 percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about breaks taken at polling booths during the observation time.
3.3 Barring Voters with NICs

FAFEN observers reported that at least one voter was prevented from casting his/her vote despite presenting a valid National Identity Card (NIC) at 54 (five percent) polling booths. No such observation was made at the remaining 1,096 (95 percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about incidents of barring voters with NICs at polling booths during the observation time.
3.4 Permitting Voting by Voters without NICs

FAFEN observers reported 62 instances at as many polling booths (five percent) where voters were allowed to vote after providing other identification documents like birth certificate, domicile, driving license etc. No such observation was made at 1,088 (95 percent) polling booths.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about incidents of permitting voters without NICs to vote at polling booths during the observation time.

3.5 Calling out Voters’ Names and Serial Numbers

FAFEN observers reported POs loudly calling out the name and serial (Silsila) number of each voter at 1,074 (93 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling booths. The required procedure was not observed in the remaining 76 (seven percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about calling out names and serial numbers of voters at polling booths during the observation time.
3.6 Omitting to Strikethrough Voters’ Names off Electoral Rolls

FAFEN observers reported that POs were crossed out each voter’s name and NIC number on the electoral rolls in majority 1,113 (97 percent) of the 1,150 polling booths observed. However, this procedure was not observed at remaining 37 (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about striking of the name of voters from electoral rolls by POs at polling booths during the observation time.
3.7 Omitting to Check Indelible Ink Marks on Voters’ Hands

POs were observed to be checking each voter’s fingers and thumbs for any signs of indelible ink at 1,102 (96 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling booths. However, the checks were omitted in the remaining 48 (four percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about checking indelible ink mark by POs at polling booths during the observation time.

3.8 Omitting to Obtain Voters’ Thumbprints on Electoral Rolls

FAFEN observers reported that voters’ thumbprints were being obtained on electoral rolls prior to the issuance of ballot papers at 1,120 (97 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling stations. However, the practice was not observed at the remaining 30 (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about obtaining voter’s thumbprints on electoral rolls at polling booths during the observation time.
3.9 Omitting to Enter Voters’ Serial Numbers on Counterfoils

Of the total 1,150 observed polling stations, FAFEN observers reported that APOs were seen entering voters’ serial numbers on counterfoils at 1,119 (97 percent) polling booths, whereas the required procedure was not observed at the remaining 31 (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about entering voter’s serial numbers at polling booths during the observation time.
3.10 Omitting to Enter Voters’ NIC Numbers on Counterfoils

FAFEN observers reported that APOs wrote down each voter’s NIC number on the counterfoil at 1,119 (97 percent) of the 1,150 polling booths observed. This procedure was not observed at the remaining 31 (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about noting voter’s NIC on counterfoil at polling booths during the observation time.

3.11 Omitting to Obtain Voters’ Thumbprints on Counterfoils

FAFEN observers noted that APOs obtained each voter’s thumb impression on the counterfoil at 1,117 (97 percent) of the 1,150 polling booths observed, whereas, this procedure was not observed at the remaining 33 (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about obtaining voter’s thumbprints on counterfoil at polling booths during the observation time.
3.12 Omitting to Sign Counterfoils

FAFEN observers reported that APOs were observed to be signing the counterfoils at 1,119 (97 percent) of the 1,150 polling booths observed whereas, they were not observed to be doing so at 31 polling booths (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about signing the counterfoil by APOs at polling booths during the observation time.
3.13 Omitting to Stamp Official Marks on Counterfoils

FAFEN observers reported that the APOs were stamping official marks on counterfoils at 1,120 (97 percent) of the 1,150 polling booths observed, whereas, this procedure was not observed at the remaining 30 (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about putting official signs on the counterfoil by APOs at polling booths during the observation time.

3.14 Omitting to Mark Voter’s Gender on Counterfoils

FAFEN observers reported that APOs were marking voters’ gender on counterfoils at 1,133 (99 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling booths. However, they were observed not doing so at the remaining 17 (one percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about marking gender details of voters on the counterfoil by APOs at polling booths during the observation time.
3.15 Omitting to Enter Voters’ Electoral Areas on Counterfoils

APOs were observed entering each voter’s electoral area on the counterfoil at 1,126 (98 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling booths. However, this process was not observed at the remaining 24 (two percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about giving details of voters’ electoral areas on the counterfoil by APOs at polling booths during the observation time.
### 3.16 Omitting to Stamp Official Mark on Backside of Ballot Papers

FAFEN observers reported that APOs were observed stamping official marks on the backside of each ballot paper at 1,115 (97 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling stations. However, they were reportedly not doing so at 35 (three percent) polling booths.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about putting official stamp on backside of ballot papers at polling booths during the observation time.

---

**Did APOs put official stamp on backside of ballot paper?**

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

---

### 3.17 Omitting to Sign on Backside of Ballot Papers

FAFEN observers reported that APOs were observed writing their signatures on the back side of each ballot paper at all 1,150 (100 percent) observed polling booths.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about APOs signing backside of ballot papers at polling booths during the observation time.

---

**Did APOs sign on backside of ballot papers?**

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%
3.18 Issuing Ballot Papers to Voters Refusing to Mark Thumb Impressions on Counterfoils

APOs did not issue ballot papers to voters who refused to mark their thumbprints on counterfoils at 1,113 (97 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling booths. However, they were observed to do so at the remaining 37 (three percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about APOs issuing ballot papers to those voters who refused to put thumbprints on counterfoil at polling booths during the observation time.
3.19 Unauthorized Persons Accompanying Voters behind Voting Screens

FAFEN observers reported that voters were accompanied by unauthorized persons behind voting/secrecy screens at 130 (11 percent) of the 1,150 observed polling booths. However, no such observation was made at the remaining 1,020 (89 percent).

The graph below shows the constituency-wise details about unauthorized person going behind the voting screen with voters at polling booths during the observation time.
4. CAMPAIGNING AND CANVASSING ON ELECTION DAY

4.1 Party Camps in Polling Station Surroundings

FAFEN observers reported the presence of an election camp in a polling station’s surrounding area at 759 (65 percent) of 1,170 observed polling stations. No election camp was established at the remaining 411 (35 percent).

Following graph show the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding presence of election camps in the surrounding areas of polling stations.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that election camps were present at 249 (59 percent) male polling stations, 78 (55 percent) female polling stations and 432 (71 percent) combined polling stations observed. On the other hand, election camps had not been established at 171 (41 percent) male stations, 63 (45 percent) female stations, and 177 (29 percent) combined polling stations.
4.2 Presence of Armed Persons inside Party Camps

FAFEN observers reported that armed persons were present inside party camps near 47 (six percent) polling stations, while no armed persons were seen at 712 (94 percent) of polling stations. The observers did not report presence of party camps outside at the remaining 411 (35 percent) polling stations.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding presence of election camps in the surrounding areas of polling stations.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that armed persons were present inside party camps at 20 (42 percent) male polling stations, seven (15 percent) female polling stations and 20 (43 percent) combined polling stations.
4.3 Provision of Transport Services to Voters

FAFEN observers reported that party workers or supporters of candidates provided transportation to voters to and/or from polling stations at 254 (22 percent) of 1,170 observed polling stations. The violation was not observed at 916 (78 percent) polling stations.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding provision of transport services to voters.

Disaggregation of the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that party workers or candidate supporters provided transportation to voters at 93 (22 percent) male polling stations, 33 (23 percent) female polling stations and 128 (21 percent) combined polling stations observed. Polling stations at which this observation was not made included 327 (78 percent) male stations, 108 (77 percent) female stations, and 481 (79 percent) combined polling stations.
4.4 Display of Campaign Material inside Polling Stations

FAFEN observers reported that campaign materials such as posters, banners and flags were displayed inside 14 (one percent) of the 1,170 polling stations observed. The violation was not observed in the overwhelming majority 1,156 (99 percent) of polling stations.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations regarding display of campaign material inside polling stations.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that campaign materials were displayed around one percent polling stations including five male polling stations, one female polling station and eight combined polling stations. No campaign material was observed inside at remaining o the male, female and combined polling stations.
4.5 **Voters Barred to Cast Vote Inside or Outside the Polling Station**

Of 1,170 polling stations observed across the NMDs, FAFEN observers reported no such case in which voter was barred to cast vote either inside or outside the polling station building at 1169 (99.9 percent) polling stations. Only one incident of barring voters outside the building of a polling station was reported from PK-102 Bajaur-III.

Following graph shows the constituency-wise distribution of observations inside and outside the polling stations regarding cases of barring voters to cast vote.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows no incident of barring voters present inside the polling station building as well as outside the polling stations at observed male and female polling stations. However, one such incident was observed outside a combined polling station.

---

**Are you ready to go?**

**Yes**

**No**

---

**Were voters barred to cast vote inside or outside the polling station?**

**Yes**

**No**

---

**Whether voters barred to cast vote inside or outside the PS, disaggregated by constituency?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK-100 Bajaur-I</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-101 Bajaur-II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-102 Bajaur-III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-103 Mohmand-I</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-104 Mohmand-II</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-105 Khyber-I</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-106 Khyber-II</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-107 Khyber-III</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-108 Khyber-IV</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-109 Orakzai</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-110 N.Waziristan-I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-111 N.Waziristan-II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-112 N.Waziristan-III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-113 S.Waziristan-I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-114 S.Waziristan-II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-115 S.Waziristan-III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Whether voters barred to cast vote, disaggregated by PS type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Yes**

**No**
5. ELECTION DAY SECURITY

5.1 Presence of Security Officials outside Polling Stations

Of 1,170 polling stations where security arrangements were observed, FAFEN observers reported that security officials were present outside 1,085 (93 percent) polling stations while security officials were not observed outside 85 (seven percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where security staff was present outside polling stations.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station reveals that security officials were present outside 392 (93 percent) male polling stations, 130 (92 percent) female polling stations and 563 (92 percent) combined polling stations. Polling stations where security officials were not seen outside included 28 (seven percent) male stations, eleven (eight percent) female stations, and 46 (eight percent) combined polling stations.
5.2 Security Officials Checking NICs before Allowing Voters to Enter Polling Stations

Of 1,170 polling stations where security arrangements were observed, FAFEN observers reported that contrary to the ECP Code of Conduct for Security Officials, these officials were checking NICs of voters before allowing them to enter polling stations at a majority of 992 (85 percent) polling stations. Security officials were not violating this provision of their code of conduct at a minority of 178 (15 percent) polling stations. The ECP’s Code of Conduct for Security Officials says that the security personnel belonging to law enforcement agencies deputed on election duty shall not ask the voters to produce their “Perchees” or prove their identity as this is the duty of PO.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where security officials were checking NICs before allowing voters to enter polling stations

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station reveals that security officials were checking voters’ NICs at 363 (86 percent) male polling stations, 110 (78 percent) female polling stations and 519 (85 percent) combined polling stations. Polling stations where no such occurrence was reported included 57 (14 percent) male stations, 31 (22 percent) female stations, and 90 (15 percent) combined polling stations.
Of 1,170 polling stations where security arrangements were observed, FAFEN observers reported that contrary to the ECP Code of Conduct for Security Officials, these officials were checking vote chits ("perchees") at a majority of 671 (57 percent) polling stations. Security officials were not violating this provision of their code of conduct at a minority of 499 (43 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where security officials were checking chits before allowing voters to enter polling stations.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that security officials were checking voter chits at 262 (62 percent) male polling stations, 70 (50 percent) female polling stations and 339 (56 percent) combined polling stations. Polling stations where no such occurrence was reported included 158 (38 percent) male stations, 71 (50 percent) female stations, and 270 (44 percent) combined polling stations.
5.4 Security Personnel Body-Searching Voters at Polling Station Entry Gates

Of 1,170 polling stations where security arrangements were observed, FAFEN observers reported that security officials were searching (or “frisking”) voters before permitting them to enter polling stations at the majority (982 or 84 percent) of polling stations. However, they were reportedly not doing so at 188 (16 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where security officials were searching voters at polling station entry gates.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that security officials searched voters before allowing them to enter polling stations at 354 (84 percent) male polling stations, 105 (74 percent) female polling stations and 523 (86 percent) combined polling stations. Polling stations where security officials did not search voters included 66 (16 percent) male stations, 36 (26 percent) female stations, and 86 (14 percent) combined polling stations.
5.5 Security Personnel Permitting Voters to Carry Phones inside Polling Stations

Of 1,170 polling stations where security arrangements were observed, FAFEN observers reported that security officials allowed the voters to bring mobile phone inside the polling stations at 151 (13 percent) polling stations. Voters were barred from carrying mobile phones inside at the majority (1,019 or 87 percent) of polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where security personnel permitted voters to carry cell phones inside polling stations.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station reveals that security officials allowed voters to enter polling stations with mobile phones at 40 (10 percent) male polling stations, 27 (19 percent) female polling stations and 84 (14 percent) combined polling stations. Polling stations where security staff disallowed voters from carrying mobile phones included 380 (90 percent) male stations, 114 (81 percent) female stations, and 525 (86 percent) combined polling stations.
5.6 Security Staff Permitting Journalists to Carry Cameras inside Polling Stations

Of 1,170 polling stations where security arrangements were observed, FAFEN observers reported that the security officials allowed media persons to bring cameras inside the polling station at 199 (17 percent) polling stations. Media were disallowed from doing so at the majority (971 or 83 percent) of polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where security personnel permitted journalists to carry cameras inside polling stations.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that security officials allowed media persons to bring cameras inside the polling station at 71 (17 percent) male polling stations, 30 (21 percent) female polling stations and 98 (16 percent) combined polling stations. Polling stations at which security officials did not allow media cameras included 349 (83 percent) male stations, 111 (79 percent) female stations, and 511 (84 percent) combined polling stations.
### 5.7 Presence of Security Personnel inside Polling Stations

Of 1,170 polling stations observed across the NMDs, FAFEN observers reported the presence of security personnel inside polling station buildings at 954 (82 percent) polling stations. However, they were not observed to be inside polling stations at the time of observation in 216 (18 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where security personnel were present inside polling stations.

With regard to type of polling stations, security personnel were present at 358 (85 percent) male polling stations, 107 (76 percent) female polling stations and 489 (80 percent) combined polling stations. They were not observed inside 62 (15 percent) male stations, 34 (24 percent) female stations, and 120 (20 percent) combined polling stations.
5.8 PrOs Exercising Magisterial Powers

Of 848 polling stations in which the counting process was observed, FAFEN observers reported that none of the PrOs exercised their magisterial powers at any of the 319 male, 96 female and 433 combined polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where Presiding Officer used magisterial powers.
6. SPECIAL MEASURES FOR MARGINALIZED GROUPS

6.1 Ramps for Wheelchair-bound Voters

FAFEN observers reported that ramps for persons with disabilities (PWDs), especially wheelchair-bound voters, were available at 500 (43 percent) of the 1,170 observed polling stations. However, ramps were not found at the majority (670 or 57 percent) of polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where ramp was found.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that ramps were available at 149 (35 percent) male polling stations, 51 (36 percent) female polling stations and 300 (49 percent) combined polling stations observed. Ramps were reportedly not available at 271 (65 percent) male stations, 90 (64 percent) female stations, and 309 (51 percent) combined polling stations.
7. MONITORING AND OBSERVATION

7.1 Permission to Observe Polling Stations

Of the total 1,357 polling stations where Election Day observers were deployed for observation, FAFEN observers reported entry without hindrance at the majority (750 or 55 percent) of polling stations. However, they were reportedly allowed entry at 420 (31 percent) polling stations only after discussing the matter with security and/or polling staff, whereas, they were barred from observing polling processes altogether at 187 (14 percent) polling stations.

The constituency-wise breakdown of the observers allowed or barred from polling stations is given below.

Disaggregating the data by type of polling station, the observers were allowed to enter 273 male, 86 female and 391 combined polling stations. Moreover, the observers got permission to enter an additional 147 male, 55 female and 218 combined polling stations after brief discussion with security officials. Conversely, they were not allowed to enter 25 male, 72 female and 90 combined polling stations.
7.2 Permission to Observe Polling Booths inside Polling Stations

FAFEN Observers obtained permission to observe polling booths without hindrance at 703 (60 percent) of 1,170 polling stations. At 447 (38 percent) polling stations, they were allowed entry after discussion or debate with security and/or polling staff, whereas they were prohibited altogether at 20 (two percent) polling stations.

The constituency-wise breakdown of the observers allowed or barred from polling stations is given below.
8. RESULT MANAGEMENT PROCESS

8.1 Voters Present inside Polling Stations after Close of Poll Hours Allowed to Vote

FAFEN observers reported that voters were present in polling station premises after the close of poll hours, i.e. 1700 hours were allowed to cast vote at 486 (57 percent) of 848 observed polling stations. However, voters present inside polling station building were not allowed to cast vote after poll hours at 362 (43 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of observed polling stations where permission was granted to cast vote after close of poll hours.

Disaggregation of the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that voters were allowed to vote after close of poll hours at 178 (56 percent) out of 319 male polling stations and disallowed at the remaining 141 (44 percent). Likewise, 55 (57 percent) out 96 female polling stations were such where voting was allowed while they were disallowed at 41 (43 percent) female polling stations. The voters at 253 (58 percent) out of 433 combined polling stations were allowed to vote while disallowed at 180 (42 percent) polling station to cast vote after 1700 hours.
8.2 Observation of Counting Process

FAFEN observers attempted to witness the counting process at 848 polling stations. Of these polling stations, observers faced no restriction at 731 (86 percent) polling stations while they were allowed to observe the process at 99 (12 percent) polling stations only after discussing the matter with security or polling staff. The observers were barred from observing the counting process at the remaining 18 (two percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where observers were allowed/barred to observe vote counting process.

An analysis of the observation data with regards to types of the polling stations shows that observers reported no hindrance to enter 277 (87 percent) male polling stations, 35 (11 percent) male polling stations were such that entry was allowed after discussion with security/polling staff, and observers were barred from witnessing the counting process at seven (two percent) male polling stations. FAFEN observers reported that 373 (86 percent) combined polling stations were such that observers faced no difficulty to enter, while permission was granted to observers at 55 (13 percent) polling stations after debate with security/polling staff. In five (one percent) combined polling stations, observation of counting processes was barred.
### Presence of Authorized Polling Agents/Candidates/Election Agents during Vote Counting Process

Authorized polling agents, candidates or their election agents were reported to be present during the vote-counting process at 772 (91 percent) of the 848 polling stations where the counting process was observed. However, candidates or their agents were reportedly not present at the remaining 76 (nine percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where authorized polling agents/candidates/election agents were present/absent during Vote-Counting Process.

With regard to type of polling station, polling agents, candidates or their polling election agents were present during the vote-counting process at 286 (90 percent) male polling stations, 86 (90 percent) female polling stations and 33 (92 percent) combined polling stations observed. However, they were reportedly not present at 33 (10 percent) male stations, ten (10 percent) female stations, and 33 (eight percent) combined polling station.
8.4 Gathering Ballot Boxes at Central Place for Counting

At 748 (88 percent) of the 848 polling stations where counting process was observed, ballot boxes of all polling booths were gathered at a central place for vote counting. However, ballot boxes were reportedly not gathered at a central place at 100 (12 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where ballot boxes were gathered/not gathered at one place for the counting process.

Disaggregating the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that ballot boxes were taken to a central place for counting at 276 (87 percent) male polling stations, 81 (84 percent) female polling stations and 391 (90 percent) combined polling stations. However, the practice was not observed at 43 (13 percent) male stations, 15 (16 percent) female stations, and 42 (10 percent) combined polling stations.
8.5 Touching or Counting of Ballot Papers by Unauthorized Persons

Unauthorized persons were reported to be touching or counting ballot papers during the vote-counting process at the 19 or four percent of 848 observed polling stations. However, polling agents at 274 (52 percent) and security officials at 235 (45 percent) were observed to be doing the same at 507 (38 percent) polling stations. The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where unauthorized persons were touching or counting ballot papers during the vote-counting process.

Disaggregation of the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that ballot papers were touched or counted by unauthorized persons at six (one percent) male polling stations, five (three percent) female polling stations and eight (one percent) combined polling stations.
8.6 Counting Ballot Papers of Each Candidate Twice

After the ballots were divided into piles for each candidate, polling staff counted each candidate’s ballots twice at 603 (71 percent) of 848 observed polling stations. However, the required procedure was reportedly not followed at the remaining 245 (29 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where polling staff counted each candidate’s ballot papers after the ballots were divided into piles for each candidate.

Disaggregation of the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that polling staff counted each candidate’s ballots twice at 222 (70 percent) male polling stations, 74 (77 percent) female polling stations and 307 (71 percent) combined polling stations observed. On the other hand, this important procedure was not implemented at 97 (30 percent) male stations, 22 (23 percent) female stations, and 126 (29 percent) combined polling stations.
8.7 Recounting of Votes at Polling Stations

Of the 848 polling stations where counting process was observed, Presiding Officers re-counted the votes for each candidate at the majority (618 or 73 percent) of polling stations while they conducted the recount on demand of Polling Agents at 40 (five percent) polling stations. However, re-counting was reportedly not conducted at the remaining 190 (22 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where presiding officer re-counted/not re-counted the votes for each candidates.

Disaggregation of the observation data with regards to type of polling station reveals that PrOs recounted the vote tallies at 217 (68 percent) male polling stations, 68 (71 percent) female polling stations and 333 (77 percent) combined polling stations observation. The PrOs conducted recount on demand of polling agents at 22 (seven percent) male polling stations, four (four percent) female polling stations and 14 (three percent) combined polling stations. Re-counting was not conducted at 80 (25 percent) male stations, 24 (25 percent) female stations, and 86 (20 percent) combined polling stations.
8.8 Refusal of Candidate, Election Agent or Polling Agent to Sign Form-45

A contesting candidate, election agent or polling agent refused to sign Form-45 at 18 (two percent) of 848 observed polling stations in which counting process was observed while no candidate or agent refused to sign Form-45 at majority of the (830 or 98 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where contesting candidate, election agent or polling agent refused/accepted to sign Form-45

Disaggregation of the observation data with regards to type of polling station reveals that a contesting candidate, election agent or polling agent refused to sign Form-45 at 13 (four percent) male polling stations, four (four percent) female polling stations and one (less than one percent) combined polling stations observed. No such incident was reported at 306 (96 percent) male polling stations, 92 (96 percent) female polling stations, and 432 (more than 99 percent) combined polling stations.
The PrOs provided a copy of Form-45 to contesting candidates or their election agent or polling agent at 649 (77 percent) of 848 observed polling stations. However, copies of Form-45 were not provided to candidates or their agent in 199 (23 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where Presiding Officer provided a copy of Form-45 to each contesting candidate or agents.

Disaggregation of the observation data with regards to type of polling station shows that PrOs provided copies of Form-45 to contesting candidates or their agents at 256 (39 percent) male polling stations, 66 (10 percent) female polling stations and 327 (51 percent) combined polling stations observed. Copies were not provided at 63 (32 percent) male stations, 30 (15 percent) female stations, and 106 (53 percent) combined polling stations.
8.10 **Affixing Form-45 at Conspicuous Place Outside Polling Station**

The PrOs affixed a copy of Form-45 at a conspicuous place outside each of 547 (64 percent) of 848 observed polling stations. However, they did not follow this essential procedure in 301 (36 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where Presiding Officer affixed/not affixed a copy of Form-45 at Conspicuous Place outside the Polling Station.

With regard to type of polling station, PrOs appropriately affixed copies of Form-45 at 202 (37 percent) male polling stations, 55 (10 percent) female polling stations and 290 (53 percent) combined polling stations observed. Polling stations where copies were not appropriately affixed included 117 (39 percent) male polling stations, 41 (13 percent) female stations, and 143 (48 percent) combined polling stations.
8.11 Affixing Form-46 at Conspicuous Place Outside Polling Station

The PrOs affixed a copy of Form-46 at a conspicuous place outside each of 415 (49 percent) of 848 observed polling stations. However, they reportedly did not follow this essential procedure in 433 (51 percent) polling stations.

The graph below shows the constituency-wise distribution of those polling stations where Presiding Officer affixed/not affixed a copy of Form-46 at Conspicuous Place outside the Polling Station.

With regard to type of polling station, PrOs appropriately affixed copies of Form-46 at 1592 (38 percent) male polling stations, 47 (11 percent) female polling stations and 209 (51 percent) combined polling stations observed. Polling stations where copies were not appropriately affixed included 160 (37 percent) male polling stations, 49 (11 percent) female stations, and 224 (52 percent) combined polling stations.

![Diagram showing constituency-wise distribution of polling stations where Form-46 was affixed/not affixed]

![Diagram showing type-wise distribution of polling stations where Form-46 was affixed/not affixed]
SECTION-4:
PRE-ELECTION ENVIRONMENT

FAFEN initiated its assessment of the political environment and implementation of election-related laws, rules and regulations in April 2019 as part of its multi-phased observation in NMDs through 16 LTOs.

During the pre-election phase, FAFEN LTOs systematically gathered through interviews of 3,132 citizens in 663 sampled electoral areas of 16 constituencies, 203 contesting candidates and observation of 111 political gatherings and the overall election campaign environment. In order to understand the election preparedness, FAFEN observers also conducted interviews with all relevant election officials, including DROs, ROs and DECs to know about their preparedness for the elections as per elections related laws.

4.1 Voter registration

According to Final List of Polling Stations (Form-28), as many as 2,798,277 citizens were registered as voters in NMDs, which are 285,976 (11 percent) more than the number of registered voters in GE-2018. All seven districts and FRs registered a growth in registered voters since GE-2018. South Waziristan had the highest growth of 19 percent, while Kurram had a lowest growth rate of seven percent. Following figure shows the growth rate in each district and FRs.

A comparison between the population and the registered voters at census block level indicates that less than 10 percent population of around seven percent census blocks in NMDs is registered as voters. Astonishingly, there are 753 census blocks with a number of registered voters higher than their population recorded during the 2017 Population Census. Presumably, these voters may be from the NMDs diaspora whose votes were transferred to their permanent address in compliance with the Elections Act, 2017. Moreover, around 20 census blocks have no population, while 11 census blocks have no registered voters but an inhabiting population. Following figure shows the number of census blocks categorized by the percentage of population that is registered as voters.
4.2 Delimitation of constituencies

Pursuant to 25th Constitutional Amendment for the merger of Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) with KP, the number of total seats in KP Assembly increased from 124 to 145. Despite geographical challenges to delimit constituencies, the ECP carried out the process in an efficient manner for timely conduct of NMDs elections. Earlier the Federal Government on January 1, 2019 had also authorized the ECP to group two more separate areas into one constituency for NMDs' elections.

Delimitation process was carried out through using district-wise provisional population data of 2017 Population Census, and the maps provided by the revenue department of KP government. The district-wise seat share, and a draft list of delimitation for NMDs was published on January 2, 2019. ECP had asked for the representation/objections on the preliminary report of delimitation until February 1, 2019. However, the committee received only 16 representations on the preliminary report submitted by 10 individuals. The delimitation committee started the hearings of these representations/objections from February 3, 2019 to March 1, 2019, and published the final list of delimitation on March 4, 2019.

4.3 Contestation for elections

A total of 476 candidates filed their nomination papers with the ROs. Following the scrutiny process 425 nomination papers were accepted, while the remaining 51 were rejected. A majority of the rejected nomination papers were filed for the five seats reserved for women and non-Muslims. The Lists of Contesting Candidates (Form-33) issued on May 29, 2019 after decisions on appeals against ROs' orders regarding rejection or acceptance of the nomination papers and the withdrawal of the candidates had 297 candidates including two women contesting on general seats.

FAFEN LTOs conducted the observation of the scrutiny process of nomination papers submitted by 275 candidates in NMDs. However, they were completely barred from observing the scrutiny process in four constituencies including PK-103 (Mohmand-I), PK-104 (Mohmand-II), PK-114 (South Waziristan II) and PK-115 (Ex-Frontier Regions). Moreover, the observation was partially restricted in PK-108 (Kurram I), PK-109 (Kurram II), PK-111 (North Waziristan I) and PK112 (North Waziristan II).

LTOs observed that the ROs followed a uniform process to scrutinize the nomination papers of candidates in accordance with legal and regulatory requirements. DROs and ROs deployed in NMDs were already serving as DEC in either the NMDs or other regions of Pakistan. FAFEN observers reported that ROs did not ask any undue, irrelevant or subjective questions for ascertaining the candidates' eligibility. ROs were observed to be fulfilling the minimum administrative criteria of checking the legal age and voter registration of candidates vying to contest election, and did not seek assistance from relevant authorities/organizations in verifying/validating the information provided by candidates.
### 4.4 Finalization of polling stations

The ECP had set up 1,896 PS comprising 5,651 polling booths for 2,798,277 registered voters, averaging one polling station for 1,476 voters. The average number of voters per polling station was marginally higher than it was in GE 2018, when 1,333 voters were assigned to each polling station on an average.

In comparison to GE-2018, as many as 285,976 voters increased on the electoral rolls for the NMDs’ election. The number of male voters increased up to 9.5 percent (159,873 voters) and female voters up to 11 percent (126,103 voters). The graph below illustrates the district-wise analysis of polling stations and registered voters of GE-2018 and NMDs’ election.

Out of total 1,896 polling stations set-up for July 20, 2019 in seven districts and Ex-FRs – 482 male, 376 female and 1,038 combined polling stations. The total number of polling stations included the 44 set up in Hangu and Kohat for the Internally Displaced Voters from PK-110 (Orakzai), and 14 in Bannu for Internally Displaced Voters from PK-112 (North Waziristan-II).

#### 4.4.1 Constituency-wise Distribution of PS Designated as Highly Sensitive

Section 59 (12) of the Elections Act, 2017 empowers DROs to declare a polling station highly sensitive if, in their assessment, the concerned polling station requires special security measures. Of 1,896 PS, ECP designated 554 (approx. 29%) PS as highly sensitive and 461 (approx. 24%) as sensitive on polling day. ECP sought assistance from Pakistan Armed Forces in making necessary security arrangements. The armed forces were deployed outside all polling stations for four days from July 18, 2019 to July 21, 2019. Additionally, they were also stationed inside the highly sensitive polling stations. Similarly, the troops were deployed at RO offices till the consolidation of the results. The ECP also authorized the designated officer in-charge of armed forces to exercise powers of magistrate first class for entire duration of their deployment in respect of offences under sections 169 (personation) and 171 (capturing of a polling station or polling booth) punishable under section 174 of the Elections Act, 2017 and took cognizance of any such offences under any of the clauses of sub-section (1) of section 190 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

#### 4.4.2 Number of PS Less or More than 1,200 Voters

Section 59(3) of the Elections Act, 2017 limits the number of voters per polling station and polling booth to 1,200 and 300 voters respectively, as far as practicable, in order to improve the efficiency of the polling process.
A comparison between the polling stations set up for GE-2018 and NMDs’ elections, the number of PS with more than 1,200 votes increased up to 7 percent. As many as 65% or 1,236 were assigned more than 1,200 voters for NMDs’ elections, while 1,100 PS (58%) in GE-2018 had more than 1200 voters. Table below shows the district-wise distribution of PS exceeding limit of 1,200 voters in GE-2018 in comparison to NMDs’ Election 2019.

### District-wise distribution of PS exceeding limit of 1,200 voters in GE-2018 in comparison to NMDs’ election 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>GE 2018</th>
<th>NMDs’ Election 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bajaur</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohmand</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khyber</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurram</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orakzai</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Waziristan</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Waziristan</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-FRs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.3 Gender-wise Distribution of Polling Booths in each constituency

According to the final list of polling stations, a total of 5,651 booths were set up at 1,896 PS. Nearly 61 percent (or 3,436) of the polling booths were set up for men, who constitute almost 60% of the NMD’s registered voters, while the remaining (39% or 2,215) polling booths were for women.

### 4.5 Security conditions

In order to preempt any untoward incident on Election Day, the ECP exercising its powers under Articles 220 and 245 of the Constitution had positioned a three-tier security system deploying over 34,000 personnel of armed forces alongside police and other law enforcement agencies inside and outside polling stations. More than 50 percent (1,015 or 53.5% of 1,896 polling stations) were marked sensitive or highly sensitive. Security forces were deployed outside all the polling stations and inside the polling booths in highly sensitive polling stations. The Commission had also directed the Provincial Government to install CCTVs at all polling booths.

### 4.6 Inclusion

#### 4.6.1 Women Voting

During its pre-election observation, FAFEN interviewed 3,132 citizens of 663 electoral areas in all PA constituencies of NMDs. As many as 265 interviewed citizens (258 men and seven women) from 99 electoral areas reported that women in their areas may not be able to cast their votes during NMDs’ elections due to various barriers including socio-cultural norms, distances and accessibility to polling stations, low literacy rate, less electoral and civic education, etc. A majority of these citizens (138 citizens or 52 percent) claiming restrictions on women’s voting were from 41 electoral areas of PK-112 North Waziristan II.

On July 20, 2019, 19 percent of the total registered women voters in NMDs cast their votes despite provision of reasonable facilities including female security and election staff. FAFEN observers highlighted the installation of security cameras inside and outside polling stations amongst one reason of this low turnout.

#### 4.6.2 IDPs

The ECP had set-up 44 polling stations in Hangu and Kohat for the Internally Displaced Voters from PK-110 (Orakzai), and 14 in Bannu for Internally Displaced Voters from PK-112 (North Waziristan-II).