2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Gender Perspective

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

```
CEC Central Electoral Commission
CCET Center for Continuous Electoral Training
DEC II District Electoral Council (second level)
DEC I District Electoral Council (first level)
PEB Precint Electoral Bureau
```

Since 2014, UNDP Moldova has supported the Central Electoral Commission in developing and presenting the analysis of elections from a gender equality perspective. The infographic set concerning the number and share of women and men involved in the electoral processes was presented to the general public after each national election exercise.

The first round of Moldovan Presidential Elections was conducted on 1 November 2020 with the participation of $\mathbf{1 3 6 4 5 9 7}$ voters or $\mathbf{4 8 . 8 1 \%}$ of the total number of citizens with voting rights. The second round of elections was held on 15 November 2020, and the voter turnout reached $\mathbf{5 9 . 0 1 \%}$ constituting 1650131 voters.

This infographic set represents the Presidential Elections from the gender perspective, describing the data for: Electoral Management, Training of Electoral Officials, Election Observation, Electoral Contestants, Voter Participation (first and second rounds), Out-of-Country Voting and Voter Participation (comparative analysis)

The infographic set also comprises data on the voters' age and geographical location criteria. It highlights the most active localities from the Republic of Moldova and out-of-country in terms of voter turnout.


## 1. ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT

More women than men were involved in organising and conducting the 2020 Presidential Elections. Hence, men accounted for $\mathbf{3 8 . 3} \%$ of the District Electoral Council (DEC) members and for slightly above $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ of the Precinct Electoral Bureau (PEB) members.

In comparison with the 2016 Presidential Elections, the number of women holding the position of DEC
Chairperson increased ( $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ in 2020 compared to $31 \%$ in 2016). The number of women holding the position of Deputy Chairperson also rose: 53\% in $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ compared to $\mathbf{4 3} \%$ in 2016. Likewise, the number of women acting as DEC Secretary and DEC Member increased further in 2020 as compared to 2016.

As for the PEB composition, women constituted the overwhelming majority, while the number of men for all four positions (of Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Secretary, and Member) dropped in comparison with 2016.

## 1. Electoral management

### 1.1 Composition of the Central Electoral Commission


1.2 Composition of the electoral management bodies

|  | $A$ women | men |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| DEC | $61.7 \%$ | $38.3 \%$ |
| PEB | $83.8 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ |

1.3 Composition of the electoral management bodies (by function)

| DEC | 2016 | Chairperson |  | Deputy Chairperson |  | Secretary |  | Member |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2 | 星 | 2 | 8 | 2 | A | 2 |
|  | 2020 | 31\% | 69\% | 43\% | 57\% | 74\% | 26\% | 46\% | 54\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 47\% | 53\% | 53\% | 47\% | 83\% | 17\% | 67\% | 33\% |
| PEB | 2016 | - | 2 | - | 2 | A | 2 | A | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 77\% | 23\% | 76\% | 24\% | 95\% | 5\% | 79\% | 21\% |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  |  | 84\% | 16\% | 78\% | 22\% | 96\% | 4\% | 82\% | 18\% |

## 2. TRAINING OF ELECTORAL OFFICIALS

More than $\mathbf{5} 500$ persons, of whom 77\% were women, had been trained by the Centre for Continuous Electoral Training to fill in the electoral officials' positions during the Presidential Elections held in November 2020. Likewise, other $\mathbf{3} 338$ persons, of whom slightly more than $\mathbf{7 0 \%}$ were women, had been trained to fill in the operator positions within the Precinct Electoral Bureaus.

In comparison with the 2016 Presidential Elections, the number of men trained as DEC electoral officials decreased from $\mathbf{5 0} \%$ in 2016 to $\mathbf{3 5 . 7 \%}$ in 2020. Instead, the number of men trained as PEB electoral officials rose by a small margin: 17\% in $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ vs. 22.6\% in 2020

## 2. Training of electoral officials

| 2.1 Trained electoral officials (total) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{A}$ women | men |
| 4237 | 1271 |
| $76.9 \%$ | $23.1 \%$ |

2.3 PEB electoral officials trained

| 是 |
| :---: |
| 4100 |
| $77.4 \%$ |

2.2 DEC electoral officials trained

| 137 | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $64.3 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ |

2.4 PEB operators trained

| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2340 | 998 |
| $70.1 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ |

2.5 Comparative analysis of trained electoral officials


## 3. ELECTION OBSERVATION

The 2020 Presidential Elections were conducted under the COVID-19 pandemic conditions, which was the main cause of the drop in the number of both national and international observers as compared to the 2016 Presidential Elections. Hence, overall, 2364 national and international observers, of whom 46.6\% were women, monitored the electoral process.

The election monitoring involved 2031 national observers, of whom $\mathbf{4 9 \%}$ were women, or by 1368 less than during the previous Presidential Elections. As for the international observers, their number reached 333 in 2020, of whom more than 30\% were women, as compared to 636 in 2016

## 3. Election observation

3.1 National observers accredited by the CEC 3.2 International observers accredited by the CEC

| A women | men \& | e |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1001 | 1030 | 101 |
| $49.3 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ | $30.3 \%$ |

3.3 Share of women among accredited international observers


## 3. Election observation

### 3.4 Share of women among accredited observers



## 4. ELECTORAL CONTESTANTS

Six men and two women were registered as 2020 Presidential Election Candidates as compared to five men and four women running for President in 2016.

One male candidate (Igor Dodon) and one female candidate (Maia Sandu) participated in the second round of the 2020 Presidential Elections.

The gender composition of the initiative groups supporting the electoral candidates was represented mainly by men, even in the case of those two female candidates.

## 4. Electoral contestants

4.1 Electoral candidates


4 women (44.4\%) 5 men (55.6\%)


2 women (25\%) 6 men (75\%)

2016 Presidential Elections Elections
4.2 Signature collectors in support of contestants


4.3 Share of women in the candidates initiative groups


## 5. VOTER PARTICIPATION (FIRST ROUND)

During the first round of the 2020 Presidential Elections, 1364597 people ( $\mathbf{4 8 . 8 1 \%}$ of those included in the Voters' Lists) cast their vote. Among the persons present at polls $\mathbf{5 3 . 4 2 \%}$ were women.

The 56 - 70 years people were amongst the most active and numerous voters as their turnout reached almost $\mathbf{6 5 \%}$ from their age group, which was slightly over $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ of the total number of people who participated in elections.

As many as $\mathbf{1 6 7 0 6}$ voters were 18-year-olds who cast their vote for the first time, representing more than half of the 18 -year people included in the Voters' Lists. As for the 18-25 years' group of citizens with voting rights, more than $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ of those registered in the Voters' Lists cast their vote during the first round, accounting for $\mathbf{8 . 8 \%}$ of the total number of people present at polls.

The turnout rate in the rural area reached $\mathbf{4 2 . 4 \%}$, of whom almost $53 \%$ were women. In the urban area, the turnout rate reached $\mathbf{5 6 . 4} \%$, of whom almost $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ were women.

## 5. Voter participation (first round)

### 5.1 Gender profile of voters present at polls



A Voter turnout
-
5.2 Gender profile of voters aged 18 present at polls


Turnout of voters aged 18 (first round)


Women on the lists

- Voter turnout
- 

Men on the lists

## 5. Voter participation (first round)

5.3 Gender profile of voters present at polls (by gender and age)


## 5. Voter participation (first round)

### 5.4 Voter turnout of young people (18-35 years)



## 5. Voter participation (first round)

5.5 Voter participation in the Chisinau municipality


## 5. Voter participation (first round)

### 5.6 Voter participation (urban area / rural area)



## 5. Voter participation (first round)

5.7 Voter turnout rates

|  |  | Voter turnout | On the lists women | Turnout | 2 men On the lists | Turnout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chisinau mun. | 45.7\% |  | $45.4 \% ~ 46.1 \%$ | 130548 <br> $282885{ }^{\prime}$ | 292247 |
| 2 | Balti mun. | 45.7\% |  | $46.1 \% 45.3 \%$ |  | 46964 |
| 3 | ATU Gagauzia | 41.6\% | 68254 <br> 29882 | 43.8\% 39.1\% | $24428$ $62443=$ | 54310 |
| 4 | Anenii Noi | 40.8\% | $35625 \text { NWNNWNVV14680 }$ | 41.2\% 40.3\% |  | 28096 |
| 5 | Basarabeasca | 35.9\% |  | $36.6 \% \text { 35.1\% }$ | 4055 | 8587 |
| 6 | Briceni | 39.9\% | $\text { 31733"N\|NWN\|NV/ } 12830$ | $40.4 \% \quad 39.4 \%$ | $11342$ <br> $28782 \%$ | 24172 |
| 7 | Cahul | 39.1\% |  | $40 \% 38.1 \%$ |  | 38454 |
| 8 | Calarasi | 38.7\% |  | $39 \% ~ 38.5 \%$ |  | 23555 |
| 9 | Cantemir | 36.3\% | $24867 \text { NWNWNWNV } 1$ | $37.3 \% 35.4 \%$ | $8692$ $24572=$ | 17964 |
| 10 | Causeni | 39.9\% |  | 41.9\% 37.8\% | 13316 | 28695 |
| 11 | Cimislia | 36.3\% |  | $35.6 \% 37 \%$ | $8852$ | 17938 |
| 12 | Criuleni | 45.6\% | $30588 \text { N\|NNNV } 14386$ | $47 \% ~ 44.1 \%$ |  | 26961 |
| 13 | Donduseni | 46.7\% |  | 48\% 45.2\% | 6912 <br> $15295 \%$ | 15155 |
| 14 | Drochia | 42.4\% |  | $43.5 \% 41.3 \%$ |  | 29108 |
| 15 | Dubasari | 40.4\% |  | 41.7\% 39.1\% |  | 11681 |
| 16 | Edinet | 43.3\% | 33827 NWNWV15081 | $44.6 \% ~ 41.9 \%$ | 12453 <br> $29735=$ | 27534 |
| 17 | Falesti | 46.3\% | $\text { "36 } 351 \text { N\|NWN\| } 18030$ | 49.6\% 42.9\% | $14667$ 34219"/ | 32697 |

## 5. Voter participation (first round)

5.7 Voter turnout rates (continued)


## 5. Voter participation (first round)

| 5.8 Top 10 localities with the highest voter participation (rural area) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## 5. Voter participation (first round)

5.9 Top 10 localities with the highest voter participation (urban area)


## 5. Voter participation (first round)

| 5.10 Top 10 localities with the lowest voter participation (rural area) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## 5. Voter participation (first round)

5.11 Top 10 localities with the lowest voter participation (urban area)


## 6. VOTER PARTICIPATION (SECOND ROUND)

As many as $\mathbf{1 6 5 0 1 3 1}$ voters or $\mathbf{5 9 . 0 1 \%}$ of those included in the Voters' Lists participated in the 2020 Presidential Elections (second round).

Like in the first round, the 56 - 70-year-olds were amongst the most active voters, whose turnout reached 73.8\% from their age group. Nonetheless, on 15 November 2020, the voters aged 26 to 40 years were the most numerous, making up almost one third ( $\mathbf{2 8 . 7} \%$ ) of the total number of people present at polls.

The number of 18-year-old people who voted in the second round was by $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{3 8 1}$ more comparing to the first round. As for the 18 - $\mathbf{2 5}$-year-olds, their proportion represented $52.2 \%$ of those included in the Voters' Lists and $\mathbf{9 . 3 \%}$ of the second round's voter turnout.

During the second round, the voter turnout rate in the rural area reached $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ (by 2\% more than in the first round), women making up more than $53 \%$ of the total number of people who cast their vote. The turnout rate in the urban area was $\mathbf{7 2 . 8 \%}$ (by $\mathbf{1 6 . 4 \%}$ more than in the first round) out of which more than $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ were women.


## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.1 Gender profile of voters present at polls

Women on the lists
8
Voter turnout
e
Men on the lists
6.2 Gender profile of voters aged 18 present at polls


Turnout of voters aged 18 (second round)


Men on the lists

- Voter turnout

2
-

## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.3 Gender profile of voters present at polls (by gender and age)


## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.4 Voter turnout of young people (18-35 years)


## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.5 Voter participation in the Chisinau municipality


## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.6 Voter participation (urban area / rural area)



Included on the lists


1176897

## 6．Voter participation（second round）

6．7 Voter turnout rates

|  |  | Voter turnout | On the lists women | Turnout | 2men On the lists | Turnout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chisinau mun． | 54．6\％ |  | 54．8\％54．4\％ |  | 349398 |
| 2 | Balti mun． | 48．5\％ | У／57， | 47．3\％ | $21592$ <br> 45695 ／ | 49905 |
| 3 | ATU Gagauzia | 52．5\％ | У／， 68.1 | 49．4\％ |  | 68568 |
| 4 | Anenii Noi | 46．8\％ | บ／35 620 | 45．9\％ |  | 32258 |
| 5 | Basarabeasca | 40．5\％ |  | 39\％ |  | 9704 |
| 6 | Briceni | 44．5\％ | シ／， 31 フ12 | 43．4\％ | 12 490 | 26947 |
| 7 | Cahul | 43．9\％ | $\text { V, } 51$ | 3\％42．3\％ | 19661 <br> $46512 \geqslant$ | 43101 |
| 8 | Calarasi | 44．3\％ |  | 5\％43．5\％ | $12907$ <br> 29683 ／／ | 26927 |
| 9 | Cantemir | 40．6\％ |  | 9\％\％39．2\％ |  | 20038 |
| 10 | Causeni | 45．7\％ | ,3, | 8\％\％43．4\％ |  | 32870 |
| 11 | Cimislia | 40．9\％ |  | 0．5\％41．3\％ |  | 20207 |
| 12 | Criuleni | 51．5\％ | $\text { Y, } 305$ | 53．7\％49．3\％ |  | 30470 |
| 13 | Donduseni | 52．3\％ | บ／1，17，173＞＞ | 54．3\％50\％ | $7643$ <br> 15278 \％ | 16966 |
| 14 | Drochia | 45．8\％ | У／36 | 47．6\％43．7\％ | 14191 <br> $32480 \%$ | 31351 |
| 15 | Dubasari | 49．7\％ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bn, } 14, \ldots 91 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 51．9\％47．5\％ | 6901 <br> 14529 | 14364 |
| 16 | Edinet | 48．2\％ | צ／33 819 | 49．8\％ $46.3 \%$ | 13779 <br> $29739 \%$ | 30626 |
| 17 | Falesti | 47．9\％ | У／， 6,1 | 51．5\％44．1\％ |  | 33810 |



## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.7 Voter turnout rates (continued)


## 6. Voter participation (second round)

| 6.8 Top 10 localities with the highest voter participation (rural area) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |

## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.9 Top 10 localities with the highest voter participation (urban area)

| 1 | Cricova, Chisinau mun. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Codru, Chisinau mun. |
| 3 |  |

## 6. Voter participation (second round)

6.10 Top 10 localities with the lowest voter participation (rural area)


1 Vulcanesti, Nisporeni

2 Caracusenii Vechi, Briceni

3 Corjeuti, Briceni

4 Tirzieni, Orhei

5 Fetesti, Edinet

6 Tabani, Briceni

7 Jora de Jos, Orhei

8 Jora de Mijloc, Orhei

Bascalia, Basarabeasca

10 Mana, Orhe


## 6. Voter participation (second round)



## 7. OUT-OF-COUNTRY VOTING

The number of Diaspora participants in the 2020 Presidential Elections in the first round reached 149840 ( $50.56 \%$ men) and 262739 (51.04\% women) in the second round.

Comparing with the 2016 Presidential Elections (second round), 124389 more people living abroad participated in the 2020 Presidential Elections (second round).

The 26 - 40-year-olds were among the Diaspora most active voters in both rounds, reaching 50.9\% in the first round and $\mathbf{5 0 . 6 5 \%}$ in the second round.

Italy, UK, France, Germany and Romania were top 5 countries with the highest voter turnout in the first round (in descending order) and Italy, France, UK, Germany and Romania - in the second round (in descending order).

## 7. Out-of-country voting

7.1 Preliminary registration of voters (comparative analysis)


Top 10 most active countries

Preliminary
registrations


16848

Italy


11898

United Kingdom


8470

Germany

6919

Romania


6718

Russian Federation


4053

Ireland


3535

USA


2234

Spain


1918
Canada

## 7. Out-of-country voting

7.2 Gender profile of voters abroad (comparative analysis)


## 7. Out-of-country voting

7.3 Profile of voters abroad (by gender and age / first round)


## 7. Out-of-country voting

7.4 Profile of voters abroad (by gender and age / second round)


## 7. Out-of-country voting

7.5 Top 10 countries with the highest voter participation


## 7. Out-of-country voting

7.6 Top 10 polling stations abroad with the highest voter participation

| Polling station | First round |  |  |  | Second round |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Voters |  |  | Polling station | Voters |  |  |
|  |  | A women | men 2 |  |  | A women | men - |
| London / United Kingdom (nr.394) | 4262 | 38.83\% | 61.17\% | Villeneuve-Saint-Georges, France (nr.343) | 4997 | 40.92\% | 59.08\% |
| Montreuil / France (nr.344) | 3650 | 38.96\% | 61.04\% | Northampton / United Kingdom (nr.397) | 4995 | 43.96\% | 56.04\% |
| London / United Kingdom (nr.393) | 3471 | 39.1\% | 60.9\% | London / United Kingdom (nr.395) | 4992 | 43.97\% | 56.03\% |
| Frankfurt am Main / Germany (nr.349) | 3315 | 37.71\% | 62.29\% | London / United Kingdom (nr.393) | 4991 | 39.99\% | 60.01\% |
| Northampton / United Kingdom (nr.397) | 3238 | 40.89\% | 51.11\% | Paris / France (nr.340) | 4987 | 46.7\% | 53.3\% |
| Villeneuve-Saint-Georges, France (nr.343) | 3202 | 41.54\% | 58.46\% | Berlin / Germany (nr.348) | 4987 | 38.52\% | 61.48\% |
| London / United Kingdom (nr.395) | 3104 | 40.11\% | 59.89\% | London / United Kingdom (nr.394) | 4987 | 41.67\% | 58.33\% |
| Bologna / Italy (nr.367) | 3038 | 61.03\% | 38.97\% | Frankfurt am Main / Germany (nr.349) | 4986 | 39.63\% | 60.37\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mestre / Italy } \\ & \text { (nr.379) } \end{aligned}$ | 3037 | 63.29\% | 36.71\% | Parma, Italy (nr.369) | 4985 | 60.74\% | 39.26\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Berlin / Germany } \\ & \text { (nr.348) } \end{aligned}$ | 2914 | 38.74\% | 61.26\% | Montreuil / France (nr.344) | 4979 | 39.71\% | 60.29\% |

## 8. VOTER PARTICIPATION (COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS)

As many as 1364597 people cast their vote during the 2020 Presidential Elections (first round), which was by 76136 less than the number of voters who participated in the 2016 election exercise (first round).

The number of people who cast their vote during the 2020 Presidential Elections (second round) reached 1650 131, excelling by 36106 the number of voters who participated in the 2016 election exercise (second round).

The trend observed during the 2016 and 2020 Presidential Elections shows that women mobilise themselves to a greater extent during the second round of voting.

## 8. Voter participation (comparative analysis)

### 8.1 Voter participation (comparative analysis)

| Total <br> voters | 1649402 | 1390537 | 881667 | 1440733 | 1614023 | 1453013 | 1184779 | 647781 | 1364597 | 1650131 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| 2014 | 2015 | 2015 | 2016 | 2016 | 2019 | 2019 | 2019 | 2020 | 2020 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parliamentary | Local | Local | Presidential | Presidential | Parliamentary | Local | Local | Presidential | Presidential |
| Elections | General | General | Elections | Elections | Elections | General | General | Elections | Elections |
|  | Elections | Elections | (1st round) | (2nd round) |  | Elections | Elections | (1st round) | (2nd round) |
|  | (1st round) | (2nd round) |  |  |  | (1st round) | (2nd round) |  |  |

## Previous editions of the infographics on the gender profile of elections



These infographics were produced in the framework of the Project "Enhancing democracy in Moldova through inclusive and transparent elections", implemented by UNDP, with the support of the American people, through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

