

Marina POPESCU – IPF 2004
FINAL REPORT OCTOBER 2005

1. RESEARCH PART

The research part involved a lot of time consuming data collection, which had to be followed by analysis.

- I carried out interviews with relevant actors in the Romanian debates (all major political parties and the representatives of the Association Pro Democratia as the originators of the idea of ‘uninominal’ and the authors of the first electoral code based on it)
- Collected
 - parliamentary debates (post 2002 developments, committee reports and plenary sessions discussions)
 - all party and NGO proposals on the electoral law (electoral system) and on other related accountability mechanisms throughout the period; the evolution of these proposals, and the party positions over time also had to be constantly followed.
 - newspaper reports and commentaries regarding the electoral system and representative institutions (covering all post 2002 developments)
 - country reports on Romania and cross-national analyses of governance indicators including Romania
- Surveyed all the relevant political science literature on the theory and empirical findings related to issues in electoral system design (choice and reform)
- Surveyed a wide range of policy, expert and academic analyses of reforms and debates in a wide range of countries such as: extensive examination of the New Zealand process of reform, considered a benchmark and with potential major implications for the nature of the public deliberation and expert inquiry necessary in Romania; review of the Spanish language literature on the debates on the change of the electoral system for the Spanish Chamber of Deputies, a system similar to the Romania, with a number of similarities in the framing of the call for reform; scrutiny of the British electoral reform, with a focus on the Jenkins report and on electoral systems other than Westminster; extensive coverage of expert opinions on the discussions of a reform of the Canadian, Dutch and Quebec electoral systems
- Last but certainly not least, like in other cases of requests of reform, in Romania and elsewhere, the current calls for a reform of the electoral system in Romania are legitimized by the claim of public opinion support and even demand like in many other calls for reform. Therefore analysis of public opinion data is essential and since the available data does not cover all the relevant topics part of the IPF funding was used for the fieldwork of a national panel survey, that was designed in collaboration with Gabriel Badescu (UBB, IPF alumnus), Aurelian Muntean (SNSPA, 2004 IPF) and Grigore Pop-Eleches (Princeton University) and included my specific module.

The analysis focus on three points, considered likely to lead to interesting and original research findings and to support the policy recommendations of the policy paper. They are:

1. Preferential voting in open lists. Cross-national analysis including all post-communist countries that employ preference voting as a means to personalize vote choice in list PR system.
2. Romanian public opinion on representation and representative democracy. Analysis based mostly on the survey partly funded through IPF.
3. Why electoral system reform in Romania? An analysis of the positions and motivations of the actors involved; looking at the Romanian case from a theoretical angle and in a comparative perspective.

The analysis so far could be completed on only one point, the first, and two papers were already submitted for publication with two major journals in the field. The research for the other two and fragments already completed from the drafts were used as background in the policy paper. During the discussions with the group mentor we agreed that although not everything can be achieved in a year, a lot of research is needed in order to be able to properly write anything with a potential to be published in prestigious scholarly journals. In order to be able to complete and submit for publication, the decision was made in agreement with the group mentor to focus on preference voting for its originality in the academic literature (no papers to date focused on this topic in reference to post-communist democracies) as well as for its possible policy implications (currently one of the two main governmental parties is considering such as system in the discussions on electoral reform). Therefore,

the two papers uploaded on the site are only the first part of a series of papers on the topic due to the IPF funding, publications in which IPF will be fully recognized.

2. POLICY PART: Policy Analysis paper: **In quest of a better political system: more accountability and better representation** (20,000 words + tables & annexes). It was posted on my website in English on 20 September 2005.

Due to the complexity of the argument and the continuous evolution of the debate, the paper became quite lengthy. In this way it is very comprehensive and still focused but I believe that sections of it as well as summaries are more appropriate to send to a number of NGO and party experts, at least as a taster to encourage them to read on. Its translation is imperative and well-timed since given other priorities electoral reform will only take centre stage again in 2006.

3. Results and legislation DATABASE

Unfortunately there was no agreement with Essex on a mirror site, due to the uncertainty of the fate of such a site after my fellowship. Also only very little updating took place due to lack of time.

However, most of the planned data collection and collation was done. Part of that was used for the preference voting papers (constituency and candidate level results for two Latvian elections, constituency level and candidate data for Estonia 2003 and Czech Republic 2002). National level, constituency level and candidate data for the 2005 Romanian presidential and parliamentary elections were collected and collated. Were also collected and collated national level results for all post-communist elections in Croatia, Macedonia and Slovenia, full electoral legislation for Serbia and Montenegro (federal and republican level elections), laws and results for the most recent elections in Estonia, Lithuania, Moldova, Russia.

4. DISSEMINATION AND ADVOCACY

The main dissemination and advocacy activity was participating in co-organizing a workshop with the Association Pro Democratia on 16-17 July 2005. The idea behind was that the best way for me to become visible was to join forces with the most important NGO in the field of elections. I participated in setting the agenda (directly and indirectly) and I invited high calibre international experts APD had no access to. I had two presentations, one on candidate nomination procedures and one on plurality-majority systems. During the workshop and subsequent meetings, I also made contact with a series of NGOs who were interested in my expertise and in collaboration and also with representatives of some important funding bodies.

Apart from the conference, due to my relative outsider status, I preferred trying to persuade privately NGO representatives and party leaders about the importance of some of my recommendations. My focus was especially the pre-eminence of transparency of parliamentary activity in monitoring our representatives, on the multiplicity of goals of electoral systems and on the complexity of achieving accountability. For the moment the long version of the Policy Paper was sent to a few party and NGO experts and to a couple of friends in the press. Short versions of it will be more widely distributed as well as the Romanian language version.