VOTERS' EDUCATION CENTER

Comparative survey of the results of the 1992, 1996, and 2000 lkh Khural elections by election systems

The results of the 1992 elections were origionally outlined by the Konrad Adenauer Foundation as models 1,2,3,4,5, while the results of the 1996 and 2000 elections were evaluated and summarized by the Voters' Education Center. Also, the outcomes of the 1996 and 2000 elections were evaluated in additionally drafted models 6 and 7.

The models, created by using the Hare-Niemeyer method, have the following variations.

<u>Model 1.</u> Proportional representation or system of quota balancing, which allows for distribution of parliamentary seats nationwide with the consideration of all the votes counted (without any limitations).

<u>Model 2.</u> Proportional representation system, which, in distributing parliamentary seats nationwide, does not let an individual candidate or party that received less than 5% of the ballot into Parliament (with a 5% threshold).

<u>Model 3.</u> Proportional representation system, which comes up with a number of seats on a district level with the consideration of all the votes counted in a given electoral district (without any limitations).

<u>Model 4.</u> A mixed system, which directly grants each electoral district one mandate (to the candidate who has won the greatest number of votes) taking into account all the remaining votes when distributing seats nationwide (without any conditions in either of the cases).

<u>Model 5.</u> A system, which grants each electoral district 1 mandate (to the candidate who has won the greatest number of votes) while distributing all the other votes nationwide without allowing the participation of parties that have received less than 5% of the ballot (with a 5% threshold)

<u>Model 6.</u> A mixed system, which grants an electoral district a direct mandate with a 50+1 threshold while taking into account other votes distributed proportionally on a nationwide scale.

<u>Model 7.</u> A mixed system, which grants an electoral district a direct mandate, while taking into account 5% of the total amount of votes cast when distributing the remaining votes proportionally on a nationwide scale.

Comparison of election results obtained by using the Hare-Niemeyer method

The 1992 lkh Khural Election

										1110	IJJE IK	ii Kiiulai L	CCLIOII
Name of a party/coalition	Percentage of votes given to a particular party out of the	system ad	According to the system adhered to at that time		l 1	Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Mode	15
	total amount of votes cast	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%
Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party	56.9	70	92.1	44	57.9	52	68.4	46	60.5	48	63.2	54	71.1
Mongolian Democratic Party-Mongolian National Progressive Party-Green Party	17.5	4	5.3	13	17.1	15	19.7	21	27.6	11	14.5	14	18.4
Mongolian Social Democratic Party	10.1	1	1.3	8	10.5	9	11.8	6	7.9	7	9.2	8	10.5
Mongolian United Party of Herders and Farmers	2			1	1.3					1	1.3		
Mongolian United Party of Private Property Owners	1.4			1	1.3					1	1.3		
Mongolian Independence Party	2			2	2.6					1	1.3		
Mongolian Party of Revival	3.7			3	3.9			1	1.3	2	2.6		
Mongolian Capitalist Party	2.1			1	1.3			1	1.3	1	1.3		-
Mongolian Religious Democratic Party- Mongolian Democratic Party	0.8			1	1.3					1	1.3		
Mongolian Green Party	0.6									1	1.3		
Independent candidates	3	1		2	2.6			1	1.3	2	2.6		
Total	100	76		76		76		76		76		76	

Voters' Education Centre

Comparison of election results obtained by using the Hare-Niemeyer method

The 1996 lkh Khural election

													1116	1990 IKII r	Milulai	election	
Name of a party/coalition party the to amou	Percentag e of votes given to a	e of votes system adhered to		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	particular party out of the total amount of votes cast	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%
Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party	40.5	25	32,9	31	40,8	35	45,85	36	47,16	29	37,99	33	43,2	27	35,4	30	39,3
Colaition of Democratic Forces	47	50	65,8	36	47,4	41	53,71	40	52,4	40	52,4	43	56,3	44	57,6	46	60,3
Mongolian Traditional Party	1.8	1	1,3	2	2,6					1	1,3			1	1,3		
"Democratic state" coalition	3.1			2	2,6					2	2,6			1	1,3		
Mongolian National Unity Party	2.2			2	2,6					1	1,3			1	1,3		
Others	4.1			1	1,3					1	1,3			1	1,3		
Independent candidates	3.1			2	2,6					2	2,6			1	1,3		
Total	100	76		76		76		76		76		76		76		76	

Voters' Education Center

Comparison of election results obtained by using the Hare-Niemeyer method

The 2000 lkh Khural election

	THE 2000 IKIT KHURAI ELECTION																
Name of a party/coalition	Percentage of votes given to a particular	According to the system adhered to at that time		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	party out of the total amount of votes cast	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%	Number of seats	%
Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party	51.6	72	94.8	39	51.09	46	60.2	47	61.6	45	59	50	65.5	52	68.1	54	70.7
Union of Democratic Forces	13.4	1	1.3	10	13.1	12	15.7	14	18.3	9	11.8	11	14.4	7	9.2	9	11.8
Mongolian Social Democratic Party	9.1			7	9.17	8	10.5	4	5.2	6	7.9	7	9.2	4	5.2	5	6.55
Motherland- Mongolian Democratic New Socialist Party	11	1	1.3	9	11.8	10	13.1	8	10.5	7	9.2	8	10.5	5	6.55	7	9.2
Republican Party	4.2			3	3.9			1	1.3	3	3.9			2	2.6		
Civic Courage- Green Party	3.6	1	1.3	3	3.9			1	1.3	2	2.6			2	2.6	1	1.3
Others	4.2			3	3.9			0		2	2.6			2	2.6		
Independent candidates	2.3	1	1.3	2	2.6			1	1.3	2	2.6			2	2.6		
Total	100	76		76		76		76		76		76		76		76	

Voters' Education Center