



PRESIDENT

**Report by the President of the National Election Commission on the
activities carried out by the National Election Commission at the General
Election of Members of Parliament held on**

3 April 2022

Rapporteur: Dr. András Téglási

President of the National Election Commission

May 2022, Budapest

In pursuance of section 13 (2) of Act XXXVI of 2013 on electoral procedure (hereinafter: Ve.), the Head of the National Election Commission shall, after a general election, report to the National Assembly (Parliament) on the activities carried out by the National Election Commission at that election. It is therefore my obligation to inform the National Assembly of the work done by the National Election Commission at the general election of Members of Parliament which date was set by the President of the Republic for 3 April 2022 in his decision 7/2022. (1. 11.) KE.

The National Election Commission (NEC) acted in the 2022 general election of Members of Parliament on the basis of the legal provisions already applied in the two previous general elections. The legal provisions applicable to the general elections appear at several levels of legal sources. Its foundations are laid down in the Fundamental Law of Hungary, which is Article R (1) of the Fundamental Law of Hungary. Among the most important constitutional principles relating to elections, Article B of the Fundamental Law should be highlighted; Article XXIII, which contains the fundamental constitutional right to vote and to stand as a candidate; Article IX, and in particular paragraph 3, which specifically refers to elections as a provision relating to elections, that, in order to provide the necessary information for the formation of democratic public opinion during the election campaign period, political advertising may be broadcast in media services only free of charge and under the conditions laid down in the cardinal law to ensure equal opportunities.

The first sentence of Article XXIX (1) was of particular importance for the 2022 elections, according to which: '[the] nationalities living in Hungary shall be the constituent factors'.

Article 2(1), which lays down the basic principles of elections, contains another important constitutional provision that should be emphasised: „Members of Parliament shall be elected on the basis of universal and equal suffrage, by direct and secret ballot, in an election ensuring the free expression of the will of the electors, in a manner determined by a cardinal law.”

Among the laws at the next level of legal sources, the following should be highlighted: Act CCIII of 2011 on the Election of Members of Parliament (hereinafter: Act CCIII), which lays down the substantive legal rules of elections, the Ve. containing procedural rules, in particular the rules of the Ve. defining the duties and powers of election committees, and the rules of the Act CLXXXV of 2010 on media services and mass media.

The specific deadlines for the procedure, determined by calendar day, the detailed rules for the performance of the tasks falling within the competence of the election offices and the forms to be used in the procedure have been laid down by the Minister of Justice in regulations. However, in view of the fact that on 3 April 2022, at the same time as the general election of Members of Parliament, voters could express their opinion on four referendum questions, the legal regulation on the so-called joint procedure has been slightly modified compared to 2018. The modification mainly affected the work of the polling stations and their organisation; the so-called joint procedure had little impact on the adjudication of cases before the National Election Commission and the system of legal remedies. Summarising the legal background presented so far, it can be said that the general election of 2022 of Members of Parliament was a major challenge for voters, election bodies, nominating organisations and election commissions, as well as for the candidates.

I will now present the most important issues affecting the work of the National Election Commission in the 2022 general election of Members of Parliament.

I. Election commissions involved in the general election of Members of Parliament

In this chapter I would like to highlight two main changes. Firstly, I will describe the changed responsibilities of the regional electoral commissions, followed by the new responsibilities of the Ve. 40/A, as a new element of the online NEC meeting, which was triggered by the coronavirus virus.

The work of the NEC is significantly influenced by the forum system of the election commissions.

Compared to the 2018 regulation, there has been a fundamental change in the forum system of election commissions, as the regional election commissions (TVB) have become actively involved in the electoral process. In order to create a more proportionate workload, the TVBs have acted on the following three types of cases, which were previously partly the responsibility of the NEC:

1. regional election commission have decided on the legal remedy against the decision of the parliamentary single-member constituency election commission (OEVB) regarding missing the deadline of submitting a recommendation by candidates who intend to stand as independent candidates or the nominating organisation intending to nominate a candidate
2. regional election commissions also handled the appeals against the decision of the OEVB on the registration of candidates for single mandate constituencies
3. the regional election committees also established the regional partial results of the national list election on the basis of the polling district minutes issued on the results of the national list voting.

In the system of legal remedies, the 106 OEVBs acted in the first instance in election administration powers related to single-member constituency elections and in cases of breaches of the law, with the exception of certain media cases. The NEC was responsible for hearing appeals against the decisions of the OEVB, with the exception of the two powers mentioned in points 1 and 2.

The experience gained in the course of the electoral procedure has shown that the above amendment has brought a positive change: the involvement of the TVBs in the system of appeal forums has created a more even division of labour by transferring the adjudication of a significant number of cases, mainly concentrated in one period and with the same subject matter, from the National Election Commission to the regional election commissions.

The National Election Commission has not only second instance but also first instance powers to adjudicate on infringements of the law, especially in media cases, and has a number of administrative (management type) decision-making duties, thus, the bottleneck between the OEVBs and the Curia, previously embodied by the NBI, is now TVBs has been widened by the intervention of the TVBs.

The rules on the composition of the National Election Commission have not changed compared to the previous two parliamentary elections. The mandate of the members of the National Election Commission delegated by the parties with political groups in the 2018-2022 parliamentary term ended with the calling of the elections on 11 January 2022. Of the 6 nominating organisations and the 12 national minority self-governments that nominated a party list, the right of the nominating organisations to nominate a national minority list was exercised by the right of the party nominating the party list in accordance with Article 27 (2) of the Ve. (2) of Article 27(2) of the Decree of the nominating parties and 5 national minority self-governments exercised their right to vote until the statutory limitation period specified in Article 30(2) of the Decree, so that the Commission had 18 members for the period between 23 March 2022 and the date of the constituent sitting of Parliament.

Article 40/A of the Ve. provided for the possibility from 21 January 2021 that the sessions of the National Election Commission may be held by using electronic means of communication as well, based on the decision of the President of NEC. As a result of this legislative decision, the Rules of Procedure of the Commission were amended by Minute No. 9 of the Board's decision of 17 February 2021. The amendment to the Rules of Procedure laid down the detailed rules for holding the meetings online. The Commission has used the possibility of online meetings only in exceptional cases, with a total of five

meetings using electronic means of communication between the date of the call for elections on 11 January 2022 and the date on which the national list results became final.

II. Decisions taken by the National Election Commission from the date of calling the election to the date of the finalisation of the results of the national list (11 January 2022 - 16 April 2022)

The National Election Commission held 39 sessions from 11 January 2022, when the election was called, until the results of the national list became final on 16 April 2022, i.e. an average of 3 sessions per week. Compared to the experience of the 2014 and 2018 parliamentary elections, the caseload was essentially more balanced, except for the week before and after election day. One of the reasons for this is the - already mentioned - repeated inclusion of regional election commissions in the electoral procedure.

The National Election Commission has acted as a forum for legal remedies at first and second instance in the parliamentary election process, in addition, in a number of other cases provided for by the Ve., of an administrative nature. These include:

- deciding on the registration of nominating organisations and national lists,
- determining the number of voters included in the central electoral roll as national minority voters,
- drawing of lots for the order of the national lists,
- the allocation of the time allotted for political advertisements of the nominating organisations constituting the national list to be broadcast on the linear media services of the public service media,
- approval of the content of party-list and nationality-list ballot papers,
- determining the central budget subsidies to be granted to the national minority municipalities that have put forward a national minority list,
- registration of observers,
- determining of the results of the national list of the election.

II.1. Decisions on the registration of nominating organisations and national lists

In 2022, far fewer parties than in previous parliamentary elections have applied to be registered as nominating organisations, with only 50 parties. In addition to these parties, 12 national minority self-governments have applied to the National Election Commission to register as nominating organisations. While the applications of all the national minority self-governments complied with the legal requirements, the Commission considered that 7 out of the 50 parties did not meet all the legal requirements, and 43 parties were finally registered. This means that a total of 55 candidate organisations were registered by the Commission. In this context, I recommend that in the future the legislator should consider setting a deadline for the submission of applications for registration of nominating organisations that is aligned with the deadline for the nomination of candidates.

For comparison, in 2014, 84 nominating organisations (71 parties and 13 national minority self-governments) and in 2018, 113 nominating organisations (100 parties and 13 national minority self-governments) participated in the general election of Members of Parliament. The same decreasing trend can be observed in the number of individual candidates legally registered by the parliamentary single-member constituency electoral committees. While 671 individual candidates were registered in 2022, 1 547 were registered in 2018 and 1 531 in 2014. Due to the significant decrease in the number of individual candidates compared to previous parliamentary elections, the number of party lists notified and registered has also fallen significantly compared to previous general elections. For the 2022 parliamentary election, a total of 7 party lists have been registered, 6 of which have been registered by the Commission. Of the 6 lists, 4 were independent lists and 2 were joint lists. In 2018, 23 of the 40

registered party lists were on the ballot paper, compared to the 41 registered national party lists in 2014, when only 23 met the conditions for inclusion on the list.

With regard to the legislative background in comparison to the 2018 elections, it should be mentioned that with the 2018 amendment to Act LXXXVII of 2013 on Making the Campaign Costs of Elections of Members of Parliament Transparent (hereinafter: Kftv.), the legislator stipulated that all candidates on the party list and all individual candidates nominated by the nominating organisation of the party are jointly and severally liable for the repayment of the state campaign funding due to the party list. The legislator also stipulated in the amendment to the Kftv. that a candidate or party (nominating organisation) that did not account for the state campaign subsidy paid during the previous parliamentary elections in accordance with the Kftv. could not claim campaign subsidy for the general election of Members of Parliament in 2022. A further change compared to the 2018 elections is the amendment to the Act on the Electoral Code effective from 21 January 2021, which requires the nomination of party lists of 71 individual candidates in 14 counties and the capital instead of the 21 candidates in 9 counties and the capital.

On a positive note, the National Election Office has launched a new online query system called "Information on the recommendation - who did I recommend?" to support the widest possible exercise of voters' right to information self-determination, which has resulted in a number of voters initiating legal remedies with election commissions on the basis of the information provided by the system, claiming that they had recommended a candidate on a recommendation form, whom they had not supported with their signature. However, given the extremely short and time-barred deadlines regarding the electoral process, only a relatively small number of these appeals have had the desired legal effect of invalidating the recommendation and reducing the number of valid recommendations. In view of the above, consideration should be given to more targeted regulation of these types of appeals in order to maximise the right to appeal.

Not only did the conditions for the establishment of party lists change prior to the elections, but the conditions for the establishment of another type of national list, the national minority list was also amended by the the legislator.

Article 117/A of Act CLXXIX of 2011 on the Rights of Nationalities (hereinafter: Njtv.), which entered into force on 26 June 2021, stipulated that if a national minority self-government wishes to participate in the general election of Members of Parliament and to establish a national minority list, it requires a decision of its general assembly in accordance with its non-transferable powers. This decision had to be taken on 1 October of the calendar year preceding the general elections, and no later than twenty calendar days after the general elections is called. According to the explanatory memorandum to the draft law, in the interests of democratic legitimacy, this provision would guarantee that the national minority list drawn up as a national list for the election of members of parliament would clearly reflect the national minority self-government is based on the decision of the assembly of the national minority.

Of the 13 national minority self-governments, 12 decided on the establishment of the national minority list by the deadline set by the Njtv. The Constitutional Court annulled the decision of the Assembly of the National Roma Self-Government No. 105/2021 (XI. 9) on the establishment of a list by its decision No. 3002/2022 (I. 13. 13.) AB, and since the Assembly did not take a new decision on the establishment of a nationality list by 31 January 2022, the National Roma Self-Government did not apply for registration as a nominating organisation and did not register a nationality list. In the absence of a nationality list, the Roma nationality will have no nationality representatives or advocates in the 2022-2026 parliamentary term. As I have already mentioned, the amendment to the Ve. has resulted in a significant reduction of the workload of the National Election Commission in the present electoral procedure, as a result of which the forums for the examination of appeals against first instance decisions of the OEVB on the registration of individual candidates and the fine imposed for the violation of the

legal obligation to hand over the recommendation sheets are the territorially regionally competent election commissions.

II.2. Decisions related to the electoral campaign

A significant part of the National Election Commission's decision-making was devoted to the first and second instance rulings on appeals against violations of election campaign rules. In addition to the 82 first instance decisions (objections), the Commission dealt with 138 appeals. The appeals focused on a number of issues, which can be summarised as follows.

II. 2. 1.

First, I will describe the cases in which, according to the established case law of the NEC and the Curia, the electoral commissions have no jurisdiction.

There have been mass appeals and, following the NEC's decision, judicial review applications on the issue of the funding of Facebook social media advertising. According to the facts of the petitions, the content of the Facebook pages of some candidates' public pages is promoted by paid advertisements continuously during the campaign period, the sponsor of which, according to the Facebook page's advertising directory, is not the candidate or candidate's organisation, but a website outside Facebook. The petitioners complained that the rule laid down in Article 7(1)(b) of the Kftv, which sets a ceiling of HUF 5 million on the financing of expenditure relating to election campaign activities, is widened to such an extent that campaign financing becomes intransparent, and they therefore requested the Commission to declare a breach of principle on the basis of the Ve.

In contrast to this, the Commission, on the basis of the decisions of the Curia No. Kvk.VI.39.270/2022/2. and Kvk.III.39.264/2022/4., took the position that the election commissions have no competence to adjudicate on the appeal based on the violation of the provisions of the Kftv. and the related claim of a violation of the basic principles of election procedure. The Commission also pointed out that only the Hungarian State Treasury is entitled to act with regard to the accounting and control of election campaign expenses, while the Kftv. only defines the duties and powers of the National Election Commission and the National Election Office as electoral bodies. However, apart from these two central bodies, the Kftv. does not establish any tasks or powers for any other electoral body. The position taken by the Commission has been confirmed by the Curia in a large number of subsequent cases, even in the last days of the campaign period, see for instance the Curia decision Kvk.II.39.397/2022/2.

The interpretation of the personal and territorial scope of the Ve. was a major issue in the election proceedings. The Curia in its decisions Kvk.I.39.354/2022/5. and Kvk.VII.39.408/2022/2. took the position that the Ve. Article 1 regulates the material scope of the Act, while it does not contain any provision on the territorial and personal scope, and therefore it must be determined in accordance with the provisions of Act CXXX of 2010 on Legislation (hereinafter: Jat.). The provisions of the Jat. Pursuant to Section 6(1) of the Act, the territorial scope of the Act extends to the territory of Hungary. Article 6(6) of the Jat. Pursuant to Article 6(3), the territorial or personal scope of the act shall be expressly specified in the cases referred to in Section 5(5) and (6) and if it covers a territory or a group of persons other than those referred to in Section 5(1) and (2). Therefore, the territorial scope of the Ve. extends to the territory of Hungary, and its personal scope extends to natural persons, legal persons and organisations without legal personality within the territory of Hungary, and to Hungarian citizens outside the territory of Hungary. In addition to all these findings, the Curia emphasises that the fact that a decision may be based on the election principles even in the absence of a legal provision on the given facts does not mean that the principles may be applied even if the territorial scope of the Ve. does not extend to the relevant facts.

II. 2. 2.

The next large group of cases I would like to highlight are the cases - also generating a large number of case files - which are the subject of the examination of competing legal relationships; in some cases, even in connection with these, the examination of Article 24 (3) of Act CXC of 2011 on National Public Education was also raised. The following three types of cases can be distinguished. First, there are cases in which state secretaries holding public office participated in an event during a campaign period. In some cases, the State Secretary participating in the event was also a candidate in the current electoral procedure. The next group consists of cases in which the activities of persons were the subject of objections, where the incumbent Member of Parliament also wished to contest the election in question, i.e. also stood as a candidate for election to Parliament. The third group includes cases in which the candidate standing in the current parliamentary elections has not previously held that office but has also contested the election by representative democracy, but in another type of election in a different electoral system.

In its assessment of the cases in the first category of cases, the Commission has consistently held that the activities of persons holding public office in the exercise of their statutory functions are not covered by the Ve. 142 does not constitute campaign activity. The legal basis for the Commission's decisions in this area was the order of the Curia No. Kvk.III.38.043/2019/2. The Commission's decisions in this type of case were later upheld by the Curia, see order No Kvk.I.39.245/2022/3. and Order No Kvk.II.39.258/2022/7.

In the second group of cases, the Commission's jurisprudence has been that the exercise of the right to hold public office by a person who is also a candidate in the next election cannot be generally restricted during the campaign period as regards the right to appear at certain events. The legal basis for these decisions was the Constitutional Court's AB 3257/2019 (X. 30.). In this context, the National Election Commission concluded that a representative who has obtained a mandate in an individual constituency primarily performs a representative function for the population of his/her constituency. However, the scope of this activity and representation cannot be defined in a taxative manner. Although, it certainly includes lobbying activities in the interests of the constituency and participation in protocol at relevant events in the life of the constituency. The Curia has also upheld the decisions of the NEC in cases falling within this category (see: Curia decisions Kvk.VII.39.273/2022/5 and Kvk.I.39.245/2022/3), and in one case the Constitutional Court rejected a constitutional complaint against a Curia decision upholding the NEC decision by AB 3131/2022 (IV. 1.).

In its assessment of the merits of the case(s) in the third category of cases, the Commission took as a benchmark the findings of the Constitutional Court in its decision 3257/2019 (X. 30.) AB and examined all the circumstances of the case, such as the public duties of the person concerned whether or not he/she took an active role in the event, and in what capacity he/she appeared at the event.

II. 2. 3.

The fact of war was also used as an election campaign issue. The Commission has received several complaints that during the campaign period, the Governmental Information Centre sent war-related e-mails to some voters. These cases rested on two main pillars. On the one hand, both the Commission and the Curia examined the parts of the petition concerning data protection provisions. In this regard, it was established that neither the NEC nor the courts hearing the election case had jurisdiction to find a violation of either Act CXII of 2011 on the Right to Information Self-Determination and Freedom of Information or the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). In terms of the lack of powers, a parallel can be drawn with the campaign finance and the territorial and personal scope of the Ve.

The second pillar was to examine the roles, complex communication and other functions of the Government under the Constitution. In this regard, the Constitutional Court reviewed the decision of the Curia Kvk.II.39.260/2022/5 in AB Decision 3130/2022 (IV. 1.). In the interpretation of the Constitutional Court, government communication in a situation of war during elections may be subject

to a specific assessment, and the Constitutional Court therefore considered that the Government's duty to inform includes the provision of first-hand, credible information on the current political situation. The Constitutional Court further held that "in that regard, the Government did not formulate a campaign message concerning the substance of the election campaign, but expressed itself on a public issue which concerns all citizens and is relevant and important to all, and which, in the light of the known circumstances of the war, took place during the campaign period." In consideration to the above findings, the the Constitutional Court found that the Government's contested action was not unlawful, and the AB decision cited thus confirmed the position taken by the NEC.

II. 2. 4.

In the closing stages of the election campaign, the issue of SMS and phone calls sent without consent for the use of personal data for the transmission of political messages has come under the spotlight. The Commission received hundreds of submissions on this subject, with different text messages and from different telephone numbers. In all cases, the National Election Commission found an infringement against an unknown perpetrator in the vast majority of cases, identifying a nominating organisation as the infringer in two cases and an individual in one case. Following judicial review, this case was brought to the Curia, which ruled in its decision No Kvk.III.39.418/2022/2 that, despite the fact that the name of the nominating organisation complained by the NEC appeared in the text of the message, it could not be established on the basis of the available evidence that the complained-of SMS was sent by the complained-of nominating organisation. Given that the Ve. 140 (b) qualifies only direct solicitation by a nominating organisation as campaign activity, the Ve. 149, the Curia did not find the finding of an infringement under § 149 of the Ve and rejected the objection.

II. 2. 5.

During the campaign period in question, several cases were brought to the NEC challenging the distribution of posters without an imprint. Ve. 144 (2) states precisely that the poster must contain the name of the publisher, the place of business of the publisher and the name of the person responsible for its publication. Despite the fact that the Commission has established the existence of an infringement in all cases, it was not possible to identify the infringer and therefore to convict him in the absence of evidence.

II. 2. 6.

The NEC has also repeatedly dealt with the assessment of the campaigning activities of elected and appointed members of parliamentary constituency election commissions on social media. In its decision No. Kvk.VI.39.308/2022/5, the Curia ruled in principle that "the president of the OEVB elected from among the elected members of the election commission must be non-party, independent and unbiased, and his/her communication must be in accordance with Article IX (1) of the Fundamental Law and Article IX (1) of the Ve. 14 paragraph (1). The President shall exercise his freedom of expression in a manner consistent with the legal requirements applicable to his office, the observance of which shall not exceed the necessary limitation of his right of expression." In contrast to the elected members of the election commission, the Curia formulated a different requirement for delegated members in its order No. Kvk.VI.39.309/2022/5, in which it stated that "A delegated member of the election commission, in his political expression outside the work of the commission, - in the absence of an express legal provision may not be limited."

II. 3.

According to the Articles 294-296 of the Ve., the results are determined at different levels. The results of the elections in single-member constituencies are established by the parliamentary single-member constituency election commissions, while the results of the elections in national lists are established by the National Election Commission.

Based on the experience of previous years, especially the 2018 elections, the legislator has also made changes in the field of results reporting in order to ensure that alleged violations in connection with the national list elections to be remedied as soon as possible. As a result of the legislative amendment, the TVBs were obliged to issue a decision on the territorial partial results of the national list elections for their respective areas of jurisdiction no later than 6 days after the election day. Appeals against this decision, which was the same as the decision of the OEVBs determining the results of the individual constituency elections, could be submitted to the National Election Commission.

Due to the introduction of the regional partial result of the national list election as a legal institution that can be challenged by an independent legal remedy, the legislator set a special deadline of one day for the submission and consideration of the request for review, as opposed to the national list result. The application for review could then be based only on an infringement committed in the aggregation of the vote totals or the allocation of seats, since any other infringement could be included in an appeal against the decision determining the regional result.

Unlike in the previous two parliamentary elections, in the procedure for the general election of Members of Parliament in 2022, in no case was the result of the election of individual constituencies contested. Likewise, no one has appealed against the regional results of the national list elections established by the TVBs. This is the reason why the National Election Commission was able to establish the national list results well before the statutory deadline of the 19th day after the vote (22 April 2022 for current elections).

The National Election Commission established the results of the election on the 11th day after the voting, on 14 April 2022, in its decision No 366/2022. Only one application for review was submitted against this decision within the statutory deadline, but this was essentially a challenge to the National Election Office's activities in relation to the verification of postal votes. However, in this connection, the Ve. provides for a separate remedy, namely an objection. Since this was not exhausted by the applicant and the procedures of the NEC and the NEO are separate when determining the national list result, the Curia held that the decision of the NEC determining the national list result cannot be challenged by objecting to the activities of the National Election Office. By its order Kvk.1.39.429/2022/3, the Curia upheld the decision of the NEC, which became final on 16 April 2022, Saturday. The procedure for the general election of Members of Parliament for 2022 has thus been closed with final effect.

II. 4. Summary

From the announcement of the general election to the finalisation of the results of the national list, the Commission took a total of 340 decisions in connection with the elections in question, of which 120 were administrative and 220 were decisions taken in the context of an appeal procedure. Of the 340 decisions, a total of 65 were subject to judicial review. This means that only 19% of the decisions taken by the NEC during this period were appealed. In 275 cases, i.e. 81% of the decisions taken by the NEC, the decision became final without further appeal.

The Curia upheld the NEC's decision in 41 of the 65 NEC decisions challenged, i.e. 63% of all NEC decisions challenged, reversed the NEC's decision in 15% of cases and in 22% of cases the application for judicial review was not suitable for examination on the merits.

The Constitutional Court ruled in 8 cases, in half of them the Constitutional Court rejected the constitutional complaint, in 3 cases the Curia's decision was annulled, and in the remaining one case the constitutional complaint was dismissed.

It follows from this that out of a total of 340 decisions taken by the National Election Commission during this period, only 3% have been overturned as a result of a judicial appeal. Of the 340 decisions of the NEC, 330 decisions, i.e. 97% of all decisions, have become final with or without appeal to the

(constitutional) courts. Detailed statistics on the Commission's decisions are given in the annex to the report Annex.

III. Guidelines

No new guidelines were issued during the current election period. In order to prepare for the high quality of the parliamentary elections, the National Election Commission reviewed and revised all its existing guidelines in the second half of 2021, resulting in the adoption of two guidelines. Guideline 1/2021 provided for the repeal of several previous guidelines, mainly in view of the fact that the legislator had since transposed several issues previously addressed in guidelines into legislation, so that the maintenance of parallel legislation was no longer justified. Guideline 2/2021 made substantive amendments to several previous guidelines, the main reason for which was to adapt the issued guidelines to the changed legislative environment, and in one case, the judgment of the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of the Hungarian Two-tailed Dog Party v. Hungary on the issue of ballot paper photographing.

IV. Conclusion

To conclude my report, firstly, I would like to express my appreciation to the election bodies for their high quality, conscientious, exhausting and competent work, especially in view of the fact that they were involved in the organisation and implementation of this particularly important task, even in the emergency situation caused by the epidemic. Thanks to their work, the 2022 parliamentary election was held successfully and in accordance with the legal provisions in force. I would also like to thank the members of the National Election Commission for their work, commitment and their constructiveness in ensuring the success of the body's work. On behalf of the National Election Commission, I wish the elected Members of Parliament and nationality representatives well in their work in the interests of the nation and the respective nationalities good health, strength and much success!

I ask the Honourable Parliament to kindly accept my report!

April 28, 2022

Budapest

Dr. Téglási András