

**RESOLVE Facilitation of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
Civil Society Organization (CSO) Observer Selection Process**

Final Selection Process Report

RESOLVE

Contributors

(RESOLVE Selection Process Project Team)

Maya Breitburg-Smith, Facilitator and Project Lead

Laura Bartock, Program Associate

Karam Ahmad, Intern

Jessica Ordonez, Intern

Eva Paul, Intern

Learn more about RESOLVE at www.resolv.org

This report summarizes RESOLVE’s activities to design, manage, and facilitate the selection process for civil society organizations (CSOs) for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), which took place from June – August 2016. In addition to a summary and analysis of the process, this report includes the selection process and timeline; the CSO Observer Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria; a list of the verified registered voters in each region; and a discussion of options to evaluate candidate’s regional balance.

Table 1: 2016-2016 Selected FCPF CSO Observers

Africa Region	Asia-Pacific Region	Latin America-Caribbean	Northern Countries
Pan African Climate Justice Alliance	Institute of Sustainable Development	Red Mexicana de Organizaciones Campesinas Forestales A.C.	Environmental Defense Fund
<i>Mithika Mwenda</i>	<i>Kanwar Muhammad</i>	<i>Gustavo Sanchez Valle</i>	<i>Chris Meyer</i>
KENYA	Javed Iqbal PAKISTAN	MEXICO	UNITED STATES

In facilitating the FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process, RESOLVE built on our previous experience facilitating CSO Observer selection processes for the Climate Investment Funds (CIFs) and designed a self-selection process that provided the CSO community with the tools to select their representatives. As with those earlier processes, our efforts on this project were guided by principles of collaboration, transparency, integrity, and participation. As a result of the process, four CSO Observers were selected to represent the diverse CSO community based in FCPF REDD+ countries and Northern Countries. Three Observer organizations are from Southern CSOs representing the Africa, Asia-Pacific, and Latin America-Caribbean Regions. One CSO represents Northern Countries. A list of the selected Observers is included below and this report describes the process implemented to select the Observers in detail. While the selection process delivered a fair, transparent, and successful outcome, there were a number of unexpected challenges. This report identifies those challenges and outlines recommendations for consideration that we hope can help to strengthen future Observer selection processes.

Table of Contents

About RESOLVE and Our Role in the FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process	4
Civil Society Organization (CSO) Observer Selection Process	5
Establishing the Advisory Committee and Process Preparation	6
Establishing the Advisory Committee	6
Process Preparation: Defining the Selection Process; Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria; Voter Criteria and Other Materials.....	6
Recommendations: Establishing the Advisory Committee and Process Preparation	7
Observer Application Process, Voter Registration, Application Review, and Voter Verification	7
Application and Review Process	8
Recommendations: Application Process	10
Voter Registration Process and Verification	11
Recommendations: Voter Registration and Verification Processes	12
Voting, Final Selection, and Announcing Observers	13
Summary of Results	15
Africa Region	15
Asia-Pacific Region	17
Latin America-Caribbean.....	18
Northern Countries	19
Recommendations: Voting and Final Selection	19
Conclusion.....	20
Appendix A: Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria for Observer Organizations and Individuals.....	21
Appendix B: List of voting organizations.....	24
Africa Region	24
Asia Pacific Region	26
Latin America-Caribbean	28
Northern Countries	28
Appendix C: Summary of Input from Stakeholders Regarding Regional Balance.....	29

About RESOLVE and Our Role in the FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process

For over 35 years, RESOLVE has been developing and promoting the effective use of collaboration and consensus building, helping groups with diverse interests engage in dialogue and find workable solutions to difficult problems. With partners in the United State and abroad, our organization designs innovative, sustainable solutions to the toughest natural resource, environmental, and public health challenges. RESOLVE is recognized internationally for helping parties analyze and work through contentious issues – particularly those involving highly visible and political dynamics, cultural differences, and complex issues.

RESOLVE has run several Observer selection processes for multilateral organizations over the past few years; our expertise in collaborative process design, governance, and project management, as well as our role as neutral actors has contributed to the success of these processes. Observers in international decision-making bodies such as the Climate Investment Funds (CIFs) or the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) represent the diverse interests of their constituents in these institutions; they provide an opportunity for engagement and support accountability, credibility, and transparency between the decision-making body and affected or interested communities. To play these roles effectively, Observers should be independent, representative of their community, and have the tools, experience, and qualifications to engage in discussions on the issues. The selection process plays an important role in identifying Observers who can fill these roles. Employing a third-party, neutral, trusted organization such as RESOLVE to facilitate the process supports the credibility and legitimacy of the selection process and the selected Observers.

Through RESOLVE's experience facilitating these processes, we have identified methods to increase efficiency, achieve credible results, manage transparent processes, and identify qualified Observers that represent their constituencies. RESOLVE designed and managed the first selection process for CSO representatives to the CIFs in 2009 and managed a second selection process for Observers to two programs under the CIFs, the Forest Investment Program (FIP) and the Scaling-up Renewable Energy Program (SREP), in late 2009–2010. In 2011 - 2012, RESOLVE consulted with CIF Observers to gather their recommendations on the selection process, and then RESOLVE updated the process design and implemented an additional selection process. In 2014-2015, RESOLVE again facilitated the selection processes for CSO observers to the CIFs.

In 2016, RESOLVE facilitated the process to select CSO Observers to the FCPF for the 2016-2018 term. RESOLVE's objective was to design and implement a selection process that enabled CSOs engaged in activities related to REDD+ and FCPF and based in [FCPF REDD+ countries](#) to select a representative CSO from their region to participate in FCPF as observers. RESOLVE acted as a neutral party in our facilitation of the selection process. We had no substantive interest in the outcome of the selection process; our interest was that the process was considered fair and credible by constituents, all eligible parties were aware of the selection process and had an opportunity to participate, and the selected observers were qualified and representative of the CSO community. To accomplish this RESOLVE built on the selection process designed by the CSO sector and used in past FCPF CSO Observer selection processes. We worked with the FCPF Secretariat, the Facility Management Team (FMT), to ensure the process and selected observers met any FCPF governance protocols. We also relied on an Advisory Committee composed of CSO representatives familiar with the FCPF and related issues, and Observer roles and selection processes to guide the process. The FCPF Observer Selection Process spanned the globe and involved a diverse set of constituents; RESOLVE relied on our process design and project management

experience to implement a process with integrity that reflected the diverse interests of the CSO constituency.

Civil Society Organization (CSO) Observer Selection Process

The table below (Table 1) outlines the process used from June to September 2016 to select civil society organization (CSO) Observers for the 2016–2018 term. The remainder of this report outlines the steps of the selection process in more detail and highlights recommendations for future selection processes.

Table 2: Selection Process and Timeline

Phase	Timeline	Description of Activities
Establishment of Advisory Committee and Preparation Phase	June - July	RESOLVE convened an Advisory Committee composed of former FCPF CSO Observers and other qualified CSO representatives to assist with the selection process. During this time, RESOLVE worked with the Advisory Committee members and FMT to prepare for the selection process.
Observer Application Process & Voter Registration	July	A call for applications for the observer positions was distributed to CSOs and networks around the world in early July, and candidates had two-three weeks to submit applications. Simultaneously, RESOLVE invited CSOs involved in relevant issues to register to vote (in accordance with circulated registration criteria). Voter registration remained open until shortly before voting began.
Application and Voter Registration Review	Late-July - Early-August	RESOLVE reviewed applications to ensure they met the eligibility requirements. RESOLVE also reviewed and verified voter registrations to ensure the registered organizations met the eligibility requirements. The Advisory Committee met by phone to discuss the candidates, selection process, and provide advice on any process questions.
Voting	August	Candidates and registered voters were notified that the voting process had opened and were invited to vote for an Observer candidate from their region. Voting remained open for two-to-three weeks.
Final Selection	Late-August	After voting closed, RESOLVE reviewed and verified the votes and checked the voting results for regional balance. RESOLVE consulted with the Advisory Committee, notified the candidates of the selection decisions, and requested confirmation of acceptance.
Announce Observers	September 1	RESOLVE publicized the final list of selected CSO observers via the RESOLVE website and email distribution lists.

Establishing the Advisory Committee and Process Preparation

The initial phase in the FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process established the framework and guiding principles for the overall process. RESOLVE worked with the existing observers, the FMT, and the Advisory Committee members to prepare for the selection process. This phase of the process included outlining the steps and timeline for the selection process; establishing the Advisory Committee; detailing the terms and responsibilities, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria for Observer organizations and individuals; and developing materials to be used during the process. This very important and time consuming phase of the process was integral in setting the stage for a successful process.

Establishing the Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee played an essential role in the selection process. As active experts in the field, Advisory Committee members provided guidance around decisions related to the selection process, supported outreach efforts, reviewed observer applications received, and advised on procedural questions that arose during the course of the selection process. RESOLVE worked with the FMT to identify and recruit Advisory Committee members active in the field and knowledgeable about the role and responsibilities of Observers.

A list of Advisory Committee members is included below (Table 2). In addition to the individuals listed in Table 2, Nicholas Ole Soikan, Social Development Specialist at the FMT, also participated in Advisory Committee conversations as an ex-officio member. He did not have a role in Advisory Committee decision-making, but provided background information, operations context, and notified the group of any conflicts between the selection process and FCPF operating procedures. Archana Godbole, Applied Environmental Research Foundation, was an initial member of the Advisory Committee. She resigned from the Committee in July due to time constraints.

Table 3: Advisory Committee Members

Name	Organization	Country	Region
Hindou Oumar Ibrahim	Association for Indigenous Women and Peoples of Chad	Chad	Africa
(Kimaren) Stanley Kimaren Riamit	Indigenous Livelihoods Enhancement Partners	Kenya	Africa
Chandra Silori	RECOFTC - The Center for People and Forests	Thailand	Asia-Pacific
Suyana Houmani	Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (DAR)	Peru	Latin America
Cecilia Tacusi Oblitas	Independent	Peru	Latin America
Lloyd Gamble	WWF-US	United States	Northern

Process Preparation: Defining the Selection Process; Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria; Voter Criteria and Other Materials

RESOLVE consulted with sitting CSO Observers, the FMT, and Advisory Committee regarding the steps of the selection process and the terms and responsibilities, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria

for CSO Observers. These two documents served as the foundation for the selection process, guiding the steps RESOLVE took at each stage of the process. As CSO Observers are identified through a self-selection process developed by the CSO community, RESOLVE felt it important to review and build on past FCPF CSO Observer selection processes, implementing process changes to address issues identified in these past processes. In addition, it was important for RESOLVE to work with the current CSO Observers and Advisory Committee members to ensure the process met the needs of the CSO community. The selection process is outlined in Table 2. The Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria are included in [Appendix A](#).

Other preparatory actions during this phase included establishing voter criteria and guidelines, building contact lists for outreach, designing the application and voting systems, and building the [CSO Observer Selection Process website](#).

Recommendations: Establishing the Advisory Committee and Process Preparation

The preparatory phase of the CSO Observer Selection Process sets the foundation for the entire process; thorough preparation can prevent later challenges to the process once it is underway. As such, a substantial amount of time (three months or longer is recommended) should be designated to this phase. Process facilitators should work closely with the FMT, current Observers, and the broader CSO community to ensure the process builds on past processes, aligns with FCPF governance requirements and operating procedures, and has broad support from the CSO community. If time permits, RESOLVE strongly recommends consulting with the CSO community around details of the selection process, Observer eligibility requirements and selection criteria, and voter criteria and guidelines before the selection process begins. Providing this opportunity for feedback can help ensure the selection process reflects the interests and needs of the CSO community.

Observer Application Process, Voter Registration, Application Review, and Voter Verification

The CSO Observer application process involved outreach to potential applicants and responding to questions, reviewing applications against the eligibility criteria, working with the Advisory Committee to address questions, and identifying the candidate CSO organizations that advanced to the voting phase of the process. The voter registration process similarly involved outreach to potential voters in the CSO community and responding to questions, as well as reviewing and verifying registrations, and working with the Advisory Committee to address any questions. The Observer application process and voter registration were launched simultaneously to encourage participation and outreach to networks. Both the application and voter registration forms were web-based forms housed on RESOLVE's website for the process.

RESOLVE circulated a call for applications and voter registration via email to our contact lists and followed up with messages in Spanish and French where appropriate. To increase CSO participation in the process, RESOLVE also conducted outreach about the application and voter registration process through social media outlets such as Twitter and Facebook, circulated messages through the FCPF-Strategy-NGO Listserv managed by the Northern CSO Observer, and asked Advisory Committee members and the FMT to circulate outreach materials to their contacts.

Application and Review Process

The application period opened on Friday, July 1, 2016 and closed on Monday, July 18, 2016. Once the application period closed, RESOLVE reviewed the applications received against the eligibility requirements. All applications that met the eligibility required as defined in the Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria document advanced to the voting phase of the process. Information about the number of applications received from each region and eligibility is included below. Table 3 below identifies the candidates that advanced to the voting phase of the process from each region.

- **Africa Region:** 31 applications were received from the Africa Region. One applicant was not based in a FCPF REDD+ country and determined to be ineligible to advance to the voting stage. Another applicant was listed on the ballot, but later indicated they did not intend to apply.
- **Asia-Pacific Region:** 15 applications were received from the Asia-Pacific Region. 3 applicants were not based in FCPF REDD+ countries and determined to be ineligible to advance to the voting stage. Another applicant withdrew from the process.
- **Latin America-Caribbean (LAC) Region:** 9 applications were received from the LAC Region and all were determined eligible for the ballot.
- **Northern CSOs:** 1 application was received from a Northern CSO, and the application was determined eligible. That candidate was selected to be the Northern CSO Observer without a voting phase of the process.

Table 4: Eligible Observer Candidates

Region	Organization (Names listed as provided in application)	Country
Africa	Réseau Femmes Africaines pour le Développement Durable	Cameroon
	GREEN HORIZON	Cameroon
	APED	Cameroon
	PERAD	Cameroon
	SERDEV	Cameroon
	Service d'Appui aux Initiatives Locales de Développement	Cameroon
	Consortium Panafricain des Droits de l'Homme et de Lutte Contre la Toxicomanie(CPDHLCT)	Congo Brazzaville
	Femmes Côte d'Ivoire Expérience (FCIEX)	Côte d'Ivoire
	Union des ONG partenaires et OCB bénéficiaires du Fonds pour l'environnement Mondial en Côte d'Ivoire (UFEM CI)	Côte d'Ivoire
	Environnement Cadre de Vie	Côte d'Ivoire
	OPESEA-Vie	Côte d'Ivoire
	MIDH	Côte d'Ivoire
	BIO CONGO	Democratic Republic of Congo

	Reseau sur le Changement Climatique RDC / DR.Congo Climate Change Network (RCC-RDC)	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Initiative Climat REDD, ICR	Democratic Republic of Congo
	ADD (Alternatives pour le Développement Durable)	Democratic Republic of Congo
	RCP-Network	Democratic Republic of Congo
	REPALEF	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Organisation pour la Défense des Droits des Communautés Locales et Peuples Autochtones/Nationale	Democratic Republic of Congo
	La Congolaise des Mines et d'Environnement LACOME	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Conseil Régional des Organisations Non Gouvernementales de Développement en sigle (CRONGD)	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA)	Kenya
	Climate Change Network Nigeria	Nigeria
	Centre for Healthworks, Development and Research Initiative	Nigeria
	ABIODUN ADEBAYO WELFARE FOUNDATION	Nigeria
	Triumphant Health & Development Initiative	Nigeria
	JUSTICE, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE COMMISSION , IJEBU ODE, OGUN STATE	Nigeria
	East and Southern African Youth Climate Change Alliance (ESAY CCA Tanzania)	Tanzania
	African Union of Conservationists (AUC)	Uganda
Asia-Pacific	Tarayana Foundation	Bhutan
	Community Resource Improvement for Development	Cambodia
	National Forum for Advocacy, Nepal (NAFAN)	Nepal
	Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN)	Nepal
	Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources (DANAR)	Nepal
	Sustainable Development Policy Institute	Pakistan
	Indus Development Organization (IDO)	Pakistan
	Village Development Organization	Pakistan

	ISD - Institute of Sustainable Development	Pakistan
	Fundamental Human Rights & Rural Development Association (FHRRDA)	Pakistan
	Al-Eimman Development Organization	Pakistan
Latin America-Caribbean	Fundacion Biosfera	Argentina
	Fundación Agreste	Argentina
	Asociación Ambiente y Sociedad	Colombia
	The Nature Conservancy	Colombia
	Universidad del Valle de Guatemala	Guatemala
	Federacion de Organizaciones No Gubernamentales para el Desarrollo de Honduras	Honduras
	Red Mexicana de Organizaciones Campesinas Forestales A.C.	México
	Centro para la autonomía y desarrollo de los pueblos indígenas (CADPI)	Nicaragua
	Horizon Peru	Peru
Northern CSOs	Environmental Defense Fund	USA

Recommendations: Application Process

RESOLVE was pleased to see the number of high quality candidates representing diverse stakeholders that applied to serve as CSO Observers to the FCPF. This section provides some recommendations around questions and issues that developed during the application process, as well as additional recommendations to improve future processes.

Increasing the Number and Diversity of Applications

In looking at the set of applications received, some regions had a higher number of applicants than others. For example, there were 32 applicants in the Africa Region and only 1 applicant for Northern CSOs. In addition, in some regions the majority of applicants were based in one or two countries. During the voting phase, it is important to have several candidates in each region and a diversity of candidates to provide voters with a choice to select the Observer candidate that can represent their interests. There are a number of reasons the number and diversity of candidates may not have been ideal for all regions; however, there are a few steps that can be taken to improve this for future selection processes. For example, the application period should be longer to provide time for potentially interested organizations to consider the opportunity and apply. In addition, a longer application period should be connected to robust and targeted outreach in regions and countries with a historically low level of participation. The application materials should be translated into additional languages to be more accessible to potential applicants. Finally, there may be some need to consult with Northern CSOs to determine whether there are changes to the role of Northern CSO Observer that would encourage additional participation.

Eligibility Requirements

Throughout the selection process, questions arose related to the Observer candidate eligibility requirements. Prior to the next CSO Observer Selection Process, RESOLVE recommends consulting with the CSO community, current CSO Observers, and the FMT to resolve the following issues related to Observer candidate eligibility requirements, which, in some cases, also apply to voter eligibility:

- **Term Limits:** During the selection process, a question was raised regarding the term limits for CSO Observers. RESOLVE worked with the Advisory Committee to address the question during this selection process, but recommends working with Observers and the CSO community to clarify how the two consecutive term limit is applied going forward.
- **Conflict of Interest:** In this selection process, applicants were asked to disclose the scope of their organizations' funding from multilateral development banks, export credit agencies, and governments in areas relevant to FCPF activities and programming on their applications. During the selection process, questions were raised regarding the funding one candidate organization received from FCPF to implement capacity building programs. Before launching future CSO selection processes, the organization facilitating the process should confirm an acceptable approach for addressing potential conflicts of interest and determine whether there are any types of conflicts that would cause a candidate to be ineligible. If there are agreed upon conflicts of interest that would cause a candidate to be ineligible, they should be included in the eligibility requirements made public in advance of the process.
- **Country:** During the selection process, some stakeholders highlighted a concern with the eligibility requirement that CSO Observer candidates and voters must be based in [FCPF REDD+ countries](#) and suggested the process should be broadened to allow CSOs based in [UN-REDD partner countries](#) to participate in the FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process. Historically, the FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process has required participants to be based in FCPF REDD+ countries, so this would represent a change from the existing selection processes. RESOLVE recommends consulting with the CSO stakeholder community in both FCPF REDD+ countries and UN-REDD+ countries to understand the interest in broader country eligibility requirements and determine the level of interest in and support for broader participation.

Voter Registration Process and Verification

RESOLVE has found that implementing a voter registration system can be an effective way to verify voters meet the eligibility requirements and minimize the number of irregular or invalid votes. Building on RESOLVE's experience managing global, electronic voting processes, we implemented a staged process in which interested organizations were asked to register to vote. The registrations were reviewed and verified; only verified registered voters and candidates received ballots once the voting started.

In the voter registration process, interested organizations were asked to complete an online form demonstrating they were:

1. Established civil society organizations, non-governmental, non-profit, and/or community based organization based in the identified region (Africa, Asia-Pacific, Latin America-Caribbean, or Northern CSOs);
2. Actively involved in issues relevant to FCPF, such as forests, community rights/development, natural resource management/biodiversity conservation, climate change, and/or REDD; and
3. Based in an [FCPF REDD+ Country](#) (Southern CSOs) or Northern country

Further, participants were informed that each organization could only register once and cast one vote; similarly, each individual was only permitted to register and vote once, on behalf of one organization. Voters were required to register as organizations rather than individuals. Finally, organizations were asked to agree to participate in an ethical manner.

During the registration process, RESOLVE tracked registrations and identified regions where registrations were low and additional outreach to potential voters was required. In addition, RESOLVE encouraged candidates to reach out to their constituents regarding the opportunity to participate in the CSO Observer Selection Process. Voter registration was open from Friday, July 1, 2016 through Sunday, July 24, 2016 for the Africa and Asia-Pacific Regions and Northern CSOs. Because of low voter registration, the registration deadline for the Latin America-Caribbean Region was extended through Monday, August 1, 2016, and RESOLVE worked with the FMT to develop a registration in Spanish to encourage additional participation.

Verification

As a part of the voter registration process, each request for registration was reviewed to ensure the registered organization met the eligibility requirements and guidelines outlined above, and that each organization and individual were only registered once. If an application for registration was flagged for any of these concerns, then RESOLVE reached out to the organization via email in order to flag the concern and request additional information. If an organization responded to the request indicating it met the registration guidelines, RESOLVE verified the registration. Each verified organization was assigned a unique registration number to be used when submitting their vote.

This verification process was time and labor intensive for RESOLVE staff, and we recognize it can impact the number of eligible CSOs who choose to participate in the voting process. We received feedback from some members of the CSO community that the registration and verification processes were overly burdensome. Given our understanding of the extent to which organizations knowingly or unknowingly engage in activity outside of the established guidelines for this process, RESOLVE believes voter registration and verification is an important component of managing a fair, credible, and transparent process. A fair voting process helps contribute to an outcome where selected observers represent the diverse group of CSO organizations across a region. Recognizing the burden the registration and verification process places on organizations wishing to participate in the voting process, RESOLVE made a concerted effort to manage the process with an inclusive and transparent ethic. This included providing information in languages other than English when time and resources allowed; allowing organizations to verify their registration until the final day of the voting period for their region; responding to questions as quickly as possible; and posting information and updates on our website, including on an [Frequently Asked Questions page](#).

The total number of registration requests and verifications for each region were as follows:

- Africa Region: 285 voters applied for registration; 166 verified registrations
- Asia-Pacific Region: 343 voters applied for registration; 122 verified registrations
- Latin America-Caribbean Region: 63 voters applied for registration; 51 verified registrations
- Northern CSOs: 18 registered and verified voters

Recommendations: Voter Registration and Verification Processes

As noted above, voter registration and verification is a resource-intensive but important step in ensuring the outcome of the selection process reflects the choices of the CSO communities in each region. This section highlights some issues that arose during this process and options to address them.

Increasing Participation

Additional participation by qualified organizations in the voting process could add to the validity of the outcome; to increase registrations and voting across all regions, we recommend considering additional outreach strategies in consultation with the existing observers, the FMT, and the Advisory Committee. In addition, the accessibility of future processes could be improved by providing all materials in English, Spanish, and French; this accommodation would require additional resources and time. RESOLVE additionally recommends working with existing CSO Observers and the FMT to develop specific strategies to increase participation from the Latin America-Caribbean Region and Northern CSOs. There was low voter participation from both regions in this process despite outreach in multiple languages where appropriate and extended voter registration deadlines; additional targeted outreach strategies in these areas could help increase participation.

Verification Issues

Through the verification process, our registration system showed that many registrations came from the same IP address, indicating that the same computer system was used to register multiple voters. While we recognize that some organizations may share resources that could result in duplicate IP addresses when registering, the volume of these occurrences caught our attention and required follow-up. RESOLVE reached out to the organizations with duplicate IP addresses via email to verify their registrations. RESOLVE suggests future selection processes continue to closely review voter registrations to identify potentially fraudulent activity. While the majority of organizations participate in good faith, it is important to identify and disallow activity that is unethical or does not follow the established guidelines. The Advisory Committee should be looked to for guidance on the verification process.

Networks and Member Organizations

We received a number of duplicate registrations for network CSOs from their member organizations. In this process, we aligned voter registration rules with the guidelines established for CSO Observer candidates. CSOs that were part of regional and national networks or coalitions had independent nomination and voting privileges; both networks and individual CSOs were eligible to register for one vote for their respective organizations. During the verification phase, we followed up with organizations to clarify this guideline and gave organizations the opportunity to revise their registration. We recommend clear communication about this eligibility requirement in the registration guidelines for future selection processes to avoid this confusion.

Sharing Information about Registered Voters

During the selection process, a number of members of the CSO community requested information about the registered voters. [Appendix B](#) provides a list of registered voters who gave consent to share their organization name in this report in response to that request.

Voting, Final Selection, and Announcing Observers

Voting took place in the Asia-Pacific and Latin America-Caribbean Regions Monday, August 8, 2016 - Friday, August 19, 2016. In the Africa Region, voting took place from Wednesday, August 17, 2016 through Sunday, August 28, 2016. Voting was delayed in this region to address some questions regarding candidate eligibility. RESOLVE worked with the Advisory Committee to address the issue before opening the voting period. As noted above, only one eligible candidate applied to serve as Observer for the Northern CSOs, as a result a vote was not held for that region.

Verified, registered CSOs received instructions to vote, including a link to the ballot and their unique registration number via email. Lists of candidates for each region and their applications were posted on the [RESOLVE FCPF Observer Selection Process website](#); the ballot for each region also included links to the Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria, FCPF website, candidate applications, and the full list of candidates, including links to their websites. For the Latin America-Caribbean Region the ballot was included in both English and Spanish. For the Africa Region, the ballot was included in both English and French. To encourage these verified, registered CSOs to vote, RESOLVE sent several reminders to registered voters and announcements about the voting process were shared on the RESOLVE website and the FCPF-Strategy-NGO Listserv.

Once the voting period closed for each region, RESOLVE reviewed and verified the votes received and analyzed the results. Each vote was reviewed to verify ensure the organization, email address, and registration number associated with that vote match the registered information. If there were any issues in verifying any of these pieces of information, the voter was contacted to address the issue.

After the votes were verified, the votes for each candidate were tallied, as were the number of votes a candidate received from CSOs based outside their home country (regional balance). A process to assess regional balance for candidates was an important step of the selection process, intended to ensure CSO Observers ultimately selected represent constituents across their region, including both within and outside of their home country. RESOLVE worked with the Advisory Committee to define the following process to assess whether a candidate had regional balance:

1. Once votes were tallied, RESOLVE would look at the candidate with the highest number of votes. If that candidate received at least 20% of their votes from outside the country where they are based, they were declared the winner. If that candidate did not, we would look at the candidate with the next highest number of votes; if they received at least 20% of their votes from outside the country where they are based, they would be declared the winner. We would continue in this fashion until a winner was identified.
2. If a candidate received less than 10 votes, at least 40% of those votes needed to be from outside of the candidate's home country.
3. If no one met these thresholds of regional diversity, of the top three candidates, we would select the candidate with the highest percentage of votes from outside their country.
4. If there was a tie and each candidate received the same percentage of votes from outside their home country, we would select the candidate with votes from the highest number of countries.

In this selection process, the candidate with the highest number of votes in each region also met the criteria for regional balance. Several members of the CSO community suggested alternative methods for determining regional balance; their suggestions are discussed below and in Appendix C.

Once we identified the candidate with the highest number of votes meeting the regional balance criteria for each region, RESOLVE shared the results with the Advisory Committee for review. Following Advisory Committee review, RESOLVE notified all Observer candidates of their status and asked selected Observers for confirmation of their acceptance. Once we received confirmation from selected organizations, RESOLVE conveyed the final list to the FMT and publicized the list of selected Observers on the RESOLVE and with an email to our contacts. The results were also shared in a message to the FCPF-Strategy-NGO Listserv.

The summary of results below identifies the number of verified votes each candidate organization received, the number of votes with verification issues that each candidate organization received (not

counted in the total), and the percentage of votes each candidate received from CSOs outside the country where they are based (regional balance).

Summary of Results

Through the FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process detailed in this report, the following organizations and primary representatives were selected to serve as CSO Observers for their regions. More detailed results for each region are included below.

- Africa Region: Pan African Climate Justice Alliance, Mithika Mwenda, Kenya
- Asia-Pacific Region: Institute of Sustainable Development, Kanwar Muhammad Javed Iqbal, Pakistan
- Latin America-Caribbean Region: Red Mexicana de Organizaciones Campesinas Forestales A.C., Gustavo Sanchez Valle, Mexico
- Northern Countries: Environmental Defense Fund, Chris Meyer, United States

Africa Region

Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA) was selected as the FCPF Observer for the Africa Region for the 2016-2018 term. PACJA received the highest number of votes of any candidate and attained satisfactory regional balance in accordance with process guidelines established by the advisory committee, shown below as the percentage of verified votes from organizations based in countries other than the candidate's home country.

PACJA identified Mithika Mwenda as the Primary Observer and Augustine Njamshi as the Alternate.

Summary Data for Africa Region Vote

- # Candidates on Ballot - 30
- # Votes Cast - 104 (63% of verified registered voters)
- Countries Represented in Voting

1. Cameroon	7. Madagascar
2. Cote d'Ivoire	8. Mozambique
3. Democratic Republic of the Congo	9. Nigeria
4. Ethiopia	10. Sudan
5. Gabon	11. Tanzania
6. Kenya	12. Togo
	13. Uganda

Africa Region: Detailed Results of Voting for All Candidates

Table 5: Detailed voting results for Africa Region.

Organization Name	# Verified Votes Received	# Votes Received with Verification Issues	Regional Balance (Verified Votes Only) %
Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA)	40	1	63.4%

Reseau sur le Changement Climatique RDC / DR.Congo Climate Change Network (RCC-RDC)	6	1	14.3%
Green Horizon	6	0	0.0%
Climate Change Network Nigeria	5	2	14.3%
REPALEF	5	1	20.0%
African Union of Conservationists (AUC)	4	1	0.0%
Justice, Development And Peace Commission, Ijebu Ode, Ogun State	4	0	25.0%
Réseau Femmes Africaines pour le Développement Durable (REFADD)	4	0	75.0%
Initiative Climat REDD (ICR)	3	1	0.0%
Centre for Healthworks, Development and Research Initiative	3	0	0.0%
SERDEV	3	0	0.0%
Climate and Sustainable Development Network of Nigeria*	2	0	0.0%
Environnement Cadre de Vie	2	0	0.0%
Union des ONG partenaires et OCB bénéficiaires du Fonds pour l'environnement Mondial en Côte d'Ivoire (UFEM CI)	2	0	50.0%
Abiodun Adebayo Welfare Foundation	1	0	0.0%
BIO CONGO	1	0	0.0%
Consortium Panafricain des Droits de l'Homme et de Lutte Contre la Toxicomanie (CPDHLCT)	1	0	0.0%
Femmes Côte d'Ivoire Expérience/FCIEX	1	0	0.0%
La Congolaise des Mines et d'Environnement LACOME	1	0	0.0%
OPESEA-Vie	1	0	0.0%
Service d'Appui aux Initiatives Locales de Développement	1	0	0.0%
Triumphant Health & Development Initiative	1	0	0.0%
ADD (Alternatives pour le Développement Durable)	0	0	0.0%
APED	0	0	0.0%
Conseil Régional des Organisations Non Gouvernementales de Développement en sigle CRONGD	0	0	0.0%
East and Southern African Youth Climate Change Alliance (ESAY CCA Tanzania)	0	0	0.0%
MIDH	0	0	0.0%
Organisation pour la Défense des Droits des Communautés Locales et Peuples Autochtones/Nationale	0	0	0.0%
PERAD	0	0	0.0%

RCP-Network	0	0	0.0%
-------------	---	---	------

*Climate and Sustainable Development Network of Nigeria was listed on the ballot, but later indicated they did not intend to apply.

Asia-Pacific Region

The Institute of Sustainable Development (ISD), formally known as the Sustainable Development Center, was selected as the FCPF Observer for the Asia-Pacific Region for the 2016-2018 term. ISD received the highest number of votes of any candidate and attained the highest regional balance of any candidate, shown below as the greatest percentage of verified votes from countries other than the organization's home country.

ISD identified Kanwar Muhammad Javed Iqbal as the Primary Observer and Iqra Tazeem as the Alternate.

Summary Data for Asia-Pacific Region Vote

- # Candidates on Ballot - 11
- # Votes Cast - 89 (73% of verified registered voters)
- Countries Represented in Voting
 1. Bhutan
 2. Cambodia
 3. Indonesia
 4. Nepal
 5. Pakistan
 6. Vietnam

Asia-Pacific Region: Detailed Results of Voting for All Candidates

Table 6: Detailed voting results for Asia-Pacific Region.

Organization Name	# Verified Votes Received	# Votes Received with Verification Issues	Regional Balance (Verified Votes Only) %
ISD – Institute of Sustainable Development (formerly SDC – Sustainable Development Centre)	50	4	12.9%
Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN)	11	2	7.7%
Indus Development Organization (IDO)	9	0	0.0%
National Forum for Advocacy, Nepal (NAFAN)	5	0	0.0%
Sustainable Development Policy Institute	2	0	0.0%
Tarayana Foundation	1	0	0.0%
Community Resource Improvement for Development	1	0	0.0%
Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources (DANAR)	1	0	0.0%
Al-Eimman Development Organization	1	0	0.0%
Village Development Organization	0	1	0.0%

Fundamental Human Rights & Rural Development Association (FHRRDA)	0	1	0.0%
---	---	---	------

Latin America-Caribbean

Red Mexicana de Organizaciones Campesinas Forestales A.C. (MOCAF) was selected as the FCPF Observer for the Latin America-Caribbean Region for the 2016-2018 term. MOCAF received the highest number of votes of any candidate and attained satisfactory regional balance in accordance with process guidelines established by the advisory committee, shown below as the percentage of verified votes from countries other than the organization's home country.

MOCAF identified Gustavo Sanchez Valle as the Primary Observer and Gonzalo Chapela as the Alternate.

Summary Data for Latin America-Caribbean Region Vote

- # Candidates on Ballot - 9
- # Votes Cast (Response Rate) - 29 (57% of verified registered voters)
- Countries Represented in Voting
 1. Argentina
 2. Colombia
 3. Costa Rica
 4. Guatemala
 5. Honduras
 6. Mexico
 7. Nicaragua
 8. Panama
 9. Paraguay
 10. Peru

Latin America-Caribbean Region: Detailed Results of Voting for All Candidates

Table 7: Detailed voting results for Latin America-Caribbean

Organization Name	# Verified Votes Received	# Votes Received with Verification Issues	Regional Balance (Verified Votes Only) %
Red Mexicana de Organizaciones Campesinas Forestales A.C.	8	0	62.5%
Asociación Ambiente y Sociedad	3	0	50.0%
Universidad del Valle de Guatemala	3	0	33.3%
Centro para la autonomía y desarrollo de los pueblos indígenas (CADPI)	3	0	66.7%
Fundación Agreste	3	2	40.0%
Horizon Peru	2	0	0.0%
Fundacion Biosfera	1	1	0.0%
Federacion de Organizaciones No Gubernamentales para el Desarrollo de Honduras	1	2	0.0%
The Nature Conservancy	0	0	0.0%

Northern Countries

One application was submitted for Northern CSOs by the Environmental Defense Fund, therefore a vote was not held. EDF identified Chris Meyer as the Primary Observer and Dana Miller as the Alternate.

Recommendations: Voting and Final Selection

The voting process and methodology for selecting the CSO Observers straightforward for voters, transparent, and fair. These final steps of the process should result in the identification of qualified CSO Observers selected by their peers in the CSO community. RESOLVE identified the following recommendations to ensure voters have the information required to fully participate in the process and select the candidate they believe to be most qualified to represent their interests.

Volume of Candidates on the Ballot

During the voting process, several voters expressed confusion after casting votes without realizing that another organization was a candidate and asked to change their vote. In particular, this presented a challenge in the Africa Region, where there were 30 organizations on the ballot. Recognizing this might be an issue in advance, RESOLVE randomized the ballot for all voting regions to avoid giving any one candidate an advantage by being the first organization listed on the ballot every time. However, we recommend future processes limit the number of candidates placed on the ballot in an effort to reduce complication for stakeholders in this process and enable them to make well-informed decisions.

There are a number of ways to achieve this goal. One option is to shorten the list of candidates on the ballot through an evaluation process. In selection processes RESOLVE has managed for other multilateral organizations, applications were reviewed and ranked against predefined selection criteria. Through a clearly defined evaluation and interview process, the five candidates determined to be most highly qualified through the evaluation process advanced to the voting phase in each region. Another option could be to implement alternative voting systems, such as a run off system, which allows verified registered voters to vote until one candidate is elected by a majority. There are likely many other options that could be implemented, and there are certainly tradeoffs to each of the options presented here. RESOLVE recommends consulting with the CSO community and existing CSO Observers to identify an acceptable, transparent process that reduces the number of candidates on the ballot in each region in order to enhance the process for stakeholders. If an acceptable process is identified, future selection processes should include time to implement it.

Translating Materials

In addition to reducing the overall number of candidates on the ballot, it is also important to make the information provided by candidates in their applications about their qualifications accessible to voters. In a global process, this includes providing translated materials to voters. RESOLVE translated many of the announcements, some materials, and ballots into English, French, and Spanish as appropriate when the project schedule and resources allowed. The information provided by candidates in their applications was translated with a software system, which led to a number of errors in the translations. RESOLVE strongly recommends future processes commit the time and resources to translate all materials to increase accessibility for stakeholders and to help them make informed decisions.

Regional Balance

As noted above, RESOLVE consulted with the Advisory Committee to identify the process to determine whether a candidate demonstrated regional balance in votes they received; showing that they had support from the CSO community both within and outside of their home country. RESOLVE received a large amount of feedback regarding alternative methods for determining whether a candidate has regional support, we agreed to share their ideas in this report, which are included in [Appendix C](#). These methods suggested taking the total number of votes into account and identifying the number of countries that should be represented in the total number of votes. When considering the approach to determining whether a candidate has regional support in future processes, it is important to consider scale (e.g., if one observer candidate received 100 votes, 24 of which were from outside their home country (24% votes from outside home country), while another observer candidate received 4 votes, one of which was from outside their home country (25% votes from outside home country), the candidate with fewer votes demonstrates more regional support); simplicity; transparency; and whether the approach is implementable in practice. While many approaches were considered, the team ultimately adopted an approach that balanced fairness to candidates with simplicity of calculation. Given the large amount of feedback and disagreement regarding the approach to evaluating a candidate's regional support, RESOLVE recommends consulting with current Observers and the broader CSO community around the approach used in future processes.

Conclusion

While the process to select FCPF CSO Observers was challenging and complex, RESOLVE believes that we designed and implemented a process that enabled CSOs engaged in activities related to REDD+ and FCPF and based in [FCPF REDD+ countries](#) to select representative CSOs from their region to participate in FCPF as observers. Guided by principles of collaboration, transparency, integrity, and participation, RESOLVE believes we accomplished our objectives in facilitating a process considered fair and credible by constituents, in which all eligible parties were aware of the selection process and had an opportunity to participate, and resulted in selected observers qualified to meaningfully serve as Observers and represent their CSO constituents. We hope that by sharing some of our lessons learned and recommendations for the future, the CSO Observer Selection Process will continue to strengthen.

Appendix A: Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria for Observer Organizations and Individuals

Background

The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) is a global partnership of governments, businesses, civil society, and Indigenous Peoples focused on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, forest carbon stock conservation, the sustainable management of forests, and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (activities commonly referred to as REDD+). The FCPF charter also prioritizes people, communities, sustainable livelihoods, and shared environmental benefits.

The FCPF is made up of two funds, the Readiness Fund and the Carbon Fund, and their governance bodies. The former supports national REDD+ readiness activities while the latter advances programming and payments for quantified emissions reductions from REDD+ countries.

The [FCPF Charter](#) establishes Observer roles for both the Participants Committee and the Carbon Fund. In addition to CSO Observers, the Charter also designates Observer roles for representatives from relevant international organizations, forest-dependent indigenous peoples and forest dwellers, relevant private sector entities, the UN-REDD Programme and the UNFCCC Secretariat. These non-voting representatives may have a seat at meetings as Observers and speak to the issues being discussed.

In accordance with the Charter, each sector developed their own process to officially “self-select” observers. The sections below outline the terms and responsibilities, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria for Observer organizations and individuals developed for CSOs.

Terms, Responsibilities, and Meetings

- Observer organizations will serve a two-year term, beginning September 2016.
- Individuals representing Observer organizations will be expected to attend approximately one FCPF Participant Committee (PC) meeting in 2016, two PC meetings in 2017, and one PC meeting in 2018. One southern Observer and the northern Observer will also be responsible for attending Carbon Fund meetings, which occur approximately three times per year. Observers also will be expected to participate in occasional teleconferences, working groups, and other “virtual” meetings.
- Observer seat during FCPF Participants Committee meetings shall rotate for the Southern CSOs observers from the three regions; however, all Observers are expected to attend and represent at all meetings. CSO representatives shall self-select the periodicity and order of this rotation, based on relevance of topic of discussion.
- Observers are responsible for disseminating FCPF and REDD related documents of interest; circulating information regarding upcoming meetings of the FCPF beforehand, noting items of potential interest and gathering views of constituents on issues included in the agenda (especially views from civil society in countries with agenda items in the FCPF meetings); and providing a report back regarding what happened at FCPF meetings afterwards.

- Northern CSOs observer organizations must be able to cover the travel costs associated with FCPF meetings. Upon request, FCPF will sponsor travel costs for organizations from developing countries (including roundtrip air fare, visa fees, airport transfer, accommodation and meals).

Eligibility Requirements

- Three Southern CSOs representatives shall be chosen from countries participating in the FCPF, one from each of the three regions: Africa, Asia-Pacific, and Latin America-Caribbean. Organizations based in [REDD+ countries](#) in each of the three regions are eligible to stand for self-selection as the regional representatives.
- One representative shall be from an organization based in a Northern country.
- CSO applicants must be not-for-profit, non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Eligible NGOs include, but are not limited to, think tanks, advocacy groups, community-based organizations, regional networks, and aid organizations.
- Applicants must be affiliated with an organization; individual applicants not affiliated with an organization will not be considered eligible for the purposes of this selection process. Academic institutions, private foundations, government affiliated institutions, and discrete projects/activities/programs/initiatives managed by CSOs will NOT be eligible to stand for self-selection.
- Only one application may be submitted per organization per region; only one vote may be submitted per organization per region.
- CSOs that are part of regional and national networks or coalitions have independent nomination and voting privileges.
- Observers are eligible to serve two (2) consecutive terms of two (2) years maximum. Observers wishing to serve a second consecutive term must participate in the selection process.

General CSO Observer Selection Criteria

The following CSO and individual selection criteria represent important qualities for CSOs and individuals serving as Observers; CSOs were asked to demonstrate how they meet the criteria in the application materials.

1. Civil Society Organization (CSO) observers to the FCPF will be established, not-for-profit non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with verifiable knowledge and understanding of the purpose, functions, and operations of the FCPF.
2. Observer organizations must demonstrate membership in, or subscribe to information from, at least one networking organization (i.e., an alliance organization that provides services to similarly focused NGOs) that is engaged on REDD+ and FCPF at the local, national and/or international level.
3. Candidate organizations will demonstrate their capacity to establish links with groups and networks, within and outside of their home country, including grassroots-level and community-based organizations.

4. Observer organizations should demonstrate an understanding of REDD+ policy and issues
5. In order to avoid conflicts of interest, observer organizations must disclose the scope of their organizations' funding with the multilateral development banks, export credit agencies, and governments in areas relevant to FCPF activities and programming, and agree to declare any potential conflict of interest that may arise during its tenure as Observer.

Selection Criteria for Individuals Representing Observer Organizations

1. Individuals representing civil society observer organizations must demonstrate the capacity to communicate and negotiate effectively and the willingness and ability to interact actively via the internet and telephone with FCPF participants and their constituencies.
2. Individuals representing observer organizations must demonstrate their commitment to open and transparent communication with any interested stakeholders in the FCPF process.
3. Individuals representing observer organizations must be willing and committed to representing the concerns and interests of their constituents/regions – not only members of their own organizations, but also the larger community to whom they are accountable. They also must be able to report back to those constituents on FCPF activities and programming.
4. Individuals representing observer organizations should be able to demonstrate the ability to actively participate in FCPF meetings. Individuals representing regions should be able to demonstrate the ability to communicate in one or more of the main regional languages or constituency being represented (e.g., English, French, Spanish, etc.).
5. Each observer organization will be expected to appoint one primary representative who will attend FCPF meetings, and one alternate who can prepare for, travel to, and actively participate in FCPF meetings in the event the primary representative is unable to attend.

Additional Information

It is recommended that organizations interested in applying for CSO observer seats review the [FCPF Charter](#) establishing the roles and functions of the CSO observers and [Rules of Procedure](#).

Interested organizations should also review the [FCPF website](#), which contains background and up-to-date information concerning FCPF activities.

Appendix B: List of voting organizations

Note: The organizations listed here are organizations that cast a verified vote. Votes that could not be verified were not included. When submitting their vote, organizations were asked for their consent to be identified as voters. Some voting organizations declined to be identified. The organization names are written here as they were submitted when casting a vote.

Africa Region

Note: Four organizations declined to be identified.

- ABIODES
- Abiodun Adebayo Welfare Foundation
- Action for Climate Resilient Communities
- Action for Sustainable Development (ASD)
- ACTIONS COMMUNAUTAIRES POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT INTEGRAL
- ACTIONS POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET LA SOLIDARITE INTERNATIONALE (AESI)
- ADD (Alternatives Durables pour le Développement)
- Africa Development Interchange Network (ADIN)
- Africa Initiative for Rural Development (AiRD)
- Africa Network for Environment and Economic Justice (ANE EJ)
- Africa Women for Peace and Development
- African Union of Conservationists (AUC)
- African Youth Initiative on Climate Change
- ASSOCIATION POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT RURAL INTEGRE DE NGANDA-TSUNDI
- BIO CONGO
- Bioresources DEVELOPMENT and Conservation Programme Cameroon
- C.A.F.E.R (Centre d'Appui aux Femmes Et aux Ruraux)
- Cameroun Ecologie (Cam-Eco)
- CENADEP
- Centre for Healthworks, Development and Research Initiative
- Centre for Peacebuilding and Disaster Relief
- CIRAD
- Climate and Sustainable Development of Nigeria
- Climate Change Network Nigeria
- Climate Wednesday
- CODELT
- CONSEIL NATIONAL DES ONGD DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA RDC
- CONSORTIUM PANAFRICAIN DES DROITS DE L'HOMME ET DE LUTTE CONTRE LA TOXICOMANIE (CPDHLCT)
- CTIDD
- Development & Integrity Intervention Goal Foundation
- Development and Environmental Law Center (DELIC) – Madagascar
- EASTERN AFRICA FARMERS FEDERATION (EAFF)
- East and Southern African Youth Climate Change Alliance (ESAY CCA Tanzania)

- Environmental Management for Livelihood Improvement Bwaise Facility (EMLI)
- Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural Revampment and Human Rights (FEEDAR & HR)
- Femme, Environnement, Santé et Education (FENSED)
- FEMMES CÔTE D'IVOIRE EXPÉRIENCE/FCIEX
- Fikir Leselam Development Organization (FLDO)
- FORUM FOR ENVIRONMENT (FfE)
- Forum Syd
- Foundation For Environmental Rights, Advocacy & Development(FENRAD)
- FOUNDATION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF THE EARTH (FOCONE)
- Global Association of West African Youths
- Global Environment Protects Cameroon
- GREEN HORIZON
- Green Vision for Community Development Initiative
- GTCR (Climate REDD Working Group)
- Habitatcare and Protection Initiative
- Indigenous Information network
- Jeunes Volontaires de Grands Lacs pour l'Environnement
- JUSTICE, DEVELOPMENT & PEACE COMMISSION , IJEBU ODE, NIGERIA
- KASWESHA Housing Cooperative Society
- Les Amis de la Terre-Togo
- Ligue Congolaise de lutte contre la Corruption (LICOCO)
- MBOSCUDA
- MISSION CLARITE
- National Youth Green Growth Secretariat
- Ngo AIDS and environment
- Ogiek Peoples Development Program(OPDP)
- ONG ABICOM
- ONG Environnement Cadre de Vie
- ONG FDH - Fondation pour le Developpement Humain
- ONG PASYD
- OPESEA-VIE
- Organisation pour la Nature l'Environnement et le Développement du Cameroun (ONED)
- Organization of Africa Youth
- Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA)
- Peace and Life Enhancement Initiative International
- PERAD
- Pleaders of Children and Elderly People at risk (PEPA)
- REFACOF
- REFADD-Antenne RDC
- Renewgen / Y-Global
- Repalef-RDC
- RESEAU NATIONAL DES ASSOCIATIONS DES JEUNES CAMEROUNAIS AMIS DE LA NATURE
- Reseau Sur le Changement Climatique RDC (RCC-RDC)
- Service d'Appui aux Initiatives Locales de Développement (SAILD)
- Serdev

- Support for Women in Agriculture and Environment (SWAGEN)
- Sustainable Education Empowerment and Development
- Suswatch Kenya
- Tanzania civil society forum on climate change
- Tanzania Forest Conservation Group
- The Fellowship of Christian Councils and Churches in West Africa
- Transparency and Economic Development Initiatives
- Triumphant Health and Development Initiative
- Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development
- Uganda Environmental Education Foundation
- Uganda Forestry Association
- UNESCO YOUTH FORUM KE
- université des Sciences, de Technologie et de Médecine de Nouakchott (USTM)
- Women and Youth Development Initiative (WOYODEV)
- Young Volunteers for the Environment Kenya
- Zanzibar Association for Climate Change Resilience (ZACCR)
- Zanzibar Climate Change Alliance (ZACCA)

Asia Pacific Region

Note: Sixteen organizations declined to be identified.

- AAS Welfare Society Layyah
- Al-Eimman Development Organization
- AnjamanTameer-e-Millat Organization
- Anjuman Samaji Behbood (ASB)
- Asia Carbon Services Partnership (ACSP)
- Asia Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources (ANSAB)
- Association for Gender Awareness & Human Empowerment (AGAHE)
- Association of Family Forest Owners Nepal (AFFON)
- AWARD
- Awaz Foundation Pakistan: Centre for Development Services
- Citizens' Campaign for Right to Information (CCRI)
- CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UPLIFT ORGANIZATION
- Citizen Development Organization
- Community Research & Development Organization
- Community Resource Improvement for Development
- COMMUNITY WELFARE ORGANIZATION
- Community-based Forestry Supporters' Network, Nepal (COFSUN,Nepal)
- Consortium for Land Research and Policy Dialogue (COLARP)
- Construction and Allied Workers' Union of Nepal
- Cuts International Hanoi Resource Center
- Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources
- ECO-Nepal
- EECO Foundation

- Environmental Protection Society
- Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN)
- Federation of Forest Based Industry and Trade, Nepal (FenFIT)
- Focus Humanitarian Assistance (FOCUS) Pakistan
- ForestAction Nepal
- Friends Initiative for a Noble Environment
- Green Foundation Nepal
- Health and Rural Development Services Foundation
- HIMAWANTI, Nepal
- IDARA KHEDMAT E KHALEQ ROJHAN DISTRICT RAJAN PUR PUNJAB PAKISTAN
- Indus Development Organization (IDO)
- Indus Sustainable Development Foundation
- Institute of Peace and Diplomatic Studies
- Institute of Policy Studies, Islamabad
- Institute of Sustainable Development
- IWATCH
- Katth Development Organization Multan.
- Live & Learn Cambodia
- Mera Haq
- MoonSoon Development Foundation
- National Forum for Advocacy, Nepal (NAFAN)
- Nepal Herbs and Herbal Products Association (NEHHPA)
- New World Hope Organization (NWHO)
- NGO Federation of Nepal
- Organization for human development
- Pak Women
- Participatory Rural Development Society (PRDS)
- Participatory Welfare Services (PWS)
- Prime Welfare Foundation
- RAHBAR Organization
- Rohi Development Organization
- Rural Community Development Program
- Save the World Foundation
- sharinghands
- Society for Skill Training and Development
- Soofi Sachal Sarmast Welfare Association
- Southasia Institute of Advances Studies
- Sustainable Development Foundation (SDF)
- Sustainable Development Policy Institute
- Sustainable Tourism Foundation Pakistan
- Tarayana Foundation
- The Mountain Institute
- Voice for Rights Society
- Watan Development Organization Pakistan
- World Vision Pakistan
- Young Man Society

- Youth Alliance for Environment (YAE)
- Youth Development Organization
- Youth Social Energetic Services (YSES)

Latin America-Caribbean

Note: No organizations declined to be identified.

- Agencia Internacional de Prensa Indígena (AIPIN)
- Alianza Mesoamericana de Pueblos y Bosques (AMPB)
- Asociación Ambiente y Sociedad
- Asociacion Ak Tenamit
- Asociacion ASPA ANDINO
- ASOCIACION DE COMUNIDADES FORESTALES DE PETEN (ACOFOP)
- Asociacion de Investigacion y Estudios Sociales (ASIES)
- Asociación de Silvicultores de la Sierra de Zongolica AC
- CEDIA
- Centro para la autonomía y desarrollo de los pueblos indigenas (CADPI)
- Cooperativa AMBIO SC de RL
- Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
- Federación de Organizaciones No Gubernamentales para el Desarrollo de Honduras
- federación por la autodeterminacion de los pueblos indigenas (FAPI)
- FEPROAH
- FOPRIDEH
- Fundacion Agreste
- Fundacion Biosfera
- Fundacion MaderaVerde
- GADE
- Gobierno Autonomo Nacion Sumu Mayangna
- horizon peru ongd
- Mesa Nacional Indigena de Costa Rica
- Organizacion moskitia asla takanka/MASTA
- RED MEXICANA DE ORGANIZACIONES CAMPESINAS FORESTALES
- Sociedad de estudios Rurales y Cultura Popular - SER
- Universidad del Valle de Guatemala

Northern Countries

Note: Only one application was received for the Northern Countries, therefore a vote a vote was not held.

Appendix C: Summary of Input from Stakeholders Regarding Regional Balance

The following input was received from the CSO community during the 2016 FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process.

1. RESOLVE Summary of Input – Option A: 20% of votes should be from outside a candidate’s home country. If the candidate with the highest number of votes receives 20% of their votes from CSOs outside their home country, they are declared the winner. If the candidate with the highest number of votes does not meet this 20% threshold, consider whether the number of regional votes they received is 20% or more of the total votes for the next highest candidate. If this is the case, they are declared the winner. If the candidate with the highest number of votes does not meet either of these requirements, apply these rules to the candidate with the next highest number of votes. If no one meets these requirements, identify the candidate with the highest number of votes who receives 10% of their votes from outside of their home country. If no one meets the 10% regional support threshold, the winner should be the candidate with the highest total number of votes outside their home country.

The individual who provided this input shared the following example to demonstrate how it could be implemented:

Option A Example:

Elaborated Example for Calculation of Regional Balance: The Case of ambiguous 20% Regional Votes

CANDIDATES’ DATA

A = Topper

B = 2nd Highest (1st Runner Up)

C = 3rd Highest (2nd Runner Up), and so on

SCENARIO -1 (Without 20% at first level)

A gets = 45 votes in total, with 8 regional votes (37+8)

B gets = 40 votes in total

As per votes in hand, A is unable to fulfill 20% requirement in at his own level first. So now calculate as under:

8 regional votes of A are equal to 20% of total votes got by B i.e. 40

So, A has extra edge on B by having 5 more votes in addition to total votes of B.

FINAL DECISION OF SCENARIO-1: A has to be declared winner

SCENARIO -2 (Without 20% at first and runner up levels)

A gets = 45 votes in total, with 7 regional votes (38+7)

B gets = 40 votes in total

As per votes in hand, A is unable to fulfill 20% requirement at his own level first. So now calculate as under:

7 regional votes of A are also not equal to 20% of total votes got by B i.e. 40
So, A has not fulfilled 20% criteria.

FINAL DECISION OF SCENARIO-2: A has to be declined and B shall be applied same method like of A with 2nd runner up i.e. C. and process will continue until the winner is decided. If, B gets 20% vote then B is winner or compare with 2nd runner up like above.

-
SCENARIO - 3 (If no one qualify as per two-tier method)

In case, all candidates unable to get through this above method then declare the top scorer with regional diversity of at-least 10%.

-
SCENARIO – 4 (If Top Scorer does not having 10% regional votes)

If no such above match exist, then declare winner the person with highest regional votes in hand among all candidates.

NOTE: In case of ambiguous results for 20% regional votes, all such scenario based analysis shall be applied in their order and next scenario will be analyzed in case of no conclusion drawn in earlier one.

2. Regional support for a candidate is determined by assessing the number of countries outside of a candidate's home country represented in the total number of votes received. Thresholds (20%, 25%, etc.) should apply to the number of FCPF REDD+ countries represented. For example, for a candidate in the Africa Region (18 countries); for a candidate to meet the 20% regional balance threshold, they would need to receive votes from 4 countries outside of their home country.

The individual who provided this input shared the description:

For voting results, the final selection of the candidate will be determined with regional balance for which votes from 20% FCPF REDD+ countries will be mandatory i.e. votes from 2 countries in Asia-Pacific (out of 11) and 4 countries in Africa and LAC regions (out of 18 countries) other than the home country votes. The top scorer meeting this criteria will be declared winner and if the person fails then the same rule will be applied to runner ups until a winner is decided.

According to previously observed 25% rule, the condition for number of countries may also be adopted now to as, "3 countries for Asia-Pacific (out of 11 FCPF REDD+ countries) and 5 countries for LAC and African regions (out of 18 FCPF REDD+ countries) other than the home country", as part of alternate proposal to ensure more inclusiveness.