

FCPF CSO Observer Voting Process Review

The FCPF CSO Observer selection process ended on February 16th, 2011. **The clear regional winners in Africa, Latin American, and “Northern” were the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance, DAR, and BIC, respectively. The results in Asia/Pacific were unclear due to some voting irregularities, explained in detail below. After accounting for the irregularities, NAFAN appeared to be the winner from the Asia/ Pacific region. There was a total of 288 votes for all regions combined.**

EDF volunteered to facilitate the FCPF CSO Observer Voting Process. Prior to starting the process we solicited volunteers to join an advisory group for the selection process to ensure transparency and thoroughness. Additionally, we looked to other processes already in place for selecting Civil Society Organization (CSO) observers to different committees. We found that the NGO Resolve was executing a selection process of CSO Observers for the Climate Investment Funds. Resolve developed this process over 4 years and with multiple CSO stakeholders, so we felt emulating components of their process would deliver good results. Specifically, we drew inspiration from Resolve’s criteria/requirements for nominating observer candidates and their voting process.

After recruiting 4 independent advisors from 3 out of 4 regions to the advisory group, we submitted to them potential criteria/requirements to be a CSO observer. The advisory group finalized the criteria/requirements and then agreed upon the process for executing the selection of the observers: candidate nomination, verification of candidates, dissemination of candidates and voting, tallying of votes, and certifying the winners and notification. The advisory group consisted of:

- Global Witness – Rick Jacobsen (Northern)
- World Resource Institute – Florence Daviet (Northern)
- Amazon Environmental Research Institute (IPAM) – Mariana Christovam (LAC)
- Livelihood Research Association – Isaac Fwemba (Africa)

For the candidate-nomination process, we created a Gmail account called fcpfselection@gmail.com and used this account to create Google Forms for the candidate nomination process. These forms were produced in English, Spanish, and French. Latin American candidates could complete an English or Spanish form while the African candidates could complete an English or French form. After candidates submitted their information, we created candidate profiles in the necessary languages/region combinations. We combined the candidate profiles with the observer criteria in new Google form that also functioned as a ballot. These voting forms were made available in the necessary language/regional combinations.

Below is the more detailed review. It is divided into 5 Sections covering the different processes executed:

[I\) Voting Process Timeline](#)

[II\) Candidate Nomination Surveys](#)

[III\) Candidate Nomination Results](#)

IV) Voting

A. Candidate Voting Surveys

B. Detailed Voting Results

C. Irregularities

V) Lessons Learned/ Recommendations.

I. Voting Process Timeline

Advisory Committee Recruitment	Dec 7 th 2011- Jan 2 nd 2012	We recruited 4 independent advisors from 3 out of 4 regions to the advisory group. The advisory group finalized the criteria/ requirements and then agreed upon the process for executing the selection of the observers: candidate nomination, verification of candidates, dissemination of candidates and voting, tallying of votes, and certifying the winners and notification.
Candidate Nomination Process (see II and III)	Jan 3 rd - Jan 23 rd 2012	EDF distributed an explanatory letter and candidate-nomination Google Survey over list-serves such as REDD+ coalition Google groups, FCPF strategy, and asked contacts to distribute the application process rules to interested observers. All candidates nominated were put on the voting ballot.
Voting (see IV)	Jan 30 th - Feb 16 th 2012	A voting ballot was developed for each region and translated into the corresponding languages with information gained from the Application/ candidate nomination process. Although the original deadline was February 23 rd , it was moved up in order to give candidates more time to obtain the necessary visas to be part of the FCPF observers.
Voting tally (see IV C)	Feb 16 th -Feb 21 st 2012	EDF went through the results and noted a few irregularities such as duplicate votes and lack of information, so the appropriate steps were taken to account for these votes, with the approval of the advisory committee (see IV C). Research on possible irregularities is explained in detail below.
Observers Notified (see V: Recommendations).	February 21 st 2012	Chris and Stephanie from EDF notified candidates who had achieved the most votes and those who had not achieved the most votes to serve as FCPF CSO Observers via the e-mails they provided on the Candidate Nomination Form. EDF also reflected on the process and thought of lessons learned and

		recommendations for future CSO Observer Voting Processes.
--	--	---

II. [Candidate Nomination surveys](#)

[English](#)

[Spanish](#)

[French](#)

III. [Candidate Nomination results](#)

[English](#)

[Spanish](#)

[French](#)

IV. [Voting](#)

For voting, we used Google Forms divided by region and language (Africa voting in English, Africa voting in French, Latin America voting in Spanish, Latin America voting in English, Asia/Pacific voting in English, and Northern voting in English). Voters were asked to provide verification information such as organization name and contact information. We disseminated the information over several relevant list-serves such as Climate-L, Forests-L, and FCPF NGO list serve subscribed to by many NGOs that follow the FCPF.

A. [Candidate Voting Surveys](#)

Below are links to the ballots disseminated in the necessary language/regional combinations.

[“Northern” country](#)

[Asia/Pacific](#)

[Africa](#)

[Latin America](#)

[América Latina](#)

[L'Afrique](#)

B. Detailed Voting Results

With Google Forms, each “ballot” was time stamped and the information provided by the voter added to different columns to allow verification if needed. See below for notes on using Google Forms compared to a more sophisticated voting software program. There are links to each respective region’s voting tables (time stamp, identification, vote). Below those links are summaries of each region’s final voting results, with the winner in bold:

[Africa](#) (English)

1. Pan African Climate Justice Alliance Kenya	47	80%
2. Cameroon Ecology	2	3%
3. Congo Observatory of Human Rights (OCDH)	2	3%
4. Organisation Concertée des Ecologistes et Amis de la Nature (OCEAN)	8	14%
Total votes: 59		

[Africa](#) (French)

1. Pan African Climate Justice Alliance Kenya (PACJA)	2	11%
2. Ecologie Cameroun	5	26%
3. Observatoire Congo de les Droits de l'Homme (OCDH)	1	5%
4. Organisation Concertée des Ecologistes et Amis de la Nature (OCEAN)	11	58%
Total votes : 19		

Africa total

1. Pan African Climate Justice Alliance Kenya (PACJA)	49	64%
2. Ecologie Cameroun	7	22%
3. Observatoire Congo de les Droits de l'Homme (OCDH)	3	6%
4. Organisation Concertée des Ecologistes et Amis de la Nature (OCEAN)	19	26%
Total votes: 78		

[Asia/ Pacific](#) (Statistically significant irregularities, see [IV C](#)).

1. The Center for People and Forests, Vietnam (RECOFTC)	51	40%
2. HUMA Indonesia (Huma)	7	6%
3. National Forum for Advocacy Nepal (NAFAN)	64	50%
Total votes: 121		

Latin America (Spanish)

1. Servicios Ambientales de Oaxaca (SAO)	3	3%
2. Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (DAR)	70	96%
Total votes: 73		

Latin America (English)

1. Oaxaca Environmental Services (Servicios Ambientales de Oaxaca/ SAO)	2	22%
2. Environmental Rights and Natural Resources (Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales/ DAR)	7	78%
Total votes: 9		

Latin America total

1. Servicios Ambientales de Oaxaca (SAO)	4	5%
2. Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (DAR)	75	95%
Total votes: 81		

Northern

BIC: 8 votes (100%)

C. Irregularities

To determine if submissions were irregular, 6 criteria were used:

- 1) Inclusion of NGO contact information
- 2) Inclusion of NGO website
- 3) If lacking contact information, the vote was flagged for an irregularity. If the irregularity was lacking a website, we googled the NGO and tried to find work they had done mentioned in a news article from at least 2009. If no Google results from 2009 or later were found, voters were emailed requesting verification of their vote. If a delivery failure notification was received from the e-mail or if the e-mail sent on February 17th received no response by the afternoon of February 21st, they were highlighted in red and labeled as irregular.
- 4) If there was no contact name or e-mail provided or if the voter was not a CSO, votes were highlighted in red.
- 5) If CSOs voted after the deadline, they were highlighted in green and not counted.
- 6) If NGOs voted more than once, they were highlighted in yellow and counted as duplicates. Only one vote was counted from the NGO and the other vote was annulled.

After using these criteria, it was found that the only statistically significant irregularities were in Asia/Pacific because voting was so close (51 votes for RECOFTC vs. 64 votes for NAFAN). **If the irregularities are taken into account and discounted, NAFAN is still the winner, but only by 3 votes.**

This is the number of irregularities found in Asia/Pacific, and how results would change if irregularities were taken out of the voting pool:

Asia/ Pacific

- | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|
| 1. The Center for People and Forests, Vietnam (RECOFTC) | 51 | 40% |
| 2. HUMA Indonesia (Huma) | 7 | 6% |
| 3. National Forum for Advocacy Nepal (NAFAN) | 64 | 50% |

Organization	Duplicates	Confirmed irregularities	Votes after the deadline
NAFAN	12	9	11
RECOFTC	4	9	5
Huma	0	2	0

(winner in pink)

Organization	Original votes	Votes discounted	New total
NAFAN	64	26	38
RECOFTC	51	16	35
Huma	7	2	5

V. Lessons Learned/ Recommendations

- A. More security for voting needed:** While we don't believe there was any fraud or ballot stuffing that occurred in this process, it could potentially become an issue when voting becomes more widespread in the future. The advantage to using Google Forms was that it was free of charge and easy to create a survey for each region. However, the disadvantage was the inability to format information in the forms, split the form into different page numbers, combine all languages in one multi-page form, and security issues encountered when noticing voting irregularities. It seems that using sophisticated software to verify IP addresses and ensure that each CSO was able to vote only once in their respective regions would be a better option than using Google Forms. To this end, some funding may be needed to purchase such software and avoid such irregularities.
- B. Budget support for a more formalized process:** The FCPF PC should take into consideration that the next election will require a more secure process and reaching out to regions. A budget should be considered to pay for the piece of software and a service provider, such as Resolve, to execute a selection process. This budget should be part of the funds that go to pay for CSO Observer participation. While the number of candidates and votes were minimal this round, we do expect interest in being an observer and voting numbers to increase as the FCPF begins implementation in many countries over the next two years. Thus, a sturdier voting infrastructure and more time to complete the voting process will be needed, which will most likely require remuneration of the executing organization.