

**RESOLVE Facilitation of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility  
Civil Society Organization (CSO) Observer Selection Process  
2018**

**Final Selection Process Report**

**RESOLVE**

Contributors

*(RESOLVE Selection Process Project Team)*

Maya Breitburg-Smith, Facilitator and Project Lead

Meg Perry, Facilitator

Laura Bartock, Program Associate

Veronica Chang, Intern

Claire Doualla, Intern

Learn more about RESOLVE at [www.resolv.org](http://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 – October 2018. 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; and a list of the verified registered voters in each region.

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 FCPF to design 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 (Table 1), and this report describes the process implemented to select the Observers in detail. This report then identifies some recommendations for consideration that we hope can help to strengthen future Observer selection processes.

**Table 1: 2018 Selected FCPF CSO Observers**

<b>Africa Region</b>	<b>Asia-Pacific Region</b>	<b>Latin America-Caribbean Region</b>	<b>Northern Countries</b>
Pan African Climate Justice Alliance  <i>Mithika Mwenda</i>  KENYA	Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN)  <i>Dil Raj Khanal</i>  NEPAL	Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Peten (ACOFOP)  <i>Sergio Guzmán</i>  GUATEMALA	Environmental Defense Fund  <i>Chris Meyer</i>  UNITED STATES

## 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
Observer Application Process, Voter Registration, Application Review, and Voter Verification .....	7
Application and Review Process .....	7
Voter Registration Process and Verification .....	9
Voting, Final Selection, and Announcing Observers .....	10
Conclusion and Recommendations .....	12
Establishing the Advisory Committee and Process Preparation.....	12
Application Process.....	13
Voter Registration and Verification Processes .....	14
Voting and Final Selection.....	14
Appendix A: Terms and Responsibilities, Eligibility Requirements, and Selection Criteria for Observer Organizations and Individuals.....	16
Appendix B: Community Feedback on the Proposed Process .....	19
Appendix C: List of Voting Organizations.....	21
Africa Region .....	21
Asia Pacific Region .....	23
Latin America-Caribbean .....	25
Northern Countries .....	25
Appendix D: Detailed Summary of Voting Results.....	26
Africa Region .....	26
Asia-Pacific Region .....	27
Latin America-Caribbean.....	28
Northern Countries .....	29

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

For 40 years, RESOLVE has been developing and promoting the effective use of collaboration and consensus building, helping groups with diverse interests engage in dialogue and forge workable solutions to difficult problems. With partners in the United States 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.

In 2018, RESOLVE facilitated the process to select CSO Observers to the FCPF for the 2018-2020 term – the topic of this report. In this process, RESOLVE's objective was to design and implement a selection process that enabled CSOs engaged in activities related to REDD+ and the FCPF and based in [FCPF REDD+ countries](#) or Northern countries to select a representative CSO from their region to participate in FCPF as official observers. RESOLVE acted as a neutral party in our facilitation 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 the guidance of an Advisory Committee composed of CSO representatives familiar with the FCPF and Observer roles and selection processes. 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 2) outlines the process used from June to October 2018 to select civil society organization (CSO) Observers for the 2018–2020 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 2018	Worked with the FMT to convene an Advisory Committee composed of former CSO observers and other CSO representatives to assist with the selection process. Advisory Committee members represented organizations that did not currently have an interest in serving as a CSO Observer. Consulted with the Advisory Committee, CSO community, and FMT to review and update the selection process and related materials.
Observer Application Process & Voter Registration	July – Early August 2018	A call for applications for the observer positions was distributed to civil society organizations and networks around the world in early August, and candidates had two weeks to submit applications. Beginning at the same time we also invited civil society organizations involved in relevant issues to register for the voting process.
Application and Registration Review	Mid–August 2018	RESOLVE screened applications against the eligibility and selection criteria. After the screening process, RESOLVE shared the list of candidates with the Advisory Committee for review. RESOLVE also verified voter registrations were received from eligible CSO organizations.
Voting	Late August – Early September 2018	Registered voters were notified that the electronic voting process was open. Organizations were able to vote for observer candidates from their region (the four regions are Africa, Asia-Pacific, Latin America, and Northern CSOs). During the voting period, RESOLVE confirmed the votes had been received from verified organizations.
Final Selection	September – October 2018	Once the voting period ended, RESOLVE consulted the Advisory Committee and worked with them to make final selections. We notified the candidates of the selection decisions and requested confirmation of acceptance.
Announce Observers	October 2018	RESOLVE worked with the FMT to publicly announce the final list of selected CSO observers via the RESOLVE website, email distribution lists, and other avenues.

## 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. Though time-consuming, these steps were essential to set the stage for a successful process.

### *Establishing the Advisory Committee*

The Advisory Committee played an integral 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. The FMT identified and recruited Advisory Committee members active in the field and knowledgeable about the role and responsibilities of Observers, with input on membership and criteria from RESOLVE.

A list of Advisory Committee members is included below (Table 3). In addition to the individuals listed in Table 3, Nicholas Soikan, 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. Other members of the FMT participated in Advisory Committee calls as schedules permitted to provide additional support if Mr. Soikan was not available.

**Table 3: Advisory Committee Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Region</b>
Elsa Esquivel Bazán	Cooperativa AMBIO	Mexico	Latin America
Joshua Lichtenstein	Rainforest Foundation US	United States	Northern
Grace Balawag	Tebtebba	Philippines	Asia-Pacific

### *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. In addition, these documents were circulated to the broader CSO community for review and feedback by email. Comments from the CSO community were shared with the Advisory Committee for consideration. A report summarizing the comments and approaches to address them was then circulated to the CSO community.

These materials served as the foundation for the selection process, guiding the steps RESOLVE took at each stage of the process, and so input from the broader CSO community was important. 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 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](#). The report detailing comments received on the process materials and responses is available in [Appendix B](#).

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](#).

### **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 accessible through RESOLVE's website.

RESOLVE circulated a call for applications and voter registration via email in English, French, and Spanish to our contact lists, including to members of the FCPF-Strategy-NGO Listserv. 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, as well as additional relevant listservs, and asked Advisory Committee members and the FMT to circulate outreach materials to their contacts.

#### ***Application and Review Process***

The application period opened on Wednesday, August 1, 2018 and closed on Wednesday, August 15, 2018. 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 4 below identifies the candidates that advanced to the voting phase of the process from each region.

- [Africa Region](#): 20 applications were received from the Africa Region. 2 applicants were not based in a FCPF REDD+ country and were therefore deemed ineligible to advance to the voting stage. Another applicant withdrew from the process.
- [Asia-Pacific Region](#): 14 applications were received from the Asia-Pacific Region. 4 applicants were not based in FCPF REDD+ countries and were therefore deemed ineligible to advance to the voting stage.
- [Latin America-Caribbean \(LAC\) Region](#): 4 applications were received from the LAC Region and all were deemed eligible for the ballot. 1 applicant was not based in a FCPF REDD+ country and was therefore deemed ineligible to advance to the voting stage.

- Northern CSOs: 2 applications were received from the Northern Countries, and both were deemed eligible for the ballot.

Table 4: Eligible Observer Candidates

Region	Organization (Names listed as provided in application)	Country
Africa	Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural Revampment and Human Rights (FEEDAR & HR)	Cameroon
	Global Environment Protects Cameroon	Cameroon
	Association Camerounaise pour le Développement, l'Entraide Sociale et la Protection de l'Environnement (Cameroon Association for Development, Social Support and Protection of the Environment) (ACDESPE)	Cameroon
	Ligue Congolaise de Lutte contre la Corruption (Congolese League Against Corruption)	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Collectif des Femmes Rurales pour le Développement/COFERD	Democratic Republic of Congo
	REFADD/RDC	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Réseau Communautaire pour le Pauvre (Community Network for the Poor)	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Women, Environment and Health (Femme, Environnement et Santé)	Democratic Republic of Congo
	COOPCONGO Scoops	Democratic Republic of Congo
	Abibiman Foundation	Ghana
	Centre for Environmental Citizenship Initiatives, Ghana	Ghana
	PAN AFRICAN CLIMATE JUSTICE ALLIANCE (PACJA)	Kenya
	ORCDES	Madagascar
	African Women's Network for Sustainable Development (REFADD, Réseau Femmes Africaines Pour le Développement Durable)	Republic of the Congo
	Association Congolaise pour le Développement Agricole (Congolese Association for Agricultural Development) ACDA	Republic of the Congo
	ONG AJEDI	Togo
	Uganda Forestry Association	Uganda
Asia-Pacific	Scale Up	Indonesia
	Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources (DANAR)	Nepal
	Community-based Forestry Supporters' Network, Nepal (COFSUN, Nepal)	Nepal
	Nepal Foresters' Association	Nepal
	Federation of Community Forestry Users, Nepal (FECOFUN)	Nepal
	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)	Pakistan



	Water, Environment and Sanitation Society WESS	Pakistan
	Awami Welfare Organization (AWS)	Pakistan
	Indus Development Organization (ISO)	Pakistan
	Civil Society Coalition for Climate Change	Pakistan
<b>Latin America-Caribbean</b>	Asociación Ambiente y Sociedad	Colombia
	Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Peten ACOFOP	Guatemala
	Proyecto Ecológico Azuero	Panama
<b>Northern CSOs</b>	Code REDD	USA
	Environmental Defense Fund	USA

### ***Voter Registration Process and Verification***

RESOLVE has found that implementing a voter registration system can be an effective way to verify that voters meet the eligibility requirements and to 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);
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 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 Wednesday, August 1, 2018 through Wednesday, August 22, 2018 for the Africa and Asia-Pacific Regions. Because of low voter registration, the registration deadline for the Latin America-Caribbean Region and Northern CSOs was extended through Wednesday, August 29, 2018.

### ***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 was only registered once. If an application for registration was flagged for

any of these concerns, then RESOLVE reached out to the organization via email 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 use when submitting its 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. 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; 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](#): 238 voters applied for registration; 180 verified registrations
- [Asia-Pacific Region](#): 111 voters applied for registration; 74 verified registrations
- [Latin America-Caribbean Region](#): 33 voters applied for registration; 27 verified registrations
- [Northern CSOs](#): 24 registered; 19 verified registrations

### **Voting, Final Selection, and Announcing Observers**

Voting took place in the Asia-Pacific and Latin America-Caribbean Regions Wednesday, August 22, 2018 - Wednesday, September 5, 2018. Because of low numbers of votes cast by the Latin America-Caribbean and Northern CSOs, the voting deadline for the Latin America-Caribbean Region was extended through Sunday, September 9, 2018, and for the Northern CSOs through Friday, September 14, 2018. RESOLVE worked with the Advisory Committee to address the issue of low turnout and reached out directly to verified voter organizations to remind and encourage them to vote.

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 available in both English and Spanish. For the Africa Region, the ballot was available 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. [Appendix C](#) provides a list of verified registrations who voted and gave consent to share their organization name in this report in response to that request.

Once the voting period closed for each region, RESOLVE reviewed and verified the votes received and analyzed the results. Each vote was reviewed to ensure the organization, email address, and registration

number associated with that vote matched the registered information. If there was any issue in verifying this information, the voter was contacted to address the issue.

After verifying the votes, RESOLVE tallied the votes for each candidate and the number of votes a candidate received from CSOs based outside their home country (regional balance). This assessment of regional balance for candidates was intended to ensure the CSO Observers ultimately selected represent constituents across their region, both within and outside of their home country. RESOLVE worked with the Advisory Committee to define the following process for assessing whether the votes received by a candidate had sufficient 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

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.

At this stage in the process, the Northern region selection result was referred to the Advisory Committee for review due to a request for appeal by one of the candidates. Following its review, the Advisory Committee selected EDF (the candidate receiving the highest number of votes, but which did not meet the regional balance criteria) to serve as the Northern Region Observer. Please see below for the Advisory Committee's decision and rationale:

*The Advisory Committee recognizes the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) as the winner of the Northern Observer CSO self-selection process. The Advisory Committee further requests that EDF and the Facility Management Team reach out to Code REDD to invite its active participation in any FCPF activities in which it is interested and convey that despite this decision, Code REDD's active participation in the FCPF is welcome.*

*The Committee finds the established regional balance criteria do not apply well to Northern CSOs, which are predominantly international in nature, with multiple offices across the region. If any candidate or voting organization had registered with a different organizational address, this could have changed the outcome of the selection, according*

---

<sup>1</sup> In this selection process, the candidate with the highest number of votes also met the criteria for regional balance in all but the Northern Region.

*to the established regional balance criteria. As such, the Committee is selecting the Northern observer candidate that received the highest number of votes overall, EDF, recognizing that the actual regional balance among the votes EDF received is sufficient for this organization to adequately represent the Northern region.*

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 detailed summary of results included in [Appendix D](#) identifies the number of verified votes each candidate organization received, the number of votes with verification issues each candidate organization received (not counted in the total), and the percentage of votes each candidate organization received from CSOs outside the country where it is based (regional balance).

## **Conclusion and Recommendations**

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 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. We offer the following recommendations for consideration in future processes:

### ***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 self-selection process builds on past processes, aligns with FCPF governance requirements and operating procedures, and has broad support from the CSO community.

In particular, the Advisory Committee plays an essential role throughout the self-selection process, providing key guidance on issues that may arise. Ideally, the Advisory Committee should consist of two representatives from each region, and at a minimum each region should be actively represented in the Advisory Committee's discussions. Because of the Advisory Committee's role in adjudicating disputes within the process, we recommend that the self-selection process not begin until an active, representative Advisory Committee is established. Furthermore, the FMT and Advisory Committee should establish a clear decision making process for when challenges or issues are brought forward for consideration so they may be resolved in a timely manner.

## ***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 20 applicants in the Africa Region and only 2 applicants 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*

Defining and grappling with potential conflicts of interest for candidates continues to be a challenge in the selection process. Prior to the next CSO Observer Selection Process, RESOLVE recommends consulting with the CSO community, current CSO Observers, and the FMT to resolve issues related to Observer candidate eligibility requirements, with a particular focus on potential conflicts 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. Although the selection criteria do not identify any grounds for disqualification due to conflicts of interest, concerns were raised regarding one candidate's eligibility due to potential conflicts of interest. 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.

### *Ensuring Adequate and Timely Review of Applications*

After the period for accepting applications closes, it is important to build sufficient time into the process to review the applications with the Advisory Committee. This would allow Advisory Committee members to identify any questions or concerns about the candidates and, if necessary, return to candidates to ask for more details in their application before voting begins.

## ***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, future processes should continue to provide all materials in English, Spanish, and French to support accessibility of the process. 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 targeted outreach in multiple languages (where appropriate) and extended voter registration deadlines; additional targeted outreach strategies in these areas could help increase participation. Continued strategic use of social media outlets to more broadly advertise the process, as well as promotion by Advisory Committee members and representatives from different regions, could greatly help with outreach.

### ***Verification Issues***

During the 2016 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. In 2016 and 2018, RESOLVE reached out to the organizations with duplicate IP addresses via email to verify their registrations. While this was a less common issue in 2018, 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.

## ***Voting and Final Selection***

The voting process and methodology for selecting the CSO Observers should be 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.

### ***Decision-making Process for Issues Raised***

When issues are brought to the facilitation team for consideration, particularly if a selection result is challenged, it is important to clearly define which of the organizing parties involved holds the final decision-making authority. Ideally, a robust, diverse, and active Advisory Committee would be best positioned to represent the interests of the CSO community and carefully consider issues brought to their attention. We recommend clearly designating a robust Advisory Committee as the final decision-maker to maintain the observer selection process as a self-selection process.

### *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. In 2016, the information provided by candidates in their applications was translated with a software system, which led to a number of errors in the translations. In 2018, RESOLVE utilized an outside translation services provider, which allowed for more timely and accurate translation of candidate applications. 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*

Regional balance continues to be important criterion, and further discussion is needed to reach shared understanding on how to apply this criterion across the four regions within this process. The purpose of the regional balance criterion is to determine whether a candidate demonstrated regional balance in votes they received; showing that they had support from, and therefore will be able to represent, the CSO community both within and outside of their home country. At the outset of the 2018 process, RESOLVE communicated feedback received in the 2016 process regarding the regional balance criterion and consulted with them regarding possible changes. The Advisory Committee recommended the continued use of the method for determining regional balance established in 2016, an approach that attempted to balance fairness to candidates with simplicity of calculation. However, given that the Advisory Committee found the established regional balance criteria do not apply well to Northern CSOs in the 2018 process, it is important to revisit what regional balance means, particularly for the Northern Region, where organizations are more global in nature and have offices around the world. For future processes, the Advisory Committee should consider whether the regional balance criterion and its application accurately reflect the priorities of the CSO community. In addition, the Advisory Committee should consider whether regional balance is a necessary criterion for the Northern region, and if so, whether regional balance should be calculated differently for the Northern Region. RESOLVE recommends consulting with current Observers and the broader CSO community around the approach used in future processes.

## **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: Community Feedback on the Proposed Process

### Feedback Request

In preparation for the biannual FCPF CSO Observer self-selection process, RESOLVE requested input from members of the FCPF Civil Society Community on the proposed self-selection process. Community members were asked to provide feedback on the following documents:

1. *Proposed 2018 FCPF CSO Observer Selection Process and Timeline*. This document details the specific steps and anticipated timeline for the 2018 selection process. (Available [online](#))
2. *Proposed 2018 FCPF CSO Observer Criteria*. This document includes the terms and responsibilities, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria for individuals and organizations, as well as the approach to assessing regional support in election results. (Available [online](#))
3. *Proposed 2018 FCPF CSO Observer Voter Criteria*. This document outlines voter eligibility requirements and voting guidelines, as well as questions that will be used asked to verify voter eligibility. (Available [online](#))

This request for input was circulated to the CSO community using the FCPF Strategy Listserv, a forum for civil discussion and information sharing specifically about the FCPF and other multilateral funds related to REDD+. This listserv provides a means for the FCPF Northern Civil Society Observer to report out to constituencies about news from the FCPF and for these constituencies to share views with each other and the Observer. We understand approximately 160 organizations are members of this listserv.

### Overview of Feedback

Two community members provided their feedback through the online form, and one member provided feedback via email. The majority of respondents were supportive of the proposed process.

One member expressed concern with the proposed approach to assessing regional balance in determining election results. The member indicated that because candidates must receive at least 20% of their votes from outside their country (or 40% if the candidate received less than 10 votes) in order to be elected, in-country votes are unfairly undervalued. This individual also suggested candidates should be known conservationists and voters should, at the least, be aware of the importance of forests and the sustainable development goals.

See [page 2](#) for detailed results.

### Response to Feedback

We appreciate all of the feedback received. The positive feedback is a helpful indicator that the 2018 CSO Observer selection process has been designed to ensure credible, transparent, and representative results. We believe the current observer criteria ensure that observer candidates are active organizations in the forestry and sustainability sectors.

We understand that the regional balance criterion means that some votes may not be valued equally. However, because observers are responsible for communicating with and gathering input from constituents across their region, it is important for selected candidates to demonstrate some regional diversity in the votes they receive. The regional balance approach that has been proposed is intended to capture the candidates' ability to adequately represent their region.

Detailed Results

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Feedback on Selection Process and Timeline	Feedback on Observer Criteria	Feedback on Voter Criteria
Raymond	Katebaka	African Union of Conservationists (AUC)	I think the process has been designed with a FAIR approach	The Criteria seem to be neutral	Very inclusive
Zain	Daudpoto	Indus Development Organization (IDO)	As per prior experience during contesting as CSO observer for Asia Pacific though I got more votes against only my Nepali candidate but he was declared successful because of country and out country votes value ratio 1:0.5. I think this formula of votes calculation is discriminating formula every vote must be considered as one vote local as well as out of country.	Candidate must be known as conservationist through his activities provable.	At least voter must be aware of importance of forests and SDGs.
Lawrence	Connell	Bank Information Center	<i>(Shared via email)</i> Those documents/criteria all look reasonable & in line with good practice		

## Appendix C: 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: No organizations declined to be identified.*

- ABANTU FOR DEVELOPMENT
- ABC-K
- Action Jeunesse pour le Développement
- ACTIONS EN FAVEUR DE L'HOMME ET DE LA NATURE (AFHON)
- Actions pour l'Environnement et la Solidarité Internationale AESI
- AFADEG
- Association Burkinabe d Action Communautaire ABAC ONG
- Association Camerounaise pour le Développement, l'Entraide Sociale et la Protection de l'Environnement
- Association des Pépiniéristes et Planteurs de Tône-Ouest (SONGOU-MAN)
- Association for Sustainable Development Alternatives
- Association of Women in Environmental and Economic Development (AWEED)
- ATO-ClimatEducate Project
- Bakassi Peninsular Women in Development
- Bakundu Women in Kwakwa
- Bakundu Youths Movement
- Bille Area Farmers
- Bioenergy Research and Development Foundation (BIFORAD), Kenya
- Bioresources Development and Conservation Programme Cameroon
- BONOMBE MULTI-PURPOSE FARMERS COMMON INITIATIVE GROUP (BOMFACIG)
- Buliisa Initiative for Rural Development Organisation (BIRUDO)
- CAFER
- CAFSO-WRAG for Development
- Cameroun Ecologie
- Care and Development Centre
- Centre for 21st Century Issues
- Centre National d'Appui au Développement et à la Participation Populaire, CENADEP en sigle
- Coalition of Civil Society Organizations in the Central African Region
- COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE
- Community Restoration Initiative Project
- Connected Advocacy for Empowerment and Youth Development Initiative
- CONSORTIUM FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ETHIOPIA
- CSDevNet
- ED/ADCF

- Emony Yefwe International
- ENDA-Ethiopia
- Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural Revampment and Human Rights ( Tcharbuahbokengo NFINN , Kinyiy Petra)
- Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural Revampment and Human Rights
- Feedar & HR MCCOOOP with BOD
- Femmes Foret Développement FFD
- Forest Action Network
- Forest and Agroforestry Promoters (FAP NGO) Cameroon
- Forest Watch Ghana
- FORETS COMMUNAUTAIRES POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT RURAL EN abrégé FOCODER
- FORUMCC
- GABON ÉCOLOGIE
- GASHE
- Gasy Youth Up
- GENDER AND ENVIRONMENTAL RISK REDUCTION INITIATIVE(GERI)
- GEOPLANET-CI
- Global Environment Protects
- Global Environment Protects (GEP)
- Global Peace and Development Organization
- GTCR
- Hard Working Farmers Common Initiative Group
- Helen Keller International
- iTC-F
- KAENGESA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION SOCIETY
- Kariobangi South Welfare & Slums Housing Association (KASWESHA Housing Cooperative Society)
- KCODEC
- KEWASNET
- KULIMA
- Labour,Health and Human Rights Development Centre
- Les Amis de la Terre-Togo
- LIPRO Uganda
- Loja de Energias
- Maison de l'Enfant et de la Femme Pygmée
- Mbororo Youth Association of Cameroon (MBOYASCAM)
- MBOSCUA
- NAADUTARO (PASTORALISTS' SURVIVAL OPTIONS)
- National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)
- Njasomo Community
- ONG AJEDI
- ONG Association Peuple Culture Développement (APCD)
- ONG BOAZ DÉVELOPPEMENT
- ONG CAV (Club des Amis du Village)
- ONG DIMENSION HUMAINE

- OPED
- ORAM
- ORAM (Rural Association for Mutual Support)
- Oroko Youths Association
- PACJA UGANDA
- PAN AFRICAN CLIMATE JUSTICE ALLIANCE
- REFACOF
- REFADD
- REFADD/RDC
- RENIALA-CC
- Researchers of International Agreements
- Réseau Communautaire pour le Pauvre
- Réseau sur le changement climatique RDC
- Réseau sur le Changement Climatique, RCCRD Congo
- RRN
- S.O.S Environnement
- Satellite Youths
- South West Farmers Multipurpose Common Initiative Group
- Support for Women in Agriculture and Environment (SWAGEN)
- SURA-MAMA (MBORORO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION)
- Talent Search International
- Terra viva
- The Needy Today
- Tree Talk Plus
- Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development
- uganda forestry association
- Welisane Foundation
- Women Environmental Programme Togo
- Zanzibar Climate Change Alliance

### ***Asia Pacific Region***

*Note: Two organizations declined to be identified.*

- Advocacy, Research, Training and Services (ARTS) Foundation
- AFFON
- ANSAB Nepal
- Awami Welfare Society
- Bioresource Research Centre
- Community Development Center (CDC)
- Community Initiatives for Development in Pakistan
- Community Self Reliance Centre (CSRC)
- Community-based Forestry Supporters' Network, Nepal
- Fast Rural Development Program
- Federation of Community Forestry Users, Nepal (FECOFUN)
- Federation of Drinking Water and Sanitation Users Nepal (FEDWASUN)

- fenfit
- FORCERT
- ForestAction Nepal
- Green Job Fund and Promotion Centre
- HIMAWANTI
- Indus Development Organization (IDO)
- Indus Sustainable Development Foundation
- ISDS
- Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environment Nepal (JVE NEPAL)
- Karnali Integrated Rural Development And Research Center( KIRDARC) Nepal
- Khpal Kore Organization
- Live & Learn Cambodia
- Media Venue for Co-Existence(MECO)
- Nakororiki Park & Youth Association
- National Campaign for Sustainable Development
- National Disability & Development Forum (NDF)
- Neighbour Organization Nepal (NEO-Nepal)
- Nepal Energy Foundation
- Nepal Foresters' Association
- Nepal Handmade Paper Association (HANDPASS)
- NGOs Development Society (NDS)
- PanNature
- Peace by Youth (PY)
- Practical Action Nepal
- Prakriti Resources Centre
- Rastriya Dalit Network (RDN) Nepal
- RISE
- Sarhad Awami Forestry Ittehad (SAFI)
- Scale Up Association
- Southasia Institute of Advanced Studies (SIAS)
- Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)
- Sustainable Environment and Development Foundation
- Sustainable Tourism Foundation Pakistan
- The Center for People and Forests - RECOFTC
- The Mountain Institute
- Tongoa-Shepherds Women's Association
- United Mission to Nepal
- Vanuatu Civil Society Platform
- WOCAN
- Women Network for Energy and Environment(WoNEE)
- WWF Nepal
- Youth Alliance for Environment (YAE)



### **Latin America-Caribbean**

*Note: No organizations declined to be identified.*

- Alianza Mesoamericana de Pueblos y Bosques
- Apocalvi
- Asociación Ak Tenamit
- asociación ambiente y sociedad
- Asociación Campesina del Valle del Rio Cimitarra
- Asociación Campesina Tierras del Occidente "TEO - OCCIDENTE"
- Asociación Ecosistemas Andinos ECOAN
- Colectivo de Abogados José Alvear Restrepo
- Ecotropics
- Fundación Alma
- Fundación Egdolina Thomas
- Fundación Embera pa el Desarrollo
- Proyecto Ecológico Azuero
- Red de Jóvenes contra el Cambio Climático Panamá
- Red Uruguaya ONGs Ambientalistas
- Tortugas Pedasi

### **Northern Countries**

*Note: Three organizations declined to be identified.*

- Bank Information Center
- Carbonfund.org Foundation
- Climate Advisers Trust
- EDF
- Global Canopy
- National Wildlife Federation
- Rainforest Alliance
- Rainforest Foundation Norway
- Verra
- Wildlife Conservation Society
- World Wildlife Fund

## Appendix D: Detailed Summary of Voting 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. Please see Appendix A for detailed voting results for each region.

- Africa Region: Pan African Climate Justice Alliance, Mithika Mwenda, Kenya
- Asia-Pacific Region: Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN), Dil Raj Khanal, Nepal
- Latin America-Caribbean Region: Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Peten (ACOFOP), Sergio Guzmán, Guatemala
- 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 2018-2020 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 Njamnshi as the Alternate.

#### *Summary Data for Africa Region Vote*

- # Candidates on Ballot - 17
- # Votes Cast - 105 (59% of verified registered voters)
- Countries Represented in Voting
  1. Burkina Faso
  2. Cameroon
  3. Central African Republic
  4. Côte d'Ivoire
  5. Democratic Republic of the Congo
  6. Ethiopia
  7. Gabon
  8. Ghana
  9. Kenya
  10. Liberia
  11. Madagascar
  12. Mozambique
  13. Nigeria
  14. Republic of the Congo
  15. Rwanda
  16. Sierra Leone

#### *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)	57	6	88%

Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural Revampment and Human Rights (FEEDAR & HR)	19	6	5%
African Women's Network for Sustainable Development (REFADD, Réseau Femmes Africaines Pour le Développement Durable)	6	1	100%
Abibiman Foundation	3	1	0%
Centre for Environmental Citizenship Initiatives, Ghana	3	0	67%
Global Environment Protects Cameroon	3	0	0%
Association Camerounaise pour le Développement, l'Entraide Sociale et la Protection de l'Environnement (Cameroon Association for Development, Social Support and Protection of the Environment) (ACDESPE)	2	0	50%
Ligue Congolaise de Lutte contre la Corruption (Congolese League Against Corruption)	2	0	0%
ONG AJEDI	2	1	0%
Uganda Forestry Association	2	0	0%
Association Congolaise pour le Développement Agricole (Congolese Association for Agricultural Development) ACDA	1	2	0%
Collectif des Femmes Rurales pour le Développement/COFERD	1	0	100%
ORCDES	1	0	0%
REFADD/RDC	1	1	0%
Réseau Communautaire pour le Pauvre (Community Network for the Poor)	1	0	0%
Women, Environment and Health (Femme, Environnement et Santé)	1	0	100%
COOPCONGO Scoops	0	0	0%

### Asia-Pacific Region

Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN), was selected as the FCPF Observer for the Asia-Pacific Region for the 2016-2018 term. FECOFUN 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.

FECOFUN identified Dil Raj Khanal as the Primary Observer and Birkha Shahi as the Alternate.

#### *Summary Data for Asia-Pacific Region Vote*

- # Candidates on Ballot - 10
- # Votes Cast - 56 (76% of verified registered voters)
- Countries Represented in Voting
  1. Cambodia
  2. Indonesia

- |                     |             |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 3. Nepal            | 6. Thailand |
| 4. Pakistan         | 7. Vanuatu  |
| 5. Papua New Guinea | 8. Vietnam  |

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

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

<b>Organization Name</b>	<b># Verified Votes Received</b>	<b># Votes Received with Verification Issues</b>	<b>Regional Balance (Verified Votes Only) %</b>
Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN)	29	0	21%
Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)	6	0	0%
Civil Society Coalition for Climate Change	4	0	0%
Indus Development Organization (IDO)	4	0	0%
Nepal Foresters' Association	4	0	25%
Community-based Forestry Supporters' Network (COFSUN)	3	0	33%
Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources (DANAR)	2	0	0%
Water, Environment and Sanitation Society (WESS)	2	0	100%
Awami Welfare Organization (AWS)	1	0	0%
Scale Up	1	0	0%

Latin America-Caribbean

Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Peten (ACOFOP) was selected as the FCPF Observer for the Latin America-Caribbean Region for the 2016-2018 term. ACOFOP 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.

ACOFOP identified Sergio Guzmán as the Primary Observer and Luis Ramirez as the Alternate.

*Summary Data for Latin America-Caribbean Region Vote*

- # Candidates on Ballot - 3
- # Votes Cast (Response Rate) - 16 (60% of verified registered voters)
- Countries Represented in Voting
 

1. Colombia	4. Panama
2. Guatemala	5. Perú
3. Nicaragua	6. Uruguay

*Latin America-Caribbean Region: Detailed Results of Voting for All Candidates***Table 7: Detailed voting results for Latin America-Caribbean**

<b>Organization Name</b>	<b># Verified Votes Received</b>	<b># Votes Received with Verification Issues</b>	<b>Regional Balance (Verified Votes Only) %</b>
Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Peten (ACOFOP)	7	0	86%
Proyecto Ecológico Azuero	5	0	20%
Asociación Ambiente y Sociedad	4	0	0%

Northern Countries

After consultation with the Advisory Committee, Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) was selected for the role of FCPF CSO Observer for the Northern Region for the 2018-2020 term.

The results of the selection showed Code REDD attained satisfactory regional balance in the votes it received, according to the criteria and process guidelines established by the Advisory Committee, whereas EDF did not. However, the initial selection of Code REDD based on its attainment of regional balance was appealed to the Advisory Committee for review.

Following its review, the Advisory Committee selected EDF to serve as the Northern Region Observer. Please see below for the Advisory Committee's decision and rationale:

*The Advisory Committee recognizes the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) as the winner of the Northern Observer CSO self-selection process. The Advisory Committee further requests that EDF and the Facility Management Team reach out to Code REDD to invite its active participation in any FCPF activities in which it is interested and convey that despite this decision, Code REDD's active participation in the FCPF is welcome.*

*The Committee finds the established regional balance criteria do not apply well to Northern CSOs, which are predominantly international in nature, with multiple offices across the region. If any candidate or voting organization had registered with a different organizational address, this could have changed the outcome of the selection, according to the established regional balance criteria. As such, the Committee is selecting the Northern observer candidate that received the highest number of votes overall, EDF, recognizing that the actual regional balance among the votes EDF received is sufficient for this organization to adequately represent the Northern region.*

EDF identified Chris Meyer as the Primary representative and Breanna Lujan as the Alternate.

*Summary Data for Northern CSOs Vote*

- # Candidates on Ballot - 2
- # Votes Cast (Response Rate) - 14 (74% of verified registered voters)
- Countries Represented in Voting

1. Norway
2. United Kingdom
3. United StatesNorthern Countries: Detailed Results of Voting for All Candidates

**Table 8: Detailed voting results for Northern CSOs**

<b>Organization Name</b>	<b># Verified Votes Received</b>	<b># Votes Received with Verification Issues</b>	<b>Regional Balance (Verified Votes Only) %</b>
Environmental Defense Fund	11	0	9%
Code REDD	3	0	67%

