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The Facilitators forum has been live for some time and needs some interaction!

The forum is a wonderful resource and provides Facilitators the opportunity to interact with each other in a real time capacity.

Unsure where that resource you require is on the BRIDGE website? Do you have a question that is region specific? Perhaps you could post it on the forum…

There are some points on the discussion boards to allow you to ask specific questions or discussions related to queries you may have, for example: suggestions for BRIDGE, the implementation of BRIDGE, curriculum, electoral resources, discussions specific to your region and even introducing yourself to the BRIDGE community.

Lets make the forum a great resource for both new and existing Facilitators!

Bridge is fantastic! Not limiting knowledge needed to administer election. Imagine the contributions the men and women trained in Nigeria will make on forth-coming elections”

-Dorathy Inyang, Nigeria
Facilitator Profile: Jessica Carney

What is your name? Jessica Carney

What organisation do you work for? I work at the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) and am based in Canberra.

What is your nationality? Australian.

What is your Facilitator category? I was recently accredited as a Workshop Facilitator by Ross Attrill during a Civic Education/ Voter Information Workshop in Vanuatu in April 2012.

Can you tell us about your work in elections and training?
I started working at the AEC in February 2011 as part of the Graduate Program. The graduate program involved completing three rotations within different branches of the AEC, where I worked on a variety of projects in Roll Management, International Services and Financial Services.

The graduate program was a great way to gain a detailed understanding of the diverse work the AEC does, whilst developing good working relationships with staff across the AEC. During my rotation in the International Services Section I was fortunate enough to be involved in organising a BRIDGE Workshop in Palau for members of the PIANZEA (Pacific Islands, Australia and New Zealand Electoral Administrators) Network. This was my first taste of BRIDGE, and gratefully not my last!

Since completing the graduate program in December 2011, I have joined the International Services team on a permanent basis. One of my main responsibilities as a project officer is managing a new three year project in Nepal. An AusAID funded Electoral Education and Information Centre has recently been constructed in Kathmandu and the project involves building the capacity of the staff working in the centre to deliver successful education programs. Our team has a number of other country programs, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region, and I am fortunate enough to be involved in a number of these as well. BRIDGE is an integral component of many of these projects so it has been great to become accredited as a Workshop Facilitator.

Can you tell us about your experience in facilitating BRIDGE? What Workshops and where?
I completed a TtF in Melbourne in February 2012, with fellow AEC colleagues and staff from the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC). The two week course significantly increased my confidence in delivering BRIDGE sessions, and I enjoyed seeing a lot of different facilitation styles and techniques in practice.

Since then, I co-facilitated a combined Civic education and voter information Module in Vanuatu in April 2012 with Ross Attrill and Tina Ilo. Being part of a Workshop that was delivered in both Bislama and English was a fantastic way to start my facilitation career and one that will stay with me for a very long time. Having very engaged participants and experienced Facilitators by my side made for a very memorable experience.

What do you like most about being a BRIDGE Facilitator?
Having the opportunity to meet and work with amazing people from a range of different cultures, with varying levels of experience, in spectacular locations. In the recent Module in Vanuatu, I enjoyed observing the sea of heads nodding in unison as individual participants shared ideas, knowledge and experiences.

What is the funniest thing you have seen in a BRIDGE Workshop?
AEC Facilitator David Zeplin meowing like a very placid cat in an ice breaker.

What are your hobbies and interests outside BRIDGE?
Outside of BRIDGE I enjoy spending time with my family and friends, and have been known to show extremely brief glimpses of skill on a hockey field. I love going to music concerts with my friends, and having recently moved from a small coastal town to Canberra, I’m enjoying living in a new city.

What advice would you have for any new BRIDGE Facilitators?
Be confident in your ability, show initiative and value the knowledge of your fellow colleagues.

If opportunities aren’t being presented to you, make them for yourself. Also, if you get the opportunity to work with Ross Attrill or Tina Ilo – jump at the chance!
With the initiation of the Election Commission of Nepal and technical and financial support made by the Partners, various BRIDGE Modules training have been conducted during this period. The BRIDGE Partners such as UNDP, IFES & International IDEA have regularly supported the training program. The status of the programs is outlined below.

1. Electoral Management Training:

   The Election Commission of Nepal with the support from IFES-Nepal conducted four-day Electoral Management Training in six locations of five development regions of the country. The training was designed to address the needs of local level staff and customized the contents from Introductory and Pre-election BRIDGE Modules. This is the first training that ever happened in the past which directly focused to strengthen the electoral management capability of district level staff. The main objective of the training was to facilitate learning and sharing of experiences with global comparative information on electoral administration. In addition, the training course was covered the ECN’s various administrative and management issues at local level to central level.

2. Gender and Social Inclusion Training:

   In order to address the demand of Training Institute of Technical Instruction (TITI), a three day long Gender and Elections training customizing with the relevant contents of social inclusion had been conducted for the Trainers/Facilitators of TITI by the team of ECN fully Accredited BRIDGE Facilitators.

3. BRIDGE Tutorial:

   Three hours long BRIDGE Tutorial has regularly been implemented since 2011 to the headquarter staff of the Election Commission Nepal for sharing of current global comparative information on electoral administration and management based on BRIDGE Modules. This tutorial is only being possible if the time is available of the staff of Election Commission of Nepal and mostly this happened during their easy time in addition of their heavily loaded regular business.
The Nepal Experience (Continued from page 4)

4. Electoral Observation and Disputes Resolution Workshop:

This program was supported by the International IDEA and the program was conducted outside of Kathmandu where the intensity of disputable matters seemed high during last elections. The program was focused to the local civil society and the concerned line agencies of the government.

5. Gender and Elections training:

This is UNDP funded program and had been arranged for the leaders of Women Groups who were working in the field of Gender rights including the Gender Focal Persons of the selected Ministries of Nepal Government.

Outcomes:

The Workshops were delivered during March to June in 2012.

During this period a total of 12 Workshops were completed with an overall 284 participants from varying backgrounds and areas of responsibility. The target audience for the Workshops were from different areas and varied organisations including the Electoral Commission of Nepal, TITI (Training Institute of Technical Instruction) and Civil society / Government staff.

The Workshops were supported directly by UNDP, IFES and International IDEA.

Congratulations on the great work Nepal!

Facilitators involved in preparing and conducting the Workshops:

1. Mr. Shanti Ram Bimali (Accrediting Facilitator)
2. Mr. Sharada Prasad Trital (Workshop Facilitator)
3. Mr Madhu Prasad Regmi (Workshop Facilitator)
4. Mr. Komai Prasad Dhamala (Workshop Facilitator)
5. Mr. Surya Prasad Aryal (Workshop Facilitator)
6. Mr. Mahesh Raj Timsina (Workshop Facilitator)
7. Ms. Radhika Regmi (Workshop Facilitator)
8. Ms. Salina Joshi (Workshop Facilitator)
9. Ms. Nikila Shrestha (Workshop Facilitator)
The use of technology in Voter Registration: Lessons from Zambia elections 2011

On the 20th of September Zambia held its fourth multi party elections since the advent of multi party democracy in Zambia. These were hailed as the most transparent elections Zambia has ever held leading to a smooth transfer of power from the ruling Movement for Multi Party Democracy to the Patriotic Front. Whilst acknowledging that there were other factors, political, economic and social, that gave rise to an open and transparent election, this paper will explore how the voter registration exercise contributed towards a credible electoral process in Zambia.

The starting point towards any credible election is the voter registration exercise. A complete and accurate voters list is the starting point of a credible election. An election that is both credible must also prevent voters from casting their votes more than once and unregistered voters from voting. The use of biometrics for automatic de-duplication, verification and authentication represents the best solution in ensuring election with highest integrity.

In Zambia voter registration and its maintenance is by the Electoral Commission of Zambia (ECZ). Voter registration is continuous and the commission has the mandate to carry out voter registration. From 1964 to 2001 the country had periodic voters register, which was prepared in preparation of an election. The system was paper based and verification of data was manual. This was costly as a new register had to be prepared for each election. Verification of data was difficult and was open to manipulation.

In 2001 a Law was enacted for ECZ to maintain a permanent Voters Register and a new Commission appointed in 2004. In 2005 the voter register was mobile with teams deployment to specific registration centers for a specific period of time. Voters were expected to register in the areas they were going to vote in. For the first time the registration exercise used Automated Figure Identification System (AFIS) to facilitate the identification of duplicated data.

Due to time and financial constraints, the 2008 Presidential election was held using the 2006 voters’ register without taking into consideration people who have become eligible voters in 2006, 2007 and 2008. Deceased people and migrants remained on the voters’ register and people who had moved within the country were not able to change their associated polling district.

It was obvious that the old voter registration system was not working neither was it inspiring confidence in the electoral system. The old system was costly and time consuming. It meant that data captured in the field in paper form would have to be brought to a central place for scanning of data entry using the double blind entry methodology and this lead to a number of errors at data entry level. It also meant that duplications on the register were many. It did not take in to account issues of credibility and transparent process. The system was manual and made it difficult to deal with issues of duplications, errors and in addition to that deceased people and migrants remained on the voters’ register.

It was less credible and did not inspire confidence in the voter registration exercise. The system was slow, security features on the voters card was not full proof and open to manipulation. The integrity of the register was always questioned. This raised a lot of concerns about the integrity of the voters’ register and the majority of stakeholders supported the implementation of continuous voter registration using biometrics technology in order to have a voters’ register which has the following qualities: integrity, inclusiveness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, accessibility, transparency, security and credibility.

The system that was required should be one that was cost effective but also combining technology that will deal with issues of duplications and minimize errors. It had to be credible and inspire confidence in the voter registration exercise. Systems change needs change. Previous system was slow, security features on the card not fool proof thus compromising the integrity of the process.

In finding a new solution priority was accorded to enhancing the integrity of the register using biometrics. This technology had to be sustainable and owned by the Zambians. A number of issues guided the Commission in deciding on going with biometrics from a sustainability and ownership perceptive. Financial sustainability of the system had to be considered in coming up with the desired system. Reality is that the Commission does not have a continuous source of funding. Funding is ad hoc and only increases in an election year. This affects operating cost of any registration system. Unlike passport system that can generate its own funds voter registration does not.

In considering the technology to use the Commission needed to consider the financial implications, from a procurement perceptive, operational and maintenance cost. Who meets the cost? Can the cost be maintained for sustainability?

Stakeholder buy in was essential in deciding the methodology as well as the technology to use during the voter registration exercise. The Commission should be commended for it is its ability to involve the stakeholders. All political parties were informed and participated in deciding on the mode of registration in their regular political parties liaison meetings. Civil society was consulted through the National Voter Education Committee (NVEC).

The Commission also had to take in to account Human Capacity/ Capacity building. It was essential to design a system that falls within the skills set of the country.
Almost all of Africa is buying skills, skills transfer low and lost from election to election. Skills retention was also made a focus area. To go round this the Commission carried out a cascade training of local staff, the vendor of the new system undertook one off training, leaves and main trainers carry on. This ensured sustainability and ownership of use of technology.

The new solution that the ECZ used had the following features. Immediate issuance of voter card, the voter was issued with his/her voters card immediately after registration. Both the Voters’ Cards and the Register bear voters’ portraits and figure print. Strict registration duplicate checks were undertaken, the voter registration kits were pre- loaded with the old register and identify double registration at source (Biometric). The system ensured the identity for which a person attempts to register to vote validly belongs to that person and removed duplicate/multiple entries from the register.

The system removed from the voters’ roll all persons who were no longer eligible to vote; for example, those who are deceased or disqualified for other reasons specified in the law such as conviction of an offence, mental incapacity or loss of citizenship. This requires comprehensive and accurate provision of data from the Department of National Registration. The system also ensured all required details for voter registration are provided by an applicant for registration or change of registration, and that the details are fully and correctly entered on the voters’ roll. The system also came with Automatic Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS).

The use of this technology enhanced inclusiveness, transparency, thus enhancing democracy in Zambia. The Commission recorded an 86% voter registration turnout, with an increased number of first time voters. This gave rise to a highly accurate voter list base for permanent voter register which in turn boosted confidence of the electorate in the process. The use of biometrics reduced duplicate registrations. Since registration was mobile it meant that registration was undertaken in all the 6456 polling districts countrywide. The mode of registration allowed for easy accessibility of registration centres. Registration officials went out into the communities

The use of registration kits meant that the time taken to register was reduced and since the kits were preloaded with the old register double registration was identified immediately. The process also gave rise to an increased number of voters because voter cards were issued upon registration. This resulted in a reduction in number of visits to the registration centres.

The ECZ embarked on a massive awareness campaign encouraging people to register to vote. In order to enfranchise as many youth as possible the ECZ resolved to register people that will turn 18 by 31st July 2011. This explains the high number of first time voters registered.

Whilst the system introduced by the Commission was successful there is need to sustain it. Continued national commitment to permanent voter registration is required. Sufficient staff to manage the permanent voter registration will be essential. This will entail having an IT department with specialized ICT expertise. Technology has lifespan and continues to evolve and hence there is need for sufficient revenue budget to maintain the system.

What were the lessons from all this? The introduction of technology in voter registration needs to be implemented well in time before an electoral event and should be legally supported. The technology to be used should be independent from proprietorship (vendor locked). Enhanced capacity building should be undertaken for both the IT department and electoral officials. The system should be cost effective and sustainable.

The process should not be driven by vendor or donor interests, the process should be home grown and should have sufficient buy in of national stakeholders and should not be implemented without sufficient funds, time and capacities.

The use of biometric technology to register voters showed its potential during the registration exercise in Zambia. Technology cuts down on human errors and the filling of forms prior to registration, which has cut down on the time it takes to register each eligible Zambian. With a thousand (1000) mobile registration kits operating on a daily basis in each district of Zambia, the ECZ’s managed to register 5 256 848 representing 86% of the eligible voters. Newly registered within the range of 18 years to 35 years were 1,111,397. The Commission recorded an 86% voter registration turnout, with an increased number of first time voters because voter cards were issued upon registration. This resulted in a reduction in number of visits to the registration centres.

The use of this technology enhanced inclusiveness, transparency, thus enhancing democracy in Zambia. The use of biometrics reduced duplicate registrations. Since registration was mobile it meant that registration was undertaken in all the 6456 polling districts countrywide. The mode of registration allowed for easy accessibility of registration centres. Registration officials went out into the communities

The use of this technology enhanced inclusiveness, transparency, thus enhancing democracy in Zambia. The Commission recorded an 86% voter registration turnout, with an increased number of first time voters. This gave rise to a highly accurate voter list base for permanent voter register which in turn boosted confidence of the electorate in the process. The use of biometrics reduced duplicate registrations. Since registration was mobile it meant that registration was undertaken in all the 6456 polling districts countrywide. The mode of registration allowed for easy accessibility of registration centres. Registration officials went out into the communities

Taona E Mwanyisa is an Election Expert specializing in Election Management. Currently he is the Project Manager: Elections for UNDP in Zambia. The views in this article are entirely his and do not represent the views of the organization he works for or currently advising. He can be contacted on tanyaona@gmail.com
Upcoming BRIDGE Workshops

**AUGUST**
- **6th-9th** AusAID Funded Customised Workshop in Indonesia
- **13th-17th** IDEA Funded BRIDGE Workshop in South Africa
- **21st-24th** Pro PALOP|TL funded Voter Registration Workshop in Mozambique

**SEPTEMBER**
- **3rd-6th** AusAID Funded Customised Workshop in Indonesia
- **10th-21st** GIZ Funded IDEA and African Union TtF in South Africa
- **12th-14th** Pro PALOP|TL Funded Strategic Planning Workshop in Mozambique
- **24th-27th** AusAID Funded Customised Workshop in Indonesia

Accreditations & Congratulations!

**WORKSHOP**

**MAY**
- Jess Carney (Australia)
- Esmeralda Amora-Ladra (Philippines)
- Endang Suryani (Indonesia)
- Abdul Jabar Sapand (Afghanistan)
- Rejoice Sibanda (Zimbabwe)
- Utloile ‘Sly’ Silaigwana (Zimbabwe)
- Faith Sebata (Zimbabwe)
- Taona Mwanyisa (Zambia)
- Sansy Silva Moreno (Cape Verde)
- Serafina Alves (Cape Verde)
- Stefan Uritiu (Moldova)
- Elsa Monteverde (Sao Tome and Principe)
- Mountaga Sylla (Guinea)
- Richard Kourouma (Guinea)
- Salomon Bayora (Cote D’Ivoire)
- Margeurite Yoli-Bi (Afghanistan)

**JUNE**
- Lynne Puckeridge (Australia)
- Peter Hunter (Australia)
- Dimity McKenzie (Australia)
- Denise Hogarth (Australia)
- Fatimata Diabate (Cote D’Ivoire)
- Dola Lawoe Akorfa Agugah (Togo)
- Yao Date (Togo)

**JULY**
- Kate Mjojo (Malawi)
- King Norman Rudi (Malawi)

**ACCREDITING**

**MAY**
- Shanti Ram Bimali (Nepal)
- Mohammad Najib (Indonesia)

**JULY**
- Djidon De Haan (Indonesia)

**EXPERT**

**JUNE**
- Theo Dowetin (Ghana)

**JULY**
- Kamissa Camara (US)
Facilitator Responsibilities

There are many key components to being a BRIDGE Facilitator, all of them important and not to be overlooked. The planning stages in the lead up to a BRIDGE Workshop include tasks like selecting other Facilitators, posting the event on the BRIDGE Website, gathering the curriculum and printing resources for your participants.

It is critical that Facilitators have enough preparation time to ensure that they properly complete the pre Workshop activities. This will also make the Workshop run smoothly and be a worthwhile and rewarding experience for both the Facilitator and for the participants.

That covers off some aspects of preparing and facilitating a Workshop, though what needs to be completed once a Workshop is over? Completing a Workshop is a great achievement in itself but there are some things we need to consider once we have completed a Workshop and how it may affect others if we don’t follow up on them. The areas below are outlined in more detail from the Facilitators’ homepage on the BRIDGE website: www.bridge-project.org/Facilitator

Accreditations: Accreditations are of great importance, especially where Train the Facilitator (TtF) Workshops are involved. So that the BRIDGE Office maintains accurate records of new Facilitators from a TtF we need to receive lists of participants. In regards to updating Accreditation information it is vital to send the information to the BRIDGE Office as soon as is practicable. Similarly if you are requested by another Facilitator to act as a referee for their transition into different Facilitator category it is beneficial to reply promptly so the BRIDGE Office can process the application in a timely manner.

Evaluations: Workshop evaluations assist the BRIDGE Office to know what is working well and areas that could do with some review or improvement. This evaluation form is only recently published to the site and is linked to the Facilitators homepage. This information provides the BRIDGE Office with a valuable overview of the Workshop and why/whom it was delivered. It also gives an overview of the funding and implementing bodies, the Facilitators involved, the language used and the target audience. This is all important data that assists the BRIDGE Office fulfill requests for information regarding BRIDGE Workshops.

Reports: Reports (preferably with photographs) are a great way of not only promoting the great work that BRIDGE does throughout the world but also a chance to highlight the different Modules being run and the varied groups of participants that are involved in BRIDGE Workshops. We receive great feedback in regards to reports and photos on the website so let’s keep them coming in!

Issues: If you have any issues related to the delivery of a Workshop: eg. Material not available, incorrect material, curriculum not being easy to find etc, please advise the BRIDGE Office so we can rectify the problem. We do attempt to ensure that all material is up to date and available wherever possible. This type of feedback can also be submitted through the new Workshop evaluation form.

Forum: The BRIDGE Facilitator Forum is an underutilised resource that is available for your use! It can be used to keep in touch with other Facilitators, ask that tricky question you have been thinking about, post information for a job or ask where to find that poster you need to run a particular Module. Have a look at the Forum and introduce yourself to other users.

Would you like to be profiled in the next newsletter?

Contact Ben P at the BRIDGE Office at projectoffice@bridge-project.org.au

We’d love to hear from Facilitators of all levels and experiences and from different regions.
It is interesting to consider the different levels of Facilitator’s delivering BRIDGE throughout the world. But where are they all from, how many facilitators are there and what are the gender ratios like?

The information is broken down below into key areas including Facilitator Categories, Facilitators by Region and Facilitators by Gender as well.

Currently there are 1810 BRIDGE Facilitators registered and this includes a cross section of Semi Accredited, Workshop, Accrediting and Expert Facilitators. There are to date approximately 2700 registered users (including facilitators) for the BRIDGE Website with around 850 non Accredited users.

Registered Female users account for around 1000 users online, where Male users account for around 1600. On top of that we have an additional 100 whose Gender is undisclosed.

Below (and Left) is the representation of the Facilitators in the region that they reside in. As we can see Africa has the highest concentration of Facilitators followed by Asia, Oceania, Europe, the Middle East, South America, North America and finally Central America.

In total there are approximately 760 Female Facilitators and 1050 Male Facilitators throughout the world.
Reports from Workshops

The BRIDGE Office loves receiving emails and reports advising us of the outcomes of Workshops delivered throughout the world.

When we receive them it gives us an opportunity to showcase them on the website for not only the BRIDGE Community to view but anyone else who has an interest in Elections and is viewing the website.

Once you have completed a Workshop please remember to send in your reports and photos to ensure that the whole BRIDGE community gets the opportunity to see the great work that our Facilitators do for the countries they are working in.

Remember to include photos where possible.

Email reports to: projectoffice@bridge-project.org.au

The BRIDGE Facebook page contains a range of BRIDGE updates, news, reports, comments, events, accreditation information, photographs, related links and much more.

Check it out at:

www.facebook.com/EBRIDGEOffice

BRIDGE Partner Update

From July 30th - 2nd August the BRIDGE Office will be hosting a Practitioners’ and Partner Meeting in Melbourne. Representation will be provided by each of the partner organisations and practitioners’ of BRIDGE worldwide. Consisting of two separate events including a two day Practitioners’ Meeting and a two day Partner meeting, participants will be discussing key elements of BRIDGE and its delivery throughout the world of elections.

The objectives of the Practitioners’ meeting are to share best practices and develop ideas and recommendations to be discussed in the BRIDGE Partners meeting. This includes elements such as Facilitator Responsibilities, Accreditation Rules, Curriculum Updates, Practitioner Reports and the BRIDGE Website. The Partner meeting will encompass the areas covered in the Practitioners’ meeting and will also consider an overall evaluation of BRIDGE as a capacity building program and how it achieves this purpose.