



“Lessons Learned from the 2011 Elections”: The relation between civil society and the ISIE Final Report

OVERVIEW

In late 2013 and early 2014, 268 stakeholders in Tunisia’s democratic transition came together for a series of workshops examining lessons learned during the October 2011 elections. The workshops were held in several locations across the country, gathering representatives of civil society organizations (CSOs) and regional electoral officials from the 2011 elections to relate experiences, exchange viewpoints, and discuss challenges surrounding the 2011 electoral process. Participants articulated recommendations in support of the anticipated national elections in 2014 for consideration by various Tunisian stakeholders, including the *Instance Supérieure Indépendante pour les Elections*, or the ISIE. This report summarizes the process and outcomes of the workshop series, and offers recommendations for consideration by Tunisia’s electoral authorities in advance of anticipated presidential and parliamentary elections.

The workshops were organized by The Carter Center with the financial support of the Government of The Netherlands.

CONTEXT

After the overthrow of autocrat President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali in January 2011, Tunisians went to the polls to elect a 217-member National Constituent Assembly (NCA) charged with drafting a new constitution. The elections, held October 23, 2011, represented the first genuinely competitive elections following more than fifty years of authoritarian rule in Tunisia. Several civil society organizations sought accreditation and deployed election observers to assess the polls. After the elections, the CSOs and international organizations (including The Carter Center) held a lessons learned workshop in Tunis to analyze and learn from the experiences of 2011. Representatives of the interim national election body, the ISIE, presented their final report on their administration of the elections and participated in the workshop discussion.

Although CSO observers were deployed outside Tunis, few activities have been conducted in the regions to collect the reflections of those observers. Similarly, electoral

authorities of the Regional Independent Commissions for Elections (IRIEs) have had little opportunity to provide structured feedback on their experiences, despite their role in administering the elections. This project brought together these two critical stakeholders in the process to discuss their experiences during the 2011 elections, and elaborate recommendations for all interested stakeholders in advance of the anticipated 2014 polls.

With the support of The Carter Center, five CSOs organized regional workshops across Tunisia. Seven sessions were held in late 2013 and early 2014, covering the greater Tunis area, as well as Kairouan, Gafsa, Gabes, El Kef, and Sousse. Each workshop addressed one electoral region and its relevant electoral constituencies as delineated in the 2011 elections. (For a full breakdown of constituencies represented and IRIEs involved, see Appendix B.)

OBJECTIVES

The workshops endeavored to create a framework for dialogue and discussion between CSO representatives and former IRIE members. This project represented the first attempt to do so following the 2011 elections, and was intended to help assess the relationship between the ISIE, the regional electoral authorities and civil society. Accordingly, the workshop discussions focused mainly on the relation between CSOs and the ISIE and its regional branches (the IRIEs), as well as the institutional relationship between the various structures of the ISIE.

Participating former members of the IRIE found the workshops a useful space in which to share their practical and organizational experiences of the 2011 elections. Although the feedback throughout the workshops included recognition of the IRIEs' achievements, the sessions focused particularly on the challenges they faced and how best to tackle these issues in the future.

The Regional Outreach workshop series allowed participants to elaborate practical recommendations based on their experiences during the 2011 elections, taking into account the electoral laws and legal framework adopted in the intervening period.¹ As an additional benefit, the workshops provided a forum for CSOs to reengage with their observer networks across Tunisia and to share their experiences in election observation in Tunisia and abroad. This interaction further enhanced the CSO's collective skills in election observation and that of their members, and provided an opportunity for CSOs to strengthen their internal and external relationships.

¹ Organic Law Number 23 of the year 2012, dated December 20, 2012, related to the Independent High Authority for the Elections and revised by the Organic Law Number 44 of the year 2013, dated November 1, 2013.

PARTICIPATION

The Carter Center brought together several CSO partners to determine a working methodology for the project. The Center and five organizations – ATIDE, Observatoire Chahed, Jeunesses Sans Frontières (JSF), Ofiya and Mourakiboun – had worked together earlier in 2013 on a Training of Trainers project and believed further collaboration would be productive. Introductory information and background materials regarding these organizations are included in Appendix A.

Each of these five CSOs acquired considerable experience by deploying observers across Tunisia during the 2011 elections. Each organization has enhanced its capacity-building since with a range of training activities, including the 2013 Carter Center project. They have demonstrated their engagement as a key player in the electoral process, unilaterally and in partnership with other local or international organizations.

In addition to the Center's five partner CSOs, representatives of the Tunisian Association of Constitutional Law (ATDC) and the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy (CSID) took part in and facilitated a number of workshops. Lastly, the Carter Center invited five former members of each IRIE to the workshops. In total, organizers invited 50 some individuals to each workshop, including 15 IRIE representatives and 35 CSO representatives from the respective governorates.

METHODOLOGY

In preparation for the workshop series, the CSOs formed a facilitation team to conduct a series of planning meetings, including one prior to each workshop. Representatives of three different CSOs facilitated each workshop to ensure a sense of equal participation and investment in the program. Discussions occasionally involved heated debates, but the teamwork developed through joint planning and preparation allowed the facilitators to steer the group back towards productive conversation.

In each workshop, participants were divided into three groups, with a mix of stakeholders from the relevant governorates in each group. Each group also featured both IRIE members and civil society representatives with various roles in the 2011 electoral process. The groups focused on three topics:

- Group I: the relationship between civil society and the IRIEs.
- Group II: the relationship between the ISIE and the IRIEs.
- Group III: the relationship between civil society and the ISIE.

Participants in each thematic group, regardless of whether they represented CSOs, the ISIE, or IRIEs, focused on that group's designated topic in each morning session. Participants met in a plenary session in the afternoon to discuss the morning's discussion and recommendations from the working groups. To facilitate conversation,

the text of the organic law regarding the ISIE's creation (Organic Law # 23 dated December 20, 2012 related to the Independent High Authority for the Elections and revised by Organic Law #44 dated November 1, 2013) was distributed to the participants to familiarize them with any changes and reforms that had been made to the 2011 electoral framework.

Further details regarding the methodology and participation in individual workshops appear in Appendix C and Appendix D.

RESULTS

The Regional Outreach Program succeeded in its primary objective of encouraging an exchange of experiences and compiled lessons learned from their experiences and challenges encountered during the 2011 elections.

The recommendations generated from the workshops fell into eight general categories:

1. Taking time to set up
2. ISIE-CSO relationships
3. Accrediting organizations
4. The code of conduct
5. Voter registration & campaigns
6. Election Day
7. CSO training
8. CSO activities

1. Regional Electoral Bodies & Electoral Structures

Based on the new Tunisian legal framework, especially the organic law on the creation of the ISIE, much of the discussion in all seven workshops centered on the composition of the ISIE. It was a topic of special concern in Breakout Group 2 in each workshop, which assessed the relationship between the ISIE and IRIEs. Many participants recommended the mandatory establishment of an IRIE in each constituency, in a timely fashion to permit a successful execution of the tasks assigned to them. Participants felt the IRIEs are essential for:

1. Establishing a decentralized decision-making policy;
2. Ensuring the impartiality of the regional branch offices. (IRIEs should refrain from interfering in regional conflicts and political clashes and should not endeavor to resolve any dispute that may arise therein);
3. Providing all necessary assistance to the newly established regional branch offices to overcome a potential lack of experience in election administration; and
4. Ensuring the effective implementation of the ISIE decisions by the regional administrative body.

Another issue of concern was that of selecting IRIE officials. Although participants held varying views on the extent to which civil society should be involved in the selection process of the electoral staff, they unanimously agreed on the need to champion high standards of transparency in the recruitment process. Some participants recommended establishing a supervisory mechanism for CSOs to monitor whether staff recruitment respected the criteria set out by the ISIE, and, if not, to allow CSOs to challenge the candidacy of potential IRIE applicants before the ISIE. Participants in the workshops held in Gafsa and the first session in Tunis recommended that the selection criteria be specified well in advance with a special focus on maintaining standards, including efficiency, impartiality and independence. Participants of the workshop in Gabes highlighted the importance of promoting women and youth representation in the composition of IRIEs.

Participants underscored the importance of budgeting on a national level for appropriate IRIE facilities and equipment, and completing the procurement of each prior to the establishment of the regional branch offices. These resources should then be dedicated and managed according to the official regulations governing the work and structure of the IRIEs.

The organic law on the creation of the ISIE incited heated debate in most of the workshops. Specifically, many participants were frustrated by the ambiguity in the law regarding the relationship between IRIEs and the executive body on the one hand, and the IRIEs and the regional administrative bodies on the other. A number of the recommendations made by participants therefore aimed to clarify the relationship between the various EMB structures.

Lastly, participants underlined the importance of establishing effective communication links between the ISIE and its subsidiaries and administrative bodies and CSOs to exchange information effectively. This could involve development of an intranet to disseminate information to key interlocutors, creation of a hotline to facilitate communication between CSOs and the electoral authorities, and/or a rapid response team within the ISIE to field calls and questions from external actors on election day. Improved communication was deemed essential to help support transparent and open communications between observers and electoral authorities, and for observers to fulfill their responsibilities. Participants placed a particular emphasis on election day and the immediate surrounding period.

2. Relationships between the ISIE and its partners

Participants in the Regional Outreach Program focused on the relationship between the ISIE and CSOs on both the central and regional levels. In general, participants suggested that any formal relationships should be set out in relevant electoral legislation. A number of participants insisted that CSOs should have legal standing to observe the comprehensive electoral process, and not only the immediate period surrounding the

balloting, counting and tabulation, thereby enhancing the participatory role of civil society.

In a less formal sense, participants felt that ISIE-CSO relationships could be improved by better, more standardized communication. They suggested that regular meetings between the ISIE and various members of civil society, structured exchanges of information. They also urged greater responsiveness on the part of both parties to recommendations from the other to benefit their partnership and help to ensure the success of the electoral process. Some participants suggested the creation of liaison committees within the ISIE to strengthen ties with civil society. Other ideas included a call center for ISIE-CSO communication, an interactive portal for CSO users on the official ISIE website, or a text messaging system of exchanging information.

The group's discussions emphasized the importance of mutual respect in maintaining constructive ISIE-CSO relationships. Participants suggested designating one representative from each CSO to communicate with the ISIE, a formal introduction process to acquaint the ISIE with CSO representatives, regular meetings, and standardized and equal treatment of all accredited CSOs. They also emphasized coordination between the groups in the areas of outreach and voter education in order to increase citizens' interest in voting and civil participation.

Participants also examined the relationship between the ISIE and the Tunisian government. Participants recommended the creation of a position within the Office of the Prime Minister to facilitate communication between the ISIE and the public institutions.

3. Accrediting organizations

Participants generally agreed that CSOs should be accredited as soon as the electoral law is adopted in order to facilitate their ability to monitor the comprehensive electoral process. They encouraged the ISIE to designate clear timelines for organizations to apply for accreditation, to alert CSOs of the criteria, and to advertise the call for accreditation on the ISIE website and media channels. Participants also recommended that the ISIE respond to applicants within 15 days of their accreditation request.

There was a vigorous debate among participants about the requirements needed by CSOs to qualify for accreditation. There was no resolution to this issue. Some participants advocated granting accreditations to CSOs based exclusively on their previous experience in election observation and expertise in the field of elections. Others described this as an exclusionary attitude towards the participatory role of civil society and encouraged the electoral authorities to grant accreditation to all CSOs that undertake training in election observation and meet general criteria, so as to offer more CSOs an opportunity to observe the electoral process.

Participants agreed on several points about accreditation. First, the central body of the ISIE should have overall authority to grant observer accreditation requests in order to standardize the accreditation and appeals processes. The ISIE could facilitate this process by consulting the IRIE(s) overseeing the electoral district in which each CSO operates. Secondly, accreditation procedures should be consistent across all regions. Relevant regional offices should have the authority to transmit accreditation materials to local observers after approval by the central electoral authorities. Lastly, The ISIE should also determine an appropriate appeals process and clarify which bodies have the authority to consider appeals from aggrieved parties whose accreditation requests were denied.

4. The Code of Conduct

While relating their experienced during the 2011 electoral period, program participants suggested that some electoral stakeholders did not clearly understand the mandate and intended mission of election observers. Most participants recommended, therefore, that the ISIE and civil society should, for ease of communication, jointly elaborate a code of conduct to clarify the relationship between the ISIE and CSOs. This code of conduct should also serve to define the role of election observers and their mission in each phase of the electoral process and regulate the actions of CSOs, observers, and election officials. The ISIE should disseminate the code of conduct to the regional authorities, and provide training on its contents, so that officials have a clear understanding of the role and responsibilities of accredited election observers.

5. Voter registration & electoral campaigns

After an active exchange of opinions and an assessment of the entire electoral process of 2011, participants recommended that IRIEs should be vested with greater autonomy in several areas, including the authority to: regulate public awareness campaigns, establish registration centers, monitor the electoral campaign at the regional and local levels, and enforce measures regarding electoral violations. They supported the creation of mobile teams to help conduct voter registration and coordinating the efforts of civil society components in this regard well in advance. They also advocated for the preparation of a detailed manual on registration procedure several weeks before the start of the registration process, so as to facilitate observation by CSOs of the process.

In relation to electoral campaigns, participants recommended that observers be allowed to monitor electoral operations through each phase of the electoral process, including such events as the lottery used to determine the allocation of publically provided advertising space and television airtime to political parties and candidates during the election campaign.

6. Election Day

Most of the workshop participants agreed on the need to prepare a detailed operational manual of procedures for voting, tabulation, and counting. Despite holding different views on estimated timeframes, participants urged that the manual be issued several months in advance of the polls, which would require early decision-making by the ISIE with regards to the appropriate procedures.

After enumerating the challenges they faced observing the tabulation process in 2011, participants recommended devoting logistical support to facilitate access of observers to tabulation centers, including measures to ensure that transparent safeguards and a time-saving tabulation process are in place (such as supplying big screens to display and observe the tabulation centers). They also recommended drawing up a detailed map showing the distribution of polling centers and stations.

Attendees in the Sousse workshop proposed that accredited observers covering polling centers and stations wear clear identification badges. Participants in the first Tunis workshop called for maintaining the procedures applied in the previous elections with respect to the results protocols: observations were noted on the results protocols, and posted at the polling station level, thus facilitating CSO monitoring efforts.

Participants, particularly CSO representatives, underscored the importance of coordinating the efforts of civil society components regarding the deployment of observer groups in order to cover all polling stations. They also underlined the significance of strengthening cooperation between observer organizations to ensure observation also in rural polling stations.

7. Training in election observation

Participants from both former IRIE members and civil society representatives coalesced around a series of recommendations on training of electoral authorities. They first suggested developing a detailed training calendar and planning a centralized program (the training of ISIE officials, IRIE members and polling staff, etc) that meets preset criteria, provides training certificates to trainees upon completion of the training sessions, and allows CSOs to observe the training sessions.

Other participants recommended establishing regional training bodies working under the aegis of ISIE and recruiting local and international trainers with prior experience in implementing training programs. Participants in the Gafsa workshop advocated for a training course for small groups of polling staff. Participants generally underscored the significance of running polling-day simulation exercises at every stage of the training program and of establishing supervisory mechanisms to assess the quality of the trainings. Regarding the training content, participants also recommended including

topics to enhance IRIE members' understanding of the nature and importance of election observation with a view to establishing mutually beneficial relationships.

8. CSO activities

After their extensive review of the 2011 elections and the lessons learned about the relationship between civil society and the various layers of the EMB, the five participating CSOs agreed generally on the need to elaborate and adhere to a uniform statement of principles. This agreement should stipulate that CSOs are bound by standards of impartiality, transparency, integrity, efficiency, and independence. Participants also underlined the significance of ensuring the observers' independence and impartiality vis-à-vis political parties and candidate lists, and stood firm on the idea that observer groups should sign and abide by a code of conduct throughout the electoral process.

Although the subject was not strictly within the Regional Outreach Program's purview, participants also discussed the issue of violations of electoral policy by various stakeholders in the 2011 elections. They recommended that lawmakers clearly define the relationship between various electoral stakeholders and set up mechanisms in the electoral law designed to detect and report electoral violations.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Altogether discussions in the Regional Outreach Program generated rich debate and detailed recommendations in each workshop session for consideration by the ISIE, the NCA, and CSOs. A summary of the discussion and recommendations is below.

The Instance Supérieure Indépendante pour les Elections (ISIE) should:

1. Require that a regional EMB (IRIE) be established in each electoral constituency, clearly articulate the process by which its members will be selected (including emphasizing processes to encourage the participation of women and youth), involve civil society in those processes, and provide mechanisms for the enforcement of those processes.
2. Clarify the relationship between the central ISIE and regional IRIE bodies, ensuring that their duties and responsibilities do not overlap or conflict.
3. Guarantee the financing and provision of sufficient resources, human and material, for the functioning of the IRIEs prior to their establishment, and allow appropriate time for that establishment and the execution of the IRIEs' various responsibilities.
4. Establish a training program for central and regional organization members, under the direction of impartial and competent trainers with previous training and electoral experience, in order to ensure consistent training across electoral officials. Allow CSOs to monitor training and design mechanisms to ensure and standardize the quality of the training.

5. Emphasize transparency, consistency, and standards in the selection of all IRIE and polling officials and in the establishment of all regional mechanisms for the execution of voter registration, campaigning, and elections.
6. Ensure that long- and short-term officials in the electoral process understand and respect the mission of election observers and CSOs. Facilitate the exchange of information and cooperation between IRIEs and CSOs, including by the official designation of liaison officers and the use of key technology. Respond positively to CSO recommendations and feedback.
7. Clearly articulate the process by which a CSO may become accredited to observe elections, using reasonable and appropriate standards, respond promptly to applications for accreditation, apply standards of accreditation uniformly across all applications, and establish mechanisms for the appeal of refusals of accreditation by CSOs.
8. Elaborate and uphold a joint code of conduct with civil society organizations, preventing misunderstandings and complications during elections and ensuring that each maximizes its potential.

The National Constituent Assembly should:

1. Amend the organic law on the creation of the ISIE in consultation with regional authorities to address issues of IRIE size and composition, while enshrining the permanent status of IRIEs in every constituency.
2. Allow CSOs to legally challenge any phase of the electoral process, acknowledging civil society's role in that process.
3. Clarify in electoral legislation the roles, rights, and responsibilities of every stakeholder in the electoral process.
4. Provide permanent and clear mechanisms for the submission and resolution of violations of the electoral process.

Civil society organizations should:

1. Operate exclusively under the restrictions of a "Statement of Principles," requiring impartiality, transparency, integrity, efficiency, and independence in all activities. Ensure observers' impartiality from any influence of parties or candidate lists.
2. Abide by a code of conduct elaborated in cooperation with the ISIE and IRIEs.
3. Provide necessary training for observers and ensure that they are clearly identified and known to election officials throughout the electoral process.
4. Commit to regular coordination meetings and other methods of communication with central and regional electoral authorities and designate a point person for clear, concise communication with those authorities.
5. Coordinate among the population of CSOs and with the ISIE to emphasize voter education, interest, and awareness, while ensuring appropriate and proportional observation and education activities across rural areas.

CONCLUSION

The Regional Outreach Program brought together, for the first time, former IRIE members and representatives of Tunisia's civil society. The workshops engaged participants in an open and frank debate, indicating a real desire by the various actors to ensure the success of such a dialogue, and awareness that the success of the electoral process is a shared responsibility. The workshops were conducted in a relaxed atmosphere in which each participant endeavored to show respect to other participants' opinions, regardless of their ideology.

The 268 willing participants in this workshop series demonstrated that IRIE members and CSO representatives place high value on the electoral process and correctly understand the importance of their varying roles in it. Through organized, constructive criticism, these stakeholders elaborated several recommendations based on lessons learned in their 2011 experiences that aimed to strengthen the upcoming electoral process. Certainly this process was not without difficulty: heated debates in the breakout groups occasionally complicated the process of articulating joint recommendations. These disagreements and the process by which they were overcome serve, however, to highlight the importance of consultative meetings to reinforce confidence in the electoral process, facilitate communication between the IRIE/ISIE institutions and CSOs, and enhance mutual understanding between the groups.

Appendix A: CSO Participants

Five civil society organizations participated in the Regional Outreach Program. These groups came together after prior experience working together and with The Carter Center. Each organization participated in the observation of the 2011 elections, but their diverse membership demographics and activities mean that their take-away experiences were quite different. They therefore had as much to offer each other in this program as they collectively had to share with the IRIEs.

The participation rates of the five CSOs varied by session. The Ofiya network contributed 49 representatives across the seven workshops and 40 participants came from JSF. Observatoire Chahed sent 34 representatives to the various meetings, the majority of whom had legal backgrounds. ATIDE members did not attend one of the Tunis sessions, but offered 37 participants in the six remaining sessions. Mourakiboun representatives too only attended six sessions, and at 26 participants had the lowest participation rate.

Jeunesses Sans Frontières

JSF is a local organization that aims to spread the values of civilized conduct, instill a sense of community life and volunteering, and consolidate the values of active citizenship among the youth. JSF endeavors to help the youth, both male and female, to be prepared for the exercise of democracy by involving them in public affairs and engaging them in politics and civic life, with a view to building a better future for Tunisia. This organization's work has a large impact on Tunisian youth, conducting a range of training programs and other activities and creating networks and partnership with local stakeholders and particularly domestic and international organizations.

JSF is a think-tank primarily engaged in involving youth in election observation, voter education, female leadership, and the dialogue for peace and human rights. It also seeks to promote intercultural dialogue, openness towards plurality and diversity and advocate for principles of solidarity, justice and impartiality.

In 2011, JSF focused on increasing civic education and observing elections. The JSF network of observers, in partnership with Mourakiboun, covered six governorates in the elections of 2011 and plans to deploy 2000 short-term observers across fifteen governorates in the upcoming elections.

Mourakiboun

Mourakiboun is a network of domestic observers, joining together the Tunisian Association for Democracy Awakening (ATED), the Tunisian Association of Development Law (ATDD), the Association of Culture and Citizenship (Regueb, Sidi Bouzid), the Association of Culture and Development (Kasserine), the PaCTE Tunisien and the Tunisian Association of Competencies (Germany). The umbrella-organization formed after the Revolution of Jan. 14, 2011, and has since trained more than 5000 observers, deploying nearly 3,200 to observe the elections of 2011.

The network of Mourakiboun observers participated in twelve international observation missions with the Carter Center, The National Democratic Institute and the Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Kenya, Sierra Leone and Ghana.

Ofiya Network

The Ofiya Network for the Integrity of the Elections, founded in Kairouan on April, 5, 2011, is a coalition of NGOs. The network conducted training sessions for 1000 observers scattered among thirteen governorates and undertook a voter education campaign in seven governorates after its participants observed the 2011 elections. The executive office of Ofiya is composed of seven members and a general secretariat. The general assembly joins all the associations together and meets once a year.

ATIDE

The Association for Transparency and the Integrity of the Elections (ATIDE), which was established on March, 24, 2011, is a non-profit NGO. ATIDE aims to protect democratic values, particularly the right to vote. The main objectives of ATIDE are:

- Awareness-raising, information dissemination and training in election observation;
- Tracking and observing the electoral process;
- Establishing communication and communicating objections; and
- Enhancing the advocacy role of civil society.

ATIDE observed the 2011 elections and conducted voter education campaigns. It also plans to observe the upcoming elections.

Observatoire Chahed

Chahed was created in July 2011 to observe the electoral process and support the democratic transition. Observatoire Chahed, which has been active since April 2012, aims at:

- Participating in election monitoring, observing the electoral operations regarding the conduct of the different phases of the electoral process, and preparing reports, while seeking impartiality and rational assessment;
- Providing legal assistance to voters and candidates to safeguard their rights in the electoral process;
- Conducting a range of training sessions for observers, monitors, trainers and stakeholders regarding the electoral process and electoral disputes;
- Supporting democracy building and contributing to efforts tailored towards institutional reform, democratic institutions and the establishment of an electoral system;
- Instilling democratic values and embracing the principles of active citizenship; and
- Supporting efforts to ensure the success of the democratic transition such as transitional justice, fighting corruption and making reparations to address the abuses of dictatorial rule.

Appendix B: IRIE Participants

77 former IRIE members participated in the Regional Outreach Program. On average, 11 IRIE members participated in each session, with a maximum of 14 at the Kairouan session and a minimum of 5 in El Kef. Of the 27 regional branch offices, 26 provided representatives for the workshop. No participants from the district of Seliana attended, despite having received official invitations. Most of the participating IRIE members were judges, professors, lawyers, and other professionals.

Date	Location	Governorates Covered	IRIEs invited
Nov. 24, 2013	Kairouan	Kairouan Sidi Bouzid Kasserine	Kairouan Sidi Bouzid Kasserine
Dec. 8, 2013	Gafsa	Kebili Tozeur Gafsa	Kebili Tozeur Gafsa
Dec. 15, 2013	Gabes	Gabes Medenine Tataouine	Gabes Medenine Tataouine
Dec. 22, 2013	Tunis	Nabeul Zaghuan Bizerte	Nabeul I Nabeul II Bizerte Zaghuan
Jan. 12, 2014	Sousse	Sousse Monastir Mahdia Sfax	Sousse Monastir Mahdia Sfax I Sfax II
Jan. 19, 2014	El Kef	El Kef Seliana Beja Jendouba	El Kef Seliana Beja Jendouba
Jan. 26, 2014	Tunis	Tunis Ariana Ben Arous Manouba	Tunis I Tunis II Ariana Ben Arous Manouba

Appendix C: Attendance

There was generally a wide participation in the seven workshops in terms of attendance with an average of 38 invitees taking part in each workshop. The highest attendance was at the workshop in Sousse, with 47 participants from a total number of 50 invitees whereas the workshop in El Kef received the lowest total participation with only 27 participants.

Kairouan, Nov. 24, 2013	IRIE	CSO	Total Participants	Female Participation
Co-facilitators: Dr. Mohamed Kamal Gharbi (Ofiya) Mrs. Sihem Bouazza (Mourakiboun)	Kairouan (10) Sidi Bouzid (3) Kasserine (1)	Chahed (6) Mourakiboun (5) JSF (7) ATIDE (7) Ofiya (7)		CSOs (11) IRIEs (2)
Rapporteur: Mr. Nidhal Mekki (JSF)				
Total	14	32	46	13

Gafsa, Dec. 8, 2013	IRIE	CSO	Total Participants	Female Participation
Co-facilitators: Professor Leila Chraïbi (ATIDE) Professor Lassaad Moussa (Chahed)	Kebili (3) Tozeur (3) Gafsa (5)	Chahed (4) Mourakiboun (0) JSF (6) ATIDE (6) Ofiya (11)		CSOs (14) IRIEs (0)
Rapporteur: Mr. Nidhal Mekki (JSF)				
Total	12*	27	39	14

*An additional representative of the elections institution (a former logistician for the ISIE) joined this session.

Gabes, Dec. 15, 2013	IRIE	CSO	Total Participants	Female Participation
Co-facilitators: Mr. Hatem Chebbi (JSF) Mr. Ammar Boumellassa (Ofiya)	Gabes (5) Medenine (1) Tataouine (5)	Chahed (4) Mourakiboun (5) JSF (4) ATIDE (4) Ofiya (6)		CSOs (3) IRIEs (2)
Rapporteur: Miss Insaf Qurashi				
Total	11	23	34	5

Tunis (Session I), Dec. 22, 2013	IRIE	CSO	Total Participants	Female Participation
Co-facilitators: Professor Chawki Gaddes (ATDC) Professor Nabil Labassi (Observatoire Chahed) Rapporteur: Mr. Nidhal Mekki (JSF)	Bizerte (5) Zaghouan (1) Nabeul I (3) Nabeul II (2)	Chahed (5) Mourakiboun (4) JSF (7) ATIDE (6) Ofiya (6)		CSOs (8) IRIEs (4)
Total	11	28	39	12

Sousse, Jan. 12, 2014	IRIE	CSO	Total Participants	Female Participation
Co-facilitators: Mr. Radhouan Masmoudi (CSID) Mr. Rafik Halouani (Mourakiboun) Rapporteur: Mr. Mounir Amri (ATIDE)	Sousse (2) Monastir (5) Mahdia (1) Sfax I (2) Sfax II (1)	Chahed (7) Mourakiboun (5) JSF (6) ATIDE (9) Ofiya (8)		CSOs (17) IRIEs (3)
Total	11	36	47	20

El Kef, Jan. 19, 2014	IRIE	CSO	Total Participants	Female Participation
Co-facilitators: Mr. Nabil Labassi (Chahed) Ms. Sihem Zaouali (ATIDE) Rapporteur: Mr. Nidhal Mekki (JSF)	El Kef (2) Jendouba (2) Beja (1)	Chahed (2) Mourakiboun (2) JSF (7) ATIDE (5) Ofiya (6)		CSOs (3) IRIEs (1)
Total	5	22	27	4

Tunis (Session II), Jan. 26, 2014	IRIE	CSO	Total Participants	Female Participation
Co-facilitators: Ms. Salsabil Klibi (ATDC) Dr. Mohamed Kamel Gharbi (Ofiya) Rapporteur: Mr. Nidhal Mekki (JSF)	Tunis I (4) Tunis II (2) Ariana (1) Manouba (3) Ben Arous (3)	Chahed (6) Mourakiboun (5) JSF (3) ATIDE (0) Ofiya (10)		CSOs (4) IRIEs (4)
Total	13	23	36	8

Appendix D: Logistical Notes

- The workshops were facilitated by civil society representatives selected for their enthusiasm, election observation experience, and competence facilitating plenary sessions.
- The five CSOs participating in the Regional Outreach Program selected a number of facilitators to represent each CSO.
- Representatives of the Tunisian Association of Constitutional Law (ATDC) and the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy (CSID) were also included in the facilitation team.
- Some attendees from governorates far from the workshop venues were accommodated for one night in a hotel.
- Workshops were scheduled to occur on Sundays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Because Sunday is the Tunisian day of rest, the planning team hoped this would ensure the greatest possible participation.
- Each day was scheduled with a general session beginning at 9:00 a.m. The Carter Center representative, Baya Kara, opened each workshop with a welcome and summary of the Regional Outreach Project's objectives and background. The facilitation team at each workshop then introduced themselves and presented the plans for the day.
- Some participants in each workshop arrived late; as a result, many sessions ran over the allotted time and finished after 4:00 p.m.
- The strategy employed to divide attendees into the three thematic discussion groups varied across workshops. In some, the division was random. In others, organizers paid special attention to the distribution of stakeholder types or geographic regions represented. In still other workshops, participants were allowed to select for themselves a thematic discussion group. In every case, each discussion group included representatives from both IRIEs and the CSO groups.