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Abstract

This doctoral thesis researched the relationship between the United Nations (UN) and Civil Society (CS). The purpose was to uncover the dynamics of the relationship with the intention to offer potential solutions in order to increase the effectiveness and productivity of this much needed relationship, for the purpose to have a stronger and more sustainable impact on international development.

Two preliminary research questions were applied to a systematic literature review. One, ‘What are the historical dynamics of the relationship between the UN and NGOs and what are the challenges and benefits of the affiliation?’ Two, ‘Does CS need a new or improved environment, potentially an institution, in order to progress its development?’ Over 76 000 documents arose from the search, of which 60 that were dated from June 1945 to January 2018, met the inclusion criteria.

The research was inductive and applied a qualitative, participatory action research method with a feminist approach. Semi-structured in-depth interviews were held with 43 participants who held high-level key stakeholder positions in the international UN and CS work environment in the second and third phase of the research. The first interview explored the question, ‘How to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the UN and CS in order to progress international development?’ Thirty-two high-level stakeholders continued and participated in the second interview, which explored the second research question, ‘Upon presenting the proposed model – how would you implement it, and would you modify it or make it better in any way before doing so?’ In total, 75 interviews were held, comprising of 745.5 years of cumulative participant experience in the UN and CS relationship environment.

Academic contributions of this PhD include the analysis of 28 themes and three inherent flaws of the relationship between the UN and CS from the data, the creation of the Naber Model, the development of a proposed reform which comprises of two frameworks, and implementation considerations for the suggested model. In addition, the research touches on broader academic concepts that include Civil Societies’ role in governance and the evolution of social responsibility.
The Lay Summary

This thesis researched the relationship between the United Nations (UN) and Civil Society (CS) for the purpose of uncovering the dynamics of the relationship with the intention to offer potential solutions in order to increase the effectiveness and productivity of this much needed relationship for the purpose of enhancing international development in a more sustainable and effective way.

Twenty-eight themes and three inherent flaws in the relationship arose from the findings of the systematic literature review and 75 interviews that were conducted with international high-level key stakeholders who had experience of the UN and CS work environment.

The Naber model was designed to incorporate two or more frameworks with the purpose of building synergies amongst the frameworks to further organisational objectives and incorporate catch systems or safeguards to protect and support organisations’ principles. For the UN and CS relationship reform the Naber model was applied and two frameworks were designed that aim to address all 28 themes and three inherent flaws. One is a structural framework and the other embodies the mechanisms through which the structure operates.

The structural framework includes the writing and implementation of a 2nd Charter for the United Peoples and is interlaced with the current 1st Charter to bring together the work of the UN and CS. There are four components that reside within the 2nd Charter’s structure.

The framework of mechanisms comprises of the UN’s Principled Decision-Making Policy to continuously ensure that all decisions align with the organisation’s principles. In addition, two other components are included in this framework.

The research also contributes to broader academic concepts that include Civil Societies’ role in governance and the evolution of social responsibility.
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Please note this thesis is written in United Kingdom (UK) English spelling format. However, when quoting literature their spelling format was kept in its original form. Therefore, as an example, although the spelling for organisation will have an ‘s’ in it for the UK spelling format, you may see it spelled with a ‘z’ if the author being quoted is writing in the American style.
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Word Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOC</td>
<td>United Nations Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Civil Society United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPR</td>
<td>Universal Periodic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSW</td>
<td>Commission on the Status of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESA</td>
<td>Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI</td>
<td>Gross National Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGLS</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Liaison Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>Franklin Delano Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA</td>
<td>United Nations Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN's PDMP</td>
<td>United Nations’ Principled Decision-Making Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Twenty-Eight Themes

Theme One: Its Heartbeat & Breath - The UN Needs CS/NGOs for Validity and Credibility
Theme Two: The Passionate Professional Partners – CS/NGOs Want to be Involved
Theme Three: The Moving Maze – CS/NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access
Theme Four: The Heavy Door to Open - The UN Needs to do More to Involve CS/NGOs
Theme Five: From Trojan Horse to Too Influential – Negative Reasons to Involving CS/NGOs
Theme Six: Bridges of Lifeline – CS/NGO Contributions to UN Activities
Theme Seven: The Power of Power - Resistance to CS/NGO Involvement
Theme Eight: The Paradoxical Situation - Resources
Theme Nine: Required Infrastructural Backbone – Structure, System, and Process
Theme Ten: Clarity Creates Cohesion - Defining the Roles
Theme Eleven: Exclusion is Frustration For All Including the Included – Inclusion
Theme Twelve: Play Leads to Meaningful Action - Social Requirements
Theme Thirteen: Restructure for Imperative Prevention - Conflict and Human Rights
Theme Fourteen: Fossil-ed Functioning - Outdated Working Structure
Theme Fifteen: Honest Broker- UN as Mediator
Theme Sixteen: Grassroot Hands Hold the Solutions – Importance of In-Country
Theme Seventeen: Sharing and Purposeful Speaking - Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer
Theme Eighteen: Necessity of Horizontal Cohesion of Collaboration and Coordination
Theme Nineteen: Virtual Bricks and Mortar
Theme Twenty: Power of the Empowered People - Human Resources
Theme Twenty-One: Relationship Dynamics Diminish Development
Theme Twenty-Two: Strong Leadership + Sound Values = Sought Solutions
Theme Twenty-Three: Critical Criticisms
Theme Twenty-Four: Validating Virtues
Theme Twenty-Five: The Unwritten Rule Books
Theme Twenty-Six: From Coin to Compassion – Corporate Collaboration
Theme Twenty-Seven: The Necessity of Principled Purpose
Theme Twenty-Eight: The Ticking ofUnavailable Time

The Three Inherent Flaws

Inherent Flaw One: Member States vs ‘The Peoples’
Inherent Flaw Two: Intrinsic Contradictions of the Relationship
Inherent Flaw Three: Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship
Chapter 1
Introduction

My Story

A number of years ago, I attended a friend’s wedding in the Dominican Republic. It was a classic all-inclusive resort with optional day trips to explore the country.

On one of the day trips, an interesting group formed and shared a tour guide. It was an interesting group in that we were clearly there for more than just a wedding or a lovely sunny vacation to get a break from the winter cold. We were curious about the country and its way of life. We wanted to gain a deeper understanding of what it is like to be a Dominican.

Hence, our tour guide opened up and shared with us frustrations that he and his fellow citizens experienced during a major natural disaster that had happened a few years before. The frustrations were regarding the aid that was supposed to be received, or shall I say the aid that was not received. It was clear that the Dominicans knew of the potential aid and what it could provide to alleviate the natural disaster’s aftermath and bring their life back to some order. However, they were also acutely aware of the bureaucracy, corruption, the unnecessary complexities, and mishandled aid funds along with the supplies.

Although the natural disaster had happened numerous years before, his family was not able to restore their family home. His wife and daughter had to live in an alternate location, a few hours commute away from him and he needed to find makeshift accommodations in order to secure some form of income in a different city. He explained, that his bed would be rolled up every morning in order to make space, as his mattress took up the entire square footage of where he was staying.

Wide-eyed, we asked compassionately what it would cost to restore his family back to a family home. About a dozen sunburnt tourists quickly did the math and realised it would amount to $3000 Canadian to replace his family’s home. We sat in silence for a moment as we reflected. It stung realising that one person’s vacation would have covered 2/3 of this expense. At the same time, it was empowering knowing that a great deal can be accomplished with less than expected. Some new realisations for those not aware of such circumstances, who were bumbling away in the open-air tour bus in the heat of the Dominican sun.

A few years passed and now the year is 2010. The family is huddled in front of the television eagerly awaiting news of the horrible earthquake that has hit Haiti. The news anchor reports that the Canadian Government has just announced that it will match any donation made by individuals. I opened my laptop and made my donation online. Knowing that it would be doubled, provided me with even more relief, as I had personally been made aware of the power of aid. I could only hope that with the passing of years better coordination of the aid donated would surely be in place than what our tour guide experienced in the Dominican Republic.
Unfortunately, this did not seem to be the case. Awhile after the natural disaster occurred, news media reported on the lack of collaboration amongst non-government organisations (NGOs) and the high cost of this was impacting the aid, which amounted to multi-million US dollars. This was confirmed by colleagues sharing similar stories of what they experienced while being onsite to help with the aid. Something is clearly not working!

Snow falls and melts, snow falls and melts... Now I am sitting at my desk working for an international charity. During this time, I witnessed some collaboration amongst NGOs, however most was reactive. I also experienced the ‘bottom’ (see Table 1.1) voice to have low value and the negative effects this can create for all stakeholders and participants involved.

A gap, I became aware of in the work setting, is that NGOs or Civil Society (CS) (see Table 1.1) in general are limited in working proactively and collaboratively due to a lack of a known platform to be able to work strategically and synergistically together in order to develop and create a better quality of life for all, especially a platform that can build a bridge with the ‘top’ (see Table 1.1) voice.

Sharing with you a few highlights of my personal story only begins to describe my very keen interest in exploring and researching that if we work more proactively and intentionally together, how much more sustainable development can be brought about. Especially when this is done in conjunction with strengthening the bridge between the ‘bottom’ and ‘top’ voices, in order to more clearly understand issues, providing deeper knowledge and awareness.

The calendar months flip by and my work experience leads me to the academic realm to explore and understand this concept further. So, I begin to write my proposal for entrance into my PhD programme at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland.

If only my Dominican tour guide knew! This strongly presents what impact we each have on one another and the importance of understanding our own butterfly effect or ripple effect and the potential it holds.

There is activist research happening which sits outside of the traditional academic setting (Choudry, 2013a), that I am involved in, where CS is coming together to make a collective impact for social movement. However, an issue in today’s context is that activist research is often not acknowledged as valid knowledge due to its residing outside of academia and therefore it does not have as much impact as it should (Choudry, 2013a). In addition, Choudry notes that academic knowledge is often used by NGOs to elevate their work (Choudry, 2011). This is one of the reasons why I have chosen to research my topic under the remit of a PhD.

My doctoral proposal describes the intention of my research whether society needs a new or improved environment; potentially an institution, which includes two-way learning and engagement between ‘top’ and ‘bottom’, in order to progress in its development.
Table 1.1: Frequently Used Phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Common Synonyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Bottom’</td>
<td>Referring to our broader social hierarchical structure. The base of the hierarchy being the ‘bottom’, where the smallest component of our societal system resides.</td>
<td>Grassroots, The Common People, Individuals, Ordinary People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Top’</td>
<td>Referring to our broader social hierarchical structure. The highest level of the hierarchy being the ‘top’, where the bigger component of our societal system resides that governs over the ‘bottom’. It is where the highest level of management over the peoples resides.</td>
<td>Policy Makers, Diplomats, Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>All identities except government. It includes individuals of society, informal and formal groups, families, NGOs (further defined in Chapter 2) often referred to as the third sector, businesses either for profit or not for profit, social enterprise, associations, and so forth. It does not include any level of government.</td>
<td>Civilisation, Society, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>All those who hold a stake in the process or outcome. Therefore, this does include all sectors of society, including government.</td>
<td>All of the Above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-state actors is a term that was not used in this thesis.

Overview of Introduction

Moving from my personal story, I will now provide an overview of the introduction of my PhD thesis.

It begins with the academic point of entry and explains why the United Nations (UN) was researched. Further background is then provided on CS and the beginning of the exploration on global theoretical perspectives are introduced. It led me to two preliminary research questions, which the first phase of my research design, the systematic literature review (see Chapter 2) examined. Lastly the theory of change is discussed and how it was used in the thesis.

The Academic Point of Entry – Why the United Nations?

Where should this academic research begin in my topic of interest? The known authority of international development is the UN (Weiss and Daws, 2007). Therefore, it may be reasonable to assume that this platform of collaborative work of sustainable development rests on the shoulders of the UN. In exploring that potential academic point of entry further, an additional three reasons supported this stance and confirmed the decision.
The United Nations was formed in 1945 with an initial 51 Member States signing the UN Charter (Historical Works, 2012; United Nations, 2017a). Article 1 of the UN Charter states that its purposes are:

‘1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends’ (Historical Works, 2012).

This provides the second reason the UN is the subject of interest for this research project, its remit includes collaborative international development.

A third reason is outlined in the Charter as well. Article 71 of the Charter states: ‘The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned’ (Historical Works, 2012). Hence, the Charter in 1945 already acknowledged the importance of governments working together with NGOs.

Fourthly, the Member States of the UN have collectively defined sustainable development by its definition. ‘The global understanding of development has changed over the years, and countries now have agreed that sustainable development – development that promotes prosperity and economic opportunity, greater social well-being, and protection of the environment – offers the best path forward for improving the lives of people everywhere’ (United Nations, 2017b).

The Member States further defined sustainable development by setting goals. Currently, Agenda 2030 holds the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which make up 17 goals with predefined indicators to be able to measure contribution towards the achievement of each development goal (Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, 2016). These goals were created over a period of two years in conjunction with numerous key stakeholders, different places around the globe, and different people from different walks of life including the most vulnerable and those in the highest poverty levels (UN General Assembly, 2015). Therefore, a robust process was used to create the indicators and the elements that define each development goal.
The following four points make the UN the academic point of entry for researching this dynamic of various groups coming together to collaborate towards a better quality of life for all:

- the UN being known as the authority on sustainable international development
- its collaborative intentions of this work
- its acknowledgment of the importance of governments working together with NGOs
- and having collectively defined sustainable development along with the creation of a set of goals for the globe to work towards, which is providing a global language

However, this also points to a limitation, as the boundaries of this collaborative work between CS or the ‘bottom’ voice and governments or the ‘top’ voice, are viewed only through the connection with the UN.

**Background on International Civil Society: Definition & History**

One of the phenomena is the history of CS and how it has become international. However, it is noted that ‘the role of transnational civil society networks in global governance was both important and insufficiently examined’ (Florini, 2000) inviting further academic research to be conducted. According to Davies, transnational CS has moved through three distinct periods: from its development to 1914, 1914 until 1939, and a following third period until the present time of his writing of 2014 (Davies, 2014).

The first period, between the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century, saw ‘the development of transnational civil society… including the influence of interactions between East and West. Amongst the aspects considered are activism in respect of both African and ‘white’ slavery, the early humanitarian, labour and women’s movements, and the first scientific societies and international business, professional, standardization and sporting associations’ (Davies, 2014). This points to Davies also including business in his definition of CS and deemed it part of its historical development (Davies, 2014).

Keane adds ‘quite a lot of what is characteristic of today’s global civil society originated in the half-century before 1914’ (Keane, 2010). Reasons for this include: the world’s cartography was effectively completed, ‘long-distance networks of trade and commerce grew’, extensive progress in communication and transportation technologies, the emergence ‘of a single global economy… Measured in terms of gross national product (GNP)’, essentially ‘the whole world consequently began to feel much smaller’ (Keane, 2010).

The following statement is of particular interest: ‘it is emphasized that the development of transnational civil society occurred in parallel with the development of the nation-state’ (Davies, 2014). It indicates that CS arose as current conceptual national governments developed. This provides support for my definition of CS that it includes everything that sits outside of government.
The second period came between World War One and World War two, there was ‘great breadth and scale of transnational non-governmental activities that developed after the First World War… is evident in the relief efforts’ (Davies, 2014). This period also includes ‘the role of transnational civil society in the formation of the League of Nations’ and sees ‘work for the protection of minorities, anti-colonial and Islamic social movement organizations, and transnational disarmament activism’ (Davies, 2014). The League of Nations being the precursor to the UN.

The third period of the development of transnational CS, according to Davies, came after the World Wars and includes ‘the dual role of the Cold War as a factor not only splitting transnational civil society… but also providing the conditions under which considerable integration could take place’ (Davies, 2014). This timeframe brings in the materialisation of organisations that are furthering their international reach and are interested in development, for example climate change and human rights (Davies, 2014). This period notes the engagement of CS with government bodies ‘including the United Nations and the World Bank’ and acknowledges Civil Societies’ role in decolonization by supporting independent nations (Davies, 2014).

A second phenomenon of CS is how varied its definition can be and how passionate some are about the definition being a certain way. The definition of CS for this research I defined as every entity, both formal and informal, that sits outside of government. Therefore, this includes individuals and organisations both for profit and not for profit (see Table 1.1). This allowed for drawing on all possibilities of CS. The researcher Davies, as cited above, demonstrated the private sector being included in CS and how CS is thought of as all entities that sit outside government. There are many different conceptualisations on the definition of CS and this thesis is looking at CS in its broadest definition. The reason this doctorate used the broadest definition is because it continued to align with the academic research just presented above on international CS and it was chosen because of the macro research level this thesis carried out.

To provide an overview of the differing definitions of CS, a few examples are presented. The World Bank Group uses the following definition: ‘the wide array of non-governmental and not for profit organizations that have a presence in public life, express the interests and values of their members and others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations’ (The World Bank, 2021). The definition lacks the inclusion of the for-profit sector that was incorporated in the previously presented academic presentation of the history of international CS. The inclusion of the private sector in the CS classification for this thesis was confirmed by the participants in the field research as the appropriate definition to use, which is presented in the findings.

The World Economic Forum definition of CS references that of The World Bank Group and adds that the definition is varied and acknowledges that it is widening (World Economic Forum, 2021).

The European Union uses a similar definition of CS to the one used in this thesis: ‘Civil society refers to all forms of social action carried out by individuals or groups who are neither connected to, nor managed by, the State’ (EUR-Lex, 2021).
In considering today’s context and what we can expect of international CS moving forward, are transnational networks that have a continuing and stable role in international relations and this reality necessitates governments to recognise Civil Societies’ enduring position and contribution to policymaking (Florini, 2000). In her book entitled *The Third Force*, Florini acknowledges international CS actors as highly relevant because the current government systems, that have been in place for hundreds of years, are not equipped to deal with growing global issues (Florini, 2000). What is important in today’s context is, ‘the world badly needs someone to act as the “global conscience,” to represent broad public interests that do not readily fall under the purview of individual territorial states or that states have shown themselves want to ignore’ (Florini, 2000) and Civil Societies’ role in that continues to be explored in this thesis.

**The Theoretical Background on the Global Perspective**

In considering the academic theoretical background, I begin by quoting Kamat to provide the current global disposition. Kamat claims, ‘the neoliberal venture of the past four decades has been devastatingly successful in reinforcing the transfer of wealth and power from public to private, from poor to rich and from labour to capital’ (Kamat, 2018). Lee and Friedrich confirm that it is in the 1980s that we witness neoliberalism emerging (Lee and Friedrich, 2011). Neoliberalism or globalisation is often associated with free market economy, laissez-faire, or free market capitalism. In addition, Choudry explores how globalisation can be defined as colonisation, in which international corporations and national governments with influential foreign policies are establishing control and exploiting the earth and people (Choudry, 2010).

This neoliberal context created a number of responses. Firstly, it has reformed CS because of the shift from government to the market. One example of this is a movement against globalisation, which is commonly defined as global justice (Choudry, 2013b). Additionally, it has also resulted in an increased dependability for NGOs to fill societal needs that were once the responsibility of government (Choudry, 2011), as NGOs are the third sector because they are typically known not to represent the market or private sector nor the government sector (Kamat, 2004).

Two examples of this would be the diplomatic UN as being part of the government sector and CS (including NGOs) being a part of the third sector. These two examples are the focus of this research: the UN and CS. The literature review and the themes uncovered in the findings unveiled this reliance of the government or diplomatic UN on the third sector, the NGOs, to carry out crucial work. Continued exploration of the global theoretical perspectives underpinning this research are discussed further, in the systematic literature review in Chapter 2.

**Theory of Change**

Researchers on theory of change, including that for international development, agree that there are a variety of different approaches that can be applied (Stein and Valters 2012). The following approach for theory of change was used for this thesis.

The *overall problem* that the thesis was researching to address was how to work more strategically, synergistically, collaboratively, and proactively together in order to
develop and create more sustainable solutions for a better quality of life for all (see Chapter 1, My Story).

The purpose was three-fold (see Chapter 3). Firstly, to contribute to the much needed further academic research on the UN and CS relationship. The second purpose was the application of the results of the research by providing a potential framework for working more strategically, synergistically, collaboratively, and proactively together for more sustainable, effective development. Thirdly, to contribute to the current international discourse on the UN’s relationship with CS.

Theory of change typically works backwards from the overall purpose. However, this thesis applied an inductive research process, as opposed to deductive. In staying true to the research design applied, the following if-then steps were carried out in an inductive process, as opposed to the backwards approach. If a chronological reflection on the UN and CS relationship is conducted, then historical challenges and benefits can be uncovered (see Chapter 2). If field research on the UN and CS relationship is carried out, then the themes that arose from the literature review can be analysed to understand whether they are still relevant today, in addition it allows for the further exploration of additional themes of the relationship to be unveiled (see Chapter 4). If dynamics can be understood between the UN and CS relationship, both historical and current, then a proposed model for reform can be designed to address those challenges and enhance the benefits (see Chapter 4). If a model for reform can be designed and presented back to the participants of the field research, then further exploration can be conducted to research a suggested proposal for implementation (see Chapter 5 and Chapter 6).

The assumptions are explained in Chapter 3 where my preconceptions are described, along how they were managed.

The map of how these steps were carried out are described in the Methodology chapter.

Boundaries of the theory of change for this thesis, essentially what was outside the scope of the research, are identified throughout the doctoral work by definitions that were applied for frequently used phrases, as noted in Table 1.1 and in the systematic literature review in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 discusses the specific limitations of the research. For example, the work was carried out on a macro or structural level and therefore specific countries or context specific topics were not delved into. Additional academic theoretical frameworks, that were not addressed in this thesis, are discussed in Chapter 6.

Theory of change is further addressed in Chapter 5.
Chapter 2
Systematic Literature Review

My Story

The process of writing this systematic literature review was all encompassing. Upon reflection, I am grateful for the robustness of the methodology and the effort in the analysis. The review started with over 76 000 documents, which unveiled findings that uncovered eight themes in the UN and CS relationship, as presented in this chapter.

I immersed myself in the synthesis of those relationship dynamics through deep reflection, using a technique of mapping on my walls for visual illustration, dictating thoughts into my recording device, and thinking through different perspectives to uncover the meaning and understanding of the different themes of the relationship. I asked questions such as, ‘What are you telling me?’, ‘What is it that you are showing me?’, ‘What is your story?’, ‘What is underlining these dynamics?’, and ‘If my research can propose a solution to this theme, what happens to that theme?’.

There, the inherent flaws of the UN and CS relationship began to emerge, which I will be discussing below. Researching proposed solutions to four out of the eight themes, would directly and negatively impact the other four, meaning, if I could solve the issue for one, it would make another one worse.

I let this realisation sink in… there is a flaw in the relationship! No wonder, the proposed solutions to date have not worked. I reflected quietly for a while longer, letting that newfound knowledge linger. This was a major flaw; if one exists, is there another? My in-depth analysis brought me into further awareness of two other inherent flaws of the relationship, as you will read below.

I must admit, I had not expected this revelation. This meant an invitation to look at a new system, due to the inherent flaws of the current system. As a researcher, I felt confident with these results from the systematic literature review given the robustness I applied by using a gold standard approach for the methodology. It provided a strong uncovering early on in the research, which opened the doors to the fieldwork with great anticipation and excitement.

Introduction

The relationship between the UN and NGOs is widely known as a tumultuous and dynamic affiliation. Liese describes the development of the relationship to be contained with ‘ups and downs’ (Liese, 2008). Falk states that the problems are complicated and have been ongoing from the UN’s inception (Falk, 2005). One paper that analysed the ‘central gate’ of NGOs access to the UN, discussed how the ‘gate’ has been opened and closed throughout different times (Symank, 2017). Otto describes the relationship as always having ‘been one of controversy and fluctuation’ (Otto, 1996). Another paper that studied the roles of NGOs in the UN system identified ‘these relations to be dynamic and diverse’ (Alger, 2002). Despite these challenges, the relationship between the UN and NGOs is needed.
Today, for the United Nations to succeed in many of its endeavours, partnership with civil society is not an option -- it is a necessity.’
Secretary-General Kofi Annan, January 2004

Non-Government Organisations can engage in UN activities through a number of different pathways and processes. The Background Paper for the Secretary-General’s Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations Relations with Civil Society presented these verifying points of both formal and informal engagements from conference attendance, to operations, to formal accreditation of consultative status (UN Secretary-General, 2003).

This systematic literature review narrows its focus on the collaborative work between two bodies; one being the UN and the other NGOs, through the formal United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) relations. The definition for NGOs, as used by the UN, is described in the next paragraph. ECOSOC is one of the five active principal organs of the UN and is the body that grants the accreditation of consultative status to qualifying NGOs.

Due to this set parameter, the wide scope of Civil Society with its many names and definitions, will be narrowed to how ESOCOC refers to this group and defines it. Any organisation that is not established by a government and is concerned with the United Nations functions, as set by the UN Charter in Chapters IX and X, is considered a NGO (UN ECOSOC, 1996). Paragraph 26 of ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31 further describes NGOs as those ‘whose primary purpose is to promote the aims, objectives and purposes of the United Nations and a furtherance of the understanding of its work’ (UN ECOSOC, 1996). Therein, for-profit organisations, due to their main concern not being the UN Charter’s functions, are implied to sit outside of the ECOSOC NGO definition. This is a loosely defined description, however, as Otto states in her paper, ‘closed categories tend to control rather than encourage participation’ (Otto, 1996).

There are two principles that guide ECOSOC when considering accrediting NGOs for consultative status with the UN. One being for ECOSOC to receive ‘expert information or advice’ from an NGO that is highly competent within its specialisation (UN ECOSOC, 1996). The other, to have NGOs ‘represent important elements of public opinion to express their views’ (UN ECOSOC, 1996).

These two guiding principles build the foundation upon which NGOs are further categorised. There are three categories to which an NGO can receive consultative status: general status, special status, or roster, which is determined by the extent of the NGOs’ activities and how broad their geographical member reach extends (UN ECOSOC, 1996; Willetts, 2006). Each category has a different scope that defines the NGOs’ relationship with the UN (UN ECOSOC, 1996). Table 2.1 presents these ‘privileges and obligations’ for each category (UN Secretary-General, 2003).
Table 2.1 Privileges and Obligations of NGO Accreditation to ECOSOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privileges/obligations</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Roster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to the work of ECOSOC</td>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>Some areas</td>
<td>limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are in consultative status with ECOSOC</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate UN representatives</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited to UN conferences</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose items for ECOSOC agenda</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend UN meetings</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can speak at ECOSOC</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate statements at ECOSOC meetings</td>
<td>2000 words</td>
<td>500 words</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate statements at ECOSOC subsidiary bodies' meetings</td>
<td>2000 words</td>
<td>1500 words</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can speak at ECOSOC subsidiary bodies' meetings</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must submit quadrennial reports</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(UN Secretary-General, 2003)

The descriptions in Table 2.1 further show the complexities of the UN and NGO relations. It is often noted that the ECOSOC procedural working parameters are unclear and therefore the interpretations inconsistent, which allow for an invitation of debates from Member States of the UN and from NGOs (Symank, 2017; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004).

The invitation from the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs, that was sent on the 17th of January 2018, is seeking feedback from NGOs ‘to review and improve the relations between the UN and civil society’ and that it has ‘become even more important’ (Chair of the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs, 2018). These discussions are being held on the 20th of June 2018. It is clear that reform is still being sought. As well, the literature that was sourced in this review all point towards a need for reform.

A critique on the previous literature includes the limited academic research on the structural level of the relationship between the UN and NGOs. The research that is conducted is often carried out through a contextual lens of one country or one issue, which can limit its contribution to the overall matter, other authors have also acknowledged this (Symank, 2017; Joachim and Locher, 2006). Another point of critique is that although the relationship dynamics of the UN and NGOs are so frequently noted, no known proposals of reform have yet considered looking at solutions outside the UN.

In recognising these shortcomings, this study provides the first systematic literature review that has been completed on this topic within the search parameters identified in the methodology, as described in the next section. Secondly, the results add to the current limited research that is carried out on this broader relationship topic of the UN and NGOs and groups the findings into themes. Thirdly, the discussion begins the exploration of finding a proposal for reform that sits outside the current UN system.
The methodology section below explains the process of the systematic literature review search in detail. This is followed by a brief history in chronological order, of the UN and NGO relationship to provide a background to the findings. The results present eight themes identified, followed by a discussion of these findings and a conclusion of the systematic literature review that presents considerations for the fieldwork.

**Methodology for the Systematic Literature Review**

The systematic review commenced with a scoping search to uncover key words, subject headings, databases, journals, and authors to build a more informed search strategy for the literature review. To minimise bias and provide a more robust and informed analysis, published literature (including peer-reviewed journal articles and books) and grey literature (including news articles, theses, conference papers, reports, as well as meeting minutes or resolution documents) were included in the literature search.

The academic documents provided literature that held reflective and analysed information that discussed the intention of the writing in advance to the analysis and formed conclusionary thoughts. The grey literature contributed historical events, decision or function-based documents, reports, along with governmental documents.

Grey literature was pertinent to the acquisition of the knowledge on this topic due to the relationship status changes between the two parties often set in resolutions. Therefore, decisions were reported in UN documents and not necessarily published. This supports the decision for a systematic literature review (which is addressed further in Chapter 3) as, ‘the specialty of systematic reviews is that they also include grey literature’ (Editage, 2021). The search strategy for the literature is explained in more detail below.

**Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria**

Free text searches were conducted as opposed to controlled vocabulary for two reasons; one to minimise any missed documents and secondly some databases do not support controlled vocabulary searches.
Table 2.2 Search Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Search Terms &amp; Synonyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Civil Society and Non-Government Organisations</td>
<td>“civil society” OR “civil society organisations” OR “civil society organizations” OR “non-government” OR “non-government organisations” OR “non-government organizations” OR “non government”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>“relationship” OR “working” OR “interrelationship” OR “alliance” OR “partnership” OR “dependence” OR “association” OR “relation” OR “network”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Factor</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>“United Nations” OR “UN”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each database has its own search method approach hence adjustments were made to accommodate. However, this was done with as little adjustments as possible to maintain consistency.

Table 2.3 Inclusion Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>June 1945, commencement of UN, to January 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>No geographic limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Journal articles, and Published and Non-Published Grey Literature including Media Press Releases, Speeches from Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Documents that related to the relationship dynamics between the two parties in relation to the ECOSOC parameters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4. Exclusion Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Literature not in the English language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Documents that related to the relationship dynamics between the two parties that pertained to one country only or a limited number of countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Literature that related to the relationship dynamics between the two parties that pertained to only one particular issue area or circumstance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Documents that related to the relationship dynamics between the two parties outside of the ECOSOC parameters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A first review was done of the searched document to uncover whether it matched the inclusion criteria noted in Table 2.3, by reading the abstract or conducting a brief
overview. If it passed the inclusion criteria, the document was further examined to identify exclusion criteria (see Table 2.4).

The documents’ relevance and credibility were ascertained by asking the following questions:

- Does it hold information that was formative to the relationship? For example, some grey literature documents contained meeting agendas that related to the relationship, however, no meeting minutes or decisions that arose were noted, resulting in the document not meeting relevant criteria and hence not included.
- Does it present insight into the relationship to provide understanding of its complexities?
- Is the information that is presented in the document strongly supported? For example, by an influential stakeholder voice or a decision that was made in a meeting with the intent to impact the relationship.

A document only needed to answer, yes, to one of the questions above to be included.

**Journal Article Search Strategy**

The search terms and synonyms that are identified in Table 2.2 were used to search the following twelve electronic databases:

- EBSCO Academic Search Complete
- EBSCO Anthropology Plus
- EBSCO Political Science Complete
- EBSCO Sociology Source Ultimate
- Google Scholar
- ProQuest IBSS
- ProQuest PAIS International
- ProQuest Political Science
- ProQuest Social Science journals
- ProQuest Sociological Abstracts
- Scopus
- Web of Science Core Collection

In addition, to searching the main social science databases, the following fourteen journals and one key forum were hand searched:

- Development and Change
- Development in Practice
- European Journal of Development Research
- European Journal of International Relations
- Global Policy Forum (independent body that monitors the work of the UN)
- Journal of Civil Society
- Journal of Human Development & Capabilities
- Journal of International Development
- NGO Watch
- Oxford Development Studies
- Public Administration & Development
- Studies in Comparative International Development
Grey Literature Search Strategy
This search was conducted in electronic formats. Search terms and synonyms presented in Table 2.2 were applied.

Electronic databases searched:
- National Library of Scotland
- United Nations Dag Hammarskjöld Library
- Social Science Research Network

The electronic databases listed below, were searched for PhD theses and dissertations:
- ProQuest Political Science Dissertations and Theses
- ProQuest Social Science Journals Dissertations and Theses
- ProQuest Sociological Abstracts Dissertations and Theses
- WorldCat Dissertations and Theses

Information was sourced from conference proceedings, including papers, posters and presentations, through the following electronic databases:
- EBSCO Political Science Complete
- ProQuest IBSS
- ProQuest Political Science
- ProQuest Social Science Journals
- ProQuest Sociological Abstracts
- Scopus
- Web of Science Core Collection

Hand searching was done on selected key websites that included:
- UN Websites
- ECOSOC Documents Website

Validation and Verification of Search Strategy
Over and above the hand searching that was already noted, a number of additional steps were conducted to validate and verify the search strategy that was applied to journal articles and grey literature to uncover any missed documents:
- The reference lists of included searched documents were reviewed to identify if any other relevant works needed to be included.
- Key authors were searched to expose any potentially missed applicable literature.
- Experts in the field were consulted and asked for relevant literature or authors to explore, that may have been over-looked and would contribute to the knowledge acquisition on the research question.
- From the included literature, citation searches were carried out to uncover any additional applicable documents to be reviewed where the sourced literature was utilised in other works.
Figure 2.1 The Literature Search Process

Electronically Searched Databases:

- EBSCO Academic  n = 725
- EBSCO Anthro    n = 1
- EBSCO Poli Sci  n = 363
- EBSCO Sociology n = 244
- Google Scholar  n = 69
- ProQuest IBSS   n = 18 089
- ProQuest PAIS   n = 4576
- UN Dag Library n = 0
- National Lib of Scot n = 62
- WorldCat Ths & Dis n = 19
- ProQuest Socio Abst n = 5975
- Web of Sci Core n = 162
- ProQuest Social Sci n = 18 348

Documents Removed Based on Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria n = 76 214
Documents Removed Based on Relevance and Credibility n = 5
Duplicate Documents Removed n = 16
Not Accessible Documents Removed n = 5

Documents that Arose from Search n = 76 291
Documents that Were Further Examined n = 77
Documents that Were Further Examined n = 72
Documents that Were Further Examined n = 56
Documents that Were Further Examined n = 51

Documents Included n = 60

Hand Searched Databases:

- Journals and Forums n = 7
- ECOSOC Website n = 7
- UN Websites n = 5

Validation and Verification:

- Referencing, Authors Search and Citations n = 5
- Key Stakeholders n = 4
Sixty documents arose from the systematic review search. In summary: there were five resolutions, one decision document, one rules of procedure, four books, one Charter, five reports, 22 academic papers, one UN paper, one agenda, 12 articles, one letter, one concept note (invitation), one interview, three speeches, and one set of meeting minutes. An additional 20 documents were added outside the search parameters, which were uncovered for the purpose of understanding the history of the UN and CS relationship and are noted in the bibliography to round out the research. In total, 80 documents were analysed. The varying pieces of literature support a more robust and fuller perspective of the topic researched.

Given the time frame this search was conducted, from 1945 to 2018, there was low volume, only 22 academic papers written on this topic within the set inclusion and exclusion criteria. This highlights a need for more empirical work to be carried out on this topic to bring this much needed information to the forefront to be developed.

**Limitations**

There is a limitation with just myself being the researcher, as opposed to working in a research team. Documents could have been missed because there was not another person to cross examine my work and/or also conduct searches themselves to potentially contribute to the review. However, these potential risks were minimised by ensuring a comprehensive systematic review protocol was followed, including key exclusion decisions documented at each stage of the search process (as identified in Figure 2.1).

The systematic review was carried out within the limitations set by the exclusion and inclusion criteria. These are presented in Tables 2.3 and 2.4. One of the exclusion criteria was any language that was not in English. However, the UN has six official languages (United Nations, 2017c), one being English, hence, all documents arising from the UN would include the English language. Therefore, this limitation of the English language is reduced to any documents that have not been translated and were sourced outside of the UN materials.

There could be missing documents especially in the grey literature. This potential limitation was minimised by having searched a number of different sources as noted above, including speaking to key stakeholders.

**A Brief History**

On the 26th day of June in 1945, the United Nations Charter was signed, which came into effect on the 24th day of October in 1945 (Historical Works, 2012). Since its commencement, the UN acknowledged the relationship with NGOs in Article 71 of the Charter; ‘the Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned’ (Historical Works, 2012).

In 1946, ECOSOC formed a committee that would oversee and manage the relationship with NGOs (Hachez, 2008). In 1950, the Council Committee on NGOs proposed a revision, which included specific requirements NGOs needed to be
considered for consultative status, as well as the governing details and principles of the working arrangement (UN ECOSOC, 1950). This formed ECOSOC Resolution 288 B (X) which was in effect until 1968, although many aspects of the ECOSOC Resolution were carried forward and are still used at the time of this writing (UN ECOSOC, 1950; Hachez, 2008).

With the Cold War era, distrust was felt by some Member States of the UN towards NGOs, which led to ECOSOC Resolution 1296 (XLIV) to address ‘secret governmental financial influence’ (UN ECOSOC, 1968; Otto, 1996). There was also a criticism that the NGOs from western regions were given more importance than those from other regions (Otto, 1996). ECOSOC Resolution 1296 (XLIV) was decided in 1968 and replaced some of the previous ECOSOC Resolution 288 B (X) (UN ECOSOC, 1968; UN ECOSOC, 1996). It regressed the relationship by implementing controls, periodic reviews, restrictions, and elements for suspension and withdrawal (UN ECOSOC, 1968).

However, in 1992 due to Agenda 21 that arose out of the Sustainable Development Conference on Environmental Development that was held in Brazil, NGOs were acknowledged as indispensable contributors (UN Sustainable Development, 1992). Agenda 21 states, ‘non-governmental organizations play a vital role… Their credibility lies in the responsible and constructive role they play in society. …possess well-established and diverse experience, expertise and capacity in fields… The community of non-governmental organizations, therefore, offers a global network that should be tapped, enabled and strengthened in support of efforts to achieve these common goals’ (UN Sustainable Development, 1992).

Hence, one of the outcomes of Agenda 21 from the Earth Summit called for ‘strengthening the role of major groups’, which identified the groups as women, children and youth, indigenous people and their communities, NGOs, local authorities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, scientific and technological communities, and farmers (UN Sustainable Development, 1992).

Although after the conference in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, the strengthening of major stakeholder groups was identified, other commonly referred to groups continue to be used in the UN, with differing parts of the UN and its agencies preferring one over the other. A high level document, a resolution from the UN’s General Assembly, illustrates this by stating: ‘the major groups identified in Agenda 21 and other stakeholders, such as private philanthropic organizations, educational and academic entities, persons with disabilities, volunteer groups and other stakeholders’ (UN General Assembly, 2013). A working document for UN Country Teams demonstrates this by expressing: ‘all major groups as well as other stakeholders, including local communities, volunteer groups and foundations, migrants and families, as well as older persons and persons with disabilities’ (UN Sustainable Development, 2015).

Regarding the major groups in relation to this thesis, the definition used for stakeholders for this doctorate aligns with the UN major stakeholders as it includes government and business, in addition to various other sectors of society (see Table 1.1). However, because the local authority major stakeholder group refers to the local government body, this is a group that sits outside the definition of CS used for
this thesis (see Table 1.1). Hence, major stakeholder groups were not a focus for this thesis, but CS instead. This decision was retroactively reinforced by the results of the findings which showed interviewees related to CS and strongly identify with the concept of CS.

After Agenda 21, in 1993, ECOSOC decided on ECOSOC Resolution 1993/80 which formulated a working group to revisit and update ECOSOC Resolution 1296 (XLIV) from 1968 (UN ECOSOC, 1993; UN ECOSOC, 1968). The working group was to consider improving the current arrangements, increase the quality of the work and further open the working relationship by asking other relevant NGOs to provide their perspectives (UN ECOSOC, 1993). Different UN bodies and NGOs that held consultative status at that time, were also invited to participate in the working group (UN ECOSOC, 1993).

These efforts contributed to ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31, which was implemented in 1996 and remains as the current consultative working relationship agreement between the UN and NGOs (UN ECOSOC, 1996). This resolution was considered to be a minor improvement on the development of the relationship (Hachez, 2008).

ECOSOC Resolution 1996/297, noted the mass contributions that NGOs provided and through ECOSOC, an invitation to another organ of the UN, the General Assembly was asked to consider having NGOs collaborate on the UN work in all of its areas (UN ECOSOC, 1996). However, this was not put into practice due to the Member States not agreeing on this point (UN ECOSOC, 1996; Hachez, 2008).

In the year of 2000, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which identified objectives for International Development to be achieved by 2015, and were signed off by 189 Heads of State (UN Resident Coordinator Dr. Marcia de Castro, 2007). The MDGs identified crucial areas where NGOs could engage with UN work: advocating the goals, implementing the goals, and monitoring of the goals (UN Resident Coordinator Dr. Marcia de Castro, 2007).

In September of 2001, at the World Federation of United Nations Associations annual meeting, General Assembly President Harri Holkeri stated, ‘the Millennial Declaration provided an enhanced mandate for civil society participation and partnership at the United Nations. The agenda for this meeting has two dimensions, because defining strategies to implement the Millennium goals implies finding new ways to develop the partnership between civil society and the United Nations’ (UN General Assembly President Holkeri, 2001).

In February of 2002, the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan appointed a Panel of Eminent Persons to evaluate and propose suggestions for the improvement of the Civil Society and United Nations relationship (M2 PressWIRE, 2004b; Anheier, 2008). This report is known as the Cardoso Report because the then President of Brazil Enrico Cardoso, was the Chairman on this panel (Anheier, 2008).

‘Governments today understand that they can’t do it all, that a society’s goals can only be realized through the cooperation and partnership of a broad range of actors, including the private sector, civil society and other groups… The doors of the United Nations are open as never before to the dynamic constellation of non-State actors.’
In June 2004 the Cardoso Report was released (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). It suggested 30 proposals and four main paradigm shifts: ‘(a) multilateralism no longer concerns Governments alone but is now multifaceted, involving many constituencies; the United Nations must develop new skills to service this new way of working; (b) it must become an outward-looking or network organization, catalysing the relationships needed to get strong results and not letting the traditions of its formal processes be barriers; (c) it must strengthen global governance by advocating universality, inclusion, participation and accountability at all levels; and (d) it must engage more systematically with world public opinion to become more responsive, to help shape public attitudes and to bolster support for multilateralism’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004).

After reviewing the findings in Chapter 4, it may be of interest to note how some of the themes that arose from the Cardoso Report continue to be relevant. Themes such as inclusion, dialogue, collaboration, human resources, corporate collaboration, importance of in-country engagement, CS having restricted influence and complicated access, the UN needing to do more to involve CS, resources, system and processes, out-dated working structure, along with accountability. One can see the beginning seeds of a United Peoples which is integrated with the United Nations in the highly valued Cardoso Report with proposal 24 suggesting that a new office be formulated that would manage the partnership between the Member States and CS (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004).

The following was stated by the Deputy Secretary-General Louise Frechette, while addressing the General Assembly in 2004, when she asked the Assembly to consider the seven points that Secretary-General Kofi Annan recommended from the Cardoso Report; ‘the contribution of civil society groups to the UN has been invaluable. The time is right to take this partnership one step further for the benefit of this Organization and the people it was created to serve’ (M2 PressWIRE, 2004b).

The Cardoso Report was perceived by NGOs with great concern and viewed the recommendations as a hindrance to the relationship, including a weaken of the rights (Global Policy Forum, 2005; Anheier, 2008). A letter was written from the International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters that was undersigned by 31 different NGOs from around the world (International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters, 2004). It was written to the Secretary-General Kofi Annan and stated its apprehensions regarding the Cardoso Report, including a serious concern to the potential undermining of the work that the UN – Non-Governmental Liaison Service provides (International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters, 2004). The letter did acknowledge the Cardoso Report and the Secretary-General’s response to the report, that it had good intentions to strengthen the relationship between the UN and NGOs, however the financial reduction may disempower and harm the relationship as opposed to strengthening it (International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters, 2004).
The Cardoso Report gained a lot of attention, which is evident by how extensively it is referred to in the literature. There was hope it would bring about the much-needed change, however, some of the major issues were not addressed (Willetts, 2006) and no new resolutions arose.

In July of 2008, ECOSOC refers back to ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31 from twelve years prior, with two points through ECOSOC Resolution 2008/5 (UN ECOSOC, 2008). Firstly it; ’regrets the weak capacity of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat and requests the Secretary- General to ensure the full utilization of the resources allocated to it as well as the filling of all vacant posts and to report on proposals to further strengthen the capacity of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section within the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 and the maintenance of the institutional memory of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section, thereby making full use of lessons learned and best practices within the Section so as to enable it to carry out its responsibilities efficiently and effectively’ (UN ECOSOC, 2008).

Secondly, it recommended the development of training materials, workshops, and encouraged partnerships with NGOs (UN ECOSOC, 2008). Although ECOSOC Resolution 2008/5 acknowledged the limited effort and requests the Secretary General to rectify the unmet needs of NGOs (UN ECOSOC, 2008), to date, no decision has been made on ECOSOC Resolution 2008/5.

In summary, there are three ECOSOC Resolutions that reviewed the consultative status of Article 71 that was outlined in the Charter in 1945. ECOSOC Resolution 288 (X) of 1950, ECOSOC Resolution 1296 (XLIV) from 1968, and ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31 from 1996, which is still the ECOSOC Resolution governing the arrangements in 2018 (Symank, 2017; Willetts, 2000; Willetts, 2006). In January of 2018, an invitation was sent to NGOs with consultative status with the UN from the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs to seek feedback to improve the working relationship (Chair of the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs, 2018). Hence, a new resolution may be on the horizon.

**Systematic Review Findings**

‘No country, no matter how powerful or resourceful, can do this work alone. The United Nations cannot do this work alone. All actors need to join hands as never before – Governments, business, civil society.’

Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon, June 2015

The purpose of this systematic review is to understand the historical background and bring it into the current context in which the next step of this research can be grounded and built on. The intent is to uncover themes that underpin this dynamic relationship of the two parties; the UN and NGOs. It has been identified, which will be explained in more detail, that this relationship is critical in order to have an increased impact on sustainable international development. The findings present eight identified themes, of which some are further narrowed down to categories within a theme.
**Theme One: Its Heartbeat & Breath - The UN Needs NGOs for Validity and Credibility**

This theme explores the UN’s recognition of its need to work effectively with NGOs, for a number of reasons. Firstly, to be accountable to the Charter and fill its obligations to Article 71. Secondly, NGOs support the UN’s legitimacy and maintain its relevance. Thirdly, NGOs improve the work it carries out and strengthens the UN’s effectiveness.

Firstly, there is a recognised responsibility to uphold Article 71 of the Charter. ECOSOC Resolution 1296 (XLIV) states, ‘recognizing that arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations provide an important means for furthering the purposes and principles of the United Nations. …consultations… should be developed to the fullest practicable extent.’ (UN ECOSOC, 1968). This responsibility was acknowledged again in 2003 by a UN report, that for NGOs to fully fulfil their role, as stated within the Charter, internal and external initiatives would need to be strengthened (UN Secretary-General, 2003).

Secondly, NGOs are important as they help the UN ‘improve its legitimacy’ and ‘remain fully relevant’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Hachez, 2008; Anheier, 2008; M2 PressWIRE, 2002)). The UN and its agencies require the expertise NGOs offer (Coate, 2009). This relationship ‘is vital for the world’s poor and for the credibility of the United Nations’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). Hence, the Cardoso Report along with Secretary General Kofi Annan, acknowledge that their mutual engagement is not an option, it is a requirement (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003).

Thirdly, the engagement between the UN and NGOs must be strengthened for the UN ‘to become fully effective’ and ‘do a better job’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). Hill agrees and adds that the UN needs a strong affiliation with NGOs to increase its capacity to achieve objectives and realise the global goals; the two bodies cannot accomplish this in isolation (Hill, 1998). Broadening and deepening the relationship with NGOs strengthens the quality of decisions made, the assessment of priorities is bettered, the public’s voice is provided, intergovernmental debates on global issues are enhanced, transparency is added to processes, and the UN’s accountability is increased (UN General Assembly, 2004; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003). The success of the UNs’ work would further and be more effective, if its relations with NGOs were strengthened (UN Secretary-General, 2003; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Murithi, 2003).

**Theme Two: The Passionate Professional Partners - NGOs Want to be Involved**

Non-Government Organisations’ interests in working together with the UN on UN work continues to grow (McKeon, 2009; UN Secretary-General, 2003). Symank’s research shows that NGOs find contributing to UN work valuable (Symank, 2017). This is relevant through the steady incline of numbers of NGOs applying for consultative status, ‘2016 and 2017, have seen record numbers of applications by NGOs’ (Symank, 2017).
This is coupled with a desire for the NGOs' work to further disseminate out into other areas of the UN, that has been traditionally closed to them (Willetts, 2006). Leininger has observed that, 'the NGO community possesses a high capacity for co-operation and co-ordination as well as high professional competence' (Leininger, 2005). The research in the literature shows that NGOs want to work with the UN, broaden and deepen the work together, and NGOs conduct themselves in a professional cooperative way to increase working effectiveness and willingness.

**Theme Three: The Moving Maze - NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access**

A larger theme, such as this one, was reviewed and through analysis unpacked further into categories, in order to gain an improved understanding of the different elements that restrict NGOs working arrangement with the UN. There are two key categories; the system or process of the UN and the people of the UN – the Member States.

The UN system itself is criticised for its complicated access (Tibbett, 2009; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Leininger, 2005), which is preventing engagement with NGOs (McKeon, 2009). These criticisms include: ‘inconsistent rules and informal practices’ (Leininger, 2005), that it is often expensive to be involved in UN work (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004), the highly political nature of the UN work environment (UN Secretary-General, 2003; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Leininger, 2005), the restrictions based on the NGOs’ consultative status (Hachez, 2008), the time intensive requirement (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003), that information is often lacking in clarity (UN Secretary-General, 2003), and the accreditation process itself is often seen as an obstacle (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). As well, availability to documents and information within the UN system, is a challenge for NGOs (UN Secretary-General, 2003; Willetts, 2000).

The UN Member States are noted to restrict the participation of NGOs, which a number of authors have written about: whether it is involvement in conferences (Leininger, 2005), inclusion in the General Assembly activities (Willetts, 2000; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004), involvement in peace and security (Hachez, 2008), or overall restrictions that limit NGOs impact on UN work (McKeon, 2009). Some Member States struggle to accept or view NGOs as having equal status to states (Willetts, 2000), which would inherently create these restrictions.

Due to these limitations, NGOs report that they are not being heard (M2 PressWIRE, 2004b; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004) and question the influence they are able to make (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; McKeon, 2009; M2 PressWIRE, 2004b). A report from the UN acknowledges this by stating, ‘too little time allocated to them (NGOs) to allow meaningful contributions’ (UN Secretary-General, 2003). There has also been criticism of the Secretariat that NGO
involvement is accepted when it is in ‘their own interests and requirements’ (Leininger, 2005). Tibbet adds that ‘some civil society groups complain of being legally constrained at the UN, with no formal speaking rights and ad hoc involvement in processes and consultations’ (Tibbett, 2009). ECOSOC itself has noted in all 3 reviews: in 1950, 1968, and 1996 that the consultative status of NGOs should look beyond the ECOSOC body and involve other principal organs of the UN (UN ECOSOC, 1950; UN ECOSOC, 1968; UN ECOSOC, 1996).

Theme Four: The Heavy Door to Open - The UN Needs to Do More to Involve NGOs

‘The participation of non-governmental organizations is important. The United Nations and governments cannot do the work alone but need partnerships with the civil society. … It is my strong belief that, through cooperation with non-governmental organizations, the results are more sustainable in all societies...’

UN General Assembly President Harri Holkeri, September 2000

The literature repeatedly notes that the UN needs to increase the involvement and engagement of NGOs to broaden and further its participation (M2 PressWIRE, 2004b; McKeon, 2009; Kane, 2008). Otto adds the necessity, ‘to encourage UN-NGO relations rather than control them’ (Otto, 1996). While, Tibbet remarks that the effort to build the relation is from the NGO side ‘reaching out to the UN’, it is not a balanced effort (Tibbett, 2009).

Leadership backing to support the NGO relation is lacking (UN Secretary-General, 2003). There are many speeches from UN leaders that talk about enhancing the UN and NGO relation, with little action that follows (UN Secretary-General, 2003). The Cardoso Report remarks that the UN, ‘should become more accountable, transparent and responsive to citizens globally’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). One author even suggests a reform to protect NGOs from antagonistic Member States (Otto, 1996).

Further incorporation of the NGO participation is a recurring topic in the literature: to support the UN’s work in political and policy processes and issues (Kane, 2008; McKeon, 2009; UN Sustainable Development, 1992), further its ‘speaking rights in key processes’ (Tibbett, 2009), and extend the legal status of NGOs role within the UN (Tibbett, 2009; Leininger, 2005). Adequate means are required to help support the enhanced UN and NGO relationship: such as funding, human resources, availability to information and documents, and training resources (UN Secretary-General, 2003). Tibbet adds that not just financial support is needed but political support as well (Tibbett, 2009).

There is an overall feeling that NGOs are not taken seriously, and that ‘a more explicitly expressed recognition of the vital role of civil society and NGOs’ needs to be made (M2 PressWIRE, 2003). NGOs feel marginalised, and not properly acknowledged (UN Secretary-General, 2003). Their meeting engagement is received meekly, if at all, ‘NGO statements are usually at the end of a session when many delegates have left and there is little feedback to their statements’ (UN Secretary-General, 2003). One author suggests respecting the NGOs’ request for a further developed participatory role (Tibbett, 2009). Despite the much-needed discussions concerning the NGO enhanced participation, these vital conversations to bring about reform, are often delayed (UN Secretary-General, 2003).
Theme Five: From Trojan Horse to Too Influential - Negative Reasons to Involving NGOs

In the literature, there are a number of reasons noted that cause concern to work with NGOs. Their legitimacy is questioned (Leininger, 2005; UN Secretary-General, 2003; Hachez, 2008; Anheier, 2008), accountability (UN General Assembly President Holkeri, 2001; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003), and credibility (Leininger, 2005; Anheier, 2008). With the UN not having a clear or overall monitoring process (UN General Assembly President Holkeri, 2001; Leininger, 2005), these issues are difficult to resolve.

Non-Government Organisations’ representation and motives are also questioned (UN Secretary-General, 2003; Anheier, 2008; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). NGOs that are funded by their states or single wealthy individuals driving their own agenda, or disguised businesses either legal or illegal businesses; essentially Trojan Horses with hidden agendas, pose a threat to the legitimacy of NGOs’ mandates (Tibbett, 2009). As well, there is a concern that there is too much of a focus on the Northern agenda and a balance is needed with Southern representation (Willetts, 2006; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003).

The numerous views and differing ideas NGOs represent, provide another form of distress to the Member States of the UN (UN Secretary-General, 2003; Leininger, 2005). These alternate positions can create tensions or conflicts between the states and between NGOs and states (UN Secretary-General, 2003).

With more and more NGOs requesting consultative status, the variance in the views could potentially broaden. Hence, there is a concern with the growing number of NGOs that multiple authors write about (Otto, 1996; Alger, 2002; UN Secretary-General, 2003). These issues include: diluting the status that current NGOs hold (Symank, 2017), over-burdening the UN process, and decelerating decision-making (UN Secretary-General, 2003).

Interestingly, one author even describes a concern with NGOs being too influential (Anheier, 2008). Despite all these apprehensions, the literature reports the growing need to work even more closely with NGOs. Their vast contributions are explored in the next theme.

Theme Six: Bridges of Lifeline - NGO Contributions to UN Activities

Non-Government Organisations’ contributions are multiple and are widely recognised. In 2000, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Dhanapala goes as far as saying, NGOs role ‘in shaping the future is virtually limitless’ (Dhanapala, 2001). Hence, this theme is further categorised into three sections. NGOs’ contributions in governmental activities, operational activities, and overall management of global issues. The results of these findings are presented in Tables 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7. Extensive literature has been written about NGOs numerous and vast contributions to UN activities, which can be noted in the references columns of the following three tables. There is an additional fourth section that is presented below the Tables.
Table 2.5 NGOs’ Contributions to UN Governmental Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Activities</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer extensive expertise and information to the intergovernmental body.</td>
<td>Dhanapala, 2001; Hill, 1998; UN ECOSOC, 1996; UN Sustainable Development, 1992; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs represent the voice and experience of the public, especially those that are often least heard.</td>
<td>Willetts, 2000; UN Deputy Secretary-General Asha-Rose Migiro, 2007a; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003; Dhanapala, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance ownership of activities and decisions that are made.</td>
<td>UN Secretary-General, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve policy making, analysis, and discussions.</td>
<td>Hill, 1998; Murithi, 2003; UN Secretary-General, 2003; UN General Assembly, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further governmental process transparency.</td>
<td>Willetts, 2000; UN Secretary-General, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong and necessary advocacy.</td>
<td>Hill, 1998; Otto, 1996; Dhanapala, 2001; UN Deputy Secretary-General Asha-Rose Migiro, 2007a; UN General Assembly, 2004; UN General Assembly President Holkeri, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance intergovernmental debates.</td>
<td>UN General Assembly, 2004; Otto, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve decision making.</td>
<td>Murithi, 2003; UN Secretary-General, 2003; Otto, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucial in assisting the construction and implementation of democracy.</td>
<td>UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, 2008; UN Sustainable Development, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase accountability.</td>
<td>UN Secretary-General, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to access and recognise priorities.</td>
<td>Leininger, 2005; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.6 NGOs’ Contributions to UN Operational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Activities</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide needs assessment.</td>
<td>Hill, 1998; UN Secretary-General, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer expertise and influence on programme creation.</td>
<td>UN General Assembly, 2004; Murithi, 2003; Hill, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly support programme and policy implementation.</td>
<td>Hill, 1998; UN Sustainable Development, 1992; Murithi, 2003; UN General Assembly, 2004; UN General Assembly President Holkeri, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide monitoring &amp; evaluation.</td>
<td>Hill, 1998; UN Secretary-General, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective in operational activities.</td>
<td>Hill, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach and build awareness.</td>
<td>Dhanapala, 2001; UN General Assembly President Holkeri, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a strong capacity to mobilise resources of great variance.</td>
<td>Dhanapala, 2001; Tibbett, 2009; Alger, 2002; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Deputy Secretary-General Asha-Rose Migiro, 2007a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vast outreach abilities.</td>
<td>UN Deputy Secretary-General Asha-Rose Migiro, 2007a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7 NGOs’ Contributions to UN Activities Regarding Management of Global Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of Global Issues</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGOs can assist in resolving conflicts, procuring peace and reduce the extent of conflicts.</td>
<td>UN General Assembly, 2004; Murithi, 2003; Hill, 1998; Dhanapala, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall extensive support of all UN work, to the UN and other countries, such as the sustainable development goals.</td>
<td>Hill, 1998; M2 PressWIRE, 2007; UN ECOSOC, 1996; UN Sustainable Development, 1992; Otto, 1996; UN Secretary-General, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide great ability and capacity to offer creative solutions.</td>
<td>Leininger, 2005; M2 PressWIRE, 2004a; Tibbett, 2009; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to recognise issues as they arise.</td>
<td>The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; M2 PressWIRE, 2004a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is another dimension that NGOs contribute, that links these three areas: of governmental activities, operational activities, and overall management of global issues, which is the much needed and important connection between the ground level, to the global forum (Otto, 1996). NGOs provide the proximity to the people that the UN work impacts on (UN Secretary-General, 2003; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). The ability to implement UN programmes and policies at country level, is made possible by the bridge that NGOs offer to the UN (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Thérien and Dumontier, 2009). Therefore, NGOs are seen as a development partner with the UN and global cooperation is recognised as vital (Leininger, 2005; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Tibbett, 2009). The NGOs move the UN work from a diplomatic governmental level to the issues’ fronts.

**Theme Seven: The Power of Power - Resistance to NGO Involvement**

Although the contributions of NGOs are widely recognised within the UN, there is also a known resistance to working with NGOs from some of the Member States of the UN. Both Otto and Willets refer to this resistance as ‘hostility’ towards NGOs, which prohibits the reform needed for the UN and NGO relationship to further (Willetts, 2006; Otto, 1996).

Many authors talk about the ‘threat’ that several Member States feel from having a more inclusive work environment with NGOs (M2 PressWIRE, 2004a; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Dhanapala, 2001; Willetts, 2006). One of the threats identified is the requirement of Member States to be more accountable (Otto, 1996; The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). For example, states need to answer to NGOs’ uncovering of human rights violations in their countries or the pressure that NGOs place on states for disarmament (Alger, 2002; Willetts, 2000). Another author describes this threat as NGOs being regarded as a ‘watchdog’ to Member States (Leininger, 2005).

Sharing or letting go of power is very much resisted (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; Otto, 1996). Most governments view themselves as the elected parties, therefore, this ownership of power feels justified (UN Secretary-General, 2003). Hence, preserving the existing system, an intergovernmental system, is desired by a number of Member States (Hachez, 2008). Leininger adds, ‘Member States are displaying only limited readiness to change the current situation’ (Leininger, 2005). Willets identifies the reason to prevent change as a fear, that Member States may not enjoy the same freedoms they currently hold (Willetts, 2006).

**Theme Eight: The Paradoxical Situation - Resources**

Required resources is a theme that arose from the systematic research. Literature, from both within and outside the UN, discusses financial resources, as well as time and space needed for the relationship between the UN and NGOs to be productive.

United Nations Economic and Social Council Resolution 2008/5 made a request to the Secretary-General to fulfil the resources needed for the UN’s affiliation with NGOs (UN ECOSOC, 2008). In this resolution, ECOSOC requested both the
required maintenance resources, as well as, resources to strengthen and grow its capacity to support the relationship (UN ECOSOC, 2008). The Cardoso Report acknowledged the pressure placed on meeting space and time that NGOs’ need to have their voices heard (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Secretary-General, 2003).

The avenues for the relationship, between the UN and NGOs, to carry out its meaningful work are often threatened by lack of funding to maintain what is in place (UN ECOSOC, 2008; Leininger, 2005; Moderator Liberato Bautista Assistant General Secretary for UN and International Affairs, 2017; International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters, 2004). Over and above the demands of maintenance costs, there is continued acknowledgement to expand and invest in these avenues, from meeting space, to time, for the affiliation to flourish (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004; UN Sustainable Development, 1992). Tibbet suggests that additional resources are needed to support ‘speaking rights’ and ‘access to meetings’ (Tibbett, 2009). However, it is a challenge to invest in this area, as Alger points out, the UN Secretariat is often posed with the great difficulty to lower expenses (Alger, 2002). This presents a paradoxical situation.

Discussion

The results of this systematic literature review unravel intrinsic flaws of the relationship dynamic that will be explained in this section. There are three inherent flaws. The first one expresses itself in the history of the UN and begins in the Charter and follows through to today’s active Resolution – ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31. That is a position of opposition between Member States and ‘the Peoples’ as referred to in the Charter, and the peoples’ concerns including global issues, which may or may not overlap with Member States’ concerns.

The voting power lies with its Member States, as ECOSOC Resolution 1996/31 states, ‘a clear distinction is drawn in the Charter of the United Nations between participation without vote in the deliberations… is fundamental and the arrangements for consultation should not be such as to accord to non-governmental organizations the same rights of participation as are accorded to States’ (UN ECOSOC, 1996). The United Nations is an intergovernmental organisation, that through the Charter ‘We the Peoples…’, represents its people (Historical Works, 2012), however through its individual political Member State lens. This poses the first inherent issue. Otto describes this issue by stating; ‘interests of peoples are acknowledged as having a different foundation than the interests of states, although they are not necessarily mutually exclusive’ (Otto, 1996).

As, today’s issues have moved extensively from individual national perspectives to globally wide issues. The Cardoso Report highlights this point, ‘the most important contribution of the United Nations has always been its convening power, bringing Governments of countries that are at war or at opposite ends of the ideological spectrum. The same applies today, except that some of the world’s major players are not governmental. …they involve hunger, poverty, illiteracy, global pandemics, terrorism, narcotics, climate change…’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004).
The second inherent issue is revealed upon analysing the eight themes that are presented in the findings. The eight themes tell a story; the UN needs NGOs for validity and credibility (theme 1) and NGOs want to be involved (theme 2), however, there is a lack of resources (theme 8) and a resistance to involve the NGOs (theme 7). Therefore, the UN needs to do more to involve NGOs (theme 4), to remove the complicated access and embrace NGOs’ influence instead of restricting it (theme 3), whilst considering concerns involving NGOs (theme 5) so that NGO contributions can grow and further, to support UN activities (theme 6).

There are contradictions in this story that provide the answer as to why reform is needed and why reform has not come to fruition. Reform is needed (theme 4) because NGOs are vital to the UN (theme 1) due to their great contributions (theme 6) and the credibility NGOs provide (theme 1). Yet, adequate resources are not supplied (theme 8) and there is resistance to involving NGOs (theme 7), as well as concerns regarding NGOs’ involvement (theme 5). NGOs want to be involved (theme 2), yet their access and influence is complicated and restricted (theme 3).

An alternate approach is taken to review the findings, which is presented in Table 2.8. However, it again, clearly presents contradictions that cause the inhibition for this valued relationship to grow.

**Table 2.8 Review of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2: NGOs Want to be Involved</th>
<th>Contradicts With</th>
<th>Theme 3: NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: The UN Needs to Do More to Involve NGOs</td>
<td>Contradicts With</td>
<td>Theme 8: Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: NGO Contributions to UN Activities</td>
<td>Contradicts With</td>
<td>Theme 5: Negative Reasons to Involving NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: The UN Needs NGOs for Validity and Credibility</td>
<td>Contradicts With</td>
<td>Theme 7: Resistance to NGO Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The themes that were uncovered through the analysis of the literature and presented in the findings, expose the contradictions that are preventing the reform. These contradictions are evidence that clearly present the underlying issues.

The literature that was identified in this systematic review, all pointed towards a need for reform. However, the challenges for this reform within the UN are so multiple that the reform is still being sought and why is now visibly presented through the contradictions in the themes of the relationship between these two bodies.

Hence, how can the reform take place within the current UN system, when multiple contradictions are preventing it from doing so. Based on these findings, a solution for the reform for the UN and NGO relationship, to become more effective, must look outside of the current UN system.
There is a third inherent flaw in this relationship, an underpinning that causes the continued distress in the affiliation. Philosophically, how are NGOs supposed to work effectively with the UN when it is working under the UN, by needing to apply for accreditation to receive consultative status? How does any healthy working relationship become effective and productive if only one party holds the power and makes pre-defined determinations based on pre-set limitations of what the collaboration will be, due its different consultative status allowances in the working relation?

When a UN paper describes NGOs’ access as ‘privileges and obligations’ (UN Secretary-General, 2003), this is a problem. The Cardoso Report also uses similar language when discussing the consultative status of NGOs, ‘they can speak only when invited and are not participants in their own right’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004).

A consistent message within the literature is the need for reform and often the literature offers a proposal for reform for the relationship between the UN and NGOs, however, always within the UN. This discussion presents three inherent flaws that prevent the relationship from flourishing and blocking the reform from within. The results suggest that the reform needs to happen outside of the current UN system.

Clearly, the relationship has been identified as needed. Needed to encourage international development in depth, breadth, and lasting impact. Therefore, what are the next steps, needs to be further researched.

This research serves a function for the present situation and the future. It provides an uncovering of past dynamics in thematic form for the current work that the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs is undertaking ‘to review and improve the relations between the UN and civil society’ (Chair of the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs, 2018). As well, it serves as a foundation for the field research, to inform a new model. In understanding what is causing the underlying issues of the relationship, one can build on that through further, much-needed research, to have more of a positive impact on sustainable and global development due to effective working relations between these two parties.

**The Global Perspective & Its Relation to The Systematic Literature Review**

From a broader global perspective, there are a number of issues that align with the themes and the inherent flaws that arose from the review, that was carried out within the predefined bounds of the UN and NGO relationship. Continuing to explore the global theoretical perspectives, more specifically in relation to this thesis, I include Table 2.9 below that highlights the findings and discussions from the systematic literature review.
Table 2.9 – Results and Findings of The Systematic Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>It’s Heartbeat &amp; Breath - the UN Needs NGOs for Validity and Credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>The Passionate Professional Partners - NGOs Want to be Involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>The Moving Maze - NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td>The Heavy Door to Open - The UN needs to do More to Involve NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5</td>
<td>From Trojan Horse to Too Influential - Negative Reasons to Involving NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td>Bridges of Lifeline - NGO Contributions to UN Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7</td>
<td>The Power of Power - Resistance to NGO Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8</td>
<td>The Paradoxical Situation - Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherent Flaw 1</td>
<td>Member States vs The Peoples and Peoples’ Concerns including Global Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherent Flaw 2</td>
<td>Intrinsic Contradictions of the Relationship within the UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherent Flaw 3</td>
<td>A Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship of the Two Bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the themes identified in the findings, theme one and theme six, uncovered the dependence the diplomatic governmental UN has on NGOs to conduct essential and fundamental work (see Table 2.9). Choudry writes about the reliance that governments now have on NGOs to respond to social needs that once was the responsibility of governments (Choudry, 2011).

Choudry identifies that ‘intergovernmental organisations... set parameters for which kinds of NGOs are officially recognized’ (Choudry, 2011). As well, through Choudry’s activist research he has identified an issue in today’s environment where, ‘the government assumed the right to determine who was in and who was out’ to include in decision making from Civil Society (Choudry, 2013a). These issues align with themes three and four.

The depoliticization of NGOs that Kamat identifies (Kamat, 2004), is often referred to as NGOisation. The literature review uncovered that the NGOs heavily connected to their state where regarded as Trojan Horses, theme five. Choudry writes ‘in some cases there is outright hostility and suspicion towards NGOs from mass movements, especially towards those which receive government and/or foreign funding’ (Choudry, 2011). Kamat also writes about this distrust due to there being ‘no mechanisms by which NGOs can be made accountable to the people they serve’ (Kamat, 2004). In this realm of polarisation, the disconnection that NGOs are undergoing from political aspects, it can be seen as giving the NGOs more credit.

The polarisation we are witnessing is of interest to this PhD research in that it is exploring how to bridge the gap.

Another global theoretical concept regarding NGOs is the notion of professionalisation of NGOs (Kamat, 2004; Choudry, 2011) and the increased NGO movement (Choudry, 2011). Theme two uncovered the increase in NGOs wanting to be involved with UN work and also their professionalism.
Theme six relates to positive NGO contributions to UN or governmental activities. This includes NGOs ability to utilise information technologies (Choudry, 2011) and to be the reliant partner ‘for the ‘bottom up’ development’ due to their ‘efficient and effective implementers’ (Kamat, 2004). NGOs have well organised access to local and global citizenship, to mobilise resources and citizens that are aware of local and global issues and engage in them.

The first inherent flaw, that is identified in the discussion of the systematic literature review relates to Member States vs the Peoples’ concerns around global issues. This is also identified in the broader setting outside of the UN context in that there is, ‘a growing identification of common issues and problems which transcended national borders [and that this] also contributed to the rise in international NGO activity’ (Choudry, 2011). It also relates to the debate of the ‘balanced partnership between states and NGOs’ in order to ‘best serve the interests of society’ (Kamat, 2003).

There are negative effects of neoliberalism on NGOs; from limiting their places to protest, to being under scrutiny in its work (Kamat, 2018). Therefore, Kamat states that ‘under these circumstances, NGOs need a more co-ordinated and collective strategy’ (Kamat, 2018), which this research explores, under the umbrella of the work with the UN.

These are some of the milieus of today’s political and Civil Society environment, which is where my research has its stage set. Although, deliberative democracy which relates to ‘citizens [being] the authors of their laws’ (Layman, 2016), is also a current global movement, it is one that is outside of the scope of this research.

One of the phenomena that has been theoretically acknowledged is the idea of compartmentalisation of NGOs. This relates to NGOs working on a particular area and becoming specialised within that topic. Although, this may create highly informed groups around a specific topic, it does create an issue of a lack of common ground in working towards broader movements (Choudry, 2011). Choudry states, whilst referring to other authors, that ‘specialization can result in valuable analytical and strategic resources... fragmentation is problematic, leaving us without a sense of common strategy’ (Choudry, 2011). Choudry states ‘for many NGO campaigns, this compartmentalization occurs around issues’ and notes the lack of ‘a broader underlying framework’ (Choudry, 2013b).

Choudry identifies a key issue in today’s environment, for which this piece of research looks to address; to explore what the underlying framework could look like in which to work collaboratively, strategically, synergistically, and proactively between the UN and CS.

**Gap in the Research**

The systematic literature review uncovered a number of gaps. Firstly, it exposed how little academic research has been conducted on the topic of the UN and CS relationship. Secondly, although the papers published clearly highlighted the need for this relationship, yet little academic work has been carried out to understand the
dynamics needed to address the issue to present an informed and effective solution for reform. Usually the research that is carried out on the UN and CS relationship is limited to one country, cause, or case, which can limit its impact to the overall matter (Joachim and Locher, 2006). Also, in the published papers very few mentioned the detailed methodology they undertook to reach their conclusions. As well, there are no previous systematic literature reviews that were identified from the search.

A third gap was uncovered. The relationship dynamics of the UN and NGOs are frequently noted, however, when researchers propose a model of reform, they have often only considered looking at solutions within the current UN system.

Lastly, this thesis also considers the global challenges that are presented and considers the gaps that are evident in the practical settings. Hence, the research methodology, which will be discussed further in the next chapter, relates to practical applications of the outcome of the research.

**Conclusion**

> *Dialogue and cooperation with civil society will, I’m sure, be a central aspect of the activities of the UN in the next few years, not only because of my own activities, but because of the concerns that all the UN bodies have, making sure that partnership becomes a key element in solving global problems.*
> — Secretary-General António Guterres, October 2016

This comprehensive systematic literature review provides a thorough analysis of the relationship dynamics between the UN and NGOs. This is the first systematic review of this topic that has been carried out based on its search parameters. After a brief history was provided to give a background of understanding, eight themes were identified that are presented in the findings through an analysis of the literature that was sourced (see Table 2.9).

The discussion presented three inherent flaws and invites further exploration. The first flaw, Member States vs The Peoples and the peoples’ concerns including global issues. The second one, intrinsic contradictions within the UN that are presented thematically in the findings. Lastly, an imbalance of the relationship itself. Due to these discoveries being inherent, research for reform for this relationship needs to look outside of the current UN system.

There are many opinions of this relationship, at different times, from different stakeholders and different parties. However, two key points arise when reflecting on the relationship being reviewed. One opinion that most seem to agree on, regardless of which background they come from, is that this relationship has been a fluctuating and challenging one. Secondly, it is widely recognized that this relationship between the UN and NGOs is needed to achieve international development sustainably, inclusively and as effectively as possible.

As was identified in the small quantity of academic literature that arose from the searched research, more empirical research is required to further produce suggestions for a more productive and effective work arrangement between these two parties. This systematic literature review sets the foundation for fieldwork to be
carried out considering the eight identified themes along with the three inherent flaws and how they relate to the context of today’s challenges. The next chapter presents the overall methodology for the thesis.
Chapter 3
Methodology

My Story

There I was embarking on my first round of field research. Would I be able to fulfil my goal of interviewing 15 to 20 international, elite people? Where would they come from, even with the sampling techniques that I had planned?

I felt completely blessed and honoured that 43 elites ended up participating in the research. It was clear the research needed to be done. It was clear there was an emotional attachment to the topic of interest. It was clear this was an international debate that was needing research for far too long.

There I was at the end of my first round of field research. How am I going to get through all these interviews? Had I not thought through the workload this would bring? Surely, my second round of research participation will be very low, otherwise I will end up with eighty-six interviews! They are international elites with time being a valuable resource, the response rate will likely to be low.

But no. My doctoral research was the food for the hunger. I was amazed and again feeling ever so blessed. All 43 individuals got back in touch with me, except for two. And had time allowed, thirty-nine would have been a part of it. Only two had said they did not have time for a second round of interviews. Well, more on that in a moment.

It was interesting, the second interview. Participants told me that I was asking questions that had never been asked before. It created this space for a dialogue where knowledge was being created right then and there. If a blackhole in an academic sense could be felt, this is what it felt like. A dimension that is difficult to describe and brought about a paradigm shift. It was a magical experience, which I will now continue to share with you…

Overview of Methodology

There are 11 different sections to this chapter on methodology. I begin by transitioning from Chapter 2 to Chapter 3 with section one highlighting the preliminary research questions, section two discussing the aim of the research and section three moving on to the fieldwork research questions. This is followed by the research design. The fifth section presents how the data was collected. The next section explains the analysis process that was utilised for this thesis. The seventh section reviews the ethical procedure that was applied, after which I disclose my reflexivity that I, as the researcher, bring to the work that was carried out. The validity and reliability considerations are found in sections nine and ten. The 11th and last section identifies the limitations of the research.
Section One - Preliminary Research Questions

To gain a better understanding of a perceived lack of a known platform that takes on the initiative and responsibility of collaborative CS and NGOs' work towards sustainable international development along with a bridge that links to the ‘top’ voice or the government, I started by looking at the history of the relationship between the UN and NGOs (see Chapter 2).

Therefore, the thesis began with a historical reflection, a chronological description of the relationship between the UN and CS. This brought about two preliminary research questions, hence a systematic literature review was conducted, as it is designed to ‘address a specific question’ and ‘provides an in-depth and detailed review of existing literature on a specific topic’ (Editage, 2021).

Those questions were:

1. What are the historical dynamics of the relationship between the UN and NGOs and what are the challenges and benefits of the affiliation?
2. Does Civil Society need a new or improved environment, potentially an institution, in order to progress its development?

The review unveiled the answers to the preliminary questions:

1. Eight themes were identified in the findings that categorise the dynamics of the relationship, including both the challenges and benefits.
2. Yes, a new model of reform might be needed in order to achieve a more effective working relationship with the UN to progress development due to the three inherent flaws that were uncovered in the review.

Section Two - Aim of the Research

There were three aims of this PhD research. The first aim was to address the gap in the literature on the topic of the UNs’ relationship with CS by providing much needed academic research. Secondly, relaying back to ‘My Story’, my hope is that the results from this PhD will be able to provide CS with a constructive framework to work synergistically, strategically, proactively, and collaboratively together for a better world, and to address the underlying framework gap that was identified by previous scholars and that I witnessed in my personal professional experiences.

When I began this PhD, the UN’s funding was being heavily pulled back by the United States. The UN has often recognised that funding is crucial to build its relationship with CS and so when I first began in 2017, the global climate was such that there was little interest in my topic. This changed in January of 2018 when the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs invited NGOs to provide feedback on their relationship with the UN. This topic continued to gain further global interest throughout my PhD research. Now, with the UN turning 75 in this year of 2020, it has come to a climax of interest and a hot global debate as to what the UN’s relationship with CS can be.

Therefore, in concluding my PhD work, a further third aim is that this doctoral research can contribute to the global debate on the UN’s relationship with CS. That
it can add academic rigour to the much-needed discussions that are happening in international consultations this year. That the proposed reform, that is presented later in this thesis, can potentially provide the fertile ground for the underlying framework for us to be able to build a stable, more sustainable future for all.

**Section Three - Fieldwork Research Questions**

The findings of the systematic literature review informed and built not only the rationale for exploring two further research questions, but also shed light on the process of how to best answer those questions: through fieldwork in the form of semi-structured interviews, which will be discussed in more detail in sections below. The two field research questions were:

1. How to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the UN and CS in order to progress international development?
2. Upon presenting the proposed model – how would you implement it, and would you modify it or make it better in any way before doing so?

Two rounds of interviews were conducted. The first round explored answers to the first fieldwork question. Are the dynamics that were uncovered in the literature review still the same in today’s context? How do we create an effective working relationship between CS and the UN? What is needed for the best working environment so we can progress international development? A complete list of the questions for Round 1 can be found in the appendix.

After analysing the results from Round 1, a proposed model for reform was created and put into a presentation format. The interviews for Round 2 began with a presentation of the new proposed model that came from the collated answers from the first round of interviews. After the presentation, questions were asked, such as how to make it better and what would need to be done to implement it. A complete list of the questions for Round 2 can be found in the appendix.

Note, this follow up fieldwork to the literature research, moved past ECOSOC and the narrow focus of NGOs to include CS as a larger body (see Table 1.1). This was done out of necessity to acknowledge the current global context, as it is widely viewed that all parties need to be actively involved in international development including all sectors of CS, as well as incorporating the private sector. In addition, there are many ways that CS can engage with the UN that sits outside the ECOSOC accreditation process. Lastly, it is also noted in the field research that receiving accreditation from ECOSOC Committee on NGOs has become increasingly difficult and therefore those NGOs who have been denied accreditation or continue to wait for accreditation, have and continue to work with the UN in other ways. Hence, the eight themes that arose from the systematic literature review, that have NGOs in the title will, after Chapter 2, include CS as well in the title, as these eight themes are still relevant today and were confirmed in the field data (see Chapter 4).

**Section Four – Research Design**

*Overview of the Research Design*

This PhD research was conducted using an exploratory research approach, which is uncovering the understanding of a phenomenon, ‘the forces and influences that drive
their occurrence’ (Ritchie et al., 2014). An exploratory research method was selected to provide insight into the issues of collaborative work on international development and whether a new form of an environment or institution is the answer.

Therefore, qualitative research was chosen as it ‘provides a unique tool for studying what lies behind, or underpins, a decision, attitude, behaviour or other phenomena. It also allows associations that occur in people’s thinking or acting’ (Ritchie et al., 2014). For this thesis, it was to uncover and understand how society can progress its development and whether it needs a new or improved environment or institution, including two-way learning, to do so. Essentially, examining the underlying motivations, trends, thoughts, reasons, and/or opinions of whether a new model of reform is required and if so, how to best implement it.

This PhD research utilised an applied research method. The intent was to ‘expand knowledge of social or organizational processes’ and to ‘produce findings of significance and value to society’ (Gray, 2014). It was applied in that its intent was to ‘improve understanding of specific social or organizational problems’ and ‘create solutions to social or organizational problems’, along with the intent to ‘develop findings of practical relevance to public and organizational stakeholders’ (Gray, 2014).

**Research Stages**

Action research was selected as it is designed with an iterative and flexible process that builds on what is uncovered through the research process, as this benefits the research itself (Koshy, 2005). The action research was carried out with a feminist approach. (This is referring to an academic methodological approach, not to be confused with the word’s meaning of gender equality.) Both of these approaches are discussed further below.

The following figure, Figure 3.1, shows a visual representation of the research process. It was designed such that the research that was uncovered in each step built on itself. The different phases and stages are explained in more detail below.

**Figure 3.1: Research Stages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Stage: Research Questions</th>
<th>Knowledge Acquiring Through Which Objects or Subjects</th>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Leading to Research Activity</th>
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</tbody>
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**The Phases & Stages Explained**

The research design is made up of three phases:
- Phase A, analysis of existing knowledge
- Phase B, collection of data through fieldwork
- Phase C, feedback of the results of the findings

There were five research stages. Each research stage informed the next stage. Thereby, this PhD research design not only built on prior existing knowledge but also built on the knowledge that arose from within each stage of the research process, continually building on its ‘own’ knowledge. This was carried out by each stage concluding with its own analysis. This created a robust research strategy that built on itself, layer by layer, that was able to present a proposed model to implement.

Phase A consisted of two stages that analysed existing knowledge. The first stage, Stage 1, was carried out to understand the background context of the relationship between the UN and NGOs. The knowledge that was acquired was the historical development of the relationship through a literature review that was analysed and written in chronological order. Stage 1 informed research Stage 2.

The second stage, Stage 2, in Phase A, researched the dynamics of the relationship between the two bodies through a systematic literature review and analysed the findings into themes which were further reviewed, concluding a result that lead to inherent flaws within the relationship. Hence, this stage provided answers to the preliminary research questions, ‘What are the historical dynamics of the relationship between the UN and NGOs and what are the challenges and benefits of the affiliation?’ and ‘Does Civil Society need a new or improved environment, potentially an institution, in order to progress its development?’. This stage informed the third stage of the research process.

Phase B consisted of Stage 3. The first fieldwork research question was explored, ‘How to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the UN and CS in order to progress international development?’. The data to answer this research question was collected through a round one of semi-structured interview fieldwork, involving elites or high-level key stakeholders. The results of the analysis of the findings informed the next stage of research.
Phase C consisted of two stages. Stage 4 designed the new model based on the data collected from the field research in Stage 3 and the previous data collected from Stages 1-2. The results informed the final stage.

The final stage considered the second fieldwork research question, ‘Upon presenting the proposed model – how you would implement it, and would you modify it or make it better in any way before doing so?’. The influential key stakeholders were interviewed a second time through semi-structured approach to collect the data. Stages 4 and 5 of research Phase C, intent was the potential implementation of the results of the findings from Stages 1 through 3.

**Ontological and Epistemological Considerations**

To answer the research questions proposed, a qualitative approach was best suited. It provides a ‘flexible nature’ and has ‘a focus on processes’ (Ritchie et al., 2014), which this research plan called for because it built and informed each subsequent stage. In addition, this practice was suitable as it requires the researcher ‘to gain a deep, intense and ‘holistic’ overview of the context under study’ and includes organisations (Gray, 2014). The variable, essentially what was researched, was the understanding or uncovering of how to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the UN and CS in order to progress international development.

**Table 3.1: The Theoretical Research Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Theoretical Perspective</th>
<th>Research Approach</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Critical Inquiry</td>
<td>Inductive</td>
<td>Action Research with a Feminist Approach</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The epistemology embodied a constructivist approach, that our world is constructed by our internal perceptions, however it does not lead to the usual theoretical perspective of interpretivism, which is that ‘natural reality… and social reality are different and therefore require different kinds of method’ (Gray, 2014). Therefore, realism, phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, and other interpretivist approaches were not utilised.

Instead it leads to the theoretical perspective of critical inquiry, as this ‘perspective is not content to interpret the world but also seeks to change it’ (Gray, 2014). The research project’s intent was to conclude with a new model of reform; hence this theoretical perspective aligns with this work. The reason why other research designs were eliminated is discussed further below.

This also aligns with the inductive research and leads to the methodology of action research, due to the research relating to organisational change (Gray, 2014) which I applied through a feminist approach. This is discussed further below. The inductive approach suits this research work as it commenced with gathering data, which then
was analysed with the intent to uncover themes or patterns to conclude with potentially offering a final theory (Gray, 2014). The research looked to build a concept of a new or improved environment or institution through induction. It was not proposing a theory on its onset. Nor did it start with a pre-existing theory or current proposed reform activity and deduct its validity, such as the Earth Charter or other CS mechanisms that are currently being undertaken within different areas of the UN and its agencies.

For the field research, semi-structured interviews were the most suitable method. Those that were interviewed were people who worked internationally and held highest-level key stakeholder positions. The research method is discussed further below.

**Rejected Design Approaches**

A quantitative approach is rejected due to the research not being interested in statistical numbers. Instead the questions are more qualitative in nature and are interested in the ‘what’, ‘why’ and ‘how’ questions’ (Ritchie et al., 2014; Gray, 2014).

Other epistemologies that were rejected included objectivism and subjectivism. Objectivism ‘holds that reality exists independently of consciousness’ and subjectivism holds that ‘subjects do construct meaning, but do so from within collective unconsciousness’ (Gray, 2014). Objectivism was not chosen due to previous extensive research and writing I have done on quantum physics and consciousness, that consciousness does impact our reality (Christiana, 2016). Subjectivism was also not selected as I believe our (un)consciousness is impacted to some degree by the external world. The quantity of this impact changes from person to person, however, we do take in information from outside sources and this external collective (un)conscious has an impact on our personal internal (un)conscious.

A positivism theoretical perspective was rejected for the same reason objectivism was. Due to my previous research and writing, I do not agree that truth sits completely externally for the subject (Christiana, 2016).

The Human-Centered Design (HCD) approach is a research process that acknowledges the important relevance of the users and their contributions to a more successful outcome and is often used in international development research (Development Impact and You, 2017). There are three steps to HCD: 1. Understanding beneficiaries’ needs in their contexts 2. Engaging users in the process of designing a solution and 3. Rapid prototyping and validating what works’ (Development Impact and You, 2017). However, this approach was rejected due to the limited literature on this method, which may create weakness in the reliability of the research.

**Participatory Action Research with A Feminist Approach**

There was a two-fold reason for the application of a feminist methodological approach. Firstly, to gain a deep understanding of the position of the researcher and secondly, to analyse power at numerous stages of the research process (Conti and O’Neil, 2007).
Due to high-level key stakeholders being the participants of the interviews, power dynamics were anticipated to be at play, hence, academic literature recommends a feminist methodological approach. My research was inadvertently impacted by my personal experience, attitudes, believes and knowledge. The feminist approach provides an analysis of this and supports my positionality, noting that all scholarly acquisition is situated (Conti and O’Neil, 2007). Positionality is discussed further below and findings on power dynamics are presented in Chapter 4. The research design in relation to the feminist approach to power dynamics can be found in the appendix.

Action research aligns neatly with a feminist methodological approach. McNiff and Whitehead state, ‘action research is embodied in the researcher, the integrating focus of the enquiry’ and they add that it, ‘is a way of working that helps us to identify the things we believe in, to check that we are justified in holding these beliefs, and then work systematically towards making them come true’ (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000).

**Participatory Action Research**

Action research is the methodology that reflected the intent of this research best, as it was designed for a work context, to increase understanding and to better the condition (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000) or as Ritchie et al. described, to apply constructive modifications for those engaged in the situation (Ritchie et al., 2014). Gray echoes this by stating the importance on encouraging change within organisations (Gray, 2014). The research was carried out for the results to be implemented and to have practical application, ‘not something only to be spoken about but also something to be done’ (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000). Gray adds that it is not just about studying a situation, it is also about creating change (Gray, 2014).

McNiff and Whitehead focus on three paradigms within action research: interpretive which relates to research embedded within the workplace, critical which relates to emancipatory issues, and living educational theories (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000). The latter paradigm was the focus of this PhD. The intent of action research within this paradigm is to comprehend a situation for the purpose to resolve the flaws and inconsistencies so to further effective and efficient work and support others to do so as well (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000). Its intent is to provide understanding to the work values and apply them, whilst acknowledging predictable incongruities (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000). Chapter 2 of this research has already identified these contradictions through a thematic analysis of the literature review. Gray writes that a key goal of action research, ‘is to transform situations or structures’ (Gray, 2014). This points to the dual purpose of my PhD work through action research - human development in practice in a professional setting (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000) and ‘generating new contributions to [a] social and political debate’ (Ritchie et al., 2014).

What is uncovered in action research is applied to develop new forms of work methods, its intent is not to shut down previous working practices (McNiff and Whitehead, 2000). This personally aligns with my intent of the practical application of the results of my PhD. I do not intend to suggest concluding any current work practices of this relationship, between the UN and CS, but instead provide a
proposed solution(s) to increase its effectiveness. This also aligns with the inductive research approach identified earlier.

Within action research, most authors encourage building a model that is most appropriate and fitting for the research in question, as opposed to following a predefined model (Koshy, 2005; McNiff and Whitehead, 2005). A general model consists of observation, analysis of the observation, implementation of selected actions based on analysis, observing again, revising, and repeat. I have customised a model, therefore staying true to action research, and designed a research process that is most appropriate for my research questions and that suited the intent of this PhD. My model did not repeat itself with revisions in a cyclical pattern but instead built on itself with research uncovered from a previous stage, which informed the next stage, through a total of five stages with two rounds of field research. There is a visual representation of this model in Figure 3.1.

Section Five – Data Collection

Data Collection Method – Interviews
The field research utilised two rounds of interviews for its method of qualitative research data collection and interviewed elites, which is discussed further below. Conti and O’Neil propose qualitative research with the interview method to be the best academic approach for ‘studying up’ or gathering data from elites (Conti and O’Neil, 2007).

The influential key stakeholders, who were interviewed in Stage 3, were interviewed for a second round. Each interview was planned for an hour long in length, sometimes they went over, and sometimes they were a bit under this time. In the first set of interviews, no prior information was presented to the interviewees and hence the full length of the interview contributed to the data collection. In the second round, participants were presented the information that was analysed from the first set of interviews with the proposed design for the new model. The data collection for the second round of interviews began after the presentation.

The second interview researched how the proposed model that was designed based on the first round of interviews and the literature review would be modified to make it better. This is known as member-checking and builds rigour into the research. It allows the interviewees to add or clarify information that was gathered. As well, how it was to be implemented was explored.

This research design has similarities with the Delphi method. It is a method that ‘involves the repeated individual questioning of the experts… all centered around some central problem’ (Dalkey and Helmer, 1963). After each round of interviews their anonymous collated answers are presented back to them for further comment. This method is used, ‘to obtain the most reliable consensus of opinion of a group of experts’ (Dalkey and Helmer, 1963).

Semi-Structured Interviews
The fieldwork consisted of semi-structured interviews conducted with elites that worked in the UN and CS international environment. The interviews consisted of some pre-set questions to begin the dialogue with the elite and guided the intention
of the research, whilst allowing the interviewee and the research content itself the space to enter new realms of thought and ideas (Gray, 2014).

The systematic literature review in Chapter 2 set the foundation for the data collection approach for the fieldwork. Interview questions were designed to relate back to the eight themes and the three flaws that were identified in the literature review. These questions were used to build the interview schedule for the first set of interviews. Considerations were made not to limit new field research findings. So, although the interview schedule was based on the literature review findings, additional questions were included to explore new themes.

A mix of closed, open and probing questions were asked. King and Horrocks identified six types of interview questions that are typically used in qualitative research; these included eliciting demographic information, questions based on their experience, values, emotions, sensory, and informational questions (King and Horrocks, 2010). All six styles of questions were included in the fieldwork. Please see the appendix for a list of questions that were asked for Round 1 and Round 2.

Although, I started exploring a number of different methods, such as making use of a mixed-methods approach for the field research, it became clear that semi-structured interviews was the most suitable approach for this PhD to answer the research questions best. Surveys often do not offer the exploration of ideas that dialogue may offer through an interview. Interviews with key stakeholders that are semi-structured are the most useful method for eliciting the data required. This single method selection is supported by an action research author, Koshy, who states that ‘using several different methods for collecting data does not make your study any better’ as it is the ‘quality of your data that matters’ (Koshy, 2005). Interviews are a method that also align with the other theoretical research components that are illustrated in Table 3.1.

Hence, the fieldwork in Stages 3 and 5, consisted of semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted face-to-face where possible. This was to provide richer data collection due to the in-person setting offering a better rapport establishment and providing non-verbal cues (Ritchie et al., 2014). This was not always possible due to elite participants’ available time, changes to where they were located at the time of the interview, and it was not possible for feasibility purposes to fly to all locations. Therefore, phone calls and virtual methods were also applied in the form of Skype, Facetime and WhatsApp. One interview was done through a reply of the interview questions in a word document, as this was the only way that particular participant was able to participate. Therefore, I adapted the interview environment in order to accommodate the varying constraints. I needed to be flexible in order to be able to have participants be able to take part in the study.

Round 1 of Interviews

Although I had a guide for my interview questions, I stayed open to my participants’ experience and knowledge they were bringing to the interview and what changes came from the research process itself. King and Horrocks state that ‘not only is it permissible to change your guide in the course of your study, it is generally advisable. Remember, the aim of a qualitative interview is to elicit participants’ accounts of aspects of their experience, rather than to collate answers to specific
questions as if they were variables in a survey. As such, any insights you gain in the process of carrying out your first few interviews should inform subsequent ones' (King and Horrocks, 2010). The semi-structured approach allowed for each individuals’ situated knowledge to be further explored and allowed for me to delve into areas as they emerged.

An active interview is selected for this research as it acknowledges the role the researcher plays and uses that inherent impact for ‘meaning construction, not contamination’ by eliciting further and deeper exploration of data by ‘constantly (being) engaged in the work of meaning-making’ (Holstein and Gubrium, 2004). The active interview considers the ‘hows’ and the ‘whats’ and delves deeper by acknowledging the content that is ‘behind’ the data and the ‘interrelatedness of the ‘whats’ and the ‘hows’ of interview conversations’ (Holstein and Gubrium, 2004). Therefore, probing questions were used when it was identified that further exploration could be made on a particular topic.

*Round 2 of Interviews*

Round 2 also made use of the semi-structured interview process. However, it took on a more exploratory, open dialogue approach to investigate further ideas. Questions in the second set of interviews had never been asked before. Not only was new knowledge being created right within the interview by the interviewee reflecting on questions, but also I was involved in this new knowledge creation and the emerging dialogue. There was at times a mutual uncovering of new knowledge through keeping the dialogue open, which allowed for richer discussion.

Before the question period, I presented the proposed model to the participant. The presentation was normally 15 minutes long, after which I would start the recorders and begin with the questions. I initially created the presentation on PowerPoint software and then printed it off and slid the sheets into a presentation folder. This was intentionally done so as to avoid any potential technological issues. In addition, I anticipated that some environments in which the interviews would be held may not be conducive to using a laptop. This proved to be effective as it provided flexibility for the changing environments. Please see the appendix for the presentation.

The questions were asking participants to think about the new model that was proposed based on the first set of interviews and the literature review. Through dialogue and interview questions the proposed model was interrogated, and a co-design process emerged across all interviews and the literature review combined, to lead to the model that is presented in this thesis.

*Interviewees – Why Elites?*

In order to study change, I needed to research those who think about change, can implement change and have considered the impact of what that international change may consist of. A non-elite may not have pondered these thoughts because it is not required, or they lack the full understanding of its complexities due to experience and/or access to information. Whereas an elite on this subject matter may have already been asked (by others or themselves or various conversations) to consider what is needed due to the current global debate on this topic. This research required...
interviewing those that had thorough experience in the subject matter, hence they were not working at a junior or entry level position.

Although elites were interviewed, this did not relate to how many years they held their positions. In order to provide a more robust sampling for this research, I ensured that participants were included that had both, many years of experience and very few years of experience. If they were new to their positions, this had the potential to provide different insights.

The Four Concerns with Interviewing Elites
Conti and O’Neil describe four concerns in interviewing elites that are ‘well documented in the literature on elite research - locating and funding travel to interview a hyper-mobile social group, gaining entrée into elite settings, modifying dress and appearance, and mastering specialized forms of knowledge in order to successfully complete interviews’ (Conti and O’Neil, 2007).

I will address each of the four points that they make. Firstly, the high-level stakeholders have only a limited number of central working locations within the UN environment. I booked my interviews in those locations: Switzerland, United States and the United Kingdom. As well, these key stakeholders are often brought together for international meetings. Therefore, where it was feasible, I booked interviews during these times.

Regarding access, I utilised three approaches. First, I began with my own network through my professional and personal contacts. Next, I expanded to my network’s network and applied the snowballing technique (discussed further below), which led me from key stakeholder to key stakeholder. Thirdly, my topic of research is often seen by others in this field as an area of significance and people have shown interest to have their voice heard and added to this debate. Therefore, I also reached out to people through social media. My message to them was concise and was focused on uncovering solutions to a global debate and that this thesis would benefit greatly from their experience and knowledge. Using social media proved to be a somewhat effective approach as a contact method, as only some became involved in the research using this route.

As to the third area of concern, which speaks to the relatability of the researcher to the elite participants, I have worked with high-level stakeholders in the past. I am comfortable with high-level discussions and in fact greatly enjoy them. My experience has been that the higher up the stakeholder, the less ego there is and the more open and receptive they are.

Conti and O’Neil’s last concern is regarding specialised knowledge. With my literature review being the only systematic review completed on this topic to my awareness and considering the volume of material worked through with the gold standard method applied, I felt comfortable with my knowledge base to carry out the interviews. In addition, I have a number of years of experience that aligns with CS and UN work environment.
**Sample Size**

The research was qualitative and therefore it is advised to keep the sample size small to ensure rich, quality data (Ritchie et al., 2014) and that the data gathered is not too significant in size (Silverman, 2011). Careful consideration was given to ensure inclusion of a variety of perspectives and perceptions to provide breadth and depth to insights acquired, while avoiding an overly burdensome quantity that may dilute the richness of the data.

There are two different paradigms of approach to collecting data; a positivist is a researcher who 'gathers large amounts of data' while a naturalist ‘tries to get inside individuals and institutions to understand situations and people’ (Koshy, 2005). A naturalistic approach was one that I applied and is best suited for this research.

In reviewing other elite research papers I uncovered one that had a sample size of seven, this paper also incorporated the Delphi method which was mentioned above in terms of its similar approach to this research design (Dalkey and Helmer, 1963). Another academic paper had a sample size of 14, in which United Kingdom elite retailers were interviewed (Rice, 2010). A third example was a research study that was completed on post-socialist transition in Estonia with a sample size of 21 elites (Mikecz, 2012).

There is little academic literature on actual numbers that should be included. What is noted is to watch for data saturation, hence, I suggested a sample size of 15 to 20 participants at the onset, but that I would stay alert to saturation. Based on the international high-level key stakeholder selection criteria and examples of other elites that were researched, I deemed this to be an appropriate number.

However, due to the high level of interest from interviewees, the number of participants rose to 43. It was concluded at that number for two reasons. One being data sampling saturation. In considering the snowballing technique (discussed further below), one of the last interviewees suggested three people, all three of whom had already been mentioned. In addition, one elite person was mentioned three times by three different people. This provided strong evidence that the pool of elites had reached data sampling saturation.

Secondly, feasibility was considered in terms of time needed for transcription and data analysis. With 43 participants and two rounds of interviews, hence potentially 86 interviews in total, it was not feasible to continue even if the data sampling had not become saturated.

**Interview Sampling - Snowballing**

The sampling technique of snowballing comprised of me asking my own network to participate in the interview. If they met the criteria (explained below) and/or if they knew someone in their network who would be interested in participating, I reached out to them. Snowballing provided further access to other elites, as I moved from key stakeholder to key stakeholder.

King and Horrocks point out, ‘snowballing may be an appropriate strategy – namely where the population to be sampled from is especially hard to access and quite tightly defined’ (King and Horrocks, 2010). To substantiate this sampling process...
further, other authors agree with this approach to interviewing elites (Conti and O’Neil, 2007).

Although they were elite interviewees, participation in this research was welcomed, due to the topic of research being of keen interest. Therefore, no deviation from this sampling process was required including for those who I reached directly through social media channels, as those were names that were provided to me in the snowballing process, but the person providing the name did not have access to their current contact information.

The following three questions were considered for each interviewee in order to meet participation criteria:

• Do they work in an international context of the UN and CS?
• Do the individuals have experience and knowledge on this topic in which they can contribute to this data collection?
• Lastly, a more practical question, would they be available to conduct an interview twice?

Note that these questions align with the reasoning noted above regarding interviewing elites.

I contacted the potential participant usually through email, besides a few social media communications. There was a maximum of three emails that were sent, at a minimum a week apart to give them the opportunity to reply back. In the last email, I did state that this was the last time that I was reaching out to them. This was an effective approach because I did not feel I was harassing them with numerous emails in a short time frame and it was also qualified by the participants themselves, such as: ‘thank you for not giving up on me, its been a busy time, thank you for reaching out to me one last time, I am interested, I get so many emails it is good you tried one last time’. This communication process was used for both rounds of interviews.

My experience with this research showed that when approaching elites, ensuring the topic is of mutual interest is an important element for successful engagement. They are typically in public profile settings and therefore social media can be a constructive way to connect with them if they are interested in contributing, as they are making themselves available in this format. Not once did I experience a gatekeeper that tried to prevent me from reaching a potential interviewee.

In addition, I stayed focused on those who wanted to contribute, and I fully believed that those who participated were the ones who wanted to take part because they desired to have their voice heard and added to the research. They had something to say. I stayed focused on the objective of the research itself. This also seemed to be a welcoming approach to the elites, as we were both focused on the work, which was important to both of us.

This sampling process did not differ from site to site. It was a similar procedure across all countries and across all three groups (UN, CS, and those that worked in a mix of UN and CS).
Demographics of Interviewees

Fourty-three individuals participated from five countries: Austria, France, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States of America. The number of individuals interviewed at each location is not identified as to protect anonymity of participants. Further information on the ethical procedure is provided below. Eight places were included in the research:

- Oxford, England
- London, England
- A few cities in Scotland (not further identified for anonymity purposes)
- Geneva, Switzerland
- Vienna, Austria
- Paris, France
- New York City, United States
- Los Angeles, United States

There was a combination of male and female elites. Seventeen individuals participated who identified themselves as males. Twenty-six interviewees identified themselves as females.

Some participants chose to be identified and some chose to be anonymous. This number is not shared in order to protect anonymity. Anonymity is discussed further below.

Out of all 43 participants, only two interviewees did not get back to me at all, even with the three emails that were sent. Two interviewees stated that due to their time constraints they were only able to participate in the first round. Seven were willing to participate and we had email communications sent back and forth to schedule a time, however, these did not participate due to unforeseen circumstances, schedule conflicts, technical changes, and time constraints. In the end, 32 participated in Round 2 of the research.

Further demographical information is provided in Chapter 4.

Section Six – Analysis

Overview of Analysis

The findings from each data collection step of the research were analysed. Stage 2, the systematic literature review, analysed the existing knowledge into themes. Stage 3, the first round of interviews, analysed the findings in comparison to the literature review and was further analysed for the uncovering of new themes that impacted the internal relationship dynamics and external dynamics. Stage 5, the second round of interviews, analysed the findings in comparison to the existing knowledge and the first round of interviews. It provided a collective analysis of the responses to key practical application questions to the proposed model, and participants’ feedback of it. In addition, triangulation analysis was applied and is discussed further below.

Moving the Data to Working Format

Each interview was recorded, except for one participant who was only able to partake by submitting a word document, and one other participant who asked not to be recorded. In the latter incident, handwritten notes were taken. The recordings
were then transcribed into a word document. Each transcribed interview, in its printed form, was reviewed and an analysis was made for demographic information, such as mathematically pulling out the number of years a participant worked in a particular sector. From there, the transcriptions were inputted into a qualitative research software called NVivo.

Once inputted into NVivo, two different analyses were made. The first set of analysis was for the demographics, which the NVivo software calls classification. The classifications of the demographic information were put into the software before each interview was coded in the software. The findings of the demographics are presented further in Chapter 4.

After the demographic information was inputted into the software, the second set of analyses was applied for the content related to the research topic. Qualitative research methods support the analysis of the data into contextual components to uncover patterns (Srivastava and Hopwood, 2009) and therefore, the data was analysed in a thematic form. The coded themes are discussed further below. The content was coded from all 75 interviews into themes. Decisions were made as to what code belonged to the different components of a transcription and if new codes were needed to be considered.

Continuing to move the data into a working format included cleaning the quotes for use in the writing of the thesis. Under no circumstance was the context of a quote changed. Excerpts were adjusted to provide clarity of meaning.

For example, if the recorder missed a word due to a loud sudden background noise, a word may have been added for comprehension. Another example, singular was used as opposed to plural. Words, used for filling moments, were deleted, such as: ‘I mean, um, I think, well, I would say that…’, ‘This was important, you know, because…’, ‘um’, ‘ah’, ‘err’, etcetera. In addition, repetitive words were deleted, for example: ‘It was really, it was really, it was really tough because…’.

**Analysis for Presentation for Round 2**

Recall that the interviews conducted in Round 2 began with a presentation of the proposed model for reform. This model was created through an overview of the data from Round 1 and included the results from the systematic literature review. The presentation was created with the intent for an open exploratory dialogue; hence, it was intentionally not a complete analysis, so that participants could co-create, adding their expertise, knowledge, and experience to the model. This approach aligns with participatory action research, which was discussed earlier in this chapter. The second interview tested a conceptual model based on preliminary findings. This may be best described through imagery; I presented a tree but did not identify what type of tree it was, where it was located, how many branches it has, and how many leaves it has.

**Three Different Groups of Themes**

There different groups of themes were applied to the coding process. The first group included those themes that arose from the previous knowledge through the systematic literature review. These included the eight identified themes and three inherent flaws:
It’s Heartbeat & Breath - The UN Needs NGOs for Validity and Credibility
• The Passionate Professional Partners - NGOs Want to be Involved
• The Moving Maze - NGOs have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access
• The Heavy Door to Open - The UN Needs to do More to Involve NGOs
• From Trojan Horse to Too Influential - Negative Reasons to Involving NGOs
• Bridges of Lifeline - NGO Contributions to UN Activities
• The Power of Power - Resistance to NGO Involvement
• The Paradoxical Situation – Resources
• Member States vs ‘The Peoples’ and Peoples’ Concerns including Global Issues
• Intrinsic Contradictions of the Relationship between NGOs and the UN
• Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship between NGOs and the UN

The second group of themes were created in advance to the analysis of the transcriptions. They were applied and ‘looked for’ in the transcriptions. The intent for the second group is for ‘the development of a conceptual framework (that) will sharpen the focus of your study’ (Bazeley, 2013). These themes related to the qualitative research approach and to finding the values of the context researched. There were seven themes in this second grouping:
• Who - The nouns or different parties that arose in the interviews.
• What – Activities or dynamics that arose (i.e. power dynamics).
• Where – Any reference to location(s). This included bricks and mortar and virtual.
• When – What sense of urgency or time frames were mentioned.
• Why – The value attached to a particular context in the interview.
• How – Activities, challenges or upside for implementation (i.e. financial).

Note that some of these groupings may overlap with each other.

The third group of themes arose out of the interview process itself; the themes that organically came about, the emergent themes. This was to ensure the research was as robust as possible and not leaving any potential themes out due to pre-set criteria of themes. It is important to ‘be looking out for unexpected outcomes which may be of significance and report them’ and that they were considered in terms of how they ‘relate to the original aims and objectives’ (Koshy, 2005).

It was necessary to consider new themes or concepts that arose. Academic literature suggests that it may be beneficial to consider the ‘three-level structure’ of the new concepts; ‘the basic level, usually a noun’ is the first level, the second is ‘dimensions that constitute the concept’ and the third is ‘the dimensions are operationalised’ (Bazeley, 2013). However, I stayed open to themes that arose organically so that it was better suited to the data that was collected due to relevance to the topic and the research questions that were considered. The findings in Chapter 4 present the full list of themes that arose from the research.

Section Seven – Ethics

Qualitative data often elicits ‘very personal and individual’ data (Gibbs, 2007), hence, careful consideration of the ethical approach was considered. The research ethics for this research was approved under a level 2 review of the Moray House School of...
Education Ethics Committee. Level 2 relates to research that is non-interventional and where the consent is obtained from the participants. Each participant received an information sheet on the research and a consent form to be signed, the documents considered all three academic theoretical components of ethical consent:

- ‘Giving information about the research which is relevant to subjects’ decisions about whether to participate
- Making sure that subjects understand that information...
- Ensuring that participation is voluntary’ (Silverman, 2011).

There were consent forms for the participant to sign for both rounds of interviews and each set of interviews had a participant information sheet (see appendix). The documents changed to accommodate the next field research question, which was written on both the consent form and the participant information sheet and included other customisations for the second round. In addition, it allowed the interviewee to be reminded of the ethical considerations that were being applied to this thesis.

During the process of reviewing consent, data protection and confidentiality with all interviewees were discussed. I presented the intent of my research, to be clear about the motivation behind the research. Data management was also reviewed with the participants. This was to ensure that they were aware of how their information and identity was and will continue to be protected. At any point during the research, the interviewees could opt out of participating without an explanation and this was explained to them, however none to date have.

In addition, anonymity and identification protection were reviewed with the interviewees. After the interviews were conducted, anonymous participants received a unique code that was applied to their transcription, unless they selected to be identified then their name was left on the transcription. There is only one Word document that relates the participants’ name with their unique code. It only resides on my personal computer and its’ personal backup, including my private and personal university backup, which is password protected. It does not include a backup on the World Wide Web (for example: iCloud, Dropbox, Google Docs) to add further protection by not being exposed to potential online threats. My MacIntosh connection to iCloud was disconnected for this very reason prior to the data collection. My personal computer is password protected and because it is a MacIntosh it has built in encryption. The University of Edinburgh’s data protection and management office was contacted and their guidelines for my research data was applied according to their recommendations.

Reason and Bradbury discuss ethics for action research and note the importance of ‘key ethical principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, as embodied in the shared values of action research’, which includes ‘the participation in democratic processes, the improvement of human life, and engagement in morally committed action’ (Reason and Bradbury, 2008). Ensuring to ‘honour the role’ of the research interviewees is key (Bazeley, 2013).

In my ethical approach, to honour their role, I ensured my interview participants felt ‘heard’ and that their insights were highly acknowledged. Therefore, at the end of each interview, for both rounds, I followed up with an email thanking them and acknowledging their contribution to the research. Recognition to their invaluable
insights was mentioned again when they were invited to participate in Round 2. Although this is an academic theoretical application, it was more than that, as it was extremely important to me personally that each individual knew how valuable they were to me and to the research.

Silverman suggests that an after study ethical approach can be considered, which can be reassuring to the participants (Silverman, 2011). Therefore, another action I undertook to demonstrate respect and good faith towards the research participants was asking them if they would like me to follow up with them once the research was complete, all said yes. Therefore, I will be following up with them upon completion of my thesis to let them know the research is concluded and where they are able to access the information and results of the thesis.

This topic of research has been shown to be a passionate one for some people, thus, to have their voice known may be of importance to them. McNiff and Whitehead state that some participants of action research may want to be acknowledged (McNiff and Whitehead, 2005). However, I did not want this to impede a full and rich discussion, hence an option was offered to the interviewees to make this research stronger for all involved. I acknowledged that some participants may want to give testimonials. This was offered in the following format: if during or after the interview the participant felt there was something they wanted to express as a testimonial they had the option to do so whilst maintaining the rest of the interview anonymous (unless they selected to be identified). No one, however, selected this option.

Due to the political nature of this PhD research, a decision was made for all participants to be anonymous. In addition, anonymity was provided to other actors as well. Those actors being Member States, UN agencies, CS agencies, and funders. When presidents or prime ministers were mentioned, their anonymous country identity was used instead of their names. However, world leaders, because they were not related to one specific country, were left identified. This thesis’s intention, which aligns with action research, is for the research outcomes to have a practical application, it was not conducted for the purpose of unveiling individual criticisms. Therefore, in protecting the identities of other actors, a higher degree of professionalism, which aligns with the feminist methodological approach, was being offered to all who were directly or indirectly participating in the research. Please note that continents are mentioned, and UN headquarter locations are kept identified.

Section Eight – Reflexivity: The Researcher’s Biases

McNiff and Whitehead explain that with action research the practitioner is involved in the research, ‘practitioners research their own practices’ (McNiff and Whitehead, 2005). Therefore, my roles as Strategic Development Director at the United Nations House in Scotland, Convenor or Chair of United Nations Association Scotland, and Elected-Trustee of United Nations Association United Kingdom, does not interfere with this thesis but is an inherent part.

As well, ‘action research is done by people who are trying to live in the direction of the values that inspire their lives’ (McNiff and Whitehead, 2005). Qualitative research does acknowledge that the work ‘becomes not just the field setting, but
also the researcher’s role within it’ (Gray, 2014). However, it is still important to note biases, to ensure transparent data gathering as best as possible.

Eagleton-Pierce describes reflexivity as an ‘actively ‘turn or bend back’, to take account of the self in relation to other subjects and objects’ (Eagleton-Pierce, 2009). In other words, to describe my position within the research, in defining my position, my scholarly acquisition then has a responsible knowledge claim (Haraway, 1988).

Haraway states, ‘feminist objectivity is about limited location and situated knowledge, not about transcendence and splitting of subject and object. It allows us to become answerable for what we learn how to see’ (Haraway, 1988). I have ‘learned’ from my professional viewpoint, that a collaborative approach with CS for international development is best, hence, this is how I ‘see’ it. In acknowledging this and other beliefs as listed below, I am being ‘answerable’ for what I continue to learn. I am working within this ‘limited location’ and within the ‘situated knowledge’ of my past experiences and understandings. In doing so, my knowledge claim is supported, as Harding states, ‘begin with the claim that knowledge is always socially situated’ (Harding, 2004).

Although I list my position below, it is of course, not all inclusive. It cannot be all inclusive because I embody what I am describing. Hence, there will invariably be blind spots, pieces of my reflexivity that I missed. Not due to a lack of trying, but simply due to being within what I am describing. Haraway describes this as, ‘modes of denial through repression, forgetting, and disappearing acts – ways of being nowhere while claiming to see comprehensively’ (Haraway, 1988).

Before I list my reflexive components, there is an interesting element about my positionality that I would like to describe, which is one that Collins writes about, the ‘outsider within’ (Collins, 1986). Although I am involved with the UN, my involvement is all CS based, such as my work with the United Nations Associations; therefore, my role is not diplomatically positioned with the UN. As such, I am placed as an ‘outsider’ of the diplomatic UN area, ‘within’ a UN context. Collins see this as, ‘outsiders within occupy a special place… their difference sensitizes them to patterns that may be more difficult for established sociological insiders to see’ (Collins, 1986). She adds, ‘the approach suggested by the experiences of outsiders within is one where intellectuals learn to trust their own personal and cultural biographies as significant sources of knowledge’ (Collins, 1986). Therefore, my ‘insider’ biases and my ‘outsider’ biases may have impacted my research, however, as Collins states, that position is acknowledged to have a potential additive effect to scholarly acquisition.

**Preconceptions**

As the researcher, I carry the following opinions, ideas, and biases:

- That people do want to develop the advancement of human civilisation.
- That CSs and governments do see the UN as a credible source of defining development.
- That government bodies are interested in seeing society develop.
- That people who make up CS and its organisations are interested in seeing society develop and that of others.
• That governments and the people who make up CSs and its organisations would like to contribute to making the world a better place.
• That people want to contribute to a better world, to the UN goals, however, very few platforms exist for them to contribute.
• That the UN is viewed as unapproachable and far-reaching for most people in CS.
• That people in society who are aware of the UN goals see these as a ‘nice thought’ but unattainable and are viewed as something that resides in the hands of diplomats.
• In today’s society, a new institution is needed for people in CS to have their voice heard.
• In today’s society, a new institution is needed to offer individuals the opportunity to learn about how to develop and how they can contribute to that development.
• When reviewing the current UN goals, Agenda 2030 – the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), it is clear it will require every individual, organisation, and government to have the opportunity to contribute, for these goals to come to fruition.

Throughout the field research process, I journaled my thoughts and experiences, to not only record them but also to bring about my own awareness. This process was done to continue to reflect on my positionality and experiences as a researcher and elicit further preconceptions I may be bringing to the data. This was often reflected in the ‘My Story’ sections of the different chapters of this thesis. It is important to bear in mind that there may have been elements of change that inherently were difficult to pinpoint or describe in my reflexivity because of the ‘blind-spot’ that was discussed above.

My knowledge acquisition is placed in my positionality and in the current academic theoretical debates of my research topic that was discussed above. Describing these two placements allows me to build on knowledge and supports my knowledge claim, ‘the only way to find a larger vision is to be somewhere in particular’ (Haraway, 1988).

The snowballing sampling technique that was applied and discussed above supported minimising the researcher’s biases, as I was not hand picking who my interviewees were. The removal of choice of who to interview provided a non-bias approach in an international context of who wanted to contribute to the research, as long as they met the inclusion criteria.

As mentioned above, I worked within the context of this research, from only one side of the two parties that were examined, which was the CS side. I do not have any work experience as a UN diplomat. Three groups were identified and sought to participant: those with UN work experience, participants in CS involvement, and those that had a mix of experience from both the UN and CS. Therefore, in ensuring participants were included from all three work areas, assisted in not minimising the researcher’s lens. This brought in diverse perspectives from all sides of the context being researched.
To further limit any bias on my part, a double-blinded approach was incorporated into the research design. The participant name was given a unique interviewee number. The number was then given a letter. Therefore, when I was writing up the findings, I was blinded to who said what. When it made sense to do so, for example, when it was necessary to show if the participant came from the UN or a CS entity, I reverse engineered the double-blinding.

When reading the next chapters, please note that a double letter, for example AA, does not refer to it being the second interview for Participant A. It may be natural to make this assumption due to the visual effect it has, however, this is not the case. Therefore, Interviewee A is a different participant than AA. Consequently, myself and the reader, will not be able to correlate a participant’s responses from the first round to the second round of interviews, again minimising any potential bias towards an interviewee.

It is important to note that this was an independently funded piece of research. This was not funded by the UN or a Civil Society Organisation (CSO) or a government body of any kind. The only funds received were fifteen hundred pounds from the University of Edinburgh. However, every student in my school or department had access to that to off-set research travel or conference attendance costs. Therefore, no potential bias came from a particular funding source. I take this opportunity in the reflexive section of this chapter to let it be known that this was an independent doctoral research, conducted with no undue influence because it was self-funded.

Section Nine – Validity

Validity is examined through a broader construct. This ‘refers to the idea that a researcher already has ideas and models (constructs) about the topic they are researching. It is therefore important to use multiple ways of establishing that what they are investigating really is going on, and is not just them imposing their existing constructs on the reality they are observing’ (McNiff and Whitehead, 2005). This was carried out through different phases of research, stages and two rounds of field research in the data gathering, along with the feminist methodological approach. Interviewing through a follow-up, round two of data collection, provided additional validity to the findings.

The research design provided an analysis after each stage (see Figure 3.1). Each research stage helped design and built on the next, as is true for a qualitative, inductive research process. The analysis of each stage, where it was possible and meaningful, referred back to the already researched and identified eight themes and three inherent flaws through content analysis, as discussed in the analysis section above. This approach will provide understanding to the research results by connecting to the existing knowledge and bringing it into today’s current context. Content analysis provided ‘reliability’ and ‘validity’ to the research findings (Silverman, 2011).

Lather writes that four elements of validity are essential: triangulation, reflexive subjectivity, face validity, and catalytic validity (Lather, 1986). Triangulation was incorporated into the research design for both the findings (see Figure 3.2) and the results (see Figure 3.3), the proposed reform, which is discussed further below. My
reflexivity is documented in the positionality section above. Face validity is not incorporated due to the time constraints this would pose on the elites that I am interviewing, which will be discussed in the next paragraph. Catalytic validity which Lather describes as ‘some documentation that the research process has led to insight and, ideally, activism on the part of the respondents’ (Lather, 1986), was incorporated in the second round of interviews where implementation of the proposed model was explored.

It was decided that respondent validation of the transcription would not be conducted. This is the process of completing an interview transcript, then having the participant verifying the transcript before analysis begins. Silverman agrees and ‘question[s] its methodological usefulness' and ‘believe[s] there to be more appropriate methods for validating' (Silverman, 2011). The reason for this is to be mindful and ethically responsible to the participants availability and respect for their time due to key stakeholders already giving their time to the two sets of interviews.

Two other elements of validity are identified by Bazeley, ‘quality and credibility’ and she highlights five points, each of which are addressed in Table 3.2 below (Bazeley, 2013).

Table 3.2 Addressing Quality and Credibility of the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality and Credibility, According to Bazeley, Relies On:</th>
<th>How the Research Addressed each Point:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Clarity of purpose and questions, and soundness of the underlying conceptual basis’</td>
<td>This thesis clearly stated the research questions, how they arose, how they related to each other and how they built on each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The usefulness of the design in fulfilling the purpose’</td>
<td>This was demonstrated by not having utilised a predefined action research procedure but instead used a research process that was thoroughly thought through with different stages and phases that was most suitable for answering the research questions of this PhD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The sensitivity, openness, and commitment of the researcher in conducting the study’</td>
<td>The ethics and reflexivity section of this paper addressed this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The level of critical thinking, depth, and thoroughness of the analysis; and’</td>
<td>This was expressed through the different areas that were applied to the analysis in both rounds of field research and in the systematic literature review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Your thoroughness and skill in pulling together an argument for your conclusions’ (Bazeley, 2013)</td>
<td>This was evidenced in Chapter 2 and the field research had these same skills applied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further validity is added to this thesis through the use of triangulation, ‘a key strategy in establishing validity is triangulation’ (McNiff and Whitehead, 2005). Lather states that it ‘is critical in establishing data trustworthiness’ (Lather, 1986). Hence, triangulation was incorporated twice into the data analysis. Figure 3.2 shows the
triangulation analysis that was applied for the findings of the research. Figure 3.3 shows the second triangulation that was carried out for the results of the findings.

**Figure 3.2 Triangulation Analysis of the Research Findings**

![Triangulation Diagram 1](image1)

A cross-comparison analysis was carried out to uncover whether the data from Round 1 supported the eight themes and three inherent flaws that arose from the systematic literature review, the themes that arose from the existing knowledge. The themes from the second round of field research were compared to the themes that arose from the first round of field research as well as the literature review.

**Figure 3.3 Triangulation Analysis of the Proposed Model for Reform**

![Triangulation Diagram 2](image2)

Figure 3.3 pictorially demonstrates the analysis of the research. On the left-hand side, it shows the collective analysis of the research findings that contributed to the proposed model for reform. On the right-hand side of the figure, it shows the post analysis that was conducted to validate the model through triangulation. Triangulation analysis was carried out in two ways on the proposed model. Firstly,
the findings from the research were revisited to validate the suggested reform. Secondly, it was done through a post literature review. Thus, providing a robust analysis of the proposed model.

Lastly, validity was also provided by seeking out participants from three different groups of people. Those who worked for the UN, those who were engaged with CS, and interviewees who worked in a mixed environment of both the UN and CS.

**Presenting the Data**

There were two different ways that I presented the data. One way was through a visual presentation including tables, figures, and charts. This provided a pictorial way to present the research. The second way was through a descriptive presentation, which included extracts from interviews and written context of the research uncovered and its analysis. Numbering the quantity of responses was not applied, as this was not a quantitative research methodology. However, qualifiers such as ‘few’ or ‘most’ were used to indicate general frequency with which particular comments emerged.

**Section Ten - Reliability**

The transcripts from the interviews can ‘provide powerful evidence for presenting data and making conclusions’ (Koshy, 2005). However, Gibbs points to an area of concern when transcribing interviews as it ‘is a change of medium’, which can create loss or misinterpretation of the data (Gibbs, 2007). Therefore, reliability of the data was checked by reviewing the transcript and replaying the audio recording to check for accuracy after it was already transcribed.

I noted the date, time, and the location of the interview. This process ensured that the data gathered was authenticated and ‘ensures quality’ (McNiff and Whitehead, 2005). Additional reliability was added by utilising three audio recorders. As well, hand-written notes were taken during the interview gathering process, especially in the second round of interviews when participants may have made comments during the presentation before the recorders were turned on. Once the recorders were turned on, I would call the comments back to the interviewee to have them captured on the recordings.

The word value will hold different meanings for different people. Due to action research being conducted for the professional context, professional values are considered, such as accountability and responsibility to the research itself. This was done by providing a clear description of the research process, applying sound ethical research conduct, being transparent about personal biases in advance of the research and any surprises that came along the way, and applying professional academic theoretical approaches to the analysis of the findings.

**Section Eleven – Limitations**

With only one researcher carrying out the interviews, no new researchers’ biases were introduced into the questioning of the elites. Efforts were made to minimise bias as was discussed above, in addition questions were asked in the interviews that
were intended to cover multiple perspectives. These efforts would not be able to account for the blind spots of the inherent biases of the researcher.

The research was conducted on a structural or macro level, it was not carried out on a specific contextual topic or in a particular country context. However, as was identified, academic research about the relationship between the UN and CS on the macro level is lacking.

The research was limited to only 43 individuals. Although, this was a limitation as more could have participated, it exceeded the goal of the sample size. As discussed above, a goal of 15 to 20 participants was a reasonable number for qualitative research, due to interviewing elites.

The interviews did not include people who worked at national or local levels, as this thesis took on an international approach. However, many participants did have national experience in their work life. The research did not include junior position holders. The reasoning for these demographic decisions were discussed above. Efforts were made to include participants who worked on different issues or SDGs and from the three different work groups (see above). This was done by asking in the snowballing technique for potential participants who were, at the time, underrepresented.

Only one method was applied for sampling, the snowballing technique. People were interviewed who came from that web of network. There was a potential that they may have had similar views. This was minimised by ensuring participants came from a range of organisations, cities, genders, and other demographical differences, such as years of experience in the work environment of the UN and CS.

Qualitative research was the singular applied method through semi-structured interviews. Although this singular methodological approach may have limited the data, it also enriched the data, as was discussed above, through detailed and deep reflections of interview discussions.

This chapter explored the methodological approaches utilised in this study. The next chapter details the findings from the fieldwork.
Chapter 4
Findings

My Story

If I were an artist, and some wisely argue that we are all artists, I would say that I started this field research with a black and white sketch of a painting. I had this concept of an idea, essentially a framework, which arose from the systematic literature review.

Some interviewees were at times concerned there were too many dynamics and issues that they were sharing. I reassured them and told them about my black and white painting. That each new dynamic and issue that was mentioned, would only add more colour, hues to the colours, textures, details, and make the painting come to life and add more and more beauty to it.

This is precisely what happened. My black and white painting, my skeleton of an initial framework based on the evidence was further and further validated as each interview passed. With the first few interviewees, my goose bumps were so strong it was difficult not to jump up from my seat. Oh, and how important it is for us as individuals to follow our goose bumps! Those feelings inspire us and resonate deep within us.

So, I have been on a journey of following my goose bumps. It has been a truly remarkable journey, which led to a stunning painting that we will continue to finish together, by giving it a frame that will make the painting stand out, as best as possible.

Overview

Chapter 4 begins with the demographics of the participants. This is followed by three parts.

The first part are the findings from the first round of field research interviews and is made up of three sections. Section one cross-compares the findings from the literature review to the findings of the first set of interviews. Section two adds to the findings and presents twelve new themes arising from the first set of interviews that relate to the internal dynamics of the UN and CS relationship. The third section offers a further analysis of the field research data and presents eight new themes of external dynamics that impact the relationship.

The second part is the presentation of the proposed model for reform that was based on the findings from the literature review and the first set of interviews. The suggested model was shown to the participants at the start of the second round of interviews.

The third part presents the findings from the second round of interviews and consists of four sections. Section one presents the initial responses to the suggested model for reform from participants. Section two provides a synthesis of the findings from
the second round of interviews in relation to the findings from the systematic literature review and first round of interviews. The third section presents findings from the second round of interviews on practical applications of the proposed reform. Concluding remarks from interviewees are provided in the last section.

Demographics

All interviewees (n = 43) worked in the international context and all areas of the UN goals, the SDGs, were covered in the research. Some participants only worked on specific SDGs, whilst others covered all of them. Those who worked on specific issues often remarked that although it was only one issue it would impact all SDGs in some way.

Although all of the SDGs were covered in the research, a further identification is provided of the different work focuses of the participants. The interviewees represented a number of different areas, which is outlined in Table 4.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Interviewees' Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Defined by Their Dominate Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader CS/NGO Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty/Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia/Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There may have been some possible impact to the results of the findings from having a higher number in the children and youth category than in some of the other areas of representation. However, as noted in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3, one of the aims of the research was to contribute to the international debate on the UN and CS relationship where children and youth have been recognised as important contributors to that debate.

Overlap in the areas of representation did exist, as participants were simultaneously in more than one category, their dominate area which they represented is indicated in Table 4.1. Their previous work also contributed some representation from other areas.

Participants originally came from a wide spectrum of countries and some identified themselves as coming from more than one country. Those countries included: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Germany, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Sierra Leone, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States of America. In total, the interviewees represented 19 countries.

There were four participants who identified themselves as working simultaneously for both the UN and CS. Twelve interviewees, 16 when including the overlap of working in both environments, worked for the UN. This considered its agencies, diplomatic roles, and civil servant roles. Twenty-seven (31 when including the overlap) participants identified themselves from CS. Although there were more participants from CS, the UN is a much smaller entity than that of CS. Therefore, it could be argued the sample was broadly reflective of the diversity that exists among the population involved in this working relationship environment.

Experience from the following position titles from interviewees were included, but not limited to: Director, Former Prime Minister, Senior, Chief Executive Officer, UN Representative, Former Chief Speech Writer to the Secretary-General Kofi Annan, Founder, President, Founder and Former Executive Director of the United Nations Global Compact, Chair, Author, Former UN Resident Coordinator, Board Member, Founding Director, Speaker, Advisor, Former UN Deputy Secretary-General, Delegate, Executive Director, Former Government Minister, Former Executive Director of the United Nations Office for Partnerships, and Diplomat. Often participants held more than one title.

The total number of combined years of experience that was included in this research that contributed to the data was 745.5 years and is demonstrated in Chart 4.1 below, with 324 years of experience in the UN and 558.5 years in CS work environment. The number of interviewees that had experience in both environments was 21 out of 43. It was common that interviewees had both CS and UN work experience and at
times some participants worked in both environments simultaneously, hence the numbers in Chart 4.1 will not add up.

**Chart 4.1 Years of Work Experience**

All participants were highly professional. UN and CS participants often acknowledged their own positive and negative dynamics that they contribute to the relationship and that of the other party. This illustrated a high level of self-awareness and self-reflection. Often, this also came from having work experience in both sectors, as noted in the above paragraph and in Chart 4.1. Therefore, when an excerpt is made from an interview, it was not necessarily identified as coming from a UN professional or a CS participant, unless that distinction was important to the findings.

Recall, when quoting an interviewee that two of the same letters does not indicate that it is the second interview. Hence, a reader cannot correlate one interviewee’s response from their first and second interview. For example, Participant Z is not the same person as Participant ZZ. Anonymity was also applied to countries, agencies (both UN and CS) and funders. See Chapter 3 for further demographic information and the double-blinded and anonymity approach that was applied.

**Part 1**

**Findings of Round 1 of Interviews**

Part 1 shows the findings of the first round of interviews, which were conducted in the spring and summer of 2019. The findings arose through either specific responses to interview questions (see appendix) or through open sharing in the interview due to the semi-structured method that was applied (see Chapter 3). Additional data excerpts from the qualitative interviews for most of the themes are further presented in the appendix.

For an overview of the UN system, its main bodies and offices, please refer to the appendix.
Section One: Findings in Relation to the Literature Review – Eight Themes and The Three Inherent Flaws

The findings from the literature review uncovered eight themes in the relationship dynamics of the UN and CS. This led to the unveiling of three inherent flaws. This first section analyses the data from the first round of interviews and cross compares it to the research results that came from the systematic literature review.

Qualitative findings identified all eight themes and all three inherent flaws. The data showed all of these dynamics are still relevant to today’s context of the relationship. Not only were they found to still be relevant, but further details and increased insight was provided from the field research. This is described in this section. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the themes of the titles now include CS to demonstrate the widening of the research to move beyond the narrower NGO definition.

Theme One: Its Heartbeat & Breath - The UN Needs CS/NGOs for Validity and Credibility
Participants from both the UN and CS engagements recognised and substantiated the vital importance of this relationship. When asked if the relationship was needed, a collection of responses included: ‘definitely the relationship is needed’ Interview D, ‘it is very clearly needed’ Interview NN, ‘of course’ Interview I, ‘oh it is most definitely needed’ Interview OO, ‘most definitely’ Interview LL, ‘100% needed because no government, no country can achieve these goals’ Interview II, ‘it is very needed’ Interview A, ‘it’s vital’ Interview L, and ‘it is very much needed’ Interview MM. Nobody said that the UN and CS relationship is not needed, nor was there even a hint of this suggestion.

When asked to substantiate their claims as to why they thought this relationship was so vital, these were some of their replies: ‘Civil Societies [are] often and almost always the implementing partners for plans that are developed between the UN and government’ Interview A, ‘there is a huge complementarity and a value-added of working together, which is tremendous’ Interview R, ‘it’s been long recognised that the work that we have to do can only be done in partnership with Civil Society’ Interview X, ‘Civil Society voices are extremely important to advance UN values’ Interview BB, ‘Civil Society is a critical constituent within our SDG coordination role’ Interview LL, and ‘it’s so clear that the work that Civil Society does is critical and different and that we have comparative advantages’ Interview X. There was a strong affirmation that the relationship is critically important: ‘the fact that Civil Society needs to be centre stage in the work of the United Nations and Member States, I would certainly make that statement’ Interview FF.

Theme Two: The Passionate Professional Partners – CS/NGOs Want to be Involved
Participant Z shared that not only is CS professional, but that their professional competency is also increasing: ‘I see Civil Society becoming increasingly effective and professional… NGOs individually and as a group are very well prepared. They are very well informed. They are bringing more and more to the table as well’. Interviewee PP shared where this comes from ‘its [CS] legitimacy and authority comes in much more from the power of its ideas and its advocacy and its innovation’.

As Chapter 2 explained, NGOs can apply for consultancy status with the UN through
applying for accreditation, which is done through the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs. However, challenges in accreditation approval were emotively remarked. Participant NN, followed by JJ explained: ‘the UN Charter, Article 71 specifies that ECOSOC as being responsible for maintaining and establishing and maintaining the consultative relationships’ and that ‘the Committee on NGOs, is an intergovernmental body with 19 members that reviews the quarter annual reports of the Civil Society reviews, and reviews the applications of Civil Society members wanting to become members and they just give them a run around especially if they work on issues like human rights or other issues that are not so popular with Member States’. Interviewee L added: ‘the ECOSOC business is very unacceptable because there’s no reason for their decisions and no appeal for their decisions. So that’s another barrier on full participation’, Interviewee BB calls it ‘the pretty useless political accreditation process’, Participant E agrees that ‘there is a strong feeling that ECOSOC is ineffective and somewhat perilous... it’s a bit of a talking shop to be honest’, and Interviewee V added; ‘it angers me about the ECOSOC accreditation committee that we have human rights women who cannot get accredited... those work with the Kurdish. How about a lot of the journalists cannot get those organisations accredited because they’re afraid of them. They don’t want to open the circle. Untouchable are untouchables, so keep them out’.

**Theme Three: The Moving Maze – CS/NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access**

The literature review uncovered two areas in which there is restricted or complicated access. One of the areas is the UN system or process itself and the second one being the Member States. Both of these areas came up in the field research data collection.

Samples of excerpts that highlight this theme, from both UN and CS participants, expressed the restricted and/or complicated access with the UN system: ‘the main challenge is access to the UN and access to the UN’s institutions… it’s becoming more challenging’ Interview J, ‘we keep facing the same challenges in terms of their access’ Interview C, ‘the key issues are that of access. Having a platform for meaningful engagement’ Interview JJ, ‘it’s too complicated, how does the UN even really work’ Interview D, ‘there are 1000 different ways in which people around the world engage with the United Nations’ Interview OO, ‘the UN has huge difficulty finding some sort of formal geometry for engagement’ Interview PP, ‘a lot of people, who are trying to get on-site to fund us, to support our work, we were told it was too complicated organise’ Interview N, ‘the one that comes up the most is a purely practical matter, but also has a philosophical underpinning is that of the access that is granted to the NGO Community by the UN… it’s becoming increasingly restricted and difficult’ Interview Z, and ‘the complexity of the system is one thing that’s holding it back’ Interview H.

Some Member States are also creating the restrictions: ‘certain governments aren’t as open to Civil Society… and they [CS] have trouble having access, real access to engagement and UN processes and meetings’ Interview AA. Participant J added that it seems to be intensifying: ‘the number of Member States that are taking measures against NGOs appears to be increasing’ Interview J.
Theme Four: The Heavy Door to Open - The UN Needs to do More to Involve CS/NGOs

This theme was also recognised in the first round of research interviews. The following remarks evidence this: ‘the UN then acts as a gatekeeper between Civil Society and Member States’ Interview K, ‘so which NGOs, and how do we determine legitimacy, how open should the doors be for all of this… the choice of who gets to be given a right to come into the UN or have some formal relationship with the UN, that’s very fraught and full of some battles and I could tell stories about it’ Interview O, and ‘I’d open the doors so the delegates have to listen to Civil Society. That we have to come together and have meetings within the UN buildings. Open the doors and cut away all the bureaucracy that keeps us outside’ Interview L.

This causes issues because ‘they ask us to participate, but at the same time it’s hard’ Interview CC. Participant L explained: ‘I think the key is proper participation and access, not just tolerating our presence. Actively opening the doors to us and regarding us as key providers of central information; it’s about that – not just tolerating our presence providing we don’t make a fuss and behave very, very, well, but actually valuing our presence. Opening the doors and giving us value’.

Theme Five: From Trojan Horse to Too Influential - Negative Reasons to Involving CS/NGOs

From both UN and CS participants, the first round of field research interviews uncovered concerns with Civil Societies’ legitimacy, accountability, and credibility, which aligned with the literature review findings. In addition, the field data uncovered further concerns regarding accountability, that it is an issue for all actors involved in international development. There was evidence that accountability was something that was needed by all three players: the UN, CS, and Member States.

Theme Six: Bridges of Lifeline – CS/NGO Contributions to UN Activities

The literature review identified four areas of CS engagement in UN activities: governmental activities with the field interviews adding findings on governance specifically on accountability and stability, operational activities with the field research adding social responsibility, management of global issues, and linking the issues from local level to the global level. All four of these areas were also identified in the first round of field research interviews: ‘our work impacts across a whole range of things that the UN is responsible for and is involved in’ Interview B.

Theme Seven: The Power of Power - Resistance to CS/NGO Involvement

This theme arose from both the literature review and the findings from the field research. Hostility from states was noted by a few participants: ‘the main difficulty is a mindset by too many states that Civil Society is the enemy. That the alternative narratives that the Civil Society players bring to the table are not welcome and that the main objectives in regard to Civil Society is to keep them out, not welcome them in’ Interview OO, ‘Civil Society is not the enemy, they are allies’ Interview JJ, and ‘there’s political opposition, I would say, to more increased level of participation of Civil Society’ Interview Z.

Theme Eight: The Paradoxical Situation - Resources

The literature review uncovered that resources are a dynamic within the UN and its relationship with CS. Specifically, resources around finances, time, and space were
noted. This aligned with the findings from the field research. Findings from the interviews around these areas included: ‘it wasn’t a lack [of] willingness on behalf of the United Nation, it wasn’t lack of willingness on our part. I think it was simply all-round a lack of resources’ Interview HH, ‘one of the key issues, is a matter of resources... one of the critical barriers is not enough of an investment of effort, both human effort and resources and engagement... the one thing within the UN, there has to be resources dedicated to the effort’ Interview LL, and ‘the number of staff, the staff positions that go to support NGOs has decreased and [has] diminished’ Interview NN.

Three key areas arose from the field research data in regard to funding that further the findings from the literature review: the lack of finances, competition for the funding, and that funding dictates decisions. In addition, three different types of donors were discussed in the interviews.

The three identified funders are: the UN itself, especially in terms of implementing programmes, governments fund both the UN and CS, and foundations. Interviewee NN begins by explaining how the UN is funded: ‘the UN, in theory, is funded through UN Charter obligations and a complicated formula based upon GNI [gross national income]. I mean the fact of the matter is that the UN, the majority of the UN is now funded through donors, earmarked contributions and that is not the way it is supposed to work’.

**Inherent Flaw One: Member States vs ‘The Peoples’**
Member States have agendas that may not align with the ‘The Peoples’ concerns regarding non-geographically bordered issues. Interviewee Z captured this by saying ‘on issues of peace and security and climate and migration, these huge global issues really require some kind of cross-border governance and cooperation. That just doesn’t seem to work very well’. Another way this was captured: ‘although it says, “We the Peoples”, the people goes through the governments and so it has quite a lot of pushback from the states’ Interview W. Interviewee II added, ‘some countries do not like the voice of Civil Society being heard. What some countries prefer is that they represent the voice of the people, not the people representing the voice of the people’.

**Inherent Flaw Two: Intrinsic Contradictions of the Relationship**
The intrinsic contradictions relate to; if solutions were found for four of the eight themes, those solutions would directly have an impact on the other four themes and worsen or heighten the dynamic of them. Due to the eight themes also emerging in the data from Round 1, this would lead to the intrinsic contradictions again expressing themselves and validated the findings that were found in the literature review.

**Inherent Flaw Three: Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship**
The UN was often regarded as having the more powerful position in the relationship with CS and this was demonstrated in how it carries out its interactions with CS. This was expressed from numerous interviewees: ‘the UN is perceived by Civil Society as more powerful, and therefore we go to them because we need their influence and we need them more than maybe they need us in a sense as Civil
Society, because UN has a relationship with the government in many countries’ Interview R, ‘the individual Member States who have the power, the authority, to make decisions’ Interview B, ‘it’s all in the hands of the UN that they can have all the power and control and we just have to follow along and behave properly and accept what is handed to us - the limited opportunities that we are offered and ask for more’ Interview Z, and ‘this is a subordinate relationship - it never works, it has to be based on equality’ Interview S.

Section Two: Twelve New Themes – Internal Dynamics of the Relationship

The overarching field research question for the first round of interviews was, “How to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the UN and CS in order to progress international development?”. This main question was then unpacked into numerous questions in the semi-structure interview (see appendix). In exploring this question with participants, twelve new themes emerged that highlight further internal dynamics of the UN and CS relationship. These twelve themes are:

- Required Infrastructural Backbone – Structure, System, and Process
- Clarity Creates Cohesion - Defining the Roles
- Exclusion is Frustration For All Including the Included – Inclusion
- Play Leads to Meaningful Action - Social Requirements
- Restructure for Imperative Prevention - Conflict and Human Rights
- Fossil-ed Functioning - Outdated Working Structure
- Honest Broker – UN as Mediator
- Grassroot Hands Hold the Solutions – Importance of In-Country
- Sharing and Purposeful Speaking - Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer
- Necessity of Horizontal Cohesion of Collaboration and Coordination
- Virtual Bricks and Mortar
- Power of the Empowered People - Human Resources

All twelve of these new themes further relate to the internal dynamics of the UN and CS relationship and are explored individually in more detail.

Theme Nine: Required Infrastructural Backbone – Structure, System, and Process

The data often used words such as system, process, or structure and the need for it. Here is a sampling of this evidence: ‘the challenges are often structure’ Interview FF, ‘the structure makes it hard’ Interview H, ‘I think structurally the United Nations doesn’t work’ Interview HH, ‘it’s bigger than Civil Society having access to the United Nations, there’s overarching structures’ Interview EE, ‘it could be better structured’ Interview CC, ‘you have to think of structures’ Interview S, ‘what kind of system we need to help us get there’ Interview Y, and ‘the process itself is important’ Interview U.

Theme Ten: Clarity Creates Cohesion - Defining the Roles

A new theme that arose from the first round of field research interviews was the need to define the roles between the UN, what it is and does, and CS. Interviewee R explained that ‘when these two worlds [the UN and CS] and these two ways of working compete with each other, the UN tries to behave like NGOs, and we are just trying to behave like UN agencies. This is where there is a clash. They try to be
implementers of projects just like a small NGO and we try to become the normative agents because we also want to influence policy’. Participant R continues: ‘my impression is that we’re trying to play a game in which we are all trying to do everything and that is not for me a sustainable basis for a relationship. We have to sit down and analyse what is the value-add in different context for the roles and then who plays that role better in this context? Hardly ever anybody does that… but if it was founded on an honest appraisal of each party’s value-add… and avoid duplication and avoid competition in order to achieve common objectives, which is to improve the well-being of people on this planet and prevent conflict and achieve prosperity peace and security’.

**Theme Eleven: Exclusion is Frustration For All, Including the Included - Inclusion**

Although the literature review may have brushed up alongside this theme in terms of ‘The Moving Maze’ or ‘The Passionate Professional Partners’ (see Chapter 2), it did not uncover the frustration that organically arose from the data in the interviews in terms of how it excluded key actors. This frustration came from both UN and CS actors: ‘and so, they would push forward their voices believing that they’re not really incorporated in UN Agency G or welcomed as much into UN Agency G as much as they would like to be, or we would at UN Agency G believe they are. And so that wasn’t always the most collaborative relationship, because although we believed there was space, whether that was on our advisory board or elsewhere, for them to voice things, I don’t think they always felt like they were always heard’ Interview P, ‘a lot of the international decision-making, that is seen as credible, comes from white male dominated and patriarchal institutions, which are well known for supporting the status quo and not encouraging a real big change in what happens and how things happen. And who is consulted and on what’ Interview K, and ‘many people have been bruised by this type of being excluded’ Interview R.

**Theme Twelve: Play Leads to Meaningful Action - Social Requirements**

A new theme that arose from the first round of interviews, which was not uncovered in the literature review, was the importance of social aspects for the UN and CS relationship to be productive. This creates the opportunity for dialogue in order to build the relationship. Interviewee O described this phenomenon: ‘we were meeting with the Ambassadors, which is again something that NGOs never get to do, or I mean very rarely of course. But we were meeting with them, I got to know them, and I was invited to all sorts of receptions and different things which is one of the places where you know, real business gets carried out at the UN… I mean I know people in Secretariat because I belong to the UN Ski Club, imagine that. And so, while we were riding in a bus going to the ski resort, we talked’.

**Theme Thirteen: Restructure for Imperative Prevention - Conflict and Human Rights**

Descriptions of today’s context in the area of human rights and conflict were provided in the first round of interviews and how the importance of the UN and CS relationship is vital to address these grave concerns. Four different participants explained today’s context. Interviewee Q stated that ‘all countries abuse human rights… it’s just variations of that’. Participant EE added the severity of the situation by describing the ‘holistic human rights and development issues are being challenged to the very core today’. ‘The Security Council isn’t working well at the moment and it is a very important form of stopping conflict’ Interview D. The interview with JJ explained that ‘today most of the conflicts are not clean between
two countries. There are all sorts of mixed groups and nonstate actors that are involved, and the Security Council does not necessarily have the know-how with how to engage with these groups. Who do they engage with and how do they engage with them? So, this is where Civil Society’s role becomes all important, both as providers of information but also those that are working on the ground; sometimes even brokering peace and other times providing that level as it were, that coming together of the various groups that need to broker peace’.

**Theme Fourteen: Fossil-ed Functioning - Outdated Working Structure**

CS and UN participants both commented on how they are working in a very much outdated way that is no longer sufficient for today’s context. Interviewee M stated, ‘in so many ways we are still approaching critical challenges in ways that we have always tried to address them… I think that we have tried to continue and tried to continue to approach these issues in very traditional ways, in ways that may not be producing the results that we need’, and ’people are trying to survive in a world that was designed for fifty years ago and is not any more relevant and therefore you see this competitiveness instead of cooperation… but at the moment we’re still operating as if we’re still in 1960, to be honest with you, and that’s also part of the problem’ Interview R. Perhaps, because of this ‘the UN is still struggling with the same problems’ Interview W.

**Theme Fifteen: Honest Broker - UN as Mediator**

An acknowledgment was made by many participants of the UN’s intermediary role, the importance of it and how crucial the role can be between governments and CS. Participant II explained: ‘the UN can be helpful in that process. That is where we should encourage the UN to provide that enabling platform for collaboration, that is the first step. UN can convene governments, nobody else can. The UN can say, can we find a way to do this… the UN is actually a broker; you cannot do anything without the approval of the governments’. Interviewee D added that ‘the UN agencies have a unique position of political leverage’. Participant C supported the view and said ‘there needs to be a little bit of that balance between the two. The UN works very closely with governments, Civil Society works very closely with people. Not to say that they don’t both cross over sometimes, but there’s a need for Civil Society to sometimes represent a different voice, from a country, then the government’s voice’.

**Theme Sixteen: Grassroot Hands Hold the Solutions – Importance of In-Country**

There was an emphasis in the data on the necessity of in-country or local level incorporation. It was often remarked that the catalyst of change sits most effectively: ‘at the country level… it’s where they live, you have more capacity to affect change’ Interview C, ‘at the country level, because anything higher than that is policy and elusive and difficult to measure. But anything from country level downwards is easier, more measurable, and the effects can be felt and seen’ Interview MM, ‘you’ve got to work in the country to get the changes you want to see here’ Interview G, ‘in-country collaboration is important’ Interview D, and ‘what really needs to happen is much more mobilisation at national level’ Interview OO.
Theme Seventeen: Sharing and Purposeful Speaking - Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer

There was a great deal of data that arose from the interviews for this theme, which was further analysed into three areas: dialogue, knowledge transfer, and language usage.

Frustration was demonstrated by a number of participants regarding the lack of effective dialogue in the UN and CS relationship. A number of excerpts expressed this view: ‘there’s no real discussion about collaboration’ Interview HH, ‘they [UN] need to create more space for real dialogue. I already [can] identify what are the meetings that are [the] ‘ticking the box’ meeting, so they can say we consulted with Civil Society, and which are the meetings that they’re really seeking out for substantial comments. So, there should be more of those substantial comments or substantial dialogues with more, so to build more trust’ Interview KK, ‘it’s never interactive enough because we don’t listen to each other. In other words, so often their countries just want to talk about their country instead of engaging with the issue’ Interview V, ‘probably related to what is most frustrating to me, [is] seeing that you’re spending a lot of money to get somebody there [UN] and jump through all the hoops to get them in the room, and maybe they read a 2-minute statement and not have any opportunities to have a real discussion or get reactions to the statement’ Interview AA, ‘there’s no meaningful dialogue’ Interview H, ‘a lot of time I think could be spent in having more of a dialogue. You need proper Chairs, but sometimes people go off on their own things and then they aren’t necessarily participating in what they’re discussing about’ Interview J, ‘I’ve been at conferences more recently where you are getting speakers only allowed to speak for seven minutes. No questions’ Interview HH, ‘being able to effectively listen to what people’s views are… unfortunately, in the UN, you don’t often listen to people’s views because they have people saying what they want people to hear’ Interview J, and with extreme sadness and unspeakable disappointment; ‘genocide is going on and no one is listening’ Interview L.

Theme Eighteen: Necessity of Horizontal Cohesion of Collaboration and Coordination

A lot of the data noted the importance of collaboration and coordination amongst the different players of international development. This was reiterated by interviewees: ‘there is greater recognition that we need to accelerate efforts, include the most marginalised - it can only be achieved if there is a much greater engagement of Civil Society and partnerships all around’ Interview LL, ‘there is strength in groups’ Interview D, ‘NGOs getting together under these various commissions is a wonderful place to collaborate and to share expertise and problem solving’ Interview V, ‘start singing from the same hymn sheet’ Interview J, ‘if we end up putting our efforts together, whether it’s at the international level or at the regional level and most importantly the local level, then we will support each other and perhaps move forward instead of reinventing the wheel’ Interview GG, and ‘we need more ways of doing this kind of coming together… to be in a way that is cohesive, in a way that we learn from each other and that we build at the global level… I think having the coalition spaces to really come together is really important… there is great need to organise, to convene and then on the flipside to be able to share that information in a coherent way with members of the partnership, with UN Agency A, with others’ Interview M, ‘coordinated efforts make it a lot easier for us’ Interview P, and ‘I don’t
think anybody, any NGO can work alone anymore… working together, how can we really listen to one another with respect’ Interview EE.

Theme Nineteen: Virtual Bricks and Mortar

There was acknowledgement of the potential of virtual access bringing in more voices and that more processes were being made available online. The following is a sample of those excerpts from the interviews: ‘being able to use technology, to have potentially more voices come in’ Interview P, ‘anytime we ask for an inclusive webinar or things like that, it usually comes through’ Interview R, ‘far more use of video link ups for meetings, to enable people to come into the room, as opposed to only those who can get the money to take a plane’ Interview OO, ‘the hugely expanded use of social media to allow a much wider and more deliberate debate’ Interview PP, and ‘it’s incredible that somebody can dial up from the other end of the world and get real time answers… calls that can engage people around the globe” Interview H.

However, not everyone has access to online capabilities: ‘the increasing requirements for internet access to be able to register for conferences. That is not inclusive’ Interview Z. Although, it was acknowledged that it is coming: ‘in a few years, we’ll all be connected to the internet’ Interview Y. Therefore, it was seen that ‘in today’s world, with modern technology, it should be possible to find smarter ways of alignment’ Interview BB.

This data was collected before the current global crisis of the coronavirus. It could be argued this theme has increased in relevance and importance. The current situation will likely interface with this theme strongly.

Theme Twenty: Power of the Empowered People - Human Resources

There was a lot of data that arose from the first round of field research interviews regarding human resources. Issues were presented along with some solutions. There were six areas under this theme that were further analysed: understaffed, turnover and successive planning, performance management and job descriptions, training, core values, and hiring. Each will be explored in more depth in the appendix.

Section Three: Eight New Themes – External Elements that Impact the Relationship

In reflecting on the interview question for the first round of field research interviews; ‘How to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the UN and CS in order to progress international development?’, it was uncovered in the qualitative findings that external dynamics also impact the UN and CS relationship, an area that did not arise in the data extracted from the systematic literature review.

An additional eight themes arose from the first round of field research interviews. The last section demonstrated the evidence that arose from the data on internal dynamics of the relationship. However, external elements impact this relationship as well, which is discussed in this section and include:
These eight additional themes are further discussed below.

**Theme Twenty-One: Relationship Dynamics Diminish Development**
There was an overwhelming response when the interviewees were asked if they have conversations about the UN and CS Relationship. Frequent comments were: ‘everyday’, ‘constantly’, ‘all the time’, and, ‘absolutely’. It was also commonly remarked on the ‘shrinking space’ for CS. The evidence consistently showed a great deal of effort being spent on dealing with, managing, and considering the relationship dynamic. The data held so much evidence on this theme, that it made one consider; if the relationship dynamic was not there, instead the relationship flowed smoothly with clear pathways of collaboration and communication, how much resource would be freed up that could be used to collectively contribute to international development?

**Theme Twenty-Two: Strong Leadership + Sound Values = Sought Solutions**
The data repeatedly noted the importance of strong, visionary and values-based leadership. A selection of those comments included: ‘how important it is to have the right kind of political leadership for progress to continue’ Interview AA, ‘at the end of the day, it has to do with having visionary leadership… it is a bit unfortunate that it might depend only on one person, but it is true that the person sitting in this leadership positions make it or break it’ Interview KK, ‘the whole idea of an organisation is the effective quality of leadership’ Interview S, and ‘a lot of it comes from leadership and thinking about the way forward’ Interview J.

**Theme Twenty-Three: Critical Criticisms**
Although the data strongly presented virtues of the UN, which is described in the next theme, criticisms were also expressed in a number of areas that impact the relationship between the UN and CS. There are eight areas in particular that were criticised. The first one being that of ‘lip service’ to CS, which was a commonly used phrased, ‘there’s a lot of lip service’ Interview EE. The second one is the acknowledgement of CS itself and its incorporation on issues, ‘in some parts of the UN the mentality is that Civil Society doesn’t exist’ Participant R. This is followed by the UN not taking enough action, ‘the problem is that we’re language rich, but action poor’ Interview Y. The fourth area demonstrates the evidence around the need for the UN to be connected to the forefront of issues, ‘it does not have the direct relationship with what the experience is like on the ground for people’ Interview K. The next critic related to the bureaucracy of the UN and how it impacts the relationship and the work itself, ‘you always imagine the UN just like one big house full of paper and nothing is really changing’ Interview CC. Lack of coordination with key stakeholders is the next identified area that requires improvement, ‘a lot of the issues also come down to coordination’ Participant X. The seventh area was on the ineffectiveness of the UN, ‘the relationship is not great because Civil Society is
rightly frustrated that the UN doesn’t address some problems with greater robustness’ Interview PP. The last critic is around power struggles within the UN and its bearings on its working relationships, “the UN declined because every bloody, stupid Assistant Secretary General or Assistant General brings his national criteria with him. It’s disgusting in my view. It’s the end of multilateralism’ Interview BB. These eight areas are explored further in the appendix.

**Theme Twenty-Four: Validating Virtues**

The interview with L shared an overview of the virtues of the UN and its impact on CS: ‘over 75 years, since the end of the Second World War, all this build up and architecture, international laws, statues, resolutions, conventions and it all looks amazing’. Participant T added: ‘the beauty to me is the fact that it happens’. Interviewee DD shared how ‘it brings leaders and people from all over the world together in one space to talk about issues. There’s something very beautiful and special about that. I like what it was formed on, the Human Rights Charter. These are tenants that we need to live by, especially today. Even more so… for all the criticism the UN gets, if people went to the UN, they would be really impressed’.

**Theme Twenty-Five: The Unwritten Rule Books**

Comments from the interviews uncovered that there are expectations of not only CS but also of individuals at the UN, conducting themselves in specific manners. However, it was remarked that those pieces of knowledge are passed down, they are not inherently known nor written about nor outwardly expressed as requirements. This can prove to be challenging for those that do not have a mentor that can teach them those expectations of conduct.

Participant DD shared: ‘there is an understanding that you don’t tweet in a closed meeting. There are these rules that you should follow and that sort of ruins our space a little bit… they’re unspoken… there’s like a list somewhere and nobody tells you… UN is an interesting piece. There’s no way to learn it, unless you’re in it and I’m still learning every day. I dress differently, I act differently, I speak differently in the UN… it’s more protocol. If I spoke the way I do at the UN outside the UN, I would probably come across [as] uppity… I had to say excellencies in my presentation, and you give thanks to everybody on the panel. It’s this very formal protocol which is sort of place and time that you have to do it, or it doesn’t look good if you don’t do it… one of my colleagues, I’m very lucky, she’s the former diplomat… she taught me initially how to read between the lines when a Member State says something, what did they actually really mean and protocol and everything on how we address certain things. That was the best learning ever and this was interesting. Recently I’ve been [in] negotiation… and the Country A senior administration, they do not have career diplomats. I don’t even know who they’re appointing and there’s turnover and you can tell because these people speaking aren’t… you can’t read between the lines. They say exactly what they mean and it’s jarring actually, because this isn’t the language you use at the UN. It is offensive and it is offending people in the room. It’s just really interesting to observe what’s happening and you see these horrid diplomats or whatever they are from Country A and it’s interesting. It ruins the whole room and you see first time ever; you see other diplomats laughing and making comments when Country A speaks… you would never have other Member States speaking or laughing while they spoke and now it’s in a very, it’s really embarrassing’.
Theme Twenty-Six: From Coin to Compassion – Corporate Collaboration
There were negative comments from the interviews in regard to the private sector being included in the work of international development. Participant F shared: ‘I just don’t get how we let big business rule the planet the way that it is, to the detriment of all of us. We have twelve years before it’s too late, before climate change is out of control… business can be a huge driver. I think it’s also a huge obstacle, you see things like the fossil fuel companies, oil, coal, gas companies that are still investing so much money in fossil fuels, that are destroying the planet, causing pollution, hurting people, in particular children’s health and preventing investment in clean energy. Not all companies, but a lot of companies still have so much vested interest in fossil fuels, and that’s a big problem’. Interviewee Y supported this view: ‘profit maximising agents are influencing outcomes rather than outcomes being reflective of the well-being of people and the environment in which they live’. Therefore, ‘the biggest challenges the UN faces is the concern that people will use the UN platform to promote their own business rather than use that platform to help others… where millionaires, for example, today would much rather see a humane company, which is focused on helping others… so how do we evaluate this approach’ Interview II.
Another perspective was remarked that the private sector itself is reviewing their own approach: ‘companies are now saying that actually it [CSR] should be the core of what we’re doing’ Interview HH.

Theme Twenty-Seven: The Necessity of Principled Purpose
There were a number of remarks made in the interviews around the necessity of ethical morals and each actors’ values being in alignment with the original purpose of the UN to ensure principled decision-making on all levels. Unwavering integrity for ethical decision-making is essential, even when confronted with adversity.

Here are a few excerpts that provided that overview: ‘it works best when [it is] genuinely, honest, and true to the foundational values of the United Nations’ Interview BB, ‘moral consciousness is extremely important’ Interview V, ‘business, government, and Civil Society are seen as the key actors working symbiotically towards public good or that they should work towards public good… [for] the earth, with caring and compassion, and our ability to enable… a greater balance amongst those [key actors] is gonna be critical for us to navigate the future. Therefore, Civil Society… and the UN often, when acting symbiotically, are able to articulate those values and inspire people with those values in a way that helps all of the actors to transcend from a position of confrontation and self-maximisation to one which is about recognising an enlightened self-interest’ Interview Y, and ‘that is where principles and ideals like the UN Charter and the Human Rights Declaration, those are like compasses’ Interview NN.

Theme Twenty-eight: The Ticking of Unavailable Time
An overwhelming consensus was evidenced in the data in regard to a deep sense of urgency being needed for reform for the UN and CS relationship. This was expressed by both UN and CS participants.

A selection of those comments included: ‘absolute urgency’, ‘the time is quite urgent, and we need to work together. At the end of the day we are all on the same
team’, ‘we’ve got an amazing opportunity in the next two years’, ‘this is urgent’, ‘there’s an extreme urgency for climate change’, ‘as soon as possible’, ‘the urgency is now yes, needs to be done now’, ‘the sooner the better’, ‘right now - there is an urgency’, ‘there’s a huge urgency’, ‘the sooner the better’, ‘urgent for this to happen right now’, and ‘actually restructuring of the system through the UN with the Civil Society should happen urgently’.

**Part 2**

**Presentation of Round 2 of Interviews**

Part 2 shows the proposed model for reform from conceptual findings that arose from the data collected in the first round of the interviews and the systematic literature review. This was presented at the beginning of second set of the interviews.

**The Proposed Model for Reform**

The proposed reform for the United Nations relationship with Civil Society was presented on the second round of interviews. The way it was described was like a tree with a lot of leaves and deep roots. However, given the time, only a few leaves of the tree could be presented, and each leaf had further evidence behind it. In addition, in staying aligned with a participatory action research method (see Chapter 3), it was not a complete proposal that was presented, rather a concept was shared with the invitation to reflect on it in the second round of interviews to allow for a truly organic potential solution to transpire. Please see the appendix for the presentation.

The presentation began with informing the participants who their colleagues were in the research. Forty-three participants participated, although the goal was 15 to 20. At the end of the interviews, one person was named three times and one of my last interviewees had provided me with three names, all of which had already been named. This was as a result of the snowballing sampling technique that was applied (see Chapter 3). Essentially, the loop had closed in on itself. They all worked in international capacities. They all held highest level key stakeholder positions and both people from the UN and CS participated.

A broad-brush visual representation was shown of the current UN relationship with CS. To prepare for the presentation of the proposed reform, participants were informed that it was based on the results of the findings of the research from both the literature and the first round of interviews. The proposed reform took into account the various challenges that were raised and the positive elements that the reform could build on.

The proposed reform is writing a 2nd Charter of the United Nations – a Civil Society United Nations (see Figure 4.1). The current Charter of the UN remains and a 2nd Charter that is for CS is written. The two Charters run parallel to each other. The current UN Charter is intergovernmental and is comprised of Member States. The 2nd Charter is a Civil Society United Nations (CSUN) that has an international body, but equally important, it is comprised of national CSUN bodies as well. This now
provides links for direct and clear pathways of communication, engagement, and collaboration between the UN and CS, both on international and national levels.

Many additional lines could have been added to the Figure 4.1, however for visual simplicity and clarity this was not done. Though another strong tie could also be national CSUN bodies assisting other national CSUN bodies. National CSUN bodies can provide feedback, input, evidence, and so forth to the international CSUN body. The international CSUN body can work with the international UN intergovernmental body and vice versa. The international CSUN body can provide information, assistance, and so forth to the national CSUN bodies.

Currently, the UN has about 131 in-country teams; they would have direct access to CS through their connection with the CSUN national bodies. Member States that do work closely with their CS would also now have direct access to one national body that would comprise of their CS. For Member States that do not work closely with their CS, they would continue their work with the current UN in-country team, which would have a link to the national CSUN body.

In the spirit of participatory action research, I added that I personally have witnessed, on a number of different accounts, my government seeking to reach out to CS for their engagement, yet struggling to do so because there currently is no clear pathway or organised platform for them to connect to. In addition, it is unclear as to who of CS is missing and how to reach out to them. Therefore, the national CSUN bodies would allow for this type of engagement to be strengthen with governments who are seeking CS collaboration.

**Figure 4.1 The Proposed Reform as Presented in Round 2 of the Interviews**

This is the overall broad concept of the proposed model for reform. At this stage of the presentation, I took a step back to build the argument as to how this was developed and added further details to the reform concept presented.
This is further presented in the appendix.

**Part 3**

**Findings of Round 2 of Interviews**

Part 3 shows the findings of the second round of interviews, which were conducted in late 2019 and the very early part of 2020, before the occurrence of the coronavirus crisis. After the presentation of the proposed model for reform, which was based on the conceptual findings from the first round of interviews and the systematic literature review, the semi-structured interview began for the second round of field research (see appendix for the list of questions).

There are four sections to Part 3 of Chapter 4. The first section provides the initial feedback from participants on their reaction to the proposed model for reform. The next section reflects back on the themes that were uncovered in the literature review and the first round of field research interviews. The third section provides the collection of responses to the questions that were asked in the second round of interviews. The last and fourth section includes a collection of excerpts on concluding remarks from the interviewees.

In staying aligned with participatory action research (see Chapter 3), which includes the professional approach, the findings from Round 2 are not labelled as positive or negative in terms of their reaction to the proposed model. Instead the responses are treated as an exploration of the proposed idea.

**Section One: Initial Feedback**

The first question that was asked in the second round of interviews related to their initial response to the proposed model. The vast majority were interested, responded to the idea with agreement and were encouraging. A couple of interviewees were hopeful but also cautionary. A very small amount thought the suggested reform was not feasible. One participant remarked on amending the existing Charter and one thought it was still not ambitious enough.

The majority respondents remarked that the proposed reform was interesting and that it was a very good idea or held promise: ‘it’s very interesting. I haven’t thought about it at all. So therefore, it’s new for me. My first reaction is to say, oh, this might be a vehicle for something very interesting’ Interview BBB, ‘it’s an extremely good idea’ Interview ZZ, ‘it’s really ambitious and I like that’ Interview CCC, ‘I’m really excited about it’ Interview RR, ‘my initial response is fantastic. It’s just what I hoped here because you’ve come up with a strong framework, it really has a chance of happening’ Interview AAA, ‘it’s a very exciting project and full of ideas’ Interview YYY, ‘I think it’s an interesting idea to have this 2nd Charter. One reason why I think it’s not only interesting, I think it’s an innovation and it has potential. For me, it has a lot of potential, particularly, within the SDG context, the school, the consultation, the stakeholder platforms, that kind of one off. Each year we bring together people and it’s not a consistent, ongoing structure that’s formalised’ Interview UUU, ‘it sounds really interesting… it’s great within the SDGs and we moved to this universal…
going from the national to the international, I like that piece, I think would be so important’ Interview TT, ‘that’s a super interesting idea and I had never even thought of it or imagined it’ Interview UU, ‘I think this is interesting’ Interview PPP, ‘this is quite an incredible proposal… very radical for sure’ Interview YY, ‘great ideal’ Interview XX, ‘it’s a good thing because they [UN & CS] need to be more organised. And then they [both] become more forceful’ Interview GGG, ‘the idea of the 2nd Charter that kind of comes from Civil Society - it is really intriguing to me’ Interview MMM, ‘I haven’t heard an idea like this before, maybe it’s absolutely new. It’s yours. I think it’s a really exciting and extraordinary new idea: a 2nd Charter’ Interview VV, and lastly, ‘I think it’s really innovative. It’s very interesting. It’s very needed’ Interview RRR.

The following reflect the quotes that were encouraging: ‘it’s developing in good logical way forward. You’ve certainly come up with a strong proposal, which would mitigate a number of the inherent flaws in the relationship between CSO and the United Nations. I mean, obviously, it can’t address the flaws that relate to the United Nations itself, but it can address that relationship. So, I like the idea of a 2nd Charter. That’s good. Thank you’ Interview SS, ‘the problem you are trying to resolve is real, so it’s good that you’re thinking about how to do it’ Interview DDD, ‘the research is excellent. I love a lot of the quotes. I think it’s important if you could pull this off, it would be marvellous. I am an optimist’ Interview JJJ, ‘a very concrete way of actually addressing what I consider the serious breakdown of multilateralism that’s occurring at the moment. And so I think it [2nd Charter] will give that opportunity, both in terms of Member States and Civil Society to actually come together in another platform, in a platform to actually begin to renegotiation based on the evidence that is coming forward here in the different aspects that would support the UN and support struggles [with] Civil Society’ Interview QQQ, ‘I like what you’ve already written out. I like the idea of the 2nd Chapter, it sounds like a good start for progress’ Interview OOO, ‘it’s well worth a discussion… this is very germane to what UN2020… what I like about the idea is that it puts the research evidence, that you’ve compiled, within a rational framework’ Interview WWW, and ‘I concur with much of what I’ve seen [regarding presentation]. I think it’s a very timely channel. The topic shows all the right ones’ Interview NNN.

A couple of participants were hopeful but also cautionary: ‘you guys [academia] are needed because you need to do these kinds of things, unpack all the different pieces. While you were presenting, I was having an inner dialogue with myself, you shouldn’t be cynical. We need to hope that this could work. I really like your acknowledgement of the proposal of a 2nd Charter under the realisation that there is the power dynamic in the current system that is hard to break, [it] is hard for the group that has less power to acquire more power… but I think that your reasoning for proposing a separate UN Charter is based on the lucid analysis of the imbalances of power of the current system. So, my other voice is saying, you should have hope’ Interview TTT, and ‘you’re trying to come up with a systemic mechanism solution to things you’ve been hearing, so whether a 2nd Charter is the answer, I can’t say. I don’t really have thoughts on that, because it’s very kind of initial thinking, so what that would actually look like and be flushed out… within that 2nd Charter can the ideas within that, how can they be translated into making changes within the current mechanisms, because there’re issues’ Interview LLL.
Only a very small number did not think the idea was feasible: ‘I think your broad recommendation, which is a Civil Society UN 2nd Charter, is simply not going to happen in the way you described it because, let me give a couple of examples where I think if you go down to more detail, clearly most of your interviewees were enthusiastic about the SDGs. I’m not actually so enthusiastic myself. But anyway, clearly what comes through, the SDGs are a great agenda. Why is that? That’s partly because Civil Society were very influential in the UN normative process that produced the SDGs. Therefore, what they have is something that is in their own likeness, which is great’ Interview WW, ‘the idea, just initially, to have an agreement between UN Member States and Civil Society and the creation of a 2nd Charter is just crazy’ Interview XXX, and ‘what I would like to imagine is that there will be a greater UN. That greater UN would be the UN bodies and all of Civil Society that are supporting the aims of the UN… I see immense problems with the 2nd Charter… I can’t see the political will and I can’t see the mechanism which would create it. But if there were to be something perceived to be a greater United Nations, that harmonious relationship between the UN system and the UN or the inter multinational organ… we’re talking about 10s of thousands [of NGOs], but assuming that they could, through the SDGs, or something like that or have a movement of a greater United Nations, inspired by some ennobling idea. I could see that happening provided there were, there was a nucleus of people with the political dimension of Kofi Annan’ Interview FFF.

One interviewee remarked on amending the existing Charter: ‘you lay out a very strong case for the 2nd Charter. The big question is, is there a way in which many of your observations you have made, especially on the weaknesses of the UN system as it is today, and also Civil Society as it is today, whether there is a way to improve and strengthen and build a stronger mission to the UN, without necessarily adopting a 2nd Charter? In other words, why would we not go for an amended Charter’ Interview VVV.

One participant acknowledged that the key issues identified in the research were real but that the proposed reform was still not enough of a change: ‘it’s fascinating research you’re doing... what you propose is a very UN idea. It’s typical UN, lets create another thing in parallel to what we have rather than changing what we have for the good. My reaction is that it’s not ambitious enough. I think we should have an overhaul of the Charter to create the UN of the people, the United People, not the United Nations. Why am I saying that? Because when the United Nation was born it was out of the idea of the nation state right. And as you said, and your respondents said, that the world has changed. Now, the nation states are being questioned because corporations are stronger than them. Citizens don’t feel that they are being served by the nation states. So, the UN itself is in crisis because of that. I think the survival of the UN depends on it becoming everyone’s United… you propose an innovative idea… the motives that justify your proposal are very, very, very true, that I don’t challenge, that these are issues. I think, you’ve really been able to capture in this research the key issues, but I’m wondering if you’d like to maybe think about a series of options, rather than just one option… this proposal is quite radical, but at the same time, for people who have been around, it’s maybe not so radical’ Interview EEE.

Only two participants did not have any initial feedback, instead the interview went
straight into an exploration of the idea.

**Section Two: Findings in Relation to the Literature Review and First Round of Interviews – The Three Inherent Flaws and Twenty-Eight Themes**

The findings from Round 2 of the field research interviews are reflected back on the three inherent flaws and 28 themes that were uncovered earlier in the research (see Chapter 2 and Part 1 of this chapter). This section analysed the data from the last interview and uncovered that all three inherent flaws and 26 of the 28 themes were recognised again in the second interview. The cross comparison found that theme 12 (Play Leads to Meaningful Action - Social Requirements) and theme 25 (The Unwritten Rule Books) were the only two not to be mentioned again, this is discussed further in the appendix (see the full list of themes and flaws presented at the beginning of the thesis).

As already seen in the responses from the initial feedback, and continuing throughout the findings of Round 2, responses from the participants validated the issues that were uncovered and presented to them in the second interview. As highlighted by this comment: ‘you’re right about the major issues. I think you’ve quite correctly identified the issues that we have’ Interview FFF. There were different responses to the overall proposed reform. However, the issues or themes themselves of the relationship dynamic between CS and UN were validated by direct statements in their responses, as seen in the example just provided, and validated again indirectly through the content of the data.

This section briefly highlights the continued evidence of the flaws and themes and touches on new findings in relation to the discussion on the 2nd Charter, a proposed model developed after Round 1 of interviews and presented back to participants in Round 2. The themes are integrated further in section three below. Often the content of a remark touched on more than one theme or flaw and this can be seen throughout all four sections.

The inherent flaws are more of an overall finding of the themes, as discussed in Chapter 2. Therefore, often individual themes support these flaws. However, specific comments relating to the flaws did come up again in the last interview.

This is further presented in the appendix.

**Section Three: Findings from the Second Round of Interviews on Practical Applications**

This next section is categorised by the responses provided from the participants in relation to the questions that were asked in the second round of interviews. In the spirit of action research, this section discusses eight questions on the practical applications of the proposed model for reform of the UN and CS relationship, although the themes continued to emerge in their responses.

The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured method (see Chapter 3), hence, responses to questions that naturally arose will have been captured in the other sections of this part of Chapter 4. Not all questions listed in the question sheet from
Round 2 (see appendix) appear in this section, this is because the responses would have been integrated into other areas. For example, the question “How to make it better?” may have contained a response regarding content of the 2nd Charter and therefore would have been moved under that question.

**What needs to be considered to implement it?**
What needs to be considered for implementing a potential 2nd Charter was asked. Responses included topics of the necessity to be fully integrated with the 1st Charter, for there to be an organising body to ensure this integration, elements to watch for were raised, what both the UN and CS would get out of a 2nd Charter, and who would need to support the proposed model. This is followed by responses that once again touched on a number of the different themes. In conclusion, for this particular question that was asked, examples of previous elements to learn from arose from the data. Figure 4.2 provides an illustration of the collated data relating to this interview question (further excerpts can be found in the appendix).

**Figure 4.2 What Needs to be Considered to Implement a 2nd Charter?**

---

**How should it be implemented?**
If a 2nd Charter was considered as a model for reform, how should it be implemented was explored through the second round of interviews. A number of different topics were covered. These included the importance of trust, utilising the SDG process and bringing together all actors. The idea of a 2nd Charter was considered as a rebirth, but that it could not be a ‘ticking the box’ exercise. Other topics included the need for a genuine consultation process, things to be aware of, reflections of a 2nd Charter being inside or outside the UN, General Assembly involvement, and to design a strategy to build momentum for the idea itself. This is followed by a number of the different themes that once again came up in the data. To conclude this question, an analysis of UNA, United Nations Association, and its role in the proposed model is reviewed, to see if an existing model could be applied.
Trust was identified as an imperative part of the process, as one respondent highlights: ‘how to get to the 2^nd^ Charter is all, I think, the process of trust building, discussions, and having the research as a background, but inviting people to come up with their own conclusions. What are the benefits of actually having this? How can it enhance both parties in terms of bringing forward issues? So even the streamlining of funding, even having that looked at and thought about but having people almost reinvent... will it be the same as this [the research] or will it add a new dimension... unless there’s trust there, and openness to begin with, nothing will happen’ Interview QQQ. In exploring the concept of trust further to uncover how that is built, the following response was provided: ‘[having a] good discussion on the presentation of the report and presenting it widely, having good visibility, inviting people to think about it or come up with new ideas almost to reinvent the research, so that people are finding these experiences themselves from the discussion… would involve Member States and Civil Society, both together to generate the trust’ Interview QQQ.

This participant agreed in bringing all actors together: ‘all these different actors and people have to get together and start moving towards it’ Interview BBB. This was further supported by the following comment and brings in the idea of mimicking the SDG process: ‘like you said, doing a process similar to the SDGs... and some sort of team, managing whatever that collective is to make sure that they’re bringing people in... similar to probably the SDG development, having a series of meetings with different Civil Society groups. [Though.] probably not so much topically like they did with the SDGs. But definitely with the Member States and providing forum, multiple forums, for people to feed in their voices, provide written comment, review drafts of things. Take it back to their government, the UN, and yes, all the players. So, providing multiple iterations of a drafting process, but having a core group of people that lead that. But then making sure that there are many rounds, because that was the thing with the SDG development. There are many rounds for people to feed in. And there’s multiple meetings at country level, as well as the big hubs’ Interview RRR.

The 2^nd^ Charter was again acknowledged as a rejuvenation or rebirth of the UN: ‘I think people will recognise that the change in how we engage with Civil Society would also have some type of long-term benefit to potentially being the rebirth’ Interview CCC. However, it cannot be ‘just like ticking the box... we need to make sure that that doesn’t happen with the 2^nd^ Charter... we need to make sure that this space has gravity’ Interview TTT.

A genuine consultation process was a frequent reply in how to implement a potential 2^nd^ Charter: ‘it would still have to be a pretty long consultative process to make sure that CSOs feel like they have some say, in the arrangement and how its structured, as well as making sure this isn’t something that is just seen as a way of appeasing CSOs, which would be problematic and harm the relationship’ Interview CCC, ‘it sounds like a great idea, make sure a lot of that is well advertised, so that it has a really big reach so that the consultation is as accessible as possible with all sorts... would need a lot of different inputs, everything from online surveys... open ended surveys, to then focus group discussions and working groups on issues... making sure that the consultation process is really accessible and very meaningful and
directed by Civil Society’ Interview YY, ‘making sure that there’s genuine consultation… to be successful is buy-in from as many sections of the global society as possible. And of course, including the main influencers and players, as in government and so on. That’s where the challenge is, who from Civil Society sits at the table’ Interview RRR, and finally: ‘the process of consultation, it has to be as wide as possible… in the process of setting it up, it has to attempt to be as inclusive as possible’ Interview UUU.

As seen in the previous question, potential challenges arose again in the responses to this question. The following response brought up a number of them: ‘it would have to obviously be Civil Society led… possibly need to have some kind of level of Member State and UN involvement because for example, how it relates to the behaviour or access of NGOs to the UN. The issue you raised of financing, that would need some kind of buy-in from states. I think they should definitely be involved there as observers… some kind of people’s convention. But it will have to be really well organised because if you got 200 NGOs in a room and ask them to come up with a new Charter, they would never manage it. So, it’s going to be [a] very careful process over a couple of years… I just mean not rush… involving all the regions, allowing everybody… then have facilitators to lead on that’ Interview DDD. In addition, it should not be too firm and rigid: ‘it has to be a little bit open ended… you have to have flexibility of this, of the spirit’ Interview OOO. One participant added: ‘be aware of those obstacles and have a strategy for over-coming them’ Interview YYY.

Further reflecting on how to implement a potential 2nd Charter, consideration as to whether it should sit outside or inside the UN came up: ‘the key is to think what you want from it… decide what it’s going to cover; self-regulation, access issues, financing - then the process [gets] set up very clearly, with that in mind. Either something outside the UN, but then you don’t get the logo and the branding or something in the UN, in which case it would need to be started by a UN resolution by a few states. That would be a few states ideally in each region’ Interview DDD.

Should it be a part of the UN then ‘the only way this could be passed really is to go through the General Assembly’ Interview JJJ. This process is explored in more depth: ‘[it] would require a resolution of the General Assembly to kick start it. Certain states could easily add amendments to that resolution to insist on state participation in these regional consultations and then once they’re there, they could try to add stuff, which would be kind of anti-NGO… you either do it within the UN, in which case, you have to play these games. And the way to prevent it [anti-NGO content] is to make sure those amendments are rejected, which probably they would be, but there’s no guarantee. Or you’re doing these things outside of the UN, which means Civil Society maintains all the control, and so there’s less danger, but it would possibly have less impact and you wouldn’t be able to use the logo… the group of main sponsors would put forward resolution calling for Civil Society consultations on a 2nd Charter. And then there would be negotiations and certain countries would try and amend it, but if the main sponsors said no, then the draft resolution would go to the General Assembly and be voted on. But before it’s voted on, states have an opportunity to put forward what are called hostile amendments, which can completely change the resolution, but then each of those amendments are voted on before the overall resolution is voted on’ Interview DDD.
This participant identified a strategy for implementation that includes planting the seed of the idea before creating the 2nd Charter: ‘it’s a big idea. I think of the viability question because I have seen so much here. We’re moving forward in a way that tries to manage some of those potential barriers that people could throw up to this kind of big idea and just like the strategic element of this is most important, having a real strategy around socialising the idea, of developing it, and getting buy-in from the right kind of people that won’t allow two or three naysayers to shoot it down… so thinking about how some of these existing networks and mechanisms [at the UN] factor into an idea like this, but also how they can potentially be utilised or how to manage them because there are people who care about those existing channels and they take them very seriously and might be threatened by this new idea. So how it’s presented to them and the opportunities for them to engage’ Interview MMM.

The following response seems to reply to the previous comment: ‘just getting the process going of building a “We the People” manifesto bottom up is highly attractive. I think it’s a very important counterweight to current trends of economic nationalism, ethnic chauvinism and the erosion of international role, including trade and investment. So, I would start with the momentum and lead some of the structural questions a little bit for the future, you won’t be able to solve everything. If the momentum is strong and you feel the positive brand affinity with the movement, then many things will fall in place’ Interview NNN.

The 2nd Charter was seen to hold potential for accountability measures, theme five: ‘then another six months later, they come back to them [government] saying, “Right show us examples of what you have done, what changes you’ve made?” So, what I really liked about that was, there was validation, there’s also accountability… and there’s checks and balances, and we measured it’ Interview GGG.

Theme seven, on the resistance of sharing power arose again: ‘some of the governments are not going to be a fan of this idea. They try to actively persecute Civil Society actors in their own country, will not get behind this kind of idea because they’re going to see it as a potential diminishing of their influence at the UN’ Interview MMM.

However, solutions are provided: ‘within the UN system, you need to find one or more Member States who would be your sponsor, so to speak, to push the idea’ Interview WWW, ‘you have different political environments around different countries, which would mean that in terms of writing a Charter, which would enable it to be devolved to the national basis, [it] might challenge some of the legal systems in some countries in terms of democratic right to speak… however, one of the things that happened in the initial stages of the development of the United Nations Charter was that a limited number of countries, Member States, signed up to that point. So, maybe you start with a similar situation for a 2nd CS UN Charter’ Interview SS, and ‘much smaller organisation participation, how to make sure that that happens and how to ensure that Member States who are not allies to Civil Society would not have the chance to obstruct this process… I like the observation ideas that Member States would be invited to observe the consultations and would be expected to observe the consultations, but not try and direct the consultations. Understand that
Civil Society has its own ways of engaging with the UN, its own expectations from the UN, its own expertise in dealing with the UN. And that it doesn’t always need to come from them or be directed by them. But it should be observed by them in order to demonstrate their willingness to cooperate with society organisations, and that Member States, who choose not to observe this process, would be making quite a statement themselves about how they engage with society in their own country and how they perceive, what they perceive the value of society to be. That, I hope, would be negatively construed or would be pushed back against. You are expected to observe this process out of respect.' Interview YY. As it is acknowledged that ‘you need political will to do that [2nd Charter]’ Interview FFF.

Regarding how to implement a potential 2nd Charter, the following remark was made in respect to the funding competition (theme 8) between INGOs (International Non-Governmental Organisations) and the UN: ‘to help convince people that might be a little hesitant within the UN that this is really needed… when you look at UN Agency G… competing with other international organisations for that space, if this can help elevate the status view, than people would be really interested in [it]’ Interview CCC.

Again, process and structure, theme nine, were words that echoed within the evidence: ‘be very clear about process and structure and what is the effective outcomes of a new [Charter], what it will actually deliver in the longer term, short, and medium term. That would help so people can see that clearly’ Interview UUU.

Although many comments in the data reflected on the need to define what CS is, theme 10, this participant provided a different perspective: ‘my concern would be that by coming up with this 2nd Charter, you are codifying something which will include and exclude and which will put on a sort of legitimacy straightjacket to a Civil Society which is so diverse, so polycentric, so heterogeneous… and I’m not sure it’s even desirable, to try and codify that too much. I think there is a beauty. There is an efficiency. There is a remarkable effectiveness to the polycentric plurality of Civil Society. It’s one of the strengths of Civil Society over and above government. Government tends to be terribly structured and organised and therefore, quite rigid, but Civil Society isn’t… Therefore, the very diversity of Civil Society is to me a thing of wonder. It is not a weakness of Civil Society’ Interview WW.

Theme 11, inclusion, was a popular response to this question. The following excerpts highlighted this need in terms of how to implement the proposed reform: ‘the most important part is to include those who today are excluded… because they bring a knowledge that nobody else holds’ Interview HHH, ‘you’ve got a good methodology really but keep testing it with different people… widening it as far as possible’ Interview YYY, ‘start with the least represented voices… start by having the most marginalised and actually have them sit at the table, have everything turned around. And see how things will change’ Interview XX, and ‘it’s the global conversation that will bring it [the 2nd Charter] about. The more people that can be invited… talking from the highest levels, right down to the local communities where they feel [it]. I mean, “We the Peoples” the 1st Charter, for this, the 2nd Charter, as I feel it in my bones now… everybody together in the process of making it, not something that was done by a few Member States’ Interview QQQ.

To further this idea, the concept of different constituencies was offered: ‘create
something that is inclusive, where you add the government constituency as it is now. Then you have inside the UN another constituency, maybe for [the] private sector, another constituency for Civil Society, maybe another constituency for academia, you can include more’ Interview EEE. This was further supported: ‘because we now have better social media, that schools may be linked in’ Interview AAA.

In the presentation, it was noted that a collated voice did not mean that all needed to agree, but that the 2nd Charter offered a process for a collected voice. This was described in the following quote: ‘we understand the view that is being taken, we take a different one and it needs to be shown as a different one. That it allows us to compose enough sentences, that it says there is another view on this and another methodology for implementation’ Interview VV.

It was acknowledged that a 2nd Charter could hold the potential for inclusion: ‘the Civil Society Charter would strengthen the capacity. And people could see that their voices could be heard if they went through the right processes’ Interview AAA.

A different response was provided to the concept of in-country CSUN bodies, theme 16: ‘since we’re creating this, could we be even more radical, because now with the internet, the power of nation states is declining… digital citizenry has changed the shape of this concept of nation states and even of the world… I don’t know that I really think that it’s a good idea to put this in within the nation state idea. But that somehow, it’s an alternative to the existing system that has failed. It’s failing us as we speak because it’s still looking at the old traditional nation state divide. We need to work together as a global community. I actually think that the 2nd Charter should be global, it should be truly global and not have the national Civil Society UN, just have the global… some other way to define the new global system that we need that [is] gonna save us from our own destruction… like 200 thousand people a day are coming on to the internet for the first time. And again, I forget the actual figure, but like they’re talking about global connectivity and not that far distant future… and so, this would be truly “We the People”… [the unheard voice] they do have a voice on the internet, more than anywhere else. That’s how they’re making their voice heard. That’s how they’re being empowered in countries where they don’t have freedom of speech’ Interview UU.

However, the importance of national CSUN bodies did continue to arise: ‘the other thing that jumped up as a good idea is the need for coordination amongst NGOs… internationally there is a certain level of coordination and I think I can’t see it really changing beyond what it is to be honest, but at national level [it] is really important… why, because we’ve done a lot of work on national implementation of international human rights, obligations and commitments, and their Civil Society has a potentially crucial role because they’re the natural ones at national level to hold the government, to know if the government [is] implementing this, if the government is supposed to pass legislation on domestic violence, did it do so? And is that legislation any good? Only the nationals [know], we can’t know that from here [international space] it is the national Civil Society. But the problem is national level, there they are generally so divided… they don’t talk to each other… because you can’t. As an individual NGO with a very narrow role you can’t have an overview of all of the recommendations the state is supposed to implement. Whether it’s doing so or not, only by all the NGOs working together, can you do that. A very good example
that you should look at, in that regard, where they have moved towards a law... for human rights is Country Y... that allowed them to almost kind of create a matrix which they then feed back into the UN. So then here in Geneva, we could know whether Country Y had implemented all the things they were supposed to implement or not' Interview DDD. This comment also touched on theme 13 in regard to human rights and theme 18 on collaboration.

Theme 17 on the importance of using lay person language continued: 'speak in a language that is not UN speak but everyday people speak' Interview AAA. In addition, knowledge transfer, which is a part of theme 17: ‘bespoke knowledge transfer of categories or departments, that can be really useful. But that’s something that collectively people could decide' Interview RR.

The collaboration and coordination, theme 18, that a 2nd Charter could provide, was seen to be worthy: ‘the bearing fruits of the outcome and the participation will in itself be the living document for moving forward... it initially becomes a living document until it is confirmed but when I say living, I'm not saying that it stops then when the document is actually presented and saying this is the way we’re moving forward, the experience itself is the trust and the relationship building. The whole thing about coordinating, realising we’re all on the same journey, even from different perspectives' Interview QQQ. This is further reflected on: ‘with having a UN Civil Society, there will be so many voices and that presents some challenges I would imagine, especially in very potentially complex societies where there might be internal conflict or various things between different groups... that would need to be addressed in-country. But country offices have to deal with that stuff anyway. Some of them, for example, will have special teams... there’s some stuff around structure on how, probably from management literature, that could be dealt with early on in the Charter... Where there’s potential synergy is across the SDGs... can we more collectively pool across SDGs where something like the UN Civil Society, where... the people in the health and the people in education are actually doing similar stuff, can we pull those resources [together]' Interview RR, and finally, ‘promoting collaboration, obviously is a really important one’ Interview XX.

The process of having virtual access to contribute to the development of the 2nd Charter is needed: ‘the 2030 agenda is a very good example of how Civil Society was included in an inclusive way more than ever before. We had these working groups, and I was part of all of it. Civil Society was invited to them, we were able to lobby Member States... that sort of participatory process, again, would be very helpful... so, you aren’t leaving out those local NGOs or those who can’t afford to come here. It would be good to somehow have an online platform or some sort of regional platform as well' Interview PPP. However, once complete ‘having a physical space is really important, similar to [UN] country offices... at the country level and then the international, because they also have regional offices. You could do regional, UN Civil Society, as well, and then a headquarters’ Interview RR. These comments relate to theme 19.

Having human resources, theme 20, properly managed was seen not only in the work itself but also in the consultation process of how to implement a 2nd Charter: ‘taking a similar approach to the SDGs and a very consultative process... you would need a lot of coordinating power of human resources to be able to do this well...
having funding to be able to make sure that people can do this as their job’ Interview YY.

The importance of the fundamental values of the UN, theme 27, was mentioned again: ‘I like this concept you discussed before. Starting with a vision of where we’re going, our aim, it is an inspiration to bridge some of the difficult challenges we are facing in terms of identifying pathways. I still like to believe that it’s key, we do not forget the lessons of history and the most fundamental essentials of human conduct and mutual trust. That is very fundamental. And some of which is very well framed in foundation documents of the United Nations’ Interview NNN

Urgency around UN and CS relationship reform again arose, theme 28: ‘it is urgent. And if you just even look at climate change, and how that will affect such things as migration, [with] more and more refugees’ Interview ZZ.

It was indicated that the time is right for this: ‘the timing is right because of what’s happening in the world’ Interview TTT, and ‘it would have to coincide with a big celebration of some kind, there are so many dates coming up like anniversaries. And it’s to be done at the highest level. It needs to have the head of government; it needs to be a really top-level claim’ Interview AAA. An example of an anniversary is the UN turning 75 in 2020.

It was explored as to whether or not UNAs were a place for the 2nd Charter: ‘UNA [may] be a model for providing this space, where the 2nd Charter [could] be negotiated’ Interview YY. However, ‘UNA maybe, but it should be a lot bigger than that because UNA is great for people who are students of foreign policy, for example’ Interview SSS, ‘I don’t see the UN associations being that strong’ Interview TT, and ‘there was this network of United Nations Associations... that sort of link between the UN and Civil Society at the national level... interesting to see why those perhaps haven’t worked or been as strong as they might have [been]... they’ve been very weak and haven’t had much of a voice... I wasn’t suggesting it should sit under UNAs, as much as looking at why the UNAs haven’t worked’ Interview UU.

As can be seen, there was a very low volume of evidence in the data around UNAs. Hence, if rejuvenation of UNAs is a potential place for the UN and CS relationship reform, very few international key stakeholders consider it as such, in fact their comments were more around what to learn from them as to why they are not working as strongly as they could be.

**Steps for implementation?**

The steps that need to be considered for implementation of a potential 2nd Charter was asked of the participants. In collating the responses, the following steps emerged, although some overlap existed: conduct background work, carry out initial conversations, followed by the involvement of the UN’s General Assembly, with consultations being the next step. However, the hierarchy of how those consultations are conducted is first discussed. This is followed by a conference to launch the proposed reform and finally a phase of pilot testing. The themes continued to emerge in the content of most excerpts, however, are not specifically pulled out in the analysis of the responses for this question, as it is related to identifying the steps to implement the potential 2nd Charter. Figure 4.3 provides an
illustrated overview of the steps to implement, as identified in the data, for the proposed model for reform.

Figure 4.3 Steps to Implement

The responses to this question are further presented in the appendix.

Any considerations on the UN brand?
Part of the exploration was that of branding and whether the UN brand would be utilised for the proposed 2nd Charter. It was intentionally asked as it had the potential to uncover a lot of concepts, such as ownership, brand protection, organisational structural implications, brand value, and more, depending on the participant’s lens through which they were answering the question. Therefore, varied responses were provided. Several responses saw the sharing of the brand between the two Charters as a strong symbol for the rejuvenation of the UN. It would also indicate equality between the two Charters; one remark viewed the brand as belonging to all due to a shared vision. However, it was acknowledged that the brand was strongly controlled. Another commented on the need for an independent CS brand. It was noted that a discussion could be held on this topic and the decisions included in the 2nd Charter. The current brand value is discussed at the end of this sub-heading.

Numerous responses indicated that the sharing of the brand with a CSUN can be symbolic for the sought UN rejuvenation: ‘you have to have a brand that shows we are together, governments and Civil Society… at the moment, it’s just the UN and that’s governments. And we don’t even have a brand Civil Society. So, it’s something to show that this is a real fundamental change, a complete change’ Interview ZZ, ‘if it was convinced that this was a way to improve the status and that it was already a central part of what the United Nations is supposed to be, then there’s an opportunity there’ Interview CCC, and ‘when we think about agencies within the UN, they all have slightly different branding. So, whether or not the 2nd Charter would have a variance of a UN brand that would look similar to an agency or whether you’re talking about rebranding the United Nations, overall, this could be an exciting initiative that helps kickstart a new age that really provides, maybe, a more authentic United Nations by the people represented. Communications would potentially be able to get behind something like that, if they believe that it was a way to solidify the status and improve the reputation of the United Nations. There’s an opportunity there’ Interview CCC. With perhaps a slight change: ‘should be the reflection of how these entities evolve. I could imagine the UN logo plus something. Again, not creating a completely new one that will shadow the existing one but just the UN logo with plus something. Maybe it’s not blue anymore… say red… purple’ Interview TTT.
The sharing of the brand would acknowledge equality between the two Charters: ‘if you’re working within an equal partnership, if the two are genuinely equal bodies and have the same significance, the branding should be equal to each. It shouldn’t be a question of license, because that implies the second body is a lesser body, because it’s having to have a license to use that branding. If they are to be equal, they must have access to the full UN branding’ Interview SS, and ‘it would be two things. One would be credibility, because we are part of this global United Nations. And also, we are saying we’re in, we’re part of this. And we’re proud to be part of it… it’s got implications, not just in terms of whether you have a license or not, but [the] much, much bigger issue [is] about how this is organised’ Interview RRR.

It was noted that the brand would be strongly controlled: ‘in the end, it [the brand] is going to be controlled and you might have to use some other name’ Interview BBB, ‘the brand is part of the status, the organisation, and so it’s fairly well guarded’ Interview CCC, and ‘UN logo is governed by the General Assembly. They keep a close eye on it, if they have to. and governments will restrain its use… I would advise to go for a new branding, to have operational flexibility, governments will shut you down. There will always be many governments who will shut you down. More than 50% of global GDP is today produced by autocratic systems. It’s true, it’s a fact, more than 50% of global GDP. Meaning western liberal thinking is already a minority. So, you can see a kind of resistance you will face there. That’s a sheer political reality of the year of 2019, which is likely to evolve further in this direction. The only way out is an independent brand, a new brand, that is modelled on the UN brand, so it builds on affinities with the UN brand, but it’s distinct from’ Interview NNN. To the point ‘you can’t use any UN [branding]’ Interview JJJ.

Brand ownership was thought to belong to all, due to a shared vision: ‘if you do it properly and people buy into it, then it should belong to everybody… it’s not like giving it away to another body…. it’s what people are working towards; you have a global understanding of what you want to achieve together’ Interview XX.

A comment indicated the need for an individual CS brand: ‘maybe Civil Society needs to create its own branding, because once it has its own branding, [it] basically has more clout… should utilise its strength in its talking for the people. So, it has the people behind it. And governments know to listen’ Interview GGG.

One participant suggested for brand management to become a part of the Charter: ‘that could be one of the things included in the Charter… branding’ Interview RR, and to wait on this: ‘ideally, you would be able to build this thing off to a point where you almost have no choice but to engage with it. But I probably wouldn’t raise the question too early because that might be a way of pushing people away more than bringing together’ Interview YYY. Part of the discussion should include: ‘this kind of brand is both the actual principle of branding and then the actual products… it’s important to have a brand link to exactly what the Charter will deliver, and it is a collective agreement on what [the] broad outcomes are, then you get buy-in to a common brand’ Interview UUU.

The brand value was commented on: ‘peaceful and prosperous world, that was the ennobling vision that they created. The branding was, at its most valuable, was
when they had a movement where lots of public support for it in an idealistic way, because they had this vision that was creating a better world, that was the actual terms that they used… people perceive the UN for what it is. It’s not universally respected. It’s seen in different parts of the world through different eyes’ Interview FFF.

**What content should go into the 2nd Charter?**

What content should be included in a potential 2nd Charter was asked of the participants. Overall comments were provided. A most frequent component was that of the inclusion of values. The integration of the two Charters should be reflected in the content. Governance, operational components, accountability and representation were also evident in the data. Another aspect was the need for structure, but to balance that with flexibility. As well as defining the roles of the UN and CS continued to be a popular response, as was inclusivity. The honest broker was mentioned and again, the strong need for dialogue and lay person language to be used. The themes continued to emerge in the data.

The analysis of the responses for this question begins with overall remarks that were made: ‘it’s the people’s agenda for the transformation of the world. And in some senses, the SDGs are the agenda, but we don’t have the structure… so, this is the peoples’ structure for the new world for the transformation. It’s the structure we’re looking for, how we will interact with each other, how we will trust the other to do the right thing’ Interview QQQ, ‘for me, the question is, when we talk about the UN, what do we need?’ Interview XX, ‘the value of what you’re proposing is that in one swoop, it would address all of the annoyances and grievances and difficulties that NGOs face in terms of access or use [and] different funding reporting requirements. You could potentially address the issue of state grievance with NGOs and its conduct on the part of certain NGOs, which is always something that nobody’s looked at before because the risks are too high to most NGOs. So, just leave the NGO Committee in New York to get on with it, because if we try and reform it, we could end up with something worse… it would have to be Civil Society lead, it would have to be very carefully organised, and probably with facilitators, you would have to have a very clear idea what it’s going to cover. Because there is a risk, whenever you launch into big exercise like that, that states, let’s say, are not friends of Civil Society or don’t have a particularly progressive view of international relations, could use it to make things worse. So, it needs to be carefully done, but in principle, at least to get it started and get people thinking about it. It should be fairly easy… in your presentation… it would be based around those themes, would have to’ Interview DDD.

The following quote provides an overall vision for the content of a potential 2nd Charter: ‘I can see a preamble that stems from the Charter that already exists… it’s more like an evolution rather than a subsidiary to the Charter that already exists. I haven’t read the Charter for such a long time, but I do think that it needs to be upgraded… because this is the new Charter the new, it’s a new world order… I can see a preamble that is saying what do we mean by “We the People”… because in international law and international politics, we say the states and the government is subject of law, right? We’re questioning that. That’s what we’re questioning. There needs to be an explanation, or a vision that shows what we’re trying to do here. We need to explain how this is going to relate to the old Charter… So, first is the
preamble and then articles that are inspirations, then how we, what we will do, what are we doing together? We should be very explicit about sharing power but working together. And then upholding the same principles, human rights... how that will relate to the decisions that are taken in the traditional structure... how do we relate to the ECOSOC... so, the first conference will be like a launch where people approve this Charter and the very first meeting right after that is establishing the global rules for CSO, meaningful participation in all the UN architecture, to link the two Charters... it's the balance between creating a parallel system, but not undermining the one that already exists... we need to decide the distance between the current structure with the new one. Not too close so it's meaning less, gets absorbed with the current power structure. But not too far that if it is successful it would take away that power' Interview TTT.

Another participant provided an overall account for the content: 'start with the basic principles again, and the basic principles should be the same as the existing UN... but then there has to be a second set of principles that address the issue of voice and participation of this group of actors, stakeholders within a society. Then the third, as you say, some parts of the Charter should get the operational components in terms of the funding. There has to be something on principles of governance... and this is part of the UN problem... too much of a technocratic approach. We need to have a focus on outcomes and equitable quality outcomes for all, but not in the way [of] the current approach... something around accountability... one of the critiques of the UN system is that given the power differential and the choice to opt out of a resolution, accountability suffers. So, how do you address that across the board? I think that is gonna have to be a fundamental [part] of the Charter for it to really work better than the current UN Charter' Interview UUU.

Values, theme 27, were frequently noted as an integral component to be included in the content of a 2nd Charter, drawing inspiration from the purpose of the creation of the UN and most importantly acknowledging human rights. The following comments reflect this: 'expressing the fundamental aspirations of humanity, which are of course peaceful coexistence, non-violence, which are supporting each other and the notion of compassion, which are working in the new era of the Anthropocene, which is the biggest systemic challenge humanity is facing, the Anthropocene, the carbon constrained world in which we're moving now. So, one will be the new Peoples' Manifesto that speaks to the aspirations of people everywhere. Going back to the drawing board, inspired by the UN Charter in the first place, I would argue, inspired by some of its normative but contextualized in our modern understanding, where we are and where we want to go to' Interview NNN, 'the pillars of sustainable development are very good. I would definitely include more on climate change this time, environment this time, inequalities, financing for development... of course, the rights, human rights, multi stakeholders and that's a very important piece, definitely peace, security. I mean, everything that the UN stands for' Interview PP, 'have a note of previous treaties and things... so often when we write things based on previous stuff, then we go further... any stuff about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights... the Beijing Platform for Action' Interview JJJ, 'we include, of course, the Human Rights Declaration' Interview HHH, 'the human rights... and realise that women are humans... we are completely equal... every person has to have the same rights going to them' Interview OOO, and 'in terms of the protections, which is probably where the need would be greatest, because the voice of Civil
Society in some countries may be less acceptable than in other countries, so there would need to be some level of protection, legal protection built in to that 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter... the human rights and the basic principles of an international voice... the Charter is a protection for every single person who lives in the world and the other things almost flow from it, like the fact that you have peace and security, that you have human rights, that they flow from the fact that that Charter is there to protect and sustain every single individual in the world' Interview SS.

Further quotes support the inclusion of values: ‘obviously there would have to be ethical considerations. There has to be also some sort of statement of common goals or missions’ Interview YYY, ‘vision and principles of ways of working so hopefully addressing the inherent flaws, so things around power within the UN and Civil Society, how they address UN partner or Civil Society partners that have different levels of power. So, bigger versus smaller, how they make sure everyone’s voices at the table’ Interview RR, and ‘definitely around the fact that Civil Society space has been shrinking, and that people who do work around peace building and human rights faced targeted intimidation and violence for the type of work that they do, and that they need to be supported to engage in these sorts of decision-making spaces and be protected... and something that makes it really clear, from what you’re saying, the blurring of lines, what the UN is responsible for, what Civil Society is responsible for, everything from advocacy to service delivery and programming, and maybe making it a bit clearer what the boundaries are between Civil Society and the human in that. In that respect, making clear what society’s expectations from UN Member States are... and reiterating a lot of stuff that’s in the 1st Charter around acting in good faith and not being deliberately obstructive... from both sides to say, we’re engaging with this. We as a society are engaging with this process in good faith and we therefore expect that you will as well. It can be framed in a really positive way as the UN is this wonderful space for dialogue... that only works if people aren’t looking to manipulate the way that the UN works for its own political purposes or be obnoxious about how the multilateral system can work’ Interview YY.

There were numerous comments on the importance of integration between the two Charters, for the purpose of effective engagement, whilst maintaining the strengths of CS. This was seen as a key component as the following excerpts highlight: ‘because if it says two parallel paths, there’s no real engagement... it’s not a seat at the table. It’s a table in another room... there needs to be some way of the engaging across the two Charters or how we speak into other UN processes would be part of it. To some extent, what support would this organisation be able to funnel down to members as well... what is the responsibility of the forum to Civil Society organisations on the ground, in country... what is the purpose for those individuals, those organisations’ Interview CCC, ‘envisage the intermission, the interconnections between the people who are identified within the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter and the people already captured there; as well but the states and then the agencies’ Interview XXX, ‘making sure the bridges are very clear... tie it in as much as possible with existing mechanisms’ Interview LLL, and ‘every time you segregated them to their own devices and things, it doesn’t work... we are calling for an integrated... we need for the 21st century a policymaking that is much more participatory... it’s integrated in the UN not creating a separate... an integration of Civil Society into a committee or creating a sub-body of the UN’ Interview EEE. However, it should be noted that; ‘they [CS] want to maintain their independence... is [the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter] going to be
compromising some of the strengths [of] Civil Society, look at their own strengths and advantages’ Interview VVV.

Different elements of governance arose in the data to be included in the proposed 2nd Charter. A couple of overall excerpts highlight this: ‘it’s a balance, on the one hand, how do we remain independent and protect our right to operate as Civil Society independent from government, at the same time we need - this is where human rights comes in - we need government to better respect the fundamental freedoms, civil, and political freedoms in these UN Charters and the UN treaties… in a certain sense, the intergovernmental system itself is a part of the problem. In other words, it’s not the solution. We need to go from an intergovernmental treaty bodies to a global constitution. In other words, constitutional democracy at the global level is the ultimate solution. And that requires, obviously, UN Charter reform on a big level… it’s an issue of governance. How can Civil Society be most effectively organised’ Interview WWW, and ‘the monitoring of the funds and who does it, what are the checks and balances in place… you have to have goals, you have to have a vision, you have to have a mission, you have to have resourcing, you have to have some kind of governance. You’ve got to have those rules of governance in there. And you’ve got to have measures for accountability and reporting and evaluation. As a minimum… you’d have to have rules of engagement. Under what circumstances do you have the power to act… the other way around from your previous question about branding and licensing. What makes you deserving of the license really… they need evaluating continuous [rules of engagement] because they don’t always continue to work as well as they might right at the beginning… it has a really strong governing body’ Interview VV.

More specific components of governance were also suggested, such as monitoring, bureaus, an election process, safeguards, transparency, enforcement, the decision-making process, funding, and communication: ‘a clear monitoring process’ Interview SS, ‘we also need monitoring’ Interview VV, ‘there has to be some ownership from Civil Society or representatives from Civil Society that changes with the bureau, so that you can put people up for election to be, say trustees for three to five years’ Interview AAA, ‘this bureaucracy… this is the risk I see for Civil Society, that it becomes this kind of thing over there, which doesn’t really serve the people that it’s supposed to serve. And it’s not representative because we don’t elect Civil Society, there is not an election process’ Interview EEE, ‘set some safeguards that ensure that there’s opportunities for equal participation in real decision-making… learning from some of the lessons on how you ensure broader participation but at the same time maintain some degree of transparent governance’ Interview UUU, ’[the] issue is really enforcement, if you look at one of the greatest achievements of the UN, [it] has been in establishing standards, codes, and norms of UN system in human rights, in humanitarian assistance in wars… if the UN… cannot enforce some of the international norms and standards today, how do you expect to do that under a 2nd Charter’ Interview VVV, and ‘something around decision-making, or at least principles around decision-making. And then something around streamlining funding and the bilateral communication between, or even trilateral’ Interview RR.

Calendar, agenda setting, and inclusivity of both CS and Member States in that process were also thought of: ‘timings of agendas… annual meetings or conventions or treaties, discussions… based on the UN calendar of events, which
Civil Societies are very dependent on. Society needs to really hustle to get itself organised in order to be able to participate in those, whereas Member States are de facto invited to participate in those discussion spaces. [So,] how to change the agenda so that Civil Society also has that de facto invitation and that Member States have to listen to Civil Society as much as Civil Society has to listen to Member States. Member States have five minutes long [to speak] and then Civil Society has two minutes [to speak] if they’re lucky, but if we run out of time, then Civil Society gets bumped to the next day or the next week and the ministers, who are relevant, might not be there anymore [at the meeting]. Even the really small stuff around agenda setting and being fair [about that]’ Interview YY.

Operational elements should be included in the content: ‘this being set up in the Charter and then the practical application of the Charter’ Interview RRR, ‘operational aspect is very important’ Interview VVV, ‘there needs to be agreement by the states on how people apply, how it is unrolled countrywide and how application to be a part of civil engagement and procedure. As well, you’d almost have some sort of report, perhaps, or guideline, definite guidelines about how you do it… what is the format? What is an agreed format for a witness statement? And nothing should be too complicated, because some of the grassroots organisations don’t have access to administrators’ Interview AAA, ‘funding is one that would be particularly helpful. A lot of NGOs suffer; talk about continually [how] they spend half the time raising money. That’s all we do, spend the time raising money rather than trying to deal with it [the issue] because they need the money and there is actually so much wealth in the world. Somehow then if a Charter like this allows NGOs to get on and do what they want to do… NGOs have a clear role and you have to have financing backing that strategy up. It’s about changing that global system. Some of the social entrepreneurs now are talking together around the world about how you do that… we’re not talking about playing around with bits of money with government but having a substantial fund that allows the social entrepreneurs access to change the system. These are high theoretical discussions’ Interview RRR, ‘get into to the operational stuff, how many times we will meet, how we will make decisions? How will we hold discussions? Are we going to have our resolutions? Are we going to vote? What is the weight of these resolutions? Who are these resolutions addressed to?’… the subsequent meetings are about specific issues. We want to discuss how to harmonise donors. The donor structure, that systematic whole and then make decisions about it’ Interview TTT.

Accountability, for both CS and the UN, is a frequently repeated theme throughout the research and shows up again in responses to this question on content for the proposed Charter. The following quotes remark on this: ‘the goals should be to set standards to encourage accountability’ Interview XX, ‘we do a lot of brainstorming with ambassadors and with NGOs about key challenges. And always this has come up, but recently, it’s come up even more. And that is the issue of what states see as NGO misbehaviour… there’s no accountability for them… there should be some self-regulatory system… it’s clear that the NGO committee in New York is supposed to monitor the behaviour of NGOs. If you look at the membership of the NGO committee in New York, it’s mainly countries that don’t allow NGOs in their own country… maybe through this 2nd Charter, there could be some kind of enhanced possibility of a bureau, for example, of NGOs and they could then hold other NGOs to account if they step outside the line’ Interview DDD, ‘at the UN, you have the
political pressure to show we’re [governments] doing this great job with 2030 Agenda, but you don’t have the actual reporting and committees like in Geneva, which is more powerful’ Interview PPP, and ‘what seems to be missing in all our UN conventions, whether it’s the CEDAW or the Convention on Political Civil Rights, Economic and Social Rights, a Children’s Charter, is [that] we have no sanctions, we have no timelines, we’ve got no limits, we’ve got no accountability processes. That’s got to be in there… we have to have to really learn from the what is missing, why these conventions look so wonderful on paper, and why they never actually get anywhere’ Interview ZZ.

Representation is one of the themes that continues to arise in the data and is noted again when asked about the content of a 2nd Charter: ‘one of the perpetual problems with Civil Society is how representative… and how do you deal with that’ Interview FFF, ‘how would you ensure the legitimacy of the people sitting at the table’ Interview WW, and ‘if they’re [CS] actually making decisions, which I’m assuming they want to have decision-making power… how do I know who’s going to be at the helm of this coalition? Sometimes, the loudest voices end up at the helm and they’re not representative of your broader wishes of the population’ Interview LLL.

The concept of structure, theme nine, and how that structure would come together arose from the field research: ‘some sort of practical structure for bringing people together [is needed], enabling them to discuss, to cooperate and [do] practical work. But, I hope, you can avoid having that structure too heavy; it’s got to be something that facilitates, rather than acting as a blockage or holding things back’ Interview YYY, ‘flatter structures that don’t necessarily have hierarchy’ Interview VV, and ‘discuss what would be a transformative structure for the workers, because we have to get beyond the nation state… it’s having something like this study in the background, but helping people to reflect, think and come up with the same or maybe better or different from their experience. It’s the dialogue and the framing of the dialogues and the inclusiveness of the dialogues, really urging people to be creative, to wonder; it’s towards transformation, it’s towards the global community, it’s towards people and planet… how we manage resources… the dialogue would create the content’ Interview QQQ.

Although the necessity of structure was noted, a balance for flexibility was mentioned and to maintain the agility and mobility of CS: ‘parts of it being flexible and parts of it being not flexible… something around their decision-making processes, similar to what we have with the Security Council. Who needs to be at the table to make decisions around that and that can have some flexibility, because that, as we’ve seen [with] the Security Council, things change over time, in terms of different countries’ influences’ Interview RR, ‘I’m just worried that… they become like a state, and then the risk of falling in the same dynamics of Member States or UN staff that are very far away in some cases from the reality of people. It would be better to keep it more as an agile structure that lobbies the UN from within… Civil Society can be very mobile, and we want to be able to keep that. The UN needs Civil Society to be mobile’ Interview EEE.

Defining the roles of responsibility between the UN and CS, theme 10, was noted: ‘clarifying roles and responsibilities… having a consultative and collaborative conversation around how these two organisations work [and] interact? What are
their roles? And how are they related? [It] would help overcome some stress and heartbreak in the future. It would help answer questions... can we clearly differentiate these [and] at the same time showing complementarity between them and how they’re engaging together’ Interview CCC, and ‘there are certain things that government should be doing that it often relies on Civil Society to do at the moment. There are certain things Civil Society should be doing that the governments do in other countries... and you don’t have people designing programmes and policies in areas that they’ve never actually implemented anything in... some countries will take longer to get there, in which case, the UN can be relied on more heavily, in terms of the Civil Society government relationship’ Interview RR. The articulation of the relationship for mobilisation purposes was mentioned: ‘don’t let it just be a symbol of something, a piece of paper. We’ve got enough of those. Okay. This is an effort to mobilise people... let’s all rally around this articulation of our relationship but... ultimately, it’s about mobilisation’ Interview XXX.

Another remark supports the need to define the roles: ‘it would have to have both rights and responsibilities... it needs to address the problems... it really has to be respectful of how the UN works. The UN is, whether we like it or not, it’s an intergovernmental state body, always has been, always will be. Civil Society should be involved, but they are not co-legislators here. They’re not. We basically have to work harder for our influence. It would have to be very careful in terms of; it shouldn’t be seen as a kind of an arrogant document where it’s basically NGOs demanding heaven on earth. It would have to be effective. It can’t be a Charter of what NGOs want states to do... it has to be about the role and involvement and the contribution of Civil Society addressing the problems of the world. And in terms of how they engage with Member States and the Secretariat’ Interview DDD.

Theme 11, inclusivity, arose again in the data: ‘you have Civil Society actors, who may be sectoral based, then there’s a whole lot of divisions, even philosophically... it has to have a platform that accommodates all shapes in some ways. We look at Member States, they’re across all colours, all geographies, all economically different [and] socially, but it’s kind of a platform that still, despite the differences, [still] offers a platform for dialogue’ Interview UUU, ‘the actual writing of it will end up just being a few people in the end. So, a lot of it is just making sure that there is ample opportunity for feedback and review. There’s a large consultation process that has a regional scope to it because within the region or within a country... having regional partners that will help identify who should be included in this consultation. There will be challenges for resources to make sure that some smaller Civil Society organisations are able to be included in that consultation. There will be challenges for resources to make sure that some smaller Civil Society organisations are able to be included in that consultation. If possible, in person is just a better way to go to make sure people’s voices are heard’ Interview CCC, and ‘inclusivity, the local to the global [process]... I wonder how this would fit for CSOs in the global north because the UN is not as strong in those countries... so how would Country CC NGOs have a voice within the national space... because they do, they have issues and are challenged with these structures’ Interview TT.

Theme 15, the honest broker concept was encouraged to be looked at from both sides and will require the position to be of genuine neutrality: ‘the issue of the honest broker, that’s a very, very bright idea. But it has to be looked at from both sides. Who is going to be the best honest broker and in what area... how do you measure the effectiveness of an honest broker? Not only by the results that you have
reconciled people, but by how you as a mediator is viewed. If you’re viewed as somebody whose balance is even handed, then there is some success in that. If not, then that is a problem. If they are viewed as siding with one side or the other, then that is a problem and you see that really across the board. In today’s crisis… where the UN and junior mediators are sometimes viewed as siding with the party in power or against those who are not’ Interview VVV.

Theme 17 on the importance of dialogue, listening, and language usage was mentioned as an element to consider. The following comment expressed the need for effective dialogue: ‘there needs to be conversations amongst everybody. It’s really important that we take on board what people have said and then you come out with some sort of action plan that has taken on what people have said, because a lot of time you ask people and then they ignore it’ Interview GGG.

The importance of layperson language was highlighted by a number of participants: ‘[the] UN has all these acronyms [in] its language. And so, in order for Civil Society to work with the United Nations, Civil Society has to adopt these acronyms. But then what’s that doing for me, the people that they’re trying to represent. You’re not interested in those acronyms which are dealing with pesticide or genital mutilation. There’s a massive disconnect… we’re not talking that way anymore because our people that we’re representing don’t talk that way, then the United Nations will have to change. But at the moment, the United Nations doesn’t have to change because Civil Society is pandering to them. Civil Society could be stronger’ Interview GGG, ‘when they were looking at the original Charter, it was about trying to make it as simple and as understandable as possible in terms of the language and that ought to be one of the principal balls that the Civil Society UN Charter should be based on’ Interview SS, ‘the ordinary person that you want to engage with in-country… so, simple language’ Interview QQQ, and ‘we’re gonna have to get away from using our own language. It’s got to be explicit self-sovereignty. There’s no point wrapping it up in something so complex, no one understands it. If this is your chance, have your say at the UN and make it your UN, your generation. It doesn’t matter whether it’s the older generation [or] the younger generation… the language needs to be very careful’ Interview AAA.

**Who writes the 2nd Charter?**

The participants were asked who should write the potential 2nd Charter and whether government should be a part of that process for a CSUN. The most common responses preferred it to be CS led, but with Member State involvement, or for it to be written together with both CS and governments due to the acknowledgement of it being a social contract. Very few suggested that only CS should write the 2nd Charter. Also, very few thought that it should only be the UN or governments. Comments were made on the necessity of inclusion and how that would be qualified. Accountability and representation continue to come up in the evidence. The concept of champions of the 2nd Charter and the involvement of experts concludes the analysis of this question.

The following excerpts expressed that the writing of the 2nd Charter should be led by CS but together with government: ‘anyone that’s impacted by it should be involved. It should be led by Civil Society in collaboration with the UN, but I definitely think government should have a say in it, because otherwise it won’t be successful’
Interview RR, ‘they’ve [CS] got to come together sufficiently to be able to write it. Now, I think it’s very important that they take account of the UN as it is and need to be aware of people’s views but… I think to have credibility, it’s got to be seen as something that genuinely comes from Civil Society’ Interview YYY, ‘governments should be included… and to be asked to be invited to observe those discussions… it’s important for them to understand why this is so important from a Civil Society perspective, and not least to allow them to feel encouraged about Civil Society’s engagement with the UN. If they see how important it is to Civil Society as well, that it can be a much more critical but also collaborative venture. Critical, as it should be a space where society holds governments accountable, but collaborative in terms of equal participation and people decision-making to a reasonable extent. I do know that some governments would be opposed to something like this, which then means you run the risk of weakening it if only some governments are involved but not others… I can see clearly the arguments on both sides of why the government should be involved or not, but my initial reaction was that, yes, it would be important for them to be involved, if nothing else, definitely to observe this process’ Interview YY, and ‘you’d have to have consultation with, first of all, Civil Society. This is like a great beginning. It’s like a catalyst’ Interview AAA.

As well, a few mentioned it should be thought through how government would be involved: ‘government should be involved but… Civil Society needs to figure out who that is, and what it is, and how it wants to speak, and… what are our goals’ Interview GGG, ‘it’s a Civil Society Charter, society has to do it… have broad consultations… but I think it would be in consultation with governments… you want it to work, you want it to be worth something… you have to really then think, what is the, where you want to end up and what you think that influence is going to achieve and how you think you can achieve the most’ Interview XX, ‘it depends on the relationship between this [2nd Charter] and the UN. Governments have to be consulted in some way’ Interview BBB, and ‘has to be a Civil Society lead. I think it has to be consultative, broadly speaking. And then I’m not sure about government’s role yet because eventually to some extent, for the operationalisation of the Charter… there needs to be involvement and commitment to it from Member States and governments, but at what stage in the process they are brought in is important. I’m not sure that from the beginning is such a good idea, again, because of the power to dominate, the power to terms may then become conditional involvement; if you want to have the Charter, then you have to meet these conditions… how do we do it in a way that government sees this as indispensable for the collective good, rather than what the governments can get out of it alone. And that may help determine at which point you involve [governments] and the nature of the consultation’ Interview UUU.

The participation of government could also be limited: ‘for certain parts, depending on where it needs some kind of buy-in from governments, if you want to have something on harmonised financing, reporting, then they [Member States] would need to be in the room’ Interview DDD.

The idea of a governmental group or committee was mentioned by a few participants: ‘what you do is you write in a draft or a bit of it, and then you show it to them [Member States]… different governments from a selected committee. Like Country AA, like Country BB, like Country CC… we just create a group, but you
really need it to be regional too... Country P... Country V... Country DD... I think that's the way, because we don't want governments writing our stuff, but we want them reflecting on power’ Interview JJJ, ‘government should be involved for legitimacy purposes. I think it has to be written by Civil Society. Some sort of consultative process and a lot of Civil Society have the opportunity to contribute... having some sort of group of governments that are endorsing it and expressing support for it... finding that kind of balance [between CS and Member States]’ Interview MMM, and ‘I don't think government should be involved. Maybe some friendly governments quietly, who are in support of it. Maybe former friends club. It will not be difficult to find. Country W, Country GG, Country HH, Country II, and Country JJ for example’ Interview NNN.

The second most common response was for a potential 2nd Charter to be written together between the UN and CS: ‘everybody should have a hand... they [Member States] also are a part of “We the People”... taking a process outside of the UN is not a good feeling for Member States. So, Member States, no matter how faulty... at least everybody is there. And there is a decorum around how you express your disappointment... and that's part of the conversation, how to build trust. That all of us on this planet, in a sense, enjoy the prosperity of the planet. If we move together’ Interview QQQ, ‘whoever writes the Charter, which is a draft Charter to go out for consultation, but actually, the SDGs are a very, very good guideline for writing the Charter, because all the social development goals, which cover such a wide range of issues that affect the lives and future of the people on this planet, depend utterly on the achievements of Civil Society. They can't work except with that input... it has to be drafted by a group, which is both from Civil Society and from the UN, which is actually, when we say from the UN, so it's some governments. You have to get together a group, which would include governments, obviously [from] north and south, you have to have people from the five UN regions, and then that would be mirrored all the time by the Civil Society coming from these five regions’ Interview ZZ, and ‘is there a role for governments in approving this 2nd UN Charter? If not, then how do we really ensure that it has legitimacy? Because if not, it's going to be a waste of exercise. At the end of the day, we just have a piece of paper that doesn't have real weight and force behind it’ Interview MMM.

Legitimacy is further explained in this comment and acknowledged a CSUN as a social contract: ‘there needs to be a small group... there needs to be a Secretariat. There needs to be someone who puts this together, who coordinates, and you need a neutral player that does that... stay with a UN Secretariat, because the UN; your research is showing that we all love the UN even with its defects, it's like a relative... the UN is supposedly neutral. So, if you create something apart from it, you undermine it... the UN can coordinate a group where you would have Civil Society and governments. You have to do it with a government because this is [a] social contract. It is a new social contract... this is about working together. This is about redefining the structure of power... you can't ask someone else to give you power if it's in a different room, it's not at the table of the discussion. So, there is no way you can do this without the government. The government needs to see the benefit of this and if you [government] don't sit at the table, we're not gonna vote for you. Or we're just gonna govern ourselves, which is in actual fact, what is happening. We're starting to look much more at local governance... it's the trend, the central governments are becoming technocrats and losing relevance. So, this
is also an opportunity for the governmental apparatus to become relevant again’ Interview TTT.

A limited number of participants were of the view that the writing of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter would only be carried out by CS: ‘if we look at the development of such as Civil Society Charter, then I have to go with it only being Civil Society that provides the voice to develop the Civil Society United Nations Charter, because originally, it was the voice of the Member States who developed the Member State Charter for the United Nations. And that would mean that you have a truly equal level partnership of the Member State United Nations and the Civil Society United Nations’ Interview SS, ‘you really want to have Civil Society itself that’s deciding this… think about a main structure whereby Civil Society can come together and can have this kind of discussion in a constructive way’ Interview YYY, and ‘it should be written, ideally with the citizens, including CSOs’ Interview TT.

Governments themselves may not wish to be involved: ‘you may not be able to include government in any formal way because there are too many governments that don’t want to know about NGOs anyway or don’t have them or don’t allow them’ Interview VV.

A very low amount of evidence in the data thought it would be UN led: ‘it probably needs to come from the UN or possibly with your work. People are inspired about it, you’re doing a presentation to them, but it needs to come from a United Nations initiative, and possibly some of the bigger Civil Society global organisations involved. There’s a lot of them that are really switched on’ Interview RRR, ‘government has to be involved, it’s the UN, but I can see Civil Society having much more of a role. Like the 2030 Agenda, there were so many drafts, and many, many times, we could see our voices, our words in the draft, because Member States would come to us and say, “You know, I’m not an expert on… tell us what to say.” And we would give it to them, and it was really nice. So, our words are in there. But we’re not given credit for it, but it’s nice to know they’re in there’ Interview PPP, and ‘the writing would happen in the Secretariat… there are parts of the UN that are designed for that. So, there’s probably a greater willing capacity at the Secretariat, then identifying separate Member States but… bring Member States in’ Interview CCC.

The importance of inclusion was reiterated and who needs to be involved: ‘you have wisdom to write it… we have to let it evolve… you have to have a broad agreement… the voice has to be from everyone, but if everyone is writing something, it will be hard, but maybe it’s possible to have everyone bringing in something and then someone who is very good in… I always think that the decision should come from many sources, that the more people will bring in their points, the more likely it is to please everyone… it’s always good to listen to the points of others… so, they [Member States] should have the same [opportunity to contribute]’ Interview OOO, ‘what you wouldn’t want is for your Civil Society initiative to be solely identified with Western states… it’s not the people who already love us, it’s the people who don’t, and we’ve got to reach out to them, we’ve got to be making progress there… this whole project is about better communication and partnership, between the two, between the civic kind of world and the political world and so you can’t avoid government conversation. You want to embrace this. But conversation about participation of Civil Society is the most toxic conversation there is’ Interview
XXX, ‘it all remains with the Member States and this is saying, “We need the new structure”, that it’s not just the Member States. It’s the global community under this 2nd Charter’ Interview QQQ, ‘youth and children need to be consulted with this. Because this is the looking ahead’ Interview TTT, and ‘this would be a very useful discussion to have within the context of the major groups and other stakeholders’ Interview WWW.

How inclusion is qualified was remarked on: ‘who can be included? Once we get to the qualification standards, amongst included parties, what do you do when you’re included? What are the roles responsibilities you have there and then how do you ensure equal participation amongst the included? I do think there needs to be some qualification standards, but that is probably a conversation for within Civil Society… there would have to be a conversation around qualification standards, just to make it manageable. But then amongst those qualified, some idea of whether it’s regional representation or thematic representation on different committees’ Interview CCC.

Accountability continued to arise in the evidence: ‘I do think this multi stakeholder participatory process is a very good approach… globally, locally, regionally. Then once it is adopted, if it were adopted, the implementation is also really important, because I see now the 2030 Agenda was adopted and now in [the] implementation phase, we’re losing steam. There has to be more emphasis on regional and national involvement and more of [an] accountability mechanism, which were missing in the 2030 Agenda’ Interview PPP.

A cautionary remark was made regarding representation: ‘I think yes, they [democratic governments] are legitimate to be in the conversation. What makes them legitimate? The fact that they are representing millions of people inhabiting the planet and Civil Society. And Civil Society… who do we represent? If we are going to be honest, we represent our donors. They are the ones who set the agenda… who is donating? These are the people that you are representing, only those people, not the people that you supposedly are serving. You don’t represent those people. You didn’t consult them. You come with your projects… they may say that they are representing them, but you’re not representing them. As long as they don’t have a voice in your organisation, as long as they don’t decide your priorities, you’re not representing them’ Interview HHH.

A number of comments were made in regard to having champions for the proposed reform, in order for the idea to hold weight: ‘you need to find champions, not only Member State champions, but perhaps even more importantly Civil Society champions… you put together this amazing research and everything else and we could put together an amazing roundtable discussion. I’d love to see something like this as a part of our UN2020 initiative. And, I think, it needs to happen and yet what I find very frustrating, this is just in general not necessarily tied to your work, but wonderful progressive ideas, visionary ideas, we need visionary ideas. And yet, I find it depressing, somehow trying to find the right word for it but are all too typical where the self-styled pundits, academic types, and leaders of thought, they’ll acknowledge “yes this is a great endeavour but it’s not going anywhere” in other words, it’s the pragmatist’ Interview WWW, ‘involving the different players in putting this forward, but the players need to be people who are in favour of it happening. So, it’s not like everybody, people who want it to happen. What you simply don’t
want [are] the naysayers’ Interview RRR, and ‘I always think of our convening power… bringing in people that are very well respected globally, not just institutions, but also individuals that will be listened to, some x-presidents, the pope now, he’s been very much heard on these issues. I’m not suggesting the pope himself, but I’m saying gathering like-thought leaders that could bring reputation and gravitas to this movement, a Kofi Annan figure… who’s gonna say no to Obama? Seriously. I mean, he’s just like, his work. In the USA, he’s in the politics game but everywhere else we’re all like, he’s a thought leader’ Interview TTT.

The Obamas were the champions who were recognised as seen in the last quote and in the following excerpts: ‘reaching out to somebody like Obama as an example.’ Interview UUU, and ‘consultation with governments is the only way to get the Charter properly agreed… my idea would be that you choose someone who is very well known, such as the Obamas to lead on this. I think it needs to be a man and a woman… the Obamas immediately came to my mind as a good team… it would have to be somebody who’s internationally respected and known and they would have a team under them… with the countries and with the UN itself, using the UN systems, because what people are really terrified of is that yet more money is spent, and it won’t actually have the desired outcome. It needs to be shown to be one of the good examples… [be] generational about it with youth representatives from Civil Society, ethnic minorities… all of them need to have their voices… thought of both [the Obamas] because they’re both equally effective, they are influencers and they are changemakers. And people need to see it’s not words, actions will come out of this’ Interview AAA.

In addition to champions, the importance of core leaders, experts or advisors were also recognised: ‘you need people… who’ve been with the UN for a long time, who understand it, [the] real problems, but have open horizons and they can see this stuff’s not working. They need to come on as the elders, really as advisors, because they will, because of their knowledge they can help to bring in countries… you need new people with proven expertise with Civil Society who are not frightened… find your experts… people would be able to point you in the right direction, and then have a series of meetings first with the key players, key influencers, the changemakers, so it needs to be done with civil servants, the decision makers. It needs to be politically agreed, it’s going to have to go to the highest level, the Foreign Office delegation, the Missions probably need to be involved. They need shaking up, frankly, and this could be one of the instruments to do that… they would be very good conduits to use to make the link between the UN and the countries’ Interview AAA, ‘it’s a combination. I’m a great believer in the people who came up with the idea leading it, so yourself and others are leading it, and then you bring in people that you maybe already identified. So, there’s a kind of collective of people who believe in this, they’re the main drivers. And then you’re bringing in experts… I think it’s got to come first from you, us, this, from coming out of this proposal, from your research study that has to be the basis of the next stage’ Interview RRR, and ‘it would have to be developed by an identified group of legal experts… what umbrella organisations can represent the voices at the national level? And perhaps, if you think like that, then you might be looking at having to develop the national level, United Nations before you even move any further. Because until you get that group in place, how can you validate the work [on] the international level’ Interview SS.
Who signs off on the 2nd Charter?
The data provided multiple responses to this question. A group of participants thought it was necessary for Member States to sign off on the 2nd Charter to provide the legitimacy and the Secretary General would only provide some of the legitimacy on his own. However, accountability would be required if it was just governments. Another version would be to have Member States sign off, but with strong engagement with CS. A different take was suggested for UN to sign off along with CS, but not Member States, hence UN agencies and the Secretary General. A suggestion was made how to identify which CSO would sign off that would provide accountability. Numerous comments suggested for all actors to be involved and that the signing of the 2nd Charter could be seen as a stamp of honour. The analysis of the responses to this question is concluded with the idea of having initial conversations to discuss the answer to this question further.

Several participants commented on the necessity of the General Assembly or Member States to sign off on it to provide legitimacy: ‘if it’s a Charter, it has to be signed off by the General Assembly… I don’t think it should be the Secretariat, because I don’t think that would give it the oomph… for it to be a resolution by Member States because that would have more teeth than just coming from the Secretary General’ Interview TT. This is further supported: ‘it wouldn’t have no teeth at all, of course, it [the Secretariat] can sign off on its own work. The Secretariat runs a lot of the existing structures and things like that’ Interview UU, and ‘it’d be nice to have Civil Society also be [a] signing member… so, there’s legitimacy’ Interview PPP. Although one participant did acknowledge the Secretary General’s impact: ‘ultimately, the Secretary General has to do something… he also plays a role in legitimacy here’ Interview MMM. However, governments need to be held accountable: ‘up to now, we just have government signing and then they just sign because it looks good. If they’ve signed but they haven’t ratified [it] they don’t do anything about it… so, you have to get that at the very beginning’ Interview ZZ.

Some acknowledged Member States to sign, however with strong engagement from CS: ‘similar to the SDGs, it needs to be sort of Member States but with… very strong Civil Society engagement’ Interview RR, and ‘United Nations for sure, absolutely. I think a certain number of minimum governments… and some of the leading players and Civil Society’ Interview RRR.

A different version included the UN, but not Member States: ‘a whole range of stakeholders definitely. People like the UN Secretary General, but also Civil Society organisations. I don’t think necessarily Member States need to sign off on it… but definitely representatives from society organisations around the world and UN agencies’ Interview YY.

When considering which CSO would sign, it was suggested: ‘each country has a regulatory body for charities, I wonder if they would be the ones that sign off on that. Just throwing that out… It could be part of the self-regulatory or accreditation… why not allow any registered NGO anywhere to sign off’ Interview DDD.

Numerous excerpts remarked that all actors should be involved in the signing of the 2nd Charter and the first quote provides the rationale as to why: ‘it needs all actors at
some point - global - because if we look at the 2nd Charter, it’s redefining a global movement for the collective good… because of the dependence of UN structures on all individual contributions. So, while the contributions come from government, the operationalisation and the success of it depends on Civil Society itself. So, in the end, there needs to be a link between the 2nd Charter and the 1st… it will mean that the current transformation will have to go to another set of transformations for the 2nd Charter to work, because I don’t think the current reform is radical enough… because it is a response to an external critique and not a deep enough reflection of internally what has gone on… so maybe having a 2nd Charter may stimulate even some more additional transformations within the 1st Charter… they [the Charters] should be in parallel or in complimentary intention. It should be complementary because you need both for the longer-term success of our development internationally’ Interview UUU, ‘everybody. Granted you’d have to have processes in place, however… there are marvellous things with technology today. I mean, can we get 6 billion people to sign the 2nd Charter… or say 1 billion’ Interview QQQ, and ‘make it a mass movement and a global mass movement where millions or hundreds of millions of people can give the endorsement. So, legitimacy comes through the people. People are the ultimate power. How to reach them, through national networks and so forth. Not so easy, but it’s possible. The UN can help’ Interview NNN. The last quote sees people as the ultimate power, as opposed to the Member States as mentioned above.

In considering all actors to be involved in signing the 2nd Charter, this excerpt provides a great visual overview of this concept: ‘CSOs, and governments, and UN, and UN agencies. Guterres needs to be the first one to sign it because the UN is the broker… actually, he needs to be the guardian of this law. Guardian is not the right word, but the one who lights the torch in the Olympics. He needs to show that he’s fully invested, committed, and convinced that this needs to happen and his signature should go first. Then you can have the different agencies, governments and CSOs, the three parties. The Rio Plus 21 had a signature process but it was chaos. Whenever you say Civil Society is equal its chaos… how do you keep the chaos when it is good with diversity, vibrance and innovation but at the same time, organised so it’s meaningful and you can [move] forward’ Interview TTT.

The signing of the 2nd Charter could also be regarded as a stamp of honour: ‘I’ve seen processes where people were actually really engaged and really into it and they wanted change to happen… but isn’t it nice when you have a Charter and all these different organisations can see we are part of that Charter and actually, it’s something to be proud of… something that, like I said about validation… it’s like a little stamp. Now we are part of the Civil Society Charter. It’s like a badge of honour’ Interview GGG.

The following participant captures the concept of first having a meeting to decide who should sign off on a 2nd Charter: ‘you’d have to have a series of meetings, where all of these questions that are being raised [in the research interview] would be hammered out’ Interview VV. This is supported by another participant: ‘there are many small voices across Civil Society that currently don’t have a place at the United Nations, that don’t even do enough to be recognised by ECOSOC. Should they be within the terms of the proposal that you’ve made [to be] recognised at the national level. They come together under a single national body, which then represents them
at an international level. There are many Civil Society organisations who don’t even have an interest at an international level. There’s a whole strand of discussion and thinking that would need to be worked through between the national and the international bodies’ Interview SS.

A couple of cautionary remarks were made when considering who would sign off on a 2nd Charter: ‘study how the [1st] Charter worked… if you look at the way the Charter conference was, there was a tremendous amount of bullying especially by Country A, especially to do with the Security Council. They had the army intelligence tapped every single suite where the delegations were, they threatened… you need to read that history’ Interview BBB, and ‘usually when that question is asked, it is ECOSOC accredited [NGOs]... but there the process is very unfair because it’s state led’ Interview DDD.

In these conversations, who should not sign it, should also be discussed; ‘it has to be organisations that want to join it. You have to think about all the people you are going to want not to sign it. I believe that the [controversial] CSO Agency E does have consultative status with ECOSOC. Are we in danger of this being taken over by organisations, which may indeed have a significant popular support in certain areas but who’s gonna really not chime with the overall purpose of the thing. That’s very difficult because who has the authority… you have to be thinking about the change you want and how to make it really meaningful. But you also have to be thinking about who is going to have to agree to accept it’ Interview YYY.

**How should the 2nd Charter be funded?**

Participants were asked how a potential 2nd Charter would be funded. Government was a more popular answer, as was the idea of all actors contributing to it. Very little data suggested that CS or the UN should finance a CSUN. Funding by donors and the private sector were thought as viable options, if managed appropriately. Fund management concepts were noted. However, ethics was the area that held the most data.

Funding from government was one of the more popular answers regarding how a 2nd Charter would be financed: ‘it would be great, if Member States would commit to funding… like a minimum percentage of funding that goes to the UN is committed to supporting and enabling Civil Societies for meaningful participation in our engagement with direction setting of the UN’ Interview YY, ‘has to be government money, but how that gets done, because [if] they’re not funding now enough to support the UN’ Interview XX, and ‘the government should build a line into their budget, because national ownership is key to moving forward… pooling resources to ensure that there’s a fund at the global level… it’s just part of the tax system’ Interview QQQ.

This following comment provided further exploration as to why the funding should come from governments: ‘it has to be a formal part of the tax system, otherwise it just doesn’t happen… if we are relying on voluntary contributions of… individuals, the lay actors, relying on handouts or private sector and so on, all of those additional resources are complementary and supplementary, but there has to be core funding that comes from tax bases of countries because Civil Society, participation of Civil Society actions is for the collective good. Economically, socially, politically, and in
terms of sustainability, an active, vibrant Civil Society is what will ensure peace, ensure all of our environmental goals being met and so on. So, it is from a tax base, it should not be seen as a drain on national resources but rather an investment for development… Civil Society’s participation should be seen as funding any other social service; funding education, funding health… a lot of the extremism that we see is perhaps a result of a lack of funding [for CS] and maintenance of democracy’ Interview UUU.

One area in government were the funding could come from is defence: ‘take military funding, decrease it and put it into development and that fund was held in common, for whoever needed it. The resources are in the world. There’s no doubt about that. The resources are there’ Interview QQQ.

Concerns were raised though regarding government funding for a CSUN: ‘money is power and its influence… those UN bodies over time have been forced to work more and more closely with the national governments for there to be national ownership. You would face the same issues with this new body. At the national level, national governments would want to have that local authority and ownership of what’s going on in their country, which comes back to this issue that that would be a challenge in some countries’ Interview UU, ‘that would also be a real question as to whether you want this coordination funded by states because of the association with certain things’ Interview XXX, and another cautionary note is provided: ‘national interests change over time. How do you get this as part of the regular resource budget? Because that would be really important, so it’s part of the commitments of the national governments’ Interview TT.

The other popular reply was that all actors should be contributing to a CSUN: ‘some of the same mix of actors that funds Civil Society now. So, probably a mix of governments and others’ Interview MMM, ‘it really does have to be Member States and… it has to be more private sector, because the Member States don’t have the money. But if it is private sector, then there has to be some sort of accountability mechanism which never seems to be there, which is a little scary… so you really do need to be funded by the government, foundations, possibly private sector, but the UN just doesn’t have the money anymore’ Interview PPP, and ‘things like match funding, so that if a country is signed up to the Charter, they would have reached out to private groups, corporate sector, to big institutions, to philanthropists, who would support this. It could be match funding so that a government doesn’t feel yet more pressure and also funded by Civil Society… they could say, we’ll put in half because we want to be at the table’ Interview AAA.

Only one piece of data from the evidence suggested that CS should fund a CSUN: ‘a lot of it would need to be funded by Civil Society who has ownership of it… whoever pays for something is in control’ Interview LLL.

Only one piece of data thought the funding should come from the UN: ‘there needs to be money that the UN allocates’ Interview JJJ.

Donors were suggested with the support of the National Committees: ‘where possible government, some government funding, but the majority will probably be, in many Member States, will be donors. The way the UN raises money is they have
national committees, so this can be something that they develop; national committees for Civil Society as well… they call [them] NatCom… they’re basically a small office that advocates… to try and fund various initiatives through the UN globally… donors listen to the NatCom quite a lot. They listen to their own sort of internal strategies, but NatCom is seen as very powerful. They’re the ones that are like a fundraising department… something like that for Civil Society. Having a group of fundraisers in the higher income countries, that also helps feed into a system that’s also supported by various donor agencies’ Interview RR. Donors through specific organisations was also suggested: ‘there are different thematic organisations that are putting together society funds… so, there are some organisations that could get behind it’ Interview CCC.

A suggestion was made as to how donor funds could be managed: ‘maybe donors give a lump sum to the UN and Civil Society… we advocate with donors to take on an initial first three years where they add on overhead type costs to help the UN Civil Society organisation, so that those funds go into that body. However, they are managed to disperse it among the different Civil Society organisations, but that there’s a willingness by all the donors to fund 20% of overheads’ Interview RRR.

Private sector funding and how that would be managed also arose in the data: ‘if it [CS] includes the private sector for profit or not for profit, and finance, and then it all depends on the value proposition. The private sector is the second biggest force in the world after governments who still dominate, thanks to their monopoly on power. In terms of resources, technology, the private sector has long outsmarted the public sector, so any meaningful funding has to come from the private sector. The scheme would need it set up to explain the value proposition. Private sector would be very cautious in lending its name and support to such an undertaking for fear of offending governments. So, a neutral way would have to be conceived to channel private sector contributions in such a way that they do not offend governments who oppose the establishment or financial situation. There are many ways of doing that. I’ve done it through local networks who are well funded now. There are educated networks out there, they advocate human rights, they advocate anti-corruption, even in countries which are systemically suffering from corruption or where genocide is a matter of life and a fact of reality. So, localisation helps. You need a localised system that fits into the global system’ Interview NNN.

The management of funds was a frequent reply to this question. For example: ‘the resources, I think, a dedicated Secretariat or dedicated members of staff to be able to do the coordination’ Interview YY. It was suggested the UN, as a neutral body, may be best placed for this: ‘it’s probably coming from the United Nations… I’d like to think that all governments are all paying for it. And somehow, we as citizens are happy to pay something towards it, either as a tax or as a contribution… maybe business has got a role to play, and maybe some businesses will be very happy to contribute, because actually I’ve heard CEOs of big businesses say for example, “I’d much rather do business in a good world than business in a bad world” and businesses have a responsibility to contribute to that… of course, there are bad businesses that want their logos and to kind of own it. But there’s something in there in terms of the funding. I would still probably revert back to my original point; it probably needs to come from the United Nations because their procedures are neutral. When you start getting into business, it’s all about what’s their motive,
although some of their motives to the business I think are good’ Interview RRR.

Each national CSUN body should manage and collect their own funds: ‘most NGOs don’t have any money and even NGOs that do have constant money problems. So, they’re not gonna be able to pay for it. And you could say [the] state pays, but it only be the states where they’re already democracies and like NGOs, nobody else would set it up. I guess, these national bodies have essentially become coalitions of NGOs, so then they would all have to do a bit of fundraising from government, private, or UN World Bank to keep it going, but it would definitely have to be left to each of the national coalition’s’ Interview DDD.

In terms of fund management, two cautionary remarks were made. One was in terms of ownership: ‘the funding, no matter where it comes from, whether it’s coming from governments or private sector, is still going to influence it somehow, so being truly independent could be a challenge’ Interview UU. The second one was regarding the concept of pooling funds: ‘we ourselves are supposed to be pooled funded… we’re having huge difficulty raising money from public or private sources for that. And then, even within that, they’re not willing to have it be anonymised or pooled or mingled, its marked it every step of the way… donors have moved towards more and more earmarking of funding, even despite the good donor principles that have been around for a while’ Interview UU.

Ethics around funding was frequently noted. Concerns included influence: ‘if it’s the governments that are having to pay for it, like they do for the UN itself, they certainly wouldn’t be willing to have something they hadn’t had a say in at some point’ Interview VV. A CSUN should be funded ‘in ways that allow work to go forward, fairly robustly, but with the minimum of influencers because wealth is more concentrated than at any other time’ Interview BBB.

Concerns on limited funding were acknowledged as it could lead to corruption: ‘if you create this structure, you can also have a big risk to undermine it because, as I say, if there’s not enough funding to run it properly, there will be corruption’ Interview EEE.

Concerns on the accountability of the private sector were noted: ‘as far as possible, it should be self-funded. I don’t think it can be funded by Member States… that would sort of officiate the purpose of the thing and if you look at the private sector, you have got to be a bit careful that it isn’t just funded by one or two very powerful corporations. Just look at Jeff Bezos and Zuckerberg, people like that getting together, it would be a rough world’ Interview YYY, and ‘if money coming from business, that gives them a prime role, a kind of ruling role… this whole issue of accountability is very difficult’ Interview VV.

An example of this is provided: ‘there are very big foundations that are now considered Civil Society, but those foundations are funded and linked very closely to big corporations that have other interests than their supposedly philanthropic goals of their foundation. And, one example is how Funder B changed the priorities of WHO. It’s one thing that you should study because when Funder B started to fund WHO, at the beginning they were just funding and then they were becoming the bigger donors, so they wanted a place at the table to make the decisions about what
their WHO is going to work on… if you die of something that is not contagious in your country, then it doesn’t touch us, but if it is contagious, they decided they wanted numbers and they wanted these kinds of results. And then WHO stopped investing as much as they used to in training doctors, training nurses, and building infrastructure in countries. That is why the Ebola crisis was so big because in those countries they were not prepared. They didn’t have [the] infrastructure. They didn’t have the doctors and nurses. They have been following the WHO commands because they bring in the money, so you do what the founders asked you to do. And so, there was a shift in the way the WHO organisation has always worked’ Interview HHH. This data was collected prior to the coronavirus crisis; therefore, it could be argued that this quote is increasing relevant due to the experience of our current context.

One participant offered a solution to some of the ethical concerns regarding funding: ‘there are models of financing where you have, because you want to keep it neutral, where you have different percentages allocated to different stakeholders… so, it doesn’t become their power. Again, that’s the definition of how you distribute the power. How you allocate the different percentages to different stakeholders… it’s a bit of what we have with the UN, except that the UN is about quotas, depending on the level of development of each country but in this case, it will be more stakeholders and sharing power’ Interview TTT.

Funding was seen as an opportunity to bring about equality: ‘one of the biggest issues for Civil Society is trying to access the United Nation system, whether it be through the agencies or commissions or committees of the United Nations. Being able to be represented and have a voice at any of the meetings is about having equality of access to funding, which enables that voice to be heard. And there are so many different bodies at the moment that Civil Society tries to access funding from, whether it be for making their voice heard at the United Nations or providing implementation of work on the ground. We need some kind of coordination, some kind of commonality and some kind of streamlining the process. If Member States are required to pay into the United Nations and the United Nations is funded from the subscriptions of individual Member States, then if we’re going to have an equal partnership for Civil Society, there has to be an equal fund that Member States contribute to enable Civil Society to take part in the conversation’ Interview SS.

**Section Four: Concluding Remarks**

At the end of the interview, some participants provided concluding remarks. This ranged from recognising the value and need for the research, that it is transformational for the UN and an ideal, to expressing interest in further exploring the topic and conveying encouraging and motivational comments.

Participants acknowledged the value of researching and analysing the relationship: ‘first of all, you’ve collected a lot of excellent evidence on the issues and systematise that, and boiled it down to a few things, which is really valuable for us. Second, is that you’re sparking a conversation. People might disagree, maybe your idea won’t go far, but I think the debate will go very far. And you should be proud of that’ Interview EEE, ‘it’s an interesting subject… because it is a subject where there is insufficient understanding on both sides of it’ Interview WW, and ‘the League of
Nations… is often regarded as having been a failure… but actually, it created many of the building blocks, which now help define the UN. So, it’s even in terms of your thesis, I think it’s a good read’ Interview WW.

The need for the research was expressed: ‘what you’ve presented and what we’re discussing is something that’s really needed… this is a very important piece of work, my opinion. I think, it’s radical in terms of helping the United Nations and us and globally, move around a set of values that made me want to have for the world… we need bind to it’ Interview RRR.

It was suggested to highlight that this proposed reform is transformational for the UN and to state up front it is an ideal suggested model: ‘what you are proposing for the UN’s present - the UN system itself, this is a major transformation for the UN what you’re proposing. And if that’s so, I think you should spell that out in language too. And I think the idea of [a] UN transformation, which is rather quite an appealing idea and quite appealing language. It’s not modifying it or whatever language you use. That transformation, if what you’re proposing is a major transformation for the UN. It’s something which historically, if you go back to the 1920s and 30s, people always felt there was a deficit in terms of how the people were represented because it was the governmental laws, League of Nations, and it was the United Nations. So, [it is] the emphasis on nations and not on people, and so how do you make up that deficit’ Interview FFF, and ‘it’s great work you are [doing], it’s a very idealistic work, you’re working on. I would advise you to state this upfront because 1000 critics could kill your work instantly from many angles. So, I’d frame your work in the foundational spirit of the United Nations, and deliberately position yourself on an idealistic pathway. If you state this upfront, then everybody knows where you stand… this is an attempt to revive that idealistic, the good spirits that guided governments when the United Nations was founded in 1945, which is one of these rare moments in human history where virtually everybody around the world was exhausted from war. Ready to realise that war is bad, and peace is good and important. And respecting each other is important’ Interview NNN.

There was an invitation to further explore the proposed reform: ‘I look forward to reading your book and continuing the conversation and finding ways that we can achieve a certain level of consensus to that goal. I’m not yet convinced that a 2nd Charter is what’s required. But I’m open to being convinced’ Interview WWW, and ‘it’s a really intriguing idea. I think, it’s really good. But I think to be the radical change, it should be, it needs a whole different way of thinking. I’m not saying you haven’t thought about it in those terms. It needs us all to think about things in a very different way. It’s not a question of getting a body together and putting something in place next year or whatever. It will be very exciting if we could have these issues of representation looked at in a very different way’ Interview XX.

Encouraging and motivational comments included: ‘I am super excited. It’s exciting to see a hint at some of the findings. I think you’ve done a great job’ Interview RR, ‘it’s different than I expected. And I gotta say, it’s quite ambitious. I’m excited to see where it goes from here’ Interview CCC, ‘I certainly wish you luck with it. I think, it’s very brave and imaginative’ Interview YYY, ‘I congratulate you for doing this. It is certainly very interesting to reflect on’ Interview BBB, ‘it’s very good. It’s very clear, and I really get it’ Interview AAA, and ‘we’ve got 193 Member States, and then we’ve
got in-country teams for some of the Member States and so what we were talking about was a coordinating body here to help make sure this happens. And so that would be a big step in making it better. And then the other, so right now, Civil Society is separated as international and national. A lot of Civil Society is driven around themes. So, this does a nice job of kind of mirroring the UN intergovernmental. This maybe is more of a, when we’re thinking about the international Secretariat, how do we create opportunities for Civil Society to coalesce around themes. It could just very nicely fall into UN agencies [who] already have set subjects’ Interview CCC.

Additionally, most participants commented on wanting to stay involved or offered support to continue to explore the proposed idea and its implementation for the UN and CS relationship reform.
Chapter 5
Analysis

My Story

My story continues with reflections from the two rounds of field research interviews that were conducted. What I had not expected, was the intensity of the emotions, the desperation for the need to work together and the extreme urgency for relationship reform.

I remember after one interview, while sitting with my neck bent, my head hanging low and my elbows resting on my knees, I realised the ache in my neck from sitting in that position too long. At times, it would take hours to recover emotionally from an interview and to process the reactions. We are so vested in this relationship between the UN and CS and hope for a better future, which we can all see, but only if we can start to figure out how to work together. Virtues in each other were not questioned and there was such a call to amplify those virtues for a healthy, collaborative working environment.

One late afternoon in New York city, I was coming back from an interview, it was heavily raining and already dark. I remember telling myself, one more step, one more step, with each one I took. I truly had become the little engine that could, that was beginning to rely on the repetition of a small number of words. Whilst alongside those words, holding the picture for the purpose of this research and being encouraged by all the participants for the sharing of their profound and incredible experiences and knowledge, which allowed the emerging of a proposed model for reform for the UN and its relationship with CS.

Overview of Analysis

This chapter proposes the new model for reform. It provides the analysis of the findings, considers the implications, and makes recommendations based on the data uncovered throughout the research. It begins by introducing a model I designed, the Naber Model, to address the needs uncovered in the findings. This is followed by the application of the Naber Model to two frameworks that are designed with the aim to address all 28 themes and three inherent flaws; a structural one titled the 2nd Charter, and a mechanical one titled The United Nation’s Principled Decision-Making Policy. Lastly, triangulation analysis is applied to the suggested model by revisiting the findings from the data to ensure robustness of the proposed reform.

The Naber Model

The Naber Model is an organisational infrastructure, that I designed, based on the research findings from this PhD: the systematic literature review and two rounds of in-depth interviews with expert key stakeholders. It is made up of three components. The first component is the utilisation of two or more frameworks that produce a greater combined effect, which allows synergies to be incorporated through the interplay of the frameworks applied. These synergies are the second component and enhances the objectives or purposes of the organisation. The third component
integrates safeguards of the organisation’s values or principles. The Naber Model aims to provide a net effect of a robust and enhancing organisational infrastructure.

The first component are the frameworks, which provide the opportunity for change. This involves two or more organisational frameworks; one that typically provides a structure, the second typically provides the mechanics in which that structure operates. Additional frameworks could be incorporated, depending on the nature of the organisation. The frameworks build on each other and provide the context to which the synergies and safeguards can be built into the infrastructure and designed in such a way to allow for flexibility and evolution of the organisation.

An analogy of this concept is that of a vehicle. The structure is the engine, the mechanics is the oil by which the engine runs. The Naber Model provides the organisation with flexibility. For example, the oil can innovate and change, however, the engine can stay the same if it has not evolved or adjustments can be made to the engine to accommodate the new advanced oil. Therefore, not only is it designed for dynamic frameworks being utilised, whilst the whole time safeguarding the principles.

The second component is synergy. Opportunities for synergies for the advancement of the organisation’s objectives are incorporated through the interplay of the frameworks and can also be done with the components within one of the frameworks. In revisiting the analogy of a vehicle, an example is utilising a better oil that enhances the efficiency of that particular type of engine creating a higher performing vehicle.

The third component integrates safeguards. The frameworks incorporate catch systems, which aims to protect the principles of the organisation. This is to support, safeguard, maintain awareness and encourage consistent application of the organisation’s values. The catch systems can be within an individual framework and/or an interplay amongst two or more frameworks.

The result is a reliable infrastructure that not only builds synergies for the purposes of the organisation’s objectives but also incorporates catch systems to ensure alignment with the organisation’s principles. The intention of the Naber Model is to provide a third entity that when implemented soundly, is an entity that is protected from influence. Hence, it enables stability, provides support, safeguards the values, and creates synergies for carrying out the organisation’s objectives in a system that allows for evolving change.

Earlier in the thesis the theory of change was discussed (see Chapter 1). The Naber Model is an organisational infrastructure that has the capacity to be able to recurrently apply the typical theory of change, the if-then process, through the catch systems that are built into the frameworks (the third component). The Naber Model frameworks require the identification of key components/activities that interplay to lead to results for contributing to the overall objectives and purpose of an organisation, hence creating synergies. The connections between the components/activities and how they contribute to the overall goal are more deeply supported (the second component). In addition, the Naber Model is designed to incorporate change to allow for the evolving of an organisation without needing to
redesign the organisation’s frameworks, thereby providing continued stability for the organisation even whilst it is undergoing change (the first component).

The Proposed Model for Reform for the UN’s Relationship with CS

In analysing the results from the findings from the literature review and both rounds of interviews, the 28 themes and the three inherent flaws, into applicable working frameworks, two emerged. Both frameworks aim to address all themes and flaws and are comprised of two layers that provide the opportunity for solutions. These two frameworks are based on the Naber Model that was discussed above.

One framework is designed for the operational structure. The results uncovered a structure through which the mechanics could potentially operate. Please see Figure 5.1 below. The other framework is for the operational mechanics. The results uncovered the mechanics through which the structure can operate. Please see Figure 5.2 below. Due to the interplay of the frameworks (as discussed above), often one framework will address another.

With both frameworks there was an overarching theme(s) that aims to address almost all the themes. This is furthered into one layer, which comprises of two to four themes, which under their umbrella encompass a few more themes, as is illustrated in the Figures 5.1 and 5.2. Both frameworks are wrapped in the theme 28, the urgency of time, and theme one, that the relationship between CS and the UN is vital. The marrying of these two frameworks aims to address the three inherent flaws.

Operational Structure Framework

The 2nd Charter of The United Nations – The United Peoples

Earlier in the writing, the concept of a 2nd Charter was described based on the findings from first round of field research interviews and the literature review. As was evidenced in the data from the second round of interviews, the proposed model for reform for a 2nd Charter was highly regarded. Very few participants thought it was not feasible.

The details and refinement of the 2nd Charter was seen as best uncovered through an inclusive collaborative consultation process. Hence, the results in this discussion stay at a structural concept level of the proposed model for reform to reiterate and support the research findings of the importance of an inclusive consultation process to continue to refine the 2nd Charter.

There was strong evidence in the data that an effective and clear system, structure, and process is needed, which includes coordinated collaboration between the UN and CS for its relationship reform. It is clear what is proposed is an all-encompassing concept, from a structural perspective, because it has the capacity to potentially address all the issues that arose in the data. The two overarching themes are first discussed.
Figure 5.1 Operational Structure
The Structure through which the Mechanics Operate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Vital</th>
<th>Theme 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Charter of the United Nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9</td>
<td>Structure, System, Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 18</td>
<td>Coordinated Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>CS/NGOs Want to be Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5</td>
<td>UN Needs to do More to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td>Involve CS/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7</td>
<td>Negative Reasons to Involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8</td>
<td>CS/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9</td>
<td>Conflict and Human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 10</td>
<td>Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 11</td>
<td>Outdated Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 12</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 13</td>
<td>Dialogue and Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 14</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global & National Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 16</th>
<th>In Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 17</td>
<td>Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 18</td>
<td>Coordinated Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grouped Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 24</th>
<th>Virtues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 11</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure Designed for Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 11</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UN as Mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 5</th>
<th>Negative Reasons to Involving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9</td>
<td>CS/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Relationship Vital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 28</td>
<td>Urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 28</td>
<td>Theme 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 28</td>
<td>Theme 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Theme Nine: This theme refers to a required infrastructural backbone; a need for a structure, system, and process that clearly provides an effective working pathway. A 2nd Charter has the capacity to outline such a structure and process for the interlacing of the UN and CS work. It could allow for the systems to join up for more effective results.

Theme Eighteen: A 2nd Charter has the capacity to address theme 18, which highlighted the necessity of horizontal cohesion of collaboration and coordination. This theme brought in key words such as: mechanism, process, horizontal, system, intersectionality, unity, and representation. Being better coordinated provides effective and more sustainable solutions.

The overall concept of a 2nd Charter addresses further themes, though always relating back to the two overarching themes of structure and collaboration.

Theme Two: It provides a structure for CS to be more involved. Increasingly CS wants to participate and further its engagement with UN work. The current accreditation process to receive consultative status with the UN was shown to be very challenging and created strong negative emotions. A 2nd Charter can provide an alternate system for engagement. The data showed that CS has a high capacity for coordination and cooperation.

Theme Three: A 2nd Charter has the capacity to provide a structure with clear points of entry in UN work that would no longer restrict or complicate the access for CS involvement. It could solve the different participation processes, times, and rights with the different parts of the current UN system.

Theme Four: This operational structure could be an answer to the UN needing to do more to include CS. It would provide an organising body focused on interlacing the UN and CS engagement. Opening the door both ways allows for greater contribution of each other towards international development work, creating collaboration through this structure. It would allow for CS to finally be taken seriously. Numerous participants provided names of multiple Member States that would be interested in providing the political support for a 2nd Charter.

Theme Five: A 2nd Charter could address the need for a CS mandate, that is currently noted as missing in the UN’s relationship with CS. The reason it is sometimes remarked that CS is seen as too influential is because the current structure has its emphasis on Member States. This proposed structure could provide the balance between CS and Member States. Regarding the concern of too many CSOs, a 2nd Charter would collect the views and voices through the structured process. What arose from the data was that the more views and voices were acknowledged, the better it would provide more effective solutions; it would collect the voices and collate the views. It does not require all to agree.

Theme Six: The proposed model could further incorporate and extend the contributions CS makes to UN activities for all four of the areas that were noted from the literature review and supported by the field research data. The bridges of lifeline would be strengthened and broadened through this new structure of collaboration.
Theme Seven: Member States’ resistance to CS involvement is partly due to the watchdog role that CS carries. However, it is a necessity for CS to be a watchdog to ensure accountability and communicate realities. This vital role of watchdog of CS is an important part and needs to be accepted and built into the structure. Though, the research did show there is a more effective way for this to be carried out. This is part of the proposed reform model that replaces the naming and shaming current mechanism with that of dialogue and the UN as mediator, which are further addressed below.

Theme Eight: A 2nd Charter would inherently provide the resource of time and space needed for CS engagement. The current funding mechanism was evidenced to create competition as opposed to collaboration. The pooled and blinded funding concept, which is discussed further in the operational mechanism framework, contributes to the overarching theme of this framework regarding collaboration.

Theme Ten: There is a great need to define the roles and responsibilities of the UN and CS to minimise duplication, minimise competition, and to work more collaboratively together to produce synergistic results, allowing each to focus on what they do best and to build that further. In creating this operational structure, it provides the opportunity for that to be done.

Theme Eleven: A clear structure provides an understanding for all as to how to collaborate. Exclusion was commented on as being very frustrating for even those that are included and diminishes the effectiveness of a solution. A 2nd Charter could provide that clear structure for inclusion.

Theme Twelve: Building relationships provides understanding amongst different actors and social components create the opportunities for this to take shape. Therefore, the structure for the proposed model could take into account the need for relationship building opportunities.

Theme Thirteen: Coorporation and dialogue are the key words that arose to reduce conflict. Hence, a reform that includes structure that is built with the overarching theme of coordinated collaboration, as discussed above, will contribute to reducing human rights violations and conflict. In addition, dialogue also contributes to this and is discussed further in the operational mechanism framework. Restructuring is imperative for the prevention of conflict and human rights. Both corporation and dialogue are important in reducing conflict, hence both those themes are built into the frameworks in overarching concepts.

Theme Fourteen: A 2nd Charter would certainly provide the much-needed updated working environment. The current outdated work setting creates competition, instead of cooperation, (the overarching theme of this framework) in a fight to stay relevant in the outdated work situation. Hence, competition would be reduced by no longer needing to struggle to stay pertinent.

In addition, with the current issues being more and more global as opposed to national, there is a greater demand for a work method that is up to date, which current technologies can provide. A renewed work environment is desperately needed where we can work together, where we can think together, solve problems
together, and connect in an organised fashion. Through this new proposed structure, global international development can be rejuvenated through a system that encourages and supports more sustainable and effective actions. And with the Naber model, flexibility to continue to change.

Theme Seventeen: With the proposed operational structure in place, clear pathways for knowledge transfer can be made available, as grouped and shared knowledge was shown in the data to be more effective and results in better outcomes. The transfer of information includes knowledge, institutional, people, skills, relationship, technological, and the transfer of information on background understanding of issues and people. The pathway for transfer of information is accessible through both Charters, from national offices to international offices, and from national office to national office. In addition, it is important to build the new system, which captures the lessons learned.

All documents and communications for the reformed working model between the UN and CS must be written in language that is intended for comprehension by the average lay person. ‘Normal speak’ should replace the current heavily jargoned language that is used, which requires knowledge or experience to be understood.

Theme Nineteen: The proposed operational structure would include both virtual and physical bricks and mortar to provide a combined space in which to carry out the work in a collaborative, inclusive way. The virtual space could bring in more voices. Although it was noted that not everyone has access to internet capabilities, it was regarded that this would be coming. However, data security would need to be addressed. The evidence noted the need for a global body for the 2nd Charter and national offices for CS, which is discussed further below.

Theme Twenty: The data showed that the new reform structure needs to address human resources, for both, those involved in the current Charter and the proposed 2nd Charter. Firstly, it needs to fill the position of the Non-Governmental Liaison Service (NGLS) role. Secondly, the performance management and job descriptions need to incorporate the importance of the relationship between CS and UN for all roles. For this to happened, it needs to be embedded in the job descriptions and to be incentivised, to build the said relationship. Working with CS and including the local level understanding needs to be seen as the norm and is an imperative component to all decision-making.

Thirdly, the new structure should provide professional development training. Training needs to include the following components.

Appreciating and respecting each other’s voice and perspective, to build understanding and apply effective communication skills including true listening. As seen in theme 17 above, the transferring of knowledge is an important component, hence training and mentoring for capacity building of that transferred knowledge and understanding the responsibilities around that is very important.

Training is especially needed for change management. The professional development needs to include better planning for succession and turnover. Systematic handover of systems and smooth and effective relationship transitioning
is required, in addition, to training for successful partnership management. All professional development needs to define teamwork to include all actors.

Fourthly, consideration is given to replace political appointments with reform-minded UN mission orientated people. Begin with the positions that are decision-making roles, as those jobs are central to allowing reform to take shape.

Fifth, employ people who believe and enact the core UN values, which are discussed further below. This is vital and as such makes up the overarching theme for the operational mechanism framework.

Theme Twenty-One: There was overwhelming evidence that the current UN and CS relationship dynamics diminish development due to resources spent on the frustrations of the relationship and due to a lack of structure that provides clear pathways of interlacing UN and CS work. With this resolved, potentially through the proposed reform, greater increased collective effort can be contributed to international development for two reasons. One, the reduction in effort spent on the current frustrating dynamics of the UN and CS relationship. Two, the synergies that can be built with a proper work structure in place.

Theme Twenty-Two: The data showed evidence that strong leadership can make all the difference for collaboration, even or especially so, for the role of Chair. Hence, the proposed model for reform needs to take into account the placement of leaders who are able to articulate collaboration consistently in their behaviours.

Theme Twenty-Three: A 2nd Charter provides the potential to address the various criticism of the current UN system. This reformed system acknowledges and incorporates CS, as opposed to the often-viewed ‘lip service’ or ‘ticking of the box’ that both UN and CS participants have acknowledged and is currently happening. In addition, a clear system and structure has the potential to reduce bureaucracy. The criticisms of lack of connection to the issues on the ground and inability to collaborate effectively could all be addressed with a 2nd Charter that is interlaced with the current Charter and has not only a global office but national offices as well. This inherently would create a much more effective and results orientated UN system.

Theme Twenty-Five: The expectations of how to conduct oneself should become more evident when there is a well-defined structure in place for collaboration. Hence, the unwritten rule book should not be required, with clear procedures in place that is accessible to all.

There is one sublayer for the operational structure framework. In this sublayer there are four components.

Component One - Global and National Offices
The importance of having in-country national offices along with a global office is the overarching theme for this component of the sublayer. The exploration of this part of the structural framework, begins with its principal theme, followed by subsequent themes relating back to the necessity of national offices.
Theme Sixteen: The evidence indicated a great importance for CS to work together in a country and for the global offices to connect with that collective group of CS in a country. In addition, with a formalised structure in place, there is the opportunity to more effectively work between countries and share best practices. It was acknowledged that the catalyst for change sits most effectively and more sustainably in-country and has the capacity to provide the honest realities of circumstances of the local levels. This is seen as vital for decision-making and information sharing within the national context as well as the global one.

Theme Eleven: The process to collaborate together in-country then globally and vice versa allows for much greater inclusion. It provides inclusion for solutions both on national and global levels.

Theme Thirteen: It was recognised in the data that although the know how does exist, there is a strong deficiency in the system for prevention; to respond to early warning signals and potentially mitigate conflict. A better coordinated mechanism that is needed to apply effective prevention, is currently missing. However, a 2nd Charter would provide the opportunity to create a clear system and process for this needed mechanism. In addition, it was noted that there is a growing need for CS to be a part of the conflict resolution discussions, as often violence has evolved past the previous government versus government historical dynamic. Hence, in-country knowledge is critical for addressing conflict and human rights violations.

Component Two - Grouped Issues
The overarching theme for this component of the sublayer relates to one of the virtues of the UN, the process and creation of the SDGs. The unifying of grouped issues was seen as a honing beacon for collaboration. The subsequent themes under this component refer back to the effectiveness of working together in grouped issues. The discussion of this component begins with its overall theme.

Theme Twenty-Four: It was remarked that organising around specific goals was effective. The SDGs were highly regarded in the research, not only for the effectiveness of working together for particular grouped issues, but also for the global common language they provided. The process of the SDG creation was seen as a gold standard of UN and CS collaborative work. The SDGs were regarded as a place to build on.

However, it was evidenced that the structure of how to achieve the SDGs was missing. This can now be provided with the 2nd Charter. The structure should be designed around grouped issues, the SDGs, as it provides a common purpose and was created through a successful UN and CS engagement. Though, accountability was evidenced to be lacking and will need more consideration for further implementation of the SDGs. In addition, 193 Member States have agreed to the SDGs and numerous national governments use the SDGs as focal points.

Theme Seventeen: Implementing a reform based on a structure with grouped issues like the SDGs, provides a common ground to work from, a global language, and has the capacity to break down silos. It provides the organisational element and the structure helps build the pathways through which collaboration can unfold. Often, an issue overlaps into more than one of the 17 SDGs; the structure would provide clarity
as to where to focus the working relations (dialogue and knowledge transfer) amongst the different grouped issues, to work unified and inclusively together.

**Theme Eighteen:** Collaborating on grouped issues and coordinating efforts towards a specific goal arose in the data as an effective way to work together.

**Theme Twenty-Three:** One of the criticisms of the UN relates to power struggles, as different actors have different goals. With clarity of the focus on grouped issues that relate to the overall intention of the UN, goals for all actors are defined and reinstated. This clarity of focus for the collective goals is supported through both the structural operation of grouped issues under a 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter, which is interlaced with the 1\textsuperscript{st} Charter, and the operational mechanism framework, which is discussed below.

**Theme Twenty-Seven:** Issues that are aligned with shared values are known to receive more support both politically and financially. With the SDGs being acknowledged by all 193 Member States, these are issues that have already been validated as shared common interests. Hence, working under the grouped issues of SDGs provides the unbiased support from all Member States regardless of their cultural background, as they have previously agreed to the SDGs. Therefore, the SDGs provide a unified value based moral compass that all have agreed to over and above the UN's goals and values, outlined in the 1\textsuperscript{st} Charter.

**Component Three - Structure Designed for Accessibility**

Even those who have managed to get access to the UN and CS work environment find the current UN structure lacking in solutions’ orientated approaches, when not all actors are able to participate. Hence, inclusion is the overarching theme for this component and is vital to the operational structure - it must be designed for accessibility that supports inclusion. This component is first explained through this overall theme of inclusion and all the succeeding themes relate back to it.

**Theme Eleven:** All actors, who want to participate in resolving an SDG, can do so under the remit of their intention to contribute towards that goal and under the remit of their intentions to be aligned with the UN values (explained further below). This could automatically create the mandate for participation that is often remarked as currently missing (without actually creating a mandate) and could potentially allow for full inclusion. Therein, if the structure and mechanics of the operation are soundly designed and implemented, additional bureaucratic steps are fundamentally not required. Creating a system on the whole that is much more efficient and allows for further resources to be diverted towards sustainable international development.

**Theme Three:** The proposed 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter provides the opportunity to state clearly the necessary involvement of CS and how it is engaged with the different sections of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Charter. Even ECOSOC, in all three of its resolutions that reviewed the NGO consultative status of Article 71 of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Charter from 1950, 1968, and 1996, stated that the UN needed to do more to include CS and have NGOs participate further in other UN organs. Hence, this proposed reform would take into account those suggestions throughout all those years.
Theme Eight: Through a pooled and blinded funding mechanism, which is discussed further below, inclusion would be encouraged. It would create a work environment of enhanced equal funding opportunities as it would potentially diminish competition. This leads to the creation of interacting as equal, which is paramount for inclusion and for effective dialogue (discussed further below). It encourages an atmosphere were actors are managed as equals, because the financial component is blinded; in feeling and being seen as an equal, actors are therefore more likely to be included.

Theme Eighteen: With inclusion built into the operational structure, collaborative coordination is further enhanced and becomes an inherent necessity.

Theme Twenty-Six: The data provided evidence for the necessity to include the private sector, with the understanding that its intention truly aligns with the UN values and goals (as mentioned above in theme 11 and explored further below in the mechanics framework). It is clear that all need to be involved in order to address today’s global issues; it requires everyone to contribute. The data demonstrated extreme urgency for the required reform to be implemented, hence leveraging all actors’ specific contributions are required.

It was regarded that the private sector has assets it can contribute towards UN goals. Examples include: its knowledge on marketing prowess, its ability to respond and move quickly, its impact on government policy and regulations in making decisions that ensure products and processes are sustainable, providing dignified employment, and taking on more and more of a role of providing charity.

The evidence showed that the private sector needs to be incorporated with governmental work to ensure employment, however this must be aligned with the values mechanics (discussed further below). This could potentially allow governments to be courageous, progressive, and innovative with policy and regulations that support sustainability due to the collaborative work with the private sector in finding ways that continue to support the economics and employment of a nation, however towards the desperately needed fulfilment of the UN’s goals and values. Sustainability comes with a sustainable earth, sustainable employment, and sustainable homes with full acknowledgement of human dignity and rights.

Component Four - UN as Mediator
The fourth component of the sublayer for the structural operational framework is the overarching theme 15 of the honest broker, the UN’s role as a mediator between governments and CS. All the following themes of this component relate back to it. The exploration of this component begins with its overarching theme.

Theme Fifteen: A part of the reformed structure could leverage one of the virtues of the UN, that of its role as an honest broker in which it is a mediator between CS and governments. The data showed evidence that some parts of CS did not want to be working with government because they see their role as challenging the government. From the opposite aspect, some governments do not want to be working with CS as they see that as diminishing their role of power, however, would feel comfortable to accept ideas from the UN. In addition, CS can say things to governments that the UN cannot, thus, further strengthening the need for this role of the mediator is necessary.
The UN is often seen as a neutral position holder. However, it was noted that if this role were to be strengthened and more formalised in this new structure, the UN would truly need to be neutral. The UN has the opportunity to carry out this very crucial role between governments and CS and extend this virtue in a more formalised role through a 2nd Charter.

Theme Five: Despite the negative reasons that were uncovered in the research for CS to work together with the UN, there was indeed far greater data that indicated the growing and desperate need to work more closely together and that the relationship between the UN and CS was vital.

Accountability of NGOs was questioned in the literature review, the research from the field data strongly added the necessity of accountability from all actors: CS, Member States, and the UN itself. The UN, through this proposed reform, can strengthen its virtue of a mediator and provide a reinforced accountability mechanism. The data showed that governments were more comfortable being held accountable by the UN as opposed to CS. With CS providing the communications of realities to the UN, the UN can carry out the role of accountability-holder with direct input from the ground knowledge.

Theme Seven: A reason stated why Member States resist the involvement of CS was that CS is seen as a threat due to the fear of being held accountable by CS. Member States prefer to be held accountable by the UN as opposed to CS, as discussed above. This proposed reform suggests the role of the UN as mediator between CS and UN to be more emphasised in the new structure. Therefore, this proposed reform has the capacity to reduce the fear of Member States including CS furthering its work with the UN, with accountability held by the UN.

Operational Mechanism Framework – UN’s Principled Decision-Making Policy (UN’s PDMP)

The structure alone would not suffice for the sought solutions, as the data highlighted. A principles-based operational mechanism, including meaningful dialogue and a new funding process, which is carried throughout the entire structure (discussed above) is required for the relationship reform between the UN and CS to more fully address the issues.

The use of the word principle in the title of the decision-making framework is quite intentional. Lexico dictionary, which is powered by Oxford provides the following definition for principle ‘a fundamental truth or proposition that serves as the foundation for a system of belief or behaviour or for a chain of reasoning’ (Lexico.com, 2020). It refers to the fundamental truth of the UN’s existence and that it is the foundation of a system. Hence, this is a framework by which the structural operation, discussed above, works through.

‘The mission and work of the United Nations are guided by the purposes and principles contained in its founding Charter’ (UN.org, 2020). The preamble from the founding Charter of the United Nations states:
'We The Peoples Of The United Nations Determined

• to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
• to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
• to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and
• to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

And For These Ends

• to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and
• to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and
• to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and
• to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

Have Resolved To Combine Our Efforts To Accomplish These Aims

Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations’ (Historical Works, 2012). This excerpt has intentionally included that Member States have agreed to the UN’s purposes and principles.

It is evident that the proposed principles-based operational mechanism, including meaningful dialogue and a new funding process, is a comprehensive concept from a mechanics perspective, because it has the capacity to address all the themes that arose from the research, see Figure 5.2. The overarching theme is first discussed.
### Figure 5.2 Operational Mechanism
The Mechanics through which the Structure Operates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>CS/NGOs Want to be Involved</th>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>UN Needs to do More to Involve CS/NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 5</td>
<td>Negative Reasons to Involving CS/NGOs</td>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td>CS/NGO Contributions to UN</td>
<td>Theme 8</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 9</td>
<td>Structure, System, Process</td>
<td>Theme 10</td>
<td>Defining the Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UN’s Principled Decision-Making Policy (UN’s PDMP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Theme 27</th>
<th>Principled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 11</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 13</td>
<td>Conflict and Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 14</td>
<td>Outdated Working Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 15</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 16</td>
<td>In Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 17</td>
<td>Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 18</td>
<td>Coordinated Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Talk for Trust
Dialogue & Knowledge Transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Theme 5</th>
<th>Negative Reasons to Involving CS/NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td>CS/NGO Contributions to UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 7</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 8</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 12</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding: Pooled & Blinded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Theme 5</th>
<th>Negative Reasons to Involving CS/NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 7</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 8</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 11</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 13</td>
<td>Conflict and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 14</td>
<td>Outdated Working Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 15</td>
<td>Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 16</td>
<td>In Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme 18</td>
<td>Coordinated Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Relationship Vital
Theme 1
Please note that when referring to values in this writing, the intent for the use of this word is to capture the purposes and principles of the UN. It was observed that this is how participants communicated. Therefore, it is used here in the writing, in this fashion as well.

**Theme Twenty-Seven:** The necessity of principled purpose is the overall theme for the operational mechanics framework. It was striking how strong the research evidence showed the need and resurgence of values, referring to the principles of the UN and its purposes. It was regarded as a key virtue and the reason for the strength of its brand. It was also clear that should the actions more fully align with the values of the UN, then far more effective international development could be brought to life. When an organisation, profit or not for profit, individual staff member, regardless of who they work for, or government do not align with UN goals and values, an unproductive dynamic occurs. Transparency around motive needs to be built into the system and structure.

Hence, creating a decision-making framework that ensures that actions consistently align with the overarching values of the UN is vital for the UN and CS relationship reform, for the reform of the UN itself and for the much-sought greater effective UN work. With the world becoming increasingly interdependent, issues moving ever more to a shared global space, having all decisions based on the UN purposes and principles is not only essential but ubiquitarian.

Therefore, the proposed reform includes the great need and revival of the UN’s values to be brought to the forefront through the creation of the UN’s Principled Decision-Making Policy (UN’s PDMP), which guides actions ensuring that decisions are aligned with the UN’s goals and values.

Only one sublayer follows this main component. The second layer includes two components: the necessity of meaningful dialogue and a pooled and blinded funding process, both of which are discussed further below. All three of these mechanical components, the UN’s PDMP, meaningful dialogue, and pooled and blinded funding would operate through all areas of the structural framework discussed above.

The overall concept of a principles-based decision-making framework, the UN’s PDMP, addresses almost all themes and continues to relay back to the overarching theme 27 of principled values, which is now explored (see Figure 5.2). It is followed by a description of the sublayer, which includes the other themes.

**Theme Two:** CS is seen as increasingly more effective and professional and desires to be more fully involved in UN work. It was remarked that one of the reasons is because of the belief in UN’s values and what it stands for is growing. As global concerns are rising, so is the need for the UN, for what it stands for, for what values it has committed to and this has created a calling for more of CS wanting to be involved with UN work.

**Theme Three:** There are two areas that restrict and complicate CS involvement in UN work, one being structure, which was addressed in the previous framework, the other being Member States struggling to accept CS and taking measures to decrease CS participation. With the incorporation of the UN’s PDMP, decisions
culminate back to the purpose of the UN. Decisions are not based on previous power-driven preferences, instead consistently brought back to the reason for being there in the first place. The values become the driving factors for the intention, in order to further the UN’s principles and purposes and all decisions align with that.

In addition, utilising this decision-making framework, creates a third entity. Meaning, when a decision needs to be made and power struggles become apparent, having a third entity becomes a reliable source to ensure that decisions align with the UN’s goals and values. This third entity also provides the neutral entity that can be relied upon without it actually being a person. It provides the scapegoat, and because it is not actually a person or party, it does not increase any tensions. Instead it holds the strong possibility of actually diminishing power struggles because the decisions lay in the UN’s PDMP, as opposed to a person or represented party.

**Theme Four:** This theme relates to the UN needing to do more to involve CS. On the 11th of June 2004, Secretary General Kofi Annan wrote a note preceding the Cardoso Report. The Cardoso Report was commissioned for the purpose of re-evaluating the UN and CS relationship and is still seen today as the most prominent piece of work on this topic, although it is 16 years old. ‘I asked the Panel to review existing guidelines, decisions and practices that affect civil society organizations’ access to and participation in United Nations deliberations and processes; to identify best practices in the United Nations system… to identifying new and better ways to interact with non-governmental organizations and other civil society organizations… to participate fully in United Nations activities… Through their work, they have already made an invaluable contribution to the strengthening of the United Nations in a world that is remarkably different from the one in which the United Nations was founded’ (The Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, 2004). At that time, he already recognised that the world had changed from the time of the UN’s commencement, that CS needed to be fully involved in the UN, and he noted the need to include not only NGOs but also the broader concept of CSOs.

This call to action from Kofi Annan in 2004 is still waiting to be answered.

Civil Society is the content of the UN’s principles and purposes (see excerpt above from the founding Charter). CS would be an integral component of the UN’s PDMP. In addition, CS is regarded as highly valued in the relationship with the UN and its invaluable contributions to the work itself, as noted in Annan’s quote above.

**Theme Five:** With the proposed UN’s PDMP in place, issues of concern around Trojan Horses, were representation and motives are questioned, have the potential to no longer prevail. With the mechanics of operation beginning with the UN’s PDMP it brings motivations back to the values and goals of the UN. The point of entry for collaborative UN/CS work begins with that main decision-making framework and could pose questions that ask; ‘Why are you there? Are your actions and engagement contributing towards the UN purposes and principles?’ It brings it back to the purpose right from the point of entry and continues throughout all decision-making.
Theme Six: The value of CS is numerous and provides expertise, implementation, and identifies issues. CS brings in information on global issues not aligned with UN values and goals. The findings highlighted the valued work of Civil Societies’ contributions include governmental activities, operational activities, overall management of global issues to moving the UN work to the forefront of issues. Hence, strengthening the UN’s purposes and principles, in terms of the work CS carries out and in bringing awareness to concerns.

Theme Eight: A pooled and blinded funding process, explained further below, supports the work carried out by the UN to align with its purposes and principles. Favoritisms because one Member State or donor gives more than another impacts philosophy, brings in Member State or donor agendas as opposed to staying aligned with UN’s PDMP. The new funding process builds anonymity into the funding mechanism, supporting decisions based on UN values and goals, as opposed to decisions based on where the sources of funding originate. This process brings in a rejuvenation of the original purpose of the UN and creates an environment for effective contributions towards international development, as opposed to appeasing outside agendas.

Theme Nine: The proposed UN reform consists of an operational structure, the 2nd Charter discussed above, and a decision-making process based on the UN’s purposes and principles, as well as meaningful dialogue, and a new funding mechanism. The two frameworks together build the required infrastructural backbone for reform.

Theme Ten: Defining the roles of the UN and CS, as part of the reform process, would be success orientated, as it can focus on the virtues of each party allowing the enhancement of those qualities, which were discussed earlier in the thesis. It is also an important part of the reform to enhance collaboration in the relationship to diminish competition amongst the two which is caused by overlapping work responsibilities.

As noted in the findings, there are many ways to define CS, as was seen in the various categorisations that were provided. Frustrations were observed in the ongoing struggle to define CS. It seemed that being able to define CS was needed in order to find the solution for the UN to engage with CS. However, it was also noted a virtue of CS was its varying personas. In addition, the introduction discussed the changing roles of CS throughout history.

As part of the proposed reform, the following defining roles are suggested. The UN rejuvenates the original purposes and principles in respect of its reason for being. CS is actually not defined by its representation, instead by its engagement with the UN through its contributing role to the UN’s goals and values. In this way, both the UN and CS maintain and enhance some of their highest virtues.

In addition, even if CS was given a definition of who or what they are, we have already seen throughout history that it changes, and it will continue to do so as the world changes. Therefore, even if it was given a definition of what it is, based on history, it would evolve soon again into something new and different. Therein, it could potentially diminish part of Civil Societies’ inherent value if it was defined.
This approach prevents the need for additional bureaucratic mandates and instead stays focused on the intrinsic reason for the UN and CS relationship. It creates a leaner system that is results-oriented.

Beyond the defining roles of the UN realigning consistently with its purposes and principles and CS as contributing towards them, one necessity is still needed. That is defining which party is responsible for what; it is required for a synergistic and collaborative working relationship. Clarity on defining the responsibilities will build cohesion. As the data evidenced, a collective consultation process was regarded as the process needed for refining the details of the UN and CS relationship reform.

**Theme Eleven:** Varying voices were highly valued in the research data and were seen as essential to be included. It was often remarked that CS needed to be categorised in order to establish whether or not they had access to work with the UN based on what category they were placed in. In this proposal this is replaced with CS answering the question; 'Does your work contribute to the UN’s purposes and principles?' (which can be identified through the application of the UN’s PDMP). All the voices who do contribute, including those that are there to provide information of where the UN’s goals and values are being threatened, are valued voices and need to have equal weight and opportunity for being heard in the new reform. The application of software is already available for participation in larger groups, either virtually or in person, which would capture and record the quieter voices and bring equal weight and opportunity.

**Theme Thirteen:** Reform and restructuring is imperative for the prevention of conflict and the violation of human rights. As evidenced in the research, before conflict, human rights are often violated. Human rights are an integral part of the UN’s purposes and principles. Therefore, it is crucial for the UN to rejuvenate its reason for being. The structure, as discussed above, and the component of meaningful dialogue, discussed below, continue to show how integral this theme is in the UN and CS relationship reform.

**Theme Fourteen:** Interestingly the research repeatedly noted that the UN is functioning in an outdated fashion, which is impeding its results. However, its original purposes and principles were regarded as in desperate need of rejuvenation and is needed more than ever. Hence, the UN’s PDMP provides a new working mechanism that enhances and brings to the forefront the never outdated reason for its being.

**Theme Fifteen:** In considering the UN as an honest broker, as mediator between governments and CS, it is vital for the UN to be true to its neutral and inclusive position. This can be fortified by the third entity, the UN’s PDMP, and protect the neutral position from potential intrusion, to not disrupt or adversely affect the movement towards the UN’s goals and values.

**Theme Sixteen:** As seen in the structural framework above, in country contribution is highly regarded. It strengthens the contribution towards the UN's goals and values. In country participation is known to influence and impact decisions for more effective results throughout all of the UN’s purposes and principles.
Theme Seventeen: Sharing and transferring knowledge and engaging in respectful, meaningful dialogue arose from the data as vital for the UN and CS relationship and the work it carries out. It provides the conduit to which understanding is built and trust. Due to this importance, as was noted above, effective communication should be included in professional development training. Evidence showed that meaningful dialogue and now coupled with the application of UN’s PDMP, decisions can be increasingly more effective whilst continuously staying aligned with the overall purpose.

Theme Eighteen: The data showed that coordination happens best when there is a clear purpose and value. Hence, a decision-making framework focused on the contribution towards UN’s purposes and principles will support and enhance collaborative coordination because it is based on UN’s goals and values.

Theme Twenty: Even decisions on employment could utilise the UN’s PDMP to ensure staff hired are people who have values that are aligned with the core purposes and principles of the UN and are motivated to make decisions in their work that are consistently about furthering the UN’s goals and values.

Theme Twenty-One: The proposed UN’s PDMP could greatly contribute to the lessening of resources spent on the UN and CS relationship dynamic. It brings all decision-making back to the core of the UN. All participants indicated the necessity of the UN and CS relationship and was shown in how much time and energy is spent on the relationship dynamic. With clarity on decisions that are continuously made that align with the original purposes and principles of the UN, a more cohesive and trusting relationship can be built as all are aligned with the same motive.

Theme Twenty-Two: Sound values and strong leadership equate to sought solutions which arose from the research findings. The proposed UN’s PDMP supports the sound values by building in a decision-making framework that always brings decisions back to the UN’s core reason for being.

Theme Twenty-Three: One of the criticisms of the UN relates to decisions being made that appease powerholder demands. Decisions based on power dynamics were evident in the research from agenda setting, programme creation, employing for political placation, funding and more. With the proposed UN’s PDMP in place, decisions can now be made that are continuously based on the UN’s goals and values and no longer that of the demands of the powerholder. The purposes and principles now hold the power and is protected through the position of a third entity of a framework that cannot be influenced.

Theme Twenty-Four: Creating the UN’s PDMP captures and strengthens one of the key virtues of the UN, its goals and values. The evidence demonstrated a cry and great need to be able to rely on the UN more than ever. This decision-making framework would build in reliability, that actions are taken that support the UN’s values and contribute towards its goals. The data showed that the UN, with its purposes and principles, is looked to for solutions for the well-being for the one world and the UN’s intentions for existing, needs to be implemented with great urgency.
Theme Twenty-Five: The UN’s PDMP provides the expectation of how to conduct oneself, how decisions are to be carried out. It provides the rules for the unwritten rule book because every interaction, provides an opportunity to express the UN values.

Theme Twenty-Six: The inclusion of the private sector was seen in the evidence as a necessity, yet at the same time must be present in UN work only for the contribution towards the purposes and principles of the UN. Therefore, as described above in theme five of this framework, the UN’s PDMP is the point of entry for all actors, including the private sector. It elicits the answer to the question, why are you there? It elicits the answer to the question, why are you taking that action? The only allowable answer is based on the purpose to contribute towards the UN’s goals and values. The UN’s PDMP is there throughout all activities and decision-making, not just the point of entry.

There is one sublayer for the operational mechanics framework. In this sublayer there are two components.

Component One - Talk for Trust
Talking builds trust and therefore is a key component of the mechanics framework. The overarching theme for this subcomponent is theme 17, which relates to the necessity of meaningful dialogue.

Before the proposed UN’s PDMP is applied to a decision being made, a conversation with those involved in a particular decision would naturally be first carried out. The data showed that dialogue needs to happen far more often and when it does, it must be done in a meaningful way.

There are a number of subsequent themes that refer back to this main one, which are discussed after the overall theme 17 is explored.

Theme Seventeen: This is the overarching theme for this component of the sublayer. Dialogue is another mechanical component through with the structure, discussed above, operates. Sharing knowledge and holding conversations with one another for the reason that the UN exists, for the fulfilling the UN’s purposes and principles, arose in the evidence of the research as required, but needs to be carried out effectively.

A number of elements touched on the necessity of meaningful dialogue; it is a way to build trust, to build understanding, it breaks down barriers, it provides the information needed for more effective decisions to be made and talking was seen as the guide to tell us what to do. However, conversations need to be held in an effective way, with active listening; dialogue should be ongoing, must be inclusive, respectful, and acknowledge that everyone has something to contribute.

Talking also provides a conduit for knowledge transfer. In addition, it was regarded that better outcomes come as a result of shared knowledge.

If participants are there for the reason the UN exists, as identified through their point of entry with the application of the UN’s PDMP, then resistance for including
meaningful dialogue in the operations should not be found. Therefore, in terms of resistance for including meaningful dialogue, one works back up to the top of this operational mechanics framework to find the UN’s PDMP, which aims to address this concern.

Theme Five: Talking for trust addresses theme five (negative reasons for including CS) in a few different ways. The research showed that dialogue improves accountability and builds trust. This also helps address the issues around legitimacy and credibility.

The concern with having too much of a northern focus could also be addressed when combined with the operational structure which provides the in-country offices. Dialogue would come up from the national offices to the global offices regardless of what region they originated. Therefore, richer dialogue would be fostered, as contributions would be made from all regions.

To solve the issue of having too many voices, again coupled with the operational structure of having in-country offices, the collated voices would be collected through their national conversations and filter up to the global level.

Theme Six: The positive reasons for including CS would be heightened by bringing in meaningful dialogue throughout the operations. It would enhance the take up and application of information contributed from CS, from both the issues frontiers to global ones. In addition, holding effective conversations could further the delivery of expertise that CS contributes.

Theme Seven: Removing the current naming and shaming process and instead making it about meaningful dialogue could reduce the anxiety of Member States to include CS. Too many Member States see CS as an opponent, so replacing naming and shaming with conversations holds the intention of building trust and understanding, which could contribute to the UN and CS relationship reform and contribute to the UN’s goals and values.

Theme Eight: The proposed pooled and blinded funding mechanism, discussed further below, would contribute to holding effective conversations. The data showed that dialogue often is associated with an agenda because of power and money. As the research evidenced, funders are often told what the recipient thinks they want to hear because they hold the purse strings, which does not necessarily contribute to the UN’s goals and values. This was noted as actually be frustrating for the funder.

Theme Twelve: Social elements provide opportunity for dialogue to build relationships and build understanding. It shapes thinking and contributes to the ease of decisions that align with the UN’s PDMP.

Theme Thirteen: Talking for the purposes of building trust is highly valued especially for the prevention of conflict and human rights violations. Restructuring with a mechanism that is built on meaningful dialogue could contribute towards the prevention of conflict and the upholding of human rights. In addition, it could potentially contribute to circumstances that would prevent defensiveness and maintaining access to provide human aid. One of the limiting factors to prevention of
conflict is the lack of trust. The research showed that trust is built through understanding and that requires dialogue.

Theme Fourteen: Focusing on meaningful dialogue throughout the UN and CS relationship provides a reformed method of working for the intention to support the UN’s goals and values.

Theme Nineteen: Due to virtual capacities, opportunities for dialogue are enhanced; as well, supports inclusion. However, internet availability needs to reach further, and online security needs to be provided.

Theme Twenty-Three: The UN is criticised for being only a talking shop, though it is noted as important. Now transforming the talking shop into making the dialogue meaningful and effective would turn one of its criticisms into its strength. This could also contribute to more effective action, which would minimise another criticism, that of ineffectiveness.

Component Two - Funding: Pooled & Blinded
The other component of the sublayer for the mechanics framework is a proposed process for funding. Funding has the capacity to support international development, but also to diminish it because of the way the process currently operates, which is discussed further below.

Member States have already agreed to the UN’s purposes and principles through the founding Charter and so accepting a pooled and blinded funding mechanism will only further support the UN’s goals and values. Other donors, again working down from the top of this framework from the UN’s PDMP to the pooled and blinding funding process, should be keen to accept this process for the sake of truly wanting to participate in contributing towards the UN’s purposes and principles. Hence, a catch system is built into the framework to secure reform measures, this is described further below in the vision.

For this component, the overall theme is first discussed, theme eight. There are a number of other themes that follow, however always relating back to this overarching theme of resources.

Theme Eight: This is the main theme for this component of the sublayer. It proposes a new funding mechanism to be carried out throughout the whole of the structural operation. Funding, regardless of its source, whether from Member States, the private sector, foundations, philanthropists, and other donors, all becomes pooled into one bucket. In addition, funding would be blinded.

A funder could state that they prefer their funds to go into a particular area of international development, and this would be pooled together in that specific bucket of funds with the other funders who are supporting that area. From the pooled funding, the monies are then dispersed. Hence, who receives from whom is blinded and who gives to whom is also blinded within their specified area.

Essentially, regardless of which funder, the monies they contribute in all likelihood originated from CS. Such as governments through taxes from CS, the private sector
from CS as its consumers, philanthropists likely from CS as customers as well in some fashion. Therefore, investing back to CS, the content of the founding Charter, is an accountability for all funders. Hence, doing so through a reformed funding mechanism, which offers a much higher rate of return, described below, should be of great interest.

This is a vital mechanism to be applied to the operations as it streamlines the process and prevents influence and bias in a number of ways, which with the current process has been shown to diminish development and therefore have an underperforming investment.

First, competition: the researched showed that rivalry is created between the UN and CS as they compete for funds. It was regarded that donors create competition through the current funding mechanism. This also contributes to power dynamics and favouritism. The proposed funding process would break down competition, offer opportunities for inclusion because of anonymity and contribute to collaboration. Although, funding increases opportunities for development, it also decreases it due to the current process that is based on competition. It prevents possible synergies through collaboration and inclusion.

Second, agenda setting: the data showed that funding dictates decisions and sets the agenda. Funders, because they provide the monies, hold the belief that they should have the right to make decisions and set agendas. However, this is often done through a limited perspective or through their own agenda and hence can greatly diminish furthering international development. The proposed funding mechanism would prevent this assumed right. Allowing agendas and decisions to be aligned with the UN’s PDMP for the full intentions to align with the UN’s purposes and principles in the most knowledgeable way, includes all perspectives, not just that of the funders and their agendas. It was noted in the research that because donors often impose ideas, as opposed to incorporating the information from the issues’ forefronts, that this can decrease development.

Third, power dynamics: a number of power dynamics are created through money, which is evidenced in the research, especially in terms of rights funders believe to hold, which is fed both ways. The givers of money believe to hold these rights and those that receive monies from them allow them these rights. The concern arises when terms are dictated that do not align with the overall purposes and principles of the UN. With the pooled and blinded funding mechanism, these power dynamics are diminished. The new mechanism allows for a realignment of investment towards the reason the UN exists. Terms are not dictated by the funders for their plans but instead terms are dictated collectively, which has been shown to be more effective for the fulfilment of the UN’s goals and values.

Fourth, streamlining: the research indicated that a great deal of effort and resources are spent on applying for and managing grants, with each funder having a different process for all steps. The 2nd Charter provides the opportunity to include streamlining the current funding process, creating one process for grant application, grant reporting, and grant management from the one pooled and blinded funding source. Hence, even smaller organisations can apply, because it was evidenced that they often lack the resources needed that INGOs have access to. This creates
a more inclusive approach to access monies. In addition, with less resources needed to administer and manage all the different reporting requirements for each funder, more resources, such as time and being able to redirect staff efforts, can be put towards the development work itself. A funding process that is pooled can provide a streamlined approach, because monies no longer come from multiple sources.

Fifth, accountability: through the consultation process, that was recommended in the research to refine the details of the proposed frameworks, accountability will need to be paramount with a funding source that is from one pooled location. However, with the funders being blinded, it provides a degree of an integrated accountability in the mechanism. In addition, applying one funding mechanism would include one method of accountability that would be described in the streamlined process. This would result in the same accountability process for all those receiving funds from this one source. The current various funding processes make accountability more difficult to be transparent on the whole because accountability is being measured in a number of different ways. This reformed funding process could add to the overall accountability for all parties involved as it would then have one definition. As well, with the application of UN’s PDMP and all decisions aligned with the UN’s purposes and principles, accountability will inherently be addressed through this decision-making model. Again, the Naber Model’s catch system and synergies are highlighted here in a number of ways.

As was evident in the research, if money is not a part of the equation, almost all problems are resolved. Obviously, money itself cannot be removed from the equation, therefore, the intention with this proposed pooled and blinded funding mechanism is to provide a potential solution to address the individual underlying causes of money that creates the problems.

**Theme Five:** The Trojan Horse issue of CS being funded by government or the private sector would be dissolved, if CS were funded from this UN pooled and blinded source. If funding is received from a different source, Civil Societies’ motivations or intentions would be addressed by the UN’s PDMP, which requires all actors involved to participate for the purpose of fulfilling the UN’s goals and values. Once again this demonstrates the catch system of the proposed model.

**Theme Seven:** As noted above, power dynamics could be reduced with this proposed funding process. The researched data showed there is a resistance of Member States to share power with CS. However, with power being noted to be held by those that are the funders, there is a dissolving of power occurring that the pooled and blinded funding mechanism provides, this allows the UN work to be realigned with its purposes and principles, as opposed to Member States individual agendas being pursued through what was deemed to be their right due to the funds they supplied and instead of participating for the actual reason for being there, the UN’s goals and values.

**Theme Eleven:** It was remarked that CS who have more resources can participate more fully in UN work. This proposed process enhances inclusion and equal opportunities for a number of reasons as noted above: reduced competition creating
more occasions for collaboration, enhanced participation in decision-making, setting of agendas, and the streamlined process.

Theme Thirteen: The research showed a clear imbalance in funding for the three different pillars of the UN, with human rights receiving an incredibly lower amount than the other two pillars of peace and security, and development. The reformed funding process should be able to support a rebalance for those three UN pillars, due to the anonymity and pooled elements. The data indicated that the violations of human rights is often a precursor to conflict. Hence, with the pillar of human rights receiving such a lower amount of the budget and the pillar of peace and security receiving a much higher amount, this is creating a counterproductive circumstance. The current funding allocations are actually unfavourable and impeding the UN’s purposes and principles and hence, decreasing international development. Conflict disrupts, destroys, and prevents development, therefore restructuring for the prevention of conflict and prevention of human rights violations is a vital component in being able to work towards the UN’s goals and values more effectively.

Theme Fourteen: The proposed funding mechanism offers a new form of working and can replace the current funding system that can impede development, as was shown in the research.

Theme Fifteen: The data indicated that with the current process, donors often give funds to the UN, as opposed to governments directly for their development because of the UN’s perceived neutral and values-based position. Hence, the pooled and blinded funding proposal would align and further support the UN honest broker role.

Theme Sixteen: The proposed funding system provides the ability for resources to be more effective for in country application due to the streamlining element that it offers. In addition, it creates an environment for more inclusive and collaborative work as it diminishes competition and offers a more collective decision-making and agenda setting situation.

Theme Eighteen: Competition decreases collaboration and the data showed that funding is often responsible for this. A more cohesive working environment is offered with the proposed funding process.

Theme Twenty-Three: One of the criticisms of the UN relates to the power dynamics. As discussed above, the pooled and blinded funding mechanism aims to address power dynamics. In addition, it diminishes the agenda setting and dictated terms that come from power holding positions.

Theme Twenty-Six: It was evidenced that a concern with the private sector exists in that it uses the UN as a profit maximising agent, as opposed to supporting the UN’s purposes and principles. This concern could now be addressed in two ways, the UN’s PDMP and the pooled and blinded funding proposal.

Theme Twenty-Seven: This theme relates to the necessity of principled purpose. This proposed funding mechanism further supports the UN’s PDMP.

Both Frameworks Wrapped in Urgency and the Necessity of the Relationship
Before moving on to the discussion of the inherent flaws, two themes are discussed that wrap both frameworks. Theme one, acknowledges the relationship between the UN and CS as vital and theme 28 relates to the urgency of the UN and CS relationship reform.

Theme One: Throughout all aspects of the research collected, it is clear that the relationship between the UN and CS is vital. Improving the relationship and creating an effective working affiliation is greatly needed and critical.

Not only does CS improve and strengthen UN work, it was evidenced that it is not possible without CSs’ expertise and wisdom. CS supports the UN’s legitimacy and maintains its relevance. In addition, CS has a right to participate through Article 71 and through the preamble of the 1st Charter stating that the UN work is about “We the People”.

The research did not even come close to a hint or even a whisper suggesting otherwise. Quite on the contrary. The relationship was vehemently noted as crucial. Comparative advantages were regarded that each contribute to the work.

Theme Twenty-Eight: The time for UN and CS relationship reform was passionately described as urgently needed, and that with each passing day is a missed opportunity to be working together towards resolving global issues.

The Three Inherent Flaws
The Frameworks - Mechanical & Structural Operations

The Naber Model, which offers a proposed solution of a structural framework and a framework for the mechanisms through which the structure operates, aims to address the three inherent flaws of the UN and CS relationship.

Inherent Flaw One: Member States vs ‘The Peoples’
The first inherent flaw relates to Member States versus The People. The 2nd Charter replaces the ‘versus’ with collaboration. The UN’s PDMP ensures that all decisions are brought back to the purposes and principles of the UN, as opposed to any agendas that sit outside of that. Therefore, the UN’s PDMP brings everyone back to the reason for the UN’s existence and supports it. The 2nd Charter provides the structure to do so.

Inherent Flaw Two: Intrinsic Contradictions of the Relationship
The literature review uncovered eight initial themes, which was supported by both rounds of field research interviews. As a researcher exploring solutions to four of the themes created a worsening condition of the other four themes. Therefore, looking for solutions outside the current UN system was needed. With the two frameworks discussed above, these intrinsic contradictions within the UN and CS relationship can be resolved.

Civil Society wants to be involved (theme 2) and with a 2nd Charter there is a clear process in how this would be carried out, as opposed to having restricted influence and complicated access (theme 3). It was acknowledged that the UN needs to do more to involve CS (theme 4), however there are restricted resources to do so.
(theme 8). A number of components aim to address this contradiction as noted above. It was evidenced that CS greatly contributes to UN work (theme 6), however there are also negative reasons in doing so (theme 5). Again, this is addressed through a number of areas that are mentioned above in both frameworks. The UN needs CS (theme 1) and yet there is resistance to including CS (theme 7). Given the richness of the data it enabled the creation of two frameworks to be designed that offers the dissolving of this inherent flaw. In addition, the potential effectiveness of the proposed framework reform is shown in the triangulation analysis below.

*Inherent Flaw Three: Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship*

The proposed 2nd Charter being interlaced with the 1st Charter offers a rebalancing of the relationship and supports a healthy working environment for both parties. As was addressed above, both frameworks offer multiple potential solutions to diminishing these power dynamics, thus, contributing to a productive and effective work situation.

**Triangulation Analysis of Proposal With Research Findings**

**Reflection on the Frameworks**

In analysing the research and in reflecting on the proposed frameworks, the data is revisited through a triangulation analysis, as mentioned in Chapter 3. A collection of excerpts is presented that often cover multiple themes. By going backwards, returning to the data to appraise the results of the proposed structural and mechanical frameworks, the comments do demonstrate how the proposed reform may offer a comprehensive solution.

**Operational Structure Framework - The 2nd Charter of The United Nations – The United Peoples**

The first excerpt covers a number of elements that the frameworks address: ‘one of the ways in which we can resolve the problem is that we can get better organised and come with one voice... we are subdivided. So, I think the unification and running behind around common priorities would make the movement of Civil Society stronger and that the UN maybe more interested in it, in involving us and they would see value-added because that movement represents 90% of everybody in Civil Society who is working on the issue... imagine when you’re doing a consultation on a new document or a new treaty. It’s hard to know because we are sending maybe a thousand - two thousand different inputs, but what if we were able to send one that reflects the views... and they say “Thank you so much. We’re going to take that into account”... creating spaces in which UN agencies, government, Civil Society, citizens, experts, academics are all equal. They are represented equally. They have equal decision-making power. Their expertise and their value added is brought together to generate something that is bigger than the sum of each... correct those imbalances and you give everybody a chance to put those ideas to the table... not wait for it to be invited by somebody or to be told - I give you money to do that, but actually, together deciding’ Interview R. (Addressing themes 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 22, and 27.)
Current networks were discussed in the first round of interviews, but were shown not to be enough for what is needed to address today’s challenges: ‘Civil Society might be able to collaborate together, but that still leaves them in a bubble at times… there’s not an overall Civil Society coordinator, it’s quite organic. There are so many different voices’ Interview P. (Addressing themes 5, 9, 11, and 18.)

Further excerpts support the proposed reform: ‘in all of these areas of work, what we’re looking for are coalition of actors that will comprise of multi-stakeholders, comprises of Civil Society and comprised of the multilateral institutions; comprised of Member States, and comprised of the private sector’ Interview FF, ‘we were all sitting around the table collaborating and working together… and equal, on an equal level playing field basis, and… that we were able to solve all these problems together’ Interview Z, ‘one solution that would be fantastic is to have… an actual body in the UN that coordinates, focuses only on Civil Society other stakeholders and our coordination… that really supports us’ Interview DD, ‘they [UN] need to find a better mechanism of engaging Civil Society so that we can all move forward together’ Interview JJ, ‘the UN would be set up from scratch with a much more established core policy of engagement with Civil Society and the relevance and importance of Civil Society would be nearly, I guess on a par with that of Member States. And so, it wouldn’t be seen as an, you know the Civil Society segment wouldn’t be seen as an excuse to leave the room. It would be seen as like, oh, this is when the experts are talking’ Interview K, ‘that’s what we need. Not just little like, oh we need to have more hours of access or whatever it is. No. No, these are, these are too small. We need to have a very, very big vision’ Interview O, and ‘it is more successful when there are clearly established processes and roles between Civil Society and the UN, in terms of how we work together, why we work together, why is it beneficial on both sides’ Interview M. (Addressing themes 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 18, 20, and 21.)

Collaboration was highly regarded as vital for the relationship reform, which the proposed framework addresses: ‘collaboration, conversation, inclusion, and… reducing the bureaucracy of course, which is really huge at any level within the UN, I feel it’s really important. Because the truth is, lives of so many people are directly affected by the… yeah, what we are doing’ Interview GG, ‘we just need to figure out how factors can collaborate and work together much more effectively in terms of outcomes… a platform for that kind of exploration and developing that collaboration to happen… for all the different actors to focus on their comparative strengths’ Interview AA, ‘more guidance on how best to manage those relationships’ Interview A, ‘a seamless collaboration between the two bodies’ Interview MM, and ‘you cannot simply address a problem on your own. You need to find solutions which are, which take advantage of the leadership role of business, of the management of supply chain efficiencies, the expertise of NGOs on the ground, who deliver goods and services, you need the research from academia, you need the investment capital from foundations or private sector, you need that enabling environment to be provided by government, and you need universality with the UN in the mix. With that kind of multi stakeholder partnership, you increase the chances of real success… each one brings specific expertise or resources and intellect to the table. Single-handedly you cannot do it’ Interview II. (Addressing themes 1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25, and 26.)
The reform needs to have a strong structure to enable effective UN and CS relationship work to be carried out on a reliable basis: 'part of the solution is to try and bring government and Civil Society to the table on a consistent basis' Interview FF and ‘the international human rights system will only work properly when we start to have a better approach in terms of Civil Society and states working together rather than the current situation. And we’re not going to achieve the SDGs and we’re not going to establish this prevention framework unless we sort this out' Interview Q, and ‘like almost building a partnership’s accelerator that connects coalitions, Civil Society, [it] connects business leaders, and different types of leaders around the world in almost a synergistic network that can be activated around different issues and can stand up [to] initiatives’ Interview Y. (Addressing themes 9, 13, 18, and 26.)

**Component One - Global and National Offices**

The need for in country offices was clearly evidenced in the data: ‘the national level is crucial’ Interview TTT, ‘what would really make a difference in achieving international development outcomes is more effective engagement and collaborations between Civil Society and businesses and governments and the UN in countries’ Interview AA, ‘they take learning from other countries and bring it to bear in their country context’ Interview A, ‘there is not enough investment in the strategies where we are engaging on both sides’ Interview LL, ‘bring partners together and actually to facilitate the collaboration to facilitate the work. And that needs to happen at the global level, certainly, as well as the national and local levels’ Interview M, ‘they have a global view and that is valuable. Civil Society will have some global world view to a degree, perhaps the understanding is much more local. So, if you’re bringing these together, that's where the reform begins’ Interview HH, and ‘it needs to not only lie in New York or Geneva or other UN hubs, but in-country at the national and regional levels; the UN needs to be more’ Interview JJ. (Addressing themes 4, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18, and 26.)

**Component Two - Grouped Issues**

The SDGs ‘are heralded not only for what they stand for, but also for the process that they were created by, which included so many people, Civil Society groups and others’ Interview MMM, ‘I think having the SDGs or some other sort of agreed framework is actually really helpful. So that it gives people really, it gives you a basis which governments in theory agree on it, and it allows you to take your own interest in your own expertise and push on that particular area’ Interview XX, ‘maybe the SDGs in the end... help direct both of these two processes [the two Charters] in the same direction. And maybe after the SDGs, there'll be the next iteration and on and on. And maybe that could be an organising phenomenon’ Interview CCC, ‘the focus on themes is helping… most of these SDG concepts are by theme now, so NGOs align by topic’ Interview BB, ‘we do need collective action across all SDGs’ Interview LL, and ‘if we can find a good mechanism where they would work together collaboratively on specific goals, specific SDGs, it would then increase the chances of success, exponentially’ Interview II. (Addressing themes 9, 11, 18, and 24.)

The vision, described in this excerpt, gives an example of how this would come together: ‘I'm part of a couple of social enterprise networks, globally. So even just yesterday, one of them has come on and said... we need to be collaborating and get out of our silos. This was in Country FF. They were talking about those guys in
health and those guys in education and they all sit in these boxes and... actually, health and education are linked... [CS] wants to collaborate. But it doesn't quite know how to' Interview HH and 'when people moved outside of their siloes, and looked at the problem, they were able to then, move ahead to the solution' Interview Y. (Addressing themes 18 and 24.)

**Component Three - Structure Designed for Accessibility**

Designing a structure that is inclusive and clear on it's an accessibility is vital; 'just knowing what the UN processes look like' Interview K and can be enhanced by 'taking advantage of technology and other developments' Interview AA. (Addressing themes 3, 9, and 19.)

The inclusion of those victimised would allow for 'a much more holistic understanding of how conflict and violence has affected this community' Interview K, 'stop seeing people as poor vulnerable people, but all these people... are key agents of change, because they know what needs to be done to make a more equal society, because it's inequality and poverty that causes the terrible resentment that actually fuels future conflict. It's terribly important that they are given roles in decision-making' Interview L, 'make sure that there is a seat at the table' Interview P, 'increasing the diversity of voices and bringing more, different NGOs, into the discussion' Interview Q, and 'broader forums, bringing in more representative and accountable groups' Interview QQ. (Addressing themes 3, 4, 5, 11, and 18.)

Lastly, 'if it continues this way, will lose respect internationally... ECOSOC accreditation... human rights women who cannot get accredited... a lot of the journalists cannot get those organisations accredited because they're afraid of them. They don't want to open the circle. Untouchables are untouchables so keep them out' Interview V. (Addressing themes 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, and 13.)

**Component Four - UN as Mediator**

The data evidenced a call for the UN to take on the role of mediator: 'they [UN] should see themselves as facilitators and mentors. So that I think is a direction which we should proceed, that is why it is important because we have the assets, but it is a question of redirecting these assets and energies in the right direction' Interview MM, 'obviously the solutions are partly political; we might have to try and get Member States on the same side as much as possible and say that this is not something that's going to undermine you and if you agree on the basic goals of the UN, the more Civil Society in your country understands them and supports them, that will strengthen you and not weaken you' Interview W, and 'there has to be mechanisms and platforms for it to occur... here [UN] or in a developing country comprising a variety of NGOs, who said we want you [UN] to focus on these things. So, it's sort of complemented the government side of things’ Interview E. The 2nd Charter offers the platform that is mentioned in this last excerpt. (Addressing themes 2, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 24, and 27.)

In addition, the honest broker role the UN can offer would encourage honest voices, because it can be the mediator between CS and governments: 'this charity is obliged to deliver on a basic set of targets each year. And if it keeps doing that, the government will keep paying it. But, of course, then what happens is the charity does not feel particularly strong or confident to be able to then criticise the
government, because it's causing a problem, because it's getting money from the government. So, it doesn't know quite where to sit, so it doesn't. Stops being vocal about the issue, cause it's getting money from the government' Interview HH.

(Applying themes 8 and 15.)

**Operational Mechanism Framework – UN’s Principled Decision-Making Policy (UN’s PDMP)**

The need to realign with the UN’s purposes and principles is paramount and was evidenced to be of great importance: ‘clarity of purpose, number one, you need to really understand and know what the mission, what your objective is. Spell it out, make it explicit, make sure the alignment is 100% on both ends. Step number two is alignment. And then on the third one, on the modus operandi... how we can improve the operational collaboration... the realigning around the core design of the UN and then giving clear responsibilities for the basic needs of organisations, reviving each central system of the UN again in a much more forceful way, that could be a way forward’ Interview BB, ‘we need a common thread amongst all of these actions and we need a way of lifting people’s aspirations and using that as a platform for the UN itself to be rejuvenated’ Interview Y, ‘to understand the long-term, what does it mean and how can we, that is where principles and ideals like the UN Charter and the Human Rights Declaration, those are like compasses’ Interview NN, and ‘I would like to see a radical reboot, which captures the preamble of the Charter in a fuller way’ Interview PP. (Addressing themes 9, 10, 13, 14, 18, and 27.)

The UN’s PDMP has the capacity to address concerns, such as ‘we can say the emperor doesn’t have its clothes on’ Interview V, ‘how do you deal with the proliferation of right-wing NGOs, corporations that are seeking influence directly at the UN’ Interview O, ‘the UN is this Member State organisation and we live in a neorealist world, where the states have all the power, but states have massive interests, self-interests of course... consultations between states and Civil Society to move them all onto the same page. To get them working, to get them thinking about working together rather than against each other, and the prize is huge’ Interview Q, and ‘making sure that decisions and sort of things that happen at the UN, in particular the secretariat, are done for substantive reasons rather than just political ones. That it’s not just political influence that you’re buying... because you want something to happen for technical reasons. There’s gotta be much more accountability in that sense’ Interview E. (Addressing themes 5, 7, 11, 17, 18, 23, and 27.)

Applying the UN’s PDMP has the opportunity to enhance sustainable and more effective solutions: ‘there is a moral argument, based on our moral grounds, that we all profess and having our Charters and whatnot. There are also some evidence-based arguments based on the fact that when you are bringing everybody to the table and you create ownership, the results are better. You can find evidence in different fields, but multidisciplinary solutions to big complex problems are the ones that are the most durable, the most sustainable' Interview R. (Addressing themes 11, 18, and 27.)

**Component One - Talk for Trust**

The data strongly evidenced the need for meaningful dialogue. It builds trust,
understanding, relationships, and accountability. ‘This all comes down to, at the end of it, is lack of trust… use these frameworks, which have mutual agreement now, to continue to build trust between actors. That will be required to deliver on the agendas’ and when asked what builds that trust: ‘dialogue. I think dialogue is very conscious… conversations and dialogue between these actors’ Interview Y. Another excerpt indicates how trust is built through dialogue: ‘working with states through cooperation and dialogue to build their national human rights capacity and human rights resilience, so that violations don’t happen in the first place… if we get better at preventing these things from happening in the first place, then we can make a difference. But that utterly relies on trust and there’s almost zero trust, but as I said, through these consultations, I’ve noticed that they are starting to improve… that’s why they [governments] trust us, because we have a different approach, which is to try to build cooperation and dialogue and trying to understand the challenges’ Interview Q. (Addressing themes 13, 17, and 18.)

Dialogue increases in meaning when it is carried out in an inclusive way, which the 2nd Charter, through its accessible design, can provide: ‘Civil Society can play a very significant role in making sure that the aspects of leave no one behind, the aspects of including the voices and the input in having a decision from the most valuable communities, from the most excluded, that I think is a really significant piece and there have been great attempts to broaden that conversation and to make sure persons most impacted by the policies have their voice heard with decision-makers, but that is a really significant piece’ Interview M, ‘first identifying when people, that are typically not heard, have a chance to be heard and then finding more efficient and cost-effective solutions to making sure they we’re able to benefit from their voices is important’ Interview P, and ‘I cannot emphasise enough the communication and having representation from the Civil Society and all aspects, and of where anything that has to do with SDGs and the UN in all regions, not only at the headquarters in New York. For us to be included in the conversation… it has been very clear that we can only be effective if we have some way of networking, exchanging information, helping each other’ Interview GG. (Addressing themes 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, and 18.)

Effective conversations was also linked to building relationships: ‘allow them to really talk about issues in a safe space, where they can really get to know each other, but also have the opportunity to work through some of the issues’ Interview AA, and ‘if we do work with people with a positive attitude, not attacking them but, actually try to create a relationship. We can make change’ Interview DD. It is remarked that the system needs to change, so that it is ‘not necessarily a naming and shaming’ Interview J, because that was shown to be ineffective. (Addressing themes 9 and 17.)

Lastly, ‘networks are such a good way to have these kinds of collaborative discussions, are such a good way to understand what the broader Civil Society is doing outside of your specific niche interest or your niche set of programs. And then as a result be able to see common threats of problems, of challenges, of opportunities that can be taken up together much more effectively and it really facilitates those conversations and those collaborations’ Interview K. (Addressing themes 1, 17, and 18.)
**Component Two - Funding: Pooled & Blinded**

Decision-making is effected throughout the system to align with the UN purposes and principles with the reformed funding mechanism applied: ‘actually insuring that Civil Society actors played a greater role in the decision-making, not just at the end of the delivery of the services, but right at the beginning in terms of the strategies we adopt, the way we work, the vision of the agencies, where Civil Society are engaged from the beginning and it is not just led by the governments or donors to determine the agenda of UN agencies’ Interview LL and ‘we have governance systems within which money gets to rule politics; and governance and democracy is meant to be about people. Even the UN Charter starts with “We the People” and we’ve shifted from “We the People” in many of these countries to “We the Wealthy” or “We the Corporations”. And, I think, in that reality, profit maximizing agents are influencing outcomes rather than outcomes being reflective of the well-being of people and the environment in which they live. And that’s the biggest challenge… money rules politics rather than the other way around’ Interview Y. (Addressing themes 4, 8, 11, 18, 26, and 27.)

Power dynamics could be diminished through the pooled and blinded funding process: ‘there are competing political interests for control at the secretariat headquarters in New York. And it means that if you’re not powerful, you don’t get as much voice, I mean NGOs aren’t on the whole, whereas big Member States which contribute to the large portion of the budget are… you do notice that large states tend to dictate play to some extent in the UN headquarters and the secretariat in particular’ Interview E. (Addressing themes 7, 8, 22, and 27.)

It was noted that ‘all the indications are that we have resources enough to live in a sustainable way in peace, why can’t we do it’ Interview EE. (Addressing theme 8.)

**Both Frameworks Wrapped in Urgency and the Necessity of the Relationship**

The relationship between the UN and CS was evidenced in the research as being critical: ‘the UN and Civil Society have huge abilities to leverage each other to multiply each other’s impact, so there would be huge gains to that’ Interview PP, ‘Civil Society being in the United Nations and continually bringing up these issues is a much more healthy situation than one where Member States, just among themselves as a club, decide what’s to be done, without hearing what the actual situation is from the ground. And, I believe, that we NGOs have that knowledge and have that voice, but the opportunity to actually deliver it is minimal’ Interview EE, ‘the only way for some of the mechanisms that exist at the United Nations to function properly is if Civil Society occupies more space… it is a much-needed collaboration and we hope that things will improve’ Interview GG, and ‘Civil Society and NGOs, they are more flexible, and they can be in areas where the UN cannot be. So, there is this issue of complementarity. So, what we are looking for is in one way, in what areas can we find where you have complimentary strength from the UN and Civil Society, which can really complement one another and result in overall strength and also in results’ Interview MM. One remark described the reality as: ‘it’s really up to everybody, because we are all Civil Society, that’s the truth’ Interview W. (Addressing themes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 16, and 18.)

The data consistently remarked on the deep urgency for the UN and CS relationship reform, for the changes to be implemented as soon as possible. Again, in reflecting
back on the data, this is an unquestionable component. This is reflected in the following excerpts: ‘the time is quite urgent’, ‘this is urgent’, ‘there’s an extreme urgency for climate change’, ‘as soon as possible’, ‘the urgency is now yes, needs to be done now’, ‘right now - there is an urgency’, and ‘there’s a huge urgency’. A concern is that ‘the catalyst of change, always in institutions, is the collapse of the old order’ Interview O. Again, addressing the need for change to be now. (Addressing theme 28.)
Chapter 6
Discussion

My Story

As a researcher, when I embarked on this thesis, I did not expect the high degree of need for this research topic. Through the literature review, I uncovered a very low amount of academic research done on the structural level of the UN and CS relationship, however, it was both surprising and interesting to witness that the need for this research was also evident from a practical perspective.

In the interviews, I asked the participants what they would like to see result from the research. The responses included practical applications, fresh ideas to rejuvenate the UN, an uncovering of understanding of the issues, and a mix of other replies.

There was a request for practical applications: ‘practical proposal’, ‘very interested to see what you will produce. I hope you make very constructive research… that people will, both in the UN and people in Civil Society around the world, can make use of’, ‘come up with clear criteria that allows the UN and the Civil Society actors to discover the shared purpose clearly’, ‘there are many good people in the UN who would like to get something going, so if your proposals are on target, I’m quite sure people will listen to it. There are also many well intended ambassadors from certain countries’, ‘I would like to see recommendations on concrete steps on how the barriers for more authentic seamless cooperation and coordination between Civil Society and UN agencies can be a constant feature of the way we work’, ‘very practical and pragmatic’, and ‘practical recommendations… for those of us working in the trenches with the UN, there is a recognition that we need to come up with new proposals’.

There was a call for a proposed reform that would come from the research results that would rejuvenate the UN: ‘to renew the United Nations’, ‘any kind of roadmap there is, to how this can be done better, would be really welcomed’, ‘practical, hands-on set of recommendations, that can instil and inspire in the UN’, ‘on the UN side, a renewed legitimacy… appeal would be a profound renewal to a sort of rather creaky institution’, and ‘please give us a report that will take us… take us somewhere good’.

The participants asked for the research to uncover understanding of the issues: ‘increased understanding about the challenges’, ‘I look forward to just seeing the patterns that have emerged and seeing how much similarity there is in the discontent and highlighting some of the issues’, ‘it’s essential, I think, in your research that you look at the funding and then you understand why certain relationships are the way they are perhaps between UN and CSO, because the funding is very similar’, ‘the benefit of your research is also to expand our world’, ‘more awareness again, to the general public of what’s happening’, and ‘better understanding and collaboration, that is one area. A second area would be complementarity, complementary support, and corporation’.
A few additional excerpts expressing requests: ‘new thinking in this space is welcomed’, ‘would love to see a little bit of this blue sky, what is the big idea. Because at the same time we are thinking about how to make incremental changes which is, unfortunately, what most of us are involved in… we also need to be thinking about the big ideas’, ‘I think it’s really good, you’re doing it because it’s a very interesting piece of work. So, I’d like to see it published and then… instead of it just sits on a shelf somewhere, it goes to decision-makers and it’s got conclusions in it that are constructive, positive, and have practical outcomes. So, here’s some researchers showing X, Y, Z, and it might show that the relationship with Civil Society and United Nations isn't very good and here's some suggestions how it might improve. And then people pick it up and say okay, these are really interesting suggestions, let's do them. That's what I’d like to see”, and ‘I’d like to see an amazing, accessible, brilliant book, which is such a call to action that it can’t be ignored’.

Upon completion of reading this chapter and the previous Chapter 5, it may be of interest to come back to the paragraphs above, to review the multitude of requests and how the proposed reform solutions may hold the potential to address them.

I do so hope, with my entire being, that I have been able to serve all those who participated.

Overview of Discussion

This chapter provides the highlights uncovered from the research, how I have incorporated them into a proposed model for reform, how they relate to the wider academic fields of knowledge including practical applications and provides a discussion on my contribution to knowledge as a result of this PhD study.

This chapter consists of six sections. The first section provides a textual illustration of the proposed reform. The second section reviews the gaps in the previous research that the first two chapters discussed. The third section explores the underlying structural defects of the current system. This is followed by a section that provides a triangulation analysis of the proposed reform with a post literature review. The fifth section discusses the research findings from this thesis in relation to a wider body of academic concepts. Lastly, further research suggestions are provided.

Section One – The United Peoples

The intention for this thesis was to uncover a way for the UN and CS to potentially work together more synergistically. To bring all our individual efforts together and build synergies amongst them so that we can, progressively and sustainably, move forward together for a better world. The place where this platform of work resides most appropriately is with the UN, as was presented in the introduction. Therefore, this doctorate research examined how the relationship between the UN and CS can function in a more effective way to make a greater difference in the world, which is unquestionably needed.

The vision is for a United Peoples to work in a healthy and engaged working environment with the United Nations, collectively for a better world. The title, the
United Peoples, arose from the field research: ‘the United People’ Interview EEE and ‘like a Peoples’ UN’ Interview SSS, and in staying true to the data, this is how the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter is titled – The United Peoples. I intentionally pluralised the word ‘people’ to indicate groups of people.

The umbrella story begins this section. Participant B shared that ‘the umbrella is stronger than the individual spokesman under the umbrella’. The research uncovered that the umbrella for CS exists in small parts, but often lacks continuity and more wholistic inclusion. Nations have this umbrella concept under the United Nations; however, it was evident in the research that the UN and CS relationship is vital. Hence, in CS creating this overarching umbrella for its collaborative work, the United Peoples, it must be combined with the nation’s umbrella, the UN. Therefore, a 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter needs to include the details of the United Peoples \textit{and} describe the interlacing of its work with the 1\textsuperscript{st} Charter.

‘If organisations working in the same field can come together and recognise the value of what they each do instead of fighting each other for funding, then you could have a very strong platform… probably because there’s so many niche places to contribute to working on that… I don’t know how you persuade groups that they’re working for the same objective, and they need to combine forces and they will be stronger. There’s an element of human need to prove themselves as having place in that market, which is achieving things, so I don’t know the answer to that’ Interview B. The evidence in the research uncovered why this was happening. The need to stay relevant (theme 14), the competition that is created due to the current funding process (theme 8), the need to be heard in a place where there is no time, no space, and often where CS is given ‘lip service’ (themes 3, 8, and 17), and a structure that is lacking an inclusive and collaborative system (themes 9, 11, and 18).

My hope is that this research may provide a more wholistic, inclusive, and stable umbrella, through mechanisms in which the structure can operate, and have the capacity to address the themes, that instead of preventing people to come together, it invites them under the shelter of an umbrella.

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter, through the inclusive consultative process, will identify the details of the United Peoples structure for the coordinated and collaborative interlacing with the five functioning bodies (General Assembly, ECOSOC, Secretariat, Security Council, International Court of Justice) of the United Nations. It could be considered that the current UN Secretariat will be the organising body between the UN and the United Peoples, renamed the \textit{Secretariat of the United Nations and Peoples}, Secretariat UNP.

A funding mechanism that is pooled and blinded and offers a single streamlined process of grant application, reporting, and management, that is applied holistically, greatly increases progressive development. It allows a more inclusive way to participate due to the streamlined process. It reduces competition and contributes to collaborative work. It does not allow for agendas and decisions to be dictated by the money holders, instead it provides the opportunity for agenda setting and decisions to be made more inclusively and collaboratively, that align with the UN’s PDMP. It has the possibility of diminishing power struggles that contain self-interests that hold back international development.
A funder can resist this reformed funding process, however, any decisions that are made still go through the UN’s PDMP, which actually brings them back to the proposed funding mechanism. The vision of the Naber Model is that the frameworks have a catch system incorporated into them. For example, should the funders intentions be aligned with the UN’s PDMP, investing their monetary contributions through the new funding process should actually be favoured because of the higher rate of return. The result can be compounding and generates greater return because all participants are working towards one goal as opposed to individual agendas and it would create an effective use of money due to the numerous points raised above, as well as impacting all areas related to funding due to its holistic approach.

With the reformed funding process and the 2nd Charter in place, national United Peoples offices can be formed in countries. Any part of CS can participate. A series of questions are asked that are outlined on the UN’s PDMP to ensure their intentions are to contribute to the UN’s purpose and principles. There is no further bureaucratic procedure. There is no definition of who CS is. Their qualification is based on their intention to contribute to the UN’s goals and values.

The research showed the need to include the private sector because we all need to contribute to the UN goals and values to actualise them, regardless of our place in society. In alignment with action research I mention my own professional experience, in which I have witnessed some of the private sector being fully conscious of their own potential demise if they continue on as they have been. That conscious group is actively trying to engage in solutions, however, no clear road to get under that umbrella, that was described above, is available to them. In trying undefined roads, they are often met with rebuke, which is definitely justified if the reason to be under the umbrella is only for their own self interests. Due to the UN’s PDMP incorporated throughout the whole structure, all decisions consistently revisit the actual intention. Hence, accountability to everyone’s motives are revisited with each decision.

When the national office comes together to discuss a particular issue, for example the need for government regulations to incorporate further policies on cleaner water, UN goal SDG 6, all those who are a part of CS, including the private sector, that would have something to contribute to addressing that issue, can come together. Therefore, this may include a wide variety of CS contributors, each having their own perspective based on their speciality (for example: environment, sanitation, health, equality) and perhaps even individuals who have a specific experience to share that would impact and contribute to the work.

Due to the SDGs providing us with a common global language, it can be used to reach different participants who want to contribute towards a particular issue. The intention is not to create silos under a particular UN goal, but instead, to bring awareness of an issue and to call all those together who want to contribute to resolving a particular concern. This common language can also be used to enhance awareness of where one’s contributions can be made and how their particular focus area reaches and touches on other SDGs. It was evidenced in this research, that working in silos is often done, but it is known to be an ineffective working method.
The data also showed that although a particular organisation may be focused primarily on one issue, it often does touch on all SDGs in some capacity.

In the national United Peoples office, there can be a physical table including a screen for virtual attendance where all those working on a particular issue can come together, either physically or virtually. In this way, CS can attend from local communities all over their country. The international United Peoples office can join so that they can offer support. Potentially a neighbouring national United Peoples office may participate if it had gone through a similar process successfully and is able to offer some guidance (with the international United Peoples office having that global view to be able to make that connection). Someone from the in-country United Nations office may also be in attendance to be able to offer the honest broker role if needed.

The national United Peoples office would announce the open meetings and organise these collaborative, inclusive gatherings for all of CS to come together on particular issues. Alternatively, a CSO, or international United Peoples, or in-country UN office can initiate get-togethers and ask the national United Peoples to set this up. The communication could be initiated by social media and an e-newsletter listing, organised by the national United Peoples office. CS would need to connect to the national office’s communication streams to be notified of such meetings.

In advance to the gatherings, attendees can offer contributions towards resolving the issue which help form the agenda for the meeting. A list of examples could include: a university is able to offer research, another CS member has a personal case story to share, a business has contacts in a particular area, or a CSO has work experience of what has and has not worked in the past. This allows for gaps to be highlighted for the intended collaborative and inclusive work environment, to be able to identify what other contributions may be missing and who is missing from the table.

The following example illustrates this by continuing on with the cleaner water regulation scenario. It was noted that the areas that are most effected by the issue of poor water quality are not yet involved with the work of the national United Peoples office. Efforts can then be made to reach out to the community leaders for their involvement in resolving the issue. It may be the case that awareness of the national United Peoples still needs to reach this particular group and added to the communication listing. Or that this particular community does not have online access. Hence, a contact list by the national United Peoples office can then be created that identifies those in CS that need to be contacted through non-online methods.

During such meetings, these collected efforts come together through effective discussions. Everyone’s contributions have the opportunity to be included, as everyone will have their unique attributes to share. After meetings, further actions are taken that align with the UN’s PDMP and are always conducted through meaningful dialogue. For example, a follow up meeting with the in-country UN office may be required, as mediation may be needed or to get their input from the national governmental perspective. Another example would be collectively producing a document to provide to the government with all contributors receiving credit for their work by including their names (or not, if they choose to stay anonymous). Therefore,
the many different voices can come together in one unified document. The issue of too many voices and how to take them forward can now be resolved. This does not mean all need to agree and outliers can be noted in the document, however, all do need to agree to the purposes and principles of the UN and the reason for contributing is to further the UN’s goals and values.

Should the concerns cross national boundaries, going back to the example for the need of cleaner water which can flow from one country to the next, collected work can be sent to the international United Peoples office. They then can carry out this work with other neighbouring national United Peoples offices, with already advanced work in place due to the collected, inclusive, collaborative work from one national United Peoples office. Knowledge transfer has a clear path to follow. One national United Peoples office of collected CS work can assist another, through the international United Peoples office, which provides the global perspective and knowledge depository, thus, creating synergies to flow.

If the neighbouring country does not have a national United Peoples office in place yet, then the international United Peoples office would work with the in-country UN office. In addition, the international United Peoples office could feed this information to the international United Nations office, should it need to be further addressed through one of the UN bodies. The 2nd Charter is offering this clear working structure.

Another example could be demonstrated by a national government looking at a policy reform on a particular topic. They could involve the national United Peoples office and ask them to initiate a meeting or organise a series of meetings with CS on that particular issue. Anyone from CS within that country, who would like to participate, has the opportunity to do so.

Further issues of concern, that need to be addressed within the nation, can be brought to the United Peoples office and also from the international United Peoples office. Due to the 2nd Charter, there is always a two-way flow of communication and collaborative work between the international and national offices. In addition, there is a two-way flow with the national United Peoples office and the in-country UN office, due to the interlacing of the 2nd Charter with the 1st Charter. There is also a two-way flow of engagement between the international United Nations offices and the international United Peoples office.

For example, with the structure that is offered by the 2nd Charter, the international United Nations office in Geneva may work together with the international United Peoples office on a particular human rights issue. The country or countries in question could then work together through the organisation provided by the international offices. It offers a one stop shop with in-country United Peoples’ offices for all CS to engage within that country and collaborative work to flow through. This organised method creates opportunities for sharing learned experiences and processes from other nations or circumstances because knowledge transfer now has a clear pathway to follow and be stored.

Another scenario may be that the in-country UN office will be receiving visitors from international UN agencies or UN bodies, which can now organise meetings with CS
around a particular issue with the national United Peoples office. Items to be discussed can be mentioned in advance to provide an opportunity for collaborating inclusively; CS would know whether or not the agenda of the meeting addresses their area of work and if so, be able to contribute.

Throughout these interaction points, meaningful dialogue is the mechanism in which the work is carried out. The research showed how this can build understanding and trust and therefore lead to more effective outcomes. Professional development, job descriptions, and performance management, from both the United Nations and United Peoples, would have meaningful dialogue incorporated so that it continues to be a key working method.

In applying the results of the findings from this research, the refinements and specifics of the above vision would be detailed through an inclusive consulting process. My hope is that the 2nd Charter with its four components, and the UN's PDMP with its two components, can offer solutions to the dynamics the research uncovered, which are all mentioned in this section of describing the vision.

The data evidenced great urgency for reform of this absolutely vital UN and CS relationship. It is imperative that actions towards reform are applied as quickly as possible in ways that build in the practical applications to make changes. Often the changes UN or CS need are known, but the structure and the mechanisms need to be applied for the reform – the umbrella - to take shape.

Section Two - Revisiting the Gaps in the Research

Four gaps in the research and practical setting were discussed in earlier chapters which this research explored. Firstly, this thesis adds to the little academic research that has been conducted on the structural level of the UN’s relationship with CS.

Secondly, criticisms of the previous research included: lacking the identification of the particular dynamics of the UN and CS relationship for the purpose of reform. The studies, that were conducted, were often done through a micro lens such as within the context of one country or one issue; no known previous systematic literature review was found, and often there was little to no methodologies described. This PhD specifically sought to uncover the dynamics of the relationship through an international macro lens, beginning with a systematic literature review on the topic and clearly describing the methodologies used, not just for the review, but also for the fieldwork.

Thirdly, the previous literature usually proposed reforms for the UN and CS relationship within the current system. This doctoral research looked beyond the current system, especially in light of its findings from the literature review uncovering three inherent flaws within today’s structure.

Fourthly, gaps in the practical setting were experienced through my professional life, which included a lack of a known platform that would bring society together to work strategically, proactively, and synergistically in collaboration for international development. This research purposely sought to explore practical applications that would address this need through the utilisation of participatory action research.
In addition to introducing the research topic of the UN and CS relationship, in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, the global theoretical perspectives that underpin the relationship were also presented. These perspectives include the interplay between CS and governments (Member States), including social responsibility and Civil Societies' role in governance. Also, previous literature noted that a framework is lacking for CS to be working more collaboratively together. These global theoretical perspectives, to which this research relates to, are discussed further below.

Section Three – Underlying Structural Defects

In reflecting back on the results of the findings, it was striking how the operations of the UN organisation would inadvertently make a situation more challenging due to the current operational structure. When I was designing the proposed reform, it was clear that it would need to address the current circumstance that was often evidenced in the UN organisation, this being the case of taking two steps forward and one or more steps back. The proposed reform would need to encourage forward moving steps, with minimal to no backward steps.

For example, it was evidenced that the ‘know how’ exists for prevention of conflict (theme 13), which is imperative for development, to not only maintain the development but also to further it. Yet, it was remarked that there is a deep deficiency in how the system operates for prevention.

In addition, the data showed the funding for the human rights pillar; one of the three pillars of the UN are greatly imbalanced and underfunded in comparison to the other two of development and peace and security. This strategy is like putting the cart before the horse and letting the horse walk into the cart to break it. ‘Human rights violations are at the heart of violent conflict and its prevention, and typically constitute foundational elements of the underlying drivers of conflict. In fact, patterns of human rights violations may provide an early indication of a potential conflict’ (Autio et al., 2019). With conflict inhibiting and tearing down previous development, reform that includes rebalancing the funding stream amongst the three pillars is paramount, for in doing so, not only would the pillar of human rights be fortified, but because it is, so would the pillar of development and the pillar of peace and security.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: ‘now, therefore, The General Assembly, Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind’ (Rights, 1948).

Unfortunately, it is not ‘common’ as stated above in the human rights declaration, it is not achieved, and it is not ‘constantly in mind’. A framework was needed that ensured human rights is ‘constantly in mind’, hence the creation of the UN’s PDMP as a proposed reform that would provide the mechanism to do so throughout its entire structure of the UN’s operation. In addition, the pooled and blinded funding process allows all three UN pillars to be given the opportunity to be equally addressed financially.
Another example of the phenomenon described in this section; it is known that inclusion (theme 11) provides more effective and sustainable solutions. Yet, the current structure is restrictive and elusive in participatory engagement (theme 3). Therefore, the proposed reform needed to ensure accessibility in the structure and inclusion. Both frameworks for the suggested model for reform build in inclusion.

For example, it is known that collaboration (theme 18) offers more successful and long-term results. Yet, the current system is quite competitive due to the need to stay relevant (theme 14) and the funding system (theme 8). The reform needed to incorporate decreasing competition to be able to create a collaborative work environment for the sake of furthering international development.

For example, funding is obviously needed (theme 8). Yet, the current system shows that it manages money in a way that often impedes development due to the power dynamics, political appointments, and decisions dictated by the funders (themes 8, 20, 26, and 27). Hence, a mechanism needed to be incorporated (the pooled and blinded funding process, UN’s PDMP, suggestions on human resources) to again have steps moving consistently forward, as opposed to backwards.

Unfortunately, further examples could be provided of this phenomenon. Such as the need to share and group knowledge, which would make solutions more effective, but it often is not done due to the lack of processes or lack of opportunities for dialogue or because of competition. Another example is how effective meaningful dialogue contributes to issues, however, how limited the opportunities are to do so. How much effort is spent on the relationship dynamic itself between the UN and CS, and if a coherent system was offered, how much more resources could be redirected towards international development.

Therefore, the proposed reform that was designed, endeavoured to take into account the underlying structural defects described above.

Section Four – Triangulation Analysis of the Proposed Model with a Post Literature Review

Another application of analysis was applied to the suggested model that arose from the synthesis of the research. Not only was the proposed reform cross-compared by going back to the data uncovered in this doctoral research, as discussed in the previous chapter, but also by revisiting the literature on the UN and CS relationship. Thus, providing more robust research findings.

The authors Pless and Voegtlin expressed the need for research to uncover possible solutions for systems, procedures, and ‘influence mechanisms’ that include in-country or local community participation, along with strong leadership (Pless and Voegtlin, 2014). This thesis contributed to this call for further research by providing a model that includes a structure and mechanisms that are influenced only by the organisation’s own principles (UN’s PDMP), incorporates in-country contributions, and addresses leadership through the human resource suggestions that were made in the model for reform.
Reflecting upon the reformed funding process that results from these thesis’ findings, which includes a pooled, blinded, and streamlined process, it is designed to mitigate the concerns that Martens and Seitz mentioned, which included accountability, influence, and staying focused on the on the reason for the UN’s existence (Martens and Seitz, 2017).

Moving from academic articles on the UN to a practical setting and acknowledging the work that is currently being undertaken by UN2020 and Together First, which highlights UN reform especially for the UN’s 75th anniversary, cross comparisons were made with their documents with the results from this research. They call for a reform that also recognised the need for inclusivity, collaborative work, the necessity for human rights to be protected, for ‘guidance and support to… defend the UN’s values and principles’, and to deepen trust between the different stakeholders, amongst other themes that overlap with the findings of this research, such as the urgency for change (UN2020 and First, 2020). Therefore, because the results from this research aligned with real-world needs, this provides evidence that the proposed model for reform may address these requirements. Together First’s publication titled Stepping Stones For A Better Future, highlights ‘the United Nations needs a high-level focal point to empower, convene and coordinate civil society’, which the 2nd Charter for the United Peoples could address (First, 2020).

As a researcher, it was reassuring and uplifting to see the proposed model for reform hold potential solutions for what other academic authors were asking for in their further research suggestions and what international consultants were asking for from their consultations.

Section Five – Research Findings and Wider Academic Literature

In conducting the post literature review, there was again very little academic literature that was available on the structural level of the UN’s relationship with CS. New articles were searched that were published between January 2018 (picking up from where the systematic literature review concluded its search) to the time of this writing. Due to the lockdown of the coronavirus with the libraries being closed, there were limitations, as I was only able to conduct the search with documents that were available online. There was one new article that was uncovered. This article acknowledged similar themes to this thesis, such as the need for a better system that encourages collaboration, sharing of knowledge, the need for dialogue, accountability, and defining the roles of the two bodies (Anheier, 2018). Hence, the findings from this PhD contribute to the body of evidence that Anheier discusses.

The wider academic literature continues to align with the results that were uncovered in this research and adds to the current evidence base. Due to the neoliberal context of today, social responsibility internationally is moving more and more from the government sector to the NGOs and CSOs (see the introduction section which presented a discussion on the historical shift in charitable work). This doctoral research agreed with these academic findings and added that a concern was arising due to the governments pulling funds that were once supplied to the NGOs and CSOs for carrying out the social responsibility work and that the private sector is beginning to fill this gap.
Other researchers also acknowledged the increase in NGO and the private sector in social responsibility. Using a policy research framework lens, Bekkers and de Wit highlight the increasing overlap between the roles of governments and non-profit or non-government organisations in the implementation of public policy (Bekkers and de Wit, 2020). This highlights how the implementation of social policy, once the remit of governments, has increasingly become an important part of CS work through NGO and other not-for-profit structures.

The links with social responsibility also exist within for-profit structures. For example, researchers in the private sector have highlighted how corporations now have much more interaction with various UN agencies, not only at the global level but also within individual countries (Bitanga & Bridwell, 2010). This relates to the growing movement around the concept of CSR that was also evidenced in the findings of this research. Scholars estimate that over the next decades, the demand for corporate social responsibility will continue to grow (Biting & Bridwell, 2010, Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). For example, in excess of 8,000 corporations across more than 150 different nations are a part of the UN’s Global Compact, which is a non-binding agreement created to encourage the private sector across the globe to commit to social and sustainable responsibilities and to report on those actions (George et al., 2016). Areas where there are increasing links between the private sector and social responsibility are on issues such as labour standards, poverty, human rights, and the environment (Bitanga and Bridwell, 2010; George et al., 2016).

Trust in CSR was noted to be of concern in this thesis’ findings and in other academic writings (Campbell, 2007). A cautionary note is provided that CSR activities are indeed authentic, rather than simply symbolic (Aguinis and Glavas, 2012). The results from this PhD aligned with other researchers regarding the concern of political appointments, money influencing agendas, and funders dictating decisions (Martens and Seitz, 2017). The importance of dialogue was remarked and how that can impact the intentions of the contributions of the private sector (Campbell, 2007). As Diamond states that ‘working towards mutually beneficial goals. To the question “Can the corporation be a good citizen?” the answer is not only that it can but, in fact, that it must’ (Diamond, 2012).

In the introduction of Chapter 1, the international role of CS was discussed. This included the concept of its role of governance and CS potentially providing the accountability on morality (Florini, 2000). Researchers have acknowledged that indeed this role for CS in governance has become increasingly relevant and needed throughout the last number of decades (Bernauer et al., 2014). The function of CS in governance also arose in the data of this PhD and was evidenced particularly in the areas of accountability and the long-term view and stability.

This is supported by other academics, as literature highlights that CS can aid in accountability of Member States, on an international level, and add to a more thorough transparency practice (Anheier, 2018; Mishra, 2012). Hopewell adds to the research written about Civil Societies’ engagement in global governance for accountability and transparency (Hopewell, 2016) and Scholte remarks on how some people have relied on CS to gain better accountability from UN agencies (Scholte,
2004). The results from this thesis supports the epistemology of Civil Societies’ role in keeping governments accountable.

The findings in this PhD uncovered the role of CS in governance extended to include providing the long-term vision and the stability for governance for the ever-changing nature of governments. As a researcher, it was surprising to uncover how difficult it was to locate academic articles on CS contributing to the stability of governments by providing the long-term vision, especially when stability is paramount for governmental institutions.

The research findings contribute to the global theoretical perspectives that underpin the UN and CS relationship; from CS in governance to the evolution of what once was the church’s role, now including the private sector’s role in social responsibility. Civil Societies’ participation in providing stability in governance is an area that invites further research, which is discussed in the next section.

Linking back to a previous citation from Choudry in Chapter 2, other researchers and my own findings highlighted the need for a framework (Choudry, 2013). Therefore, the Naber Model, applied to the suggested model for reform of the UN and CS relationship with its two frameworks (the mechanisms and the structure) responds to the 28 themes and three inherent flaws, proposes as a contribution to knowledge.

Section Six – Implications for Further Research

For advancing the findings from this thesis, the UN and CS relationship, a number of recommendations are suggested. Firstly, there are opportunities to explore each of the 28 themes and three inherent flaws identified through this PhD work, more in-depth exploration either from a global or national research lens could be applied. Secondly, future research could look at the nexus of the UN and CS relationship between the global and the national levels, its engagement and communication pathways. Thirdly, academic studies into the process of how the SDGs were developed is suggested for further exploration. It is clear that the evidence in this research showed the SDG development to be an exemplar, albeit accountability needed to have been further built into the SDGs but could the process of how the SDGs were created be utilised as a framework for inclusive international programme development.

Broadening the reach into other academic areas, additional recommendations can be suggested for further research. The private sector was included in the definition of CS for this PhD; however, the multiple dynamics of corporate social responsibility and corporate philanthropy was outside the scope of this PhD. Suggestions for further research in this area include solutions and applications of those solutions to address CSR concerns, especially if a continued increase in private sector activity is anticipated in social responsibility.

Although Civil Societies’ role in accountability in global governance is well researched, it is clear from the outcomes of this thesis that research is still needed on the application methods that can be utilised for practical purposes.
Where academic literature was lacking was in Civil Societies’ contribution of providing the long-term view and the stability that comes with that for governance. It is clear, that in this doctorate research the data evidenced a need for CS to address this concern, and to be able to do so in a more formalised way.
Chapter 7
Conclusion

My Story

When I began with my goal of 15 to 20 participants for my planned interviews for my thesis, I wondered how I might fulfil such a large number based on my demographics. I feel ever so blessed and very humbled by the 43 participants who came forward, and especially those who made themselves available for a second interview.

Yet, here they were thanking me: ‘thank you for this conversation’ and ‘I’m glad to be involved. If you need anything else from me’. Some commented on how they appreciated the style of the interview: ‘thanks so much… very interesting to think about’, ‘I appreciate your interview. I think it’s a very valuable thing you’re giving people’, ‘it’s difficult for the UN to speak about the challenges that it has with Civil Society because of that power imbalance’, and ‘I tell you it has been a pleasure speaking with you. I really enjoyed it’.

Others acknowledged the importance of this research topic: ‘your project is very important’, ‘I just think that your research is really, really important. That you actually have really impressive names’, ‘an independent piece of research could hopefully increase understanding among all the actors as to what the limitations are for everybody’, ‘I will be as excited or looking forward to reading your information when you’re ready to share’, ‘it would be really helpful to have this kind of independent piece of work’, and ‘I can stress again the importance that you are doing this and I’m sure I and others that you’ve talked to are genuinely intrigued to see what you come up with in terms of ways forward’.

I am filled with such gratitude!

The Purpose

My journey with this doctoral pursuit began with a gap I experienced in the practical setting. Where was the place that brought CS together to work collaboratively in a synergistic, strategic and proactive way, as opposed to so much reactive work I was experiencing? There are so many well-intended initiatives, why are we not working in a synergistic and strategic way together?

This led me to ask, where can I best uncover answers to these questions. Hence, I followed my path of questions into the academic realm to try to discover solutions in a format that was most recognised through pursuit of a PhD. My questions continued. Where would my answer to what I was seeking most naturally sit? Who would have responsibility to make this platform come together? The United Nations quite quickly became the answer, as was discussed in the introduction, as the place where this platform would come together, as it was already somewhat there, however lacking. Therefore, the purpose of this doctoral research was to understand the UN and CS relationship dynamic and to propose solutions for reform that would allow for more effective work environment, that would contribute to the furthering of
more sustainable international development.

A couple of excerpts from participants also confirmed this: ‘an argument can be made that this is a natural partnership and that almost the UN is to some extent betraying themselves. When you think about the aims of the UN, the UN is, yes Member State driven, but it’s for the peoples. Is the UN really fulfilling that role of being for the peoples, if representatives of the peoples don’t have a voice? I think you could also make that argument that this is a natural extension, or next step for what needs to happen to ensure that we actually meet the goals that were initially laid out. It’s not something that necessarily is brand new and different. But when we think about how we engage and make sure that we’re supporting the voice of the peoples, that this is a natural thing, that should have been happening anyway’ Interview CCC and ‘it’s kind of the difficulty of working with the UN system and countries, because it’s not set up in a way that it can be that really important platform for bringing people together that have similar priorities’ Interview MMM.

The Research Questions and Answers

Preliminary Questions and Results from Systematic Literature Review

The thesis commenced with a historical reflection of the UN and CS relationship, in which two preliminary questions were asked when I embarked on the systematic literature review.

The first question was: ‘What are the historical dynamics of the relationship between the UN and NGOs and what are the challenges and benefits of the affiliation?’ The answer was the identification of eight themes that put the dynamics of the relationship into specific categories. Those eight themes being:
- Its Heartbeat & Breath - The UN Needs NGOs for Validity and Credibility
- The Passionate Professional Partners - NGOs Want to be Involved
- The Moving Maze - NGOs have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access
- The Heavy Door to Open - The UN Needs to do More to Involve NGOs
- From Trojan Horse to Too Influential - Negative Reasons to Involving NGOs
- Bridges of Lifeline - NGO Contributions to UN Activities
- The Power of Power - Resistance to NGO Involvement
- The Paradoxical Situation - Resources

The themes naturally expanded from the narrower NGO definition in the literature review to the inclusion of the broader CS definition in the findings from the fieldwork (see Table 1.1 and Chapter 3).

The second question was: ‘Does CS need a new or improved environment, potentially an institution, in order to progress its development?’ The answer was: ‘yes’, a new model for reform would be needed to progress international development due to the uncovering of three inherent flaws in the UN and CS relationship that arose out of the results of the systematic literature review. Those three inherent flaws being:
- Member States vs ‘The Peoples’
- Intrinsic Contradictions of the Relationship
- Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship
This part of the research informed the research design process and led to two additional questions to be answered through two subsequent rounds of interviews of qualitative fieldwork.

**Field Research Interview Questions and Results from Findings**

The research question associated with Round 1 of the field interviews was; ‘How to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the UN and CS in order to progress international development?’. The answers, culminated from 43 semi-structured interviews, confirmed the findings from the systematic literature review and added an additional 20 themes; 12 further internal dynamics and eight external dynamics (see Table 7.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1 Additional Themes that arose from the First Round of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Dynamics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Infrastructural Backbone – Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System, and Process, Clarity Creates Cohesion - Defining the Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion is Frustration For All Including the Included – Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Leads to Meaningful Action - Social Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructure for Imperative Prevention - Conflict and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil-ed Functioning - Outdated Working Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest Broker – UN as Mediator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroot Hands Hold the Solutions – Importance of In-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing and Purposeful Speaking - Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity of Horizontal Cohesion of Collaboration and Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Bricks and Mortar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of the Empowered People - Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A proposed model for reform was designed at that stage from the research findings. Through a second semi-structured interview with 32 participants, the second field research question was explored; ‘How would you implement it, and would you modify it or make it better in any way before doing so?’ The answers uncovered mostly favourable responses to the proposed reform, implementation steps for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter, and the requirement of an inclusive consultative process for identifying the content of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter.

**The Proposed Reform**

In analysing the whole of the research findings, the systematic literature review and both semi-structured interviews, a more thorough reform for the UN and CS relationship is proposed. The Naber model was designed to incorporate two or more frameworks with the purpose of building synergies amongst the frameworks to further organisational objectives and incorporate catch systems or safeguards to protect and support organisations’ principles. For the UN and CS relationship reform the Naber model was applied and two frameworks were designed that aim to address all 28 themes and three inherent flaws. One is a structural framework and the other embodies the mechanisms through which the structure operates.

The structural framework comprises of a 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter, a formalised structure that includes the writing and implementation of a 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter for the United Peoples and is interlaced with the 1\textsuperscript{st} Charter to bring together the work of the UN and CS. There are four components that reside within the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter’s structure. Firstly, for the structure to incorporate an international office and in-country national offices. Secondly, that the work is coordinated through grouped themes, such as the SDGs because of their acknowledged success of a UN and CS working relationship and because of their ability in contributing to collaborative work. Thirdly, the structure needs to be inclusive with clearly laid out ways to collaborate so that it is designed for accessibility. Fourthly, to build on strengths of the UN and incorporate its mediator role.

The framework of mechanisms comprises of the UN’s Principled Decision-Making Policy to continuously ensure that all decisions align with the organisation’s principles. In addition, two other components are included in this framework; the need for meaningful dialogue as it greatly contributes to effective and results orientated solutions – talk for trust, and a pooled and blinded funding system that offers a streamlined process. These three mechanisms are infused throughout the structure, essentially the structure operates through these mechanisms.

In considering the practical application of the proposed UN reform, to apply learning from other examples is an important step as the findings highlighted and as Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3 demonstrated (for example, Chapter 3 mentioned the example of the Earth Charter).

In addition, a retired body of the UN could be considered. For example, in 1994, one of the six main UN organs, the Trusteeship Council, suspended its operations (see Appendix for further background information). It could be considered to house and operate UN reform.
**Links with Global Theoretical Perspectives**

The qualitative interview findings also led to the exploration of intersecting areas within the wider literature; links with social responsibility and the concept of CS in governance.

The private sector was included in the definition of CS, this was acknowledged by how the UN defines CS through the participants and was acknowledged in the history of the definition for international CS that was discussed in the introduction. In addition, the research findings noted that every actor is required to be involved in solving today’s problems. The findings of this research agreed with the current academic epistemology of CSR being more and more involved in social responsibility. In my personal professional experience, I have witnessed businesses wanting to be involved but not really knowing how to best be engaged in the solution. However, intentions of private sector involvement were questioned.

It was remarked that CS provides the stability to allow for government changes. Hence, a further need for CS as part of the UN is needed to uphold the three UN pillars regardless of the changes that are happening in government. Currently governments are: ‘it’s really frightening to see a move towards nationalist sovereignty, right-wing populism’ Interview L. That puts pressure on the three pillars and therefore the UN itself: ‘that’s the context that we’re living in, where we are seeing a push back against those principles. Then, those challenges are exasperated within the UN space as well’ Interview FF. This change, that we are seeing globally in the government regimes, was often noted by participants. They expressed their concerns regarding the changes, and the uncooperative pressure this puts on the UN.

‘And that more distributed approach to organising the human story, or telling the human story, or writing the next chapter of the human story, is where the UN really needs to innovate basically. It’s time for the UN to innovate on its governance and in that, to figure out how does citizen organisation, citizen mobilisation, and Civil Society, and progressive and committed sustainable business all fit together in that equation’ Interview Y. If the UN is our global hope, we cannot leave it in the hands of the ever-changing political environment. It must involve CS to provide the stability.

A number of different organisational frameworks exist. Research into a systematic literature review that would culminate into a result of providing a guideline of different frameworks for different purposes would be beneficial for their application.

**Implications for Future Research**

This thesis offers the invitation to further research in a number of areas. Each of the 28 themes and three inherent flaws, individually, offer the opportunity for further research in the UN and CS relationship. Another prospect is research in the deeper exploration of CSR to identify possible solutions for applicable approaches in transparency of motives. There is an invitation for further studying Civil Societies’ role in governance. Lastly, future reviews of the varying frameworks that exist and their usefulness for exploring the UN and CS relationship could be considered.
Original Contribution to Knowledge

To recap, the PhD contributes original knowledge to understanding the UN and CS relationship in 11 key areas:

- The thesis offers the first ever systematic literature review on this research topic.
- It was the first study, that the researcher is aware of, to use comprehensive data from elite interviews on the UN and CS relationship from a structural and global perspective that was not limited to a specific issue.
- The analysis of the data, through a robust research methodology, presents findings of key relationship dynamics that includes 28 themes and three inherent flaws.
- The development of the Naber Model for reform for the UN and CS relationship, which has the capacity to be applied to other institutional or organisational reform.
- The research informed the development of an evidence-based proposed model for reform for the UN and CS relationship. The two frameworks designed are founded within the Naber Model and based on the data from the research. A structural one, the 2nd Charter ‘The United Peoples’, comprises of an additional four components: global and national offices, grouped issues, structure designed for accessibility, and the UN as mediator. The second framework presents the mechanisms through which the structure operates. It comprises of the UN’s Principled Decision-Making Policy, along with talk for trust and funding: pooled and blinded.
- Elite interview consultations on this suggested model presented findings on how reform can potentially be implemented.
- The analysis of the findings from the data uncovered structural defects of the current UN system in regard to its relationship with CS, that cannot be addressed without reform.
- A unique element of the Naber Model is that it addresses the structural defects of the current system, as it is designed to safeguard organisational principles and to build synergies for organisational goals.
- The research began to explore solutions to other author's suggestions for further research.
- The results of the thesis offer potential solutions to current international consultants’ who are tasked with UN and CS relationship reform, especially during this time of the UN’s 75th anniversary.
- The findings further academic concepts regarding CS in governance and the evolution of social responsibility based on evidence from the elite interviews.

Future Vision – Looking Past a 2nd Charter

This thesis takes into account the limitations of the current situation of the UN and CS relationship. It would be ideal to have the current system function better and for the reform to reside within the current structure, however, as shown in the research, there are the inherent flaws that prevent it from doing so.

Therefore, a 2nd Charter takes the current situation into account, both the positive and the negative and incorporates both the criticisms and the virtues of each party,
of the structure, and of the relationship as it currently exists. Although the proposed reform may seem to be idealistic, it is not in my opinion, in comparison to the strong resistance in reopening the 1st Charter. In addition, we have drifted so far away from the UN’s principles, that a move back towards them certainly is not only idealistic but absolutely necessary, especially in the context of today. Further, one could argue the 1st Charter was idealistic; however, it came into being and still holds a strong global presence. A 2nd Charter to support the first one is perhaps a viable solution.

Perhaps in the future, we can see the writing of another Charter, the amalgamation of the 1st and 2nd Charter. Maintaining the 1st Charter and establishing a 2nd Charter to create a parallel structure seems for the moment the best scenario while merging them will be done in the future. The 2nd Charter then becomes a steppingstone to a further transformation of the UN. This might be an intermittent step, to have a 2nd Charter. Maybe in the future, once working bridges have been established between the various components, different bodies, and organisations, those pathways of collaboration can be created and reinforced through a clearly defined 2nd Charter.

‘How we actually move to a system where we are having as many voices at the table as possible, but within a framework that we can actually make progress… it’s a steppingstone to actually rethinking how we deal with global business, if you like, because we have to. Because we’re interdependent, and because the problems are so big now, especially around climate change and issues, that actually we have to conceive of a whole different way of thinking. So, if we can think of a whole new conceptualization here of how more people can be engaged, and what that’s going to look like, I think, that could be where we’re heading and the way to win’ Interview XX.

The Heart of the Matter

The real heart of the matter was a unified call for action, an urgent call for action for reform for the UN and CS relationship. For example: ‘the UN has a moral responsibility to discuss this and reform itself’ Interview R, ‘we are at a point and time where human survival is the biggest challenge and which the UN is there to safeguard at its core’ Interview Y, ‘I think, there is a danger of nothing changing’ Interview AA, ‘if nothing changes you will just be going towards this catastrophe that we seem to be going towards… if you work together it can be more… we can change the world’ Interview CC, ‘charity will not change the systems and structures’ Interview EE, and ‘because the truth is, lives of so many people are directly affected by… that we are doing’ Interview GG. Please see the appendix for further excerpts.

Since these interviews were conducted, the world has further transformed and the call for change can easily be argued is of even greater urgency, especially when considering the global crisis of the coronavirus, which we see is causing a grassroots movement pleading for systems changes, and the international unrest calling for equality. In addition, we are in the year of 2020, where the UN turns 75, and many global discussions are taking place addressing UN reform.

To Conclude

I will leave you with the voice of the people, the voice of the participants, which I am
ever so grateful for. For it is their vast experience, their voice, that has made this doctoral research a profound undertaking. The United Nations is needed more than ever and is looked upon for upholding morality and maintaining moral excellence including within its own institution. Is CS the UN’s ally to build back up its legitimacy, to provide it with an opportunity to not shrink but in effect grow – effectively?

‘I think we are in a world which is needing - your idea is needed. I think, it would be fantastic. If you could do this for civil, if we could do this for Civil Society at a global level and also a national level’ Interview VV.

‘Without a 2nd Charter… their voices won’t be heard or can’t be heard, and the mechanisms are there. And, I’m sorry, but it’s [the UN] not going to survive’ Interview AAA.

‘In terms of an exercise in re-energizing the UN, [this] is a good idea… clearly, there are issues that the UN isn’t doing as well as it should… it says “We the Peoples” at the beginning, it doesn’t say we the governments of the peoples’ Interview DDD.

‘Is it the moment, is it the right time? So, the 2nd Charter, is this the moment… given the rationale. I think it’s the first constructive conversation that I have been engaged in in terms of what might be… it is a solid proposal, calling for the best of humanity, inclusive platform… maybe this offers another moment for looking at what could be transformative’ Interview QQQ.

‘You’ve come up with a credible suggestion for a 2nd Charter which is relevant to the modern world. Well, are you going to leave that research on a desk somewhere? Is it going to be published, well, then what? Who is taking this research and going, “Have you read this?”. We should be doing this. We should be doing that. And that should be… a combination of civil servant government or it might be all Civil Society or all United Nations’ Interview RRR.

‘You’re offering something which is very important for the UN. This intellectual research analysis of saying “UN is going to be 75, its aging, here are some other ways you should be looking at, here’s what you should consider”, seriously’ Interview SSS.
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Background Information on the United Nations

This section provides an overview of information on the UN; its system, main organs, and the UN offices. The referenced information is from UN websites and is provided as a resource.

The following information is included in this section:

- An Overview of the UN
- The Main Organs of the UN (each of which is referenced further after the UN System Chart)
- The UN System Chart (for clarity is split over two pages)
- About the General Assembly
- About the Security Council
- About the Economic and Social Council (including ECOSOC System Chart)
- About the Trusteeship Council
- About the International Court of Justice
- About the Secretariat
- UN Regional Commissions
- United Nations Geneva Office
- United Nations Nairobi Office
- United Nations New York Office
- United Nations Vienna Office

Overview of the UN

The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945. It is currently made up of 193 Member States. The mission and work of the United Nations are guided by the purposes and principles contained in its founding Charter.

Due to the powers vested in its Charter and its unique international character, the United Nations can take action on the issues confronting humanity in the 21st century, such as peace and security, climate change, sustainable development, human rights, disarmament, terrorism, humanitarian and health emergencies, gender equality, governance, food production, and more.

The UN also provides a forum for its members to express their views in the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and other bodies and committees. By enabling dialogue between its members, and by hosting negotiations, the Organization has become a mechanism for governments to find areas of agreement and solve problems together.

The UN's Chief Administrative Officer is the Secretary-General.

2020 marks the 75th anniversary of the United Nations’ (United Nations, 2020e).
Main Organs

The main organs of the UN are the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the UN Secretariat. All were established in 1945 when the UN was founded.

**General Assembly**
The General Assembly is the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the UN. All 193 Member States of the UN are represented in the General Assembly, making it the only UN body with universal representation. Each year, in September, the full UN membership meets in the General Assembly Hall in New York for the annual General Assembly session, and general debate, which many heads of state attend and address. Decisions on important questions, such as those on peace and security, admission of new members and budgetary matters, require a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly. Decisions on other questions are by simple majority. The General Assembly, each year, elects a GA President to serve a one-year term of office.

**Security Council**
The Security Council has primary responsibility, under the UN Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security. It has 15 Members (5 permanent and 10 non-permanent members). Each Member has one vote. Under the Charter, all Member States are obligated to comply with Council decisions. The Security Council takes the lead in determining the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression. It calls upon the parties to a dispute to settle it by peaceful means and recommends methods of adjustment or terms of settlement. In some cases, the Security Council can resort to imposing sanctions or even authorize the use of force to maintain or restore international peace and security. The Security Council has a Presidency, which rotates, and changes, every month.

**Economic and Social Council**
The Economic and Social Council is the principal body for coordination, policy review, policy dialogue and recommendations on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as implementation of internationally agreed development goals. It serves as the central mechanism for activities of the UN system and its specialized agencies in the economic, social and environmental fields, supervising subsidiary and expert bodies. It has 54 Members, elected by the General Assembly for overlapping three-year terms. It is the United Nations’ central platform for reflection, debate, and innovative thinking on sustainable development.

**Trusteeship Council**
The Trusteeship Council was established in 1945 by the UN Charter, under Chapter XIII, to provide international supervision for 11 Trust Territories that had been placed under the administration of seven Member States, and ensure that adequate steps were taken to prepare the Territories for self-government and independence. By 1994, all Trust Territories had attained self-government or independence. The Trusteeship Council suspended operation on 1 November 1994. By a resolution adopted on 25 May 1994, the Council amended its rules of procedure to drop the obligation to meet annually and agreed to meet as occasion required -- by its
decision or the decision of its President, or at the request of a majority of its members or the General Assembly or the Security Council.

**International Court of Justice**
The International Court of Justice is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. Its seat is at the Peace Palace in the Hague (Netherlands). It is the only one of the six principal organs of the United Nations not located in New York (United States of America). The Court’s role is to settle, in accordance with international law, legal disputes submitted to it by States and to give advisory opinions on legal questions referred to it by authorized United Nations organs and specialized agencies.

**Secretariat**
The Secretariat comprises the Secretary-General and tens of thousands of international UN staff members who carry out the day-to-day work of the UN as mandated by the General Assembly and the Organization's other principal organs. The Secretary-General is chief administrative officer of the Organization, appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council for a five-year, renewable term. UN staff members are recruited internationally and locally, and work in duty stations and on peacekeeping missions all around the world. But serving the cause of peace in a violent world is a dangerous occupation. Since the founding of the United Nations, hundreds of brave men and women have given their lives in its service’ (United Nations, 2020d).
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Research and Training
- UNIDIR United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research
- UNITAR United Nations Institute for Training and Research
- UNESCO United Nations System Staff College
- UNI United Nations University

Other Entities
- ITC International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO)
- UNCTAD United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
- UNRCCI Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
- UNOPS United Nations Office for Project Services
- UNRWA United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
- UN-WOMEN United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

Related Organizations
- CBTO PREPARATORY COMMISSION
  Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization
- IAEA International Atomic Energy Agency
- ICC International Criminal Court
- IOM International Organization for Migration
- ISA International Seabed Authority
- ITLOS International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea
- OPCW Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
- WTO World Trade Organization

Peacebuilding Commission

HLFP High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development

Other Bodies
- Committee for Development Policy
- Committee of Experts on Public Administration
- Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations
- Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
- UNAIDS Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
- UNESQ United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names
- UNGSOP Committee of Experts on Global Geospatial Information Management

Research and Training
- UNICRI United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute
- UNRISD United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

Specialized Agencies
- FAO Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
- ICAO International Civil Aviation Organization
- IFAD International Fund for Agricultural Development
- ILO International Labour Organization
- IMF International Monetary Fund
- IMO International Maritime Organization
- ITU International Telecommunication Union
- UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- UNIDO United Nations Industrial Development Organization
- UNWTO World Tourism Organization
- UPU Universal Postal Union
- WHO World Health Organization
- WIPO World Intellectual Property Organization
- WMO World Meteorological Organization
- WORLD BANK GROUP
  - IBRD International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
  - IDA International Development Association
  - IFC International Finance Corporation

Notes:
1. Members of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB).
2. UN Office for Partnerships (UNOP) is the UN’s focal point vis-a-vis the United Nations Foundation, Inc.
4. WTO has no reporting obligation to the GA, but contributes on an ad hoc basis to GA and Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) work on inter alia, finance and development issues.
5. Specialized agencies are autonomous organizations whose work is coordinated through ECOSOC (intergovernmental level) and CEB (inter-secretariat level).
6. The Trusteeship Council suspended operation on 1 November 1994, as on 1 October 1994 Palau, the last United Nations Trust Territory, became independent.
7. International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) are not specialized agencies in accordance with Articles 57 and 63 of the Charter, but are part of the World Bank Group.
8. The secretariats of these organs are part of the UN Secretariat.
9. The Secretariat also includes the following offices: The Ethics Office, United Nations Ombudsman and Mediation Services, and the Office of Administration of Justice.
10. For a complete list of ECOSOC Subsidiary Bodies see un.org/ecosoc.

This Chart is a reflection of the functional organization of the United Nations System and for informational purposes only. It does not include all offices or entities of the United Nations System.

(United Nations, 2020i)
About the General Assembly

‘All 193 Member States of the Organization are represented in the General Assembly - one of the six main organs of the UN - to discuss and work together on a wide array of international issues covered by the Charter of the United Nations, such as development, peace and security, international law, etc.

Every year in September, all the Members meet in this unique forum at Headquarters in New York for the General Assembly session.

Sitting arrangements in the General Assembly Hall change for each session. During the 74th Session (2019-2020), Ghana occupies the first seat in the Hall, including in the Main Committees (followed by all the other countries, in English alphabetical order)’ (United Nations, 2020a).

About the Security Council

‘Mandate

The United Nations Charter established six main organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council. It gives primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security to the Security Council, which may meet whenever peace is threatened.

According to the Charter, the United Nations has four purposes:

• to maintain international peace and security;
• to develop friendly relations among nations;
• to cooperate in solving international problems and in promoting respect for human rights;
• and to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations.

All members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. While other organs of the United Nations make recommendations to member states, only the Security Council has the power to make decisions that member states are then obligated to implement under the Charter.

Maintaining Peace and Security

When a complaint concerning a threat to peace is brought before it, the Council’s first action is usually to recommend that the parties try to reach agreement by peaceful means. The Council may:

• set forth principles for such an agreement;
• undertake investigation and mediation, in some cases;
• dispatch a mission;
• appoint special envoys; or
• request the Secretary-General to use his good offices to achieve a pacific settlement of the dispute.

When a dispute leads to hostilities, the Council’s primary concern is to bring them to an end as soon as possible. In that case, the Council may:
issue ceasefire directives that can help prevent an escalation of the conflict;
dispatch military observers or a peacekeeping force to help reduce tensions,
separate opposing forces and establish a calm in which peaceful settlements
may be sought.

Beyond this, the Council may opt for enforcement measures, including:

- economic sanctions, arms embargoes, financial penalties and restrictions,
  and travel bans;
- severance of diplomatic relations;
- blockade;
- or even collective military action.

A chief concern is to focus action on those responsible for the policies or practices
condemned by the international community, while minimizing the impact of the
measures taken on other parts of the population and economy.

**Organization**

The Security Council held its first session on 17 January 1946 at Church House,
Westminster, London. Since its first meeting, the Security Council has taken
permanent residence at the United Nations Headquarters in New York City. It also
travelled to many cities, holding sessions in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 1972, in
Panama City, Panama, and in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1990.

A representative of each of its members must be present at all times at UN
Headquarters so that the Security Council can meet at any time as the need arises’
(United Nations, 2020m).

**About the Economic and Social Council**

‘The Economic and Social Council is at the heart of the United Nations system to
advance the three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and
environmental. It is the central platform for fostering debate and innovative thinking,
forging consensus on ways forward, and coordinating efforts to achieve
internationally agreed goals. It is also responsible for the follow-up to major UN
conferences and summits.\The UN Charter established ECOSOC in 1945 as one of
the six main organs of the United Nations.

**Coordination within the UN**

ECOSOC links a diverse family of UN entities (Organigram) dedicated to sustainable
development, providing overall guidance and coordination. The entities include
regional economic and social commissions, functional commissions facilitating
intergovernmental discussions of major global issues, and specialized agencies,
programmes and funds at work around the world to translate development
commitments into real changes in people’s lives.

Reforms over the last decade, particularly General Assembly resolution 68/1, have
strengthened ECOSOC’s leading role in identifying emerging challenges, promoting
innovation, and achieving a balanced integration of the three pillars of sustainable development—economic, social and environmental. ECOSOC is charged with giving special attention to coordinated follow-up on major UN conferences and summits.

**Partnership with the Rest of the World**

Building on its coordination role within the UN system, ECOSOC is a gateway for UN partnership and participation by the rest of the world. It offers a unique global meeting point for productive dialogues among policymakers, parliamentarians, academics, foundations, businesses, youth and 3,200+ registered non-governmental organizations.

**A Spotlight on Global Issues**

Each year, ECOSOC structures its work around an annual theme of global importance to sustainable development. This ensures focused attention, among ECOSOC’s array of partners, and throughout the UN development system.

By emphasizing combined economic, social and environmental concerns, ECOSOC encourages agreement on coherent policies and actions that make fundamental links across all three.

**ECOSOC’s Annual High-Level Segment Includes:**

- High-Level Political Forum provides political leadership, guidance and recommendations for sustainable development, and reviews progress in implementing sustainable development commitments
- Development Cooperation Forum reviews trends and progress in development cooperation

**Other Sessions Encompass:**

- Integration Segment promotes integrated actions on economic, social and environmental issues, within the United Nations system and beyond
- Humanitarian Affairs Segment strengthens coordination of UN humanitarian efforts
- Operational Activities for Development Segment provides overall guidance for UN funds and programmes
- Management Segment reviews reports of ECOSOC subsidiary and expert bodies; promotes UN system coordination on development issues; and considers special country or regional concerns
- Youth Forum brings youth voices into discussions on global policy-making on development issues of the day
- Partnership Forum encourages collaboration among Governments, businesses and foundations, non-governmental organizations, academia and Parliamentarians
- Special meetings to address global development emergencies or crises, to raise awareness and to serve as a high level policy platform for coordination of actors working on a specific situation’ (United Nations, 2020b).
**About the Trusteeship Council**

**Status**

The Trusteeship Council suspended its operations on 1 November 1994, a month after the independence of Palau, the last remaining United Nations trust territory. By a resolution adopted on 25 May 1994, the Council amended its rules of procedure to drop the obligation to meet annually and agreed to meet as occasion required -- by its decision or the decision of its President, or at the request of a majority of its members or the General Assembly or the Security Council.

**Background**

In setting up an International Trusteeship System, the Charter established the Trusteeship Council as one of the main organs of the United Nations and assigned to it the task of supervising the administration of Trust Territories placed under the Trusteeship System. The main goals of the System were to promote the advancement of the inhabitants of Trust Territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence. The Trusteeship Council is made up of the five permanent members of the Security Council -- China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States. The aims of the Trusteeship System have been fulfilled to the extent that all Trust Territories have...
attained self-government or independence, either as separate States or by joining neighbouring independent countries.

**Functions and powers**

Under the Charter, the Trusteeship Council is authorized to examine and discuss reports from the Administering Authority on the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the peoples of Trust Territories and, in consultation with the Administering Authority, to examine petitions from and undertake periodic and other special missions to Trust Territories.

**Bureau**

At the beginning of each session the Trusteeship Council elects a President and a Vice-President from among the representatives of the members of the Council. The President and the Vice-President hold their offices until their respective successors are elected, for a maximum duration of five years. At its seventy-second session, the Trusteeship Council elected Anne Gueguen of France as its President and Jonathan Guy Allen of the United Kingdom as its Vice-President.

**Proceedings and documentation**

The Index to Proceedings of the Trusteeship Council is an annual bibliographic guide to the proceedings and documentation of the Trusteeship Council prepared by the Dag Hammarskjöld Library’ (United Nations, 2020h).

**About the International Court of Justice**

‘The Court’

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations (UN). It was established in June 1945 by the Charter of the United Nations and began work in April 1946.

The seat of the Court is at the Peace Palace in The Hague (Netherlands). Of the six principal organs of the United Nations, it is the only one not located in New York (United States of America).

The Court’s role is to settle, in accordance with international law, legal disputes submitted to it by States and to give advisory opinions on legal questions referred to it by authorized United Nations organs and specialized agencies.

The Court is composed of 15 judges, who are elected for terms of office of nine years by the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council. It is assisted by a Registry, its administrative organ. Its official languages are English and French’ (United Nations, 2020f).
About the Secretariat

‘The Secretariat, one of the main organs of the UN, is organized along departmental lines, with each department or office having a distinct area of action and responsibility. Offices and departments coordinate with each other to ensure cohesion as they carry out the day to day work of the Organization in offices and duty stations around the world. At the head of the United Nations Secretariat is the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General is the chief administrative officer and head of the Secretariat’ (United Nations, 2020g).

UN Regional Commissions

‘Bangkok: Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
Beirut: Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia
Addis Ababa: Economic Commission for Africa
Geneva: Economic Commission for Europe
Santiago: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean’ (United Nations, 2020g).

United Nations Geneva Office

‘Housed at the Palais des Nations, the United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG) serves as the representative office of the Secretary-General at Geneva. A focal point for multilateral diplomacy, UNOG services more than 8,000 meetings every year, making it one of the busiest conference centres in the world. With more than 1,600 staff, it is the biggest duty stations outside of United Nations headquarters in New York.

Providing key infrastructure and support, UNOG contributes significantly to the Organization’s efforts to maintain international peace and security, to advance disarmament, to protect and promote human rights, to eradicate poverty, to implement sustainable development practices and to provide fast, effective humanitarian relief in emergencies – to mention just a few of the tasks. A large number of dignitaries and high-level delegations come to UNOG every year to participate in bilateral exchanges, intergovernmental meetings, conferences and other events, making UNOG a centre for information sharing and exchange.

UNOG performs representation and liaison functions with permanent missions, the host Government and other Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, research and academic institutions at Geneva as well as other organizations of the United Nations common system at Geneva. UNOG also facilitates inter-agency cooperation and cooperation with regional organizations.

The Office provides financial and administrative support services to more than 20 Geneva-based organizations/departments as well as entities located in Bonn and Turin. It manages the United Nations facilities in Geneva and provides conference services for the United Nations meetings held at Geneva and at other locations as
well as for specialized agencies understanding or special arrangements.

UNOG is also a centre for an on-going exchange among cultures through its Cultural Activities.

UNOG is headed by a Director-General at the level of Under-Secretary-General who is accountable directly to the Secretary-General’ (United Nations, 2020j).

**United Nations Nairobi Office**

‘Division of Conference Services (DCS) of the United Nations Office [is located] at Nairobi (UNON). DCS is also part of the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM) at United Nations Headquarters in New York. Since its inception in 1996, DCS has been providing conference and meeting facilities within Nairobi and also servicing meetings abroad. With 14 Conference Rooms of international standard, supported by dedicated personnel, sophisticated Conference Equipment and other facilities, DCS is geared towards catering to the needs of every kind of client and providing services for a broad range of conference events.

In addition to providing conference facilities, DCS offers a wide array of other Conference Services these include publishing services, editing, translation, and interpretation. The conference rooms are equipped to cater for extra services, such as projection and voting. In addition to providing conference rooms, DCS also, upon request, accommodates Exhibitions’ (United Nations, 2020k).

**United Nations New York Office**

The following lists the departments and offices located at the headquarters at the United Nations in New York.

‘Executive Office of the Secretary-General:

- Office of the Spokesperson for the Secretary-General

Office of Internal Oversight Services:

- Internal Audit Division
- Inspection and Evaluation Division
- Investigations Division

Office of Legal Affairs:

- Office of the Legal Counsel
- General Legal Division
- Treaty Section
- Codification Division
- International Trade Law Division
- Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea
Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs:

- Peacebuilding Support Office
- Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect
- Africa I and II Divisions
- Americas Division
- Asia and the Pacific Division
- Europe Division
- Middle East and West Asia Division
- Electoral Assistance Division
- Division for Palestinian Rights
- Policy and Mediation Division
- Security Council Affairs Division
- Decolonization Unit

Office for Disarmament Affairs:

- Weapons of Mass Destruction Branch
- Conventional Arms Branch
- Information and Outreach Branch
- Regional Disarmament Branch
- Conference on Disarmament Secretariat and Conference Support Branch

Department of Peace Operations:

- Office of Operations
- Office of Military Affairs
- Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions
  - Police Division
  - Mine Action Service
  - Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Section
  - Criminal Law and Judicial Advisory Service: Justice and Corrections
  - Security Sector Reform Unit
- Policy, Evaluation and Training Division

Department of Operational Support:

- Department of Operational Support (DOS)
- Office of the Under-Secretary-General (OUSG)
- Office of Support Operations (OSO)
- Office of Supply Chain Management (OSCM)
- Division for Special Activities (DSA)
- Division of Administration, New York (DOA)
- Office of Information and Communication Technology

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs:

- Coordination
- Policy
- Advocacy
• Information Management
• Humanitarian Financing

Office of Counter-Terrorism (OCT)

Department of Economic and Social Affairs:

• Financing for Sustainable Development Office
• Office for Intergovernmental Support and Coordination for Sustainable Development
• Division for Inclusive Social Development
• Secretariat of the UN Forum on Forests
• Statistics Division
• Division for Sustainable Development Goals
• Population Division
• Economic Analysis and Policy Division
• Division for Public Institutions and Digital Government
• Capacity Development Office
• United Nations Forum on Forests

Department for General Assembly and Conference Management:

• Central Planning and Coordination Division
• Documentation Division
• General Assembly and ECOSOC Affairs Division
• Meetings and Publishing Division
• Protocol and Liaison Service

Department of Global Communications:

• News and Media Division
• Outreach Division
• Strategic Communications Division

Department of Safety and Security:

• Field Support Service
• Division of Regional Operations
• Division of Headquarters Security and Safety Services

Department of Management Strategy, Policy and Compliance:

• Programme Planning, Finance and Budget
• Office of Human Resources
  o HR Portal
  o Careers Portal
• Business Transformation & Accountability
• Office of Information and Communication Technology
• Umoja
Internal Justice Bodies:

- Office of the United Nations Ombudsman
- Office of Administration of Justice
- UN Dispute Tribunal
- UN Appeals Tribunal [the United Nations Administrative Tribunal was abolished as of 31 December 2009 by GA resolution 63/253]

Other Offices:

- Office of the Victims' Rights Advocate (UN response to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse)
- United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund
- Secretariat of the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB)
- Ethics Office
- Global Compact Office
- United Nations Office for Partnerships (UNOP)
- United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF)
- United Nations Staff Union

Special Advisers, Representatives and Envoys:

- Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States
- Office of the Special Adviser on Africa
- Office of the Special Advisers to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect
- Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict
- Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict' (United Nations, 2020g).

United Nations Vienna Office

‘Vienna is one of the four headquarters of the United Nations, along with New York, Geneva and Nairobi.

The Vienna International Centre (VIC), commonly known in Austria as "UNO City", was opened in 1979 and is leased for a symbolic annual rental sum of one Austrian schilling (equivalent to seven euro cents) to the United Nations for 99 years. Around 5,000 employees from more than 125 countries work for the organizations based in Vienna.

The United Nations family in Vienna includes:

**The United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV):** provides administrative support including conference planning, security and language interpretation to UN programmes. The Director-General of UNOV represents the Secretary-General in dealings with the host country and diplomatic missions in Vienna.
The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA): is the world's central intergovernmental forum for scientific and technical co-operation in the nuclear field. It works for the safe, secure and peaceful uses of nuclear science and technology, contributing to international peace and security and the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals.

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO): is the specialized agency that promotes industrial development to create shared prosperity and advance economic competitiveness while safeguarding the environment and strengthening knowledge and institutions.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC): from its headquarters in Vienna and through a global network of field offices, UNODC assists Member States to address the threat posed by drugs, crime, corruption and terrorism and to promote security and justice for all.

The Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO PrepCom): is preparing for the implementation of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which bans nuclear explosions by everyone, everywhere: on the Earth's surface, in the atmosphere, underwater and underground. It is establishing a global verification regime with 337 monitoring facilities to ensure no nuclear explosion goes undetected. The monitoring data are also used for non-verification purposes such as tsunami warnings and global radiation monitoring.

The United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA): promotes international cooperation in the peaceful use of outer space. It helps Member States, in particular developing countries, gain access to space science, technology and applications for sustainable development. Through UN-SPIDER, UNOOSA helps all countries leverage the potential of space technologies for disaster management and emergency response. UNOOSA also implements the Secretary-General's responsibilities under international space law and maintains the UN Register of Objects Launched into Outer Space.

The International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR): promotes international cooperation to make the Danube, Europe's second largest river, cleaner, healthier and safer while working towards ensuring the sustainable and equitable use of waters and freshwater resources in the Danube River Basin. The work of ICPDR is based on the Danube River Protection Convention.

The International Narcotics Control Board (INCB): is an independent panel of experts monitoring and promoting the implementation of the UN drug control conventions. INCB works to ensure the availability of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances for medical and scientific purposes while preventing diversion into illicit channels. The Board monitors national controls over precursor chemicals used in the illicit manufacturing of drugs and assists Governments in preventing the diversion of precursors.
The International Organization for Migration (IOM): is dedicated to promoting humane and orderly migration for the benefit of all and international cooperation on migration issues. It also provides humanitarian assistance to migrants in need. IOM Vienna consists of the IOM Country Office for Austria and the Regional Office for South-Eastern Europe, Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

Secretariat of the Carpathian Convention - UN Environment Vienna: promotes international cooperation for the protection and sustainable development of the Carpathians, Europe’s largest transboundary mountain region, based on the Carpathian Convention. The office is UN Environment's global hub for work on mountains and the sub-regional hub for UN Environment in South-East Europe.

Sustainable Energy for All Initiative (SEforALL): is a global platform working to achieve universal access to sustainable energy, as a contribution to a cleaner, just and prosperous world for all. The initiative brings together thousands of partners from the public sector, private sector and civil society.

The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL): is focussed on the modernization and harmonization of laws for international trade and business to reduce legal obstacles to the international flow of goods. UNCITRAL develops conventions, model laws and rules as well as legal and legislative guides in areas such as arbitration and mediation; micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises; electronic commerce; insolvency law and security interests.

The United Nations Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA): maintains a Liaison Office in Vienna, which also represents the UN Departments of Peace Operations, and Operational Support. It aims to strengthen the cooperation between the represented departments and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): monitors the implementation of the relevant asylum laws in Austria according to the Geneva Refugee Convention and makes suggestions on refugee related questions to the authorities.

The United Nations Information Service (UNIS) Vienna: as part of the network of UN Information Centres around the world, UNIS communicates the activities and concerns of the United Nations to the four countries it serves - Austria, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia. It also supports the public information activities of Vienna-based UN organizations.

The United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) Vienna Office: facilitates closer cooperation and effective interaction in all areas of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. The Vienna Office coordinates the Disarmament and Non-Proliferation (DNP) Education Partnership bringing together 30 partner organizations to develop educational packages on disarmament topics.

The United Nations Postal Administration (UNPA): issues United Nations stamps which reflect the work of the organization. The stamps issued in Vienna are valid for postage on mail sent from the United Nations in Vienna.
The United Nations Register of Damage Caused by the Construction of the Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (UNRoD): keeps documentary record of the damage resulting from the construction of the Wall by Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including in and around East Jerusalem.

The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR): evaluates the levels and effects of exposure to ionizing radiation. Its reports provide the scientific basis for radiation protection measures used by governments and international bodies' (United Nations, 2020l).
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

You are being invited to take part in research on the relationship between the United Nations and Civil Society. My name is Dorothea Christiana Vincent, a doctoral candidate at the University of Edinburgh, who is leading this research. Before you decide to take part, it is important you understand why the research is being conducted and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY?

The purpose of the study is to uncover how to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the United Nations (UN) and Civil Society (CS) in order to progress international development.

WHY HAVE I BEEN INVITED TO TAKE PART?

You are invited to participate in this study because you have been identified as an international high-level key stakeholder that is best placed for the collection of data on this research question.

It is international research, hence due to your global work that relates to the UN and CS, you are in the environment that is being researched. The collected data requires you to have knowledge and experience in the subject matter, therefore, junior level positions may not be able to comfortably partake, due to their limited experience and/or access to information, meetings or conversations on the subject matter. In order to study change, I need to research those that think about change, implement change and have considered the impact of what the change may look like.

DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART?

No – it is entirely up to you. If you do decide to take part, please keep this Information Sheet and complete the Informed Consent Form to show that you understand your rights in relation to the research, and that you are happy to
participate. If you do decide to take part, you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I DECIDE TO TAKE PART?

You will be asked a number of questions regarding the research topic. The interview will take place in a safe environment at a time that is convenient to you. Ideally, I would like to audio record your responses (and will require your consent for this), so the location should be in a fairly quiet area. The interview should take around one hour to complete.

You will be invited to partake in a second interview, once the first round of interviews is completed. In the second interview, the collated responses from the first round of interviews will be presented to you for feedback, exploration and uncovering of insights. I will contact you when the second round of interviews are being scheduled. A second consent form will be signed at that time.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE BENEFITS OF TAKING PART?

By sharing your experiences with me, you will be helping to uncover what possible solutions and changes are needed to better impact international development by providing an environment for the relationship between UN and CS to flourish.

This research process will give you the opportunity to have your voice heard, on this research topic, to contribute to potential solutions.

In the second round of interviews you will be able to see the collated answers from your international colleagues, that work in the global arena of the UN and CS. You will be able to provide your valuable feedback that will contribute to the research collected in round two.

DO YOU HAVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OTHER INTERVIEWEES?

Do you have contacts that you think would be interested and would like to contribute to this research? If yes, please consider:
- Do they work in an international context of the UN and CS?
- Do the individuals have experience and knowledge on this topic in which they can contribute to this data collection?
- Would they be available to conduct an interview a second time?

Contact Name: ___________________________

Contact Email: ___________________________

Contact Position: _____________________ Organisation: ___________________

Why Recommended: __________________________________________________
Can I Mention Your Name? ________

ARE THERE ANY RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH TAKING PART?

There are no significant risks associated with participation.

WHAT IF I WANT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY?

Agreeing to participate in this project does not oblige you to remain in the study nor have any further obligation to this study. If, at any stage, you no longer want to be part of the study, please inform Dorothea, at dorothea.vincent@ed.ac.uk

You should note that your data may be used in the production of formal research outputs (e.g. journal articles, presentations, conference papers, books, theses and reports) and informal (e.g. social media) prior to your withdrawal and so you are advised to contact the researcher at the earliest opportunity should you wish to withdraw from the study. On specific request we will destroy all your identifiable answers, but we will need to use the data collected prior to your withdrawal, and to maintain our records of your consenting participation.

DATA PROTECTION AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Your data will be processed in accordance with Data Protection Law. All information collected about you will be kept strictly confidential. Your data will be referred to by a unique participant code rather than by name. If you consent to being audio recorded, all recordings will be kept for a minimum of three years. Your data will only be viewed by the researcher and research team.

All electronic data will be stored on a password-protected computer file and all paper records will only be identified with your unique participant code. Your consent information with unique participant code, will be kept separately from your responses in order to minimise risk.

You can select to be identified. This is an option to you that is acknowledged on the consent form. In this circumstance, no unique participant code is provided to replace your name.

You can select to have testimonials identified. By which the interview is anonymise, with the option to have a testimonial identified with your name. This is an option to you that is acknowledged on the consent form. In this circumstance, your treated as an anonymised interviewee with a unique participant code provided to replace your name on the transcribed interview. Your name is only identified to the testimonial that you have indicated.

INTERNATIONAL DATA TRANSFERS
Data being transferred will be managed securely through saving electronic information on encrypted devices. The University of Edinburgh's secured DataSync service will also be used as a back-up device for the data.

**WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITH THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY?**

The results of this study may be summarised in published and unpublished materials, conference papers, books, theses, reports and presentations, along with highlights mentioned in social media messages. Quotes or key findings will always be made anonymous in any formal outputs unless we have your prior and explicit written permission to attribute them to you by name. Information may also be kept for future research.

**WHO CAN I CONTACT?**

- If you have any further questions about the study, please contact the researcher:

  Dorothea Christiana Vincent  
  [Dorothea.vincent@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Dorothea.vincent@ed.ac.uk)

- If you wish to make a complaint about the study, please contact:

  Dr. Deborah Fry  
  [Debi.fry@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Debi.fry@ed.ac.uk)

  Dr. Jingyi Li  
  [Jingyi.li@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Jingyi.li@ed.ac.uk)

  Dr. Pete Higgins  
  [Pete.higgins@ed.ac.uk](mailto:Pete.higgins@ed.ac.uk)

  In your communication, please provide the study title and detail the nature of your complaint.

  For general information about how we use your data go to:  
  [https://www.ed.ac.uk/records-management/privacy-notice-research](https://www.ed.ac.uk/records-management/privacy-notice-research)

This research has been approved by the University of Edinburgh Research Ethics Committee.
Consent Form Round 1

How to Best Create an Environment for an Effective Working Relationship Between the United Nations and Civil Society in order to Progress International Development

CONSENT FORM
Please tick the boxes beside the statement you agree with, sign and date the bottom of the page. I will leave you with your own copy of this consent form.

- I confirm that I have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet.
- I have been given the opportunity to consider the information provided, ask questions and have had these questions answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that I am being interviewed as part of a PhD thesis.
- I understand the purpose of this research, and that I am able to ask questions about it at any time.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent for involvement with this research project at any time.
- I am willing for this interview to be digitally recorded and transcribed for use as part of the research project.
- I am willing for anonymised extracts from this interview to be used as part of the research.
- I understand that anonymised extracts from this interview may appear in publications relevant to this area of research.
- I understand that I do have the option to be identified. If I prefer to be identified in the research then I state Yes or No, here: _____
  - If yes, do I have your permission to take a photo of you and us that will be used to share publicly? Please circle: YES  NO
- I understand that I have the option to be completely anonymous but may have a testimonial I want to share. If I have a testimonial that I want to share, then I state that in printed form on the bottom of this consent form.
  - If yes, do I have your permission to take a photo of you and us that will be used to share publicly? Please circle: YES  NO
- I understand that the data will be stored on a password-protected computer file.
- I understand that the data will be stored for a minimum of 3 years and may be used in future ethically approved research.
- I agree to take part in this study.

Interviewee - Name of Person Giving Consent (Please Print):
_______________________
Signature: ____________________ Date: ____________________

Title: ____________________ Organisation: ____________________

Interviewer – Name of Person Taking Consent: Dorothea Christiana Vincent

Signature: ____________________ Date: ____________________

Testimonials:

____________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________
My signature below provides permission to identify my name with the testimonials that are provided above:

Name (please print): __________________________________________

Signature: ____________________ Date:

Title: __________________________ Organisation:

Contact Address: Dorothea Vincent, Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh, Thomson’s Land 1.10, EH8 9AG

If you have any queries or concerns, please get in touch with Dorothea
Christiana Vincent at: dorothea.vincent@ed.ac.uk

The University of Edinburgh is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SC005336.
Interview Schedule Round 1

Objectives:
- Identify the range of factors affecting UN and CS/NGO relationship
- Identify beliefs around the dynamic
- Identify beliefs around need to work collaboratively to develop
- Identifying the pathways that lead to a healthier relationship
- Identifying what makes the relationship unhealthy
- Describing the impact of working together and not working together on UN goals & values and the factors that influence the nature and scale of impact

Initial Notes
Location:
Date:
Start Time:
End Time:
Researcher’s Name:
Participant Anonymous Code:

Topic Guide
1. Introduction
   - Introduce myself.

Pull out my notebook for notes.

Go Over Participant Information Sheet
- Purpose of the research that I am doing.
- Explain the aims and objectives of the study.
- There are no right or wrong answers. Simply honesty and transparency.
- Explain recording, length (1 hour to 1.5 hours) and nature of discussion, outputs/reporting and data storage process.

Go Over Consent Form and Get It Signed
- Explain confidentiality and anonymity.
- Go through consent issues explaining that he may withdraw at any time from interview as a whole and do not have to answer any questions they would prefer not to; position on disclosure.
- Check whether she/he has any questions.

Before Start
- Check that she/he is happy to continue.
- Tell them I will sometimes check on the time.
- Ask them how much time do we have?
- Ask them to clarify acronyms.
- Go over Civil Society definition, all identities except government (aligns with PB pg 3.)
Start all 3 recorders.

2. **Background**  
   **Aims:** to get her/him talking and to find out contextual information about her/his current circumstances.

   - Go through demographic questions

3. **Insight of UN and CS/NGO Relationship**  
   **Aims:** to understand and uncover the dynamics of the relationship. What is bad? What is good? How can it be changed? Who can change it?

   - Go through insight questions

4. **Future & Last Comments**  
   **Aim:** to find out how she/he sees the future, reflections on that. To close interview by talking about something less emotional and to see if there is anything else they may want to share.

   - Go through future questions
   - Go through any last experiences and comments questions.

5. **In Conclusion**  
   **Aim:** to reiterate confidentiality and to ask permission to archive participant’s transcript for research purposes.

   - Thank them for their time. Tell them they are welcome to contact me to ask questions at a later date if they wishes.

**END RECORDING**

**LEAVE COPY OF:**
- Participant Information Sheet
- A Copy of Signed Consent Form

Personal Side Note: Remember to highlight sections for visual ease.
Questions Round 1

How to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the United Nations and Civil Society in order to progress international development.

*Defined as UN = government, Civil Society = everything outside of government

Thank you for contributing! By participating, it provides the opportunity to incorporate your vast experience, views and insights to add to the data of this research. There are no right or wrong answers. The more open, honest and transparent the responses, the richer the data.

Demographics:

There are 3 sections. Demographics is the first section. If you have selected to be anonymous, the data will be aggregated. For example, X number of years of UN work experience contributed to the data.

1 – Do you work for the United Nations (UN) or a Non-Government Organisation (NGO) or other Civil Society (CS) body?

2 - What is your organisations name that you work for?

3 - How long have you worked there?

4 – What country are you originally from?

5 – Prior to your current work, have you worked for the UN or other NGO/CS body?

6 - In total how long have you worked in the relationship environment of the UN and CS?

7 – In total how many years have you worked for the UN? In total how many years have you worked for an NGO or CS body? If it was a combined position, how many years?

8 - What is your current position?

9 - Is your work international?

10 - What countries do you work with?

11 – What issues or SDGs do you work with?

Insights:

12 – Have you given thought to or have you and your colleagues had conversations about the UN and the CS or NGO relationship?

A - Do you think the UN and CS/NGO relation is needed? Why are why not?
B - What **challenges** of this relationship have been identified?

C - What **possible solutions** to those challenges have come up?

D - What does work **really well**?

13 – Do you think the relationship needs to **change**?

14 – Would we be able to **achieve international development more effectively, quicker**, and more sustainably if the relationship was **improved**?

15 – What are the **key issues** that need to be resolved in this relationship?

16 – **Who** would make that happen, who could change it?

17 – **How** would it need to be carried out?

18 – **Where** does the **catalyst of change** or solutions begin or sit most effectively?

19 – **When** do you think it needs to be done? Do you think there is an urgency?

20 – **Why** does it need to change?

21 – Why has it not yet happened? **What is holding it back?** **What barriers** have prevented **reform**?

22 - How do we **enhance** the **UN & CS engagement** to increase international development?

23 - What should it or can it **build on**?

24 - What stops international development from **gaining momentum**?

25 – I keep hearing CS, amongst each other, wants to **collaborate**. **Under what platform** should that sit under or how would that collaboration come together?

25 B - **Who** would have responsibility to initiate that?

26 - When thinking about your work, **what keeps you up at night**?

27 – If you had a **magic wand**, what change would you make happen in this relationship?

**Future & Closing Questions:**

28 - How do you think this **relationship will change in the upcoming years**?

29 - What if **nothing changes**?

30 – As a contributor to the research, **what would you like to see from the work**?
31 – If the research could change two things, what two would be most beneficial to international development?

32 – Are there any experiences in the UN and NGO/CS relationship that really stand out for you and why? Positive, negative, and or neutral.

33 – Closing off, is there anything else you would like to share?
Participant Information Sheet Round 2

Present Proposed Model that Arose from the Analysis of the First Set of Interviews

How Would You Implement It, Modify It, or Make It Better, Before Implementing the Proposed Model?

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

You are being invited to take part in research on the relationship between the United Nations and Civil Society. My name is Dorothea Christiana Vincent, a doctoral candidate at the University of Edinburgh, who is leading this research. Before you decide to take part, it is important you understand why the research is being conducted and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY?

The purpose of the study is to present to you a proposed model that arose from the analysis of the first set of interviews on how to best create an environment for an effective working relationship between the United Nations (UN) and Civil Society (CS) in order to progress international development.

To study how the proposed model should be implemented, if it needs modification, and explore how to make it better for implementation.

WHY HAVE I BEEN INVITED TO TAKE PART?

You are invited to participate in this study because you have been identified as an international high-level key stakeholder that is best placed for the collection of data on this research question.

It is international research, hence due to your global work that relates to the UN and CS, you are in the environment that is being researched. The collected data requires you to have knowledge and experience in the subject matter, therefore, junior level positions may not be able to comfortably partake, due to their limited experience and/or access to information, meetings or conversations on the subject matter. In order to study change, I need to research those that think about change, implement change and have considered the impact of what the change may look like.
DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART?

No – it is entirely up to you. If you do decide to take part, please keep this Information Sheet and complete the Informed Consent Form to show that you understand your rights in relation to the research, and that you are happy to participate. If you do decide to take part, you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I DECIDE TO TAKE PART?

You will be presented the analysed collated responses from the first round of interviews. You will be asked a number of questions regarding the presented model to provide your valuable feedback, exploration and uncovering of insights.

The interview will take place in a safe environment at a time that is convenient to you. Ideally, I would like to audio record your responses (and will require your consent for this), so the location should be in a fairly quiet area. The interview should take around one hour to complete.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE BENEFITS OF TAKING PART?

By sharing your knowledge and experiences with me, you will be helping to uncover what possible solutions and changes are needed to better impact international development by providing an environment for the relationship between UN and CS to flourish.

This research process will give you the opportunity to have your voice heard, on this research topic, to contribute to potential solutions.

In this second and final round of interviews, you will be able to see the collated answers from your international colleagues, that work in the global arena of the UN and CS. You will be able to provide your valuable feedback that will contribute to the research collected in this second round.

ARE THERE ANY RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH TAKING PART?

There are no significant risks associated with participation.

WHAT IF I WANT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY?

Agreeing to participate in this project does not oblige you to remain in the study nor have any further obligation to this study. If, at any stage, you no longer want to be part of the study, please inform Dorothea, at dorothea.vincent@ed.ac.uk

You should note that your data may be used in the production of formal research outputs (e.g. journal articles, presentations, conference papers, books, theses and reports) and informal (e.g. social media) prior to your withdrawal and so you are advised to contact the researcher at the earliest opportunity should you wish to
withdraw from the study. On specific request we will destroy all your identifiable
answers, but we will need to use the data collected prior to your withdrawal, and to
maintain our records of your consenting participation.

DATA PROTECTION AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Your data will be processed in accordance with Data Protection Law. All information
collected about you will be kept strictly confidential. Your data will be referred to by a
unique participant code rather than by name. If you consent to being audio recorded,
all recordings will be kept for a minimum of three years. Your data will only be
viewed by the researcher and research team.

All electronic data will be stored on a password-protected computer file and all paper
records will only be identified with your unique participant code. Your consent
information with unique participant code, will be kept separately from your responses
in order to minimise risk.

You can select to be identified. This is an option to you that is acknowledged on the
consent form. In this circumstance, no unique participant code is provided to replace
your name.

You can select to have testimonials identified. By which the interview is anonymise,
with the option to have a testimonial identified with your name. This is an option to
you that is acknowledged on the consent form. In this circumstance, your treated as
an anonymised interviewee with a unique participant code provided to replace your
name on the transcribed interview. Your name is only identified to the testimonial
that you have indicated.

INTERNATIONAL DATA TRANSFERS

Data being transferred will be managed securely through saving electronic
information on encrypted devices. The University of Edinburgh’s secured DataSync
service will also be used as a back-up device for the data.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITH THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY?

The results of this study may be summarised in published and unpublished
materials, conference papers, books, theses, reports and presentations, along with
highlights mentioned in social media messages. Quotes or key findings will always
be made anonymous in any formal outputs unless I have your prior and explicit
written permission to attribute them to you by name. Information may also be kept for
future research.

WHO CAN I CONTACT?

-If you have any further questions about the study, please contact the researcher:

Dorothea Christiana Vincent

Dorothea.vincent@ed.ac.uk
-If you wish to make a complaint about the study, please contact:

Dr. Deborah Fry

Debi.fry@ed.ac.uk

Dr. Jingyi Li

Jingyi.li@ed.ac.uk

In your communication, please provide the study title and detail the nature of your complaint.

For general information about how we use your data go to:

https://www.ed.ac.uk/records-management/privacy-notice-research

This research has been approved by the University of Edinburgh Research Ethics Committee.
Consent Form Round 2

Present Proposed Model that Arose from the Analysis of the First Set of Interviews

How Would You Implement It, Modify It, or Make It Better, Before Implementing the Proposed Model?

CONSENT FORM

Please tick the boxes beside the statement you agree with, sign and date the bottom of the page. I will leave you with your own copy of this consent form.

- I confirm that I have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet for this second and final interview.
- I have been given the opportunity to consider the information provided, ask questions and have had these questions answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that I am being interviewed as part of a PhD thesis.
- I understand the purpose of this research, and that I am able to ask questions about it at any time.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent for involvement with this research project at any time.
- I am willing for this interview to be digitally recorded and transcribed for use as part of the research project.
- I am willing for anonymised extracts from this interview to be used as part of the research.
- I understand that anonymised extracts from this interview may appear in publications relevant to this area of research.
- I understand that I do have the option to be identified. If I prefer to be identified in the research than I state Yes or No, here: _____
  - If yes, do I have your permission to take a photo of you and us that will be used to share publicly? Please circle: YES NO
- I understand that I have the option to be completely anonymous but may have a testimonial I want to share. If I have a testimonial that I want to share, then I state that in printed form on the bottom of this consent form.
  - If yes, do I have your permission to take a photo of you and us that will be used to share publicly? Please circle: YES NO
- I understand that the data will be stored on a password-protected computer file.
- I understand that the data will be stored for a minimum of 3 years and may be used in future ethically approved research.
- I agree to take part in this study.
Interviewee - Name of Person Giving Consent (Please Print):
_______________________
Signature: ________________ Date: __________________________
Title: ____________________ Organisation: __________________

Interviewer – Name of Person Taking Consent: Dorothea Christiana Vincent

Signature: ________________ Date: __________________________

Testimonials:
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
My signature below provides permission to identify my name with the testimonials that are provided above:

Name (please print): __________________________________________

Signature: ____________________ Date: ______________________

Title: ______________________ Organisation: __________________

Contact Address: Dorothea Vincent, Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh, Thomson’s Land 1.10, EH8 9AG

If you have any queries or concerns, please get in touch with Dorothea Christiana Vincent at: dorothea.vincent@ed.ac.uk

The University of Edinburgh is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SC005336.
Interview Schedule Round 2

Objectives:
- Present the proposed reform
- Identify the response to the proposed reform
- Identify how to make the proposed reform better
- Identify how to implement the proposed reform

Journal Field Notes
Prior to interview, journal feelings, thoughts, expectations and so forth.

Initial Notes
Prior to interview, note the location, date, start time, End time, researcher’s name, participant anonymous code, and any other details that are relevant.

Topic Guide
Introduction
- Thank them again for previous interview in round 1.
- Pull out my presentation, questions, participant information sheet and consent form.

Go Over Participant Information Sheet
- Purpose of the research that I am doing.
- Explain the aims and objectives of the study.
- There are no right or wrong answers. Simply honesty and transparency.
- Explain nature of discussion; presentation about 30 minutes and questions afterwards for about 30 minutes which is when the recorders will be turned on.

Go Over Consent Form and Get It Signed
- Explain confidentiality and anonymity.
- Go through consent issues explaining that they may withdraw at any time from interview as a whole and do not have to answer any questions they would prefer not to; position on disclosure.
- Check whether they have any questions.

Before Start
- Check that they are happy to continue.
- Tell them I will sometimes check on the time.
- Ask them how much time do we have?
- Start all 3 recorders.

Questions
1. Feedback
   Aims: to garner their initial thoughts and reactions to the proposed reform.
   - Initial thoughts and or feedback?

2. Implementation of Proposed Reform
   Aims: to understand how the implementation might be carried out and uncover any specifics that need to be considered.
   - What needs to be considered to implement it?
- How would it be implemented?
- What would the steps look like?

3. Branding  
*Aim: to find out legal limits that might exist around branding*  
- Who owns the branding?
- Do you think it would be licensed to a CS UN?

4. The 2nd Charter  
*Aim: to explore the concept around a 2nd Charter, its content and who would be involved*  
- What goes into the 2nd Charter for content?
- Who would sign off on the 2nd Charter?
- Who writes the 2nd charter and signs off on it?

5. Funding  
*Aim: to find out how the proposed reform should be funded*  
- How should it be funded the CSUN, international body and national bodies?

6. Address Issues  
*Aim: to uncover any foreseeable issues and how to address them now*  
- Any other issues that can be foreseen that can be addressed now?
- How make it better?

7. Dissemination  
*Aim: to find out how this piece of research can be made most accessible*  
- How to disseminate the information?

8. In Conclusion  
*Aim: to reiterate my thanks in their participation and what my next steps will be.*  
- Thank them for their time. Tell them they are welcome to contact me to ask questions at a later date if they wish.
- Tell them I will follow up when the research is made publicly available and how they can access it.

END RECORDING  

LEAVE COPY OF:  
- Participant Information Sheet  
- A Copy of Signed Consent Form  

Journal Field Notes  
Capture any thoughts, feelings and so forth post interview.
Verbal Non-Disclosure Agreement

Please provide verbal agreement that no content of any kind from this interview will be shared in any form.

I will follow up by email when the information is publicly made available and where it can be retrieved.
This Presentation

• Will intentionally have minimal visual embellishments to not detract from the content.
• Will present the high level points that came from the research.
• The points presented all have further evidence and rationale behind them that will be made available in the new year.
• Presents the proposed reform that came from the findings of the research.
• After the presentation, questions will be asked for exploration of the proposed reform.

Who Were Your Colleagues in this Research

• 43 Participated (Goal was 15-20)
• At the End of the Interviews:
  • 1 Person Named 3x
  • 1 Person Named 3 People to Interview - All 3 Had Already Been Named
• All in International Work Capacities
• All in Highest-Level Key Stakeholder Positions
• Both from UN and Civil Society
Current United Nations

United Nations

Member State 1 of 193
Member State 2 of 193
Member State 3 of 193
Member State 4 of 193...

= Civil Society

Proposed Reform – The 2nd Charter of the UN

United Nations
Intergovernmental

Member State 1 of 193
Member State 2 of 193
Member State 3 of 193
Member State 4 of 193...

United Nations
Civil Society
International

National Civil Society UN Office 1 of 193
National Civil Society UN Office 2 of 193
National Civil Society UN Office 3 of 193
National Civil Society UN Office 4 of 193...

In Country Team 4 of 131...
Three Inherent Flaws in Current UN System

1. Member States vs ‘The Peoples’ & Peoples’ Concerns i.e. Global Issues

2. Intrinsic Contradictions with the Challenges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: The UN Needs NGOs for Validity and Credibility</th>
<th>Contradicts With</th>
<th>Theme 2: NGOs Want to be Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: The UN Needs to Do More to Involve NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5: Negative Reasons to Involving NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: NGO Contributions to UN Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7: Resistance to NGO Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship
   • UN document describes NGOs’ access as ‘privileges and obligations’
   • ‘they can speak only when invited & are not participants in their own right’ - The Cardoso Report

Is The Relationship Needed?

• “if civil society is not engaged in a more systematic consistent way then we will always not be utilising a big part of the power that we have to make these changes”

• “the UN is in a period of decline in terms of its erosion of its authority and stature and influence in the world. A more dynamic relationship with civil society is... like a come back strategy.”

• “it’s not just a matter of need it’s a matter of practical reality”
• “desperately so” “absolutely vital”
• “Definitely the relationship is needed”
• “it’s needed from the point of view of the outcome”
The Relationship

• “absolute urgency” for reform for the relationship – unified belief
• Great deal of resources spent discussing the relationship & dealing with its dynamics:
  • “So I just, I get frustrated with having the same... every time pushing and pushing and
    pushing, but really do I still have to have a conversation with you about you not giving
    passes again”
  • “the fact that there’s a lot of potential and we’re losing time and try to figure
    out how to harness it”
• It needs to change for:
  • “better outcomes”
  • “nothing’s going to happen without civil society”
  • “There’s no way you can implement this, the SDGs, without civil society”
• What if nothing changes in regards to the UN and civil society relationship?:
  • “there will be more suffering, inequality, racism, refugees...”

The Virtues of the UN (1 of 2)

• “it’s very important and I think it’s often said that if it didn't exist we
  would have to invent it”
• The body that can set international normative standards
• The body that brings governments together for international dialogue
• Is looked to for hope
• It has utmost importance to global contribution of peace & prosperity
• “UN should be seen more as the facilitator and enabler of these
  bodies, than the UN doing the job itself”
• Lots of successful stories were shared were the UN was indispensable
The Virtues of the UN (2 of 2)

- “we do need the UN we do need a global multilateral system”
- Its convening power
- Needed for “pressing global issues that cannot be solved on national levels”
- “it’s one place where you can hold governments accountable... We do have various conventions that governments have signed on to so...governments went very much before treaty bodies, and so they would look at what their obligations were under the convention...And you’d have a group of experts, the treaty body who would be effectively telling the government that it needs to pull its socks”

The SDGs

- Seen as a highly regarded piece of work carried out by the UN
- Seen by all as a very strong positive example of the UN and CS working relationship
- Provide a common language globally
- Evidence of its success seen by how it has been implemented all over the world
- Brought unifying themes to CS and Member States and the UN
- Are so strongly regarded that they are seen as a place that we can build further success on
- Have become the landmark “There needs to be a change in the relationship in order to achieve the SDGs”
The UN - Identity Values

- A lack of understanding what the UN is and what it does
- Although the UN has an extremely strong brand
- Clarity is needed about what the brand is and what it does
- Communication about the UN successes is critical
  - i.e. SDGs are sometimes not known to be born from the UN
- Huge expectations on the UN because it is the people’s hope
- People look to the UN to answer global and national issues
- People need the UN and need it to be everything it can be
- The UN is the people’s beacon of light
- People’s expectations of its output is demanding

Defining Roles – UN and CS

- Lack of clarity as to who is responsible for what between CS and UN
- This diminishes the opportunity for each body to focus on what they do best
- Both bodies clearly have their expertise but due to this blurring of identity there is a perceived lack of success
- The blurring of identity of what the UN actually is and does, puts a veil over quite how indispensable the UN is
- With clearly defined roles it sets up the UN and CS for success because it can focus on what it does best
- “establishing complementarities between the UN and civil society, defining the responsibilities that can be undertaken by the UN and also by civil society”
- “No one knows who is doing what”

2nd Charter Provides Clarity of Defined Roles of Responsibilities for the Two Bodies
The **2nd Charter of the United Nations** (1 of 5)

- No longer an issue that “the international system is in desperate need of change”
  - A 2nd Charter provides the opportunity for that change through a CSUN

- No longer an issue to having “too many” NGOs or that “they got loads of different views”
  - A CSUN offers a *collective voice* because of unified platform to work from

- No longer an issue that CS is not taken seriously and seen as an after thought
  - With a 2nd Charter they are put on the same level

- No longer an issue of “inclusivity is a challenge, so making sure everyone is at the table”
  - A CSUN offers all of CS to come together under one platform

---

The **2nd Charter of the United Nations** (2 of 5)

- No longer an issue that there is a “lack of structure” and no clear path between UN and CS for communication, engagement, knowledge transfer...
  - A CSUN provides that clear path and bridge between UN and CS
  - A CSUN provides the answer to “the solutions are largely structural”

- No longer an issue of “duplication and inefficiencies”
  - For shared knowledge transfer “The sharing of information for sharing products and materials *sharing data this is a really big one, this is going to be you know continue to become a bigger topic. It is really difficult sometimes to share information and share data without having these structures for how we work together put into place.*”
  - Due to combined work, there is an uncovering of gaps that need to be filled as opposed to duplicating efforts in known areas
  - A CSUN enhances communication between both bodies
  - “overlap” is no longer UN’s concern but stays in CS hands
The 2nd Charter of the United Nations (3 of 5)

- No longer an issue that “The UN has no mandate for civil society” or that “there are still rules about civil society accountability and legitimacy that have to be addressed”
  - Can now be self-governed by CS itself under the 2nd Charter
  - A 2nd Charter would provide the regulatory requirements

- No longer that “All (donors) have their own different reporting requirements, complex, so (there has to be) infrastructure first to apply for the grant, to keep track of the grant and report on it.”
  - A 2nd Charter can address “a multilateral system to be simplified to have streamlined approach for grant applications, for grant making, for grant management.”

- No “step(ping) on each other”
  - A CSUN provides the opportunity for synergies to be built

The 2nd Charter of the United Nations (4 of 5)

- No longer is it a “Challenge that civil society is not a homogenous entity, you have international NGOs, you have national NGOs, and then you have civil society at a very local level. And how the UN system engages with each of these is not necessarily on an equal basis.”
  - International NGOs work with the International CSUN
  - National NGOs work with the National CSUN
  - CSUN Collates the CS voice and brings in the unheard voice
  - UN (and Member States) has a one-stop shop to connect with CS
  - UN can now engage on a equal basis
  - UN can now engage with CS on clear pathways in the structure
The 2nd Charter of the United Nations (5 of 5)

- No longer wasted resources on trying to figure out a process or system “civil societies are always trying to do is figure out ways to collaborate and the big word is coordination. How do we coordinate, how do we coordinate, we spend so much more time talking about how we coordinate that we’re not coordinating”
  - With a CSUN we can save resources by collaborating under a unified platform
  - Opportunity to build synergies amongst CS due to unified working platform
  - CS can work strategically and proactively work together and build synergies with the UN and each other

- No longer an issue with the existing Charter’s limitations: “no one wants to reopen the charter”
  - A 2nd Charter provides the solution

  “we should encourage the UN to provide that enabling platform for (CS) collaboration that is the first step”

National Civil Society UNs - In Country (1 of 2)

- CSUN at a National Level is Imperative:
  
  - “The solution lies with the victims or the stakeholders who are struggling”

  - The catalyst of change sits most effectively “At the country level” and again “at the country level because anything higher than that is policy and elusive and difficult to measure. But anything from country level downwards is easier, more measurable, and the effects can be felt and seen”

  - “civil society/UN partnership is not only in New York or Geneva or the regional hubs it really is in every country in every part of the world”
National Civil Society UNs - In Country (2 of 2)

- Emphasis on the impact that country level work has

- “if the *countries’* civil societies could actually work together”, national CSUN would provide that platform

- A real concern for the unheard voice, national CSUN would mitigate that

- “you’ve got to work in the country to get the changes you want to see”

- Can coordinate & communicate with current UN In Country Team (and allied Member States)

UN – The Honest Broker (1 of 2)

The UN is seen as an conduit of being the “honest broker” from both government perspective and CS:

- CS: “sometimes civil society doesn’t want to work with government because they don’t want to be seen as partnering with government because they see their role as being critical and trying to push government to do more. So it’s not always to their advantage to be seen as partnering with government.”

- Gov: “they (some governments) will say, you have no right to tell us. Some governments, run the risk of losing their power of some leaders so they will never acquiesce to that kind of thing (listening to CS)”

- Gov: “Sometimes national governments are willing to take a smart idea about micro finance or nutrition from the UN rather than directly from their own local civil society”
UN – The Honest Broker (2 of 2)

• “In a country where free speech isn’t necessarily encouraged there are concerns with people actually voicing opposition to a government, especially in an international forum.”

• “you don’t want governments cherry picking their own [NGOs] because then you get corruption”

• “There is a status and a sort of assurance which the UN can provide”

A 2nd Charter for a CSUN would enhance the crucial role of the UN as an honest broker.

Closing the Presentation

“It (the relationship) needs to change if we are going to see the full realisation of human rights... and certainly the sustainability and survival of our planet.

There is quite a lot of urgency and it sounds dramatic to say it like this but it’s actually not.”

We need the UN to be more because it is our collective hope, it is our beacon of light and so I invite us to consider the 2nd Charter of the United Nations.
Questions Round 2

1. Initial thoughts and or feedback on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter and Civil Society United Nations (CSUN)?

2. What needs to be considered to implement it?

3. How would it be implemented?

4. What would the steps look like?

5. Who writes the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter and should governments be involved?

6. What goes into the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter for content?

7. Who would sign off on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter?

8. Who owns the branding?

9. Do you think it would be licensed to a CSUN?

10. How should it be funded the CSUN, both the international body and national bodies?

11. Any other issues that can be foreseen that can be addressed now?

12. Thoughts on how to make the proposed reform better?

13. How to disseminate the information?

14. Any final comments or thoughts?
Feminist Ethical Approach

Although this was a planned part of the research design, very little was needed. This was potentially because of the strategic approaches that were used to mitigate power dynamics that are presented in Table A.2 below. For example, it became redundant when reflective questions continued to receive similar answers (see Table A.1). Therefore, not as much consideration was needed than I had originally planned there to be. Power dynamics did come up in the findings that was explored in Chapter 4, especially in relation to the UN and CS.

Overview of the Feminist Ethical Approach

Ackerly and True write that, “a feminist research ethic… is a set of questioning practices deployed through the research process” and therein will, “enhance the quality of the research” by consistently, “reviewing and challenging notions of what are appropriate and reliable ways of knowing and understanding the world” (Ackerly and True, 2010).

This reflective process has four areas that it draws out;
- “the power of knowledge, and more profoundly, of epistemology;
- boundaries, marginalization, silences, and intersections;
- relationships and their power differentials; and
- your own socio-political location (or “situatedness”)” (Ackerly and True, 2010).

Each of which I explored further:

1. Power
   This was addressed through analysing power in the five areas that are mentioned and explored further below, which lists a series of questions to reflect on in five different areas of the research process. The intent was to uncover power in the various forms that it can be actualised, such as but not limited to; job title, gender, language, race, appearance, meaning, monetary position, and knowledge. In addition, I relayed this reflective section on power back to my overall research question to not lose sight of the main objective and evaluate any impact correlation.

2. Boundaries
   The journaling and reflective process was designed to re-evaluate the different boundaries that I was working and living within. The purpose for this inquiry was to, “be attentive to their [boundaries] power to exclude and marginalize both people and possible research phenomena” (Ackerly and True, 2010).
   - Have I uncovered new boundaries?
   - Did any boundaries crossover? Consider the ‘outsider within’ concept that I addressed in Chapter 3. Where there any limitations due to those professional boundaries or did walls come down? Why or why not?
   - Reflect on my researcher boundaries within the theory (the paper) and within the fieldwork (the people).
   - Reflect on my personal boundaries. Consider the list of my beliefs that I stated in Chapter 3.
   - Has anything changed, opened up, closed up, why or why not?
• Relay this reflective section on boundaries back to my overall research question to not lose sight of the main objective and evaluate any impact correlation.

3. Relationships
The reflection process was designed to consider all the different relationships that are involved in this research process; the interviewees, supervisors, librarians, editors, the colleagues of the interviewees, just to name a few. Questions I journaled on included:
  • The power dynamics between the interviewees and myself, which are discussed below.
  • Are any of the relationships having an impact on the research data, if so, why and how?
  • Are any of the relationships having an impact on the process of the research, if so, why and how?
  • Where there any signs that the interviewees gave me, that showed being involved in this particular research, that it had an impact on them? If so, how and why? Consider any catalytic validity this may have.
  • Relay this reflective section on relationships back to my overall research question to not lose sight of the main objective and evaluate any impact correlation.

4. Situatedness
My situatedness was described further in Chapter 3. I journaled on my pre-stated beliefs and reflected on them throughout the field research. Questions I explored:
  • Have my beliefs changed in any way, if so, why?
  • Have my social constructs changed in any way in interviewee elites, if so how?
  • Have others viewed me in a certain perspective that impact the research data?
  • Have there been any political beliefs that have emerged or dissolved?
  • Have economic dynamics had any impact on the research?
  • Has there been any academic or scholarly unravelling?
  • Relay this reflective section on situatedness back to my overall research question to not lose sight of the main objective and evaluate any impact correlation.

This review of the research throughout the process aligned with both the feminist and action research methodology. In the recording of this process, I was able to locate areas where change had occurred or not occurred, the latter being more so the case. This strengthened my positionality as it recognised the various components within it and noted the little change. In strengthening my positionality, I strengthened my knowledge claim.

Power Analysis in the Research Process

There were five areas where power was analysed in the research process. These are explored further in Table A.1. They list reflective questions that were considered
in the research design during the semi-structured interviews to analyses power based on the feminist methodological approach.

### Table A.1: Reflective Journaling on Power Dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Type of Power Analysis</th>
<th>Questions to Consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-Interview</td>
<td>My first interviewees come through my own network before the snowballing takes effect. Begin with considering whether there are any power dynamics within this construct.</td>
<td>Was it difficult to book the appointment? Did they get back to me? What was their demeanour in doing so? Was it respectful? Where they doing me a favour or where they genuinely interested in contributing their knowledge and experience to the research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Interview</td>
<td>Consider dynamics in the office with other colleagues and the interviewee, the interviewee and myself, and other distractions such as a phone ringing.</td>
<td>Was I acknowledged as an equal or made to feel inadequate? Who controlled the interview? Was I interrupted? Where we interrupted? Where my questions taken seriously by answering them or where they responding with what they felt like sharing and what was on their agenda? Where my questions and research evaluated or judged by them? Was I seen as suspicious? Did they multi-task and therein have ‘better things to do’ or was I given their full attention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Post Interview – Immediately Afterwards</td>
<td>Explore my emotions.</td>
<td>How did I feel? Am I excited about a great conversation which lead to in-depth data that I am looking forward to analysis? Or did I feel disrespected, inadequate or disillusioned? Did I need to tend to my emotions and heal them before continuing with my work? Was I questioning my research and its worth and my worth? How did the interviewee express themselves upon conclusion? Was their interest in the second interview or did I feel inconvenience on their part?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Interventions to Mitigate Power Dynamics

Researching elites or high-level key stakeholders is often referred to as ‘studying up’. To diffuse any distortion in the interview due to power dynamics, strategic interventions were employed to diminish the authority imbalance. Planning and applying strategic interventions to minimize the power of the interviewee and researcher is known to produce richer data and therefore impacts the knowledge claim. Conti and O'Neil state, “the authority relationship in the interview must be strategically managed. In doing so, a premium is placed on tracking the effects of such interventions on knowledge claims” (Conti and O'Neil, 2007).
### Table A.2: Strategic Interventions Applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create Familiarity</td>
<td>Name drop, utilise my network to establish familiar relations.                                                                所需信息的来源不明确。 Present myself visually as an equal, as best as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge their Experience, Skills, Ego</td>
<td>Present my research in a way that is intriguing to them. For example, ‘have your very important voice and thoughts heard’. I will set the stage at the onset. I will tell them that I am asking them personally not their position that they are holding. That it is an opportunity for them to share with me their personal knowledge and experience to remove any professional boundaries they feel they may be carrying. The intent of setting this stage is to elicit deeper meaning and insight. Begin to build intrigue for the second interview process by being, again, open and honest, and telling them they will be contributing to a framework that is designed by elites in the field, such as themselves. They may want to contribute to the creation and development due to this open approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place on Same Plane</td>
<td>Provide my credentials, as I too have worked in an international environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer my business card so as to be seen as a working colleague as opposed to a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate with an approach that puts us on the same team. For example, ‘we are all trying to do what we can to make the world a little better, thank you for aiding me in this’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will take a very open and honest approach right from the onset and invite them to do the same with me. For example, ‘I’m looking to find a solution on this matter, can you help me find it by giving me your most open, honest and transparent answers’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this open and transparent approach, the intention was to strengthen my knowledge claim. It also aligned with who I am as a person and my own personal values.

**Combining Research Process with Reflective Journaling**

The positionality or reflexive journaling and the power dynamic journaling is incorporated in the research process. This is best presented visually, as seen in Figure A.1.
Figure A.1: Combing Journaling into the Research Process
Further Excerpts

Chapter 4
Findings

Part 1
Findings of Round 1 of Interviews

Section One: Findings in Relation to the Literature Review – Eight Themes and The Three Inherent Flaws

Theme One: Its Heartbeat & Breath - The UN Needs CS/NGOs for Validity and Credibility

Interview OO stated, ‘we [CS] have a right to participate’. Participant L explained this right to the relationship because it is ‘mandatory - at the actual creation of the UN that there should be the participation of Civil Society. Not only is it essential, but it was a part of the thinking. The conception - it’s actually written into the document that founded the United Nations… at the beginning, even at the very establishment of the UN, the role of the Civil Society was highlighted as being an absolute important contributor to actually implement and promote the principles of the UN and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights'. Interviewee I added: ‘the UN preambles starts [with], “We the Peoples” and therefore, it is not only about governance it is also about people and communities and Civil Society is one articulation'.

CS maintains the relevance and supports the legitimacy of the UN: ‘it’s increasingly important for citizens and indeed Civil Society as a body… that its engagement with bodies like the UN is ever more important in order to increase the legitimacy, credibility, and effectiveness of the UN and its organs to deliver on its agenda… it is increasingly important for the UN to consider how it can reach out and work with Civil Society to try and deliver an agenda which it alone can never deliver’ Interview Y. Participant PP provided this perspective: ‘the UN probably consummate core skills, and core differentiating capacities is its convening power; convening power, which doesn’t include Civil Society, is like a stool without a leg’. Interviewee FF added to the claim by saying: ‘it is not possible without the support of Civil Society, the expertise, and the wisdom of Civil Society’.

There was recognition by both the UN participants of this study and CS participants, that the work CS carries out improves and strengthens the UN’s work. Interviewee JJ shared: ‘Civil Society actors have been very instrumental in service providing, in assisting in the local and national levels, where the UN doesn’t necessarily have the reach… the strength of the United Nations is working collaboratively with Civil Society. Civil Society are like, like my father used to like to say, NGOs are like extended arms of the UN. So, I often think of that. Because, yes civil society… can take things much further than what the UN is able to do’. Further excerpts to this claim include: ‘they [CS] are experts in those specific flags or areas of work. So, the conversations that the UN facilitates need to be nurtured by that expertise’ Interview...
KK, ‘Civil Society is a critical stakeholder. Not only in terms of actually even as a provider and as a supporter, but most importantly in terms of holding both governments and other stakeholders accountable’ Interview LL, ‘the expertise and insights that Civil Society brings to the table contribute to better outcomes by UN bodies. It’s useful. In other words, we actually are playing a useful role in providing states with ideas, recommendations, analysis, that if they’re open to it, it would guide them in directions that might be useful in terms of outcomes, effective outcomes’ Interview OO, ‘Civil Society increases the impact, multiplies the impact that the UN can do’ Interview PP, and ‘most UN organisations, they simply must work with Civil Society in the countries where they operate, in order to deliver programs that are going to be sustainable’ Interview F.

**Theme Two: The Passionate Professional Partners – CS/NGOs Want to be Involved**

Participant U offers one solution to the ECOSOC accreditation process: ‘the UN has a committee that reviews the accreditation process and it is only Member States. We could have Civil Society in the room also reviewing these and advising Member States who should be accredited because they bring an insight that is still lacking in these kinds of things’.

Interviewee R shared the keen CS interest in working with the UN: ‘my job requires me to work with many Civil Society organisations. All of them desperately want to partner with the UN. They want to know what the UN is doing. They’re desperate to build contact’. In addition, participants remarked on the increase in CS participating at the UN: ‘one of the things that has happened is that the number of Civil Society [that] want to be presented at the UN has increased exponentially’ Interview U, ‘it keeps growing that number for advocacy and for promoting UN’s agenda’ Interview II, ‘the challenge that the UN was facing too many NGOs trying to get accreditation’ Interview BB. But despite the challenges more CSO are getting involved: ‘the number of Civil Society colleagues who come to CSW [Commission on the Status of Women] have risen and risen, this despite the fact that there are numerous challenges to have Civil Society engage in CSW space’ Interview FF. These comments demonstrate the keen interest in wanting to participate in the UN work.

**Theme Three: The Moving Maze – CS/NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access**

A difference in terms of access was noted between the UN headquarters: ‘my colleagues from Geneva, who come to New York, suffer culture shock because they are just astonished, they can’t automatically get up and make a comment during [a] debate. That doesn’t happen in New York. Unless you’re invited to do so… some of the obstacles, are embedded in the institution itself, it is embedded in the rules and procedures and in other instances it is embedded in the customary practices of the institution or the culture. There are different cultures in New York and in Geneva’ Interview NN. Interviewee OO agrees: ‘there is a mass of different examples of restrictions in these bodies in Geneva and in New York’.

Interviewee OO remarks on the variance of experience with the UN between national and global levels: ‘many peoples’ experience with UN, fortunately, where they primarily engage with the UN, will be at national [or] maybe community level, hopefully in some positive sense, that the UN is providing some kind of useful service. And that might be where Civil Society engagements are relatively a positive
one. Then you move through the system, then you end up here in New York or at
the human rights council in Geneva, where we face these questions of reprisals
which can be very acute. There are cases, of course, where people are being killed
in their attempt to access UN spaces in Geneva.

In addition, there is inconsistency in participating with the different parts of the UN:
‘the United Nations has different participation rights in different practices of
participation depending upon the UN bodies… with each department, each office,
each agency having its own rules of engagement’ Interview NN. Participant OO
added: ‘be at the Secretariat side, the agency side, or the political side that we are
talking about and there is a difference’. Interviewee F shared this view by saying:
different organisations working in different ways.

Access to the UN also changes over time: ‘the Civil Society space around some of
the UN processes has kind of evolved at various points and times. At some points
there has been significant space, at other points it’s been very little space’ Interview
Y. Participant G added: ‘I remember we could go into the negotiating rooms; we’d
go on the floor of the chambers - that you can’t do here anymore’.

**Theme Four: The Heavy Door to Open - The UN Needs to do More to Involve
CS/NGOs**

Interviewee GG described, how ideally it would be to have ‘equal collaboration, equal
voice and from the UN perspective, more open doors both ways. Meaning that is not
only when they need something from us, but when we also have something that we
can contribute, and we need something from them as well for the purpose and
interest of the people whom we serve’. An idea was offered by Participant II: ‘you
need kind of a shopfront at the UN that says open for business. What I mean is not
just business entities but open for business on the SDGs… the UN should have a
dedicated [office]… focused on each SDG and focused on regions to bring private
sector and Civil Society into the mix of programs at the UN, collaborate with Member
States of the UN and implement programs. So, really you need to have an open-
door policy’.

The need for political support of CS engagement arose not only from the literature
review but also the field data. Interviewee J said that ‘sometimes I see even in the
human rights Council that when NGOs are there that Member States get up and
leave’. Participant N added: ‘governments are very wary of engagement with Civil
Society and they put it off for as long as they can’. A few other remarks from other
participants include: ‘the challenge is political… there are countries that are blocking
it. And right now, I would say, it’s happening more than in my previous years of
experience’ Interview KK, ‘there are many parts of the UN where we can access, I
think some of the pushback comes primarily from Member States that are suspicious
or not very open to Civil Society’ Interview JJ, ‘there is a commitment to Civil Society
partnerships, but I think a lot more can be done’ Interview LL, ‘when I say UN, I start
by saying the Secretary General of the UN as a leadership role, but then he or she
cannot just say I want more Civil Society because it is Member States who will
decide what the role of Civil Society will be. And some countries do not like the
voice of Civil Society being heard’ Interview II, and ‘the opportunity to engage at
significant levels with Member States… is usually constrictive and is very limited’
Interview EE.
Interviewee NN further described this phenomenon: ‘it’s a combination of efforts; UN staff and UN bodies will typically look to Civil Society to apply the appropriate pressure to Member States because Member States are ultimately their bosses, their paymasters and so they can only go so far... and this is what most people tend to forget about the UN. It is the Member States who are in charge’. Interviewee J added: ‘some governments embrace Civil Society more warmly than others and so, if the UN system itself, which is after all governed by its Member States, would try and give more room to Civil Society... even if the UN institutions themselves want to change it, I’m sure there will be a pushback from Member States, which will be very difficult’.

Interviewee K explained why this lack of support from states exists and a solution, with having the UN step in, was provided: ‘there were plenty of states that were very resistant to Civil Society engagement and Civil Society involvement in these processes and there are lots of reasons around it. Like it can compromise security, or it can prevent honest discussions from taking place. So, at a certain point people in those decision-making positions at the UN do need to sort of put their foot down and say “no” it is happening this way’. 

As the literature review highlighted, CS is not taken seriously. This was a claim that was supported by the data from the first round of field research interviews. The following are some remarks that provided this evidence: ‘their delegations don’t take them seriously and that’s the majority of NGOs. I would say even the overwhelming majority of NGOs... they don’t take NGOs very seriously’ Interview O, ‘they never think of us when they are discussing concepts. They always invite us at the end and I can give you 50 examples of that from [the] last three years and it is very frustrating for us in the Civil Society’ Interview R, ‘access and the opportunities to participate are more on paper than in actuality’ Interview Z, ‘frequently, there is very little recognition of the work of Civil Society, or the role that it plays and the scale of it as a key partner’ Interview M, ‘they don’t think about us, we are always the last ones. Recently, there was an event in New York in which a partnership - a global partnership of which Civil Society is a member. They invited [all] the donors, all of them, and it was organised by the partnership Secretariat and this is supposed to be the Secretariat that represents governments and Civil Society, and they didn’t invite Civil Society’ Interview R, ‘I mean we should have a right to be sitting at the table, but I think in many of our countries we’re led to expect that NGOs sort of beg for crumbs under the table and are handed out a few little sweeties every now and again, and we’re used to accepting that relationship rather than saying, hang on it’s my right to be here’ Interview J, and ‘UN Agency F doesn’t always want to hear and NGOs have opinions that need to be heard, voices aren’t heard on the ground’ Interview D.

Interviewee P admits that ‘there needs to be more of a recognition that Civil Society voices are beneficial to UN Agency G and to the UN and I think that, broadly speaking, when you talk to people, it’s like, “yeah, yeah, that’s true”, but when you look at the practice, I don’t know that we ... that you see that reflected’.

Interviewee M explained why it is important to fully recognise CS: ‘engaged in the full
breath so that it’s not just a singular Civil Society partner that maybe checks that box, but that it is really full engagement. This is when we see the best results on the ground, when we see the most movement, and this is how we can make sure there is sustainability’.

**Theme Five: From Trojan Horse to Too Influential - Negative Reasons to Involving CS/NGOs**

Concerned remarks regarding credibility include: ‘unfortunately, some of the Civil Society organisations have not been squeaky clean’ Interview P, and ‘Civil Society organisations have not quite lived up to their own ideals’ Interview W.

Interviewee O stated the challenges with legitimacy: ‘so which NGOs and how do we determine legitimacy’. Participant E provided an example: ‘the legitimacy of NGOs themselves. You can say you’re an NGO and not be. One so called NGO we had something to do with last year, we had a meeting with them, it turns out it wasn’t really one. It was a lobbying organisation for oil in Africa… pretty horrific actually’. Interviewee PP added: ‘there are still rules about Civil Society’s accountability and legitimacy that have to be addressed… many governments, so members of the UN, they simply don’t except the legitimacy of Civil Society as a partner to their deliberations or decision-making’. Participant Y explained a possible reason for this, that states ‘don’t necessarily see the legitimacy in Civil Society, because it’s not an elected group of people’.

Interview O provided a solution: ‘the more international the work is, the more groups of NGOs manage to bring together voices from the global South and from all over the globe, the more legitimacy they have’. Interview E added further solutions to legitimacy: ‘it’s transparency, leadership, and history of getting things done, getting your hands dirty rather than being, you know distant, and reducing bureaucracy showing money is well spent, accountable’. Interviewee DD agrees on the importance of transparency: ‘from the Civil Society side, I think there needs to be more transparency on what is happening’. Participant U added: ‘as Civil Society we can improve the understanding… who do we represent and what is the legitimacy we have with what we bring to the UN… from the perspective of Member States and the UN’.

Although the literature review only uncovered accountability as a theme for CS, the first round of interviews expanded that theme to include the need of accountability for Member States, as well as the UN. Interview Y explained that ‘accountability is one of the biggest challenges’.

Participant QQ stated that ‘NGOs in Civil Society are not necessarily representative or accountable’. Further remarks include: ‘on the other hand, you know, are NGOs accountable?’ Interview J, ‘there wasn’t as much evidence that Civil Society is really ever held into account’ Interview P, and ‘Civil Society’s accountability is a question that needs to be worked on, as much as the accountability of states’ Interview Y. Participant II stated the challenge though is that ‘the UN has no mandate for Civil Society’.

There were remarks, including from government diplomats, about the necessity of states being held accountable as well as CS. A sample of those excerpts are: ‘there
is no format to Member States accountability’ Interview D, ‘the space for being critical and making Member States accountable has shrunk’ Interview U, and ‘there aren’t any sanctions even if you breach the CEDAW [Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women]. It’s about what sort of sanctions can we use to make governments accountable about breach of their obligations under UN treaties’ Interview L.

The UN itself was also recognised as needing to be held accountable. Those comments include: ‘there needs to be also a system, where the UN is made more accountable’ Interview KK, and ‘United Nations needs to be accountable’ Interview T.

Concerns about who CS represents and transparency around representation arose in the interviews: ‘So are they representative? Who are these people, what do they do, do they represent society, are they good?’ Interview E, ‘Civil Society are in a sense, self-proclaimed representatives of issues or groups’ Interview PP, and ‘who are NGOs or Civil Society anyway, in who’s interest do they act’ Interview O. Participant U admits that ‘one of the challenges I see with Civil Society is that we don’t always realise who do we represent and we’re all not always authentic in what we represent’.

Participants did recognise the Trojan Horse concept as well, which the literature review also uncovered: ‘what about the fake NGOs that are set up by… [referring to private]… that come in there and also want to have access’ Interview O, ‘one of the biggest challenges the UN faces is the concern that people will use the UN platform to promote their own business rather than use that platform to help others’ Interview II, and ‘we come back to the question of which NGOs? The NGOs that have been set up by Country A in order to provide fake arguments about this and that’ Interview O, referring to an NGO that is actually set up by government.

The field research data showed a need to include more CS from the Global South, which aligned with the literature review: ‘there should be more NGO, Civil Society voices from the Global South, who are empowered to come here and engage’ Interview Q, and ‘most of the Civil Society present at the UN are from the North and many from the European Union’ Interview U.

Participant U explained why there may be this barrier for CS in the Global South to participant and a possible solution is offered: ‘a need for more space for Civil Society in the South to have a say. Not all the organisations have the means to come to New York, so making more meaningful… participation in the commissions that are regional level can be a way of allowing more diverse participation’. Interviewee DD agrees that ‘it’s harder for presenters from the Global South to come to the UN’.

Interviewee U described the importance of their participation: ‘if more organisations from the South are applying, it means that Civil Society is getting stronger in the South and they aren’t only… concerned about national issues. They are also concerned about international issues’.

Although the literature review uncovered a negative reason for too many views, the
field research thought this as a positive: ‘the more views you have, the more fair the system and the better ideas you get in the mix... if you’re looking at all these different points of view, you’ll be able to understand what the issue is, and you should be able to solve it better’ Interview J. Participant P agrees: ‘we want to make sure all the voices are there somewhere’.

However, challenges are noted: ‘having deliberations across over 190 countries means that sometimes there’s very little progress because there’s so many different voices in the room’ Interview P, ‘it’s a huge job then on the side of the UN if they’re trying to take in all this information, it’s like drinking from a fire hose, how do they actually then synthesise all that information’ Interview Z, and ‘they got loads of different views, you know, your mission is typically a week and you’ve got to see half a dozen ministries for example... you’ve got hundreds of them [NGOs] and you can’t hear hundreds of people’ Interview E.

The issue of too many CS actors, which both the field data and the literature noted, was further commented on: ‘the other complexity I would say about Civil Society is that we are so many... also that people in the UN don’t know how to handle all this diversity’ Interview R, ‘while the idea is very good to let 1000 flowers bloom you also don’t want to duplication and inefficiencies in the system’ Interview II, ‘one of the problems is we are literally thousands more now. Trying to get into a place that is only marginally bigger than it ever was. That’s a problem’ Interview G, and ‘how can I have a relationship with 10 thousand Civil Society organisations’ Interview I.

Participant AA offers a solution: ‘somebody could say that I’m representing such and such organisation, but I’ve gone around and gotten input from fifty different colleagues and fifty different organisations and here’s a collective statement of the things we care about’.

**Theme Six: Bridges of Lifeline – CS/NGO Contributions to UN Activities**

Interviewee X explained the governmental activities, the first area of CS contributions to UN activities, that CS is involved in ‘we couldn’t do anything without our partners, it would really be difficult. They are representing the views of people in a different way than the government is. They are able to work with us to also pressure governments. We’re able to say [that] we work with them and they [can] say things that maybe the UN cannot say. So, we really do work in this equal system together, that definitely goes beyond just programme type of implementation... working with Civil Society was critical to get to lobby Member States, not really lobby but to advocate... some of the strongest influencers are Civil Society organisations... they have a type of reach and legitimacy and community that the government doesn’t even have in many instances. Working with these actors, which are often these community-based organisations, is critical to our work’.

The findings from this PhD thesis expressed Civil Societies’ role in governance specifically in regard to accountability and stability.

The data highlighted Civil Societies’ role in keeping governments accountable: ‘Civil Society hold the government accountable’ Interview AA, ‘I like to say (about NGOs), I don’t know if I’m right about this, but I’ll say it anyway, the moral consciousness -
extremely important’ Interview V, ‘overall my sense is, states would do nothing unless Civil Society [is] constantly pushing them’ Interview OO, and ‘people are quite happy to say we’ve achieved this, we’ve achieved that, but there’s so many failures still going on and it seems to me that it’s Civil Society that calls it out’ Interview T.

Some provided evidence to this: ‘Civil Society has an important voice to play in education accountability of government actors… most of the time when we talk about Civil Society, we talked about them as the ones holding others into account’ Interview P and ‘even the most transparent and honest state is not going to come here to Geneva and say “Okay, we hold the power of the house and we’ve been doing terrible things with human rights and we’ve made some mistakes.” They’re never gonna do it. That kind of honesty and objectivity and independence of voice comes from Civil Society, clearly. So, there’s that honesty and objectivity and independence side and there’s also the expertise side… they [the secretariat] can’t say what they think because they’re only there to do what the states tell them to do. So, independents in society is the only one that can say it as it is’ Interview Q.

The findings showed that electoral cycles of elected Member States prevent addressing long-term issues and this is where CS has provided stability and the essential longer-term view: ‘there are electoral cycles and then business has its own quarterly cycles, who is looking out for the long term? And this is where Civil Society perhaps provides it, maybe that’s where Civil Society can be looking at the long-term… often Civil Society [is] looking beyond the electoral horizon, looking beyond the next quarter in the stock market’ Interview NN, ‘however, the politicians that are still ignoring it [climate change] a bit because they are thinking about the next 4 years, or 5 years, or 7 years, depends on election time. That’s why everyone is happy that the youth is having climate strikes’ Interview CC, and ‘the diplomats will be here three or four years and then they’ll move on. The NGO experts who are here in Geneva, let’s just say, they’re from New York, [they] are the kind of institutional memory and institutional expertise about what’s going on’ Interview Q.

Even within the UN, itself the instability and short-term governments have an impact: ‘he said well it depends on whether or not Guterres is going to run again. If he runs again, then we have a six-year time horizon and if he doesn’t run again, we have a two-year time horizon, whatever the term of office is. It is interesting, a part of the dynamic, part of the challenge we have in the time-limited goals, targets, indicators. [It] illustrates this as there are different time horizons and different cycles in terms of decision-makers’ Interview NN, ‘the NGOs are not the bosses of the UN. The UN is under very heavy pressure, there’s one Member State in particular that’s making huge amount of trouble for the UN and has done for a long time, Country A. And under the present administration, it’s even worse, but it never was very good for a long time. After all, they assassinated the Secretary General back in the day’ Interview O, and ‘it comes back to this cycle of political commitment. One significant example of that [is] Country A, where under previous presidents, you have had a movement to support the UN by paying the dues; the subscription to the UN from Country A. You have had a lead issue which enabled change to take place and committed to recognition of climate change and signed up for [the] Paris Agreement. You had a leadership which moved things forward in terms of equal human rights across a range of disadvantaged groups. And within 2 years that is completely reversed’ Interview B.
The stability required was evidenced as not being provided by governments: ‘because you’re working in international political arena where anything can happen as we have discovered in the last four or five years. Nothing is stable and there will be constant change’ Interview B.

Evidence arose that indicated that CS provides the stability: ‘government is fragile, or government is changing or there’s conflict in the country, which means that government can’t actually provide educational services or social welfare services or water and sanitation. So, you’ve got CSOs providing those services’ Interview A.

One participant remarked: ‘eventually if Civil Societies could actually transition from providing basic services to actually being the voice of Civil Society, in system strengthening, instead of actually providing the services’ Interview A. This quote indicates the need for CS to move to more of a role in governance.

A number of different participants remarked on the second area of CS contributions to UN work, the importance of the role of CS in operational activities: ‘I like to think about NGOs [as] providing a lot of the expertise, a lot of on the ground implementation’ Interview V, ‘you need NGOs to be part of the solution, because they have the expertise in delivering on the ground’ Interview II, ‘they play an active role in the structures, but also in the advocacy, and communication and in supporting UN Agency G, the UN, and Member States, in implementing and achieving the goals of the SDG agenda’ Interview LL, ‘as we know, it’s many NGOs, who are actually delivering the services, who are actually implementing, who are providing, who are out in the field on the ground doing the work that is translating the SDGs from words into action’ Interview Z, ‘we work very closely with implementing these programmes with those Civil Society partners’ Interview FF, and ‘Civil Society really is the arms and legs of delivery… international Civil Society, as well as local Civil Society is absolutely an indispensable partner’ Interview PP.

The findings from the fieldwork remarked how social responsibility was more in the hands of the charitable sector than with governments. The following excerpts highlight this: ‘the government will employ one of two charities to do that job’ Interview HH, ‘the organisation or the institution, that looked after people in poverty, was the church. Then you had the war, 1945. Then after that it was government. Government came in and said, “We are creating the welfare state. This is our responsibility.” Over time, up until recent times, the charity sector started to emerge. And so, what you’ve got then is a combination of government and charity, with charity increasing’ Interview RRR, ‘these human rights services that should be the domain of government, are being implemented by CSOs in a lot of countries like safe water, sanitation, health services, child protection… a lot CSOs are actually managing what government should be providing’ Interview A, and ‘more and more service provision is being expected of NGOs whereas it’s developed from the state, you think. And then they cut off the money. First, they give you a lot of money. They say you do this, because you’re sort of a branch of us. Then they say, well, actually no, we’re cutting off this money now and they’ve got rid of it completely and it wasn’t their responsibility before as it were, because they managed to distance themselves, it’s really… that’s the worry’ Interview J.
This was further supported with a couple of examples. One participant shared: ‘just a couple of weeks ago, one of the counsellors, who will remain nameless said, “You know, we the council, we don’t have [to] deal with homelessness, the charitable sectors dealing with that”… Is that true? Surely, they are - the city, it’s obviously our obligation here. But maybe we’re moving into a world where government no longer feels [it] has these obligations and then it’s Civil Society who is taking on that moral responsibility… there’s a shift… pre-war, you know in terms of poverty or people who fell in hard times… there was the church who took on the responsibility of providing soup, providing basic housing, etc., for those who were destitute, looking after them. Then you had the war and along came the social welfare system in 1945… government said no, we have responsibility for building a welfare state to support and provide social protection for our people, which should be the health services, etc, etc. So that was government, clearly, then the emergence of Civil Society and it shifted much more. Government would work with Civil Society’ Interview HH.

Another illustration: ‘for example, the withdrawal of a lot of government [funding] from providing international aid or deciding that their international [aid] has to be spent in a specific way. Then you start to rely on the small organisations, the NGO’s developing to fill the need that the national government and international no longer cover… particularly in the current political climate. There are so many governments who are withdrawing from a whole range of areas that in the past public services would have supported; that [now] the small organisations are really relied on to move in and fill that space. I think, it’s a juxtaposition as organisations, like individual governments, face up to austerity; their budgets are reduced. Then charities, trade unions, small educational foundations, small foundations move in to support Civil Society to actually carry out that the public sector would have been responsible for. Or even not necessarily at local levels but national levels as well’ Interview B.

The third area is on the management of global issues and was commented on by Interviewee J: ‘we [CS] are sort of moving and talking about new things and identifying issues that we should care about’. Participant X added ‘the comparative advantage of the UN is one thing and the comparative advantage of Civil Society is very different and they need each other to move forward the global agenda’. Interviewee Q remarks on NGOs’ knowledge and understanding of the system: ‘the NGOs - it’s the independence and objectivity of analysis and voice, and it’s the expertise. These NGOs, they all have very impressive people working for them, people who understand the system, probably better than most diplomats do’.

Interviewee K shared the linking of the issues from the local level to the global level, the fourth area, by stating that ‘the UN does not have the same access to information, and it cannot move in the same way as grassroots NGOs and grassroots Civil Society can’. Participant F gives an example of this: ‘we would work with those organisations, sort of like quietly and informally so that we could get supplies into those areas in Country L where we [UN] didn’t have access. But because they were outside of the formal arrangement of access… they could go to those areas, they did at a great risk, but that was the nature of those organisations. They took those risks; they went to those areas where nobody else was accessing. We sometimes gave them supplies to take in for the local population, for the civilians’. Interviewee HH supported this view: ‘some of the things that the NGOs or
Civil Society are actually quite good at, is actually doing things on the ground or connecting on the ground. I don't believe that the UN is particularly good at that, but you create a partnership between the two and you start to see how you can get global connection with people that are doing separate work on the ground and that can be quite powerful'.

In addition, the information that CS brings from the local to the global level was remarked on: 'Civil Society can bring a perspective where the interest is not my foreign office ministry priorities but we can have a look at global issues that are affecting humanity with a global perspective' Interview U, '[CS] bring a lot of data from those remote places that the UN absolutely needs to take into account to be relevant… trying to generate or produce guidelines that help or shrink the gap between global processes and field implementation, that works really well. And I think the UN recognises that, so they're like mechanisms for financing some NGOs to be the arms of these UN agencies’ Interview KK, and ‘you need to hear what is happening on the ground and its context, before the UN makes decisions’ Interview D.

Due to these claims, Interviewee J stated that ‘we do need to keep that Civil Society space, that really, really, really is a vital thing’. Participant Z acknowledges the importance of 'the expertise that the NGO community brings to the UN Member States and to the UN processes'.

**Theme Seven: The Power of Power - Resistance to CS/NGO Involvement**

Interviewee II shared an opposite example; 'And I have other cases like Country M says, “We will not interfere with how you want to do it providing it is not sabotaging the sovereignty of our country. You can give grants to NGOs who are doing good work. We do not control the NGOs.” So, there are some very good working examples'.

There were a number of references made to the concept of CS being seen as a watchdog, these include: 'we are very used to having Civil Society be like a watchdog' Interview II, 'fear of being held accountable - I think the biggest problem is that Member States don’t want to have trouble makers, don’t want to have Civil Society that will call… on them to criticise what they are doing' Interview U, 'countries have different opinions from their NGOs' Interview D, and ‘anyone who is being threatened, that is a question for security officers of the United Nations. If it is happening there, its possibly a police matter. But what it isn’t or shouldn’t be used as, is an excuse to then say all Civil Society is dangerous or it is too much trouble for us to fight for Civil Society because we don’t really like them much anyway because they are troublesome because sometimes they say things we don’t like. They oppose us, and they make us feel uneasy. Or maybe even feel threatened' Interview OO.

It was recognised there was a need for the watchdog role: ‘sometimes it is Member States that are going after certain groups and we have to shine the light on that. It is for the sake of justice and the well-being of the globe that we have to do it’ Interview JJ, ‘where you’ve got government statements coming out, if you don’t have Civil Society in the room, questioning some of what’s being said, the truth may not come out’ Interview C.
Sharing of power is resisted and this was evidenced in the data: ‘a lot of this is just power, once you’ve allowed more voices and more people in the room there’s a feeling whether it’s right or wrong, that power… can be diluted’ Interview AA, ‘yeah there’s a power issue’ Interview C, and ‘we can only do what we’re permitted to do in that space’ Interview Z.

Theme Eight: The Paradoxical Situation - Resources
A lack of funding was noted by a number of participants as having an impact on the UN and CS relationship: ‘there is a fundamental issue of funding and support’ Interview NN, and ‘the lack of funding, that is the big barrier’ Interview DD. Participant N explained the impact it has within UN agencies as well: ‘they [Member States] pledge for UN Agency F… and then when it comes to it, they don’t deliver. So, we’re always in a state of shortfall because the need is so great, but the financing is so limited’.

Participant R described how funding stops synergy from being created: ‘I wouldn’t say that the fault is on one side or the other, it’s just that the competition for resources and for survival and for staying relevant in the 21st century is driving [this] also… when there is a tendency to exclude the other. Sometimes CSO excludes the UN or the UN excludes us, with this idea of shining and gaining ground, to stay relevant, to remain the main actor in the room etc. without sometimes putting aside your opportunities to synergise actually’. Although funding creates the opportunity for programmes to be implemented, money also diminishes the opportunity, due to the process preventing synergy from being built.

Lack of funding impacts the UN and CS relationship in other ways as well, due to an expectation of some UN agencies to have their CS partners raise funds for them. This was shared by Participant B: ‘CSO Agency A used to be a partner of UN Agency B, but some years ago they lost that formal relation, because UN Agency B decided that we were not raising enough funding to contribute to the work of UN Agency B. There has been a whole lot of tension between Civil Society Organisations and UN Agency B, because they have turned to organisations that help them raise enormous sums of money… the same thing applies as far as UN Agency A is concerned’.

Some possible solutions to the lack of funding was offered by Participant LL: ‘it’s a contribution from all sectors. Governments themselves need to have funds set aside for supporting capacity and development of Civil Society, private sector either through CSR [corporate social responsibility] or direct contribution from private sector, because Civil Society are their clients and they owe some kind of investment to them. Agencies themselves need to set aside funds for such engagement, it cannot be left as ad hoc activities. And then at the international donor level, there needs to be more engagement of donors to provide this as well’.

It was widely recognised that funding breeds competition amongst all the players. A collection of excerpts to express this concern include: ‘the UN is in competition with NGOs… there is competition around funding’ Interview D, ‘the main obstacle and barrier for collaborating among NGOs is the money’ Interview KK, ‘funding is important, but it is also the cause of the division amongst UN agencies, because
they're all competing for the same resources… the same thing between the UN and the international NGOs’ Interview MM, ‘in certain areas the charitable sector is more competitive than business. And part of the challenge there is that there’s finite funds’ Interview HH, ‘the situation would be very different, if we’re not competing for the same money’ Interview R, and ‘it’s just our reality that we are partners and we’re also sometimes competitors for funds’ Interview X.

Participant K remarks that the funding mechanism is at fault for the competition as opposed to collaboration: ‘if you work competitively and you’re good, you can kind of corner more of those resources for yourself to support your work. So, I do think the system isn’t set up to encourage a collaborative way of working because of the way that funding mechanisms are designed’. Interviewee R points out the donors’ responsibility in this: ‘the donors are creating… these power dynamics because they favour some players against others… if you are funded equally, maybe then you feel equal and you can interact with others in a more equal standing approach’.

Some solutions are offered by different participants to minimise competition and increase collaboration: ‘six organisations together have a coverage, much larger coverage than us individually. So, I think that donors need to be more intentional at promoting this [collaboration] and having standards like that’ Interview KK, ‘more funding being earmarked for the participation of marginalised groups in those discussions’ Interview K, and lastly ‘the donors have an immense power. A donor like Country E is a major donor to many of the activities I work on… the donors influence on the UN agencies helps us to get a seat at the table and to create that relationship… once they see that we can bring value added, we’re not just after their money, that we just want to have a genuine understanding, then collaboration flows very naturally. It’s more the initial resistance or lack of incentives, I talked about. Once you overcome that, maybe with the help of a donor that goes in and tells them, “you guys really need to work with Civil Society”’ Interview R.

The data showed that funding is too much of a decision-maker and that it can actually impede international development due to donors pre-deciding or imposing ideas, as opposed to recognising the needs that have been identified by organisations and agencies closely involved in the issue on the ground. A number of participants remark on this: ‘you see a lot of bizarre programming. Some of it is donor driven, sometimes donors get these ideas in their head without consulting anyone really and will just go straight to the UN and say “do it”… like crazy programming, that’s not based on anything’ Interview A, ‘Oh, yes donors decide everything, everywhere. Foundation B decides the health agenda globally. Country E decides many, many agendas related to children because they invest a lot of money in that. Country A decides the agenda on child labour, where the money goes. We don’t like to hear that, but I can tell you that we see it from the inside, this is what it is. Yeah, unfortunately we talk today of a globalised world multilateralism, but we are going back to a world in which it’s who has the money’ Interview R, ‘Member States will fund Civil Society organisations in expecting that these Civil Society organisations will defend their agenda and this you can see. Country E is one of these big governments and very strategic in what they do and how they do it’ Interview U, ‘money and influence often get in the way’ Interview K, ‘the funding issue drives what their [UN] policies are’ Interview B, ‘we have governance systems within which money gets to rule politics’ Interview Y, and ‘often times, when we were
talking about future themes, maybe Civil Society is pushing something different than their donors are pushing’ Interview P.

Due to this phenomenon, Participant NN said that ‘we are urging donors that they listen to grassroots’. Essentially, money is not only the creator, but also the diminisher of effective development due to the system of the funding mechanism.

The imposition even continues down the line. Those that receive the funding, then carry on what they feel to be their right, to dictate the terms: ‘it is all about the person who dictates the terms is the one who comes in with most funding - and it’s very unbalanced… so, it’s not based on skills’ Interview GG, ‘when somebody is giving them money, the perception is that they hold the power’ Interview X, and ‘the downside to that is, you then become a mouthpiece for government, that’s always an issue. If you take the money, can you retain that independence’ Interview G.

This was also remarked from the other perspective: ‘I can maintain very good and solid long-term relationships with so many actors… because I do not compete with them [for funding] and they know that. They are like, okay we can talk to CSO Agency B’ Interview GG. Further in our conversation, Participant GG, who at times provides funding, found it challenging because instead of hearing the truth, the recipient tells the donor want they think they want to hear, because they provided the funding: ‘it is really unbalanced, because in that case when people feel that you’re bringing the money, then they don’t share what is really happening at the ground level, because everything is given - the information is shared based on what their perception is on what they feel that you want to hear’.

Funding is also impacting the overall relationship of the UN and CS: ‘Country B has taken on more of an influential role in the UN, at least in New York, based on what I’ve seen and heard because they’re putting in more resources to offset Country A - the other official supporters taking a step back, so that makes it more difficult for the UN champions to push back against Country B, when obviously they’re one of the countries that are not as supportive of Civil Society engagement’ Interview AA. Participant DD also has noticed this impact: ‘We see Country B giving more money [to the UN] and that affects a lot of things cause Country B is not as open to Civil Society’.

In addition, funding has an impact on the voice, Interviewee R explained how ‘Civil Society cannot really criticise the UN. This is why the UN doesn’t care about us because they know we’re not going to criticise them, because many of our operations depend on the money they give us… you will never see strong condemnation by Civil Society of UN positions. It’s very rare. If you look at the literature in my experience, very rare’.

These comments provided evidence that with the decision-maker often being the funder, it impedes international development. Two participants provided some possible solutions: ‘if our advisory board, which includes our donors, decided that having Civil Society liaison was important for the team, then they would potentially be open to that’ Interview P, and Participant A added: ‘donors have a big role to play. I think, your [international aid funds from] Country E, Country A, Country P, or
Country W, all of those donors, and some are more progressive than others, they could require as part of their funding mechanisms that Civil Society be included in all elements - they have a lot of power.

Interviewee R provided further, more general solutions around finance: ‘sometimes it’s better not to have any money transaction and just [do] exchanges as experts, as people, who are in the same business and just from different points of view… taking money out of the equation, resolves 90% of the problem… I would change the funding models for sure. [I] would definitely have a different funding model that doesn’t allow UN agency to compete against an NGO and… we should really have different funding processes, because we are competing apples and pears and oranges, and it’s very unfair - it puts strain on the relationship’.

The idea of needed and not needed finance is provided by Participant OO: ‘key changes within the system - that doesn’t really require money. It is about a political will… funds are needed because funding Civil Societies work; funding their engagement in a meaningful way, providing funds to facilitate and enable, [is] absolutely critical. Funding programmes that protect human rights defenders, who have been attacked or seek to cooperate, and fear being attacked, again critical. So, the funding engagement starts from the community level upwards, but actually the key decisions that speak to whether a restriction is put in place or a reprisal happens, that is not about funding, that is about political will” Interview OO.

A perspective around finance was offered by Interviewee F: ‘the media asks us, and governments, where does the money go? Why isn’t the media asking cigarette companies, fossil fuel companies, [or] arms manufacturers, where does their money go? Apart from the huge bonuses that the CEOs get, look at the profits they’re making out of death and destruction’.

Participant MM said something similar: ‘Country L is estimated to be receiving [about] $2 billion of oil [revenue] at its current stage per year, and yet, it has a peace agreement which it is unable to implement because, it says, it does not have money. Where is the money going?’ and suggests ‘donors have a certain set percentage of their budget to humanitarian assistance, [and] to development, that is already set by parliament in their respective countries. We should have a similar thing in all those countries also [including developing countries] so you will be able to meet a large part of funding. It should not be a one-way street, in which they are relying entirely on donors’. Participant II explained why that may be necessary: ‘I can’t remember the exact number now, but it is a small country like Country N. There are 10,000 NGOs stepping on each other, clamouring for funds from the donor agencies. As a result, Country N continues to struggle. There was money given to those people… it is a complex thing… there are many countries… [they] will come to the UN and say to the UN [that] the rich countries should pay the bills and then, separately, they will come to us and say, can you help us bring private sector into my country. There is a double standard’.

Another resource, that of time, was also noted as lacking for CS to engage more fully in UN work. A number of participants shared this view: ‘there is less and less time for Civil Society to open, to participate… so, there’s limited time for NGOs to speak and then they get tacked on [to] the end of a discussion of other people’s
discussions… access to time, access to speaking, that’s the biggest thing’ Interview J, ‘there’s less time because there are so many who need to talk. So, the states and the Ambassadors, and it depends on what kind of meeting, they have the first right’ Interview CC, ‘it’s a rationing of time and that we, as NGOs do have to be cognisant of that and recognise that reality’ Interview Z, and ‘it’s just difficult sometimes. I mean, you got NGOs you want to speak to [and] you got limited time’ Interview E.

A possible solution was offered by Participant J: ‘there’s less and less time, because NGOs are always tacked at the end. They’re the ones that are gonna fall off the back. So, what you could have is better Chairing and more rigid Chairing, in the sense of keeping to time. I’ve seen some Chairs do that… give more time to NGOs to speak, so prioritise NGO voices’.

A number of participants remarked on the limited physical space that is available for CS to carry out the shared work with the UN: ‘how much space Civil Society is offered, and how much it is offered to contribute to conversations that go on in the UN’ was questioned by Participant B. Interview L added: ‘there should be much more possibilities for Civil Society to actually have meetings within the UN buildings’, ‘the way that the world has changed has made it much harder for Civil Society to find a space… in terms of access and exchange’ Interview H, ‘the space is reduced in a way that is not conducive and is not easy’ Interview U, ‘the other issue is some of the meeting space… there are logistical problems’ Interview J, ‘there’s very little space set aside for increasing numbers of NGOs’ Interview G, ‘the quality of the space that is given to each other, that I can see, that it’s not an equal relationship’ Interview R, and ‘they [UN] just don’t have enough physical space. So, it’s a rationing process. It’s a rationing of space’ Interview Z.

**Inherent Flaw One: Member States vs ‘The Peoples’**

This was further illustrated by Interviewee S, ‘the whole concept of an international body is that it’s the one body, that’s looking at the universe as a whole it’s not looking at sixty million people in the Country E. It’s looking at the entire universe. The General Assembly is the parliament of that universe, which is what international services do, they are independent, they are impartial, neutral and they’re looking at the world, of every single citizen in this universe. Whereas a political leader is looking narrowly… [their] nation, what’s good for their own particular country. This is why multilateralism matters, because it’s the only body at the moment looking at the universe as a whole and the welfare of human population as a whole. It’s very easy to be preoccupied with politicians, with all the immediate problems that they face. Very, very, few have the time horizon of beyond five years, politicians don’t do that. So, these are two things that the UN has; first of all it’s independent, it’s neutral, impartial and it’s a longer time horizon. It produces facts and the facts that are incontrovertible, that climate change is an existential issue for human beings’.

Interviewee II brings us back to the origins: ‘when the UN was set up, it was set up as a platform for Member States to come together. To focus on peace, security, and human rights, and economic and social policy agendas’. In Interview C, a few different points were made on this: ‘it needs to change, because the UN is here for people, and that should not just be government… it’s supposed to be for everybody… making it more accessible to people. Because ultimately the UN is
here [for] people, and that shouldn’t be limited to just government’. There was
acknowledgement as to who has the right to vote, the Member States, not CS, ‘the
UN system as a whole, whether it is at the Security Council level or other levels, the
alliances and the ability of particular countries to veto, really is sometimes a
challenge, to be able to build real relationships across countries with Civil Society
directly’ Interview LL.

Interviewee JJ further reflects on this by stating: ‘just by the very fact that the UN
Charter starts with, “We the Peoples of the world”. The Charter also calls for a
relationship with non-government organisations. The UN was meant to be a club of
nations, as it is the Member States, but they were meant to have an open
relationship with Civil Society organisations with non-governmental organisations’.
In addition, ‘pressing global issues that cannot be solved on national levels, such as
climate change, migration, and the rest, it will force a renewed sort of
internationalism and multinational politics, which will in turn carry an enhanced role
of Civil Society with it. You know, if it doesn’t it is not just Civil Society which will be
the looser, but the UN and the world will be as well’ Interview PP.

Inherent Flaw Three: Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship
How the work is carried out was demonstrated as part of the underlying problem for
the imbalance. CS Participant R explained: ‘many Civil Society organisations are
subcontractors of the UN… this is what also imbalances the relationship.
Sometimes we want to partner with the UN as an equal’. An interviewee from the
UN also brought this up from their perspective: ‘often Civil Society actors are called
to the table to be implementing partners and they don’t just want that - they want to
be at the table with equal voices. And because there is a power imbalance in that
relationship… we try to advise our partnerships’ managers and anyone who’s
working with our partners to hold consultations more regularly with our Civil So-
ciety partners, to hear from them not just when it's time to implement programmes but to
hold opportunities for joint strategic planning, advocacy, and other issues. So, that
there isn’t this feeling that they’re only contractors, implementers, for us which
they’re not. I don’t think people really see them that way, but we all understand why
those feelings arise’ Interview X.

A power imbalance was also noted regarding the strength of the UN brand and the
visibility that it offers can overshadow CS. Interviewee X explained: ‘another issue
that tends to come up is also our partners’ feeling overshadowed by the UN’s
presence. For example, they will often raise concerns that if we are doing a joint
project, they feel that the UN will often take up more visibility, they'll get more
visibility in the space; whether visually or just that logo overpowers their own. That’s
something else that we’re trying to be a lot more conscious of in terms of making
sure that the visibility of how we work is better shared’. The UN brand’s strength is
sometimes also used for CS to benefit from. Interviewee X continues, ‘on the other
hand, I would also say that we’re often approached by a lot of Civil Society partners
who… want to partner with the UN so that they can benefit from the legitimacy of the
UN brand and logo’.

A UN participant admits: ‘even reflecting on this conversation here, it just tends to be
one-way. We provide something for Civil Society, they benefit from us, and I’m not
always sure that we think about how we can benefit from them and what they can
contribute’ Interview P. Participant R provided an example of this: ‘you will always see Civil Society going to meet the UN representative in a country, but not the other way around, again it’s… power’.

Section Two: Twelve New Themes – Internal Dynamics of the Relationship

Theme Nine: Required Infrastructural Backbone – Structure, System, and Process
Participants claimed that structural solutions would allow for more inclusion. Interviwee J explained: ‘you need to be able to make room for everyone to have their voice [heard], so you need to have a structure’. This was further supported by Participant R: a lot of these UN agencies, who don’t know who to talk to, they end up talking to the person they went to university with, who happens to be from one NGO, just because they don’t know any better… our work is better if we consult it and we do it together with the other, you know, together with the UN agency from our side and together with Civil Society…. I believe strongly that when you have different perspectives in the room, the work is better… sometimes the operational modalities are such that they discourage an involvement at the formal level… it’s just personal relationships which then translate into cooperation… come up with modalities for interacting that are not time consuming and that are more agile. So that you cannot use the excuse of “oh, it’s going to take me so much time to consult all these people, so let’s just forget about them” and which I think is on both sides… we disregard the UN and the UN also does the same’.

Interview E delves into this concept further: ‘we [UN] try to speak to Civil Societies and NGOs when we go to countries and we do make an effort to keep them involved, but it is certainly a challenge in really reflecting the views of Civil Society, which is a huge thing… It tends to be somewhat side-lined, I would say, in our work. You do your best, and you try to understand what they are saying, but it’s hard to really fully reflect what NGOs have to say and to make it prominent in your analysis and recommendations. One of the things is that we work with governments, inherently, because UN is a government sort of institution. You tend to be obliged to reflect their voice more than [the] NGOs, so that’s one challenge’. Participant E continues: ‘it’s just difficult sometimes. You got NGOs you want to speak to, you got limited time, they got loads of different views, your mission is typically a week and you’ve got to see half a dozen ministries for example. You’re going [to the] ministry of economic affairs, trade, finance, prime minister’s office and whatever. And then, you’ve got to somehow figure out which NGOs are relevant to you, do they have time to see you, do they know what you’re doing, do they know who you’re doing, so there are time constraints. But also, I would just say that they don’t, kind of by default, they don’t get a look to the same extent [as] the intergovernmental aspect of the work. That’s one of the challenges’. A system that takes these different elements into account is not there, ‘there’s not really a coordinating mechanism’ Interview P.

Interviewee X explained that ‘often we don’t know how to respond to a problem in a complex way, we think that if we put more staff and money behind it, then that will solve it. I don’t think that’s true’ and continues ‘we just need to be more systematic and deliberate about it’. Therefore, the system is seen as having a negative impact on the CS and UN relation: ‘there is no understanding of who talks to who, who talks to who when, there’s no clear: this is how it works’ Interview T, and ‘the systems
aren’t joining up’ Interview N.

Therefore, having a proper structure in place on ‘how the system expects that engagement to look’ was identified in Interview H, as a solution to help the relationship. Participant LL agrees: ‘the solutions are largely structural’, and Interviewee Y added: ‘multi-stakeholder initiatives properly designed with a systemic focus can be really effective… what we haven’t focused on is, in order to get there, what are the big systematic changes that would need to come about’. It ‘requires a rethinking of their [UN] whole architecture’ Interview R, as this, Participant PP claims, will lead to ‘all the voices to be heard and for there to be some weighting between big and small voices. You need some structures, so representatives of Civil Society grouping which leads to people and organisations elected, terms of office, representatives of strands of opinions of Civil Society, all that is critical’. Interviewee BB remarks: ‘alignment - organisational component is very important… and reshape its [UN] whole organisation accordingly’.

Theme Ten: Clarity Creates Cohesion - Defining the Roles

There was an expression of a real need for ‘having a formalised role for how this relationship functions’ Interview M. A collection of excerpts that demonstrate this need include: ‘no one knows who is doing what’ Interview D, ‘value-added and roles of each, mutual agreement on that… it has to be resolved’ Interview R, ‘there are some agencies that compete with NGOs for funding, so we would be better to define the roles of what everyone is doing’ Interview D, ‘how do we work together when we are exchanging transaction in a contract and how do we work together when we’re not in a contract’ Interview R, ‘the key issues are: establishing complementarities between the UN and Civil Society, defining the responsibilities that can be undertaken by the UN and also by Civil Society’ Interview MM, ‘the big questions remain, whose role it is to do certain things and whose job it is, who’s better placed’ Interview R, and ‘it is quite normal behaviour to say “this is my project” and “I am going to implement this” and by the way, there are ten others who are doing the same thing’ Interview II.

A solution was offered by Interviewee MM: ‘certain agencies taking lead in certain sectors… why should we not give the organisation that is running and doing the implementation to the local Civil Society groups on the ground and back them up with necessary means and tools to do their job. That way it is a division of labour and it will actually enhance results and will be more rewarding to everybody, to us and also to Civil Society and to the communities who are being served’.

Trying to define CS was an apparent ongoing, seemingly unresolvable frustration. This was reflected in a number of comments: ‘NGOs are never really mapped, nor the worth of their work’ Interview D, ‘there’s not a lot of information on Civil Society… some of the challenges for that within the team was trying to figure out what Civil Society is’ Interview P, ‘NGOs have different modus operandi’ Interview BB, ‘who is [this] supposed Civil Society’ Interview P, and ‘[a] complex nature of NGOs because they fall in different categories. Some do just provocation, some do advocacy, and some do advocacy together with [an] actual project for changes’ Interview BB.

Interviewee BB identified CS into three groups: programmes orientated, advocacy, and ‘just anti, just opposing. There’s lots of NGOs, more than one in particular, who
just are against something’. Another participant described CS to have these three roles: ‘You have citizen movements… you have individual activisms… you have networks’ Interview FF. Yet, Participant I acknowledged three other identities: advocacy, implementation of programmes, and thirdly keeping ‘government accountable, well, also the [UN] Secretariat to some extent’.

Participant FF provided the field explanation as to why the literature review in Chapter 2 focused on NGOs and why it naturally progressed to CS in the interviews, as was mentioned in Chapter 3: ‘the whole definition of Civil Society is expanding and we need to address to that change and to respond to that change and say that Civil Society is about civic space and it’s about citizen movement, it’s not necessarily about registered NGOs that we’re working with… the whole idea of Civil Society is changing direction’.

This challenge in trying to define CS is partly due to establishing the roles of each of the players. ‘Sometimes we are contractors. Sometimes we are partners, it’s different. When you receive money [or] when you don’t, it is different’ Interview R. Defining the roles would reduce the competition for funding: ‘there are some agencies that compete with NGOs for funding, so would be better to define the roles of what everyone is doing’ Interview D.

However, in the non-definability of CS, it was also remarked that this was one of their virtues. Interviewee R described this: ‘it’s also the way we are structured as a diverse Civil Society, which is excellent. It is the strength of the Civil Society movement, but it’s also complex, because then, who do you invite and how do you ensure representation’. Participant M added: ‘we enjoy a flexibility that I think is an opportunity for us to bring credibility to the work that we do on the ground… in a more direct manner… we can be more nimble, we can respond sometimes more directly to situations and circumstances and we can organise ourselves a little bit more quickly’.

How the UN defines CS was shared by Interviewee Y: ‘the UN considered Civil Society and business as all Civil Society. So, in terms of the actor, they would often request representation from Civil Society and that would include whatever business representation was available’. Interviewee W agrees: ‘the very term Civil Society is a bit ambiguous and I tend to think of it as everything that is not state’, as does Participant II when shared that CS is defined as everything that sits outside of government for this research (see Table 1.1); ‘I hundred percent agree with you - hundred percent’.

Although it was often remarked how difficult it is for CS to be defined, there was also obscurity in understanding who the UN actually is. These comments come from UN staff, diplomats, and CS. As Participant U described: ‘the UN is very big and has many actors. Who are we talking about? It’s not the same to talk about Member States that are part of the UN and Member State led organisms like ECOSOC, the General Assembly and the UN Secretariat and UN agencies and UN programmes; it is very different’. Interviewee E remarks: ‘most people don’t really know what the UN is’, and Participant D added: ‘how does the UN even really work’. Another definition was provided: ‘the UN is twofold, not one thing. The UN is on the one hand, an intergovernmental process, and on the other hand, it’s a Secretariat serving that
intergovernmental process. And most people confuse the two’ Interview I. However, there are also the UN agencies: ‘the UN was designed as specialised agencies initially, all of those mirroring the roles of government: health, employment, environment, foreign affairs, [and] security concerns’ Interview BB.

The complexity of the UN and its various components was also highlighted in these excerpts: ‘whenever I say the UN, I mean the public servants, the agencies, the people - I don’t mean the Member States, which are also part of the UN’ Interview KK. An alternate way this was referred to: ‘what is the United Nations? It’s Member States’ Interview L.

Even within the UN itself there was a recognised need to define the roles to better establish internal working relations. Participant M described this: ‘we brought about a plan to link each agency as a lead agency for specific areas… until that stage there had not much collaboration between the UN itself… there is also a big gap between the UN agencies themselves, which people have been trying to bridge for long. There is a term called “working together”… there is the issue of turf, there is the issue of publicity, there is issue of giving credit, whether you own the credit yourself or give credit or pay recognition to others, those are major problems’. Interviewee M provided understanding as to why this may be a complex process: ‘UN partners definitely have different layers to the relationships that they have, especially with governments or with other UN agencies. They have to navigate that [and] they have to take care of [that] in the process of their work’.

Interviewee FF brings us back as to the purpose of the UN - its original role: ‘the UN was created as a peace organisation and if you look at the pillars of the United Nations it’s a peace organisation and it has two other sets of arms. One is the human rights principle, so the setting of standards for human rights, standards that everyone can strive towards. And two, in order to maintain peace and in order to strive towards a human rights standard, we need to have development. So, the arms of the United Nations [are]: peace, development, and human rights’. This was further supported: ‘so the role of United Nations… it’s a peacemaker and bringing people together and looking after the world’ Interview HH.

Participant R provided a resolution for the future of the defined roles by saying: ‘their relationship with Civil Society can also help the UN identify itself in the 21st century’.

**Theme Eleven: Exclusion is Frustration For All, Including the Included - Inclusion**

Interviewee K described this by saying: ‘the perception of how the UN engages with Civil Society is still seen as a very opaque process and seen as something that you can do once you’re established or well you know, a big name, and that hinders a lot… having the usual suspects there it’s not a good thing, but it isn’t a bad thing to have those people there. It just should be more open’. Participant K added, ‘there will be grassroots organisations who will have never… it will have never occurred to them that they could, with the research that they have done, the knowledge that they have and the reach that they have, that they could go to the UN and address the human rights Council or a disarmament conference or human rights or gender and human rights conference with the things that they know, their experience and the qualitative and quantitative data that they have. But they absolutely should be and that is incredibly useful knowledge’. Interviewee A also noticed this: ‘when I think of
big CSOs, I think of the ones that have big headquarters somewhere in the country offices. Those tend to be the ones that get the contracts, so the smaller national CSOs or nationally developed CSOs might be side-lined in terms of funding from UN as an implementing partner on various sort of projects... I've noticed that as a challenge'.

Why this has occurred was identified. Interviewee P stated, ‘the fact that they [INGOs] understand the process is part of, potentially, the reason why we hear their voice more’, and Interviewee U added ‘those who are bigger and have more money, have a bigger say and I don’t think that makes any favour to Civil Society and the way we represent Civil Society. It shouldn’t be because you have more means, your ideas will have a better chance to be heard. But that is the reality because having staff in New York is the distance and the more staff you have and the more qualified, the better they will do their job and that costs a lot of money’.

Similar comments come from the interview with X: ‘the major INGO partners there’s… because they’re very sophisticated and they’ve been doing this work all over the world for a very long time, they become very similar to the UN in terms of their processes so they have that capacity to absorb our bureaucratic needs in terms of the processes, getting grants, etc. They have roles that are very similar, it is a little bit more difficult to partner with the smaller Civil Society actors and that’s something we need to be doing better… it’s easier for us to work with organisations of a higher capacity. They know how to manage those procedures but, we need to find better ways that we can work with smaller organisations as well… we’re trying to find a way that we might better be able to directly have relationships with smaller entities, but it is a challenge’. Participant EE supported this claim: ‘you need to be a big NGO to be able to make it to the level that one seems to [need to] have to be able to get a voice at the United Nations. And so, [you need] lots of background study, lots of documents, huge number of PhDs, etcetera’, as does Interviewee LL ‘international NGOs, particularly northern NGOs, may have a more structured way of interacting; they may have more resources. So, one of the challenges for the UN system is to ensure… [to] engage so that it becomes more inclusive at each of these levels, how to engage both the international and national NGOs, northern or southern NGOs, and to reach out more to the NGOs at the real grass roots level’.

Interviewee K described how CS is trying to find solutions to resolve this, ‘very often it comes down to international NGOs who see that power imbalance within the Civil Society space and are able to incorporate grassroots organisations into their own delegation and cover their costs’. Further solution is suggested by Participant DD: ‘we don’t have the time or the capacity to engage and only a few can and then groups that are really powerful. But like refugees or LGBTQI don’t have the capacity to engage, but they should also have a voice and representation, and this is where UN structure could help’.

Participant KK noted the downside to this: ‘we have no choice then to unify voices as much as possible and sometimes I have trouble with that and it has to do with who’s stronger, having visibility and things like this, you know’. Interviewee P agreed: ‘when you get so many voices in a room, if things are going to be moved forward, you end up having some voices dominate… I would think that there are definitely Civil Society organisations who feel that they’re not accepted and are heard. I think
what happened at the meetings is that there’re certain voices that are more powerful and come to the forefront and may drown out others’.

Participant DD makes a request for more voices to be heard: ‘we need to work more together now than ever... if we don’t include everybody, we won’t be able to achieve as much or if anything actually. Voices of everybody are so important’. Interviewee E agrees: ‘you need to hear people’s voices’, as does Participant J ‘to do this properly, we really need to hear from these voices you never hear from before’, and Participant EE ‘the people who are most affected by all of these things asked about how they can be helped, it’s not there’.

It was acknowledged that more needs to be done to bring in the unheard voice. A number of participants remark on this: ‘one of the challenges for the UN system is how do we make sure that our engagement is more inclusive, given those that are most marginalised a greater voice’ Interview LL, ‘to the extent that as a member of Civil Society, I feel like we have to, those of us who still do have access as limited as it may be, that those of us who have an opportunity to speak need to also speak on behalf of those who cannot... those that can have their voices heard have a responsibility to ensure that those voices that cannot be heard are spoken for them’ Interview Z, ‘they’re not hearing the real voices of the women who suffer such discrimination, abuse, violence, and poverty... the non-governmental organisations are the ones that are in touch with a whole range of people whose voices will not often be heard by their own government or by the UN. And so, we are the conduit pipe for absolute vital information... it never stops, our work, to keep pulling up those voices that are not heard, that have to be heard which is the basic, which is a universal human right. Otherwise, these are just pieces of paper’ Interview L, and ‘when a particular Civil Society organisation feels excluded, then other Civil Society organisation will often rally around that and it creates this sort of tension’ Interview A.

A few participants noted an elitism for those in CS who engage in UN work; ‘what I notice at the UN is very few Civil Society people have the privilege to access the UN, so you’re getting the same people. It would be really, really nice to have more people’ DD, ‘it becomes like a circle of elitism or it remains that way’ Interview H, and ‘Civil Society’s ability to engage is very much determined by knowledge and specialisation and then being very strategic as to where to impact’ Interview EE.

It was remarked that the whole process for engagement for inclusion needs to be revisited for the complete process of a particular piece of work. Interviewee A stated that ‘inclusivity is a challenge, so making sure everyone is at the table at key points’. Participant LL supported this claim from a geographical perspective: ‘one challenge is that Civil Society is not a homogenous entity, you have international NGOs, you have national NGOs, and then you have Civil Society at a very local level, and how the UN system engages with each of these is not necessarily on an equal basis’.

A couple of participants remarked on were the exclusion was being expressed. Two examples were provided by Participant DD: ‘we had last year a Member State, I think it was during the High-level Political Forum, actually say that they wanted Civil Society to stop speaking, in the middle of the Civil Society presentation... a couple [of] years ago, one of the statistics leaders asked Civil Society to leave the room, not [to] participate and that was pretty shocking’. Other areas were
exclusion was noted was education and language: ‘the barrier is that we do not have strategies that are truly inclusive… there is a tendency to reach out to those within Civil Society that are more educated or has access to an international language and so on… one of the challenges is really how to make the process of Civil Society engagement much more inclusive’ Interview LL.

Theme Twelve: Play Leads to Meaningful Action - Social Requirements
Having the opportunity to socialise was shown to build relationships and therefore understanding. Participant V described this by saying: ‘Sometimes we got invited to events and then there’s a reception afterwards. There will be lots of talking and I meet lots of good people at those kinds of gatherings, after the talks then sharing ideas and that’s good. There was a group of Ambassadors… most of them mean quite well and sometimes they are way ahead of their countries, sometimes, and so that’s difficult again. I’ve been more concerned with developing Civil Society and NGOs and I’m trying to figure out the problems with them. Relating to them’.

The evidence showed that having the opportunity for dialogue contributes to a good working environment amongst the different parties involved. A number of participants commented on this: ‘it was sort of a discussion and a back and forth and we’ve built a really nice relationship with the Secretariat’ Interview DD, ‘I feel that the only way to really impact people’s lives is to have really good relationships with people from different sections of, you know, from the UN or from the Member States’ Interview GG, and ‘it is how people interact and get on. The five minutes meeting before the actual meeting is where the progress is in the relationship’ Interview D.

Theme Thirteen: Restructure for Imperative Prevention - Conflict and Human Rights
There are different ways for CS and the Security Council of the UN to work together that Interviewee JJ described: ‘the Arria Formula, yes, is one way of course where Civil Society members are invited in to testify and meet with governments, but it is off the record. But you have on the record meetings now where Member States will invite NGOs, key NGOs to testify… then the NGO Working Group on Security Council meets with the Ambassadors working on the Security Council… they are off the record meetings, are confidential, we share candidly with them what our concerns are, what we are seeing on the ground and likewise the Ambassador of the country. Of course, some are more direct than others and we hear their concerns as well, so it is really an opportunity for Civil Society to engage quite closely with the members of the Security Council. And it is not a formalised process, but it is becoming an excepted norm’. A further description was provided for one of the methods: ‘the NGO Working Group on Security Council, it is made up of a number of global organisations that are working on issues of peace and security’ Interview JJ.

Interviewee CC described the current practices in place for human rights: ‘all these things like CEDAW, like the UPR [Universal Periodic Review], there are these conventions that they [UN] have made… and the country has to say how are you doing this, and how are you doing that, they have to make… periodically reports… the process is very, very repetitive, but [in] four years you see, or three years later, this has improved, but here you have not improved’. Participant CC provided an example of how currently it is being carried out and recalls a moment at a recent human rights meeting: ‘it was Country J defending something… and Civil Societies were saying that… they [imprisoned women] were standing naked in the cold,'
everyone laughing at them. It was really horrible news. And then the guy who had to answer for the state, he got so angry [saying], “What? Who is lying to you? Who is - I mean we never treat our women like, we never treat anyone like that!” And the one who directed the meeting said, we are not accusing you, I mean this is what we hear. This is not the place where we accuse persons. This is the place where we try to find solutions… we are letting you know, and we will help you… that was at CEDAW… it was about women in prison because CEDAW is concentrated on everything that is related to women, but the UPR are the human rights’ Interview CC.

An alternate example was provided by Interviewee DD, where Civil Societies’ comments were shut down: ‘another example with a government [happened] a couple [of] years ago at the High-level Political Forum that was presenting and the Civil Society statement was very critical of the government in certain areas against gender based violence, gay rights, [and] other issues. The government got involved and basically wouldn’t let Civil Society present or speak on most of the document’. This indicates that CS has different rights in terms of having their voice heard, depending on what type of meeting it is. These two examples show the difference between a human rights meeting and a High-level Political Forum that was also addressing the issue of rights.

There are indicators prior to conflict arising and it was noted that CS plays a key role in helping to identify those indicators. The interview with D explained this: ‘before you have conflict you have women’s rights, human rights, being attacked. We need to intervene before full conflict… we need to know what is happening on the ground to know if human rights are being attacked’. Human rights being violated was identified as an indicator and another that was mentioned was ‘school is always such a core part of the community that attacking it is really an attack on that community. Conflicts are often ideological, so schools are seen as places where ideologies are given out’ Interview F.

The interview with Q highlights that ‘prevention is better than the cure, rather than waiting for the conflicts to happen, you prevent them from happening’, and that ‘the Human Rights Council has always been the body in the whole UN system which is ideally placed to do prevention… the idea being the human rights system is to set a norm, even though that’s looking at the human rights relations, and then for the UN to work with states to move them towards improved compliance with those norms. Whereas what has become is something that is heavily focused on basically attacking developing countries for not doing well enough. Of course, in some instances, it is absolutely justified, but it’s also almost become the raison d’être of the UN human rights system, is this attack’.

Participant Q added ‘in fact, I would say Human Rights Council is the UNs prevention council… prevention is actually all about finding diplomacy. States working together to address root causes, basically place…so implementing their international human rights obligations and commitments. Because if every state has a free press and a police force that’s trained in human rights, a group constitution with an independent judiciary. Then it’s not - you’re not going to have the level of violations that will lead to conflict. So that’s primary prevention and then secondary prevention… is the smoke that tells the fire alarm, it’s patterns of human rights violations, it’s nothing else. It’s not development stuff or security stuff, it’s pattern of
human rights violations... at the moment, the international human rights system is not pulling in that early warning prevention and is not acting on it. It has not been working with states. Why, because the only thing in its armoury is the attack... early prevention is about like saying to Country K, it’s about me as a representative of the human rights system saying, look we picked up on these worrying concerns about patterns of human rights violations in Country K. We want to work with you to try to move you onto a different path, to address these problems before it escalates.

However, prevention is limited in its working capacity, because ‘that all requires trust and confidence, and part of the reason why it’s never happened is because [there is] zero trust and Western NGOs and developing countries do not trust each other’ Interview Q.

The Interview with K further highlights the need for the prevention of conflict, because even after conflict there continues to be a high degree of violence. ‘Once a political piece is negotiated or once there’s a ceasefire, because [of] the level of violence [that] has already increased so much in the community... community based violence and intimate partner violence is really strong; the prevalence of violence is quite shocking’. Therefore, political negotiations to end conflict does not necessarily indicate the ending of violence within its Civil Society.

Participant PP noted the significance of CS in human rights work: ‘the international official human rights machinery makes the role of Civil Society, [its] advocacy, push for those decisions is critical and beyond. Its ability to hold a spotlight on issues that the UN still won’t touch is even more critical’. Interviewee Q remarked on the acceptance of Civil Societies’ involvement at the UN in Geneva: ‘the Human Rights Council is much more open to Civil Society engagement than any other part of the UN. If you go to New York, the NGOs are basically shunted off into a dark corner and are not allowed any kind of access or its very difficult for them to get access. The international human rights system is relatively very open to NGOs’.

The challenge with human rights is that ‘no governments want to be told that they are useless and that they’re not doing its job. No government wants to be told that it has been delinquent in looking after its citizens; all of them want to be told how wonderful of a job they are doing’ Interview II, and ‘states hate being criticised for human rights violations because they are being accused of hurting their own people, that’s what they’re being accused of doing, which of course they are’ Interview Q.

However, Participant U shared how important it is to show governments where human rights maybe advertently or inadvertently violated: ‘mostly everywhere we live in a capitalist society, a capitalist society by definition values high education, money, and wealth and by that, realising or not realising, meaning or not meaning it, there is a stereotype and [a] discrimination against those who are at the bottom of the money, social networks and education. Having a space internationally, where you can point out how our societies discriminate, marginalise, incarcerate those who are at the bottom is very important’ Interview U.

Cooperation and dialogue between CS, states, and the UN was remarked as part of the solution to human rights management ‘what states hate, and this is why the human rights system has developed a bad reputation, is they hate this kind of... the UN being seen as a crucible for public condemnation and attacks, basically. What
they think is that yes, when a country does terrible things, there is a role for public condemnation, but that’s almost the last resort. Before you get there, there should be sensible, moderate discussions between states and also between Civil Society, states, and between the UN... try to understand the challenges placed by states, whether it’s implementing their human rights obligations or whether it’s making progress towards the SDGs. And then working with states to overcome those challenges and obstacles to create progress, through cooperation and dialogue. Those are the key words, cooperation and dialogue' Interview Q. Dialogue was also noted by Participant N as being important to prevent defensiveness: ‘Civil Society needs to find a new discourse of engagement with, for example UN Agency F, so that they don’t feel, or Country E, so [they] don’t feel somehow defensive all the time’, and Interviewee F added why it is important ‘if we name and shame, then we risk losing the access that we have for humanitarian purposes to be able to bring food or medical supplies for those’.

Another proposed solution to improve human rights management is regarding changing the funding approach: ‘funding is heavily linked with the ability of NGOs to publicly, very publicly criticise states. The louder they shout, the more funding they get’ Interview Q. In addition, Participant Q noted the disparity of funds: ‘even though it’s one of the three pillars [of the UN], human rights gets far less funding than the security and development pillars. Human rights only gets 3% of the budget, the other pillars get 25% of the regular budget’.

Theme Fourteen: Fossil-Ed Functioning - Outdated Working Structure
Interviewee K observed this lack of change in two different examples, the first one in resource material: ‘sometimes when I look at resources that were developed during the 70’s and the 80’s… it’s just exactly the same thing; just repackaged with different graphics’. Secondly in the relationship: ‘it’s hard to see what changes in terms of policy and in terms of facilitating Civil Society engagement’ Interview K.

There was acknowledgement for the UN to begin to work in a new way: ‘the UN and its organs need to figure out a way of moving beyond. [It] feels like we’re still faxing each other, in a world in which it’s almost like we can instantaneously think together about how to solve problems, and connect, and organise, and distribute energy in different parts of the world to solve different problems’ Interview Y, ‘it’s time for the Security Council to change as well, it’s old and the structure is very old’ Interview DD, and ‘but is the United Nations now relevant in the modern world? And does it need reforming? The answer to that, it probably does, not necessarily because the values are necessarily wrong, they’re the same ones that were set up after the Second World War for peace, for making the world a better place, but simply in terms of its functions. It’s not moving at the pace that we are moving at these days’ Interview HH.

The literature review in Chapter 2 sourced documents from the commencement of the UN, June 1945 until the time of the data collection, January 2018. The findings found eight themes in the relationship dynamic of the UN and CS. The data from the first round of interview research recognised that all eight of the themes of the literature review are still relevant today, provides further support to this claim; that work is still being carried out ‘the old way’.
Theme Fifteen: Honest Broker - UN as Mediator

Interviewee A explained from a financial perspective: ‘donor agencies won’t give direct funds to government. So that is why UN is there as an intermediary… they do occupy that middle space. That’s their whole role as working with government’.

This is also true from an accountability view: ‘at the end of the day, states are much more willing to be held accountable by the UN than they are by Civil Society… they feel that the UN has a set of processes and that is more likely to hold the state accountable to make sure they’re reporting on what they’re doing, rather than Civil Society’ Interview K. Another view related to accountability was provided by Participant N: ‘where someone [UN] is bringing an umbrella of independently chosen NGOs because what you don’t want is governments cherry picking their own, because then you get corruption of the whole idea’.

It is considered that the UN provides a position of neutrality and inclusion: ‘put in the UN Agency B logo in our work, it gives a different status and it’s also a guarantee of the neutrality that the UN is guarding’ Interview KK, and ‘you could push the government to a more inclusive policy, for instance, by having this multi-directional approach’ Interview P.

The UN is an important intermediary between CS and state governments: ‘many of our organisations operate in communities…. we don’t need to notify the government, but the UN agencies have to tell the government everything they do which also gives them access and trust. So, if we, in Civil Society want to influence the governor, we have to go, in access to the UN… the UN agency being very close to the government. If you want to influence the government, you have to go to [a] UN agency’ Interview R. This claim was supported by Participant X: ‘and the Civil Society partners are also aware of, if you partner with any UN agency, you get more access to the government. So, they want to be aligned with the UN as much as possible’.

Some governments prefer to work with the UN and therefore this intermediary role can be very crucial for development: ‘and for the government, they don’t always want to open the door to having a Civil Society seen as equal footing with them, or to hear from them… in a country where free speech isn’t necessarily encouraged, there are concerns with people actually voicing opposition to a government, especially in an international forum’ Interview C, and ‘in some countries where Civil Society does not have a voice, we will have to work on an incremental beneficiary principle, step-by-step work with governments and find common ground. And then demonstrate that Civil Society brings real value to the table, it can be helpful… the UN can be an honest broker by not insisting on something but encouraging governments to explore collaboration’ Interview II.

As well, it is important for the UN to be connected with CS: ‘the government is vital to their survival. Unlike ours, you know. Of course, CSO is also dependent on approval, but in general we are much less. Once we get the legal approval, we are not so bound by an agreement with the government about what we do, we are much, much freer. But the UN agencies, everything they do is to be pleasing to the governments’ Interview R. A different perspective was provided by Participant C: ‘sometimes Civil Society doesn’t want to work with government, because they don’t
want to be seen as partnering with government. They see their role as being critical and trying to push government to do more. So, it’s not always to their advantage to be seen as partnering with government’.

The role of the UN as an honest broker may provide a solution to today’s context. Interviewee FF explained this view: ‘the solution is to look at what’s happening in the world today where there is a restricting of civic space, and to push back against that; the role of the United Nations is advocating for that’. Participant PP supported this claim and added: ‘in the development space, it is also a critical relationship. A lot of piloting of smart new ideas in development often begins at the Civil Society levels and the UN is critical in helping take that to scale and is being a kind of bridge between Civil Society and national government. Sometimes national governments are willing to take a smart idea about micro finance or nutrition from the UN rather than directly from their own local Civil Society. There is a status and a sort of assurance which the UN can provide’.

Theme Sixteen: Grassroot Hands Hold the Solutions – Importance of In-Country

The local or in-country voice that is communicated by CS was seen as valuable to the UN work: ‘Civil Society has an important role to play in representing different voices in a country especially being open to hearing and participating with and collaborating with the various stakeholders in a country are important… when we’re doing country case studies, we try to get Civil Society at times to provide that type of information for society, knowing that the voices on the ground and in the country are probably more accurate and up to date’ Interview P. Participant Q added the importance of the voice in developing countries for human rights: ‘we need to start to change this perception of Human Rights Council as an attack dog and start trying to understand what’s important for developing countries. And now that thinking process came as big new initiative on human rights in the SDGs, which is all about how the human rights system can contribute to sustainable development in developing countries – prevention - as I said’ Interview Q. The interview with K shared this same message from a peace and security perspective: ‘hold consultations with women’s rights organisations in its focus countries, for women peace and security, ahead of drafting policies and programming that will then impact those communities’.

It was regarded that the solutions lie with those individuals and communities that are experiencing the circumstance or issue. Interviewee II explained that ‘we think we have the solution, actually, we have no solution. The solution lies with the victims or the stakeholders who are struggling. Solving poverty, I have no idea how to solve poverty. It is the poor who can tell us what their needs are… success would come when you go into a country… and figure out a way to empower the people… you need to empower those people so that they can produce better crops more efficiently and if they can do that, then they can maintain their families and so on. We do it in piecemeal. There are many people who are doing a great job in this kind of thing, but we tend to say the agronomist based in Country A is the only one who can provide that kind of expertise. She or he has to go out to Country R for six months, get paid Country A salary plus per-diem to transfer that technology or even one month or a few weeks - must travel business class and so on. That is the unsaid issue by the way, people don’t want to mention those kinds of things’.
This view was supported by Participant E and provided an example: ‘it would be nice for NGOs to be much more vocal and really make sure they get their foot in the door, express the views [of] the people that they or the communities that they represent… the more you hear from people the better. If you’re saying [that] we’ve just done this paper, you should have an industrial park in your country and that it should specialise in garment manufacture, for example. What are the potential pitfalls? I mean NGOs have a lot of things to say’. As does Interviewee GG: ‘concentrate on what works and of course is very different depending on the region… and we do need the local NGOs… without their information, their input… we understand that most of them work in impoverished countries, in communities where, a lot of times, money is not even used as manner of exchange. That’s how poor the community is’. In the interview with S, a possible explanation was provided, ‘it is too fragmented. I would like the structure … the emergent structure should be based on practical experience on what happens in countries to deal with the important problems’.

Interviewee CC provided another example: ‘if it’s for developmental changes, so more sustainable, it has to come from the local people… then changes will last more. Because you hear sometimes, and you read things like, this organisation gave plenty of toilets to that part [of] Country M, and people will say, but we don’t want toilets, we need food, or we need this, or we need that. So, Civil Societies have spent a lot of money to make toilets and then the toilets are just breaking down… you cannot just bring in your idea… the idea has to come from the locals’. Therefore, it is important to ‘really get as close as possible to the marginalised communities you need to be working with, smaller community base type organisations. But the UN agencies are often not set up in a way that they can… we don’t have the capacity’ Interview X.

A number of participants commented on the importance of CS working amongst themselves in-country and the effect this would bring. Interviewee M explained ‘there is a real need to have some support not just in the delivery of services, but also for the capacity building and strengthening of Civil Society coalitions at the national level, to really convene and bring CSOs together in a way that makes sure that those efforts aren’t being duplicated, that efforts are decentralised, that things are happening beyond the capital level but are actually also happening at local levels… that is meaningful change’. Participant T encouraged this as well by saying ‘if the countries' Civil Societies could actually work together more’, and Interviewee G added that ‘I’d like to see those country level relationships between NGOs and government closer and more trusting’. A solution was provided that ‘we can create little nodes around the world’ Interview II.

Comments arose regarding the shift of information from the local level to the global level. The interview with C stated that ‘when governments come here, it’s more about showing off, it’s a bit of a peacock session. No one wants to be embarrassed on a global stage, everyone wants to tell only good stories. The reason there isn’t a lot of, “this is what we tried, and it didn’t work” is because that’s not going to sit well with your constituency at home… I hope at the national level, there can be more constructive discussions’.

From the other perspective, from global to local, it was noted that caution needs to be applied in taking on a template approach. The interview with A explained the
importance of ‘making sure everyone’s heard, everyone’s around the table, everyone’s expertise is included in creating national solutions, nationally driven solutions. It would be great if it was a lot more country-led, country-controlled processes, which is where, UN and government can, or UN can be the impotence for government to really take the driving seat and have everyone around the table for nationally led solutions to then build to these larger global goals. But context is incredibly important. That’s where sometimes international development gets it wrong – it’s trying to do blueprints, but not thinking about actual country contexts and adaptation’.

Participant P supported this by saying: ‘obviously, when you got a type of global coordination, you lose some of the nuances from each country which is quite challenging… what is the audience of the report, what is the desired purpose of the report, which is a question we continuously ask ourselves… if we decided that national change was one of our important outcomes and sometimes, we don’t really suggest how that might be, then one way to get that is to do more with Civil Society in those countries; to use potentially our material to make efforts for changing the countries’. Interviewee DD added: ‘since I’m at the UN, I’m in New York, I feel that sometimes I forget what I’m fighting for’, and that ‘there’s a big disconnection between those working, I guess, so remotely on issues that are not directly affecting them… maybe some of us have even visited the places but it’s so easy to forget. And if we are not in direct contact with those who are always on the ground, we run a very high risk of just investing our time, our skills, resources, [and] education into just building more and more documents that mean nothing at the local level’ Interview GG.

There is importance that ‘Civil Society/UN partnership is not only in New York or Geneva or the regional hubs, it really is in every country, in every part of the world’ Interview JJ. Participant Q explores this further: ‘the other thing that needs to happen is that we need to get much better at making the international human rights system more accessible for local NGOs, national NGOs… what goes on here is a battle between the West, Western NGOs, and developing countries. Whereas if we started getting NGOs from Africa and from Asia to come and play a more important role here in Geneva… to engage with the international system in other ways. For example, being able to report or easily access what’s going on at national levels - it would strengthen the international human rights system. It would be far better in terms of holding countries like Country Q, Country B, and others to account because we would have honest information from the ground. Which, by the way, is why they don’t want it. These countries are promptly trying to stop NGOs and human rights defenders coming from their countries and travelling to Geneva, because they don’t want that level of scrutiny. I’ve always thought, for example, that we should set up some kind of trust fund at the Human Rights Council for NGOs from the developing world to bring them here for human rights counselling sessions. You would have a much bigger diversity of voices; you would have power… to actually hold their own government to account, and you would break this west against the rest idea’.

Theme Seventeen: Sharing and Purposeful Speaking - Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer
Participant CC described the importance of dialogue: ‘we have to talk together, that’s it. It has to be more important. It has to be talking that tells us what to do’. Due to
this importance, there was expressed need for more opportunities for active conversations: ‘there needs to be more opportunities for dialogue’ Interview KK, ‘not just always listen to people talking on the panel, but making sure there is enough room for a dialogue’ Interview J, and ‘there should be a more open dialogue’ Interview Z.

Doing so would also break down the silos that people work in: ‘speak to each other, work with each other, stop sitting in silos, get together. That’s the biggest thing, the communication rather than back off and hold off, barrier around me, this is what I do. Open up and speak to each other’ Interview B. This view was supported by Participant CC: ‘get out of silos and try to make these SDGs’.

It was regarded that access was needed for these conversations. The interview with OO shared, to ‘enable people who don’t have any access currently to the United Nations to engage through technological innovations and current applications. To have their voice heard in key spaces’. Participant E added: ‘certainly raising the voice of NGOs, making them more prominent, requiring UN organisations to listen, to consult them, and to reflect their decisions in things that they do… I suppose the only way in which things happen is through countries making proposals to the General Assembly or ECOSOC that these things happen, you could do a resolution on it’.

Inclusion for the dialogue is important: ‘a connected world, global solutions and we need everyone to be involved... to have a space where you can have a discussion and also get lots of different actors involved, I think it’s really important’ Interview J, ‘and it’s making this dialogue a little bit more horizontal... very much horizontal sitting at the same table’ Interview KK, and ‘Civil Society brings to the table is this kind of diversity of voices, authentic local voices and a real sense of what the pressing issues are. The more we’re able to open up and listen to those types of voices, the more we’re going to get a sense on what are the key issues that we should be focussing on, what are things to study if we’re looking to change policy.’ Interview P.

It was remarked that the dialogue needed to be ongoing: ‘we could do better at creating, deliberately creating, more opportunities for consultation, where we jointly discuss more strategic issues and not just pragmatically when we need to get something done… we need to be consulting with our partners, not just when they can implement programmes, but again just to have an ongoing dialogue’ Interview X. Participant O explained why this is important: ‘my thinking is affected by all those conversations with those people, as well as with people in the Secretariat and in delegations’.

There was a real call for honest and open discussions: ‘I’d say the best thing is just having Civil Society members on the committee and saying what they think. And then we sit down and talk about development issues' Interview E, and ‘if we leave this space to have the honest conversation and people are up for that conversation now more than ever’ Interview HH.

In having these conversations, active listening is going to be needed. Participant V points this out by saying ‘it needs to be dialogues of really listening to each other and
talking’. Interviewee B added to ‘expand the space that enables Civil Society Organisations to be heard but also to be listened to... hearing and listening, actively listening on both parts, because I think that there is an element where Civil Society says we’re precious and unique and you have to listen to us. Whereas, I think what they need to do is take account for the environment in the context in which the UN has to work with and make some concessions towards that environment. That doesn’t necessarily mean giving in’.

A number of participants remarked on the value of voices and the positive impact it has on international development work. A sample of those excerpts are: ‘if we were genuine and authentic and we believe that their voices are valuable contributions, then maybe we can spend more time and lay out when should those be incorporated… that type of two-way dialogue and appreciating each other’s voice and perspective’ Interview P, ‘dialogue with Civil Society in a meaningful and impactful way is useful for creating change for international development. I think that a lot of that evidence is there and just needs to be implemented’ Interview K, and ‘in order to make really effective constructive policies when it’s an international policy or national policy, you have to be able to respond to what people are saying… it would be much more effect to the whole world if we could hear these voices’ Interview L.

Dialogue offers the opportunity to build relationships and trust, which fosters a fruitful working environment. Participant DD shared: ‘and it was sort of a discussion and a back and forth and we’ve built a really nice relationship with the Secretariat and now we have accessibility in place’. Interviewee V supported this view: ‘learning how to do dialogue… not being afraid of each other different backgrounds… trust one another and that we have different things to contribute… have that kind of relationship of respect’.

Conversations are one of the ways that knowledge can be transferred. The data showed that ‘we are not really doing technology transfer, information transfer’ Interview II, and that ‘not a good amount of information is being shared’ Interview H.

A number of participants commented on the relevance of knowledge transfer. The following is a sample of those remarks: ‘better mechanisms for lessons learned and sharing information’ Interview AA, ‘there is a need also to transfer skills and how especially in managing programmes, in implementing programmes, in monitoring programmes, in evaluating programmes’ Interview MM, ‘how will you bring that knowledge so that people can contribute meaningfully’ Interview U, ‘the big people need to be informed by the little people’ Interview T, ‘focusing on know-how, knowledge transfer, technology transfer’ Interview II, and ‘then hopefully the knowledge passes and they can start to work together’ Interview CC.

Participant CC noted that in sharing information more can be done: ‘always, when we group the knowledge together, normally we get more out of it… if UN knows that Civil Society is doing that, they could maybe offer this experience’. Interviewee MM added the other perspective and noted the importance of institutional knowledge memory: ‘knowledge of the surroundings of the problems, of the issues of the root causes, of the issues which are sometimes better understood by the Civil Society than by the UN, and how you can capitalise on that, including institutional memory of what occurred, what is occurring’.
Not only are the structures not in place for knowledge transfer but this will also become a bigger issue. ‘The sharing of information for sharing products and materials, sharing data this is a really big one, this is going to be, will continue to become a bigger topic. It is really difficult sometimes to share information and share data without having these structures for how we work together put into place’ was a reflection provided by Participant M.

In addition, it was remarked by Participant CC that there is opportunity for knowledge and learning to be transferred from country to country: ‘if the CSO Agency A are doing something in one region, in a country like Country F [and] they would know about that in the next region, that there is another Civil Society doing very similar things, they would know that [and] maybe knowing that would make them more efficient… they can learn from each other, each other’s mistakes’.

Interviewee MM comments on ‘the issue of capacity building, what you call training, where you have an international NGO and national NGO training together so there can be a transfer of knowledge, of technology, of skills. This is an area that needs to be developed very strongly because it is very, very weak because we are speaking of transferring responsibilities. Then we must equip the people who you are transferring the responsibility to. So, mentorship and capacity building becomes important… transferring knowledge, transferring skills, transferring capacity to the people who are the beneficiaries. To be the one to take charge and look after themselves and carry things forward… you need to have that sort of scope and direction and vision with where you’re going’.

In order for knowledge to be effectively transferred and learning to be shared, comments arose from the first round of interviews regarding the use of language. That ‘one of the solutions to me was we really need to start speaking in normal speak. The amount of jargon that goes on is absolutely unbelievable’ Interview T.

This view was supported by Participant E and added their experience: ‘talking not in conventional UN language, but in a much more sort of provocative public way about development issues. And it went down really well and a lot of people came’.

Participant F added: ‘I think that when it comes to business, they don’t speak the same language, like it’s two different languages being spoken. I think that has been a challenge for many organisations that have wanted to engage business for different reasons. You really need someone that can translate between the two entities when it comes to the language and the way of working’.

Interviewee C comments on the necessity to ‘making it [the UN] accessible both to people being in the space but also the language being used’, and another comment: ‘that’s another huge challenge because my people don’t want to read that [the agreed declaration] and even if it’s sent to them, they say we can’t read it, we don’t understand it’ Interview EE. This view about the type of language used came from not only CS but also from those who work within the UN.

*Theme Eighteen: Necessity of Horizontal Cohesion of Collaboration and Coordination*

Key words that arose from the field research under this theme of coordination and
collaboration were system, structure, mechanism, and process. This expressed need for a system to collaborate, can be reflected in the following excerpts: ‘on both sides there needs to be a system for incorporating collaboration’ Interview LL, ‘I know part of Civil Society does want to make sure that they’re contributing input and they’re involved, but there’s not always a clear mechanism on how they can do that or when they should do that, or when it’s appropriate to do that… a relationship with Civil Society and government organisations and other organisations - it’s just how do we improve communication? But the diversification we’re always talking about… how do we get connected… and we don’t talk about the process’ Interview P, ‘we do not have a system of prevention well developed; early warning, preparedness, prevention, mitigation, in place - country by country… the know-how is there. What is missing is a better more effective coordination of efforts in the various sectors’ Interview MM, and ‘the unique thing about Civil Society is that it is so many different sectors and so many different types of organisations… develop a sort of management structure’ Interview A.

The responsibility of who puts the structure in place is missing: ‘we have talked in this interview about different levels, different relationships from individual agency, to institutional, to global, to issue specific, to radiographically specific. Who has the big picture of all these together? Nobody’ Interview R. Participant Y identified this responsibility to belong to the UN: ‘but the UN needs to learn how to become an enabler of that kind of collaboration’.

Another set of key words were used to describe a necessary concept of collaboration and coordination. They were horizontal, unity, intersectionality, and representation. Participant FF remarks on intersectionality: ‘where the growth can build on… the movement building the intersectionality… in a much more efficient way… that intersectional approach that has sort of taken on, has strengthened and has brought the growth patterns that we’re looking at’. What is required is ‘very much horizontal sitting at the same table… generate or produce guidelines that help or shrink the gap between global processes and field implementation, that works really well. And I think the UN recognises that’ Interview KK. Another participant used the word unity: ‘build unity at the level of Civil Society rules and understanding at the level of Member States… when we are united, and we are working with a common sense of purpose we can make many more advances’ Interview JJ. The need for representation was mentioned in the interview with P: ‘you have a Civil Society person on a certain board and they’re different but they’re often coming from a special interest on their own and don’t represent the rest of the diversity in Civil Society’.

Another reason for the necessity of coordination and collaboration is for the sake of funding and the diminishmen of competition. Participant G remarked on funding: ‘the funders will have more trust, if a number of organisations are involved. Interviewee O explained that ‘they [NGOs] also are rivals and there’s jealousy and funding and all sorts of things that interfere with their good cooperation’. This was admitted by Participant EE ‘there’s huge competition even among NGOs and sometimes that’s our downfall’.

In the interview with GG, it was commented on how the competition or lack of collaboration can arise because of the funding mechanism: ‘everyone wants to get
credit… unfortunately, this is priority, who gets the credit? And the reason why this is important is because further funding is pending on how much, let’s say, success rate you have and how you can demonstrate through data that indeed you have positively contributed and performed your duties as an NGO’. Participant B supported this view by sharing ‘one of the barriers is lack of collaboration between Civil Society organisations and some of the organisations that work around the same field can get very precious about their territory and what they do, rather than see their contributions to an overall picture… so, there’s a huge issue of collaboration there’ Interview B.

Although it was recognised that coalitions, networks, and major groups were very important in their contribution to international development work, there was also a lot of evidence in the data that it was not enough. That the current collaboration and coordination efforts were seen as lacking. Even within a current collation that is recognised as very strong: ‘we have had some really significant moments, so each member of the coalition is doing really significant work… how we then translate that into something that is done at the global level, we haven’t quite figured that out’ Interview M.

Participant U explained one perspective as to why the current networks are lacking: ‘one of the issues that tends to come up with these umbrella networks is if you go broad then it becomes vague; if you go sectoral, then that has its own challenges as well. But you need to kind of create these… but not a single one is representative of all the Civil Society organisations’.

These groups are needed, as Interviewee C described: ‘the major groups and other stakeholders have a role to play, in that managing the conversations between governments, the UN and Civil Society. They don’t always function well’. Participant JJ supported this view: ‘we have a major group system… but there is plenty of room for improvement within that. Inclusive collaboration and coordination amongst NGOs themselves would be very helpful, but the major group setting is limited in what it can do’.

Current coalitions are not solving the whole issue as they can often be seen as gatekeepers: ‘there’s also the danger of being too much of a gatekeeper… there’s also the danger of; “If you’re not part of CSO Agency C in Country E, how effective is your women peace and security work really going to be?” It’s like a double-edged sword, because as someone who coordinates the network, I want more members who are really engaged on women peace and security and I want their work to be more effective because they’re part of the network. But I also don’t want to be responsible for hindering the effectiveness of someone else’s work, simply because they don’t have the resources. Members pay a fee to be part of our network. So, it’s kind of interesting, bit of [a] dilemma’ Interview K.

Interviewee Q also agreed that it can often be the same actors: ‘but from what I’ve seen and what I’ve spoken to, some of the smaller NGOs, the CSO Agency D and these network opportunities, it’s still dominated by the usual suspects’. Participant M added: ‘we have some structures for working together, for engagement, but they are not enough… there is a power difference for sure and there is not always the same outreach’.
There was a solution offered by Interviewee P, in that the focus of collaboration and coordination could be on issues: ‘how do you bring everyone under one umbrella to support initiative is quite challenging and we hope that the SDGs can do that to some extent’. Participant A supported this view: ‘organising towards a specific goal has often proved helpful… there’s lots of examples in different fields where that has happened naturally, but that seems to happen best when there’s kind of a specific purpose in mind’.

**Theme Twenty: Power of the Empowered People - Human Resources**

Two participants noted that the UN was understaffed and how it relates to the UN and CS relationship: ‘the UN, that I have worked with, is chaotic, understaffed, [and] doing a ton of work. They actually have very little time for relationship building and sort of landscaping, knowing who’s doing what. So, they kind of stick with their main partners’ Interview A. Participant GG added: ‘our work keeps us so engaged that most times we only can deal with emergencies’.

It was remarked that one area that should not be understaffed or a position that should be filled for the UN and CS relationship is that of the NGLS (Non-Governmental Liaison Service). Participant JJ explained: ‘the appointment of that liaison person would help to ease things on a daily basis as the problems arise and to ease any misunderstandings… we asked the Secretary General, the current one Guterres, to appoint a senior level liaison person. In the past they did… serving as the Civil Society focal point or liaison. I don’t remember the exact title. What it meant was, if we had an issue, we could approach her. And we had a listening ear, somebody who could help to facilitate whatever we needed to happen or to ease some of the restrictions if there were any. And it was a very effective resource for us to access. Well, after she retired, they never replaced her. And now if we have a problem we really don’t know where to go… in fact, I had asked the question at a public meeting that he [Guterres] had and the response was yes [the position would be filled]… and still hasn’t happened… that was exactly, three years ago, I think’.

Interviewee DD supported the view of the importance of this role: ‘there used to be one and it’s not there anymore, so that sort of coordination mechanism officially sitting in the UN would be very, very helpful. If properly coordinated I will add… and transparent’. Participant H further described the issue: ‘NGLS is about bringing Civil Societies voices into the work of the UN. So, to have that structural change, it’s quite significant and quite a step back… they organised orientations for new organisations coming, or new reps for organisations that were ECOSOC accredited to give us a sense of how to work with the UN system. You know, where you should be, who you should connect with to access certain things, how to manage relationships, how to register for sessions. And all of that has become more and more – that’s the other thing that’s happening, technology is taken over where people used to sit, so UN Agency H had an NGO branch that was quite well staffed, that had a desk where you could go and talk to somebody. They might not always be friendly, but at least they had to answer your questions eventually, because you were standing in front of them. Now, if you have a question about accreditation and access and all of that, it all must be done through a system online, which is not user friendly. It has flaws. There’s no name and person you could pick up the phone and call. It’s a problem’.
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Turnover and the lack of successive planning was commented on and the challenges it can bring to the UN and CS relationship: ‘there’s a lot of turnover too. The international posts in the UN; all your managers have to change posts every three to four years in country offices. Relationships that are built with particular Civil Society organisations sometimes don’t last, because a new Chief of a section will say, I want to do things differently or this is what I did in my previous country office. There’s something around continuity, that’s there for a reason. The UN does that, so it doesn’t become too entrenched in government, so it doesn’t lead to corruption. But there’s a disadvantage in terms of relationship building and actually, knowing the landscape because every three years you’ve got new leadership coming in that doesn’t have any of the relationships. And if you’ve got junior staff still there, they can introduce senior staff to the key CSO partners. But sometimes junior staff will vacate when new leadership comes in. So, you often get a lot of change over. Someone who might’ve had a big-in with working with the UN, suddenly there’s a new leadership and the whole landscape changes in terms of UN and CSO’.

Interview A. Participant CC supported this view: ‘we keep facing the same challenges… and it’s partly because of the turnover of the people’, as did Interviewee DD: ‘I work with so many people and there’s so much turnover… there’s a restructuring in the UN that keeps taking place and it gets really confusing with people shifting around. Sometimes it’s confusing to know. You build a relationship with one person and that person moves, so there’s sort of an inconsistency and maybe that will change, but in my six years at the UN, I’ve worked with so many different people, coordinating Civil Society work… that I think is a big barrier’.

A solution was provided by Participant S: ‘we should think about some successive planning. In that process of successive planning, [we] look at the people who are coming up and give them a range of skills to help them be persuasive, independent, neutral, and focus on the problem that people have and [people] who have this idea of shared leadership and equality’.

Performance management and job descriptions was a topic that arose in the data. The evidence showed that the staff at the UN are not incentivised to engage with Civil Society, which identifies a disconnect with Article 71 of the UN Charter where it recognises Civil Society and its contribution to UN work. Participant R highlighted this: ‘there is no incentive necessarily to partner with Civil Society… I can tell you… as a former UN official, I often excluded Civil Society. It’s just the way the system functions that doesn’t prioritise the relationship with Civil Society as an incentive… because I have been on the other side. I understand it’s not individuals. It’s the incentive system as well of the UN that does not facilitate. It’s always, for a UN official, it will always be better to build a relationship with a government official or another UN member, not Civil Society. There is no reward and you’re not praised unless you’re working in a Civil Society section of a UN agency. And if you look at the size of those sections, they are very small’.

Participant OO supported this view: ‘all parts of the UN civil service; the Secretariat, HR, the other agencies, and so on, they all have an incredibly important role in facilitating contact and facilitating the participation of Civil Society as being also champions of Civil Society and enabling greater contact between Civil Society and states. So, they definitely play a role, and that role could be, maybe, better'}
articulated. Definitely they could put more energy into that’. Interviewee GG added: ‘many people feel very complacent and it’s convenient for them’.

Solutions were offered in changing performance management, incentive programmes, and job descriptions. Participant R explained: ‘change up descriptions to include cooperation with the UN in the job description of Civil Society servants and vice versa in the UN job descriptions. That’s very easy to do. I have seen first-hand how making a change in the job description changes what the person does… an integrated partnering with Civil Society as a core job competency of everybody… you also have to ensure that these things are in the performance agreements… I think job descriptions of everyone, always [include] external engagement with different agencies and Civil Society organisations. I think that could really be a small thing, but a magic thing that can and see change actually. Great performance management makes sure that there is a reward for people who cooperate with [on] the one side the UN and on the other side Civil Society’.

Interviewee LL supported this view: ‘it has to be in the mandate of each organisation, that this is one of the pillars of the ways of working, where you build it into the job responsibilities and the role and function of every staff member’, and suggested ‘to have staff dedicated to building connections’. Participant OO highlighted the importance of this: ‘a really important part of this puzzle is creating and articulating and holding people to account for a framework by which the UN understands how to engage with Civil Society’.

The training, especially in regard to change management, was evidence that arose from the data: ‘issue about the change management; a lot better handover systems; so systematic handover systems. Whereas at the moment, it’s really left to the individuals. Sometimes there’s gaps in posts, so you have someone leave and you have an officer in charge who is often like a senior officer, who might or might not be good at management. It may be six months later [that] they actually hire for that post. So, I think [we need] better change management, because it happens all the time, it’s not like it’s new… [being] a little bit more strategic, that would be good’ Interview A. Participant LL supported this claim: ‘educating in the task of a smooth and effective relationships… the engagement and capacity building of staff to engage in a way that is more, is important, so it requires the whole agency in a sense to adapt and to see Civil Society engaged in the fundamental core principles and practice of the work the UN does’, as did Interviewee X: ‘we can try to educate and better train people on effective partnership management. At least there’s some scope for improvement there’, and ‘I think they [UN] would need to be involved at all levels of training for themselves, in engagement with Civil Society’ Interview N. Participant S provided the perspective that all actors are part of the team: ‘development is important, particularly development of teamwork is really important. And that teamwork means you work with all actors’.

There were quite a number of comments regarding the core values that are needed by staff to effectively carry out their roles in this setting. A number of interviewees had comments to share on this.

One participant, KK, who changed roles from the UN to CS, shared that ‘when I left the UN, I could see how the perception towards me had changed. I think that UN
officials individually have a superiority complex for some reason, because they belong to what is a very important organisation and institution; they get amazing salaries and it gives a lot of status… So, I felt that the attitude towards me from other colleagues had changed a little bit. All of a sudden, it was not that urgent to have meetings with me… too many UN officials do consider NGOs [and] NGOs workers as some sort of lower-level citizens or second class’.

‘I think that the UN needs to do a better job of hiring people’ Interviewee DD shared and added: ‘[in] the UN, I know, sometimes if a unit or a person doesn’t like a certain organisation or doesn’t like a certain leader or person in that organisation, that can really hurt us and it sometimes can be petty, like a personality thing, but I know certain situations, where certain people won’t work with certain people, like certain people in the UN won’t work with certain Civil Society organisations and I think this is ridiculous. How do we get around that issue when people don’t retire until they’re really quite old because of a personality clash. This I’ve seen a couple [of] times and I think it’s really problematic’.

Participant BB comments on ‘a focus back to the core values would be a healthy revival, but there’s so many interests now there to sustain operations just for keeping the jobs going; which is a bit tragic’. This was further supported by the interview with K: ‘I think the change just needs new staff’.

‘Climbing on the career ladder. They just decide that it’s just safer and easier to do that. And then five years down the road, after they have achieved a new position with a higher pay and [their job] is very secure because they work for the UN, they feel, and I have had many confessions, that they sold their soul. Meaning that they actually agreed to something that they knew it was not in the best interest, but it was done in a way to be able to document that there has been improvement or change, when real change has not really happened’ Interview GG.

‘Part of it is also where the different UN agencies and the personnel that works in the UN have experience… what do they bring with them? What is the baggage of relationship with Civil Society that they bring with them’ Interview R.

Employing staff that are aligned with the authentic mission of the UN was suggested as a possible solution: ‘people - you need to have reform-minded people… they [UN] have to find these people and try to empower them’ Interview S, and ‘if we do work with people with a positive attitude, not attacking them but actually try to create a relationship, we can make change’ Interview DD. Participant X added that you need the right people before you can do the training: ‘train managers to be better managers. Is the training going to do it? I don’t know, it will help in some regards, but sometimes you just have rotten people in place, there’s no helping that’.

Participant X remarks that ‘having people that have the skills to manage partnerships respectfully, that matters’. Interviewee S further described the deep respect that is needed in working in international positions: ‘it is an enormous privilege to go into a sovereign country as an international person. To work with nationals in that country and want to solve the problems the country faces, it’s an enormous privilege… that all the work within a country, what’s going to be important, is done with the people in the country and not anyone that came from the outside’.
Interviewee A shared an example of the difference UN staff can make: ‘you have this direct ear of government; actually UN officers, who sometimes have a lot of experience and sometimes don’t, [they] have very direct access to planning and programming. And they may not actually be the experts in the field, you know. Whereas Civil Society organisations, they’ve been working with country contexts for decades, might actually be much more knowledgeable of a particular topic area, so you see a lot of bizarre programming… it can also allow for really innovative stuff. If you have a really strong, innovative UN person, they can really drive change and create that environment. For me, I see that UN person, the people in those offices as in very powerful positions, for [designing] both crazy programming that’s not based on anything, to also innovative programming’.

‘The UN also needs to look at the way its staff is recruited’ stated Interviewee LL. Participant KK explained why: ‘how is hiring being undertaken? We know that you also need quotas from different countries, that also creates some problem. In terms of sometimes performance, you just want a representative from one country, but then… this person doesn’t really have all the qualification… I didn’t like some incompetencies - people that were in positions that couldn’t perform and that affected a lot of other issues. It is particularly irritating when those positions are key and they could make a huge impact, that bothered me a lot’ Interview KK. This was further explained: ‘there is a commitment to the geographical distribution of staff, but I think there is still a tendency of staff to be much more [than that], to come from a very formal training background, coming through diplomatic training, very technocratic requirements in terms of either by specialisation [or] by agencies. If it’s around education or nutrition or housing, it is very much a professional recruitment and that is unavoidable. But it’s also… how you do it - in a way [that] you get technical expertise, but you also create positions that require different forms of recognition of skills. Right now, in education we talk about recognising equivalency of skills in the context of migration. For example, I think the UN really needs to look at how do you value and recognise skills that may not come through formal institutions or only elite institutions, because you do need a mix of competencies within certain agencies. That may be something to look at, how do you get Civil Society representation that is not inhibited through formal qualifications. I don’t know whether it is feasible or practical, but I think that is something that we need to explore a lot more’ Interview LL.

There was an additional challenge that arose in the data in terms of hiring. ‘And then there is the states placing people in key positions to inform policy and practice and those are becoming increasingly worrying. The UN civil service isn’t this kind of pure group of people who are pure and good hearted, there are many of them who are. It’s also a place where the states are playing chess, they are moving their people into positions within the Secretariat because they know that they have, they yield influence at the very least’ Interview OO. This was supported by Participant F: ‘some of the appointees to the UN maybe, political appointees, they might be more interested in a cushy job than in really wanting to make a change in the world. So, I think that’s the kind of thing I believe should change in the UN, is to get away from those kind of political appointments’, and by Interviewee E ‘there are competing political interests for control at the Secretariat HQ [headquarters] in New York. And it means that if you’re not powerful, you don’t get as much voice’.
It was acknowledged that ‘recruiting people - the right people’ is crucial as ‘the people that you let in are probably the most important decision you make’ Interview S. This was supported by Participant X: ‘it really depends on individuals’. Interviewee JJ added ‘at the end of the day, it depends on where the person is from, both in terms of geographically, the country, but also his or her past affiliation, if they worked for an organisation that was open and understands the value of Civil Society or they come from within a part of the UN where they didn’t interact that much. All of that came to bear on how responsive they were to us’.

Suggestions were made regarding hiring and employing UN staff: ‘the good thing is that many people have bridged both worlds they worked [in]. These people really are the ones who have no problem. For them it’s not a problem - this relationship. They can manage it because they come from both worlds. Sometimes individuals have been only in one area, only working in Civil Society or only work in the UN. There may be more difficulty to see the other point of view and to see the other value added. Mobility is a big solution for this problem. When you have people moved around usually, they manage to combine the two worlds much, much easier and make it work. They make it work; finding those individuals, empowering more individuals to drive that, can be also [be a] catalyst in my view’ Interview R.

Participant S added: ‘if people are going to work, particularly in decision-making positions in the UN headquarters, they should have country experience where working with Civil Society is the norm and nothing gets done without it’ Interview S.

Participant LL summaries core components of this theme: ‘capacity building of staff, as I said, it has to become part of the ethics institutions contained in transferred responsibilities’.

**Section Three: Eight New Themes – External Elements that Impact the Relationship**

**Theme Twenty-Two: Strong Leadership + Sound Values = Sought Solutions**

Three examples of frequently occurring findings highlight the importance of values-based, visionary leadership. The first example refers to a past Secretary General, Kofi Annan: ‘he was the first Secretary General that had rose up through the ranks of the UN before he was appointed as the Secretary General, but he was hugely a man of principle, of ethics, somebody who truly embodied the UNs mission and mandate and, I think, that really came across in how respected and admired he was by UN staff… for the first time in UN’s history, UN staff felt really, like a lot of pride, in the Secretary General and in the promise that the UN brings in terms of its mandate. So, I just think it’s very mixed after that. That’s one of the challenges that I would call out’ Interview F.

A second example illustrates this in a different context. Interviewee P explained that ‘in the middle of the accountability report was a change in Director… the initial Director thought it was fine to have this general mapping of Civil Society and that alone could be a contribution. The new Director saw Civil Society as organisations that were more advocacy focused, so smaller portion should be focussed on [them]’. This was concluded by saying, ‘the Director has a lot to do with the direction of the report’ Interview P.
A third example relates to ‘a year-and-a-half series of meetings that happened at the UN New York and may have happened in other places, but it was lead initially by the Ambassadors to the UN from Country F and Country G, who were both kind of different UN leaders, from what I’ve seen over the years. Not that they haven’t been a number of strong Ambassadors, but they were both really open to get ideas and engagement from others and not just other diplomatic colleagues… political leadership matters, having individuals who are willing to… lead to make a difference… the Ambassador of Country G had to go back to his country and the Ambassador of Country H stepped in and they just set up the whole thing in a process that looked and felt different. These were still meetings that were held in the UN, but they would invite outside guest speakers and engage… but also, together into a back and forth with the other diplomatic leaders who were in the room. And for some reason, we don’t really do that often, and it worked. If anything, it gave the sense to the outside world, [the] non-UN policymakers, that the UN was open to hear from them’ Interview AA.

Participant BB described the need for strong, visionary leadership: ‘for everything you need solid leadership… we would need solid leadership to define forward-looking vision… we gave it a lot of thought, how to make change happen in the UN. And the answer was very clear, you need solid leadership’.

It was remarked that leadership is found on a number of different levels, not just the top positions, and that strong, visionary leadership with high values is needed on all the levels and all sectors of society. Interviewee F described ‘the UN - it’s such an amorphous mass of organisations and entities and individuals and there are a lot of visionary leaders within it at a lot of different levels. We just need more visionary leaders like that in the UN. There are a lot of visionary leaders in Civil Society… I mean the UN is not a homogenous organisation, and Civil Society is not homogenous, and business is not homogenous. These are all very complicated sectors that are made up of multiple organisations and individuals, but that what it requires across all of the sectors is visionary leaders, and we’ve seen some of them that have stood out’.

Interviewee S added the importance of shared leadership: ‘and there needs to be leadership, the leadership can be shared between people, sometimes it can be a government organisation, sometimes it can be non-governmental organisation’.

Participant OO provided a different perspective: ‘if it’s one thing I have learned from mucking about multilateral spaces over years, that a lot of progress in particular issues often depends on one or two individual diplomats getting fired up about an issue and wanting to drive something forward’.

Theme Twenty-Three: Critical Criticisms
Comments that demonstrated the first area of critic, the lack of quality of engagement with CS, included: ‘one week of rich discussions [with CS] and then they go, nothing happens’ Interview II, and ‘there’s a lot of lip service’ Interview EE. Participant Z added: ‘high-level UN people who always make it a point, certainly when they’re talking to the NGO community, to thank the NGO community and to express gratitude and appreciation for what we do, but I wonder how much of that is
– there’s a lot of very positive rhetoric, but I don’t know how [or] if it translates into positive action’.

This inauthentic engagement with CS was also expressed through the intended working relationship with ECOSOC: ‘the main point being is we report to ECOSOC, which is a forum at which NGOs gather and where they are supposed to have their views recognised. And I would say, being fairly candid here, that there is a strong feeling that ECOSOC is ineffective and somewhat perilous. And it certainly doesn’t have equal status with the Security Council, you know for historic reasons. It’s a bit of a talking shop to be honest. But we report to the central body of it, so therefore it should be our relationship with Civil Society, it should be a place where we make our views felt and heard and get things done. And maybe theoretically we should get feedback from Civil Society, but actually the institution is flawed, in my opinion and some of my colleagues’ opinions. We report to it formally every year and yet nothing happens, to be honest, in that area. That’s probably another aspect of the Civil Society challenge… empowering ECOSOC, if this is the place where NGO’s are supposed to have their voice heard; it’s not powerful enough to be blunt. The site of a lot of politicking and this is not just an NGO thing, but it’s a lot of talking and a lot of lip service and a lot of resolutions, formal declarations, [and] negotiations between nation states but it’s not effective enough’ Interview E.

Participant R expressed the second area of critic and noted a deep concern that ‘in some parts of the UN the mentality is that Civil Society doesn’t exist. And I can tell you because I have been on that side’. Interviewee U provided an example: ‘the UN will have no problem to have a panel of experts. All of them have PhDs but have no clue of what living in poverty means and there will be no person with experience of poverty… true for disabilities… for indigenous issues… if they were talking about housing, for example, you won’t have homeless people in the panel… if you are talking about access to decent health, you won’t have people who have had members of their family die because they didn’t have the adequate access to health… I mean if we want to improve how Civil Society works at the UN, then we need to create spaces for those who are affected by the issues that we are addressing, to be heard at the UN, because they have the knowledge and experience that Member States are not going to hear from academics or from UN staff… it’s a service that Civil Society could give to the UN and it’s the same for refugees or migrants’.

The third area of critic was that of the lack of action: ‘overall the UN needs to be more practical, so a lot of times it’s just high lofty talk words and no action. There needs to be more action’ Interview DD, ‘the problem is that we’re language rich, but action poor’ Interview Y, and ‘be really nice if it’s not only about writing reports, but actually getting things done’ Interview GG. This lack of action has an impact on the relationship because ‘for Civil Society, I think they get frustrated sometimes that the UN doesn’t speak out in difficult situations’ Interview F.

One participant did acknowledge the importance of conversations, however that action was still needed, ‘you need action to it. You need people to focus on results. There will be many people who will disagree with me because they feel they need a platform at the UN to talk about issues, which [I] 100% agree with, but talk without action remains talk’ Interview II. Another perspective was provided by Participant Z:
people who criticise the UN and say, “It’s just a talking shop and it’s doesn’t really do anything”. I say that it is a talking shop, but it’s essential, because I think the world would be a much worse place if we didn’t have Member States representatives sitting together in rooms talking to each other’.

The next area of critic expressed in the data were comments around the disconnect the UN has with issues at the forefront: ‘it does not have the direct relationship with what the experience is like on the ground for people’ Interview K, ‘more solutions, more focus on what’s actually happening on the ground, in the fields, on the national level [and] regional level’ Interview DD, ‘the United Nations is perceived to be a bit remote and bit cumbersome’ Interview HH, and as very poignantly expressed by Participant GG ‘the local approach really matters… but the inability of those who are within the UN system to even sometimes take information, because they feel that it does not… it doesn’t reflect what their duties are. So, it’s just really frustrating and I say it’s frustrating because we lose people, basically people died because of that’.

This concern was further commented on: ‘did we do a good enough job for actual people in their countries’ Interview E. Participant K gives an example: ‘organisations in Country S, for example, tend to be quite jaded around the desire for international organisations and also for the UN to engage with them because they have done it many times before and they don’t see results from it for them. They don’t, there’s no reciprocal capacity-building. They give up in information and don’t get anything back or don’t see a change in the context that they’re working in’.

Interviewee GG described this further: ‘the communication is initiated and there is an open line when something from the UN is needed from the Civil Society, but it is really biased when it happens the other way around… and sharing of information which could actually save lives in some cases… many of our partners whom we work with are on the ground. They are the ones directly in contact with the people who need the protection… So, it’s really hard when the communication is only one way’.

A summary of this issue was provided by Participant E: ‘if you want [the] UN to be genuinely representative of the world’s peoples, then you need to go directly to Civil Society. It’s a matter of democratic accountability and representation’.

The fifth area demonstrates the remarks that came from the data that related to the bureaucracy of the UN and how that impacts the work and the relationship: ‘I mean for me it’s just bureaucracy. It’s just knowing who to speak to, when, and how to interface. That’s the challenge’ Interview HH, ‘people got frustrated with the duplication of UN institutions… you spend far much more time on administration and process, rather than substance’ Interview E, ‘the UN is a bloody bureaucracy, an accumulation of lost procedures… but this is the fragility of the UN, it’s bureaucracy and it’s stalling operations. The UN has far too much duplication, inefficiencies, it’s a real issue’ Interview BB, ‘you always imagine the UN just like one big house full of paper and nothing is really changing’ Interview CC, and ‘it’s very clumsy and… it’s not very agile’ Interview K.

However, Interviewee HH explained: ‘it’s dreadful, but one of the problems with the UN is it’s over governance and I don’t know how you get away from that. I don’t
have a solution for that because you require the governance, and governments all... are looking for different things and you've got to go through procedures'. Participant F supported this view: 'quite bureaucratic. It has a lot of processes, a lot of these are imposed by governments. Some of them are processes that the UN, as a public sector body, must have in terms of transparency of contracting, of hiring, of being accountable for the way it spends its money. There tends to be a lot of bureaucratic processes to make sure those are met’. The concern though is 'it's probably, honestly, getting worse and if you've talked to people that have been here their whole careers, they say that it's got worse, the bureaucracy and the duplication' Interview E.

Participant F also expressed the challenge: ‘a lot of those rules and bureaucratic procedures are in place because of the need for them but at the same time it slows the organisation down, a lot, and sometimes that is frustrating for Civil Society organisations. For business, it’s very frustrating because business moves very fast and the UN tends to be very slow’.

'I think a lot of the issues also come down to coordination, coordination is very difficult. It's hard enough for us to coordinate internally, so that's no easy task. And even Civil Society actors themselves find it difficult to coordinate amongst themselves, because they have their own competing demands and limitations as well... to diagnose the problem and say that effective partnerships is what's not working here' this comment from Participant X provided an overview of the sixth area of critic - lack of coordination. This participant continued to explain the issue: ‘sometimes it's not about the partnership, but there's instances where there are so many competing demands on a UN agency, in terms of donor governments, political considerations... partnerships are one element of many things that are being addressed at any given time. And so, depending on what a context or a situation is, one of those elements might be a stronger force than another element. No matter how much you try to, improve a partnership, if there's larger forces at work; there's only so far you're going to go with the partnership improvement, for example’.

The need for coordination was expressed in the interview with AA: ‘the UN itself needs to be more open to engagement and ideas from different sectors including business, including Civil Society’. However, there is a challenge to finding that solution. Participant HH shared: ‘I find anybody I've ever spoken to within the UN at different levels, and not only UN but in different agencies, have always been very open to us. It's been very positive conversations, always. But then the next step of how do we work together? It doesn't happen. I think that's partly due to the fact that the UN is big and administrative, and we are small and nimble... just after he finished being the UN General Secretary, I had dinner with him... his view of the world and my view of the world were completely aligned, but the challenge was we couldn't work out a way to work together. Similarly, at that kind of level, I met the CEO of UN Agency A and she was great. We had a similar conversation, even had meetings with some of her people within the UN Agency A and we could never work out how we could work together’.

Comments that demonstrated the view of the UN’s incompetence in terms of carrying out its purpose, the seventh area of critic, included: 'issues in the areas around genocide and where countries are not being held to account at the
international court of justice. Huge range of things where it seems weak’ Interview B, ‘meetings and conferences and traveling and a lot of resources being spent when the problem could have been resolved in a direct way and that’s just not beneficial. So, everyone along the way was kind of silent’ Interview GG, and ‘key people keep harping back to the Beijing agreement which was 25 years ago and that was 25 years ago. Why are people still wanting to achieve something that was agreed on 25 years ago? If that is the case, then this thing that we meet every year is absolutely and utterly failing if everyone keeps talking about this Beijing agreement. And people should be embarrassed at that, UN should be embarrassed about that’ Interview T.

This is having an impact on CS and its relationship with CS, whether it is those that are receiving or needing the support on the issues’ forefronts or CSOs that carry out the work. Interviewee PP explained, ‘there are other areas particularly in the political and security areas were actually the relationship is not great because Civil Society is rightly frustrated that the UN doesn’t address some problems with greater robustness’. Participant Q added: ‘the UN needs to demonstrate credibility and effectiveness’.

The eighth area of critic, that was found in the data, was in regard to the power struggles within the UN and how it has an effect on its work and its relationships: ‘a common mistake by many Secretary Generals, including Ban Ki-moon, [is] bringing his national people to the UN. [It] did a lot of damage to the meaning of civil servant. Just a little side note to show how the UN declined because every bloody, stupid Assistant Secretary General or Assistant General brings his national criteria with him. It’s disgusting in my view. It’s the end of multilateralism’ Interview BB. This view was supported by another participant: ‘look up who, what, [or] which nationalities the Under-Secretary General of each of those [are]... they’re bringing their own people... if you run it and you have the power, why would you want to give it up’ Interview E, and ‘Member States are free to really do whatever they want without any kind of sanction in the public eye’ Interview Z. An interesting perspective was provided by Participant G: ‘in a way you could argue that, that’s a problem with the relationship between the Member States and the UN, rather than the Civil Society and the UN’.

An explanation was provided by Interviewee PP: ‘in a strange kind of way, the UN, which is largely side-lined at the moment by the administrations in power around the world, that almost always leads to the people who would resist this. In a sense, looking the other way and ignoring the other things, for example, Country A administration. What goes on at the UN is hardly its highest priority and that would be the same for Country C [and] Country B, but they are never going to take their eyes off of what goes on in the Security Council. There is a perverse sort of grey area where there isn’t that much priority - to where there could probably be a period of quiet innovation and an improvement of the role of Civil Society and a sort of reinforcement of its voice in UN deliberations, precisely because the big powers don’t care that much about the UN at the moment’.

This was supported by Participant NN: ‘when people say that the UN is not doing this or the UN, look what a mess the UN has done with Country D. No, it’s not the UN, it’s the permanent members of the Security Council. I mean name names it’s
Country C and Country A that are the cause of Security Council failure. This is where the media and even NGOs, I mean this is where the UN is definitely silent because they cannot, they can only go so far. The Secretary General can only go so far, he can point out the abuses in Country D or what not. He has got to be very careful not to point the finger too directly or he will suffer the same fate as Boutros-Ghali, who was unceremoniously kicked out of a second term by a democratic president no less by Country A’. This participant remarked, when CS is criticising the UN, to be mindful of the roles Member States carry and the power they hold under the current system. Interviewee PP also acknowledged this: ‘Security Council can’t agree; no amount of Civil Society pressure in many cases can overcome that and so in that space, there is a certain often blindness on Civil Society’s part, on the constraints the UN is forced to operate under’.

Interviewee FF provided an example: ‘UN Agency F is an inter-governmental organisation. It was created by Member States that has intergovernmental mandate and with that comes the competition, the pros and cons of being in that space, including the fact of what determines the agenda. The agenda is often determined by Member States, but not all Member States are always open to engage with Civil Society at the kind of level that we would like them to. In fact, Civil Society is engaged with work across the world but in varying degrees. So, you have some countries where civil state is expanded to an extent where government relies deeply on the work of Civil Society. In other spaces, that work is restricted and so that plays out in the structures of the United Nations, in the intergovernmental organisations. Often you see what plays out in ways which can prove challenging and the work of UN Agency F has been to advocate for a strengthened environment between the UN and Civil Society to advance the agenda’. This claim was supported by Interviewee E: ‘the power games [in] particular countries - representatives of those countries [are] bending the agenda in their direction’.

This was noted by Participant GG in the field work: ‘I have heard something that is very common, which is they all feel that their hands are tied. There’s only so much that they, meaning the people who are working at different UN agencies, can actually do’.

There was an ask, from the interviewees, for the UN to not acquiesce to those powers so easily. This was demonstrated in the following excerpt from Participant F, ‘most likely, Civil Society would like the UN to change, they’d like it to be more open to Civil Society, they’d like it to be more open to be a stronger voice on human rights issues, and not to be so passive and to bow down to the will of governments. I would imagine that that’s one of the biggest criticisms of the UN by Civil Society’.

A summary of this critic was provided by Participant E and explained why there is a lack of reform, because of ‘entrenched interests of the prominent powers, they don’t need. It doesn’t need to change, from the perspective of the five permanent members of the Security Council, where power really lies, they don’t want change. It doesn’t need to because they are in control, they influence the whole thing in their own interests… the Secretariat itself is more or less divided among the permanent five members of [the] Security Council. Country B has DESA, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, I believe, Country E has humanitarian affairs, Country C, I think, has peacekeeping, Country T has food or something, and Country A is
pulling out, but used to run the UNDP [United Nations Development Programme],
until a while ago. So, they parcel it out amongst themselves, because they’re the
ones with the authority, the power and influence’.

**Theme Twenty-Four: Validating Virtues**
Participant W shared a comment: ‘Kofi Annan used to say that, if it wasn’t for United
Nations, you’ve got to be an optimist, so - I think that it’s true. There are a lot of
things that are very depressed about the state of the world and various
developments in it but there’s also an incredible number of dedicated and
imaginative people who are improving their lives and other people’s lives every day
and that it’s very important not to give up’.

One of the many virtues that was listed for the UN was an element of moving beyond
the self, the individual, the nation, it was the idea of the UN providing the concept of
one. A well-being for the whole of one. Participant S explained how ‘the only people
who are looking at the welfare of the world are the UN’. Interviewee J supported this
by stating that ‘the UN is one of the important leaders for change… is more
important than working in an individual country or working on a regional body’. Participant Y expressed this as well and asked for more of it by saying ‘the UN’s
ability to help people move beyond self and towards a collective approach, to looking
at a problem should be its greatest strength. But its ability to cultivate that, nurture
that invest in that form of leadership and facilitation at scale is still something that it
hasn’t quite managed to do to the best of its ability’.

As the world is moving in the direction it is, excerpts indicated how the UN is
needed even more: ‘things like climate change and anti-immigrant rhetoric, it’s [the
UN] really, really important. I strongly, strongly believe in the UN even more. It’s the
only body in the world like this and it’s super important. Some days I get scared that
it will be shut down by Country A government… I hope I’m wrong, fully wrong there;
but I really, really, really believe in this system. We need it more than ever, even if
it’s not perfect, we need this more than ever’ Interview DD.

This was supported with the comment that ‘it’s a totally necessary institution’
Interview K, and ‘we are at a point and time where human survival is the biggest
challenge, which the UN is there to safeguard - at its core’ Interview Y.

‘The longing for hope, for peace - it’s a very deep human aspiration; it’s arguably the
deepest or one of the deepest. It speaks to the emotions and anybody who has
experienced violence knows how important the absence of violence is for life, for
family, for... so that appeal of peace, I think, it will stay and it’s a good thing. That’s
why the spirit of the UN, the idea of the UN is still going so strong’ Interview BB.

Due to this expressed need for the work of the UN, there was a real cry for the ability
to rely more on it. ‘Fundamentally it’s great and it has done wonderful things, but it’s
not good enough and it needs a proper deep–seated look at how the UN could work
better’ Interview E.

The UN’s global perspective and its ability to set normative standards was highly
regarded and a seen as a necessity. Participant R explained what ‘normative means
setting developing consulting global standards of practice and policy. So, human right standards, standards in the various areas of well-being, health education... it means adopting conventions, treaties, discussing, updating those treaties to be in-line with the changing of times, proposing new ways of analysing and understanding how these norms are working in practice... that's what I see as the values of the UN, what they do well, and they should be concentrating their resources on... UN agencies... are so good at doing the normative work, which is not necessarily showing results immediately, but instead investing in improving the way these results are achieved over time and make a big difference'.

This is further explained: 'big normative agenda is about the consensus which means that there are no strong objections to a decision... normative agenda is when you establish international norm behaviour or procedure, or compliance and you have value driven norms and technical driven norms. For example... how we will sail around the world. This is how we will fly around the world. This is how we will administer pesticides... that's normative. It's not value driven... value driven is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights convention on the forms of the elimination of discriminating women, convention on the rights of a child... which is an expression of values, not so much of technical compliance but both types of norms are really important. And, let me tell you, the technical norms the UN does an incredibly good job... I would think the whole relationship between the UN's normative agenda and Civil Society has been very good over the years. Civil Societies had a huge impact on their normative agenda' Interview I.

Participant J provided some examples: 'we do have the SDGs. We do have the Beijing Platform for Action. We do have various conventions that governments have signed on to. The principles are getting promoted and those are being expanded, as we talked, in new areas that we hadn't thought about before. All that is very good'.

The setting of the SDGs in particular was seen as a hallmark of a good example of Civil Society and UN collaborative work, aside from some participants who commented on the lack of accountability that was incorporated into the SDG framework: 'they were discussing the review mechanisms and we started with accountability because this is what the real mechanism is about, but the word was banned' Interview U, and 'SDGs itself are a bit of a wishy-washy... we haven't really seen accountability' Interview R.

Besides the accountability piece that some mentioned, there was an overall consensus that the SDGs were a real high-level mark for the UN in terms of its collaboration and incorporation of CS. Participant AA shared how 'a survey went online, but [for] some countries where online didn’t work as well; UN leaders [then] went door-to-door to get the views of the average citizens on what they thought they needed to do to end extreme poverty and to have the most sustainable world... that survey ended up getting 8 million responses, that was very different for the UN - to say that an average citizen should have a voice in creating a policy agenda for the UN', 'the SDG indicators are a great example of progress for our work' Interview DD, 'they never said we don’t want Civil Society. Some Member States say that, but the Co-Chairs were very clear that throughout the process this was going to be an open process and they kept their promise and because there was no precedent about how to negotiate this... usually negotiations are closed, and they [SDG creation] were
not’ Interview U, ‘the SDGs were great examples of Civil Society’s involvement, where the NGOs came here to make sure that their concerns were reflected in the SDGs, so formal consultation and summits and high-level forums. That’s how things should be done’ Interview E, ‘for having worked for the UN for over 15 years, it was unprecedented levels of excitement for that project and part of [that] success was at least because so many people felt that they were part of the process and being able to contribute. That’s probably the best example’ Interview AA, ‘a great example is the 2030 Agenda. It was the most inclusive process in our experience as advocates in the UN for Civil Society. The multi stakeholder partnerships were so strong. We had a voice during all the negotiations and the open working group, the post 2015 negotiations. It was really well done and if you look at the 2030 Agenda it setup, you see a lot of reference to stakeholders, to different groups, to marginalised groups, and this was really a wonderful process’ Interview DD, and ‘I do think things are changing also with business and I think that the lead up to the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals in 2015 was a good example, where business was a key player. That was the first time that we saw that at a global level where… business was actually among the parties that were consulted in the development of the Sustainable Development Goals… and Civil Society similarly were hugely influential in the way that those goals were worded and framed’ Interview F.

It was often remarked that the SDGs are a place to build on: ‘the SDGs are calling for partnerships and collaboration and the efforts of everybody to be valued at the same… improving the relationship should be integral to implementing the SDGs’ Interview R, ‘what has worked really well is when different organisations have a common purpose. For example, working towards the SDGs has really been a good unifying theme across organisations. When everyone is at the table and there’s something that UN or government is driving, if it’s framed within the SDGs, then it’s easier to get everyone on board… SDGs is a really good honing beacon for allowing collaboration. Essentially, having a common language was one thing that has been working really well [and] that the UN has provided, that allows Civil Society to be engaged… [its] been profound so even just getting everyone around the table… lots of governments are using it as a focal [point] and that’s huge. The fact that there’s this international consensus and priority areas, even though it’s very broad… even just identifying how they should be worded… how it should be measured. It should definitely build onto the work that has already been done’ Interview A, and ‘Agenda 2030 and the SDG17 with partnerships is the key cornerstone to start building these partnerships. And I think it’s happening’ Interview KK.

‘However, my concern is that, what we’ve ended up with is an agenda which has the right vision in terms of the set of outcomes that we should be striving towards and the picture of what the world we might want should look like, but it doesn’t speak to what kind of system we need to help us get there’, this view was shared by Interviewee Y and expresses how the system to support international development is still needed.

Participant U shared that it is refreshing to see that ‘this agenda looks at all countries, no distinction… development was an issue of the south, of the developing countries… and now it is about poverty in all the countries, it is about access to justice and democracy and participation in all countries’.
Another virtue of the UN is its convening power: ‘core differentiating capacities is its convening power’ Interview PP, ‘the UN is playing a function of facilitating neutral conversation’ Interview KK, ‘the UN is a wonderful thing, a place where all countries come together, the dialogue is so important’ Interview D, ‘it is a good forum to discuss issues and if you didn’t have it, you would wonder, where would you have that exchange, where would you be able to talk to people, where would you come together and understand what the issues are, and also draw lines’ Interview J, ‘it’s the only place in the world where 193 agree to sit down’ Interview EE, ‘the near fact that everybody meets’ Interview T, and ‘somehow one has to bring together states and government which are sort of operating on varying preconceptions or ideas, on how the world should [be] run and everyone should work together and the challenges are as global as ever… we only have one [world]’ Interview W.

Participant K explained another virtue: ‘once the UN has committed to an engagement with Civil Society, it’s very good at following through with that in my experience’ and provided an example: ‘I’ve also been at one of those organisations where we have repeatedly been asked for our input and our participation is very facilitated. The expertise of that organisation is absolutely brilliant, and they work really closely with Civil Society grassroots organisations in all sorts of contexts’.

Another example was provided: ‘Civil Society did a significant job to make sure that everything was documented in terms of input from Member States, of concerns that came up, things like this, and really was kind of the vessel for creating that bridge to the General Assembly. One of the major pieces that was really important [was] to capture [the] great work done with Civil Society partners to engage children and young people themselves that had experience in care [and] to have input into these guidelines. This is huge. This was such a unique process, a process that resulted in a new section of the guidelines being introduced in terms of after-care [and] what happened [was] identifying what states’ responsibilities [are], what do children and young people need when they exit state care. And that was so huge! Children… wanted to have access to health care services… access to identification, things like this included. These are really significant pieces. That example is one that I sometimes pull from to talk about how we can all work together and why it is so important and why it is so beneficial. And, of course, the next step is implementation. But that is another conversation’ Interview M.

The work done by the UN was also seen as a virtue: ‘the range of work that it does is absolutely massive’ Interview B, ‘I think UN Agency F best kept secret is its work and I suspect it could be true of other agencies as well’ Interview N, ‘prior to 2000 it was rare for anyone to even acknowledge that they work with religious organisations… I think there are 20 entities of the UN that have representatives on this task force which is charged with working with religious NGOs around the world. The task force looks at not only how religious organisations can assist in providing services [and] humanitarian response, but also in terms of providing input into some policy discussions’ Interview JJ, and ‘there’s a lot more that’s working than isn’t working. Which is not to say that we shouldn’t be trying to improve what is working, of course we should. But I think that there’s a lot… I would say hands-down, there’s a lot that’s truthful, positive, jointly achieving, than not’ Interview X.

Participant N provided an example: ‘many countries when they’re coming through
conflict and really need to get stuff going, they turn to the UN because it is the organisation that is known and trusted to be able to deliver, and at least get things going. Maybe not perfect, but like when Country U for example in 2006 had a real problem with women disappearing in… in despair Country U government turned to what was then UN Agency C and asked them to go find out what was happening to women… and it was a very successful program’. Interviewee N further shared that ‘one of the things it’s [UN] very good at, is the steps of data collection’.

Further examples are provided. Interviewee E shared: ‘there are lots of really brilliant NGO and UN interactions. I was in… the biggest refugee camp in the world and it’s a massive success story… when the journalists have gone, and the dust settles, there’s this incredible camp set up by Country V NGOs, overseen by the UN and the international community. And [it is] seemingly, almost seamless relationship; I mean that’s because Country V has very good NGOs. The UN should be congratulated and applauded for overseeing it. It’s incredible, they’re on fragile land prone to mudslide, there’s a million traumatised victims. Also [there is] the climate change issue there, because the coast is eroding… so, you have these contemporary horrible issues going on in this dreadful situation, they’re doing the best they can. They’ve inoculated something like 95% of them against measles within a week or something like that, check it. Incredible stuff that’s been done really well, so it’s just a good example of UN collaboration’.

Participant X stated, ‘for example, our processes being too onerous and [so we are] asking [our] partners. They respond to us and then we adjust in turn, as much as we can, while still meeting our commitments to donors. For example, our due diligence. But there is a constant communication that is happening there and that will probably continue to be the case, where we listen, we adjust, we listen, we adjust… in my agency we try, as I said, [to] have even internally these types of consultations, reviews, with staff that are heavily involved in partnership work. But everyone’s involved in partnership work, this is a part of everybody’s [work]… everyone is in some way managing some kind of relationship with our partners, some aspect of that relationship’.

The following example demonstrated how the UN successfully brought business and CS together to impact needed change ‘in 2015, when the Paris Summit was being held on Climate Change, the UN took a much more open approach to ensure that Civil Society had a presence at the summit, at the forum. That was distinctive and that business also had a significant presence at the forum, which was distinctive. What we ended up with was a mutually reinforcing relationship between business and Civil Society and an ability for both to… provide investment signals, market signals as well as bottom line pressure for change, de-risking the political process and enabling political Europe to go farther in the process of deciding and designing the final agreement in terms of Paris climate agreement’ Interview Y.

In the area of human rights, the work done by the UN in regard to its relationship with CS was also regarded: ‘CEDAW, and other places, prior to big meetings, they have smaller meetings with Civil Society. It’s more informal and everyone can tell what they have… I think that’s one of the solutions, to meet [and] to have a working day before… not so much between the Member States, but more between organisers and Civil Society. So, the ones who will then create the meeting… they are trying to
make it better’ Interview CC.

Theme Twenty-Five: The Unwritten Rule Books
Participant DD shared: ‘there is an understanding that you don’t tweet in a closed meeting. There are these rules that you should follow and that sort of ruins our space a little bit… they’re unspoken… there’s like a list somewhere and nobody tells you… UN is an interesting piece. There’s no way to learn it, unless you’re in it and I’m still learning every day. I dress differently, I act differently, I speak differently in the UN… it’s more protocol. If I spoke the way I do at the UN outside the UN, I would probably come across [as] uppity… I had to say excellencies in my presentation, and you give thanks to everybody on the panel. It’s this very formal protocol which is sort of place and time that you have to do it, or it doesn’t look good if you don’t do it… one of my colleagues, I’m very lucky, she’s the former diplomat… she taught me initially how to read between the lines when a Member State says something, what did they actually really mean and protocol and everything on how we address certain things. That was the best learning ever and this was interesting. Recently I’ve been [in] negotiation… and the Country A senior administration, they do not have career diplomats. I don’t even know who they’re appointing and there’s turnover and you can tell because these people speaking aren’t… you can’t read between the lines. They say exactly what they mean and it’s jarring actually, because this isn’t the language you use at the UN. It is offensive and it is offending people in the room. It’s just really interesting to observe what’s happening and you see these horrid diplomats or whatever they are from Country A and it’s interesting. It ruins the whole room and you see first time ever; you see other diplomats laughing and making comments when Country A speaks… you would never have other Member States speaking or laughing while they spoke and now it’s in a very, it’s really embarrassing’.

Interviewee G expressed how when ‘new people [who are] going to CSW, where I say at the beginning, “Look, remember we are observers, we are not government. That means we have to be particularly careful, because if we don’t behave in accordance with the expectations, the rules and the norms, [and] it’s not all written down, we can be thrown out… you’re not allowed to protest and bring in banners and those kinds of things to the UN, so don’t do it.” But people still do; I saw some people trying to get in with a poster the other day, and I thought, for crying out loud, that’s not all right… behave like model NGOs are supposed to behave’. Participant DD supported this view: ‘there’s an expectation that if you are in the room with Civil Society, you are respectful and that was broken by one or two people or organisations. Sometimes when that happens, you might ruin the relationship and so, I think, some governments don’t want any Civil Society cause they don’t want any issues again’.

Theme Twenty-Six: From Coin to Compassion – Corporate Collaboration
Why this phenomenon exists is expressed by Participant Y: ‘political leaders are sometimes hesitant to be courageous in their decision-making because they’re concerned about the economic consequences… and the more you can broaden the business support for a decision, the more that political leaders might be willing to be more courageous in the decision-making… people care about jobs and they care about the economy and therefore if investors are sitting around the table, saying, if
you send the right market signals through your governance and political process and, for example, if you let us know that the global economy should phase out greenhouse gas emissions with a clear timeline of 2050, it gives us a clear enough market signal to then invest in the transition’. The interview with II further explained: ‘real sustainability comes in when people have jobs, when they can earn a living and provide for their families. They can send their children to school and they have a better IQ, they can learn better, they are healthier, they become a part of society rather than just rely on aid. So, I am very pleased to see that the SDGs are focused on that sustainability objective’.

Some participants reflected in their interviews the importance of the UN and CS working together with the private sector. Interviewee F explained that ‘it’s going to require business working together with Civil Society, governments, and the UN to solve the crisis that confronts humankind with climate change… there’s a lot of business leaders that are really championing the fight, they are even doing a lot to hold governments and the UN accountable… I think even more than the governments can hold businesses accountable... it’s essential for the survival of the planet and the species… I don’t think sustainable development can be achieved without business. The engagement of business is like the last frontier that needs to be crossed in terms of making the difference in the world... the planet, for its resources, and that can’t be changed without a fundamental change in business behaviour, in what drives business’. Participant FF supported this view ‘because in many spaces now the kind of financial clout [and] political clout, that the private sector yields, needs to be taken into account and needs to be brought into these coalition’s that we are talking about’.

A couple of examples were provided by Participant F: ‘in more recent years we’ve started to see even businesses having better standards than governments on issues like climate change. There were 30 companies that banded together to put pressure on, I think, for the Paris Climate Conference a few years ago to make governments agree, to come to agreement for tighter restrictions on businesses. In Country E you saw private sector coming together with Civil Society; business coming together with Civil Society to introduce a clause in the modern slavery act. That meant that business had to report on modern slavery in their supply chain, like trafficking, child labour, any issues like that. That was driven by a couple dozen companies; that is now an act in Country E law... business has the economic leverage and the power to really move people through its marketing prowess and its advertising prowess, let’s put that to good use’.

Another example was shared by Interviewee Y: ‘you also had the UN providing a platform for business to demonstrate solutions and a pathway for change around climate issues, similar to what the Montreal Protocol and the Ozone Depletion were on CFCs. There was a similar mobilisation of public pressure, followed by companies working in new refrigerants naturally. Many of these coalitions [were] being formed to demonstrate that there were technological solutions to phasing out the use of CFCs. And then that created the context within which a political agreement could be reached. When the UN is at its best, it has the ability to cultivate and partner with both business and Civil Society to create an environment which is enabling of political progress’.
‘All of this around public private partnerships and CSOs, Civil Society, NGOs, all of this needs a good open conversation. There should be [a] balance with regards to the key issue, being the corporate sectors right to enter and address issues, because they have money on the ground, or money in the UN, or money into what they want to achieve... if that does not always translate into the good of the people... then that would be an issue... that needs to be challenged. It is the key issue at the moment’ Interview EE. Participant F shared an example of that ‘we all have to take action every day. I see my colleagues throw away plastic every day. I do too, myself, because it’s so hard to do anything without plastic. I could go on and on’. The interview with LL referred to a financial responsibility that the private sector has: ‘it requires multip...le actors including practical engagement, it is even a responsibility for [the] private sector to fund [and] to engage in part of that’.

The findings, and through the action research methodology of applying my own professional experience, uncovered the furthering of social responsibility from CS (as discussed above in theme six) to the private sector, which is taking on more of a social responsibility role. The data highlighted this: ‘now you get into a space, where government’s tax are going down, charity receipts are actually going down... now what you’re starting to see, fascinatingly, is business starting to talk about CSR and genuine CSR, so not CSR as part of some PR [Public Relations] plan, but CSR in terms of what is the role of business in the community and we’re going to do a lot more in the community, because it’s good for our staff and good for the community around, wherever we have our offices or factories or wherever. They’ve moved into that space, where they [have] never really been before’ Interview RRR, and ‘it is like things are changing and where governments are failing, private sector is coming in and trying to say, let us put some patient capital to work’ Interview II. Although, it was evidenced in the interviews as being controversial if CSR is not aligned for the well-being of people and the planet but instead for self-serving and profit maximising purposes.

**Theme Twenty-Seven: The Necessity of Principled Purpose**

There was such a call for a rejuvenation, a renewal, a reminder as to why the UN was created: ‘we are in a moment where Country A, as well as most other countries, seem to have forgotten the founding vision of the UN... so that is why we feel the 75th anniversary is a very important moment to remind [us]... of World War II and its enormous sacrifices... people need to be reminded why the UN was created in the first place and how important it truly is. Without it, where will we be in five years time’ Interview NN, ‘it works when the UN is honest about its values. The blame is a little bit on the UN because it has become very politicised, to put it mildly. These days it’s even difficult to say human rights, some of the officials are shying away from that term, because they fear this could offend some of the populace who are among the most powerful shareholders of the organisation. Of course, NGOs sense that dishonesty, the political compromise. Then they no longer really buy into the value proposition’ Interview BB, ‘really [it has] to do with, how can we recognise each other as a human rights bearers with dignity and entitled to a dignified way of living. For me, that’s the driving force and that’s the change that’s needed’ Interview EE, ‘in a way, building a long-term relationship with Civil Society is an investment in time; it is a building of relationships, but also ensuring that you share common values and share common mission and vision’ Interview LL, and the ‘UN would need to go back to its foundational spirit and reconsider what its original mission statement was:
peace, development, and human rights. And then genuinely stand for it, genuinely, even if politically inconvenient. Then I’m sure, Civil Society all over the world would realign and become great advocates for the organisation everywhere. The UN is the beacon of hope and the UN brand is still going strong despite the fact that [there are] many political setbacks or failures. Why? Because it’s the initial proposition of the UN which still carries a lot of attraction. People like to believe in it for good reasons. The more the UN is making political compromises, the less attractive its current organisational operations are to Civil Society. I would say, if the UN were to genuinely reform and go back to its core missions, then there would be a huge outburst of Civil Society support all over the world, I’m pretty sure. I know it, because I’ve travelled all over the world and I used to see, not necessarily what the UN does, but what the UN stands for and that’s a big difference’ Interview BB.

The evidence for the need for the renewal and reminder of the core reason and purpose of the UN continues: ‘when the UN was set up, there were huge waves of empathy and sympathy for the outcome of the Second World War and to a certain extent the First World War, which meant that people wanted to see the establishment of human rights for all, people wanted to see a secure and peaceful world for everybody. They wanted to see the disarmament of so many countries. But over the years that… gets challenged.’ Interview B, ‘for the social contract to be redeveloped in a way that puts society back on track, but from a social perspective, and economic perspective, and an environmental perspective... with trust and values and mutual respect which are at the centre of that issue... and therefore, we need to be able to have a conversation at some point, some level around values and that’s why I think the most... some of the most interesting things that are happening right now, actually aren’t necessarily just among states, but the fact that we’ve got some of the world’s religions coming together, next year, to agree a friendship pact’ Interview Y, ‘it’s about going back to the Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Charter itself. [It] was a visionary document that outlined the United Nations having the good of humanity, of every person, as its focus’ Interview EE, ‘the core mission would need to be updated, that’s solid leadership. It’s very important because that gives the idea a new forward momentum... you need to basically go back to the core mission of the UN, because the strongest thing the UN has is its brand... the UN is based on ideas; peace is an idea, development is an idea, human rights are an idea. They’re all creations of our mind, we need to update that with the current setting... ultimately the UN would need to reform itself, I have no doubt in my mind. If the UN doesn’t reform itself and goes back to its core values and redefines the ways of engagement in alignment with how the world has changed today, it won’t happen on a big scale’ Interview BB, and ‘there are some ethical reasons related to the fact that our principles of operation, both of the UN and Civil Societies, are based on cooperation and partnerships. So, we cannot say that we are based on these things and then don’t do it’ Interview R.

The quality of the values of individuals and organisations is a necessity. This is expressed in the following excerpts: ‘you have oil companies and their foreign policy or their strategic policy influencing the foreign policy of entire nation states which then of course contributes to conflict, contributes to… kind of a dwarfing… a warping of some of the international norms and leadership that you need to address some of these problems’ Interview Y, ‘the essential of that is really the quality between people, you have to value them equally, no one is more important than
another. We need to have in any coordination body and ethos that everyone inside is equal and no one is more valuable than the other and that’s how good collaboration is achieved’ Interview S, ‘It’s lack of vision. It’s the fundamentals. It is like the Bible says people without vision perish. The clichés have utility. Can the United Nations really thrive without ethical national politicians?... but until you have national leaders that are confident, that are ethical, that are trustworthy, can be trusted and are honest, transparent, who uphold human rights, understand human rights... we are living in a moment where the international system is in desperate need of change, so unless rational discourse and enlightened leadership takes over, you’re going to have bad actors who will just destroy the place... we can’t just throw up our hands in despair we need to continue to operate and work together in a constructive manner. Citizens [should] do everything we can to ensure that we elect leaders at every level of government that are honest and will uphold democratic values and human rights practices. We need to continue what we are doing, but at the same time we need vision’ Interview NN, ‘challenge some of this lazy, passive, discourse being admitted by some of the more allied states around, “Oh, it is all just too much trouble.” Which is one of the most dangerous things I am hearing currently’ Interview OO, ‘at the core of the human condition, we perhaps have forgotten how to cultivate values in the individual that help us collectively navigate our future’ Interview Y, and ‘the political lack of willingness to support multilateralism and the emergence of populism and nationalism, that’s being quite frank. Country A doesn’t want a strong UN, Country B doesn’t necessarily want a strong UN; they are quite happy to have an insurance policy there, in case it’s needed you can go back to it... there’s been a decline of political willingness to engage globally, [a] general retreat from multilateralism. Very tragic, because the irony, of course, is that the world is ever more interdependent and global public goods are ever more important for humanity’s future. Yet, at the same time, leading governments are turning their backs on this agenda, very tragic.’ Interview BB. The challenge is ‘that everyone is not trying to achieve the same thing’ Interview C.

Participant KK provided an explanation as to why some issues receive more political support than others, which aligns with values: ‘health is a very tangible issue within the issues of development rate, and it is also very clear that whatever happens in one country, in terms of health, can affect neighbouring countries and globally. We’ve seen this with epidemics and so on. I mean even historically. That helps make the agency be very clear about their mandate. It is also very clear [of] the need for the internationality of it. That’s one thing, the issue at hand makes the organisation easier... it makes the operation and the measuring of impact very clear... that’s a huge factor that influences the effectiveness of a UN agency... the subject matter shapes the mandate and also the level of budget’. Interview X supported this view: ‘my agency has [it a] little bit easier because our mandate is less controversial, it makes it a lot harder for some of our sister agencies... working more directly on issues that are more sensitive’.

Interviewee BB expressed that ‘we live in a new world, we live in a new era, for the UN to stay relevant, it’s key that its values preposition is understood and how they do that, we need a fresh approach. We can learn from various well-known international figures which amazingly have put on major movements within short periods of time... we need to restore some kind of ethic or trust and that’s not there at the moment’. Interviewee M supported this view, ‘when the work is very clearly mission driven,
very clearly, Civil Society organisations when they came together to advocate that this partnership should be created, that it should be funded, that there was a need, that there was urgency... it is a really significant dynamic that they have created, and I think that has come from being very mission focused’.

*Theme Twenty-eight: The Ticking of Unavailable Time*

Participant F explained further ‘change is most urgent… not just to save the planet, but to help solve the other issues that are holding people in the world back from being the great place that it could be for everyone’. The interview with GG supported this view: ‘there is huge urgency. Yes, it has to be done like right now, on a daily basis and on all levels… and I’m sure that Member States, many of them feel the same, because they are also funding and contributing to the UN. They feel maybe the contributions that the UN can do at the local level, or at least the regional, could be a little bit more hands-on’.

Interview Q expressed why ‘there is an urgency because… the international human rights system will only work properly when we start to have a better approach in terms of Civil Society and states working together rather than the current situation. And we’re not going to achieve the SDGs and we are not going to establish this prevention framework unless we sort this out’. Participant B added: ‘absolutely [with] migration and conflict zones and the violence going on in the conflict zones; there’s a huge urgency on climate change where you’ve got the range of flooding’, in addition ‘also women’s human rights’ Interview V, ‘if we were to live for another couple hundred years, we would probably see this as a real period of change’ Interview HH, and ‘we still need a great sense of urgency’ Interview W.

The interview with GG noted: ‘it is not a matter of being critical, it’s a matter of improving these relations so we can better deliver the services that are needed… losing time may mean the difference between life and death. And I’ve had several examples of that’. Participant S added: ‘really changing how these problems are addressed and seeming to be urgent. The environment has to be seen to be in existential urgency’. Lastly, ‘we need to formulate something like this in the next 18 months. It needs to have a breakthrough… a breakthrough initiative, a breakthrough project basically’ Interview Y.

**Part 2**

**Presentation of Round 2 of Interviews**

**The Proposed Model for Reform**

The literature review uncovered three inherent flaws in the relationship of the UN and CS. This was concurred by the data from the first round of interviews. The eight themes that came from the findings of the literature review and first round of interviews unveiled one of the inherent flaws. As a researcher, reflecting on these eight themes, what does the data show to provide resolutions for them? The problem with taking each theme and trying to find a solution to it, created a worsening situation for another theme. A solution for one theme actually made another theme worse or intensified it. This presents one of the three inherent flaws.
It also provides insight as to why previous proposed reforms to date have not been able to achieve the reform that is needed.

A second inherent flaw is a predetermined imbalance in the relationship. When a UN document describes NGOs’ access as ‘privileges and obligations’ and ‘they can speak only when invited and are not participants in their own right’, then this provides evidence as to how imbalanced the relationship is. With an imbalance such as this, how can there be a healthy working relationship that's effective? The last quote comes from The Cardoso Report, which is still the most highly regarded document that was done by the UN on CS relationship, based on comments from the first round of interviews. However, it is now sixteen years old and it is still considered a main resource.

The third one inherent flaw is Member States vs the people and the people's concern, which is often now of a global nature as opposed to national. The Member States have a geographical boundary focus, whereas the people have global concerns; whether it is climate change, migration, terrorism, and so forth.

Therefore, in considering these inherent flaws, is the relationship between the UN and CS then even needed? Considering these eight themes of the relationship, considering these inherent flaws and the challenges with finding a proposed reform, do we even need this relationship? The data answered this interview question with a resounding yes.

The following are quotes from the first round of interviews exploring the answer to the question, is the relationship even needed. Interviewee LL: ‘if Civil Society is not engaged in a more systematic consistent way, then we will always not be utilising a big part of the power that we have to make these changes’, Interviewee PP: ‘the UN is in a period of decline in terms of its erosion of its authority and stature and influence in the world. A more dynamic relationship with Civil Society is… like a come-back strategy’, Interviewee S: ‘it’s not just a matter of need, it’s a matter of practical reality’, Interviewee N: ‘desperately so’, Interviewee D: ‘definitely, the relationship is needed’, and Interviewee G: ‘it’s needed from the point of view of the outcome’.

Based on these excerpts, and there were many more, this was a unified belief. The data showed that the relationship is needed and desperately needed. In continuing to build the argument, the relationship was further examined.

There was another unified belief that reform for the relationship was needed with absolute urgency. Additional highlights of further exploring the relationship included the expression of a great deal of resources being spent on discussing the relationship and dealing with its dynamics: ‘So I just, I get frustrated with having the same... every time pushing and pushing and pushing, but really do I still have to have a conversation with you about you not giving passes again’ Interview C. It was noted that ‘the fact that there’s a lot of potential and we’re losing time and try to figure out how to harness it’ Interview AA. In asking why the relationship needed to change, the replies included for better outcomes, ‘nothing’s going to happen without Civil Society’ Interview H, and ‘there’s no way you can implement this, the SDGs, without Civil Society’ Interview V. When asked what would happen if nothing
changed in regard to the UN and CS relationship: ‘there will be more suffering, inequality, racism, refugees...’ Interview L. This is a very strong quote and really identifies the necessity and value of the UN.

The argument leads us subsequently to exploring and understanding the virtues and the value of the UN further. Participant W explained, ‘it’s very important and I think it’s often said that if it didn’t exist, we would have to invent it’. The UN is the body that sets international normative standards. This was a highly regarded piece of value the UN contributes and was expressed by interviewees in the first round of interviews. It is also the body that brings governments together for international dialogue. It is looked to for hope. It has utmost importance to global contribution for peace and prosperity. Interviewee MM shared that the ‘UN should be seen more as a facilitator and enabler of these bodies, than the UN doing the job itself’. In general, there were a lot of success stories shared where the UN was indispensable (see Part 1 of this Chapter).

Participant W continued to express the virtues of the UN: ‘we do need the UN; we do need a global multilateral system’. The UN’s convening power is noted as highly valued and necessary. In addition, it is needed for ‘pressing global issues that cannot be solved on national levels’ Interview PP. Often the UN is criticised for not holding governments accountable. However, the research showed that actually is not the case. Although the UN may not directly employ staff to do so, there are mechanisms that do. This was expressed by Interviewee J: ‘it’s one place where you can hold governments accountable... we do have various conventions that governments have signed on to so... governments went very much before treaty bodies and so they would look at what their obligations were under the convention... and you’d have a group of experts, the treaty body, who would be effectively telling the government that it needs to pull up its socks’.

When this was shared in the second interview, many participants nodded their heads in agreement and added other mechanisms, such as backroom discussions, where government accountability does happen. This is a critical point that arose from the research; that the UN is often criticized for, as it is often not acknowledged that the UN does hold governments accountable. Albeit, it is often remarked how much more this needs to be done. Therefore, the data showed this as a virtue of the UN, and it needs to do this even more so

The SDGs are seen as a highly regarded piece of work carried out by the UN. It is seen by everyone has a strong positive example of the UN and CS working relationship. The SDGs provided a common global language for development. Evidence of its success is seen by how they have been implemented in so many parts of the world. The SDGs brought unifying themes to all actors: CS, Member States, the UN and its agencies. They are so strongly regarded that they are seen as a place where further success can be built on. In addition, the SDGs have now become the landmark and that reform for the relationship between the UN and CS is needed to achieve the goals.

There was a summary of values of the UN’s identity presented in round two of the interviews. There is a lack of understanding what the UN actually is and what it does. Although the UN has an extremely strong brand, clarity is needed about what
it is and what it does. In addition, communication about the UN successes is required. For example, the SDGs are sometimes known not to be born from the UN, yet this was acknowledged by all participants as an excellent example of the UN and its relationship with CS (albeit more could have been done around accountability). There are huge expectations of the UN because it is the peoples’ hope. As an example, regarding climate change, people look to the UN for the solution. People look to the UN to answer global and national issues. People need the UN to be everything it can be. As Participant BB described, ‘The UN is the beacon of hope’. Peoples’ expectations of its output is demanding.

In exploring the identity further, not just with the UN but also with CS, there was a lot of data around the need for defining the roles between the two bodies. Frequently, the data expressed the lack of clarity as to who is responsible for what between the UN and CS. This diminishes the opportunity for each body to focus on what they do best. Both bodies clearly have their expertise, but due to the blurring of identity, there is perceived lack of success. Being competitors for the same funding is one example. Therefore, it is critical to define who is responsible for what. The blurring of identity of what the UN actually is and does puts a veil over quite how indispensable it is. With clearly defined roles, it sets up the UN and CS for success because they can focus on what they do best. Interviewee MM expressed: ‘establishing complementarities between the UN and Civil Society and defining the responsibilities that can be undertaken by the UN and also by Civil Society’. This issue was captured succinctly by Participant D: ‘no one knows who is doing what’. A 2nd Charter would provide the opportunity for clarity of defined roles of responsibilities for the two bodies.

This moved the presentation to unfolding the arguments specifically for the 2nd Charter and exploring it in more detail.

No longer potentially would it be an issue that ‘the international system is in desperate need of change’ Interview NN. A 2nd Charter provides the opportunity for that change through a CSUN. In the research words like system, process, and structure kept on repeating themselves. There was a real need for that to be a part of the solution.

No longer potentially would it be an issue of having ‘too many NGOs’ Interview BB and ‘they got loads of different views’ Interview E. A CSUN offers a collective voice because of a combined platform to work from. This does not mean that they all need to agree, it does not need to be a unified voice, but it does provide the means for a collected voice.

Here is an example of why a collected voice is important. When the literature review was being conducted, the ECOSOC Committee on NGOs sent out invitations to UN accredited NGOs, to provide feedback on the current working relationship between the UN and accredited NGOs in January of 2018. Feedback was to be submitted for the discussion meeting that was held in June of 2018. The research showed that no actions came from this meeting because there were too many voices. There was a lack of clear, collected voice by NGOs in order to take forward specific changes.
No longer potentially would it be an issue that CS is not taken seriously and seen as an afterthought. With a 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter, they would be elevated to the same level. Not all Member States are going to feel comfortable with the statement just made. However, this is envisioned much like the current Charter, where only 51 Member States originally signed the document. This has now grown to 193 countries.

No longer potentially would it be an issue that ‘inclusivity is a challenge, so making sure everyone is at the table’ Interview A. A CSUN offers all of CS to come together under one platform, should they choose to do so. It is difficult to be able to see who is missing at the ‘table’ when work is being carried out in silos. Due to the CSUN platform, clarity is provided about who is absent. It is much easier to identify who is missing when there is collaborative work as opposed to working in silos.

No longer potentially would it be an issue that ‘the challenges are often structure’ Interview FF and that there is no clear path between the UN and CS for communication, engagement, and knowledge transfer. A CSUN has the potential to provide that clear path and bridge between the UN and CS, it has the capacity to provide the answer to ‘the solutions are largely structural’ Interview LL.

No longer potentially would it be an issue of ‘duplication and inefficiencies’ Interview II. An example, would be shared knowledge transfer, including institutional knowledge transfer: ‘the sharing of information for sharing products and materials, sharing data this is a really big one, this is going to be you know, will continue to become a bigger topic. It is really difficult sometimes to share information and share data without having these structures for how we work together put into place’ Interview M. Another point is that due to combined work, there is an uncovering of gaps that need to be filled, as opposed to duplicating efforts of known areas. A CSUN enhances communication between both the UN and CS and between CS themselves. The concept of overlap is no longer potentially the UN's concern but stays in the hands of CS. A CSUN is the platform that can provide the ability to see more clearly where the gaps are and also where the duplications reside.

No longer potentially would it be an issue that ‘the UN has no mandate for Civil Society’ Interview II or that ‘there are still rules about Civil Society accountability and legitimacy that have to be addressed’ Interview PP. This can now be self-governed by CS itself under the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter. A 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter has the potential to provide the regulatory requirements.

No longer potentially would it be an issue that ‘all [donors] have their own different reporting requirements, complex, so [there has to be]… infrastructure first to apply for the grant, to keep track of the grant and report on it’ Interview II. A 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter can address ‘a multilateral system also has to be simplified to have streamlined approach for grant applications, for grant making, for grant management’ Interview II. Essentially, a 2\textsuperscript{nd} Charter could provide the opportunity for streamlining a number of different elements for a more efficient system to further enable effective development.

No longer potentially would it be an issue of ‘stepping on each other’ Interview II. A CSUN can provide the opportunity for synergies to be built.
No longer potentially would it be an issue that a ‘challenge is that Civil Society is not a homogenous entity, you have international NGOs, you have national NGOs, and then you have Civil Society at a very local level. And how the UN system engages with each of these is not necessarily on an equal basis’ Interview LL. A CSUN offers international NGOs to work with the international CSUN. National NGOs work with the national CSUN body. CSUN collates the CS voice and is able to more easily identify the unheard voice. The UN has a one-stop shop to connect with CS. The UN and CS can now engage on an equal basis with clear structures and pathways for communication and engagement.

No longer potentially would it be an issue of wasted resources on trying to figure out a process or system: ‘Civil Societies are always trying to do is figure out ways to collaborate and the big word is coordination. How do we coordinate, how do we coordinate, we spend so much more time talking about how we coordinate that we’re not coordinating’ Interview C. With a CSUN, resources can be saved by collaborating under a unified platform. There is opportunity to build synergies amongst CS and the UN due to the unified working platform. CS can work strategically and proactively together and build synergies with the UN and each other.

No longer potentially would it be an issue with the existing Charter’s limitations on the CS and UN relationship: ‘no one wants to reopen the Charter. So, there is that issue. It remains a constraint’ Interview PP (although some do want to rewrite the 1st Charter). However, a 2nd Charter could provide the solution.

‘We should encourage the UN to provide the enabling platform for [Civil Society] collaboration, that is the first step’ Interview II.

The presentation did include a couple of slides on the importance of in-country CSUN bodies. The slides were only shown and not talked about in detail, due to time restrictions. It was included to demonstrate that there was a great deal of evidence on this necessity.

Towards the end of the presentation, the concept of the UN as a mediator, the honest broker, was presented. The data showed that a strong suit of the UN is its ability to be a conduit, a mediator or an honest broker, between government and CS. A number of participants expressed this: ‘sometimes Civil Society doesn’t want to work with government because they don’t want to be seen as partnering with government because they see their role as being critical and trying to push government to do more. So, it’s not always to their advantage to be seen as partnering with government’ Interview C, ‘they [some governments] will say, you have no right to tell us. Some governments run the risk of losing their power of some leaders so they will never acquiesce to that kind of thing [listening to CS] Interview II, and sometimes national governments are willing to take a smart idea about micro finance or nutrition from the UN rather than directly from their own local Civil Society’ Interview PP.

The honest broker, mediator role, can also be beneficial in other situations that will enhance development and pull out the highlights of the UN and CS relationship. For example: ‘in a country where free speech isn’t necessarily encouraged there are
concerns with people actually voicing opposition to a government, especially in an international forum’ Interview C, and ‘you don’t want governments cherry picking their own [NGOs] because then you get corruption’ Interview N. The UN can enact its mediator roles in these circumstances. Essentially, ‘there is a status and a sort of assurance which the UN can provide’ Interview PP. A 2nd Charter for a CSUN could enhance the crucial role of the UN as an honest broker.

In closing the presentation: ‘it [the relationship between the UN and CS] needs to change if we are going to see the full realisation of human rights… and certainly, the sustainability and survival of our planet. There is quite a lot of urgency and it sounds dramatic to say it like this but it’s actually not’ Interview M.

We need the UN to be more, because it is our collective hope, it is our beacon of light and so I invite us to consider the 2nd Charter of the United Nations.

At this point, the questions for Round 2 of the interviews began (see appendix for the list of questions).

Part 3
Findings of Round 2 of Interviews

Section Two: Findings in Relation to the Literature Review and First Round of Interviews – The Three Inherent Flaws and Twenty-Eight Themes

Inherent Flaw One: Member States vs ‘The Peoples’
The current Charter states “We the Peoples”, however, this flaw of the relationship indicates this to be a challenge and often a contrast with Member States. A personal account is given: ‘I’m also treated differently… I’m told much more, and I’m included much more than when they see me as Civil Society. And I get much more of the real picture. And it’s not always pleasant, I should say. I’m a little more cynical, probably than most people because of what I’m seeing… there’s a lot that happens that isn’t so wonderful… [that gets] shared with me more and that wouldn’t be shared if I was a Civil Society person, and they do distinguish the difference’ Interview PPP.

In another interview it was remarked that ‘it’s like a different planet, what people say in the UN and what Civil Society is saying’ Interview ZZ.

This excerpt indicated the proposal may be a potential solution: ‘that’s why like a 2nd Charter space where Civil Society is sitting at a table with governments, [it] may be more meaningful, the intervention may be more meaningful’ Interview TTT.

Inherent Flaw Two: Intrinsic Contradictions of the Relationship
The second flaw relates to the initial eight themes contradicting with each other. The second round of interviews again recognised those themes in the relationship, therein, substantiating this flaw again.

Inherent Flaw Three: Predetermined Imbalance in the Relationship
It is often remarked on the predetermined imbalance of power in the relationship, with the UN holding more of the power than CS. Again, this flaw was recognised in
this set of interviews. The following comment reflects this: ‘the Secretariat is very clear. They say we are working for the UN… everything we do is for Member States, they are the priority and they have the say, so the UN is definitely owned by the Member States. That is very, very, very clear… we are the privileged observers and we can participate in Civil Society, but we are not that equal to the Member States… that’s the reality. I’m not saying what I want, I’m saying that’s the reality… the Secretariat and Civil Society are sort of a lesser bodies… so, if you were a Member State, you would be treated much more nicer than you would as someone coming in from Civil Society’ Interview PPP.

The pre-determined imbalance can be seen not just with CS and UN but Member States within UN as well: ‘the fact that the UN gives a veto power to five countries… I know it [the UN] is the only place for multilateral conversations, but it’s a very limited one. And while these subspaces are not ready to renegotiate the way it was created and the way it works, there is a big flaw’ Interview HHH.

**Theme One: Its Heartbeat & Breath - The UN Needs CS/NGOs for Validity and Credibility**

The following remark relates not only to the UN’s need for NGOs but also relates to theme six in regards to CSs’ contributions to the UN: ‘over the years that I’ve been working internationally and the UN, I have seen not just a shrinking of Civil Society space but also diminishing in the value of anything that comes out of the UN because it has lost that input from Civil Society, which gives it the vital information… it’s Civil Society that can describe the realities of the people of the world’ Interview ZZ.

**Theme Two: The Passionate Professional Partners – CS/NGOs Want to be Involved**

This comment indicates CS wants to be more integrated into the current structure and organised in a more inclusive fashion: ‘another thought is how much opportunity would there be to push back against the ultimate silos that has been created out of the current operations of the UN around peace, security, development and various other issues that don’t always have a very strong conversation with each other in terms of how Member States engage, and how could the 2nd Charter push back against those silos and organise in a way that is much more holistic’ Interview YY.

**Theme Three: The Moving Maze – CS/NGOs Have Restricted Influence and Complicated Access**

Having restricted influence and complicated access continued in the evidence and is explored further in section three under the various questions that were explored. However, this remark indicated that this dynamic was intensifying: ‘outside trying to get in there [UN], it’s worse than it ever was’ Interview ZZ.

The cause of the issue was poignantly identified: ‘those who need to make the decision to open the door for more dialogue, are those who have more power and people don’t want to relinquish their power, it’s as simple as that’ Interview TTT. This comment also relates to theme seven, regarding the resistance to releasing or sharing power.

**Theme Four: The Heavy Door to Open - The UN Needs to do More to Involve CS/NGOs**
The following comment indicates that the UN’s Secretary General also recognises the need to involve CS more: ‘we need this kind of research and analysis as we move forward and 2020 is a year of reflection. The Secretary General wants that, he wants to listen, he said that this is a listening year. We want to hear from people from around the world in terms of what the UN needs to do. So, this is very timely’ Interview SSS. The hope is: ‘really [to] empower Civil Society’ Interview MMM.

In another interview it was noted the importance of building acceptance for the 2nd Charter from Member States in order to work together on key issues: ‘build up a whole lot of allies on this from governments who understand it, because the issues that we’re dealing with now, global issues, they’re to do with climate change, they’re to do with migration, they’re to do with terrorism, they’re to do with the increasing gap between the rich and the poor, between the poverty and inequality - that fuel leads to conflict… there’s lots that we have to do, that’s really urgent, it’s really urgent and there’s not that much time. So, we’ve got to start working as soon as possible’ Interview ZZ.

What is being done by the UN to connect with CS, often lacks real authenticity of interaction: ‘I think your 2nd Charter will work because what tends to happen with creating bits that are dedicated to Civil Society [for example,] if you have a UN agency… you have a division that is supposed to deal with us [CS]… each agency has one place that it has to deal with the NGOs and Civil Society. Usually that division tends to be a tick on the box sort of thing and gets very, very little budget. It’s not efficient’ Interview TTT. The phrase ‘tick on the box’ was very commonly used throughout the research by participants.

Two of these comments also touch on theme 28 relating to time, the urgency for UN and CS relationship reform.

**Theme Five: From Trojan Horse to Too Influential - Negative Reasons to Involving CS/NGOs**

Accountability continued to be a major point for all actors. Regarding the presentation:

‘I’d really love the points around accountability. I think it’s so, so true. And a lot of the work that we do is also around how to use these spaces by multilateral fora to strengthen accountability’ Interview YY.

The following remark was made in terms of government accountability and brings it back to the proposed model how it can improve the current system: ‘they [government] will stand up for example, at the conference of states parties to the arms trade treaty. They will talk about the assistance that they give in technical assistance [and] financial assistance to other states but won’t report so much on the issues within their own national structures. Then they expect states from the global south to stand up and report on their own problems. This sort of setup would strengthen the accountability of donor governments to their own Civil Society who are questioning what’s going on with them, rather than letting them dictate the terms of the conversation’ Interview YY.

Representation is another component to this theme that also came up strongly in the evidence, which will be further reflected on in section three. The following comment
relates to that and theme 11 around the necessity of inclusion: ‘if it [the 2nd Charter] could be conceived of in a way that was truly… much more representative of Civil Society and found a way to collect information, rotate membership frequently or feed in information that was then analysed… how do you represent them? How do you make sure you’ve got their voices, their information, their knowledge, and their experience? How are you representing that to other people? If a structure could be found to make a change in the way we look at [true representation], rather than of recreating the structure that embeds a way that isn’t that representative, that could really [be] the way to go. Then use it as a stepping-stone to have more radical change with other places as well’ Interview XX.

**Theme Six: Bridges of Lifeline – CS/NGO Contributions to UN Activities**
It continued to be acknowledged that CS contributions to UN work is imperative to the point that reputational risk is at hand if the relationship cannot work more closely together to achieve the UN goals. This was remarked by the following comment: ‘but you know that they’re [SDGs] not being achieved quickly enough. And we’re approaching the final 10 years of the SDGs. So, I think this is a reputational risk for the UN. And the UN needs to be empowering all of the different actors that are needed to achieve the SDGs and figure out a way to be a better platform for partnerships for their achievement’ Interview MMM.

**Theme Seven: The Power of Power - Resistance to CS/NGO Involvement**
The resistance of releasing or sharing of power by Member States was identified again and is acknowledged as a major challenge for the UN and CS relationship reform. This participant highlights the issue by stating, ‘Civil Society is [a] very, very political issue… Civil Society in many countries is seen as the enemy because they question the authoritarianism of the government and the lack of democracy and all kinds of different things’ Interview UU and further acknowledged, ‘I would say the most difficult will be the representative states… that are quite suspicious of Civil Society’ Interview YYY, and ‘you’re gonna have a lot of governments that are going to say no, no’ Interview TT.

However, ‘there will be some governments who will hate this idea, of course, but if you have a core group of governments that stand for the idea. Whether they’re officially endorsing it or some other way of showing their support, I think that that could be one of the legitimizing forces. There are certainly some governments who are vocal proponents of Civil Society already, so there’s a good base to start from’ Interview MMM.

A reverse perspective on power is provided in the following comment: ‘I think that they [government] don’t get to sit at the table if they don’t take active measures to engage with Civil Society’ Interview AAA.

One participant asked for a solution in the interim, a balance of power on representation in the ECOSOC NGO Committee, which makes decisions on NGOs receiving consultative status with the UN: ‘there’s a group of Member States that now have the authority to review CSO applications to ECOSOC. It would be great in the interim if there could be a balance, a more clear balance in terms of which Member States are part of that committee… in the interim, it might be interesting to see if there’s any reform that could happen with that committee’ Interview TT.
Theme Eight: The Paradoxical Situation - Resources

Issues around donors was raised again: ‘the UN’s delivery has been influenced by donors coming in, problem-specific donors coming in, and that is a major problem with the UN system’ Interview FFF.

The proposal provided a potential solution on this issue. Feedback was provided on that idea: ‘one of your points was touching on the idea of funding. I think with more streamlining, we could save a lot of money that is presently being duplicated, the wheel keeps being reinvented time and time again. I’m cautiously optimistic that this alternative solution, you’re putting forward, would allow us to have a new lens on how access, how other Civil Society groups access the UN. Who pays, how’s it done, how [and] where the funding streams are coming from’ Interview AAA. This was supported by other participants: ‘it’s difficult because they’re all applying for the same grant. So, they’re all against each other… it’s definitely making sense [the 2nd Charter]’ Interview GGG, ‘some of the ideas around pulling resources and finding ways to better direct resources to organisations based on their strengths. And to try to avoid overlap [of] what people do and some of that unnecessary competition. For me, that’s also really important. Finding a better system for that should definitely be available. I think that the behaviour of funders contributes to a lot of this sometimes’ Interview MMM.

The idea is further developed for cross issue investing: ‘collective fund pots to do them thematically, potentially relating back to the SDGs… but also keeping in mind the need to be conscious of silos because some of the effective… interventions are looking at the intersection of issues, not just one issue versus another. There’s evidence that sometimes shows gains on one issue come from investments made in another issue… cross issue investing opportunities that could be set up for not just governments, but foundations and others. Another area where we’re seeing people pull resources to try to do more together and try to be more collaborative is also in philanthropy’ Interview MMM.

Section three below discusses further the main resource requirement of funding for the proposed idea.

Theme Nine: Required Infrastructural Backbone – Structure, System, and Process

The need for structural change was raised again and is further discussed below in section three. It was often acknowledged that the current challenge is ‘structural exclusion’ Interview HHH.

The following remark shows how the research helped identified this need: ‘among Civil Society, we spend a lot of time [in] saying we should work together. But maybe the research is showing that the process or the structure is not there to enable us to work together’ Interview QQQ. The need for a better process was commented on: ‘Civil Society now is really fractured on lots of different levels. And I’m not sure how you can get to a process where people feel fairly represented in a body. You need to bring a lot of those people together. There needs to be a process of doing that.’ Interview XX.
The necessity for a better structure would also create more effective results in-country, which relates to theme 16: ‘in CEDAW, I haven’t got the exact wording on the tip of my tongue, I’m sorry, but they do say something like without national mechanisms, you cannot, do not have the methodologies to implement what it is that you’re trying to implement. That’s huge, that’s my area. That’s why I’m always talking about mechanisms. They’re there. They’re the most important area because why, how, can you talk about poverty eradication, if you don’t have the mechanisms and the methodologies that are actually going to enable you to meet these goals and these targets that you’re setting’ Interview VV.

Regarding the proposed reform, the importance of having a structured main headquarters was noted: ‘it’s helpful to have a headquarters just to be the final stamp, when someone needs to do the collective voice… there are benefits to having headquarters supporting your country programme’ Interview RR.

**Theme Ten: Clarity Creates Cohesion - Defining the Roles**

This theme was again highlighted as a major topic in the second round of interviews.

One participant began to see the definition of the UN and CS more clearly emerge with the proposed reform: ‘because we people around the UN sometimes say that there [are] two UN’s already. There’s the UN staff of people who are out in the field… then there’s the UN, that’s the governments of the UN, that are in control of the budget and how everything works. So now in a way, this to me, becomes like a third UN, a UN Civil Society… so that puts this idea of a 2nd UN Charter on an equal footing from the start’ Interview MMM.

Numerous comments were made on calling for the need to define who CS is: ‘one of the puzzles in life is getting a handle on describing what is an NGO and what qualifies as an NGO’ Interview NNN, and ‘who is a Civil Society? Some of the points you make towards the end of that presentation about [CS], some don’t want to be associated with government because they want to be, feel absolutely empowered to say what they want. They’re not influenced by government… we need to define… what is Civil Society’ Interview RRR. This last comment also relates to the theme 15 on the honesty broker.

**Theme Eleven: Exclusion is Frustration For All Including the Included - Inclusion**

Inclusion continues to be another major topic and the absolute necessity to ensure the UN and CS relationship reform does not achieve the opposite: ‘the downside is, it [the 2nd Charter] could also be an exclusion process… that’s the nice thing about a lot of interesting relationships between NGOs, they have this kind of non-status. I could imagine that setting up something separate could be a way for the marginalisation’ Interview BBB, and ‘we are part of the people who work with homeless people. They are the poorest and most excluded people in society. But these people have no voice… and there were rules and roles and so how do we make sure that that doesn’t happen in this situation… they [marginalised people] have to be part of the process of the thinking, because they are, and I don’t say it’s easy… the UN has zero, I worked at the UN for seven years, zero knowledge on how to include these people. And when I say zero knowledge, I mean, it’s worse than zero knowledge because they think they know how to do it. They don’t know how to do it’ Interview HHH.
The topic of inclusion brought up the concept of being qualified to be included: ‘the inclusiveness of Civil Society, and I like the idea that okay, well, you have structure that provides opportunities for international and other Civil Society organizations to engage at the level that they’re interested in right now. The question would be on inclusiveness. Like what are the requirements for inclusion into this practice?... The other thing would be trying to figure out what are appropriate qualification standards for being included in this’ Interview CCC, and ‘right now with how the structures stand it’s really hard for young people to be heard... child led organisations that are up and running and operational they might not be legal entities. So, we’d have to see how we can still bring those voices in? We may need to have an umbrella organisation that is the recipient of all of those different views’ Interview TT.

The following comment provides insight as to why inclusion currently is not happening: ‘leave no one behind, you really need to reach the furthest behind first... you have people that are closer to the poverty line and people that are very far away. And so, if the goal is to reach 50 people, 50% out of the poverty line, you’re going to start with those that who are easier to reach’ Interview HHH.

**Theme Twelve: Play Leads to Meaningful Action - Social Requirements**

Although this theme did not reappear in the second round of interviews, it could be easily argued that it indirectly did in the sense that the purpose for the requirement of social interactions was to provide a means for dialogue. This is more robustly covered under theme 17, which did have extensive supportive data from this second round of interviews (see theme 17 in this part of Chapter 4).

**Theme Thirteen: Restructure for Imperative Prevention - Conflict and Human Rights**

Conflict and human rights was brought up again. This first quote links human rights to theme 15, the honest broker: ‘in human rights the UN… it’s not an honest broker. If you look at the situation in Country EE… several hundred thousand civilians were killed. The UN was totally ineffective. Why was it ineffective? It was ineffective because Country B was able to veto anything from the 38th floor, which would criticise that - the Country EE government. And they were commercial. There was strategic commercial... so, there the UN in human rights, the UN isn’t an honest broker. Not at all. Most governments are shameful in their behaviour in certain kinds of situations. Not all, there are very good examples were that is not the case’ Interview WW. This excerpt also highlights the frustration with the UN when not providing the honest broker role.

Deeper insight is provided in this comment. It identifies the necessity of training, to bring in their voice and the importance of this to prevent conflict: ‘every society has a group. I am calling it a group and it’s not a group, because they never have the possibility to come together, to think [of] themselves as a group. People that don’t succeed - living in Country A is obsessed with success, so the “losers” of our society, the ones that are unable, that never had the possibility to hold the job... we dehumanise them so that you can treat them like that. Otherwise, as human beings, we couldn’t treat them like that... and how do you train them or build the capacity so that they can build collective knowledge? Because individual knowledge is not enough. You really need to bring the knowledge of the community of a group of people to be validated the same way as academia, build knowledge collectively... if
they were to participate in this process, then they will need the training… those that were unable to be a part of the system, those that know that the system didn’t want them, they don’t know the system… they were denied all the opportunities. You just need to go; if you have the opportunity to visit some schools… young people were talking about their experience of high school. One of the girls said, “In my high school, the flexibility you need is to fight… people come from gangs and you need to know what are the right colours in this neighbourhood”… they were saying, this is more important than knowing how to read and write if you want to survive in the school. What kind of experience are we providing for these kids? What kind? And then we blame them that they become violent? … and the UN doesn’t hold that knowledge… really nobody should be [left] out of the system. It is hell… because they are not considered human beings’ Interview HHH.

**Theme Fourteen: Fossil-ed Functioning - Outdated Working Structure**

This theme came up more frequently in the second round of interviews than [in] the first set of interviews. A collection of excerpts reflected on the idea of the UN still working in an outdated structure: ‘what we have at the moment is not fit for purpose. And after all, the United Nations were set up in 1945. That’s a very, very long time ago’ Interview ZZ, ‘I mean, after 75 years, we seem to still be stuck and go around, backwards, and forwards. So, anything new, ideas, it’s worth it’ Interview OOO, and ‘one of the challenges with the United Nations is, it is out of date… having United Nations more fit for the modern world is important. So, something like this [2nd Charter], I think it’s important… it [UN] needs to be modernised or it needs to be a bit more out facing or less bureaucratic. And I think that’s very easy to see’ Interview RRR.

Strong support for the 2nd Charter is provided in this comment, as being a solution to offer for the next generation: ‘the UN, if it wishes to survive, it is going to have to implement a 2nd Charter Civil Society that is properly funded, properly safeguarded. It has a bureau that changes every five years, it’s got to be transparent so that the next generation can see that it’s up to them to make sure there are some systems in place that are worth improving on, working on, [and] making appropriate [changes] for the next generation, all those things. But without this idea, I think UN is going to be weaker. I do’ Interview AAA.

**Theme Fifteen: Honest Broker- UN as Mediator**

The idea of the honest broker was a welcomed concept: ‘the honest broker part of the presentation that the UN can do, should lend legitimacy to the recommendations that Civil Society puts forward. Where governments don’t feel comfortable just taking on recommendations from society, if the UN where to, in some way, endorse or support those recommendations, then governments are willing to listen. It can give that kind of credibility and weight to Civil Society organisations who might otherwise struggle to get governments to listen to them’ Interview YY, and ‘it would be good if there was a mechanism for Civil Society in ODA [Official Development Assistance] countries to be able to interact directly with a UN body in their country, in the absence of that, right now they work directly with their government. But there isn’t that intermediary, which is the role that the UN plays really well’ Interview TT.

This comment not only responds to the idea of the honest broker, but also brings in theme 18 on the necessity of collaboration and theme 11, inclusion: ‘I like the honest
broker too, and the collective platform, making sure all the voices are at the table… it breaks down the silos even topically, which I think is really important for international development, because there’s so much overlap between what we’re trying to address in child protection versus climate changes. It’s actually kind of similar, trying to address poverty, we’re trying to address all of these different things. It provides a bit of a way to actually be more effective. That’s what initially struck me is okay, perfect’ Interview RR.

Theme Sixteen: Grassroot Hands Hold the Solutions – Importance of In-Country
The importance of in-country work resonated in the second round of interviews and the need for it as expressed in this comment: ‘for issues like the one that we’re working on, where it is absolutely an example of a universal issue… it’s everywhere, so we need there to be bodies to work with Civil Society at that national level and I don’t see those existing currently’ Interview TT.

This participant saw how national CSUN bodies could bring accountability to the national governments, and therefore overlaps with theme five on accountability: ‘how much added value are we putting into the system in terms of accountability? It’s great. You’ve got people [governments], they might say good things. How does that translate then to being back at home and what they feel at home? And maybe the answer is actually to get more of the CSO input at home, so that actually, the governments are more representative of their people’ Interview XX.

Another synergy was identified with national CSUN bodies and relates to theme nine in terms of structures: ‘headquarters are useful… a headquarter provides the bigger strategy vision… And similarly, you could have country programmes, and those two country programmes should, or multiple country programmes should talk to each other… and maybe the 2nd Charter can set up a way to make sure they’re all talking to each other’ Interview RR

Theme Seventeen: Sharing and Purposeful Speaking - Dialogue and Knowledge Transfer
As noted in Part 1 of this chapter, there were a number of components that comprise this theme. Two areas in particular were echoed for this theme in the last interviews: the need for dialogue and the need for the usage of layperson language: ‘there has to be much more dialogue’ Interview ZZ, and ‘when it’s [2nd Charter] finished, it needs to be in a format, which is easily understandable - the rationale behind it’ Interview RRR.

In addition, it was acknowledged that the current system discourages dialogue: ‘we do have people inside the UN that do want to talk to Civil Society and are trying from the inside, fighting the system’ Interview TTT.

Theme Eighteen: Necessity of Horizontal Cohesion of Collaboration and Coordination
Collaboration strongly arose from the data as an overarching issue: ‘more broadly around this concept of truly working together and moving away from, I mean, just coordinate’ Interview UU, and ‘this notion that we all work in silos. That problem is
a real one. Absolutely’ Interview XXX.

It was acknowledged that CS would benefit from further collaboration and coordination: ‘if Civil Society got together and had a collective voice, mostly, and had the most number of signatures on a particular project that would strengthen the Civil Society… it also strengthens the results of the causes’ Interview OOO, and the need for it was expressed: ‘there’s no strategy in the sector [of CS]’ Interview RRR.

However, in the process of collaboration, it is important to watch for the following issue: ‘what happens in a network is that you have to come to an agreement, and that agreement usually happens in the common lower denominator’ Interview HHH.

A process for collaborative success was offered: ‘we [CSOs] come together on issues and work really well together on issues… NGOs were sometimes not speaking the same language and a times competing with each other for language in the document. How do you bridge those conflicts to get people to recognise that this is going to make it better for everybody, through something like this in place, I think might be a bit of a challenge. You know that “Leave your logo at the door” is a great expression. At the working level, we do it really well’ Interview TT.

Theme Nineteen: Virtual Bricks and Mortar

The utilisation of technology was acknowledged as a very real potential for bringing together the different voices: ‘and how do we get those people? And maybe there are going to be other ways of doing it. People could do video conferencing. And they don’t have to attend virtually in person all the time. They can send witness statements’ Interview AAA, and ‘it has to be really thought through. How do you get that feedback? I think we’re better connected now. So certainly, there are a lot more people who have access to channels and information that they can use’ Interview XX.

Technology would enable the analysis of the different voices; however, it comes with a cautionary note: ‘what’s the mechanism for them to collect the voices… maybe the new technologies in AI will be able to analyse inputs… how do you analyse the massive amount of data… technology might help us a lot, but also hinders us because of surveillance’ Interview LLL.

In terms of a physical location, comments were made regarding the country selection for the international CSUN: ‘I’m just so depressed, as most of us are, about the UN being based in Country A. And that has really been a terrible blow to the participation… the whole problem of being refused visas on such a large scale’ Interview ZZ.

Theme Twenty: Power of the Empowered People - Human Resources

Challenges of UN human resources arose again: ‘your hands are much more tied when you work as the UN staff… the Secretary, it’s such a monster, because it actually has 193 bosses and there’s so many staff and there’s so many different departments and they don’t communicate with each other… and they often bitch about each other… people are very territorial. People don’t have money, and they
have less and less money. So, it’s becoming more competitive. And, you know, a lot of people pass the responsibility around’ Interview PPP.

Employees of the CSUN would need to be working on behalf of the issue with complete integrity to bringing in all voices, they would not be able to be associated with one particular agenda: ‘the thing too, with the UN Civil Society, is just making sure that there’re people within that group [that] are actually employed as a UN Civil Society person and not just as their NGO representative to the UN Civil Society because I can see how… “I’m going to push my [own] NGO stuff or make sure that’s definitely addressed.”… Whereas if I’m a UN Civil Society employee, and my role is to bring everyone’s voice to the table, then I want to bring everyone’s voice to that particular discussion’ Interview RR.

**Theme Twenty-One: Relationship Dynamics Diminish Development**

The second round of interviews again noted how much effort is being spent on the relationship dynamics between the UN and CS. This was captured in the following excerpt: ‘we’ve got a whole lot of issues and we’re busy talking about not working together instead of dealing with the issues’ Interview XXX.

**Theme Twenty-Two: Strong Leadership + Sound Values = Sought Solutions**

The necessity of strong leadership that has the capacity to demonstrate sound values was echoed as part of the solution in the second round of interviews. This was already noted in the quotes for the initial feedback in section one, referring back to Kofi Annan and is reflecting in the following remark: ‘I want to unpack political will and political leadership. I would say political will depends upon the leadership in place, the quality of the leadership in place. In other words, when you look at the history of the UN, the UN would not have occurred, at least in its current configuration without a world leader of FDR [Franklin Delano Roosevelt], wouldn’t have happened without him. I’m coming to the reluctant conclusion, as we approach 2020, that maybe that type of leader comes once a century... it’s a classic argument of historians, the great leaders, great men versus circumstances, there’s a combination of the two. But I’m wondering if climate change is that circumstance today’ Interview WWW. Recall, the interviews were conducted prior to the coronavirus crisis, which could now be seen to amplify this last statement.

**Theme Twenty-Three: Critical Criticisms**

Criticisms of the current UN and CS relationship continued: ‘with the United Nations, there’re a lot of criticisms you’ll find from Civil Society and so on. It’s just too bureaucratic and administrative and therefore impenetrable’ Interview RRR, and this leads to exclusivity: ‘the current system, it makes it very difficult for smaller organisations’ Interview LLL.

It was encouraged to face the criticisms head on to address much needed issues: ‘I do think there’s a role for the UN where there’s a lot that could be improved. [It] might be good to also show maybe some more critical aspects, I hope other people had some critical aspects of the UN. I think that the bureaucracy and - there’s still people in the UN who have lifetime contracts. They don’t do them anymore. But lifetime contracts, you can’t fire a person like that... if you have one person or two people in very high up positions who don’t want to work with Civil Society and we don’t have a system that can change those people, how can we actually work with
The UN and CS relationship is impacted by internal issues: ‘each UN agency is still very jealous of its own turf’ Interview VVV, and the physical location: ‘we’ve got a huge problem now about the visa issues [attendees not getting access into Country A for UN meetings]. And somehow this has exposed how unfit for purpose the present system is. I really welcome what you’re doing and that you’re hearing our voices [about] what we are experiencing. What we want and the real need for us to be able to work together, not as secondary partners, but on an equal basis’ Interview ZZ.

Theme Twenty-Four: Validating Virtues
Virtues of the UN were acknowledged in the second round of interviews: ‘there’s a lot of good stuff the UN does, a lot of really good stuff, and people just don’t know about it’ Interview RRR, and ‘the UN actually is doing an extraordinarily good job under extraordinarily difficult circumstances’ Interview WW.

Theme Twenty-Five: The Unwritten Rule Books
This was a theme that did not arise again in the last interview, which was regarding the importance of writing the unwritten rule book for those working at the UN. Due to this theme not arising again and there being a lower number of participants who provided this evidence in the first round of field research interviews, it could be hypothesised that this is not as prevalent of a dynamic.

Theme Twenty-Six: From Coin to Compassion – Corporate Collaboration
This theme is addressed further in section three below. However, this participant makes a strong point in that private collaboration does need to be addressed: ‘the way the international system is constructed, not just formally, but in fact through multinational companies through internationalisation of all sorts of communication. How does this influence because this is a very, very important basis for institutional roles, always’ Interview BBB, in addition: ‘the UN Charter recognises NGOs, it doesn’t recognise private sector’ Interview WWW.

Theme Twenty-Seven: The Necessity of Principled Purpose
This was strongly echoed in the last interviews, the necessity for reawakening the UN values and the call to acknowledge that that is the UN’s purpose. This is reflected in the following quotes: ‘the idea that this is a body to have a peaceful prosperous world, that got lost somewhere and it will be good to come back to this idea of a movement again’ Interview FFF, and ‘United Nations was always, even though it’s an agreement between nation states, it’s also positioned itself very much as this embodiment of people, citizens, everyone, business, everyone reflected because it’s everyone, it’s every country, and every people. So, if you want to embody that vision, why not both instead and revise UN where you have states alongside Civil Society, alongside other stakeholders that are required to achieve the Charter’s objectives, the SDGs, the human rights treaties’ Interview EEE.

Theme Twenty-Eight: The Ticking of Unavailable Time
The notion of time being critical was noted again. A number of reasons arose for this: the UN’s 75th birthday in the year of 2020, climate change, the world’s current state prior to the coronavirus crisis, and the potential that the global virus crisis could
set the stage for urgent and great reform.

One crucial reason for reform was the reflection on the UN and its role, because of its 75th birthday in the year of 2020: ‘the UN is at a critical time, it’s now in its 75th anniversary, and the Secretary General is using that opportunity to initiate a dialogue with people and Civil Society… where it needs to be headed in the future. I’m sure there will be also some reminder of what the UN’s role has historically been. But this is really meant to be a forward looking exercise and look at where the UN needs to be in 25 years to continue to have legitimacy and to be a force for global peace and prosperity and including, of course, achieving the SDGs’ Interview MMM, and ‘it’s a very interesting proposition for this next year, UN75’ Interview WWW.

Another urgent reason for a UN and CS relationship reform relates to climate change: ‘we need a new way of thinking, we need a new way of working, we need to work together to solve this crisis, the moment is now to basically save the planet and the future of humankind… if we don’t save the planet from destruction, there’s nothing else to save, all of the other issues just fall by the wayside’ Interview UU, and ‘good luck with it [2nd Charter], it’s urgently needed. It truly is like never before. And we know it is urgent because of the things that are happening in the world, might be the very end of our future and our planet and our people. So good luck’ Interview ZZ.

The importance of urgency was also noted from the perspective of the world’s current condition (recall the interviews were conducted prior to the coronavirus): ‘at least we know that the world has to change... we see that things are rather going worse... shows us that we have to reinvent, so that would be the positive for this’ Interview OOO, and ‘as an academic, I would also encourage you to be dreaming because those ideas are desperately needed in this moment of history. We have no ideas. Everything is just accepting and working within the limits. Sometimes it’s good to propose alternatives that are beyond the limits that we have’ Interview EEE.

In considering the global coronavirus crisis, perhaps the stage is set for that call of true change that is recognised as so urgently needed: ‘the major problem I have in CSUN would be to see the process to do that… the UN Charter… was done in the context of war that had just been completed… so, what we had at that moment was a political compromise… and it’s difficult for me to imagine the process that would create an urgency that would create [this]’ Interview FFF, ‘your research has highlighted a lot of long term things that, maybe, you can start planting those seeds of more transformative ideas, even though they are not physical now’ Interview EEE, and ‘it’s an unfortunate fact that history, at least up to this point, that major innovations and global governance reform has only occurred after catastrophes’ Interview WWW.

Section Three: Responses to Questions

What needs to be considered to implement it?
Numerous comments were made around the necessity to ensure the two Charters are integrated with each other and that there is an organising body that supports that interaction: ‘how are we going to coordinate action across the two [Charters]
because we’re trying to break down hierarchical relationships here, which I think is necessary. I think, creating parallel structures, there still needs to be some type of organising body that is making sure that they’re moving in unison’ Interview CCC. These comments continue in responses to the other questions.

There were elements to watch out for as well. These are highlighted in the following excerpts: ‘might also have been an attempt for people to control us [CS], more difficult to do the things that we think are most important’ Interview YYY, ‘one of the issues to look at as the Charter develops, that it doesn’t just become again dominated by a technocratic approach to things’ Interview UUU, ‘my guess would be that Civil Society would be concerned, is this authentic? And do we have a real avenue for influence here? Or is this just placating’ Interview CCC, ‘if we’re building a new system, we need to watch for - I have a legal background - very clear procedures can ensure a shared power and equitable sharing of power’ Interview TTT, and ‘the UN is so bureaucratic already, you’re creating another layer of bureaucracy. That would be my concern’ Interview PPP. It was asked how we ensure it doesn’t become something bureaucratic, instead to become a place of collaboration: ‘you have to be connected to Civil Society, you have to be connected to stakeholders and have conversations and inter-agency projects’ Interview PPP.

When asked what was needed to implement the 2nd Charter, one form of response was what the UN and CS would get out of it: ‘the presentation of the idea, along what has been presented here, in terms of what the UN might gain from it, what the NGOs might gain from it, would in actual fact create a new momentum. And you’re talking about the international NGOs, and maybe regional NGOs, national NGOs all having their place, yes. And then governments knowing where they are in relation to the Civil Society’ Interview QQQ, ‘there needs to be key influencers from Civil Society who already have a good track record of working with government… there are people with expertise, they just have to be identified and called on. And they need to be working with government and to allow government to understand that it’s not something that’s going to hinder them, it’s actually going to tick a lot of their boxes. So, there has to be a lot of negotiation with government that is actually going to do them an awful lot of good. And actually, it’s going to open up funding strings from other UN agencies. That wouldn’t be open to them if they were not signed up to the Civil Society Charter’ Interview AAA, this was further supported: ‘it [2nd Charter] goes out of national boundaries. It’s people, it’s not the government, so that’s a good point. That’s a good point… it’s like a universal coming out’ Interview OOO. However, how do we ensure ‘in-countries where there are not UN offices, is there a path that can mirror the process?’ Interview CCC.

One participant responded by identifying the bodies that would need to support the 2nd Charter: ‘you need Member State support… definitely the Secretary General… the only reason it really happened was because it came from the Secretary General. So, when you have that kind of push, that’s when things will happen… you want those key states from the regional bodies’ Interview PPP. This could be supported with the concept of the SDGs: ‘you’ve got some very good ideas in there, like emphasising the SDGs, which is something that all Member States, at least in theory, have bought into’ Interview YYY.

The concept of representation, theme five, continues: ‘the question of how exactly
representation works within the Charter is an important question’ Interview UUU. This is further seen in responses to the other questions.

The resistance of some Member States towards CS around power sharing, theme seven, is highlighted again: ‘in terms of the 2nd Charter, how do you, [what would be] the new ways you potentially would engage with Civil Society? There would be pushback on even elevating the rank of society to be a full actor in conversations, [that] would be challenging for some’ Interview CCC, and ‘you’re going to need Member State buy-in because the UN is Member States really… those Member States who currently don’t wish to listen to their Civil Society. And that’s not just the usual suspects. There are other countries who claim to have processes, but actually really do not have those transparent, reflective feedback loops that they should have. How are you going to get them on board to really support this’ Interview XX.

Financial support, theme eight, would need to be considered to implement a potential 2nd Charter. However, the following response noted the savings that could potentially be involved: ‘resources definitely… efficiencies can be gained from restructuring from the way we’re doing things at the moment’ Interview UUU. Other comments around funding included: ‘I do really worry about resourcing it. It’s so hard for the UN itself to keep functioning and meet its current needs. I do think in principle, I’m very much in favour of institutional mechanisms’ Interview VV, and ‘what I fear about the model you propose is that it’s a very UN thing of creating another committee. That is, let’s keep things as they are and pretend that we’re going to change by creating another structure that is doomed to fail in my view, because who is going to fund that’ Interview EEE.

If funding was secured, it would lead to a supported holistic approach: ‘from an organisational perspective and my perspective, there’s a lot of call all the time for more holistic working, more joined up working, making sure that humanitarian development, peace and security are really tied in with each other and complimentary to each other. That there are long term approaches, but what inhibits that is that funding models through the UN and through UN Agency F and the states don’t allow for that kind of work and the existing agreements and treaties separate that type of work out. And it would be really great if there was a way that the 2nd Charter could facilitate a much more holistic approach to global issues’ Interview YY. Funding is further reviewed below.

Theme nine, the importance of structure and process for operational purposes was echoed: ‘it could be an end in and of itself in a symbolic way and it gives a substance base for something and an identity to this collective right. But at the same time, it should be what it’s going to achieve and how does it achieve that? It is important to stress from the beginning the operationalisation of it [what it] should be - to use a cliched term - it should be function flowing form rather than form defining the function’ Interview UUU.

The process of defining the roles, theme 10, was reflected on: ‘clarity on definitions of what is an NGO, at least defining the principles and criteria in order to qualify, including very strict, exclusionary criteria. Be aware of religiously motivated NGOs, party political, party motivated NGOs, be aware of foundations, special interest groups, be aware of billionaires who really believe they’re playing God on earth and
who are so spoiled in their mindset that they actually believe they’re running the
world. I’ve met many of them and careful’ Interview NNN, ‘let’s be very clear about
the Civil Society side, what that means and who we are, who is interacting on that.
Very clear on the UN side, government side, then I think it’s a question of people
sitting down talking to both and coming up with the words’ Interview RRR, and ‘it
would be an interesting negotiation on roles… So, what is the responsibilities of the
Civil Society organisations within this relationship? Is it appropriate to have
overlapping responsibilities and if so, how is that decided on’ Interview CCC.

Regardless of that process, the new proposal for reform would need to continue to
protect ‘the nature of Civil Society. It has a degree of spontaneity, it’s voluntary, it’s
people doing their own thing’ Interview YYY.

What needs to be considered in the new reform is inclusion, theme 11: ‘bringing in
that leave no one behind, bringing in that unheard voice… for example, the
participation of indigenous people is crucial… indigenous thinking comes from the
understanding that we don’t own the earth, we’re guests’ Interview HHH.

Whilst considering how to make inclusion happen: ‘the issue of smaller and more
government organisations, potentially not finding their way… not even being
asked whether they want to be a current member of the UN Civil Society
international or national… and that could be anything from; they have a very small
service delivery profile or very limited funding [or] don’t have an online presence [or]
maybe come from somewhere where the work that they do is seen as antagonistic to
to a government agenda and isn’t safe for them to be public about their work’ Interview
YY, and ‘whose voice gets to be heard and how does it get channelled? And who
gets to decide what, what information goes in… how do you manage to collect
information that’s fair and [in a] proper way that [it] can be used… you need to have
very concrete ways of looking at things, and all concrete things that you have to deal
with at some point in the process. So how is that process going to work’ Interview
XX.

In exploring this further, how to ensure the smaller or fringe CSOs could be insured
to be effectively included, the following response was provided: ‘it would be
important to have some sort of formalised approach so that people can definitely
know what they are signing up to when they are [a] part of that, and that they can
collaborate within that space and understand why they’re collaborating together. But
it would also be important that it remains an open space. And so, there isn’t sort of
one call every five years for organisations to formally become part of it, but that is
advertised regularly as a body that exists either for new NGOs or for NGOs who may
have spent limited time online or have few resources to be able to dedicate to
international advocacy and types of spaces that can influence in and may not be
made aware of its existence immediately. And making sure that all engagement with
it is I mean, this is obvious, and I’m not saying it because I don’t think that you would,
would include it anyway. But making sure that it’s fully informed participation…
participation takes place on the basis of being fully informed of what the objective of
that collaboration would be at any given moment. To manage expectations and to
avoid disappointment and to make it clear that organising can take place within those
spaces and outside of those spaces, if it is not seen as the right space for that
particular organisation’ Interview YY.
Human rights, theme 13, is an integral component of what needs to be considered: ‘it’s got to be based on human rights. If you don’t base it on human rights, then you’re not working in parallel with the United Nations itself, you’re not developing that partnership with the United Nations. So it’s got to be based on the Charter of the human rights of the United Nations itself, because a voice for the people is fundamentally rights, our human rights for every person on the earth, you can obviously break that down into all the different categories whether it be peace or whether it be it education or the right to water or whatever it is. But at the end of the day, those are the principles by which any Civil Society Charter is going to have to work, to be on an equal footing with the United Nations Member States itself’ Interview SS.

Another element that needs to be considered is to allow for change, to allow for continual renewal, to prevent an outdated working method as was uncovered in theme 14: ‘by and large, it is an interesting innovation that needs the detail; practice always matters. How do you translate something that is an idea, that can have a lot of potential in it? [But] not becoming as the UN, because it has become calcified in a sense. How do we set it up in a way that allows it to regenerate and look at itself into the lessons and make changes and adapts to change that circumstance’ Interview UUU.

Although the SDGs, ‘the idea it did come from the people. But it’s getting very hard to get it down to the people’ Interview OOO. Hence, highlighting the need to ensure the reform does have a national perspective (theme 16).

A suggestion for collaboration, theme 18, was through the engagement with the Secretariat: ‘I don’t entirely know how it’d be integrated. The simplest way to do it would probably be to have at the Secretariat, [at] the global level, where you’ve got some representations from both sides coming into that or where there’s a coordinating body. Because that would allow the UN 1st Charter to stay pretty stable, while you’re creating a coordinating body, at the top’ Interview CCC. Another response saw the overarching collaboration potential in the proposed reform: ‘it is an interesting proposal, a 2nd Charter, I like the idea of [a] one stop shop… it’s the potential of how it actually operates’ Interview UUU.

What needs to be considered are other resources that may need to be required (theme 19): ‘what are the resources that aren’t just financial, even having proper equipment to facilitate those meetings, whether it’s virtually or in person can be challenging’ Interview CCC.

Theme 22, strong leadership with sound values arose in the evidence again: ‘a lot of change happens when you find people who are senior; if the main change [is] from the top down, because they’re demanding it. Then the managers they all will have to behave this way. In order to get that promotion, to look good. I need to be seen to do this or do that or implement this structure and then I get patted on the back and the goal gets done and it starts to filter down. So yes, what I’m learning is change can happen, grassroots, but really for change to happen it has to be top down because it has to be managed with interest. Someone has to be like, yeah, this is what I want to [have] happen. This is my vision and I want you to create my vision.'
Then you have like-minded people who are enthusiastic to meet that vision. A lot of the times, when we have a lot of people who don’t have that vision are rubbish, and you can’t get rid of them’ Interview GGG. This comment also reflects on theme 20, in regard to human resources.

Resistance to the new reform related back to a prior mentioned criticism (theme 23), on how slow the UN moves: ‘it’s a huge bureaucratic organisation, so there’s slow movement within the UN. It would take quite a bit of convincing to have a major structural shift in how we interact with Civil Society. Even though people say that it’s not efficient, not effective. This is quite a task. I think you would have some resistance internally’ Interview CCC. However, virtues (theme 24) also were mentioned: ‘I think, the UN works well with Civil Society a lot of the time because the UN is to some extent advocacy’ Interview CCC.

Principled purpose, theme 27, arose in the data again as a strong need to revisit the values and purpose of the UN and apply that to reform: ‘need to go back to the basics of what the UN stands for, at its very core, at its very foundation. Then reformulate an action agenda for Civil Society based, on this foundational understanding, contextualised in our modern world where we are today, basically an update of our historical context into today’s world’ Interview NNN, and ‘there needs to be a core part to establish and create something that’s meaningful. Clarity would be one. The second thing is going to be about a process for its mission’ Interview UUU.

The 2nd Charter was thought to provide rejuvenation for the UN’s purpose: ‘the UN is celebrating its 75th birthday and they had all these ideas of making the world better, this [2nd Charter] is like a car booster. There are still so many problems in the world’ Interview OOO, and ‘the goodwill of everybody would be the foundation to start… like a trusting relationship. And the setting of the goal to get this [a 2nd Charter] will actually bring people together… unless there’s trust there, and openness to begin with, nothing will happen’ Interview QQQ.

Such urgency continues to resonate in the data for the UN and CS relationship reform, theme 28: ‘we have to do things very quickly to get off the ground… the speed of [it] is important’ Interview UUU, ‘enough critical mass of people among NGOs, this would add something to the way the world works. And the context right now, historical context, is the crisis. Existential crisis in the world that is greater than any other. Now, there’s a possibility of the disappearance of all species, very, very soon. Pretty soon everyone’s running around like chickens with their heads cut off, trying to figure out how do we deal with this? Can this be put forward as a pathway that would help’ Interview BBB, and ‘UN 75 presents an important opportunity for… identifying proposals that would enhance and protect the role of Civil Society within the UN’ Interview WWW.

A concept that frequently came up in the data from the second round of interviews was to learn from other examples. One participant highlights a number of examples: ‘the International Union for Conservation of Nature is a hybrid organisation of CSOs and government and we had assemblies… of like 1200 members, combined NGOs and governments. In the assembly they take the floor differently, I mean in distinctly, it’s not first governments and then CSOs, they’re literally side by side. The only
difference between the two of them is the number of votes. If a government votes "yes" it's three votes; if an NGO votes "yes" [it] is one vote, which you could say is fair because the numbers are very different, there are much less governments than CSOs… so, there’s a model for that… that’s why we call it a hybrid, it’s intergovernmental but also an NGO… it’s the kind of thing that your 2nd Charter will create’ Interview TTT, ‘what would be really important is to look at what was that about [Rio Plus 20] and build on the lessons learned… that could also give you some tips of how to implement it' Interview TTT, and ‘ILO Tripartite' Interview TTT. Others mentioned ‘the Global Fund – in just one sector HIV’ Interview MMM, in regard to pooling funding, and the ‘International Criminal Court’ Interview BBB was another method to review.

Of course, ‘there’s already an example, we already have the 1st Charter, which is great and where that worked and what didn’t work. I really liked your point [that] we don’t need everyone to sign up initially. Because I think that’s a really good [point], so we have a functioning UN system where like you said, only 51 nations, or however many nation states signed up initially, but we’ve expanded it into a working model. The fact that we have an example and the experience of what works and what doesn’t work and what mechanisms, where to have the flexibility in the Charter versus where to be more prescriptive is useful or something to consider’ Interview RR.

It became evident that the conceptual components that make up the 2nd Charter, actually may already exist in different pockets, in different parts of the world, in different systems. It is about bringing the learning from those different examples together. To consider what has worked well in the other scenarios. How can that be built on? Why did it not work or work? How can or what needs to be changed? Whilst at the same time considering today’s context.

**Steps for implementation?**
The first step would be to carry out some initial background work. This is because ‘countries like to see governments, civil servants; they like to see that there is precedence. They like to see that things have been done in the past. And, I think, to flag up maybe three or four key efforts to engage Civil Society that they haven’t unrolled. Why haven’t they been unrolled? There must be good reasons and it is because the structure, the mechanisms, the institutional mechanism, wasn’t up to the job, it was passed its sell-by date’ Interview AAA. The Cardoso Report (see Chapter 2) would be one example of this, as highlighted in this quote: ‘you mentioned the Cardoso Report. I would say that was the last time there was a real substantive conversation’ Interview WWW.

Other initial steps of background work include consideration towards mechanisms and meeting places: ‘it’s a global project and it sounds like it’s something which is really gonna happen all over the world in a maximum number of countries. I think it’s gonna be in the nature of things, it’s quite difficult to get to a large number of countries at once and make sure that things happen in parallel in all of them. You need to look for mechanisms and meeting places… you need to look around for places like that. Since you included the private sector, I would say, the World Economic Forum itself, however much some of us may dislike it. It is a place where important people get together and talk and so, I would definitely want to, if I were
you, visit them, talk to them and see how far they are interested in your ideas and whether they might provide a way for you to engage organizations and a wider group of people… you’re gonna have to look at more than one mechanism to get this idea as broad as you’re hoping… the World Social Forum, if it still exists, and if not, there are other comparable places also to look [at] to try and get Civil Society excited and interested in your project’ Interview YYY, and uncovering ‘who are the key gatekeepers in the community… then it’s also trying to think about how do you engage with people that aren’t connected’ Interview CCC.

Another participant also encouraged consideration of mechanisms and how the implementation would be structured: ‘you addressed many real problems in your presentation. And your solution is, I like it. But it’s a very bold all-encompassing solution. One of those types of solution that looks very nice on paper, but then the practicalities of getting a room of five NGOs to agree with each other… it needs to be, we need to be structured. Well, the process, as you said, maybe being national Civil Societies feed into regional consultations and then the regional feed into international in New York or Geneva. You would have to involve whatever your chapters are, or streams are, you would have two facilitators who would have to be very senior respected figures from the NGO world because then they could not get together if necessary’ Interview DDD.

It was recommended to look further at current internal practices within the different UN institutions and to bring in those key leaders: ‘it starts… within the United Nations and within the different institutions with the United Nations. Here’s how these institutions are engaging with Civil Society. Here are the shortcomings and what that means. It means that the same 20 Civil Society partners are dominating the conversation, for instance or it means that there’s no authentic voice in different conversations. From there, that would also provide you an opportunity to make arguments for why this approach [is] better. Because there’s such diversity within the UN. I think you would probably have to also convince at least some key Members States that this is an approach towards backing, and key members of institutions, in Civil Society, at the UN… start by just getting a scope and you probably have more knowledge on this, an idea of how Civil Society [is] currently engaging with them. What are the limitations around inclusion and that type of engagement? I think the UN and other international organisations continue to go to the same partners over and over and over again. How do we break away from that pattern to make sure it is a more comprehensive, inclusive body and so it starts by just what’s currently taking place first’ Interview CCC.

The second step for implementation that arose from the data was the concept of initial conversations: ‘you want to start with buy-in from Civil Society themselves, are there distinct networks of Civil Society that are seen as having a representative voice for the greater Civil Society that can be consulted with and bought into this idea. Are there certain governments that can be reached to get their thoughts on this idea and its viability and whether they’d be willing to support the idea. Those are the two places I’d start and also, at some point, talking to UN leaders, including the Deputy Secretary General whose portfolio is championing the SDGs, and I think, would respond to this idea; who probably lives that contradiction day to day, the urgency of needing everyone, including Civil Society and really be charging forward with the achievement of the SDGs’ Interview MMM, ‘people come together in New York,
students, small groups start to talk, they are connected, and they get in contact with one another’ Interview BBB, and ‘you probably need to talk to a few investors too, I think the ambassador from Country Z’ Interview JJJ.

The next step recognised the need for it to be kicked off by a UN resolution at the General Assembly, this would have the proposed reform integrated into the current UN system, provide support for the organisation of the consultations and would allow the conference to be held at the UN: ‘it would require to have it as an official branded UN process… it would need to be a UN initiative, which means that it would need to be kicked off by a UN resolution, by a group of Member States at the General Assembly, basically, which is not a bad idea. It would be easy to get some states to agree to that. It would look very similar to the process that led to the SDGs, because then, if it’s a UN resolution starting it, led by a few Member States, then it would mean that the UN Secretariat could help organise the regional consultations. And it means that any final conference could take place in the UN… [it takes] just one [Member State] to take the resolution… you will have to aim for adoption by consensus of the resolution. But that’s possible. In any way, it’s always best with resolutions to have a few sponsors, especially from each region of the world. But in principle, you only need one state to table a resolution. That doesn’t mean everybody would vote in favour of it, but you’ll need one sponsor’ Interview DDD.

The next step for implementation that was suggested from the data in the field research is a series of consultations. Before that is discussed further, the hierarchy or geography of how those consultations would be carried out is first presented.

Varied responses for the hierarchical structure of how to carry out the consultations arose in the data. One comment captures this best by suggesting to go in both directions: ‘from local to global and global to local’ Interview QQQ, this is further supported: ‘firstly, consultation and expressions of interest on a really huge global scale with very ambitious targets for participation… national forums and then regional forums and then these conversations are supposed to filter up to the UN’ Interview YY.

From local to global was a common approach: ‘what is the UN, it is the Member States. So, you’ve got to get lots going on in every country where you can, where you’ve got a strong Civil Society movement… there are quite a lot of countries where you can get that dialogue going now, at the national level. From the national level, you get it up to the regional level, and then up to the international level. But that’s where it’s got to start. Everything that you want to change has got to start from small; go down, locally, district level [to] national’ Interview ZZ, and ‘involve Civil Society bottom up in a process that allows them to express their voices and preference. And then build a maturity in the non-state actor world. To the extent that this is possible, ultimately it has to go back to national frameworks. It’s a bottom up exercise’ Interview NNN.

The national component was crucial: ‘the formation of the global Charter and the global platform has to have some links and basis to ensure a platform and a national Charter… using Civil Society networks that truly cross sectoral in-country’ Interview UUU.
Conducting a series of consultations was widely remarked. Inclusion was seen as a vital component to the process of consultations: ‘if you don’t have all the representatives of the marginalised groups, you’re not really having a full picture. I find that a lot of these consultations are lacking… when you hear people speak, they say all the great things they’re doing, but then leaving out all these people. So, that’s my big problem with implementation’ Interview PPP, and is often reflected throughout the evidence in Round 2 of the research.

Comments were made on the approach to the consultations, that they needed to be about genuine reform: ‘and when we talk, we’re talking about reforming the system’ Interview ZZ, and ‘to do it in a similar way to how you have been conducting this research. Rather than, what sometimes happens, where the UN has a draft and we’ll read it once, and then do some Civil Society consultations and tweak the draft based on that consultation. But you’re being slotted into an existing framework rather than a much more creative and free process of getting information and then teasing out what needs to, [what] the recommendation [of] something [is]… Yeah, so that’s the consultation process’ Interview YY.

The consultation process needs to be led by a core group and should have multiple drafts: ‘first of all, consultation is important, but sometimes it can go too far and sometimes you just have to take a lead… the first phase will be consultation with relevant organisations, people, government, and maybe people that you’ve even spoken to who are going “right let’s do this”. You’re then in the second phases, the writing up, maybe it’s a draft, draft one. Then you’re speaking to some governments, you’re testing it with governments or some parts of Civil Society, that will be stage three. Then your moving on to stage two draft, draft three, where you say right this is it’ Interview RRR.

The following comment echoes the need for multiple iterations and a core group to lead the process: ‘it needs to be written in an iteration of consultations, like what you’re doing with your research. I do recognise that some people say, it’s meetings upon meetings, upon meetings, but I get that. With all my years, I learned that these conversations need to happen. They need to happen to bring the people together and start making reality of some of the ideas that sound at the beginning completely utopic. Once you have these series of consultations, waves of consultations coordinated by the cell, that is the UN, Civil Society and government, then we have to figure out how you represent that. It could be a rotational basis, then that almost final draft is circulated before the big conference comes and sign it with a big splash and celebrities and Lady Gaga having a song about it’ Interview TTT.

This leads us to the next step, a conference: ‘there should be a big conference launch where you would have to have Guterres there. You would already have at least X numbers of countries lined up and Civil Society… before that [the launch] you would have distributed the proposal with a vision of how this looks like, but also with a very clear understanding of the rules and procedures of that conference and how it’s going to work. There needs to be a Secretariat to this, someone who’s putting all this together. You will need to have at least three key documents that would be sent out at least six months in advance. So, you already have people talking in the corridors about this. And the three [documents] will be the vision, the
most important [is] the proposal [and] the rules of procedure of how the conference will be led, because you need in that conference the endorsements of that proposal. Then you will... need the approval of a modus operandi for how this Charter is going to be followed. You're going to have to discuss how are we going to do this. How many times are we going to meet? Is it gonna be every three years? What are we going to discuss? How do we take the floor? We have to relearn how to take the floor in an assembly where we are going to be sitting side by side with governments’ Interview TTT. This is supported by another participant: 'sometimes conferences are places where something happens' Interview BBB.

The process of the consultations and conferences is summarised in this quote; to begin with a core group, then widen out to CS with an inclusive approach and finishing with a conference: 'you have to, first of all, get together a significant group of like-minded people. I would say that should, as far as possible, include eminent persons who have genuine moral authority and who are diverse in the sense of coming from different parts of the world. It must not obviously be predominantly from the North. They should also represent different disciplines: scientists, philosophers, writers and so on. They could issue a, not too long, not too detailed, but an overall statement of purpose of what this is intended to achieve. Then you should invite Civil Society organisations, say if you think this is on the right lines, it describes in general terms something that you would like to be a part of, then come. Then you probably need to have some national conferences, regional conferences, and culminating in some kind of global conference’ Interview YYY.

The final step would be a pilot testing phase: 'you would need to maybe ask a few countries if they would be prepared to be pilots for this implementation. Sometimes, the pilot is a good thing, because it means that you can back off or you can say, let's come back with a new lens. We missed this point. But it wasn't till we started to do it that we saw it... some pilot schemes with a few countries or two countries, three countries, just by invitation, just to test some of the ideas, but also using countries where there is no success with working strongly with Civil Society groups’ Interview AAA, and 'more thinking will have to be given to processes to see actually how it works in practice' Interview XX.

Chapter 7
Conclusion

The Heart of the Matter

It was asked, what if nothing changes in the UN and CS relationship: ‘we will be in a worse world than we are in today... we will be in a world which we will not be proud of. And all we can do is to pray to God for miracles’ Interview MM.

‘Harnesses the leadership of something like the UN... the platform, that it provides for collective action, with also the ability to coordinate and support, and empower distributed action to take place. That connects people to those values and enables human civilisation to act in line with those values [that] haven't yet been fully realised’ Interview Y. This is also supported by another participant; 'the right to food, the right to housing, clothing, and the right to social security, it's all there. But we
haven’t actualised it for all people everywhere’ Interview EE.

‘I saw some of the placards that some children were holding; there was one that said, “Wake up humans! You’re endangered!” Do we need children to tell us this? What’s wrong, why are we so blind?... Let’s work together and address real enemies. Climate change, disease, lack of water and sanitation; these are the things we should be focusing on, ending violence against children in all of its forms; war, what good is that? I mean, it sure sells a lot of arms’ Interview F.

‘My magic wand would be, that all the worlds’ decision-makers and leaders would look to the long-term and ask themselves; [like] the American Indians supposedly asked themselves. “Every decision I make, what impact will that have seven generations from now?”. The magic wand would be, that all of us decision-makers, and we are all decision-makers, at one level or another, would ask ourselves, look to the future generations, how are my decisions going to impact future generations and be honest about it’ Interview NN.
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