ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY VOICE IN INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

In 2013, civic engagement was again highlighted as an essential element for sustainable development, as reflected clearly in an array of publications and statements on developing a new development framework building on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). However, civil society is now more diverse than ever, ranging from organised groups to huge movements and various forms of non-formal mass action. This brings with it unparalleled power and possibilities, but also complexities. It makes it harder to work with a representative cross-section of civil society, but brings with it opportunities for innovative solutions that can potentially transform citizen-state relations.

A 2013 World Economic Forum report noted how “networked citizens have started to change the interface and expectations of civil society empowerment.” It highlighted different forms of citizen expression and participation over recent years, including uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa to the Occupy Movement and citizen protests, from those against austerity to those demanding fair elections. A late 2013 analysis (covering 87 countries and 90 percent of the world’s population) of 843 protests between 2006 and 2013 notes the main grievances were economic justice and opposition to austerity, failure of political representation and political systems, global justice and human rights. It noted that the increase in the number and diversity of protests are “a result of people’s growing awareness that policy-making has not prioritized them.”

A changed civil society context was also illustrated by the findings of the Civil Society at Crossroads research project, which found different forms of organising among civil society players – reflected in different forms of engagement, expression and innovation – requiring realigned relationships nationally and internationally as a result of blurred North-South boundaries. Achieving representativeness of civil society and citizen voice in governance processes is complex and cannot simply rely on including organised civil society as a proxy. As the 2011 CIVICUS Civil Society Index (CSI) summary report noted: “CSOs are in danger of being seen as urban,
elitist institutions, disconnected from their constituencies.” However, there are new and broader alliances that can also emerge with new powers to influence change, for example, the anti-corruption movement in India.

The importance of creating an enabling environment that can respond to new forms of civic engagement in sustainable development is now widely acknowledged. The 2013 Report of the UN Secretary-General on accelerating progress for the MDGs and advancing beyond 2015 said: “The world’s quest for dignity, peace, prosperity, justice, sustainability and an end to poverty has reached an unprecedented moment of urgency.” It acknowledged that to achieve that: “People across the world are demanding more responsive governments and better governance and rights at all levels.”

The summary report from post-2015 consultations, “A Million Voices,” also made citizen expectations clear: “The consultations have revealed a huge appetite and demand for involvement not only in the design of the development agenda, but also in its future implementation.”

CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE NEED TO RECOGNISE THE ROLE OF VOLUNTEERISM

It is in this global context that we suggest there is a need to understand the constructive and complementary role volunteer groups and volunteerism can play, alongside broader civil society efforts, to achieve people-centred development.

However, perceptions from people in civil society about the contributions of volunteers and volunteer groups are mixed. As one interviewee reflected:

“Volunteers provide closeness to the issues and what’s going on. However volunteering is a framework that isn’t commonly used – it’s seen as unpaid work. This makes it harder to find common purpose with other CSO groups, where the language is deliberately not used for political reasons. Because of that the concepts behind it need more explanation.”

Another interviewee in the multilateral arena went further, saying:

“We engage with organisations, not citizens; that’s why we are glad to bring in the volunteer voice to broaden the voice of communities. However there is some resistance on the basis that volunteer groups don’t bring a separate policy angle to the intergovernmental process. They are also in a sense part of the work of all Major Groups. However, they are also a conduit for decisions bringing community voice to the table and conveying back decisions also, and in this way ownership and accountability at a community level is enhanced.”

This suggests there is a need for more clarity on the purpose and role of volunteer groups. The terms volunteering, volunteerism and voluntary activities refer to a wide range of activities, including traditional forms of mutual aid and self-help, formal service delivery and other forms of civic participation, undertaken of free will, for the general public good, and where monetary reward is not the principal motivating factor.

Within this conceptual framework, at least four different types of volunteer activity can be identified: “mutual aid or self-help; service
to others; participation or civic engagement; and advocacy or campaigning”. 17

This clear breadth of volunteer work undermines suggestions that volunteerism is or should be simply about service delivery and shows volunteer work can also be oriented towards achieving change, for example, through advocacy or social activism18 and through engagement in governance processes.19 The power of volunteerism is related to its values of solidarity, reciprocity, social inclusion, social cohesion, empowerment and individual and societal well-being.20

The engagement of volunteers in the work of civil society is more frequently referred to as participation, mobilisation or civic engagement than volunteering. This partly reflects the levels of professionalisation many CSOs have adopted over the last 20 years, partly in order to maintain funding and credibility. However, it also corresponds to perceived negative stereotypes of volunteers as unprofessional, inexperienced and unqualified, even though there have been strong efforts to change these misperceptions, particularly in the last 10 years.21 As one agency explained when interviewed, “We use the term development workers to differentiate those we recruit to work in development on the basis that they receive a basic stipend and are not volunteers - and won’t be confused with stereotypes of volunteers.”

Partly in response to such attitudes, the term volunteer involving organisations (VIOs) has been devised. It includes many groups, not all of which are within civil society, that actively engage volunteers in their work, but do not consciously highlight volunteers as an explicit and visible part of their work. There are some recent advances in recognition of the role of volunteerism in CSO work, including in the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness, the 2008-2011 CSI findings, the 2011 UN Department of Public Information (DPI) Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) conference, the outcomes of the Rio+20 sustainable development summit and recognition of “volunteer groups” in post-2015 processes.

The development of the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness involved hundreds of civil society representatives and groups. The framework adopted in June 2011 by CSO representatives from 70 countries explicitly recognised the contribution of volunteers to development effectiveness. The Framework was later referenced in the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, adopted by the Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness.22

Numerous volunteer groups were active in the organisation and content of the 2011 UN DPI/NGO conference on the theme of “Sustainable Societies, Responsive Citizens.” There was some debate in this process about the extent to which volunteerism and volunteer groups needed explicit recognition, as opposed to implicit inclusion, as part of citizens’ and civil society groups’ approaches to sustainable development. This was particularly noticeable in the approach of environmental organisations compared to more socially-oriented organisations. It was therefore a leap forward that discussions and working together led to a mutual understanding and recognition that people volunteering their time in both kinds of organisation form a fundamental base of citizen engagement for sustainability. The final declaration was adopted by 1,300 civil society representatives.23 It demonstrated how a substantial conference preparation process, with diverse civil society representation, brought about explicit recognition of the role of volunteerism in achieving sustainable societies.

Rio+20, held in 2012, offered a further example. Volunteer groups worked in coalition
the Rio+20 outcome document. This has provided heightened recognition alongside the nine Major Groups that have provided avenues for civil society engagement in sustainable development processes since 1992. See the growing recent recognition of volunteerism and volunteer groups in Graphic 1: Recent Volunteerism Milestones.

These recent positive steps should underscore that advocacy is part of volunteerism: “volunteers have supported action on a scale that would not have been possible without their involvement, and education and awareness campaigns gain a reach that would be impossible if it were not for voluntary contributions of time, skill and energy, to achieved broad-based social change.”

It’s also important to note here that non-formal voluntary action, where people act “…either as individuals or in groups, on either a periodic or ongoing basis” should be seen as part of the civil society spectrum; the 2008-2011 CSI findings reported that non-formal action was the most common and preferred method for volunteering.

**VOLUNTEER INVOLVING ORGANISATIONS IN MULTILATERAL PROCESSES**

In 2012, the annual meeting of international volunteer cooperation organisations (IVCOs) in Ottawa, Canada addressed the issue of how volunteer groups could engage with...
post-2015 processes to encourage voluntary civic engagement as a more explicit part of the new development framework. This led to a declaration on volunteerism in the post-2015 context, which was shared with the UN system to advocate for a role for volunteer groups. Similarly, a September 2013 volunteer stakeholders meeting in New York led to the formation of a task force involving a broader coalition of volunteer groups, which led to a first-ever intervention on behalf of volunteer groups at the 2013 General Assembly High Level Event on the MDGs.

Volunteer groups have faced challenges in engaging in multilateral processes. One VIO interviewee explained:

“Firstly, there have been barriers within the community of VIOs itself, partly through a lack of awareness and recognition of the importance of engaging more strongly in multilateral processes, and partly through resource shortness to engage effectively as a collective. These have to be overcome through internal policy development and strategy work, strengthened resources as well as increased networking within and outside of VIOs. Secondly, there has also been resistance from within the broader family of CSOs – who tend to take volunteerism as such for granted and rather focus on their specific niche/political sectors and not on the very conditions for people’s participation and inter-human relations, including volunteering.”

Thus, there are challenges both within and outside VIOs. Further challenges for volunteer groups can be resource issues and a lack of focus on multilateral level issues. As another interviewee commented, “We focus more on advocacy in our headquarters and in the specific countries where we work than [sic] the global level.” Such engagement also requires being able to demonstrate evidence of the substantive and distinctive policy contribution of volunteer groups and volunteerism at the local level.

It is not easy to develop an evidence base, but this is crucial for effective policy engagement by civil society, and work needs to be done here with intergovernmental bodies, as recognised for example by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report, Better Policies for Development. It points out the need to complement standard economic measures with other indicators covering dimensions of well-being and societal progress, such as income inequalities and many important services that households produce at home, including vol-
Volunteer activities. The development of such non-monetary measures will be important for developing a credible and accountable post-2015 framework with useful indicators. Volunteer groups are increasingly investing in this area to better document their substantive contributions. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) made an important contribution to standardising measurement of volunteer work through its Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work. The manual provides a standardised set of measures of volunteering for country labour force surveys. What is increasingly important is to pursue complementary work by CSOs, volunteer groups and multilateral/intergovernmental bodies to promote and build on tools and experience like the ILO manual and civil society measures like the CIVICUS CSI. These can enhance participatory processes, ownership, engagement, sustainability and multiple accountabilities.

VOLUNTEER GROUPS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

In terms of multilateral engagement, interviewees from CSOs and volunteer groups suggested that the quality of opportunities has been mixed. As one volunteer group interviewee said:

“There are not overt barriers at multilateral levels. Historically, governments and multilaterals have supported volunteerism. This support has often led to people from the volunteering world taking key roles in international engagement. However, I think that governments and multilaterals still see civil society generally, and volunteering in particular, as amateur (so not serious) and supplicant (only after the money), rather than equal partners.”

There is, however, increasing recognition of the substantive contribution that volunteer groups make. This is reflected in the “MY World” survey for the post-2015 process, which collected the views of more than 1.5 million people through online, mobile and offline outreach, and particularly through strong voluntary civic engagement all over the world. Substantive recognition is also evident in key recent documents ranging from national post-2015 reports to those by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network and others.

UN consultation with civil society is based on Article 71 of the 1945 UN charter. In 2004, the Cardoso High Level Panel on UN-Civil Society Relations recommended that the UN become more outward-looking, focusing on convening and facilitating work with civil society. It suggested that the UN embrace a plurality of constituencies to connect local operational work with global goals, and ensure that these reflect local realities. As highlighted by a range of interviews for this paper, civil society and volunteer groups are seen as groups that can strongly engage a plurality of constituencies and link the local to the global. The importance and complexity of providing the UN with direct input from people’s movements and people at the margins requires volunteer groups to build carefully on lessons learned in this area.

Following on from Rio+20, the UN General Assembly agreed to “establish a universal, intergovernmental, high-level political forum, building on the strengths, experiences, resources and inclusive participation modalities of the Commission on Sustainable Development, and subsequently replacing the Commission.” The high-level political forum (HLPF) will provide “political leadership, guidance and recommendations for sustainable development,” and it will probably be the home of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) after they are agreed upon by UN member states. “Volunteer groups” were explicitly recognised as a
relevant stakeholder in the HLPF. They have the same rights as the other historic constituencies of the Major Groups, with a recognised voice in the process of monitoring the implementation of the future SDGs.39

A 2013 study on Strengthening Public Participation at the UN noted the achievements and challenges of the Major Groups system.40 The report drew on past reviews to highlight the “dangers and advantages of the professionalization of multi-stakeholder dialogues.” It highlighted interest from a range of other groups, including people with disabilities and volunteer groups and said, “Volunteers are asking for their contributions on the ground and to the implementation of the sustainable development agenda to be recognized, and are keen to be able to engage fully in the process.”41

In the context of the emerging experience with the HLPF, it is worth considering how current examples and suggestions of good practice in civil society interaction with multilateral arenas can be acted on and enhanced. Many people surveyed on post-2015 accountability mechanisms proposed a system of multiple accountability involving all stakeholders, and to include governments, civil society, donors and the private sector, along with all beneficiaries, particularly those from marginalised groups.42

In a recent survey of major groups and stakeholders, 18 percent of respondents highlighted UNEP, 10 percent UNDP and 8 percent the UN Commission on Sustainable Development as having the most effective civil society interactions,43 suggesting that these are arenas to explore for examples of practice.44 Some particularly valued examples of positive interaction have also been observed in mechanisms that provide some opportunity for participation alongside governments in discussions, drafting groups and governance, for example, the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), the Committee on World Food Security and its Civil Society Mechanism, or the ILO with its tripartite governance system where representatives of governments, employers and workers participate on equal terms.45 The fact that a diversity of volunteer groups engage at different levels, from non-formal and community-based organisations to national and international levels, suggests that there are many possibilities for engagement that could be explored.

Volunteer groups should find ways forward and use the multiple arenas and new opportunities to build coalitions and gain traction. As one interviewee in the multilateral arena stated:

“The view from outside is that civil society organisations with presence in multilateral arenas are often very specialised and with strong knowledge on some issues. They see volunteer groups make a contribution in bringing voices from the local level but not making a substantive contribution to the debate... Volunteer groups have done well to take advantage of recent opportunities, e.g. with the HLPF modalities and special reference to volunteer groups alongside Major Groups. This reflects more openness on the part of member states. Volunteer groups have taken up this space, but this has to be taken up as a long-term presence and commitment.”

**OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR VOLUNTEER GROUPS**

It can be seen that there is growing recognition of the contribution of volunteer groups to sustainable development, though there remains a need to improve the understanding of this amongst some. Volunteerism is gradually being understood not just for its role in helping to deliver, but also for the substantive and distinctive contribution that volunteer groups can make in multilateral arenas. While there are still some challenges, the HLPF provides a positive entry point for volunteer groups to complement the work of others, such as the Major Groups and other stakeholders.

The challenge for volunteer groups is to establish themselves as a broad and inclusive constituency that can relate to all volunteer involving
organisations at the global, national and local levels, as well as the formal and non-formal arenas. By doing so, they can offer connection to grassroots realities and make it easier for people in CSOs to recognise volunteer groups as a key form of civic participation for sustainable development. In turn, greater engagement with volunteers would allow CSOs to take on and address critiques of disconnect between organised civil society and citizens, counterbalance reliance on external funders, and strengthen direct connections with citizens.46

Volunteer groups can now be seen as part of a broader movement to build on the Major Groups process. As one interviewee from the multilateral arena noted:

“Last year volunteer groups were advocating for engagement but not so many others. Now others – energy, climate change, trade and finance groups – are bubbling up and they can help [Major] Groups think about how to be more visible and accountable. All groups need to be accountable to wider groups and people are searching for ways to create and invest in improving and changing the process. Groups have to come together to help define that. Then we can find common cause.”

There are challenges and opportunities for CSOs to engage more successfully with volunteer groups and volunteerism in both formal and non-formal settings. The diversity of volunteerism and the substantive contribution of volunteer groups offer benefits for collaboration to strengthen the participation, voice and representation of civil society. The challenge for CSOs is to see the benefits of accountability, reach and action from engaging more strongly with volunteer groups at every level.

The challenge in multilateral arenas is to find genuine spaces for participatory governance that “promote greater democratic engagement by enabling citizens to play an active role in the decision-making process.”47 The post-2015 process provides a valuable framework to consolidate this space in structure and in practice, building on citizens’ engagement with participatory processes and consultations to date and the emerging recognition of volunteer groups.

UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS (UNV)

The United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme is the UN organisation that promotes volunteerism to support peace and development worldwide. Volunteerism can transform the pace and nature of development, and it benefits both society at large and the individual volunteer. UNV contributes to peace and development by advocating for volunteerism globally, encouraging partners to integrate volunteerism into development programming and mobilizing volunteers.

UNV is administered by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
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