Chapter 2

A changing aid and finance architecture and development partnerships

A Changing Landscape for Partnerships: The Australian NGO experience

Chris Roche, La Trobe University, Melbourne; Linda Kelly, Praxis Consulting

Introduction

In 2013 the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) commissioned research to better understand the changing landscape for Australian NGO (ANGO) partnerships and the emerging challenges and opportunities. The research looked at the way ANGOs were responding to the current context, the lessons to be learned and the areas for further development. This paper outlines the findings of this research and proposed several recommendations to support partnerships for effective development within the changing context for aid and development. We believe this to be of particular relevance given the current debate on the need for 'renewed global partnerships' in the post-2015 development agenda.

The Changing Landscape for Partnerships

Today, almost three-quarters of the world's poorest people — up to a billion people, or a 'new bottom billion' — live in largely stable, non-fragile middle-income countries such as India and China. These middle-income countries retain high levels of inequality in income, educational attainment and health, despite their economic success. This suggests that the root cause of poverty in middle-income countries is not a lack of economic development in a country as a whole, but rather the political, economic and social marginalisation of some groups in countries that are otherwise doing quite well. However, some estimate that by 2025, the number of income poor in stable, middle-income countries could be as low as 18 per cent of the world's poor. Conversely, the concentration of the poor in fragile or conflict-affected states could increase, particularly as energy, water and food become increasingly scarce due to the impacts of climate change.

Alongside the changing location of poverty, new donors and new sources of development funding are challenging long-established aid industry actors such as OECD-DAC donors, and arguably International NGOs. Furthermore, the debate associated with the post-2015 development agenda is raising important questions about the universal nature of the problems that need to be addressed, including those related to persistent levels of poverty in many countries, inequality and sustainability.

Finally, many of the problems that development is normally concerned with, such as poverty and inequality, international immigration, HIV/AIDS, human rights, food security and climate change, are now understood as 'wicked' problems. That is, they are complex, politicised, unpredictable and global. The complexity of linkages between development actors means that no single perspective, or agency, can hope to capture the complex reality. Multiple perspectives and collective action are thus required to address such issues.

Implications for NGOs and Partnership

These shifts in the development landscape should affect with whom NGOs are partnering, where they are partnering and how they are partnering. For the next decade at least, most poor people — the traditional target group of NGOs — will be living in places that have increasing domestic resources to address their problems over time. In these cases, NGOs will need to move beyond 'traditional' aid relationships and projects and continue to find alternative means of supporting poverty reduction and associated inequality. This might include:

- Increasingly engaging with local NGOs and civil society organisations which address exclusion and inequality more squarely;
- A shift to policy agendas that promote empowerment and political voice as well as the transfer of resources and investment in public services;
- Supporting domestic policy processes that favour the redistribution of economic, social and political power; and
- Building middle-class political support for more inclusive policy interventions.

The emergence of new types of donors and alternative funding sources may also alter the power dynamic that underlies many partnerships, putting greater pressure on more traditional international NGOs to demonstrate their added value given that local organisations may have greater choice in who they work with.

NGOs will need to develop a range of new skills and competencies in learning, bridging, mediation, dialogue and influencing to support these roles and relationships. NGOs will need to move beyond unique partnerships as bilateral relationships with a single 'partner' or counterpart, but rather become simultaneously engaged with multiple actors through networks, coalitions and alliances.

The pressure on INGOs from their donors, and increasingly from their own boards and management, to demonstrate results and value for money is not going away. At the same time the complexity of the development process makes simple definitive statements about 'results' and 'what works' highly problematic. This situation is often compounded by INGOs' fundraising and advocacy imperatives to keep their messages to the public accessible and straightforward.

Partnership Typologies

ACFID research undertaken in 2013 identified that over the last 10 years of Australian NGO work, a range of relationships has begun to emerge, in part to respond to this changing aid and development landscape. These partnerships serve various purposes, including:

- Building the capacity and independent ability of local organisations to function as effective development agencies;
- Contributing to the development of civil society;
- Working with various actors in order to leverage a range of capacities to address complex development situations;
- The fostering of learning and interaction for the purpose of better quality development work;
- Membership of alliances and networks that contribute to the creation of new paradigms of development.

These many different types of partnerships or relationships illustrate that defining and identifying the purpose of the relationship is important. Not all development partnerships operate for the same purpose. The complexity and diversity of partnerships has emerged as a critical issue in the research, with ANGOs identifying a critical link between partnership purpose and effective partnership management.

Partnership Management and Implementation

The research highlighted two areas of interest and concern for participating NGOs. The first was the development of tools and approaches for more effective management of the emerging diversity of partnership; and the second, better assessment and identification of the value of these various relationships.

Partnership Practice

Many of the existing tools for partnership management were largely developed in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Most of these tools are based upon a transactional approach to partnerships. The research identified that many NGOs find these tools to be inadequate and that they fail to support new types of partnership. Overall it appeared that the associated management and business practices to support new types of partnership are still under-developed.

Some of the features that require further consideration are identified below.

Organisation approach

New understandings of how change happens are shifting some organisations' approach to development practice, which in turn requires new ways of managing partnerships (see case study 1).

Partnership objectives and values

Partnerships can have different objectives and values than those of each individual organisation respectively. Research participants suggested that it was important to identify the individual organisation objectives for entering into a partnership, and those of the partnership itself. Are there differences between what could be achieved by working together, as distinct from each individual organisational mandate?

In the past, shared values were often the 'glue' that held together many partnerships. In current situations, however, organisations are moving into partnership with other agencies where there may be common objectives, but where values are not necessarily the same. While there may be some overlap and a degree of respect for each other's values, it is clear that NGOs are entering into relationships, for example with private business and governments, where there can be considerable difference in significant organisational values. Negotiation in these situations requires honest and realistic identification of differences, due diligence, and in many cases, the creation of a working arrangement that respects differences, but creates a shared way of working that both or all partners can negotiate.

> **Case study 1: Anglican Board of Mission (ABM) — Working with the Episcopal Church in the Philippines**
>
> ABM describes its project work with different Church partners as a means to a more long-term goal: that of supporting the church to become an actor for development in their local context.
>
> ABM has worked to develop systems to support this long-term approach to partnership. For example, it has developed different types of MoUs, and is currently developing new partnership frameworks for different types of partnership. Significantly, it is fostering an approach within the organisation that identifies its need to change and grow internally, in the same way that it expects to see change in its partners.

Identifying differences in values and objectives may not be possible at the start of all relationships, and objectives are likely to change over time as partners develop a sense of trust, as well as a common understanding of problems and solutions. It is important that agreements between organisations are able to accommodate this flexibility and learning. It is also important that the NGO as an organisation is able to identify both risks and opportunities within partnerships, and be able to manage these as they emerge (see case study 2).

> Case study 2: Oxfam and BHP Billiton — A Changing Relationship
>
> The relationship between Oxfam and BHP Billiton (BHPB) is an interesting example of a relationship that has evolved over time.
>
> Oxfam's initial relationship with BHPB was largely centred on activist-led campaigns against the mining company's social and environmental activities in developing countries. In response to the negative publicity and criticism surrounding the mine, BHPB approached Oxfam and other Australian-based NGOs in the late 1990s to examine the social, economic and environmental dilemmas they faced in their mining operations. This approach coincided with recognition from Oxfam that engagement with multi-national corporations such as BHPB was becoming an important policy consideration for NGOs. This engagement led to the establishment of the Forum on Corporate Responsibility, which now has a permanent place within BHPB's broader stakeholder engagement program.
>
> These efforts towards collaboration were accompanied by increased 'constructive engagement' and 'dialogue' between the two organisations. Although challenging, such engagement did result in opportunities for mutual learning and positive outcomes.
> While generally positive, the increased engagement between Oxfam and BHPB left Oxfam feeling that in some cases, there was a "risk of opening the engagement door too far."[1] As a result, Oxfam has recently pursued a policy of more strategic engagement and 'critical collaboration' with BHPB and other mining industry players.

[1] *Phillips, R 2003, Stakeholders on the Periphery of Citizenship in NGO/Corporate Engagement, Paper presented at the Australian Social Policy Conference, July 9-11 2003, Sydney.*

Partnership agreements

International research around development partnerships suggests that these agreements have often been problematic, in particular because they fail to address power differences, and indeed may even exacerbate them. There are issues with hidden power relationships in typical partnership arrangements between international and local organisations, which often limit the opportunity of local partners to influence the fundamental approach and purpose of the relationship.

Broader research suggests that what is required are approaches to agreements and working arrangements that build on and enable the emergence of local solutions, which are politically acceptable and technically feasible in a given context. The implication is that international NGOs need to "*take partners as they find them,*" and try to work with them, rather than trying to make them work in fundamentally different ways. Finding a 'good fit' with locally driven change is more important than the inappropriate introduction of alien 'best practice' (Booth, 2013).

Recognising this, various agencies are experimenting with reinvigorated approaches to partnership interaction. For example, Caritas Australia has a revised set of principles from which it manages its various partnerships. Likewise, ACFID has proposed a principled-based approach for ANGOs wanting to work with Australian indigenous organisations.

These approaches represent important shifts from what have become increasingly transactional or contractual approaches to managing partnerships in recent years, and can provide for some more respectful and diverse engagements.

Some agencies are also examining their use of finances and are trying to separate financial agreements and accountabilities from the partnership process, in order to delink financial power from the relationship negotiations (see case study 3). This is of course easier for larger and more powerful agencies like BRAC. These cases can also perhaps serve as examples for how others might try and structure their partnership relations.

> Case study 3: Australian Government Partnership with BRAC
>
> The Australian Government together with the UK Department for International Development has a large-scale partnership with BRAC, focused around enabling and supporting BRAC to grow as an organisation and continue to make effective development contributions in Bangladesh.
>
> It was identified through partnership negotiations that even for a large NGO such as BRAC there can be problems in negotiating ongoing working arrangements with international donors. To this end an additional paper was developed to guide the partnership that outlines the terms of engagement for donors. This holds the two current and any future donors to account for their behaviour, and provide some empowerment for BRAC in ongoing partnership management.
>
> The partnership is reviewed annually, with attention given to the quality of relationship as well as the outcomes of working together.

Partnership implementation

Probably the most significant challenge identified in partnership management is the process of implementing the partnership.

Effective partnerships take considerable effort and work, particularly in the early months of initial partnership negotiation. This requires considerable skill and a wide range of tools and resources, in order to facilitate between individuals and organisations the kind of communication necessary for an honest engagement. Some organisations have existing long-term relationships and/or international structures that provide some framework for these negotiations. But in other cases, particularly for non-traditional partners, this process can take considerable time.

For example, the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) has estimated that a recent partnership negotiation in South Asia, bringing together local NGOs, as well as donors and regional organisations, required a seven-month establishment process. This period included time for developing the skills of each organisation to be able to effectively negotiate for their needs and interests as well as establishing the core objectives and principles that would guide the partnership.

The skills required to facilitate these processes are considerable, and can potentially change the role of the typical Australian based NGO program manager. Being an effective partnership manager may require them to be highly skilled in multi-stakeholder facilitation, cross-cultural mediation and negotiation, as well as being able to mediate across differences in power, gender and other divides. Program managers ideally would also be highly competent in adaptive management skills.

Some agencies are working to specify and develop these skills within their organisations. For example, Caritas Australia has identified a series of core competencies for their program managers that include a focus on competency in relationship building and management. Plan International Australia is currently researching the types of skills that program managers require for effective partnership implementation.

Research participants reported that they often had to create new space in their organisations to accommodate new types of relationships.

Some participants suggested that partnerships that were about capacity building of local actors, and/or relied on multiple actors to achieve change, could be contrary to the public identity and messaging of their organisation. That is, for some agencies it was still difficult to explain to some Board members, as well as the public, that they were working to facilitate others to achieve change, rather than directly achieving the change themselves.

The research suggests that ultimately the business processes, including agreements and financing arrangements as well as agreements around communication and reporting, need to be developed to suit the partnership. Partnerships, particularly those emerging between non-traditional partners and those designed to facilitate partners' creative responses to complex problems, should not be driven by organisational systems (see case study 4).

Case study 4: Australian Red Cross — Measuring and Evaluating Partnerships

Australian Red Cross has adopted and adapted a partnership assessment tool developed by a consortium of Red Cross national societies in Africa (led by the Netherlands Red Cross in 2008). The tool is structured around a number of core values: equality and respect, relevance, integrity, transparency, mutual responsibility, achieving expectations, harmonisation, flexibility and communication, and has been adapted for use in different contexts. Criterion and indicators are attributed to each of these values, and a numeric rating is also possible.

Several ANGO respondents discussed how difficult it is to explain effective partnership implementation to official donors. They particularly identified the time it takes to negotiate and manage good quality partnerships alongside the need for partnerships to be mutually accountable. People pointed out that donor systems, including the current Australian Government process of NGO accreditation, largely fail to appreciate these elements of effective partnership. It was further noted that donor funding systems and requirements generally failed to give the space or the time required for good partnership implementation.

Finally, it is clear that most people working in NGO partnerships understand the importance of mutual accountability as an aspect of the partnership. There remains, however, some tension in some organisations as to whether accountability is about partnership outcomes, attention to accountabilities between partners, and/or accountability for the quality of partnership implementation.

In the past, organisations appear to have relied on the quality of the relationship between individuals and organisations to provide accountability for partnership outcomes. While international research suggests that this focus on relationships often masked considerable inequality in power and control between partners, it did provide some form of oversight for development outcomes.

In more complex partnerships where individual relationships are not necessarily a feature of the partnership and where the ANGO is not 'in control', accountabilities need to be negotiated and problems and differences need to be identified and solved. This context requires good quality conflict resolution and mediation skills. Ideally, there should be regular independent assessments to ensure that the accountability of all partners — both mutual accountability and accountability for the outcomes of the work — is addressed and understood. It also requires that organisations assess their risk appetite and the degree to which they are willing to enter into partnerships where they are likely to be even less in control — if they ever were — of the progress and outcomes of those relationships.

Monitoring and Evaluation of Partnerships

It is clear that in the more simple transactional partnerships of the past it was easier to identify the value each partner bought to the project. However, once we turn attention to some of the new forms and modalities for partnership and the purposes that they seek to achieve, the complex nature of these multi-stakeholder partnerships makes them much more challenging to evaluate. Perhaps for this reason, there are few evidence-based evaluations of partnerships available, other than a few empirical studies.

Current accountability requirements within partnerships often fail to allow for the complex and political nature of partnerships, and therefore may not be sufficient to capture value and impact. INGOs, following the requirements of back-donors, including private donors, often rely on linear, cause-effect and results-based monitoring and evaluation tools and frameworks in order to measure the success of relationships. Many of these tools and frameworks are designed for simpler, grassroots-based direct-action or service delivery organisations, rather than processes or practices intended to change power relations, including those that may exist between partners. The focus on risk and financial accountability within partnerships can crowd out other less quantifiable aspects of partnership, and underestimate the importance of inter-personal relationships.

It is increasingly recognised that in complex non-linear systems adaptive learning mechanisms and feedback loops are critical in helping partnerships evolve in a positive manner. The new 'transparency and accountability movement' that has emerged in the development sector, alongside initiatives such as the Keystone Development Partnership Survey, which allows independent feedback to be collected from the partners of International NGOs and then be compared, are attempts to build stronger independent and collective feedback. These initiatives complement moves by individual agencies to build greater accountability to the people and partners they support, as well as to conduct research into their approaches to partnership (see case study 5).

In order to more effectively demonstrate the value of partnerships, International NGOs will first of all need to be much clearer about the assumptions and hypothesis about why and how working through partnerships should be adding value. Second, it will require a better ability to assess the changing nature of partnerships and relationships over time. Third, it will mean enhancing agencies' ability to assess development outcomes — an ongoing challenge. And finally it requires a clearer delineation of the role of different partners and how they have contributed to those outcomes. There are innovations in monitoring and evaluation that are proving to be promising1 in engaging stakeholders more effectively and providing more real-time feedback.

The experience of NGOs and government agencies working on complex leadership programs also provides some useful pointers and lessons on some key aspects that inform innovative monitoring and evaluation.[2]

Having a Theory of Change that provides an explanation for the program

'Complex' program environments require an analysis of political and social relations and processes as well as careful study of influential stakeholders and the relationships between them.

This kind of analysis can provide an informed starting point for program strategy (or what some call a theory of action) and effective partnerships. This provides a useful basis for partners to *collectively* decide what should be measured and assessed over time.

Capturing short-term process and results in a long-term program

For many programs – particularly in their early days – short-term 'results,' focused upon changes in individual and organisational relationships, can provide crucial early learning about whether the foundations of an effective partnership are being built. Tools and methods such as Outcome Mapping[3] are particularly helpful in focusing attention on changes in the behaviour of what have been called 'boundary partners,' i.e. those stakeholders in a direct relationship with a given program.

Understanding contributions to longer-term change

When trying to assess significant and longer-term social change, it is usually more realistic to use monitoring and evaluation systems to identify a program's or partnership's overall *contribution* to change, rather than trying to directly attribute changes to their inputs. Rather than asking "did it work?," it is often more helpful to ask "did it make a difference?"

Monitoring and analysis that is timely and responsive

Development programs and partnerships need to be flexible, adaptive, and able to readily test their continuing relevance. Monitoring in this environment needs to be nimble and focused upon the actions at hand. At the same time, it is important that monitoring and evaluation continue in a systematic way, enabling programs to collect the regular data they need for reporting and communicating with stakeholders. Reserving the time and the space for analysis and reflection can be a critical component of this process. It can enable partnerships to flexibly manage, systematically document, and maintain a common understanding about changes to the program rationale and direction.

Resourcing effective communication and feedback

If monitoring and evaluation are going to meet the demands of multiple stakeholders, as well as lead to program and policy adaptation, then the effective communication of what are often complex processes needs to be a central consideration. Supporting partners and coalitions in 'telling their own story' can not only provide some concrete and verifiable examples of achievements, but can also allow the primary actors to determine which of these they choose to make public. In this sense the process can simultaneously strengthen partners in their ability to promote change and provide donors with some of the evidence of change that they need to satisfy their constituents.

Integrating and resourcing monitoring and evaluation (and related research)

It can also be important to separate out some longer-term research or evaluation work from more immediate monitoring. The complex, non-linear nature of the change processes involved may require a more research-oriented approach to tracking and explaining change over time.

Conclusions

ANGOs are not standing still. They are evolving towards an uncertain future in a variety of ways based on their own circumstances, the changing context and institutional pressures and demands. The ACFID research suggests that partnerships are likewise evolving. The challenges lie in understanding the various purposes of these partnerships and shaping implementation and assessment practices to support and enhance these innovations.

There is widespread recognition that unusual alliances, reform coalitions and multi-stakeholder partnerships will all be needed if the post-2015 agenda is going to produce the real transformation required to address poverty, inequality and sustainability issues. Partnerships, coalitions and networks will thus form an essential component of the effective collective action required to address these global challenges. Australian NGOs have a range of new opportunities available to them in terms of who they partner with, where and how they partner, and the types of partnerships that they engage in. Whether they seize these opportunities will depend on remaining relevant in a changing world, being reflective about current practice and relationships, and ongoing adaptation.

Endnotes

1 The full report of the research can be found at http://www.acfid.asn.au/resources-publications/files/partnerships-for-effective-development/view

2 A number of authors also see the failure in many countries to achieve the Millennium Development Goals as a function of inequality. Owen Barder, in his analysis of the 2010 UN Summit on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), argues that one of the main narratives emerging in development is the idea that “The challenge is increasingly inequality, not absolute poverty”.

3 This paper deliberately focuses on International NGOs rather than the broader notion of Civil Society Organisations

4 This study focused mainly on long-term development and advocacy work, not humanitarian programming

5 Clearly one could argue that such relationships are not partnerships at all. However, for the purposes of this exercise we have a taken a broad definition of partnership which includes cooperation between agencies and looser alliances for change.

6 Booth, D 2013, Facilitating Development: An Arm’s Length Approach to Aid, Politics and Governance Group, Overseas Development Institute, London.

7 ACFID, Effective Development Practice with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities, 2013, Available: http://www.acfid.asn.au/resources-publications/publications/practice-notes/effective-development-practice-in-aboriginal-torres-strait-islander-communities

8 Roche, C 2009, Promoting Voice and Choice. Exploring Innovations in Australian NGO Accountability for Development Effectiveness, Australian Council for International Development, Canberra

9 See for example BOND’s work in this area http://www.bond.org.uk/data/files/Effectiveness_Programme/comparative_study_of_parterships_final.pdf

10 See UNDP (2013) Innovations in Monitoring and Evaluation, UNDP Discussion Paper, New York

11 See Roche, C and Kelly, L 2013a, Monitoring and Evaluation When Politics Matter, DLP, Canberra.

12 See http://www.outcomemapping.ca/

Post-2015 Partnerships: Shared benefits with the private sector? [1]

Shannon Kindornay
Adjunct Research Professor, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University

Introduction

There is no question that the international development community is excited about the potential of new and innovative partnerships to address sustainable development challenges. Much attention has focused on the private sector and the possibilities offered by increased engagement for improved development solutions. The private sector is seen as a source of innovation, expertise, effectiveness, long-term business solutions, and perhaps, most importantly, finance in future sustainable development efforts. Combined with declining aid resources and significant global development and environmental challenges, the private sector presents donors with a potential way to harness each aid dollar and demonstrate value-for-money to taxpayers.

Now, as policymakers look towards the 2015 deadline for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), they see clear possibilities for the private sector in implementing (and financing) the post-2015 agenda.[1] Civil society organizations (CSOs) engaged in the process — many of whom have seen first-hand the negative impacts of foreign and domestic companies on development outcomes — have voiced their concerns with this approach,[2] some of which argue that the UN, and by extension, the post-2015 agenda, is increasingly becoming corporatized.[3] On the other hand, some CSOs are equally excited about the potential of partnering with socially responsible companies on sustainable development initiatives. While there is no question that governments will need to play a critical regulatory role in the realization of the post-2015 agenda — particularly in terms of addressing systemic challenges in areas such as trade, taxation, development financing, and climate change — the excitement around the potential of partnerships across sectors to deliver on sustainable development outcomes is likely here to stay. ‘

Over the past three years, the North-South Institute has carried out a number of research projects examining the role of the private sector in development cooperation. These projects have looked at the terms on which members of the development cooperation community partner with the private sector for development[4] and examined cases of partnerships in practice.[5] This work shows that the push for partnerships with the private sector is based on the assumption that partnerships among development actors represent wins for everyone: recipient governments, the private sector, donors, and CSOs. As has been argued elsewhere,[6] the rationale for partnership is described in terms of capitalizing on the shared interests and comparative advantages of different partners to achieve positive sustainable development results, often in situations where the nature of challenges — such as climate change — is such that no one sector can address them alone.

1 This chapter draws from Kindornay, Shannon, Stephanie Tissot, and Nabeel Sheiban. 2013. The Value of Cross-Sector Development Partnerships. Available at: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/private-sector-partnerships-for-development/.

Each sector has a role to play in the overarching narrative on private sector partnerships for development. The private sector provides expertise, innovation, and finance while governments regulate and incentivise as well as convene different stakeholders across sectors. NGOs provide on-the-ground legitimacy in the communities that they operate, as well as knowledge and expertise, and implementation capacity. The comparative advantages of these different actors and the benefits of working through partnership — *in theory* — have been described in great detail in the development context.

Yet, partnerships in and of themselves do not necessarily guarantee sustainable development outcomes. Nor are they an assurance that marginalized populations will benefit. Indeed, the extent to which partnerships lead to sustainable development outcomes such as the realization of human rights, poverty reduction, and environmental sustainability is an obvious and critical determinant of success. In the excitement of the post-2015 discussions, stakeholders should not develop partnerships simply for the sake of partnership. A clear alignment of interests, examination of costs and benefits and a strong likelihood of achieving more or better sustainable development results than what could be achieved working on one's own are important factors in the consideration of whether or not to partner.

Furthermore, less attention has been paid to the necessary mechanics of partnership that make it possible to realise sustainable development outcomes and shared benefits across sectors. There is an implicit assumption in the international discussions on partnership that more can be achieved by working together than alone. While this is often true, benefits from partnership are not automatic, nor are they necessarily equally shared among partners. This chapter goes beyond current policy discussions on private sector partnership for development, which tend to focus on the policies, approaches, and programming that promote partnerships, and case studies, usually with a bias toward successful examples.[7] Rather, it focuses on the various ways in which partners benefit and improve their effectiveness through partnerships across sectors, presenting a summary of key findings from a recent literature review. This chapter focuses on the types of financial and non-financial benefits that arise from partnership, and considers to whom these benefits accrue. It concludes with a summary of key issues that should be considered in embarking on cross-sectoral partnerships.

Why partner?

Partnerships provide short-term and long-term benefits to organizations and society arising from the complementarities that occur due to interaction between and among public, private, and non-profit partners.[8] Among international cooperation actors, partnerships with the private sector combine the capabilities and resources of public and private actors to leverage different interests and resources. They support businesses' corporate social responsibility strategies, mandates, and operations and enable businesses to access new markets, improve relationships with key stakeholders, and strengthen the quality and vitality of their supply chains.[9]

However, the usefulness of these partnerships is contingent on the complementarity, nature, direction, and use of resources between partners. The degree to which partners invest in the partnership has important implications not only for outcomes achieved, but also for the impact of the partnership on the behaviour of participants. The section below examines what is gained through partnership and what dynamics potential partners should consider when partnering.

What are you really getting from partnership?

Before embarking on any partnership (within or across sectors), organizations should examine what they bring to the table and what they hope to get out of partnership. Austin and Seitanidi argue that participants gain from partnerships in four ways: through association, transferred resources, interaction and synergies.[10] Association with a particular partner can lead to reputational gains, including improved projected credibility. For example, the UN Global Compact offers greater credibility to private sector members, who, through association with the UN system, are able to project greater legitimacy and credibility with respect to being a good corporate citizen. Association also presents risks, particularly if potential conflicts of interest exist (such as in the case of partnerships between organizations dedicated to promoting health outcomes and companies in the food and beverage industry).

Resources that are transferred between partners represent an obvious area where benefits accrue to partners. The potential for private sector resources to fill development finance gaps has been a significant part of international discussions on the private sector for development, which tend to focus on who brings what to the table.

Partners also benefit from interacting with one another — what Austin and Seitanidi call "interaction value." This refers to what partners gain by working with one another, such as improved relationships, greater knowledge, and skills development. For example, through partnerships CSOs may build their capacity to engage on and develop solutions to development challenges through more market-based approaches; meanwhile, private sector partners may build their capacity to engage on sustainable development issues.

Finally, synergies are created through partnership. Synergies refer to the benefits generated from the partnership that otherwise would not have occurred if partners acted alone. In the context of post-2015 discussions, synergies represent the sustainable development outcomes for beneficiary populations that arise from partnership. A concrete example of synergies is in the field of advanced market commitments in health. Public, private and non-government actors are each playing a role to develop new vaccines, which could not have occurred (or would have occurred, but within a much longer timeframe) without partnership.

These benefits are not mutually exclusive; partnerships typically generate a combination of benefits arising from association, resource transfers, interaction and synergies. The extent to which benefits are garnered depends on the interests of participants, the level of integration and interaction between the various partners, and the nature of resources transferred. For example, a business may choose to work with an NGO on a discrete project that serves both partners' interests. This type of partnership would likely mean associational value for both parties—in other words, reputational gain. However, the scope of the partnership and distribution of responsibilities will have implications for the extent to which each organization benefits from interacting with one another and the extent to which the partnership offers synergies – i.e. outcomes that would not have occurred on their own or could not have occurred working with other partners.

Who benefits from partnership?

Concerns have been raised regarding the extent to which partnerships with the private sector really benefit marginalized populations in ways that would not have occurred without public support. In instances where public funding is used to subsidize innovative business models and new products and services, there is also concern regarding the extent to which benefits accrue to the private sector partner versus the supposed beneficiaries of the project. For example, if public funding is used to support the creation of an organic line of produce for sale in a partnering retail store, the question of how benefits (increased profits) are shared between the retailer and smallholder farmers needs to be addressed.

Ideally, society, partnering organizations and individuals would experience and share in the benefits of partnership.[11] The extent to which benefits accrue on different levels depends on the goals and objectives of different organizations involved in the partnership. In the case of development partnerships, typically, the most important rationale for partnership relates to potential sustainable development outcomes for society, articulated through goals such as poverty reduction, generation of improved livelihoods and inclusive socio-economic development, and the creation of key services and products aimed at meeting the needs of the poor. The benefits to society occur beyond the domain of either organization's participation in the partnership; i.e. the benefits (such as developing new vaccines) that otherwise would not have happened without the partnership.

At the organizational level, partners benefit through the fulfilment of partnership objectives. For private sector actors, this can be in the form of improved corporate image, increases in sales and firm performance, access to new markets, greater legitimacy and social license to operate, achievement of corporate social responsibility objectives, and compliance with other business principles and standards. For their part, public and non-profit actors may improve their ability to leverage financial and non-traditional resources, gain new skills and visibility, exchange knowledge, engage in opportunities for innovation and sustainable approaches to development, and share risks and costs associated with development initiatives. Individuals who represent their organization in partnerships also benefit. Through working across sectors, individuals may see the development of new skills, higher levels of trust and personal commitment, and improved job satisfaction owing to shared project success.

What kind of partnership is needed?

There is no question that a wide variety of partnership mechanisms have emerged as a result of the increasing emphasis on the private sector as a development partner.[12] Rather than unpacking partnership mechanisms (which has already been done by others), another way of thinking about partnerships is in terms of the level of integration or collaboration that occurs between participants. Austin and Steidini identify four existing stages of partnership: philanthropic, transactional, integrative, and transformative. These stages, though not mutually exclusive, represent a continuum along which partners move as they deepen their relationships. This can allow for the achievements of greater benefits.[13] While Austin and Steidini consider donations a form of partnership under the philanthropic stage, international discussion on cross-sector partnerships typically refer to broader relationships that move beyond the unilateral transfers of resources where no repayment is required, and thus fall within the transactional, integrative and transformative stages. Partnerships at the transactional stage are those in which a reciprocal exchange of resources occurs through specific activities and where there is an agreed exchange of goods or services based upon an explicit or implicit contract. An example of this is when a business and a NGO enter into a contractual agreement under which the business develops a project and then transfers resources to an NGO for implementation. In this example, the NGO essentially serves as implementing partner and the private sector as funder, working more closely together.

The integrative stage refers to partnerships that require greater efforts from partners to work jointly to define a common partnership plan that will meet each partner's interests and create benefits. These types of partnership are typically manifested in the form of a joint development project supported by public, private, and non-profit actors, where partners develop clear objectives and employ joint decision-making processes and implementation strategies. In this instance, projects or initiatives are co-developed by partners across sector, and each actor plays a role in achieving shared benefits.

An example of an integrative partnership is the Tim Hortons Coffee Partnership that supports small-scale coffee farmers throughout Latin America, with the aim of building sustainable coffee communities through improved farming practices and more efficient production of higher quality coffee.[14] Under the partnership, Tim Hortons serves as a funder and coffee purchaser, partnering with government and non-governmental organizations to work directly with farmers, local coffee organizations, and NGOs. All partners play a specific role under the project to support implementation of projects with coffee growers and other aspects of the Coffee Partnership, such as educational and environmental sustainability initiatives. Over time, the initiative has allowed partners to increasingly and jointly find new ways to combine their key competencies and resources to achieve the partnership's goals.

The transformational stage is the most advanced collaborative stage for a partnership. Partners not only agree on the social issues relevant to those involved, but also on their intention to deliver transformation through social innovation and better the lives of those affected. While integrative partnerships can also lead to social transformation, transformative partnerships are characterized by interdependence and collective action as the operational modality. Partners collaborate on longer-term timeframes and express stronger commitments to the development initiative. Partnerships at the transformational stage include catalytic engagements between public, private, and non-profit actors that have clear and sustainable development impacts, the potential to alter or reform business practices, and even the possibility of new modalities for public service provision. The scope of efforts employed and the extent to which partners are invested in the outcomes of the partnership is the most advanced at this stage.

For instance, initiatives may aim to fundamentally alter the sustainability of supply chains through reduced inputs, changes in farming practices, and the promotion of organic or fair trade products. Such initiatives would be transformational partnerships, long-term in nature and potentially wide-reaching in impact – resulting, for example, in improved livelihoods for farmers, and more socially conscious production and consumption. The impacts of transformational partnerships go beyond the goals of any one actor involved, such as enabling non-profits and governments to meet objectives with respect to improving livelihoods and reducing poverty, and enabling the private sector partner to ensure sustainability within supply chains and to position itself as good corporate citizen. Transformation partnerships provide greater possibilities for wider transformations across society (consumption habits and sustainable livelihoods), organizations (behavioural change in the form of new business models and approaches) and individuals (new skills for managing partnership developed for example).

In practice, it is difficult to identify clear "stages" of partnership; often partnerships include elements of more than one stage as they progress. Nevertheless, Austin and Steindini's theoretical conception of the stages of partnership is helpful for thinking through the type of partnership needed to achieve different goals. If the goal of partnership is to secure financing for a particular campaign, then partners may benefit more from a philanthropic arrangement. If the goal is a more systemic change in terms of behaviour of business and consumers, a transformational partnership may be needed.

Partnerships evolve and new benefits emerge over time. Not all partnerships aim to reach the transformational stage as the goals of the partners determine the level of integration required (Table 1). Nevertheless, as partners' interactions strengthen and expand, so too do the possibilities for shared benefits. When partners collaborate more closely, they employ resources and capabilities that are key determinants of their respective success, which may lead to resource complementarity and greater co-creation of benefits. Stronger integration and deepened relationships allow partners to achieve greater congruency of their missions, values, and strategies. This may help in creating organizational cohesion, and in finding new means of innovation and joint problem solving.[15]

Conclusion

There is no question that a significant push for partnerships exists in discussions on how the post-2015 SDGs will be realized. However, partnerships should not occur simply for the sake of partnership. It should not always be assumed that the benefits of working through partnership outweigh the costs, or what could be achieved by working on one's own in terms of development outcomes; organizational differences and transaction costs of working with partners can be quite high, at least initially. Furthermore, realizing the post-2015 SDGs will require systemic change in areas such as trade, taxation, development financing, and approaches to climate change. These issues require action by governments whose regulatory role should not be diminished

Table 1. Sources of organizational benefits accruing from partnership[16]

	Sole creation	→	Co-creation
Organizational			
Resource complementarity	Low	→	High
Resource nature	Generic	→	Distinct competency
Resource directionality	Unilateral	→	Joint
Linked interests	Weak/narrow	→	Strong/broad
Types of benefits			
Associational	Modest	→	High
Transferred resource	Depreciable	→	Renewable
Interaction	Minimal	→	Maximal
Synergistic	Least	→	Most
Innovation	Seldom	→	Frequent
Stages	Philanthropic Transactional Integrative Transformational		

in an era of partnership and for whom taking steps to address systemic issues at the multilateral level remains a priority.

Nevertheless, as development actors increasingly engage in partnerships, it is important that the structure and nature of partnerships are determined by agreed upon objectives and purposes, including an understanding of the implications of objectives for the composition of the partnership and roles of each partner. Once deemed beneficial to development, realising the full potential of partnerships depends on the management and maintenance of relationships. Trust is built over time. Overcoming differences and aligning contributions is pivotal as partnerships deepen and expand, enabling partners to co-create social and organizational value. At the same time, while deeper integration among public, private, and non-profit actors can lead to greater value creation, including in terms of achieving more and better sustainable development results, the management and maintenance of these engagements is a challenging task. Policy-makers and practitioners should carefully examine the benefits and costs of forming and maintaining a partnership.

The comparative advantages of different partners determine the types of benefits derived from partnership — associational, resource, interaction, and synergistic. Assessment of the core competencies that each partner possesses is important. It is equally important for partners to identify their weaknesses. Potential partners need to assess partnerships not only in terms of the combined resources and capabilities that each partner brings, but also with a consideration of the organizational impacts that the formation and maintenance of a partnership may entail.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that there is a difference between a successful partnership and a successful initiative carried out in partnership. A development initiative may be successful even if a partnership is dysfunctional or fails. As such, it is important to establish a measurable set of outcomes that focus on both the partnership and the development initiative, particularly as excitement continues to build for the establishment of partnerships in the post-2015 landscape.

References

Austin, James E., and M. May Seitanidi. 2012. "Collaborative Value Creation: A Review of Partnering between Nonprofits and Businesses. Part 2: Partnership Processes and Outcomes." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 41 (6): 929–68.

BCLC (Business Civic Leadership Center) and Corporate Citizenship. 2009. Partnering for Global Development: The Evolving Links between Business and International Development Agencies. Washington, DC: BCLC.

BMZ (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2011. Forms of Development Cooperation Involving the Private Sector. Strategy paper 05/2011e. Bonn and Berlin: BMZ.

Chandy, Laurence, Kemal Derviş, George Ingram, Homi Kharas and Stephen Rocker. 2014.

Profitable Development Solutions. How the Private Sector Can Contribute to the Post-2015 Agenda. Available at http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2014/04/private-sector-post-2015-agenda

European Parliament (Directorate-General for External Policies, Policy Department). 2014.

Financial for Development Post-2015: Improving the Contribution of Private Finance. Available at: http://eurodad.org/files/pdf/5346a6b10e9a4.pdf.

Glennie, Jonathan. 2014. How silver-tongued multinationals can win trust in development circles. The Guardian. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2014/apr/29/multinationals-business-global-development-regulation

Global Policy Forum. 2014. Privatizing Global Governance: Corporate Influence at the United Nations. GPF Briefing 1. Global Policy Forum.

Googins, Bradley K., and Steven A. Rochlin. 2000. "Creating the Partnership Society: Understanding the Rhetoric and Reality of Cross-Sectoral Partnerships." Business and Society Review 105 (1): 127–44.

HLP (High Level Panel of Imminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda). 2013. A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development. Available at: http://www.post2015hlp.org/the-report/.

Di Bella, José, Alicia Grant, Shannon Kindornay and Stephanie Tissot. 2013. Mapping Private Sector Engagements in Development Cooperation. Available at: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/publications/mapping-private-sector-engagements-in-development-cooperation/.

Heinrich, Melina. 2013. "Donor Partnerships with Business for Private Sector Development: What Can We Learn from Experience?" Working Paper, Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, Cambridge.

Kindornay, Shannon, Kate Higgins and Michael Olender. 2013. Models for Trade-Related Private Sector Partnerships for Development. Available at: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/private-sector-partnerships-for-development/

Kindornay, Shannon, and Fraser Reilly-King. 2013. Investing in the Business of Development. Available at: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/publications/investing-in-the-business-of-development/

Kindornay, Shannon, Stephanie Tissot, and Nabeel Sheiban. 2013. The Value of Cross-Sector Development Partnerships. Available at: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/private-sector-partnerships-for-development/.

Kwakkenbos, Jeroen. 2012. Private Profit for Public Good? Can Investing in Private Companies Deliver for the Poor? Brussels: European Network on Debt and Development (Eurodad).

Pingeot, Lou. 2014. Corporate influence in the Post-2015 process. Available at: http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/GPFEurope/Corporate_influence_in_the_Post-2015_process_web.pdf

Selsky, John W., and Barbara Parker. 2010. "Platforms for Cross-Sector Social Partnerships: Prospective Sensemaking Devices for Social Benefit." Journal of Business Ethics 94 (1): 21–37.

Smith, William. 2013. How Donors Engage with Business. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Social Watch. 2014. The privatization of the post-2015 development agenda. Available at: http://www.socialwatch.org/node/16400

UNSG (United Nations Secretary General). 2012. The Secretary-General's Five-Year Action Agenda. Available at: http://www.un.org/sg/priorities/sg_agenda_2012.pdf.

UNGC (United Nations Global Compact). 2013. Architects of a Better World: Building the Post- 2015 Business Engagement Architecture. Available at: http://www.unglobalcompact.org/resources/441

16 Adapted from Austin and Seitanidi 2012.

Endnotes

1 Endnotes
See, for example, UNSG 2012; HLP 2013; UNGC 2013; Chandy et al. 2014.

2 Glennie 2014; Lou Pingeot 2014; European Parliament 2014.

3 For example, GPF 2014; Social Watch 2014.

4 Kindornay and Reilly-King 2013; Di Bella et al. 2013.

5 Kindornay, Higgins, and Olender 2013.

6 Kindornay, Sheiban and Tissot 2014.

7 See, for instance, BCLC 2009; Di Bella et al. 2013; Kindornay and Reilly-King 2013; Kindornay, Higgins, and Olender 2013; Heinrich 2013; Smith 2013; Kwakkenbos 2012.

8 Austin and Seitanidi 2012.

9 Googins and Rochlin 2000; see also Di Bella et al. 2013; Kindornay, Higgins, and Olender 2013.

10 Austin and Seitanidi 2012.

11 Selsky and Parker 2010.

12 Di Bella et al. 2013; BMZ 2011.

13 Austin and Steidini 2012; Tissot 2013.

14 See Kindornay, Higgins and Olender 2013; Tissot 2013.

15 Googins and Rochlin 2000.

Prototypes for Effective Partnership: Development Cooperation in Mozambique

Taurai Chiraerae
African Forum and Network on Debt and Development (AFRODAD)

Partnerships have long been manipulated by the international community as a compact of commitments for promoting development effectiveness. These partnerships have pursued policies for more enabling domestic environments, so that increased opportunities would translate into outcomes for development effectiveness.

According to the OECD, a partnership is an agreement to do work together in ways that will benefit all involved, bringing results that could not be achieved by a single partner operating alone, and reducing duplication of efforts.[1] The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) emerged from an agreement reached at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, Republic of Korea, in 2011. This Partnership is intended to nurture engagement and knowledge exchange among diverse actors in implementing the agreements reached in Busan.

The Global Partnership also supports regular monitoring of progress in implementing the Busan commitments. The ability of the Global Partnership to strengthen the effectiveness of development co-operation partnerships at the country level will be its principal measure of success and relevance to the post-2015 development agenda. However, in many countries the quality of partnerships has never been evaluated. This chapter will measure the indicators at the global and national level for the success of partnerships, and set out some of the preconditions for equitable partnerships as they manifest in Mozambique. Specifically, it will analyse how partnerships between the Mozambican government and development partners, private sector and civil society organizations (CSOs) have aided or undermined development effectiveness in Mozambique.

Measures and indicators for success of partnerships at the global and national level

For successful country-level partnerships, it is paramount to develop global and national measures and indicators. The legal framework is critical for boosting partnerships. Critical financial legislation and other legal instruments should be in place; namely, legislation for Financial Administration, Audit and the Public Procurement. With such legislation in place, donors as part of national partnerships need to show more confidence in the reformed systems. If further change is required, donors need to collaborate with government to achieve mutually acceptable systems. Also in conformity with the GPEDC, the legal framework should give development actors (Parliament, the Private Sector, and CSOs) the legal mandate to perform their watchdog role. For example, the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee (PAC) is mandated by law to assess any identified misappropriations and corruption issues.

In terms of evaluating the success (or failures) of country-level partnerships, government aid management policies[2] are critical policy documents for the implementation of a working partnership. Aid policies will determine the manner in which aid will be disbursed, and will also ensure that aid priorities will be in line with the national development plans of the recipient country. Most African development frameworks are fully committed to fighting poverty and have articulated plans for poverty reduction and economic growth. Aid management policies will establish the government's preferences in terms of the types of aid it wishes to receive and the processes to be followed when managing foreign aid. However, for aid to be effective, aid management policies should be an outcome of extensive consultations.

Development partners need to allow partner countries to lead the process as they lend support in the partnership. While they should remain true to their own development cooperation policies and strategies, they nevertheless need to remain flexible regarding the priorities of the partner country, and structure their support accordingly. They ought to use country systems as the default approach for development co-operation in support of activities managed by the public sector. These country systems include, among others, the Public Financial Management systems and Procurement systems. Therefore, in effective partnerships, donors should reinforce the use of country systems by strengthening governments' capacities and by promoting transfer of skills.

Governments and donors must come up with a platform where they are able to meet with CSOs, ideally every month, to discuss specific topics aimed at sharing information and best practice. For partner countries in which direct budget support is the desired form of disbursement, policy dialogue[3] has proved to be of paramount importance as it supports the inclusive nature of the GPEDC commitments. Policy dialogue is an appreciated instrument for donors and partner governments because it provides the possibility of open and frank discussions that are partnership-based. In most cases, policy dialogue is done through a contract between donors and a partner government, which normally regulates the responsibilities agreed upon by the partners.

Policy dialogues and inclusive country observatories[4] are essential in order to reflect the inclusive nature of the aid architecture as articulated in the GPEDC. Observatories will include non-state actors in the monitoring and evaluation of government programmes. Non-state actors will carry out their own independent monitoring and evaluation, and their findings could be discussed with government through advisory institutions. This independent monitoring is critical as evidence demonstrates slow progress in including non-executive stakeholders in national level processes. Government together with its partners should establish a transparent, dynamic and an informal dialogue mechanism among all actors.

Partner governments should institutionalize and strengthen aid and development policy dialogue between all levels of government, donors, civil society, parliaments, the private sector, and emerging lenders to institutionalize a more participatory process. Parliaments should ensure effective and tangible implementation of the GPEDC to raise political pressure to deliver on the Busan commitments. Citizen participation at all levels of decision-making must be highlighted. Governments should provide an enabling environment for CSOs to measure progressive progress. CSOs in turn need to promote and operationalise the Istanbul Principles and the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness.[5]

African countries require key policies and efforts to be put in place for managing development cooperation, and should work towards mechanisms by which other stakeholders can play a larger role in managing the development agenda. In policy dialogue, all stakeholders can contribute to addressing country-specific priority areas and needs, hence resulting in the effectiveness of aid.

A code of conduct for all partners, focusing on more inclusive aid architecture, is a desirable reference point for partnerships to enable development effectiveness. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is a tool for setting out a shared agenda that defines the performances and reporting commitments of all partners in implementing aid initiatives. The MoU in most cases is based on the aid effectiveness commitments from the 2005 Paris Declaration and the 2011 GPEDC. A MoU also usually contains commitments to sound macroeconomic policies, peace, credible and democratic processes, and overarching goals for reduce poverty.

Another important instrument similar to the MoU is the performance assessment framework for programme aid partners. A Donor's Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) forms a part of a mutual review process designed to strengthen mutual accountability at the country level, drawing from international and national agreements on the quality of development assistance. Partner countries and donors need to commit to be mutually accountable to each other as they implement the GPEDC agreements. Donors are encouraged to show strong commitment towards meeting their financing targets, and governments should be able to hold donors accountable. Under this platform, partner countries can assess the impact on aid outcomes from issues relating to the predictability of aid flows and donor conditionalities attached to aid received. The performance assessment is measured along the national development priorities of the country. Donors therefore use indicators and targets of the recipient government to also assess the recipient government.

Joint Assistance Strategies (JASs) are expected to guide aid modalities and the delivery of development assistance in the context of increased harmonization between the donors.[6] But these JASs need to be revised and implemented in an effort to improve donor coordination, harmonization and alignment with government priorities. They should be geared towards strengthening national ownership of development programmes through aligning donor support to national priorities and government policy frameworks. They should reduce transaction costs for the government, as well as for the donor community by doing away with multiple strategies, processes, and reporting formats and duplicate/overlaps in donor supported activities. They can also achieve more efficient and effective use of donor resources through a donor division of labour. The process of formulating the JAS should be led by the government of the partner country and involve extensive and broad-based consultations with development partners and non-state actors.

All governments should create institutionalized platforms backed by law that will promote the exchange of information. To enable aid transparency, publishing user-friendly aid information on a timely basis under the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard will allow citizens to track the purposes for which aid is being used and especially to monitor what it is achieving. Transparency will also help donors and governments manage aid more effectively, so that every dollar destined towards fighting poverty, does so. For partner countries with strong donor dependence, timely transparent information on aid flows is crucial.

This information should be available through a database, which will also be important for monitoring and improving the capture of data for various sectoral/ministerial activities and budgets. Partner countries have already started to review existing frameworks to bring them in line with Busan commitments.[7]

Transparent data for statistics provides the evidence needed to improve decision-making, document results, and heighten public accountability. Fully integrated statistics assist in decision-making, making open access to statistics an essential policy to be implemented. Improving transparency in relation to the budgeting process and development processes is critical to ensure that all actors are fully and meaningfully involved.

Effective partnerships in Mozambique

A partnership is collaborative and will be effective if it shares a strategic vision, pursues compatible targets, and ensures that all are equal members. Partnerships need to embody an acceptable sharing of obligations and responsibilities, and entail a package of commitments attractive enough for all partners to join. The Mozambican official development assistance landscape includes the Development Partners Group (DPG), consisting of heads of mission of multilateral and bilateral donors, among others. These partners are further categorized into non-General Budget Support (GBS) countries, such as Japan and the United States, Programme Aid Partners (PAPs), and the emerging economies such as Brazil and Indonesia. Mozambique has been considerably successful in establishing a positive partnership and dialogue between government and the donor community, as this partnership conforms to the guiding principle of equity. The partnership has also thrived because the requisite political will exists on the part of both the government of Mozambique and its development partner.

Mozambique is highly dependent on official development assistance (ODA) and has received substantial ODA from the international community since independence. Mozambique is placed among the ten most aid-dependent countries in the world, with nearly 40% of the state budget financed with resources (e.g. grants and loans) from aid.[8] Mozambique has been making significant improvements in economic growth rate, implementing reforms aimed at ensure in a stable government. The Government has adopted a number of well-articulated plans for poverty reduction and growth. These include Agenda 2025 (the national long term vision), which is the basis for the Five Year Programme (2005-2009) and the second generation of Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty (PARPA II, Mozambican PRSP II).

Cooperation between the Government of Mozambique and its development partners

Mozambique has embarked on partnerships that have achieved impressive development impacts leading to improved social and economic conditions. Mozambique defines poverty as "the impossibility, owing to inability and/or lack of opportunity for individuals, families, and communities to have access to the minimum basic conditions, according to the society's basic standard."[9] In 2004 the Government and its development partners signed a Memorandum of Understanding for Program Aid Partnership (PAP). The MoU set out the principles, terms and operations for the partnership. In 2009 the MoU was reviewed and revised, adding sector programme support to the assessment framework. All donors abide by the procedures agreed upon in the MoU to increase transparency and improve budget support.

The Programme Aid Partners' Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) process has provided the country offices of donors with a useful tool in lobbying their respective donor headquarters to preserve or improve the compliance with the current discourse of development effectiveness as elaborated at the Busan High Level Meeting. The process has also provided some extrinsic incentives for behaviour change through 'naming and shaming' and contributed to a greater acceptance of the notion that donors can and should be held accountable against commonly agreed aid effectiveness commitments.

In 2008, the Monitoring and Evaluation of the Paris Declaration noted that over 18 donors were providing General Budget Support (GBS) and establishing Sector Working Groups. In Mozambique this modality of support has increased the policy space. With budget support, aid on the budget is scrutinized for its effectiveness by the parliament and can be allocated to ministries most in need of aid. Positive impacts of direct budget support include an improvement in public welfare, resulting from the implementation of government programs.

PAPs have channelled official development assistance to the Mozambican government with an average of 90% going as direct budget support during the last five years.[10] Only 10% goes towards civil society and the private sector. More donors now provide at least two-thirds of their aid as programme aid, and more aid is coming on-budget. Overall, PAPs are well aligned with the government's priorities. Predictability of disbursements has been improved and a high proportion of disbursements occur in the early months of the fiscal year. PAPs have been extended since 2000 to increase the resources available for public spending, thus contributing to improving the country's poverty reduction efforts.[11]

The European Union and the Government of Mozambique signed a comprehensive Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme for 2008-2013.[12] The European Union provided support to Mozambique to promote fast, sustainable and broad-based growth, as defined in Mozambique's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. The strategy for this cooperation with Mozambique is focused on certain areas, which follows the government's existing policy framework and which seeks out complementarity with other donors and EC instruments. The EU provided the major part of its funds as General or Sectoral Budget Support, and the rest was allocated to priority sectors such as transport infrastructures, agricultural and rural development, and regional integration.

Among other examples, Norwegian development cooperation has also embarked on partnerships with Mozambique for poverty reduction. It has provided humanitarian aid and support to reconstruction, rehabilitation, peace and reconciliation, which were gradually phased out as Mozambique's economy and situation improved. Danish development cooperation partnerships with Mozambique also reflect the ambition to address issues of poverty reduction through promotion of political dialogue, development cooperation, and stronger trade and investment ties. Due to the rising importance of emerging donors like China, India and Brazil, there is also a continued effort to better integrate these new donors in the existing aid architecture.

Mozambique adopted its International Cooperation Policy document in 2010, concerning development cooperation targeted at poverty reduction. Mozambique is preparing a "Code of Conduct" for donors in line with the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation.

Ownership of development priorities has been obliquely defined by the Mozambique government, resulting in positive outcomes. Mozambique was a pioneer in the establishment of coordination mechanisms between government and donors. Technical assistance in many partner countries is often driven by supply rather than demand, relatively expensive, and sometimes, not based on a representative assessment. However, these realities have not been the experience of Mozambique. It made impressive advances regarding the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and is also taking the lead in the implementation of the Busan principles. Mozambique has assumed leadership within the partnerships, allocating aid to specific sectors that need it the most. The group of 19 donors (G19) has aligned with these priorities, resulting in greater effectiveness of development assistance in Mozambique.

The Government of Mozambique and civil society

Political, economic and social reforms around the world have highlighted the need for civil society to participate effectively in decision-making processes and in the implementation and monitoring of public policies and programmes. CSOs have increasingly taken on the role of equal development partners, participating actively in research and advocacy actions that monitor and influence public and community development policies. The notion that involvement of civil society in the policy process improves effectiveness has gained considerable support from studies and evaluations of projects over several decades. In Mozambique, the main vehicle for implementing this approach has been the Poverty Observatory (known in Portuguese as Observatório da Pobreza, or 'OP'), a consultative and participatory forum for monitoring the implementation of Mozambique's PRS, the Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty.

Civil Society involvement in the Poverty Observatory process has been coordinated through the "G20" group of NGOs, which was formed in 2003 in order to more effectively organize civil society input into the second national Poverty Observatory. The group — now comprised of over 20 organizations — represents religious groups, trade unions, private and financial sector groups and other NGOs. The principal contribution of the G20 has been the production of an annual participatory review of progress in poverty reduction, the Annual Poverty Report (known in Portuguese as the Relatório Anual da Pobreza, or 'RAP'), to serve as the core civil society input into the OP process and represent the voices of the poor. The national RAP is also complemented by provincial versions, developed by autonomous provincial bodies of the G20 and presented at the OPs.

The Government of Mozambique and the private sector

The private sector is increasingly viewed as an engine for growth across the African continent. Mozambique has managed to attract investors in several "mega-projects." These projects are concentrated in the energy (Cahora Bassa, Pande/Temane gas fields), industrial (Mozal Aluminum plant) and mining (Moatize coal mines, Moma Titanium) sectors.[13] They have been criticised in the past for not generating enough employment or for failing to develop linkages with the broader economy. The Government's privatisation program is well advanced and has facilitated investment, especially in infrastructure Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) such as ports and railways.

It should be noted that long-lasting civil wars and floods have hampered Mozambique's infrastructure development. Railway and port charges once made up a large share of the country's public revenue. Rail, road and port handling were major service industries in the country though the level of development has been uneven. The extreme South of the country (Maputo and Maputo province) is fairly developed compared to the rest of the country. Given the significant capital requirement of infrastructure investment, PPPs continue to be the most feasible financing option for infrastructure in Mozambique.

Some cases of PPPs in Mozambique include Ressano Garcia railroad, Sena and Machipanda Railroad, TRAC, Nacala Railway, Maputo Port, and Beira Port. Evidence shows mixed results for PPPs in Mozambique. For example, the Maputo corridor results appear to be good, with all the concessions in operation and with coordinated expansion plans as installed capacity is reached. In the case of the Nacala and Beira ports and the associated railways, the results are not as good, with long dwell times and little dredging at Beira.[14] In any case, the assessments of most railway PPPs in Eastern and Southern Africa is negative. These failures have been due to the tardiness of the concession process, the lack of interim funding, the quality of the contracts, and the poor choice of concessionaires.[15]

Conclusion

As they say, there is no equal partnership under the sun, if one or the other is cheated. This analogy is highly relevant to how partnerships for aid and development effectiveness can result in meaningful development cooperation. It has been noted that for Mozambique, genuine partnerships with the donor community have been built over a long period of time. Donors have financed the country using priorities set by the Mozambique government. For a partnership to be effective, both parties should ensure that they both adhere to officially made agreements. These MOUs should subscribe to the aid management policies in place and be aligned with the legal statutes of the country. Ultimately, partner developing countries should take leadership in these partnerships, as they are the ones to benefit the most from effective partnerships.

References

AFRODAD 2013 Delivering on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation in Africa. Accessed at:. http://www.afrodad.org/index.php/resource-centre/publications/category/18-policy-briefs.html

AFRODAD 2013 The effectiveness of foreign aid beyond Busan, Case study Mozambique, Zambia and Ghana. AFRODAD publication series 2012.

Alex Warren-Rodríguez April (2008) A Study for the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI) and the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA) Accessed at: http://www.mokoro.co.uk/files/13/publication/AOB-MozambiqueReport(April08final).pdf

Annette Scoppetta. Successful partnerships. Accessed at: http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/36279186.pdf

Development initiatives 2014: Evaluating progress on the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, post Busan Mozambique Case Study.

SADEX 2012. Mutual accountability in practice. The case of Mozambique.

Tony Killick 2005, Perfect Partners? The performance of Programme Aid Partners in Mozambique. Accessed at:http://www.afrimap.org/english/images/documents/file42b16ae21a2b4.pdf

Ronald Fischer 2013, Infrastructure PPPs: Lessons from Latin America for Africa. Accessed at: http://www.theigc.org/sites/default/files/Fischer%20and%20Nhabinde%202012%20PPPs%20in%20Mozambique%20Working%20Paper.pdf

Endnotes

1 OECD, Forum on partnerships and Local governance, Successful partnership, A guide, Accessed at http://www.google.co.zw/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CB4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.fonduri-ue.ro%2Fposdru%2Fimages%2Fdowndocs%2Fbrosura_parteneriate_de_succes.pdf&ei=lf8TVPHqKYWVauylgvAF&usg=AFQjCNFyeCnpFah7Ez-uSAFycpJL7XIR7Q&sig2=kRDMgpOTyPtsVC86wPUTOA&bvm=bv.75097201,d.d2s

2 Most African countries have developed their aid policies, in countries such as Zimbabwe, Zambia, Ghana, Uganda, and Namibia, only to mention a few.

3 Policy dialogues are implemented in Zambia, which through its aid management policy opted for direct budget support as its desired aid modality.

4 Mozambique has developed its observatories to monitor implementation of the GPEDC.

5 See http://cso-effectiveness.org/istanbul-principles,067

6 Joint Assistance Strategies have been examined this is for the three countries Ghana, Mozambique and Zambia.

7 Results and Accountability Building Block , Regional Workshop, 11-13 September, 2012, Zambia

8 Informal Governance Group, Alliance 2015, Aid and Budget Transparency in Mozambique

9 UNDP (2007), Human Development Report 2006

10 Ministry of planning and Development, Mozambique, 2011

11 Programme Aid Partnership website, http://www.pap.org.mz/history.htm and http://www.pap.org.mz/pap_ structure.htm.

12 http://www.entwicklung.at/uploads/media/Country_Strategy_Mozambique_2010-2013_03.pdf

13 Mozambique-private-sector-country-profile-august-2008

14 Ronald Fischer 2013, Infrastructure PPPs: Lessons from Latin America for Africa http://www.theigc.org/sites/default/files/Fischer%20and%20Nhabinde%202012%20PPPs%20in%20Mozambique%20Working%20Paper.pdf

15 Ibid

Making South-South Cooperation Partnerships Work for Africa: A situational analysis and policy recommendations

Vitalice Meja
Reality of Aid Africa

Situational Analysis

There have been significant changes in recent years in the structure of the development co-operation and partnerships. South-South Cooperation (SSC) is increasingly playing an important role in global trade, finance, investment and governance. These changes have opened up opportunities for further partnerships between Africa and countries in the South, as evidenced by the plethora of new initiatives aimed at fostering political, economic and social relations.

In the past decade, South-South trade has expanded more quickly than North-South trade. South-South investment has also shown unprecedented dynamism. Africa's total merchandise trade with non-African developing countries increased from US$34 billion in 1995 to US$97 billion in 2004, and then jumped to US$283 billion in 2008 and US$595 billion in 2012.[1]

At the same time the number of "Greenfield"[2] foreign direct investment (FDI) projects by investors from non-African developing countries more than tripled, from 52 in 2004 to 184 in 2008.[3]

A further indicator of the increased importance of South-South Cooperation and partnerships is the fact that countries in the South have become an additional source of official development assistance (ODA) to African countries. While data availability does not permit a comprehensive and reliable estimate of the scale of official flows to Africa from the South, it is estimated that official aid to the region from the South was US$2.8 billion in 2006. And it has risen substantially since, as China committed to double its assistance to Africa by 2009. Aid to Africa made up 45.7% of China's total aid in 2009 and this share has jumped to 52% by 2012. The estimate of China's current concessional foreign aid is approximately US$5 billion, making its current annual contribution to Africa US$2.6 billion.[4] The flows are increasingly channelled to the infrastructure and production sectors of African economies. Available evidence suggests that Chinese infrastructure and public works finance commitments in sub-Saharan Africa, both in concessional and non-concessional terms, rose from US$470 million in 2001 to US$4.5 billion in 2007, and is likely significantly larger today.[5]

South-South Cooperation continues to gain traction among governments in Africa, albeit with different intensity. Resource flows within the context of SSC partnerships have seen a massive increase despite the dwindling aid flows from the OECD countries. At the political level there are clear initiatives to promote SSC and partnerships. Political leadership considers South-South partnerships to be more economical and effective. Furthermore, there is a feeling among the African governments that the partnering countries have relevant development experience and technical capacity in the area of cooperation as well as availability of practical know-how. These South–South partnerships have the potential to help Africa's transformation, not only through growing trade and financial flows, but also by supporting regional infrastructure projects, transferring knowledge and poverty eradication.[6]

The positive sides of current and dynamic South-South Cooperation have been registered primarily in the increased inflows of resources, especially to the benefit of African countries. Nevertheless many states also face major challenges because of increased dependence on raw materials and the greater pressure of competition from other countries in the South in the case of light manufactures. The challenges for Africa in SSC seem to revolve around Africa's political and emotional approach to SSC partnerships, rather than focusing on the actual strategic, economic and technical interests such partnerships can generate. The effect has been the failure to develop relevant institutions in Africa, both technical and academic, to facilitate and deepen and benefit more substantially from these partnerships.

African countries are yet to fully invest in South-South partnerships. Most of the efforts to date to improve these partnerships across the board appear to have been left to non-Africa partners and South Africa. The stronger Southern partners from outside Africa seem to fully fund and finance the partnerships, rather than work through joint ventures. In the end, SSC partnerships seem to strengthen the visibility of the provider, rather than be based on mutual interest of the partnerships.

This scenario has seen African governments, particularly those on the recipient side, take less initiative to develop a strong policy and legal and institutional framework that could govern and promote their interests in partnerships beyond political dialogue and engagement. Their approach to legal and institutional reform has been that of creation of an enabling environment for trade and investment opportunities for their counterparts from the South. Other challenges include lack of budgetary allocation to SSC partnerships as well as data and information management. It is therefore difficult for Africa to measure the true value and outcome of these partnerships.

While South-South partners promote the notion of equality in the political sphere, there exist significant imbalances in economic and real political power among the co-operating partners. The fear is that SSC, with their accompanying inequalities, may degenerate into political and economic patronage.[7] Many of the initiatives in the partnerships are largely funded and supported by the provider with the recipient creating space for absorption of the investment or knowledge transfer, accompanied by extraction of minerals and raw materials by the provider. This 'two-way street' exchange remains a mirage.

The use of traditional instruments of aid transfers including project aid, loans and credits, with grants through technical co-operation and humanitarian assistance, exemplify worrying similarities between such South-South partnerships and traditional partnerships in North-South cooperation. Similar to the framework for North-South cooperation, African countries play the role of beneficiaries rather than stakeholders. As such, little exchange of experience takes place with African countries in SSC, unless it is engineered through a third bilateral or multilateral party in the context of triangular cooperation and/or learning from SSC.

In the context of the importance given to the principle of ownership in effective development cooperation, partnership engagement seems to be limited to deal-making with heads of state, with little involvement of the relevant government institutions. Citizen involvement in the growth of these partnerships is almost always completely absent. There is little or no emphasis on the promotion of citizen exchanges, promoting citizen-based institutions or academic institutions partnerships. Citizens are seen as mere recipients and beneficiaries of development projects and programs. The focus seems to be on providing scholarships to African countries, rather than in student exchange programs, curriculum development exchanges and establishment of relevant institutes to help in building the partnerships.

Furthermore, there are no efforts towards joint surveys and joint consultative meetings with potential collaboration of national organizations, including the private sector or relevant government agencies. African governments generally clear the way for SSC 'development projects,' including destruction of property, involuntary relocation and land repossession.

Understanding the institutional model of SSC partnerships

In SSC, there is often no clear distinction between official and commercial flows, making it difficult to classify the form of co-operation under any particular institutional model. SSC usually involves a mixture of capacity building, technology transfer, research and public-private partnership. Partners engage both at the regional and national levels, depending on the magnitude of the project. The following areas define different forms of engagement that are common to SSC partnerships:

- Regional technical cooperation: Involvement of the aid-provider government representatives in regional experts meetings organized by the African Union or regional trading blocks.
- Technical cooperation: African countries receive technical assistance to develop sectoral programmes or improve existing initiatives.
- Study tour: Organisation of a visit to enable an exchange of experiences between African and host government officials.
- Capacity building, technology transfer, and Public-Private Partnership.

The areas of co-operation between African countries and their Southern partners have included infrastructure construction, agriculture, human resources development, and health and water supply. In this regard, co-operation has resulted in major projects including among others, the Kollo Project (Tunisia-Niger), the Pan-African E-Network Project (India-African Countries), the Lighten-up Africa Project (China-African countries), the SMASSE project (Kenya-Niger), and the Growth Triangle Initiative by Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique (ZMM-GT).

Financing South – South Cooperation in Africa

Financing efforts by African governments that promote SSC remain very limited. African countries do not allocate budgets towards the facilitation of SSC and partnership development, unlike their counterparts in China, Brazil and India. The continent heavily relies on the support of the bilateral South–South aid-provider, or a multilateral institution such as the UNDP Special Office for SSC, or the Africa Development Bank. Triangular co-operation has also become one of the tools commonly used to support SSC.

The South-South Cooperation Trust Fund is one example of a financing mechanism. Largely funded by the government of Brazil, the South-South Cooperation Trust Fund (SSCTF) seeks to support African countries in mobilizing and taking advantage of development solutions and technical expertise available in the South. The Fund also seeks to promote South-South partnerships and knowledge sharing among middle-income countries (MICs) and between

MICs and least-developed countries (LDCs) in Africa. The Fund's focus areas include Agriculture and agri-business, health, social development and clean energy. It supports:

- Provision of technical assistance in the preparation of policy and sector studies, research and analysis;
- Capacity-building and human resources development;
- Organization of seminars, workshops, conferences and consultations and sharing of knowledge and experiences; and
- Implementation and piloting of innovative approaches to solve development challenges in African countries.

Policy forums in Africa for Partnerships

Whereas SSC receives political backing from the continent's political leadership, there is no leading African policy forum to provide stakeholders with the support they need to engage with this diverse and challenging co-operation. There are investment promotion centres across the continent with a very restricted mandate for business promotion. In the same context, there is little evidence to show the existence of 'stand-alone' policy forums dedicated to SSC partnership development in African most countries. Efforts to create partnership development institutions are yet to be initiated.

At the regional level, SSC policy dialogue forums take place alongside other major development financing conferences. While the African Platform on Development Effectiveness (APDEV), the African Union Commission and NEPAD all have SSC as one of their thematic focus areas, no Platform has yet to fully develop a more ongoing and substantial dialogue on SSC. At the global level, the United Nations Development Co-operation Forum (DCF) that reviews the global development trends includes a focus on the South-South Co-operation.[8]

At the initiative of the more economically advanced SSC aid-providers outside Africa, there exists several more structured policy forum for partnership development. These include the Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC), the China-Africa Business Council (CABC), the Turkey-Africa Cooperation Summit, the BRICS Summit, the India-Brazil-South Africa Dialogue Forum (IBSA), the BASIC group comprising Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), and the India-Africa summit.

What makes SSC Partnerships work better for more advance members of SSC?

The more advanced economies involved in SSC appear to have an upper hand. This is particularly visible in the deteriorating terms of trade between African economies and their Southern Partners. The establishment of the BRICS Bank for Brazil, Russia, China and South Africa without seeking contributions from other Southern partners is a clear indication that levels of investment in the SSC are not equal. Institutions, such as the BRIC Bank, and the fora mentioned above seem to have been put in place to advance the interests of the BRIC and other emerging economies in the partnership.

Other important institutions to advance South-South Cooperation and partnerships include:

The Special Unit for South-South Cooperation at the United Nations

The United Nations has created a special unit for SSC to mainstream SSC throughout the international development community. It does so by leveraging its global reach as well as its policy and institutional capacities to assist developing countries in strengthening their SSC capacities. It supports countries' efforts to manage, design and implement SSC policies and initiatives through the identification, sharing and transfer of successful Southern-generated development solutions. Despite its existence, African countries are yet to utilise this facility to enhance their capacity on partnership development with their more advanced SSC partners. But the reverse is the case, where countries such as China have benefited from the expertise of this institution.

China-Africa Business Council (CABC)

Based in Beijing, the China- Africa Business Council seeks to create an enabling environment for China-Africa economic and technical cooperation, and in particular deepen economic relations between China and Africa with regard to investment. It is private sector-driven with strong public sector support, and working alongside government ministries. It provides business advice and technical information on policies and regulations to assist Chinese and African companies, tailored to the need of Chinese and African companies, to achieve their investment objectives. CABC has established offices in five 'core' countries: Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania, Mozambique and Cameroon.

The Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC)

FOCAC operates at three levels: 1) a Ministerial Conference, convened once every three years, and attended by Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Ministers responsible for International Cooperation and/or Financial and Economic Affairs; 2) the Senior Officials Meetings (SOMs), which are convened one year ahead of the Ministerial Conference to discuss follow-up activities; and 3) The head of State Summit which is convened once every three years and attended by the heads of states and government. FOCAC has been institutionalized and remains an important platform for collective dialogue and an effective mechanism for enhancing cooperation and partnerships between China and African countries.

In addition, China has established key academic and policy based institutional think tanks, which facilitate its engagement in SSC and partnership development. These include the China International Centre for Economic and Technical Cooperation (CICETE) and the China South-South Cooperation Network.

CSOs in the South-South Cooperation

Civil society participation in SSC and related partnerships has been influenced by their notion that CSO partnerships are embedded in a human rights-based approached to development and as such work within a framework of solidarity, justice and mutuality. CSOs focus mostly in areas and on issues that are considered peripheral by official SSC partnerships.

CSOs as development actors in their own right have equally been at the forefront in promoting and participating in their own South-South Cooperation partnerships albeit with difficulties. Issues touching on human rights, social development, cultural exchanges, environmental sustainability, democracy and sustainable employment form the cornerstone of CSO SSC partnerships. Currently CSOs have different forum for sharing experiences and knowledge on poverty reduction, advocacy for human rights, debt cancellation, removal of aid policy conditionalities, and challenging human rights abuses, among others.

Focus on issues such as human rights have created tensions between CSOs and many Southern governments. These tensions have resulted in visiting activists being imprisoned or being denied the right of entry by the violating country. For example, activists were denied access to the annual World Bank CSO meetings in Singapore in 2009 because of visa restrictions and other political considerations. In 2012 the Chinese investor in Zambia copper mines shot and killed two miners advocating for better employment terms, stoking protests by CSO activists across the country.

Cooperation between Southern CSOs on debt campaign issues have resulted in many of the African governments receiving debt relief, and also reforms in aid conditionalities. AFRODAD with its partners, for example, worked closely with CSOs in Liberia to push for the cancellation of the country's debt at the time.

On the capacity-building front, CSO cooperation in the context of SSC has seen a cross-pollination of ideas for organisational and program management. IBON International, based in the Philippines, undertook personnel exchange with the Kenya Debt Relief Network based in Nairobi. The objective was to build the capacity of the personnel with the view of improving program management as well as the institutional capacity in organisational administration. KENDREN had a gap in organisational program management, while IBON International was constrained in its understanding of the African CSO policy terrain. In this regard the two institutions signed an agreement for a six-month exchange program of senior staff.

CSO South-South Cooperation has seen tremendous growth over the years. However, these partnerships have continued to operate parallel and often in an antagonistic manner to Official SSC. The reason is largely due to a lack of dialogue fora for discussions of critical issues. Furthermore governments in SSC have yet to see the real value of CSO participation in SSC partnerships. This is particularly so given the prominence given to trade and investment in official SSC.

Most of the reforms suggested to improve SSC partnerships appear to be geared towards creating an enabling environment for trade and investment. Little effort has been made towards improving social and cultural exchanges. CSO-SSC partnerships, on the other hand, continue to experience dis-enabling environments for their work, particularly through restrictions in the movement of people across the borders as well as the legal and regulatory framework for CSO operations in many countries involved in SSC.

Conclusions

The largest impediment for the SSC and its partnerships are the limitations on, or absence of, participation on the part of citizens of the beneficiary countries in SSC. This impediment is noticeable at all levels, from the assessment of needs, to project design and implementation. This limitation is further compounded by the lack of opportunities by the aid-providers in SSC to consult widely beyond the immediate beneficiaries of a project, which is usually the government or the private sector. Furthermore, there is little partnership co-ordination between SSC aid-providers in the sectors where they have common interest. The national interest of the provider seems to discourage partnership co-ordination.

At another level, the absence of overall national policies on SSC and related partnership development among most African countries make it difficult for them to pursue SSC in a comprehensive manner. Even with a political declaration in support of South-South Cooperation at the highest political level, legal reforms and institutional and policy frameworks have not been established to guide the engagement.

Policy Recommendations

The relationship between Africa and Southern partners in SSC has clearly increased resources available for development. Africa must therefore take advantage of the opportunities and enhance their partnership engagement in this form of cooperation.

For African Governments

Mainstream SSC into national development strategies

SSC provides new opportunities for the continent to comprehensively address their development challenges. SSC can address and increase the potential to improve Africa's capacity to deal with the challenges of poverty, poor infrastructure, weak productive capacity, food insecurity, energy deficits, as well as financial and economic crises. African countries should adopt a well-defined strategy for SSC and related partnership development to ensure that it maximises African benefits from the partnership. SSC should be mainstreamed into national development strategies if Africa is to realise these benefits. In this regard, African governments should endeavour to ensure that SSC partnerships are aligned to their national development plans and priorities.

Develop strong policy and institutional frameworks for SSC

The absence of African governments' policies on SSC and partnership development strategies, alongside the absence of mechanisms to coordinate the activities of different implementing agencies, make it difficult for African countries to pursue SSC partnerships in a comprehensive manner. Many countries appear to be guided by political statements and directives from those in position of power with no policy and institutional framework. Decisions on SSC partnerships and projects are taken at various levels including the offices of the heads government, ministries of finance and the line ministries with little or no co-ordination among themselves. Furthermore these institutions often lack credibility among other stakeholders because of the non-inclusive nature of the partnership.

This scenario has greatly contributed to the passive nature of Africa's participation in the current SSC. Political commitment to SSC must be backed up by a strong policy and institutional framework. This framework should promote democratic ownership, transparency and accountability and development results. It should be the outcome of extensive consultations, bringing together representatives of central and local government, SSC aid-providers, civil society and the private sector. The end result should be a framework that clearly sets out how the government will participate and partner in SSC, and ensure that such cooperation will contribute to poverty reduction and people's empowerment.

Create an enabling environment for civil society organisations

Civil society organisations continue to assume more responsibilities and are gaining greater visibility and influence both at the national and the regional levels in all areas of development. The latter, including such issues as civil rights for women and minorities, human rights, environmental protection, democratic governance, corruption and abuse of power. Through the mobilization of constituents and resources, CSOs can influence and monitor national policies and their implementation.

Despite their growing presence and importance, CSOs have been locked out of official SSC partnerships, especially in trade development programs and investment processes. SSC seems to acknowledge the existence of only two spheres – the market and the state. As a consequence, CSOs have been seriously hampered and their potential for contributing to the solution of development issues in the South under SSC is often challenged or ignored.

Governments involved in SSC partnerships continue to attempt to control and silence civil society organisations. Most of the recent passage of NGO laws seeks to constrain and limit the space for civil society, compromise their independence, and clamp down on their operations at the national level. This scenario has greatly contributed to suspicion and lack of partnership between CSOs and their governments in SSC arrangements. Therefore governments across the continent must work with CSOs to develop relevant legislation and institutional frameworks that not only anchor CSOs' legitimacy within the country's development policies and strategies, but also maximise their contribution to the development process in their countries, including those involving SSC.

Broaden the ownership of SSC

According to the 1990 African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Empowerment,

> 'We believe strongly that popular participation is in essence, the empowerment of the people to effectively involve themselves in creating the structures and in designing policies and programmes that serve the interests of all as well as to effectively contribute to the development process and share equitably in its benefits.[9]'

Unless SSC is able to include CSOs as key stakeholders in policy development and implementation of these partnerships, in Africa SSC will fall far short of the African Charter quoted above and the transformation it sought to bring to the continent.

Participation of CSOs in SSC has the potential to broaden country ownership of SSC development projects and programs. It is an important avenue to put people at the centre of the partnership and address the current gaps in engagement with citizens. To ensure effective national ownership of the process and outcomes of evolving partnerships in the South, African governments should make efforts to get parliaments, the private sector, and civil society more directly engaged in the process of negotiations, project design, implementation and evaluation. This engagement will increase transparency and accountability as well as the likelihood that resources will be used in pursuit of national development goals and priorities. It will also reduce public scepticism and give more credibility to the partnerships.

Recommendations for regional and multilateral institutions

The role of regional and multilateral agencies such as the UN in promoting equal partnerships among SSC partners cannot be over-emphasized. They not only have a global network ideal for knowledge exchange, but can also provide the relevant expertise that can benefit both sides of the partnership. In this regard, these institutions should endeavour to:

(a) Coordinate capacity development for African public institutions that deal with SSC, particularly those that manage statistics and collection of information on SSC and partnership development. Failure to have reliable data and information has made it difficult for African countries to assess the impact of SSC in the overall efforts for poverty eradication. African regional organizations such as the African Union Commission and NEPAD, in collaboration with the United Nations, should develop a database on Africa-SSC partnerships. This will allow for an identification of best practices for learning.

(b) Provide more research support. Despite the increasing engagement of Africa in SSC partnerships, there are relatively very few think tank, academic, and research institutions that guide the continent, both at the regional and national level on the development effectiveness of their engagement of SSC partnerships. Therefore there is a need for the creation and development of national and regional institutions of excellence for SSC partnerships. These institutions should carry out rigorous and systematic country and regional studies of the impact and sustainability of these activities in the region. Such institutions would provide African policymakers with the information needed to make decisions on partnerships with SSC aid-providers. Thus, African regional organizations as well as the United Nations and other multilateral institutions should scale up their support in this area.

(c) Establish financing facilities for SSC partnership development. Regional and multilateral finance institutions should make more resources available for support to SSC partnership projects and initiatives. Inadequate resources continue to inhibit the growth of intra-Africa and Africa-South partnerships. Funding instruments in the form of trust funds should be established with national governments making substantial contributions. The funds should largely be directed towards supporting intra-regional cooperation, as well as boosting the cooperation of African participation in the South-South Cooperation.

References

Catherine Gwin, 2011. Support for South-South Cooperation: Lessons from the South-South Experience, Exchange Trust Fund, accessed at http://www.africafocus.org/docs10/unct1006.php

Tatjana Chahoud, 2007. South-South Cooperation – Opportunities and Challenges for International Cooperation German Development institute, accessed at http://www.die-gdi.de/en/briefing-paper/article/south-south-cooperation-opportunities-and-challenges-for-international-cooperation/

UNDP, 2009. Enhancing South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Study of the Current Situation and Existing Good Practices in Policy, Institutions, and Operation of South-South and Triangular Cooperation, accessed at http://southsouthconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/E_Book.pdf

UNCTAD, 2014. UNCTAD Handbook of Statistics 2013, accessed at http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/tdstat38_en.pdf

UNCTAD, 2010. "South-South cooperation: Africa and the new forms of development partnership," accessed at http://unctad.org/en/pages/PublicationArchive.aspx?publicationid=75

Endnotes

1 UNCTAD, 2010 and UNTAD 2014.

2 A "greenfield" investment is an investment in a manufacturing, office, or other physical company-related venture where no previous facilities exist.

3 UNCTAD, 2010.

4 Yun Sun, "Africa in China's New Foreign Aid White Paper," Brookings Institute, July 16, 2014, accessed at http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/africa-in-focus/posts/2014/07/16-africa-china-foreign-aid-sun

5 UNCTAD, 2010.

6 NEPAD, 2011.African Consensus and Position on Development Effectiveness http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfunct/pdf/luxembourg_afr_pos_busan.pdf

7 UNCTAD 2010 on South-South cooperation: "Africa and the new forms of development partnership shows that trade and investment flows with the South are reinforcing a longstanding trend in which African countries export farm produce, minerals, ores, and crude oil, and import manufactured goods. It says this situation should be reversed while the South-South trend is still in its early stages. A repeat of the traditional pattern will not help African countries to reduce their traditional dependence on exports of commodities and low-value-added goods."

\8 The UN Development Co-operation Forum brings together policy makers, civil society organizations, Members of Parliaments, local authorities and foundations from rich and poor countries to review development cooperation trends. It allows building greater coherence among various development actors. It debates ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation and to increase its impact on development goals.

9 "African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Transformation," Arusha, 1990.