

GOVERNMENT AS PARTNERS IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: A META-STUDY

Judy Walker

Introduction:

We have a rich and unique set of data in the studies and dissertations prepared by course participants from the PCCP and the PBAS courses of 2005 – 2007. In this paper, we analyse those studies. Most of the authors are not researchers by background or training but they all have enquiring minds. They share an interest in partnerships. They have closely observed the diverse and unique partnerships they encounter in their jobs. The studies mirror this rich diversity. We are privileged to observe governments' involvement in partnerships through the eyes of our course participants.

Government is important to partnering. Its influence ought to be felt indirectly in the legal, policy or financial environment of any partnership. Some governments become more directly involved in partnering. Of the 150 dissertations submitted as course requirements, we have selected twelve that include a strong mention of governments. The remainder of the dissertations do not refer to government at all.

This surprises us. We think that governments have a significant contribution to make. Governments are better at institutionalising sustainability than any other sector. And, if we are looking to achieve large scale transformation, the government sector is the obvious one to select. While we understand that governments do not easily lend themselves to working in partnerships, we would like to see more government involvement in cross-sectoral partnering. Government can be enhanced by bringing it into partnership with other sectors. The quality of partnership programmes can be improved by including governments as partners.

We acknowledge that some people and organisations take a dim view of partnering government. We have encountered a spectrum of negative opinions ranging from the view that government is irrelevant to those believing that government is a corrupt hazard.

Nobody is suggesting that we don't need government. Rather, we find it awkward, difficult and frustrating to work with them. We don't understand why they work the way they do. Ignoring them is easier. We would prefer to get on without them. In this analysis we will present a mixed view of government partnering. This reflects the diversity of views of our authors.

Summary

We cannot draw any conclusions from our study on whether development sustainability is altered by including or excluding government in partnerships. Intuitively, we believe that governments have the potential for larger scale and more sustainable impacts. It is possible that only government can achieve this. But we are going to need much more evidence before we can draw any conclusions.

We see two dynamically opposite views of government involvement in partnerships from our studies. One view is that government is slow, laborious, corrupt, difficult and frustrating. Nobody in their right mind would want to include government as a partner in a development project. The opposite view is that governments bring things to partnerships that are invaluable. Moreover they are very keen to see how partnerships can improve the way things are done. And, if we can have any influence on governments we could multiple our development effectiveness.

What do these polemical views of government partnership tell us?

First, it means that we must demystify what we mean by government. The word “government” means too many things and it is too easy to say government when we mean a very small, discrete part of national machinery or we might even make the mistake of expecting “government” to be represented by one individual.

Our first task when talking about “government” is to say which part of government and explain how it relates to other parts. We might also need to explain its roles, responsibilities, size, and organisation, processes, who is in charge, how it is accountable, what size its budget it, what it does not do. Or put another way, we might need an organisational analysis of the part of government we are plan to partner. They might require something similar in return – they may not be very familiar with other sectors’ operations.

➤ **This means we need some proper tools for public sector organisation analysis.**

Secondly, we need to be very clear about why we want government to become involved. What exactly do we hope their contribution will be? Normally, governments do four simple things. They arbitrate competing claims through a political process. They set policy and laws which establish targets and standards for what has been decided. They implement policy. They account for achievement against policy.

With one exception, all the studies have been silent on government policy roles. Yet policy is the means by which sustainability is achieved.

[There should perhaps be a “rule” that states that we engage governments in implementation processes only where we believe there is a direct influence on policy. Let us be very aware of the trade-off between time / effort and the quality of outcomes.]

- **This means we need a) more competence in understanding policy and b) have some models available for policy analysis and yet more models for political analysis (which ultimately decides policy).**

Thirdly, we need to make sure that our analytical models are robust enough to cope with “fragile” governments. There is a lot written about fragile states and much of the work that will be required already exists. But we need some new ways to understand and influence bad behaviour, poorly-resourced governments and governments that have serious challenges.

- **This means sharing information more broadly and getting the right sorts of expertise into partnerships – possibly by encouraging some specialist arbitration agencies to join partnerships. And, it also implies that we are going to need to join up with others who find themselves in similar circumstances (even if they are not our natural collaborators).**

Finally, if we believe that the outcome of partnerships does produce sustainable and transformative development – we need to provide evidence of this.

- **This means we need to dedicate some resources to measuring impact and reliable evaluation.**

What do our authors tell us about working in partnerships with government?

The trade-off.....

There is a basic trade-off that affects any organisation’s decision to work in partnership. This is particularly felt in cross-sectoral partnerships. The trade-off is between the amount of time or effort required and the quality of outcome. It takes longer to work collaboratively –

especially with unfamiliar partners - than it takes to work alone. And, the outcome can be hard to pin down. Providing evidence of outcome is difficult.

Governments have to make this trade-off all the time. It is no different to any other sector. It has to justify the investments it makes. This presents difficult choices. Government accountability is demanding. All public servants are accountable upwards – to their political masters. Politicians are accountable to the people who select them. At least, that is how it is supposed to work in a democracy. Holding on to that accountability is sometimes hard even for the most prosperous and democratically established governments. As we are aware, accountability sometimes falters where governments are fragile.

.....Partners need to understand how complicated it is for government to commit to a partnership.

The Government of Zambia opts out.....

This tension is well illustrated in the PCCP study of the *Zambian Cassava Market Development Partnership*ⁱ where the partners who include the business Sector (Zambian Breweries Group; CHC Commodities Ltd; Freshpikt Ltd), the NGO sector (Care Zambia) and the International Development Community (UNDP) are all extremely clear about their reasons for partneringⁱⁱ. Whereas the Government of Zambia – also named as a partner – seems to have opted out of the arrangement. The author of this study conducted a survey of all partners to establish their motives for collaboration. But, he was unable to get a response from the Government of Zambia. He says he could not substantiate his assertion that the Government ought to see private sector partnerships as “more responsive and acceptable” to primary producers. Nor could he get government to confirm that the partnership would contribute to the Government’s agricultural policy objective of diversifying out of maize production.

.....So we must presume that the Government of Zambia has decided that the costs of partnering outweigh the benefits.

While the British Government experiments.....

Two other studies offer quite different evidence. In these, a government has decided that partnerships are worth considering. These extremely interesting examples are taken from the UK, one from a local government body, Manchester City Councilⁱⁱⁱ and the other from the Home Office^{iv} which is a central government ministry. What the two have in common is that each has set up a semi-autonomous, intermediary agency that is responsible for

identifying and operating new partnership arrangements. The advantage for both parent bodies is that they can flexibly experiment with partnership to see how well it works. This is achieved without compromising the parent organisation's existing structures and systems.

.....The trade-off between time and outcome is therefore being observed by parts of the British Government.

The challenges governments face

Limitations of departmentalised government and scarce resources.....

The resources governments have available have a lot to do with the amount of risk they can take. We should note that in the United Kingdom, government bodies have considerably more resources at their disposal than a government in a developing country would have.

Alder's paper^v is quite clear on the advantages and difficulties of government working in partnership. The Home Office has identified a problem – there are obstacles to managing the movement of remand prisoners and getting them to their court appearance. This process requires collaboration from many actors. The Home Office appears to be experimenting with partnerships as a means of consolidating action by central government departments (horizontal integration) and ensuring that the regional governments can implement a new approach (vertical integration). There is a cross-sectoral dimension as some of the partners are private sector service providers. The study conveys the sense that partnerships are an important means of achieving collaboration between different parts of government that share a common problem.

.....We may conclude that resources may limit governments' scope for partnerships. Wealthier governments can afford to experiment. We should take note that the priority for one British ministry is to form partnerships with other government bodies.

Managing the political dimension.....

Alder's^v thesis is that partnerships help government to work differently. One of the serious challenges she identifies is how to set aside the government's short term political targets in favour of medium to longer term transformations. Alder recognises the trade-off between time and outcome when she identifies the difficulty senior ministerial advisers have to ensure the principles of joint working are understood by ministers. She suggests that senior

advisers are challenged by presenting timescales and milestones that may be less immediate than the ones Ministers are familiar with.

.....Building and maintaining political support for partnership will present a challenge

Managing the interface of government and community.....

Kayoma's^{vi} study also demonstrates how partnering can help public sector bodies find new ways to work together. Kayoma^{vii} believes that partnerships can improve public services. This implies that the outcome is worth^{viii} the time taken but, sadly, evidence for this conclusion is short. Kayoma^{ix} focuses on the interface between local government and "community". She is one of several authors who introduce concepts of "social good" or "social capital". Social capital has always proved to be extremely difficult to adequately define or measure. Nevertheless Kayoma's^x thesis is that partnerships that work at the interface of public services and community development result in qualitative changes in social capital. Kayoma^{xi} attributes this to a larger pool of competences becoming available to through partnerships.

.....Building and maintaining public support for partnerships will also challenge governments.

The challenges of fragile government.....

Several of our studies have carried out their research in south eastern Nigeria in the Delta region. This is an area of economic importance – with significant gas and oil resources. Many of the Nigeria studies are critical of the past military government. Daniel-Kalio Blessing^{xii} comments:

"The resort to negotiation by government rather than force is a remarkable shift in approach".

Several study authors discuss the establishment of new regional government structures in Nigeria. The regional governments have needed to find new ways of implementing development programmes that have to reach close to 30 million citizens living there. There is general agreement in the studies that the delta population has become militant as a result of years of under-development and disenfranchisement. Clearly, the development task ahead will be demanding as the rate has to accelerate and reach a very large number of people in an area where incomes are very low and where violence has become institutionalised.

In the past, the oil companies operating in this region have found themselves at the sharp end of delivering development programmes – because of government failures. There is a strong interest in forming new alliances and new partnering arrangement across sectors.

.....The challenges of partnering fragile governments are very real. We may need some new ways of working.

How to get the best from partnering government?

Supporting governments' policy role.....

The regional /local governments of the Nigeria Delta appear to have welcomed new alliances and partnerships. We must assume a high level of political support for this change in approach. Partnerships should help everybody. Government bodies and oil companies in particular will be able to allocate financial resources effectively, pool human resources and to manage risks better.

But, in the Delta region, all partners face a gargantuan development task. The circumstances and the population are the equivalent of a medium-sized African country recently emerging from conflict. Despite the high-level political support for partnering approach, it is not clear what the government's development policy for the region is. Perhaps this is a dislocation between Federal and Regional government?

There is only one study that recognises the government's policy role. Our authors are possibly unaware of the importance that the international development community might attach to sound recovery policy. We might therefore wonder whether the new regional partnerships include enough of the right expertise needed in the circumstances. The impression from our Nigerian studies is that the partnership approach is an attempt to make development come about on a project by project basis. The essential role of Government in formulating policy is not evident.

.....The Nigerian case studies raise questions over how well governments' role in developing policy and public investment is understood in partnership approaches.

Communications are important.....

Our studies recognise the importance of communications. Again we have an example from Nigeria.

Nigerian regional / local government seems to have embraced the idea of working in partnership. Godwin Jaja's^{xiii} account describes a partnership between the Niger Delta Commission [NDDC] and the Academic Associates Peaceworks [AAPW] in the Etche Local Government Area. This partnership has been set up to address problems of alienation associated with a lack of participation by local people in development decision-making. Jaja^{ix} argues strongly for improved communications and open information systems designed to empower local people. He describes a number of ways this is being achieved using handbooks, billboards, newspapers, newspapers and magazines, town criers, posters, building community meeting places, holding workshops, and targeting interventions for youth.

The study does not cover the content of the messages and we are left to wonder how these are formulated and where they come from.

.....Communications are of fundamental importance but to be fully effective they need generate confidence that they are credible messages. Government needs to decide what messages it can deliver on. This should be based on clear policy.

Implementing policy.....

Into this situation – where development in the Delta appears to be conducted through a series of projects rather than through systematic public policy reform and investment – our studies identify NGO activity. We have several descriptions of NGOs managing projects or providing services. The NGO sector seems well established in “partnership” mode. Many people, of course, have argued that NGOs are not always accountable organisations.

Ogbalor's^{xiv} account of attempts to establish the Council of Nigerian NGOs offers us an insight into the diverse interests of NGOs, their evolution from their “fight to liberate the citizenry from military dictatorship” to their repositioning under the current government. And, it is also an account of how the Nigerian NGO sector wants the Council to self-regulate rather than be controlled by government. But we should take note of the message here about NGOs wanting to become more accountable.

For more of a government view of NGOs, Daniel-Kalio Blessing^{xv} has an interesting account of his part in partnership brokering in which sectoral roles seem to have become confused. Blessing represented the Rivers State Government in arbitrating a “Global Memorandum of Understanding”^{xvi} between the Shell Petroleum Development Company [SPDC] and 300 local communities. SPDC hired an NGO to act as broker for the MOU but as Blessing

comments “not all of these NGOs...perform their roles effectively”. His report is an account of the challenges of this process and the complex roles that government must play.

Akpomudjere^{xvii} describes the expansion of a Benin-based NGO – Songhai International – into the Delta region to promote agricultural entrepreneurship among the youth. The study examines the nature of partnering between the Songhai International and the Delta State Government. Akpomudjere^{xviii} collected information about key peoples’ thoughts on the “partnership”. He concluded that it has not met early expectations.

.....Fragmentation or absence of overall policy framework seems likely to result in a proliferation of project-based initiatives. Many of these will be implemented by NGOs. Successful partnerships might want to make sure policy and implementation are harmonised and that accountability systems are operating effectively.

The Mechanics of Partnering Governments

Preparing to partner with governments.....

Experience and good sense seems to show any partnership requires each partner to invest in its understanding of the others. Akpomudjere^{xix} offers us a good example when he writes:

“Whereas there was trust built in the initial phases of the partnership, a lack of understanding of the full workings of government by Songhai International made her to expect a level of performance that was never met. Thus NGOs seeking to partner with government agencies must endeavour to do due diligence studies on the workings of these agencies. The same also applies to government organisations seeking partnerships with non-governmental organisations”.

Akpomudjere^{xx} and Walker^{xxi} both advocate that investment is made into understanding how governments and other sectors will operate as partners. Walker^{xxii} compares case-studies of three business investment partnerships between the Government of Rwanda and the private sector organisations. The results are interestingly different but seem to show that business partnering government becomes more successful with careful research, increasing knowledge and experience. Clumsy preparation results in misunderstandings for between government and businesses in Walker’s^{xxiii} case studies. The study also concludes that given the right circumstances, governments can be the most effective, if not the most comfortable, of partners.

.....Sectors considering a partnership with government would be well advised to understand and negotiate the terms of the partnership at the outset.

Constructing ideas of what government is and does.....

One overarching conclusion from all our studies is that governments can rarely be looked upon as being a coherent whole. The studies offer insights into the way that government is fragmented and differentiated. We have seen in Alder's work how government departments themselves recognise the challenge of working across other parts of the same government. The word "government" is in many ways misleading. When considering government partnership, it is advantageous to be very specific about which part – the ministry, the department or the local government – is being included. And partnerships need to be aware of multiple roles. Our studies have consistently mixed up politics, with policy, with implementation roles. The result is confusion and disillusionment.

.....Partnerships need some helpful models showing ways to analyse government and how to analyse politics.

Taking time to partner with governments.....

Governments are generally big, complicated machines made up of many different parts. Potential partners are often relieved to come across a public servant who appears to understand and talk sense. But there is a big question over the extent to which one individual is able to represent a government.

Ogbalor^{xxiv} has an interesting account of the how government operates in the Delta region. He writes:

"In the Nigerian system like most developing economies there are no clear cut systems and processes of doing things....So plans and programmes are not process driven but people and influence driven. For example the way and manner a policy or programme is implemented is largely determined by the man running the programme. So in the same organisation irrespective of laid down regulations, a policy will be implemented in two ways."

Alder's^{xxv} study of a government sponsored partnership explores the subject of responsibility delegated to individuals. She describes in detail how a two-tier hierarchy of organisational responsibility has been set up with differentiated roles and accountability systems. She seems to suggest that autonomy from the parent department can be achieved when sufficient attention is given to the detail of the alternative. This example illustrates rather well how a British government department can vest flexible decision-making powers

in an individual – but only when a complex set of organisational checks and balances have been set in motion. This might be frustrating for partners as the organisational structures seem unnecessarily complicated and will doubtless take a substantial period to be agreed. But, Alder^{xxvi} sees advantages in this. She writes:

“By developing personal relationships, it has changed inter government relationships.”

.....Cross sectoral partnering means confronting the culture of organisations that do not operate as you do. We understand that this is both the reason for and against forming partnerships.

Equality amongst partners.....

Several of the studies concern themselves with equality of power in partnership. It is an interesting question whether government can share power (or accountability) with other partners. Many governments would argue that their accountability is to ministers, Parliaments or citizens – rather than to cross-sectoral partners. In our two UK government studies, accountability is achieved by ring-fencing new semi-autonomous agencies and allowing them the flexibility to negotiate. And, as Alder^{xxvii} recognises:

“The findings of this study support the suggestion that the Government is moving towards a governance based model. This is defined by Pierre and Peter (2000) as *“how the centre of government interacts with society to reach mutually acceptable decisions”* and takes *“responsibility to use its resources, capacity and capability to mobilise other sectors to meet the common purpose”*.

But, in our Nigerian studies, government accountability to citizens has had a more fragile history. This has been why the Oil Companies have shouldered more of the responsibility for development programming than government.

.....We might want to consider a more sophisticated approach to questions of power in partnership. Partnership cannot make all participants equal. But agreement over how different kinds of power are used might be more achievable.

And the “rules” of partnership.....

Our studies do not systematically tackle the power relationships behind government partnering. But we have several points we can draw out. The first is that some governments believe they write the “rules” of partnership themselves. This seems implicit in the Nigeria Delta studies as well as Walker’s^{xxviii} study of Rwanda. And indeed, governments can establish the “rules of the game”. Generally, it is only the more prosperous and democratically established government that can be challenged through their own legal systems. Businesses that enter partnerships in more fragile circumstances weigh risks

against returns. It seems that investment in understanding the partner and in supporting individuals is the preferred approach to managing risk.

Kayoma^{xxix} suggests a different approach by asking for a more nuanced interpretation of the word “partnership”. The recommendation of Kayoma’s study is that the term partnership should be applied only where partners agree to comply with an established set of rules. [Although there is no suggestion on how the rules are agreed or enforced].

This is an interesting view as it is clear from some of the studies that there is continuing difficulty about what constitutes partnership. A common confusion seems to arise when exchange relationships – ones that could otherwise be called contracts - are given a “partnership” title. This seems to happen when the partnership wishes to transfer more than financial resources and where access to power, legitimacy or to human resource competences are part of the exchange.

.....Perhaps we need to be a lot clearer about defining different analytical “partnership” models and as well as a lexicon of terms.

Doing things differently: Sustainability and Transformation

Partnering and social change.....

Two of the studies, Kayoma^{xxx} and Onaolapa^{xxxi} address themselves to governments working with private sector partners and NGOs to support community-based development. Both studies conclude that social capital is enhanced by partnerships that work to form a new public consensus. Both studies conclude that the full potential of social capital – in terms of triggering peoples’ involvement, promoting competencies and building trust – cannot be realised without strategic investment in community based organisations.

Presumably a similar intention motivates both the regional government and Shell Petroleum Development Company in the Nigeria Delta – as reported by Blessing^{xxxii} – where the target is to build local social capital as a contribution to accelerating other forms of development.

Cross sectoral partnerships that involve government seem therefore to be closely associated with the benefits of strengthening social capital. And, perhaps this an important reason to involve government in partnerships. Governments have the potential to institutionalise

sustainable development in ways that few other organisations can manage. And, they have the potential to do this on a large scale.

Our studies seem generally to agree that a good purpose for forming cross-sectoral partnerships is to achieve some form of transformation that opens 'new space' in governance, social capital or sustainable development that would not have been achieved by traditional single sector operations.

.....Choosing to work through partnerships takes longer and requires a lot of effort and it is difficult to substantiate the outcome. Government partnerships are never going to be easy. Where government is particularly fragile are the areas most in need of partnership support. Our evidence suggests that transformation is possible and that governments are the key to sustainable development. Partnerships – as all our studies agree – matter for government.

ⁱ Author Unknown: Benefits of Cross Sector Partnerships: The Cassava Market Development Partnership, Zambia.

ⁱⁱ Cassava Market Development Partnership in Zambia :Partnership Benefits Table

To UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Additional help in formulating, implementing and managing a range of development projects ➤ Create a climate for change by building trust between sectors (reinforces UNDP’s facilitator role) ➤ Gives UNDP greater access to a variety of skills and resources
To Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Managing business risk and achieving operational efficiencies (including foreign exchange fluctuations, poor organisational and governance structures (such as bribery & corruption) and poor enforcement of laws ➤ Operational efficiencies through reduced costs reduced lead time of supplies by including new or alternative suppliers in the supply chain. ➤ Enhanced reputation by partnering key stakeholders (particularly by tackling issues of underdevelopment) ➤ Understanding how other sectors operate
To NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Leveraging financial and human resources. ➤ Scale up the activities to reach greater numbers ➤ Benefit from alternative skills, knowledge and techniques ➤ Better access to policymakers and increased advocacy
To Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Access to the private sector which is seen as more responsive & acceptable (taken from Tennyson & Wilde) No direct evidence collected in this sector so anecdotal evidence was used instead. Argues that the same effect could have been achieved by a carefully thought through private sector initiative without the need for “partnering”. ➤ Likely to be some achievement against Gov agricultural policy to diversify out of maize as well as create new markets for farmers.

ⁱⁱⁱ Imonina E Kayoma : The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England.

^{iv} Sue Alder: Partnership and Public Policy: How Partnership Governance Models are Transforming UK Public Policy.

^v Sue Alder: Partnership and Public Policy: How Partnership Governance Models are Transforming UK Public Policy.

^{vi} Imonina E Kayoma The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England

^{vii} Imonina E Kayoma The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England

^{viii} Kayoma’s evidence of improved public services resulting from partnerships is incomplete.

^{ix} Imonina E Kayoma The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England

^x Imonina E Kayoma The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England

^{xi} Imonina E Kayoma The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England

^{xii} Daniel-Kalio Blessing Partnership Building in the Niger Delta : The Challenges of Government Representative as a Broker in the SPDC’s Global Memorandum of Understanding. May 2007

^{xiii} Godwin Jaja Untitled

^{xiv} Benjamin Ogbalor Selling as the Key to Successful and Sustainable Partnership: An analysis of some Partnership Projects in Nigeria

^{xv} Daniel-Kalio Blessing Partnership Building in the Niger Delta : The Challenges of Government Representative as a Broker in the SPDC's Global Memorandum of Understanding. May 2007

^{xvi} We are not given the reasons for SPDC establishing a Global Memorandum of Understanding with 300 villages. We must assume that this is an attempt to define roles and responsibilities more clearly.

^{xvii} E. Akpomudjere Public-Private Sector Partnerships for Agricultural Development in the Niger Delta : Case study of the DTSG-Songhai Partnership.

^{xviii} E. Akpomudjere Public-Private Sector Partnerships for Agricultural Development in the Niger Delta : Case study of the DTSG-Songhai Partnership.

^{xix} E. Akpomudjere Public-Private Sector Partnerships for Agricultural Development in the Niger Delta : Case study of the DTSG-Songhai Partnership.

^{xx} E. Akpomudjere Public-Private Sector Partnerships for Agricultural Development in the Niger Delta : Case study of the DTSG-Songhai Partnership.

^{xxi} Judy Walker Do Governments Make Good Partners ? A Study of What is Possible in Rwanda. March 2006

^{xxii} Judy Walker Do Governments Make Good Partners ? A Study of What is Possible in Rwanda. March 2006

^{xxiii} Judy Walker Do Governments Make Good Partners ? A Study of What is Possible in Rwanda. March 2006

^{xxiv} Benjamin Ogbalor Selling as the Key to Successful and Sustainable Partnership: An analysis of some Partnership Projects in Nigeria

^{xxv} Sue Alder : Partnership and Public Policy : How Partnership Governance Models are Transforming UK Public Policy.

^{xxvi} Sue Alder : Partnership and Public Policy : How Partnership Governance Models are Transforming UK Public Policy.

^{xxvii} Sue Alder : Partnership and Public Policy : How Partnership Governance Models are Transforming UK Public Policy.

^{xxviii} Judy Walker Do Governments Make Good Partners ? A Study of What is Possible in Rwanda. March 2006

^{xxix} E Kayoma The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England

^{xxx} E Kayoma The Partnership Approach to Local Service Delivery in England

^{xxxi} Bolarinwa Onaolapa Role of Cross Sector Partnerships in Strengthening Social Capital in Niger Delta Communities 17 January 2006

^{xxxii} Daniel-Kalio Blessing Partnership Building in the Niger Delta : The Challenges of Government Representative as a Broker in the SPDC's Global Memorandum of Understanding. May 2007