Background paper

Experiences, good practices and challenges of partnerships involving business: Towards Human Security Business Partnerships

Introduction

With the adoption of the SDGs agenda, partnerships have gained new currency as a mechanism for tackling a broad range of developmental problems. Partnerships with the business sector and civil society hold out the promise of achieving what governments and multilateral institutions such as the UN are unable to do alone (Martens 2007:7; Bezanson and Isenman 2012). Strong endorsement of partnership arrangements in the SDGs' implementation refers especially to a new generation of transnational multistakeholder partnerships (MSP) that have multiplied over the last twenty- five years in response to some of the world's most intractable problems of development and sustainability, including in conflict-affected areas, and which are expected to utilise the versatile potential of the private sector (Backstrand and Kylsater 2014; Bezanson and Isenman 2012: 1; Dodds 2015; Reid et al 2014; Bendel 2017). According to The Report to the Secretary General on 'Enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular the private sector' large majority of United Nations entities believe that achieving the SDG will not be possible without significant scaling up of partnerships between the United Nations and business. The innovation-based partnerships leveraging core business capabilities to drive greater impact are expected to become the most common focus of partnerships between the United Nations and businesses within the next three to five years (UN 2017:5).

The rising number of multistakeholder and other types of partnerships reflects a widespread view that they are more flexible, efficient and pragmatic problem- solving solutions compared to the actions of solitary actors. This enthusiasm for partnerships among scholars and policy-makers is contrasted by mixed evidence of implementing partnerships in practice (Beisheim and Ellersiek 2017:5; Pattberg et al 2012).). Part of the problem is that significant variations in terms of objectives, structures, governance arrangements, and operational practices among the different forms of partnerships prevent conclusive assessments of their impact and success (Beisheim and Simon 2016; OECD 2015). Especially in the development field, there are many open issues and dilemmas concerning the effectiveness of the partnership as a collective action tool. Setting up and implementing partnerships as hybrid public-private governance arrangements when most partners are not institutionally set up for such a purpose, remains a core challenge. While knowledge of the internal workings of partnerships is particularly modest, academic and practitioner literature is replete with generic good partnership guidance. The application of such guidance to make MSPs effective instrument for the implementation of the SDGs raises a number of salient issues that remain unaddressed amid general endorsement of MSP in development and peacebuilding (Loveridge and Wilson 2017: 17; Dodds 2015; Scott 2007). For MSPs to live up to the claim that they represent ‘the collaborative paradigm of the 21st Century’ (Brouwer et al 2015), both the concept and the practice of partnerships ought to be problematized and a model of collective action developed that leads to fundamental change in the way development and security issues are addressed.

This paper undertakes a selective overview of the main issues and challenges in partnerships discussed in the scholarly and practitioner literature with the aim of informing the design of novel forms of partnerships involving business actors. The paper first looks at the concept of partnership and some of the main characteristics of existing partnerships involving business. The second section identifies possible entry points for improvement. The concluding section outlines some challenges and dilemmas that have been addressed specifically in designing the Human Security Business Partnerships (HSBP) framework as a novel modality of associative action.

The elusive field of partnerships for development: conceptual ambiguity and implications for practice

A surge in the number of partnerships involving business is linked to three key inter-related processes, namely changing practices in public management, the rise of corporate responsibility as a new business norm, and increased efforts to create a global governance system for some of the most pressing issues of development and security. Partnerships involving business surfaced first in the form of the public-private sector partnerships (PPP)- commonly referred to as traditional/ classic/conventional PPP- in the context of public policy innovation in developed countries. The business sector’s involvement was sought on the grounds of cost-efficiency and finance or ‘value-for-money’ considerations (Bayliss and van Waeyenberge 2018: 577). Conceived as public policy tools linking government agencies and companies, PPP were largely concentrated in infrastructure. They have since evolved and transmuted into much more diverse formations in terms of scale, scope and objectives. PPPs have been scaled up to international level through international aid practices driven by resource mobilisation objectives as well as by the diffusion of this western investment model throughout the developing world (Beishem et al 2014; IOB 2013; Bayliss and van Waeyenberge ibid; Pfisterer 2013). Much of the partnership discourse is shaped by the experience of traditional PPPs as highly institutionalised forms of collaboration in which a lead partner selectively and strategically engages with preferred partner(s) based on certain established criteria, and whose success depends on how the partnerships are designed, resourced and governed.

Another distinct category includes 'social partnerships', as forms of collaboration between business and non-profit organisations which emerged initially through corporate philanthropy. These types of partnerships have also undergone a process of diversification and scaling up. Driving a change in the modalities of social partnerships- or as some scholars call them 'social alliances'- is an emerging paradigm shift within corporate social responsibility discourse towards collaborative value creation (or co-creation) which enables the partners (companies and non-profit entities) to simultaneously pursue economic alongside social objectives. This paradigm shift foregrounds more interactive and, in its most developed phase , qualitatively different relationships between companies and non-profit organisations. Non- governmental organisations, particularly international ones (INGO), are acutely aware of the implication of this shift and are seeking different modes of engagement with companies outside arms- length philanthropy. A major report of 50 largest INGOs in the United States has called for a 'systems lens' in reviewing partnerships with business to account for more complex emerging forms of interactions that cross the boundaries of business, civil society, government and society (Mahmud et al 2013; Mercy Corps 2011; Brouwer, Woodhill et al 2015). Arguments for a step change in the relationships between INGOs and business chime with a broader quest for reinventing partnerships to meet the SDG agenda. Despite this increased awareness and pressure on both parties, namely the companies and the INGOs, it has yet to result in genuine change in dominant practices (Karaki 2016).

The concept of partnership is one of those terms with ambiguous meaning, used in a variety of ways to denote just about any type of collaboration (Potterg and Widerberg 2016:45; IHBP 2015:17). PPP and social partnerships in their pure forms entail dyadic relationships between the private sector and other social actors. They co- exist and overlap with Multistakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) as more expansive network structures linking diverse actors, which are concerned explicitly with social impact, innovation and scalability, and which can often arise spontaneously and organically as well as under the initiative of a major international or global actor. International and global institutions, including notably the UN, often play a prominent role in MSPs in the development and security field. As with other types of partnerships, MSPs encompass wide-ranging forms of collaboration; for example, one type of MSPs that have proliferated in response to the UN- supported initiatives on business and human rights are multistakeholder partnerships formed under the Global Compact initiative, whose remit differs as much as it overlaps with erstwhile models of business- non profit collaboration (Byiers et al 2016; Mercy Corps 2011). At the local level, INGO- led initiatives such as those by Mercy Corps (Mercy Corps 2011) have resulted in different types of MSPs in terms of the lead- agency, duration, the role of Mercy Corps and so on. Given such variety in the existing forms of collaboration between business and other actors, and the fact that a notion of public- private collaboration underpins all MSPs, analysing them presents a challenge (Loveridge and Wilson 2017; Reid et al 2014). Against this backdrop, it is something of a moot point in the mainstream debate how good partnership practice guidance provided by scholars and practitioners can be interpreted and applied to support the use of MSP involving business and make them fit for purpose in the context of SDG implementation.

While all partnerships involve collaboration, not every collaborative arrangement is a partnership. From the practice side, efforts to inject more precision highlight an interdependent, interactive and reciprocal nature of relationship which involves some form of sharing and learning-- whether the shared content involves material resources, competencies, risks and/or benefits (Danish Red Cross 2015:2; IOB 2013; KPMG 2016). From this perspective, many philanthropy- driven arrangements between companies and non- profit organisations which are often devoid of any meaningful interaction, mutual engagement and/or reciprocity, cannot be considered partnerships in its true meaning although they are commonly referred as such by both parties (Austin 2000).

The levels of engagement and the different content of relations across different types of collaboration involving business, determine the extent to which the imputed value added of partnership to generate synergies, as its *raison d'être*, is effectively realised. According to Pfisterer (2013:8), mutuality- the interdependence of partners to create joint value- is the key principle for achieving synergist rewards from collaboration but its manifestations vary. For traditional PPPs, the emphasis in interactions between business and non-state actors is on exchanging tangible resources (technical, financial, human, physical, knowledge) since partnerships are viewed as mechanisms of pooling and sharing generic resources of each actor to deliver the project in a most cost-effective way. An illustration of this kind of partnership in international development cooperation are PPPs in the health, water, sanitation and food security sectors (IOB 2013; Pfisterer 2013). These partnerships are typically focused on discrete issues that can be addressed within a specified time frame, are usually implemented on a project- basis, and can produce quick win-win solutions for those involved, and for the 'beneficiaries'/'target groups' of the partnership action. In partnerships between business and other types of non- profit social actors, besides economic transactions, strong emphasis is placed on the exchange and accumulation of intangible resources produced through mutual interactions that mobilise each partner's assets including specific knowledge and skills and organisational culture. When arrangements include non governmental organisations, the justification and the perceived advantages of partnership are set out broadly to include the provision of: i) associational value as a quality that emanates from being associated with the other partner; ii) transferred resources from sharing access to each other resources; iii) interactive value which contributes to social capital building and indirectly to social cohesion; iv) synergistic value from the complementarity among the sets of knowledge and expertise that the partners possess (Byiers et al. ibid:4). While motivations for collaboration between business and non- profit actors are always a mix of altruism and utilitarianism (Austin and Seintanidi 2012: Part 1:730), for MSPs the importance of intangible values such as reputational trust, relational capital, learning, joint problem solving, communication, coordination, transparency, accountability and conflict resolution generated through interactions among diverse partners is crucial. According to Austin and Seintainidi (ibid), the intangible value emerges through the process of partners working together as well as being a pre-requisites for partnerships to work. The relevance of intangible assets intrinsic to the partners' interactions, contrasts with the logic and practice of traditional PPPs in which some of these elements are either absent or addressed through formal contractual arrangements. In multistakeholder platforms that have proliferated more recently in support of multistakeholder partnerships, intangible assets produced as a result of bringing together actors with diverse assets and capabilities bring a unique value that is deemed pivotal for the success of partnerships which operate without or with weak legal foundation. Concretely, in such frameworks, interactive value is deemed essential for institutionalising partnerships (Jamali et al 2011).

A principal support for partnerships as a superior collective action tool rests on a claim that partnerships emerge in situations where innovation is needed to deal with an issue in a more comprehensive and effective way. In this respect, traditional partnerships are somewhat of an outlier in so far as innovation matters indirectly when considering the various forms of blended finance to secure necessary project funding and share financial risks (Bayliss and van Waeyenberge 2018:580). In contrast, social partnerships and MSP respective discourse and practice make a strong claim regarding partnerships innovation potential. According to one comprehensive review of CSO-business partnerships, for companies the opportunity for innovation follows closely behind resource sharing as a motive for entering the partnership. For example, adapting products to local consumer preferences and to their cultural, social, and economic peculiarities may need innovation for which civil society organisations are able to provide often unique knowledge on the specific needs of the targeted groups (Byiers et al ibid:3). UN- endorsed multistakeholder platforms created to support the implementation of the business and human rights agenda, which are regularly showcased during annual UN Business and Human Rights Forum sessions, provide abundant evidence of partnerships aimed at this kind of collaborative outcomes that engage companies, non governmental organisations as well as a variety of other actors in achieving simultaneously commercial and social objectives. The experience of INGO Mercy Corps in partnering with diverse actors illustrates the role of local dialogue platforms produced by partnerships with the private sector in providing novel approaches to inclusive development (Mercy Corps 2011; Pfisterer 2013: 7).

In all types of partnerships, risk mitigation is an important consideration in setting up a partnership and for its sustainability. Risk mitigation is implemented differently depending on the type of partnership and the form of its institutionalisation (Reid et al 2014). In the case of classic PPPs between companies and government, although risk management is formally shared, and the relevant procedures are set out under contract terms, the burden of risk mitigation lies with the government as a body ultimately responsible for public service delivery (Beisheim and Simon 2016:2; Bayliss and van Waeyenberge ibid). Within a MSP framework characterised by open- ended, multilevel (voluntary) interactions among a variety of social actors with different understanding of risks, the issue of risk mitigation and risk sharing is more complex as well as ambiguous. This is because the combination of interdependence and fluid and dynamic nature of the relationships among a wide range of actors, blurs the boundaries of individual actor's responsibilities; this in turn may impact on the degree on an actor's engagement in partnership action. From an individual actor's perspective, the possibility for risk mitigation is hedged by the uncertainty surrounding the actions and behaviour of other partners in the absence of formal, legally binding rules. Consequently, in MSPs which lack a firm legal foundation akin to the traditional PPP, risk sharing is rarely explicitly addressed as part of the partnership process.

Lastly, the way in which the concept of partnership is used by scholars and practitioners, and the main thrust of the debate, underplay the importance of power asymmetry for partnership performance and impact. In practice, the meaning of partnership is constructed in a context of power differentials among discrete actors which typically favour business as an actor/partner in possession of superior resources over local governments, civil society organisations and other non-state actors. This is corroborated by the evidence from partnerships between business and non-profit organisations in which corporate interests prevail (Byiers et al 2016:6).

Discrepancies in financial and human resources, and information can be detrimental to partnership building (Pattberg and Widerberg 2016: 47). But power imbalance can also arise for other reasons that determine the degree of partners' engagement, influence and control over the decision making process, and consequently the extent to which partners are evenly engaged in co-developing and implementing partnership objectives. It may be the case that some partners are more interested in the partnership than others; or some partners lack confidence to engage actively in the partnering process. The debates on partnerships focused on the transaction of resources in possession of different actors, and on the governance modalities to compensate for absent capacities, tend to ignore this dimension of power differences. The emphasis on uneven capacities and the need for capacity building to initiate and sustain partnerships with the private sector, overlooks that in practice partnering presents a challenge for any social actor (Pfisterer 2013:15). Hence, the very process of working jointly on an issue of shared concern is inextricably tied to capacity building, as 'every partner [*company included*] has something to learn, capacity to acquire and improve' so that acting together becomes possible and is sustained (Osborne 2002:320; Stobart 2010: 14; Byiers et al 2015:25). This requires a different approach to addressing power asymmetry through partnering. The success of partnerships hinge ultimately on the ability of the actors to build relationships which enable and are sustained by mutual learning, and which builds both on visible as well as latent capacities of each actor.

From transactional models to transformational ambition : partnerships for SDGs

While the UN has made a strong plea for reinventing multistakeholder partnerships as instruments for the implementation of the SDG agenda, it has provided little by way of elaborating what this transformation might entail and how to achieve it. From the review of the scholarship on partnerships and an analysis of the most common forms of partnerships involving business presented in the first part of this paper, it can be deduced that transactional relationships are still prevalent in existing models. Transactional logic is most evident in traditional PPPs and this is why this model of business engagement is seen by some scholars and practitioners as being at odds with the SDG ambition to catalyse systemic change in addressing complex problems of development and security. Recent expansion of PPPs prompted UNECE to call for 'people first PPPs' amidst evidence of failure to extend services to the poorest section of the local population (UNECE 2016; Bayliss and van Wayenberg 2018;). The World Bank has adjusted its lending practice to promote PPP that work with marginalised groups and small and medium size enterprises. The practices of social partnerships under the CSR fiat lag significantly behind theoretical advances towards truly transformational relationships between business and other actors, especially because, as some scholars argue, the engagement with local actors including local communities is often 'too little, too late' (Karaki 2016). Similar failure plagues the development partnerships that have emerged in the aftermath of the UN World Summit, criticised for their inadequate community involvement which has arguably led to a lack of community agreed ground rules to foster accountability, capacity building and ensure learning, with a knock- on effect on the effectiveness and sustainability of those partnerships (Bezanson and Isenman 2012).The MSP platforms which operate mostly transnationally, have had limited success so far in achieving empowerment and resolving specific problems of insecurity and poverty, while being suffused with visibility, accountability and transparency problems (Hazelwood 2015).

How in practice different modalities and experiences of partnerships involving business can be reconciled and utilised in a constructive way to develop a new type of associative action involving business which is appropriate in the local context is still unclear. According to KPMG, the most advanced form of transformational partnership would aim to achieve sustained impact and scale, result in learning- based transformation at the partner and partnership level, address systemic issues and have the potential to enable catalytic change across geographies and sectors (2015:9). In light of the experience of the existing models of partnerships, moving toward this vision requires a fundamental change in the approach to local actors and in attitudes towards the purpose of the partnership itself. In transactional partnerships, companies and other actors when 'partnering' follow the logic of self- efficacy', aimed at balancing costs and benefits, and approach local communities primarily as recipients of services provided by the partnership. On this point, it is interesting that the scholarship and practice discourse on partnerships take the concept of 'partner' as self- evident and engage mostly in debating different aspects of partnership governance and impact. For transformative partnership, the core challenge entails a conceptual and practice shift from 'participating' to 'building' partners (or from stakeholders to partners) that engage with each other from the position of equity, mutual benefit and shared responsibilities and risks while addressing the partnership's focal issues. How the partnership focal issue- the common understanding of the problem and the shared value- is defined goes to the very core of the notion of transformational partnership. The focal issue is rarely predetermined, but rather becomes fully articulated through the process of mutual interaction. Hence, the formulation of the problem, the decision on the appropriate way to address it, and the role of each actor affected by it, all hinge on the extent and the way companies engage with the local actors in the localities in which they work. This necessitates inclusion of all those actors whose viewpoints are critical to partnership success, and in turn draws attention to the importance of how business understands and implements stakeholder engagement (Danish Red Cross 2015:28). Shortcomings in the involvement of local actors are among the key reasons behind limited success of partnerships and lack of sustainable impact (Beisheim and Ellersiek 2017: 18).

Experience shows that the most innovative partnerships emerge organically at the local level where there is the strongest potential for frequent, sustained and face-to-face interaction between companies and other social actors, and enhanced possibilities to arrive through this process at a clear formulation of the problem for which joint effort is needed. This has prompted some experts to call for the establishment of national platforms to support the development of MSPs based on local needs and link those to national strategies in the course of SDGs implementation IBeisheim and Ellersiek 2017). Engagement based on intensive, innovative and sustained collaboration which many scholars identify to be an imperative for successful partnerships through shared learning, requires trust and commitment that are not readily available qualities in the interaction between companies and other local actors, but are created through the process of sustained engagement (Reid et al ibid; Karaki 2016). According to some analysts, making MSPs work has been a struggle because of the difficulty of ensuring ‘a working relationship based on trust, mutual respect, open communication and understanding among stakeholders about each other’s strengths and weaknesses. […] without … processes in place to facilitate negotiations among stakeholders for optimal outcomes, effective MSPs will not emerge.’ (ODI 2003:iii).

The importance of business engagement at the local level as the most likely site for transformative partnerships, is premised on maintaining working relationships at other levels, namely national and international, that the business is engaged in. And yet, extant practices and MSP debates differentiate between global and local level MSPs, which leaves a blind spot in how companies can best navigate the complex web of formal and informal processes that guide their operations and that in practice are impossible to disentangle (Mercy Corps 2011). Business engagement with local actors is voluntary which reinforces the importance of soft norms and international standards such as those that inform SDGs, in providing a supporting structure for managing and sustaining mutual interactions. According to Bezanson and Isenman (2012), voluntary governance arrangements are characterized by ‘attraction as opposed to force, persuasion instead of regulation, convening rather than requiring others to follow and the power of complex information systems rather than rule-based systems’. Those informal practices and soft norms that operate in conjunction with legal and regulatory frameworks, carry particular weight for the transformational objective of stimulating a change in attitudes, behaviours, and value systems of all actors involved and thus to go beyond the compliance mentality prevalent in transactional modes of collaboration.

What makes partnerships succeed is understood differently by scholars and practitioners. Nevertheless, according to Stobart (2010), it is possible to identify some commonalities across diverse perspectives including ‘mutual and shared commitments, transparency coupled with good communication, clear objectives, and promoting participatory processes to build trust and understanding’. These common points highlight the importance of personal relations as well as process issues suggesting a need to develop a different metrics to assess the success of the partnerships that aspire to provide the foundations for broader change beyond output- based (typically quantifiable) formats used in existing partnerships. One proposal is to assign a preponderant weight to accountability, transparency, effectiveness, equity, flexibility, good governance, inclusiveness, participation and engagement, independence from vested interests, human rights compliance, and the alignment of partnership governing principles with the UN Global Compact Principles (Dodds 2015:12).

Conclusions: Challenges and dilemmas for building effective human security business partnerships for the implementation of the SDGs

The call for more and better partnerships to implement the UN- led Agenda 2030 for sustainable development with a prominent role assigned to business, have opened to scrutiny almost three decades of experience in collaborative efforts to address contemporary security and development challenges. The overview of the main issues in academic and policy debates on partnerships provided in this paper, suggests several possible entry points where a human security- informed approach can support novel forms of collaboration between the private sector and other social actors, such as human security business partnerships (HSBPs)- to produce systemic change and ensure favourable results . They include an emphasis on process, particularly to emphasise interpersonal relationships within the partnership, the relevance of context as defined by the confluence between local and global dynamics, and the central role of shared responsibility and shared risks for individual and joint action. Taking human security as a framework to rethink partnerships can address some of the key concerns in scholarship and practice about **how** partnerships are conducted and their fundamental processes, which remain a 'terra incognita' (Byiers et al 2015) in the available practice guidance with its focus on partnership results. Most concretely, human security as a goal and methodology can provide pointers about how the process of engagement among diverse actors can help trust- building and commitment without which sustained collective action enshrined in transformative partnerships is likely to fail. Human security as methodology foregrounds individual needs, perceptions, values and expectations as shaped by the contextual idiosyncrasy, and can facilitate the processes leading to common understandings of the problem, what drives it and how best to address it. It can shape agreement on each respective actor's contributions and responsibilities for implementing them in situations when there are no pre-defined lead partners, 'problems' or 'target groups' as defined in the mainstream discourse on partnerships.   Companies are embedded in the lifeworld of local communities in their operational sites and face an unpredictable and dynamic field for engagement with local and other actors whose presence and action bear on a company's commercial and other objectives. From a pragmatic point of view, human security business partnerships can facilitate the process of 'localising the SDGs' and of mobilising the key constituencies for their implementation at multiple levels.

In stating a claim that human security as a methodology and a framework can contribute to a shift from transactional to transformative partnership through fostering and structuring more constructive relationships between companies and other actors, it is important not to underestimate some pertinent challenges and dilemmas of partnership involving business as a distinctive social actor. They concern the tension between inclusiveness/ effectiveness; the difficulty of ensuring sustained engagement; the dilemma between flexibility and accountability; and the tension between the impact and the time horizon of joint action among multiple actors with different interests, motives, value systems, and organisational cultures. These challenges and dilemmas are heightened in multilevel (local, national, international), open ended and flexible interactions characteristic of a new breed of MSP envisaged as the key instrument in the implementation of SDGs. Two important lessons from practical experience are useful in thinking how best to address these challenges and dilemmas. One concerns the role of a mediator- a third party facilitation to initiate and/or maintain engagement among different actors; and the other relates to the critical role that personal and professional leadership plays in sustaining commitment to the partnership process.

References

Abramov, I. 2010. Building peace I fragile states- building trust is essential for effective public private partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics* 89:481–494.

Austin, J.E. and Seitanide, M.M. 2012. Collaborative value creation: A review of partnerships between non profit and business. Part 1: value creation spectrum and collaboration stages. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 42(5):727-*

Austin, J.E. and Seitanide, M.M. 2012. Collaborative value creation: A review of partnerships between non profit and business. Part 2. Partnership process and outcomes. *Non- profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 41(6):929-968.*

Austin, J.E . 2000. Strategic collaboration between non-profit and business. *Non- profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 29(1):69-97.*

Backstrand, K. and Kylsater, M. 2014. Old wine in new bottles: The legitimation and delegitimation of UN public-private partnerships for sustainable development from the Johannesburg summit to the Rio+ summit. *Globalization*s 11(3):331-347.

Bayliss, K. and Van Waeyenberge, E. 2018. Unpacking the public private partnership revival, The *Journal of Development Studies* 54(40):577-593.

Bendel, J. 2017. *Evolving partnerships: A guide to working with business for greater social change*. Abindon: Routledge.

Bezanson, K A. and Isenman, P. 2012. Governance of new global partnerships: Challenges, weaknesses and lessons. Washington: Center for Global Development.

Besihemim, M. and Ellersiek, A. (2017) Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Transformative, Inclusive and Accountable?, SWP Research paper, Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft and Politik.

Beisheim, M. and Simon, N. 2016. Multi-stakeholder partnerships for implementing the 2030 agenda: Improving accountability and transparency. Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft unf Politik.

Besheim, M., Liese, A., Janetschek, and Sarre, J. 2014. Transnational partnerships: Conditions for successful service provision in areas of limited statehood. *Governance* 27(4):655-573).

Brouwer, H., Woodhill, J et al. (2015) The MSP Guide: How to design and Faciliatte MSP, Wageningen: University Center for Development Innovation Wageningen University.

Byiers, B., Guadagno, F. and Karaki, K. 2015. From looking good to doing good: Mapping CSO-business partnerships. Brussels- Mastricht: European Centre for Development Management Discussion Paper no. 182.

Danish Red Cross 2015. Not business as usual- partnerships between CSOs and business. Copenhagen: Danish Red Cross.

Dodds, F. 2015. Multistakeholder partnerships: Making them work for the post-2015 development agenda. Available at: www.un.org

European Commission 2016 EQUAL guide for development partnerships: Learning from the experience of EQUAL partnerships. Brussels: European Commission- Employment and European Social Fund.

Hazlewood, P. 2015. Global MSP: Scalling up public- private global impact for the SDGs. World Resources Institute

Hemmato, M. 2002. Multistakeholder processes for governance and sustainability: Beyond deadlock and conflict. Abingdon: Earthscan

IHRB 2015. State of play: Business and SDGs: Mind the gap: Challenges for implementation. Volume Four. London.

IOB 2013. Public- private partnerships in developing countries: A systematic literature review. The Netherlands: Ministry of Foreign Affairs Policy and Operations Department (IOB).

Jamali, D; Yianni, M. and Abdallahy, H. 2011. Strategic partnerships, social capital and innovation: Accoounting for social alliances innovation. *Business and Ethics* 20(4).

Karaki, K. 2016: Deconstructing partnerships: An opportunity to learn. GREAT Insight Magazine 5(2).

KPMG International 2015. Unlocking the power of partnership: A framework for effective cross-sector collaboration to advance the global goals for sustainable development. Available at: www.kpmg.com

Loveridge, D. and Wilson, N. 2017. Engaging with the private sector through multistakeholder platforms. The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development. Available at: www.enterprise-development.org

Mahmud, A., Peterson, K. and Weissburg, R. 2013. Ahead of the curve: Insights for the international NGO of the future

Martens, J. 2007. Multistakeholder partnerships- future models of multilateralism? Berlin: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Occasional papers no. 29.

Mercy Corps. 2011. Local partnerships: A guide to partnering with civil society, business and government groups.

ODI 2003. Multi-stakeholder Partnerships Issue Paper. London: ODI.

OECD 2015. Development cooperation report 2015: Making partnerships effective coalitions for action. Paris: OECD.

Osborne, S P. (ed) 2002. Public- private partnerships: Theory and practice in international perspective. London- New York: Taylor and Francis.

Pattberg, P. and Widerberg, O. 2016. Transnational multistakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: Conditions for success. *Ambio* 45(1): 42-51.

Pattberg, P. et al (2012) Public- private Partnerships for Sustainable development: Emergence, Influence and Legitimacy, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Pfisterer, S. 2013. Development partnerships with the private sector at work. Rotterdam: Partnership Resource Center.

Reid, S., Hayes, JP. and Stibbe, D. 2014. Platforms for partnerships: Emerging good practice to systematically engage business as a partner in development. Available at: http://thepartneringinitiative.org

Scott, L. 2007. Conflicting cultures: Lessons from UN business partnerships. Partnership Initiative

Stobart, A. 2010. Approaches to partnerships. London: Hafton Consultancy.

UN 2017. The Report to the Secretary General Enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular the private sector. A/72/310.

UNECE 2016. Promoting people first public- private partnerships (PPP) for the UN SDGs. UN Economic Commission for Europe Agency Task Force on Financing for Development.