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Chapter 4
Building Partnerships for Climate Compatible Development

Building networks is important to establish resilience to climate change and future uncertainties.¹ Networks represent connections and pools of resources that different actors can tap into, for example after a disaster or when taking action for sustainable development. In the context of project implementation (i.e. CCD) these networks should move towards creating partnerships. Partnerships represent flexible arrangements between two or more actors within a network, in order to act together towards a common objective. Partnerships do not always need to be formalised and permanent; however, they constitute a coordinated attempt to move action forward towards sustainable neighbourhoods that can address climate compatible development concerns.

In this section we explore the realities of forming partnerships for climate governance, while recognising the diversity and inequality that mark the urban poor. The section starts by exploring the question ‘What is a partnership?’ This leads to a consideration of the principles for a successful partnership. Two challenges emerge: 1) to establish the partnership in relation to an understanding of the context in which it will be implemented; and 2) to challenge potential power imbalances which may hinder the operation of the partnership. The PAPD approach, explained in the previous chapter, is a key method for addressing these challenges during the constitution of a partnership.

4.1. What is a partnership and how does it work within an urban context?

When thinking about service delivery, partnerships are often identified with public–private agreements. These are highly formalised agreements, usually

on a commercial basis, that have been developed to address perceptions that some governments are inefficient and lack capacity to provide urban services. This is, however, a narrow understanding of partnerships for climate compatible development.

Partnerships can, instead, be seen as a form of cooperative environmental governance. Cooperative environmental governance occurs when actors with different interests find mechanisms to 1) develop a shared understanding of a problem; and 2) coordinate action to address it. Cooperative environmental governance in the arena of climate change may help to build dialogue between multiple social values and competing courses of action.

As a form of cooperative environmental governance, a partnership can be understood as a dynamic relationship between actors who share a common problem and are willing to work together towards its resolution. In the context of climate change, partnerships are important because they offer the opportunity to link the actions of diverse actors with different scales of operation, and thus they may be flexible enough to deal with uncertain futures and changing development demands.

Establishing a partnership entails recognising the capacity of different actors to intervene and devise strategies to maximise their synergies. On the one hand, actors participating in the partnership need to recognise the interests and capacities of other partners (mutuality). On the other hand, they will equally need to maintain their initial purpose, not being subject to co-optation within the partnership (identity). Only those relationships built upon high mutuality and high identity will constitute a true partnership, as opposed to less cooperative forms of work between two organisations (Table 8).

Table 8  Characteristics of a working partnership (adapted from Brinkerhoff, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutuality</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Contracting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnerships are not necessarily a rare occurrence. They may emerge spontaneously from a shared need when different organisations and social groups realise that they can work together towards achieving a common objective. In Maputo, for example, there are already working examples of successful partnerships between governments, formal and informal business, and communities (see Box 13).

In summary, there is an important need to move beyond narrow understandings of partnerships for service delivery as formal public–private arrangements and look instead to the multiple possibilities that open up for cooperative partnerships for climate compatible development in cities. In doing so, individuals working towards a partnership will need 1) to identify participants; 2) to develop mutual interests; and 3) to establish commitments. To understand how to develop these different stages, we turn now to understand the principles of partnership building.

Box 13 Examples of ongoing partnerships in Maputo

PARTNERSHIP FOR DISASTER RISK REDUCTION IN MOZAMBIQUE
This partnership between UN-Habitat and the government’s National Disaster Management Institute (INGC) works towards a national-level assessment of disaster risks. As partners recognise the importance of incorporating local priorities, citizens are involved through consultations.

PARTNERSHIP FOR WASTE COLLECTION AND RECYCLING IN MAPUTO
The waste management NGO AMOR works in partnership with cata-dores (informal waste collectors) and civil society organisations that manage waste streams. The establishment of collection centres supports this partnership.

PARTNERSHIP FOR WATER PROVISION IN DEPRIVED AREAS IN MAPUTO
FIPAG (Investment and Patrimony Fund for Water Supply) supports financing and infrastructure for small-scale private water providers. These can reach deprived areas better than through the standard water provision model at the national level.
4.2. Principles of partnership building

Partnership is not about influencing things directly, but rather about creating networks and connections, which will enable social, environmental and technological change. In doing so partnerships often emerge to address two simultaneous challenges: building a collective solution for an agreed common goal, and establishing dialogue across institutions and organisations that can support such common goal. Rather than being a formal agreement at a given time, a partnership is an iterative process to develop a common vision – and thus a common goal – and recognises the capacities and possibilities of different partners in attaining it. An agreement to deliver common action should be made in relation to both partners’ capacities and their role within the political context.

What can foster the process of partnership building? Overall, partnership building means bringing together collective efforts to push in the same direction. While partnerships may be oriented towards engaging a variety of social groups, they are most often led by a core group of individuals who are able and willing to move the partnership forward. Sometimes the core group emerges from within the sector of the population that stands to benefit from the partnership. For example, community representatives who defend the interest of the urban poor may organise themselves to actively defend their interests. Locally based organisations may gain leverage through partnerships to raise awareness and gain resources available beyond their local space of action. Other times, a range of intermediaries, concerned with hearing the voice of disadvantaged communities, mediate the establishment of a partnership. This may be particularly relevant in partnerships for climate compatible development, when local concerns need to be balanced with broader considerations of a changing climate at a planetary scale.

Having a core group will help in avoiding situations in which everyone is concerned about a certain problem – the unfolding of climate change in Maputo – but nobody is initiating or leading action. In particular, the core group will need to deal with specific practical considerations to put the partnership into practice (see Box 14), from starting a dialogue to establishing the terms of that dialogue in relation to the actors participating, resources needed and time frames within which different actors operate. Finding a common entry point is a key issue, since some partners may need a hook to get involved in the partnership. Some other partners may get involved at later stages within the partnership, once some interventions are ongoing and its effectiveness has been demonstrated.
Box 14 Some practical questions relevant for the establishment of a partnership

WHO ARE THE PARTNERS?
Partnerships may be actively started by one of the partners who enrol those who can support their cause, but it will only come to fruition if all the potential partners recognise their mutual interest within the partnership. Sometimes, the partnership needs to also enrol those partners whose contribution to the overall goal is not clear, but who have the capacity to act as gatekeepers from within the particular context in which the partnership operates.

WHAT IS THE ENTRY POINT FOR THE PARTNERSHIP?
While the mutual interest may not be obvious at the outset, there needs to be an entry point through which all participants can engage in dialogue. In Maputo, for example, waste management was a good entry point because it is a very current issue, which relates to both existing vulnerabilities and the potential for sustainable development.

WHAT IS THE KNOWLEDGE BASE AND HOW CAN IT BE COMMUNICATED ACROSS PARTNERS?
The development of a partnership requires the transfer of knowledge and skills across partners. This is essential to develop a common vision. Yet, often, the challenge is the recognition of the knowledge that other partners hold. Non-technical partners may not engage with technical information if it cannot be easily understood, interpreted and acted upon. Equally, technical partners may not recognise the important contextual knowledge that other partners may have, from understanding the institutional framework of emergency operations to recognising the specific ways in which community action may improve resilience.

WHAT IS THE TIME FRAME OF THE PARTNERSHIP?
Time frame issues are crucial when dealing with both development and climate change. Often, development objectives are short term, if the need to intervene in a specific context is immediate or if partners with short term-interests, such as business, frame the intervention. With regards to climate change, engagement with climate information requires adopting longer time frames, particularly when the objective is to reduce vulnerability. However, sometimes, considering certain events, such as seasonal rainfall patterns, may shorten the time frame of intervention. Establishing an appropriate time frame for the
Box 14 (Continued)

achievement of collective goals will depend on the context of the partnership. However time frames need to be, on the one hand, short enough to support action implementation but, also, long enough so that immediate concerns do not foreclose the possibility of undertaking a more ambitious perspective to address the concerns of all the partners within the partnership.

WHAT ARE THE RESOURCES NEEDED WITHIN THE PARTNERSHIP AND THE FINANCIAL MECHANISMS AVAILABLE?
The partnership represents the collective efforts of each of the partners, but for it to be successful, partners will have to work towards building in mechanisms to finance the partnership independently. Often, partnerships are a means to leverage those resources which otherwise would not be available to any of the partners working in isolation.

WHAT MECHANISMS CAN ENSURE FLEXIBILITY WITHIN THE PARTNERSHIP?
Partnerships will depend on their ability to adapt to changing conditions, both to deal with the uncertainty inherent in climate change issues and to deal with the changing institutional demands within an urban context. Flexibility may depend on a progressive process of partnership building.

IS THE PARTNERSHIP SUSTAINABLE?
Partnerships do not merely represent a dialogue between partners, but rather, they need to be constituted independently with an orientation towards their sustainability. Showing effectiveness is also a strategy to promote sustainability. However, the need for the partnership also depends on the extent to which the objectives have been achieved. Once they have been achieved, the partnership may no longer be needed.

There is a difference between partnerships and other forms of cooperative governance that focus only on building dialogue between actors who intervene separately. The partnership mediates a form of cooperative action that is common to all the partners and, thus, cannot be brought about by their separate interventions. Hence, an effective partnership has an independent entity beyond partners. This means that partners need to agree their commitment to the partnership and, in particular, what the collective
resources are that will support the partnership and during what period of time it will be operative.

While partnerships may enable the bringing together of disparate sets of interests – defined at different scales and relying on a variety of knowledge and understandings of climate compatible development priorities – they also require a conscious effort to bring the partnership together and commit to the objectives of the partnership, independently from those of the individual partners. To do so, it is crucial to consider how the partnership will work within a given context and in particular, how the partnership will: 1) strengthen current institutions (rather than replicate existing efforts); 2) recognise the mutual interests and capacities of partners; 3) gain political will; 4) develop flexible arrangements that open the door to future partners and adapt to a changing environment; and 5) disseminate its results and demonstrate effectiveness.

In the context of uncertainty discussed in chapter 2, building partnerships may require a strategy for experimentation, that is, one that attempts to be learning-by-doing and within which partners recognise each other’s right to be wrong. In this way partnerships may allow for strategies which go beyond business as usual proposals that emerge from an open dialogue between participants. Simultaneously, the success of the process will depend on the extent to which the partnership fits its existing context of operation, and builds upon existing networks. A key challenge for a successful partnership is understanding how it will operate within a given context.

Another critique of partnerships is the extent to which they depend on negotiations which take place within a power-laden environment. Ideally, partnerships should be understood as creating debate beyond highly institutionalised domains of environmental policy and, in particular, opening spaces for the voices of those who are disempowered within the policy process. 4 In practice, however, partnerships may depend on the effectiveness of the core group to deal with existing power-centred relations, and the extent to which they may mediate the intervention of less powerful actors within the partnership.

In the context of climate change, struggles may emerge in terms of who gets to define what benefits the partnership has to deliver and to whom. Concerns with vulnerability in the city already point at the urban poor and the provision of urban services as key areas of intervention for climate compatible development. However, powerful actors – particularly those who are able to tap into global discourses of development and access international

---

finance—may be able to shape the collective goal to suit their interests and, drawing in pre-established solutions (e.g. privatisation, capital investment, infrastructure development), use the partnership as a means to legitimate interventions that respond to the interests of dominant elites. Co-optation is, thus, a risk within partnerships that derives from the difficulties of some actors to establish a strong identity within the partnership.

Therefore, the rest of the chapter reflects on how to manage the two main challenges that emerge for the constitution of successful partnerships. The first challenge is building the partnerships in context—addressing existing realities and concerns of intervening partners—while having space to bring in new ideas and innovations that will make the partnership unique and worthwhile. The second challenge is building a partnership from a perspective that addresses power relations explicitly, by enabling less powerful actors to gain strength and visibility through the development of a collective identity.

4.3. Understanding partnerships in context

Thinking about context means understanding the interrelated set of conditions in which the partnership-building process takes place. As the partnership is built upon a set of social relations, examining the conditions that shape such relations will help in understanding how they can develop. Mapping out who are the different actors intervening in that context and how they can influence the formation of the partnership and the achievement of objectives is a step towards drawing out the context of the partnership. The actor mapping reveals the multiplicity of interests and values intervening in climate compatible development in a particular location, and thus, it also reveals the constraints and challenges to the partnership as perceived by different actors.

The actor mapping will define the actors that can intervene in climate compatible development and the relationships between those actors. For the purposes of the partnership, the core group will need to understand who the key actors participating are, what their interests are, what role they are currently playing in climate governance in that particular city and what further role they could play. Box 15 provides an example of the characterisation of the core group in the participatory project in Maputo, together with the motivations. Key roles are:

- **The facilitator:** an individual (or group of individuals) capable of providing guidance and bringing about a process of negotiation between potential partners in an unobtrusive manner.
Box 15 Active roles in the process of building a partnership in Chamnaculo C

FUNAB played a key role as a champion for the need to involve urban citizens in any decision for climate compatible development in Maputo. The motivations of FUNAB were both to ensure their policies were legitimate and to take leadership in addressing climate change. Through the development of the project the research team attempted to find other champions such as institutional representatives from the municipality.

Originally, the researchers at the three participant universities played the role of facilitators. Their main motivation was to experiment with innovative ways to deliver climate compatible development in a city like Maputo. However, within the project there was a strong concern with delivering project sustainability and thus, the project helped transfer the facilitator role to the CPC, once the CPC was established, through the intervention of local consultants and the NGO AVSI.

The research team made a thorough review of which actors had knowledge relevant to the situation in Maputo. In doing so, they established relationships with actors who had already studied the impact of climate change in the area (such as UNDP and UN-Habitat) and actors who had an intimate knowledge of planning processes in the city (e.g. researchers in the Eduardo Mondlane University). The team also developed networks including actors who had practical experience of building partnerships in the city, especially the Mozambican Association of Recycling, AMOR.

- The champion: access to institutions may require the intervention of a partnership advocate who is institutionally embedded, and thus, is able to establish local linkages.
- Knowledge communicators: partners may need to draw from different sources of knowledge both during partners’ negotiation and to facilitate implementation.

Understanding who integrates the core group, which role each actor plays and what their interests are helps, not only to develop appropriate strategies for partnership making, but also to build in flexibility through
an understanding of what matters to each partner and what the areas are in which compromise is possible. This also helps to establish channels for reaching other actors who may also intervene in the partnership.

Actor mapping will not only enable the identification of those actors who could participate or mediate the partnership, but will also contribute to understanding the constraints that some actors face within the existing context, and the relationships that may be needed to succeed in establishing the partnership at the local level. Rather than looking into actors’ interests only, the objective here is to map existing capacities, both in relation to what the actors can do and in relation to the politics of the place, in order to identify areas of potential engagement and gatekeepers.

The core group may work towards identifying a long list of important actors through brainstorming and preliminary interviews. Current thinking in cooperative environmental governance may inform this process. Figure 4, for example, shows the dominant view within the literature that has studied examples of partnership, both between government institutions and business (public–private partnerships) and between government institutions and communities (community-based natural resource management). This provides a starting point to think about potential partners and their interests.

The model, however, limits the potential for partnerships to adapt flexibly to the changing demands and the uncertainty inherent in climate compatible development. First, the model does not reflect that, in practice, partnerships emerge at all levels, with or without the intervention of the government. Institutional backing is important but may happen without formally becoming part of the partnership – for example, in the partnerships

![Figure 4](image-url)

Cooperative environmental governance models (redrawn from Plummer and FitzGibbon, 2004).
for waste collection in Maputo the government provides support but it is not a central part of the partnership. Governments may develop enabling strategies to develop action beyond their capacities.

Moreover, capacities may lie outside the government. In Maputo, for example, FUNAB was overcommitted, and the staff often lacked the capacity to respond to some of the challenges that emerged during the project. Thus, while FUNAB championed the project, staff had to be found outside FUNAB to manage the project within Eduardo Mondlane University (see Box 15).

Untangling the map of actors is a difficult task within an urban context where multiple layers operate simultaneously. Moreover, the identification of actors will depend on the consequences of climate change and the possibilities to address its impacts within that specific context. In Maputo, climate change adaptation emerges as a priority in relation to waste and water management. This is different from other cities where energy consumption and de-carbonisation may be the main priorities. Moreover, climate change action is also related to questions of timescales. Developing a sense that climate change is already happening – by relating climate change with recent flooding for example – is a strategy to convince institutional representatives (i.e. city mayors) and business of the need to take action in partnership. Moreover, thinking long term (the kind of thinking that supports climate compatible development) may be a luxury in policy contexts where institutions are already stretched or lack the capacities to respond adequately to current development challenges.

Much discussion around climate compatible development relates to the need to deal with questions of scale, for example how a global problem is managed within a local context. Overall, partnerships enable the interaction of actors regardless of their ambit of intervention. Moreover, partners work together for a collective goal, which may go beyond addressing their particular interests. Actors may be acting simultaneously in public and private realms, dissolving these boundaries. Overall, when thinking about partnerships, actors should be understood as operating in a continuum which challenges fixed understandings of scale and public and private divisions. Figure 5 shows some examples of actors who may be intervening in partnership regardless of their characterisation across the permeable continuum of scale and public/private characterisation.

Finally, thinking about partnership also requires characterising the interests and constraints under which actors operate. This may require quite lengthy work from the core group in communicating and exchanging information with potential partners, for example through interviews. Rather than understanding the interview as a mere means of gathering information,
in Maputo we used it as a way to influence potential partners and gain their support for the partnership. Understanding what could be achieved and how the other partner will contribute to this objective is a strategy to ensure the interview is sufficiently persuasive. However, the interview is also a space of negotiation, one in which both interviewers and interviewees can redefine their own interests and objectives.

One key concern within our project was to understand the extent to which different organisations related to climate compatible development concerns. Thus, following consultations with key informants, an important part of the project consisted of an actor-mapping exercise. This explicitly looked into the climate compatible development orientations of different actors, and the extent to which each one directly addressed the trade-offs between climate change adaptation, mitigation, and broader development concerns, or took advantage of their synergies. We looked at 73

---

**Figure 5**
Summary of actor mapping for climate compatible development in Maputo alongside the axis of scale and public/private character.
organisations that could potentially intervene for climate compatible development in Maputo. These included NGOs, international development and government institutions, private-sector bodies, local networks and educational institutions (Figure 6).

Then we looked into the dimensions of climate compatible development – mitigation, adaptation, development – which each organisation prioritised, as expressed in their objectives and policy documents. Figure 7 shows that, despite increasing awareness about climate change, development is the main priority for most institutions. Few prioritise

![Figure 6](image-url)

Distribution of actors in the sample.

![Figure 7](image-url)

Key climate compatible development orientations of different actors in Maputo.

---

adaptation and even fewer mitigation. We found the lack of prominence of adaptation surprising, given the urgent nature of adaptation challenges in Maputo and the vulnerabilities that have been made particularly visible during floods in the last two decades. Mitigation is often considered as part of development interventions, giving them additional value, rather than being an objective in itself, and is most often linked to urban-planning interventions which focus on the future of a sustainable city. Recognising both the distinct objectives of each organisation and how they link with different concerns is important for developing strategies for partnerships.

Developing partnerships with an organisation may require further research about its practices and policies. In our project we felt that this was a key area in which our academic team could assist communities. We made a selection of key organisations from the example above and we contacted them for in-depth interviews. The core team prepared a long list of questions that could lead such interviews to reveal how actors understood climate change issues in Maputo, their outlook on the current governance structure, the relationship between different actors, and the potential for partnerships and participatory planning to have an impact in the context of Maputo (see Table 9). However, a long list of questions may not be always the most appropriate way to engage potential partners. This approach would work better when the grounds for dialogue are insufficiently understood or when outsiders lead the core group (as was the case in this project). In Maputo, for example, when the CPC took on core group responsibilities after the PAPD completion, they were able to engage with potential partners in relation to concrete development proposals which did not require a wider discussion of organisational objectives.

4.4. Gaining visibility to address power imbalances

Partnerships emerge in specific social contexts, in which each actor has different capacities to influence the course of action. This does not mean that only some actors – for example, government, transnational private companies – can develop and contribute to a partnership. Instead, the partnership approach helps in recognising the multiple capacities within an urban setting from citizens, organisations and networks. Climate compatible development emerges from numerous context-specific actions, rather than just from grand strategies and master planning.

This, however, should not distract attention from the difficulties in bringing about a partnership that addresses citizens’ concerns when certain actors have capacity both to prevent less powerful actors to intervene and to
Table 9  Full list of questions with which to approach potential partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main objectives of the interview in relation to the main objectives of the project</th>
<th>The question would contribute to:</th>
<th>Sample questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Understanding climate change scenarios for Maputo in context | Actor’s understanding of current environmental issues in Maputo, for example:  
- Flooding  
- Waste and sanitation  
- Water security  
- Food security  
- Land  
- Pollution | • What are, in your opinion, the main environmental issues in Maputo?  
• Can you explain how the environmental issues mentioned may affect different groups of people in the city? |
| Understanding the role that different institutions can play for climate compatible development. Should start thinking about urban and social development and its implications for CCD | Actor’s understanding of potential climate impacts, for example:  
- Flooding  
- Sea-level rise  
- Heat island  
- Food security  
- Other | • [If not mentioned above] To what extent is climate change a relevant issue in Maputo?  
(Y/N ask to explain)  
• [If Yes] Explain the main challenges in relation to climate change in Maputo |
| Understanding the current governance context | Actor’s understanding of vulnerability factors, for example:  
- Poverty  
- Inequality  
- Access to resources and services  
- Housing  
- Livelihoods | • Who are the main actors affected by these problems?  
• What are the main factors which affect the vulnerability of different actors in Maputo?  
• Can you explain how each of the factors mentioned affect different groups of population? |
| | Understanding the role that different institutions can play for climate compatible development. Should start thinking about urban and social development and its implications for CCD | • What are the main institutions which are influencing urban development planning in Maputo?  
• How do they intervene? Resources?  
• How have they developed?  
• What is the role of the local government? And the national government? Any other actors you want to mention?  
• To what extent can this deal with the problems discussed above? |
## Table 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main objectives of the interview in relation to the main objectives of the project</th>
<th>The question would contribute to:</th>
<th>Sample questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role attributed to public participation</td>
<td>• What does public participation mean in your work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the mechanisms to give different publics a voice in current government?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who gets excluded? Why? What mechanisms are in place/should be in place to reach them? What support is available (if any)? Who is hardest to reach? Whose voice is most routinely heard and acted on?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is participatory budgeting in place? (Explain that we know that participatory budgeting is working in some places in Mozambique.) How does it operate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If I were a citizen in Maputo, what would be the alternatives to have my voice heard by the local government/by the national government (may like to refer to specific institutions or process)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the actors intervening in climate change</td>
<td>Understanding how actors present the ongoing initiatives that they are taking for climate change/environment</td>
<td>• Can you briefly describe any initiatives related to climate change/flooding/energy efficiency and energy security/water and sanitation/food and resource security/pollution within your organisation, and who is leading them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What has made these initiatives possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What has been their impact so far?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the perceptions of actors from other initiatives taking place in the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Who are the main actors in Maputo taking action for climate change/flooding/energy efficiency and energy security/water and sanitation/food and resource security/pollution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the main initiatives in these areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National government</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What has been the impact of such initiatives so far?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International organisations and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local civil society organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private sector and business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main objectives of the interview in relation to the main objectives of the project</td>
<td>The question would contribute to:</td>
<td>Sample questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the local perceptions of who are the movers and shakers</td>
<td>Understanding the operation of partnerships in practice in Maputo</td>
<td>• Who can stir action for climate change (or the environment) in Maputo? Or who are the movers and shakers in Maputo, in terms of bringing about climate/environmental action? • How do they interact with formal institutions? • Where do resources for these initiatives come from? • How does change really happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the operation of partnerships in practice in Maputo</td>
<td>Understanding the potential of partnerships in the context of Maputo</td>
<td>• Do you work in partnership? Explain. • Are you aware of any partnerships in any of the areas mentioned above which are currently operating in Maputo? • If not mentioned, what is your opinion of the waste management partnership which is operating in several communities (perhaps additional detail is needed)? • (In relation to these experiences, what are the disadvantages and advantages of working in partnership?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the potential of partnerships in the context of Maputo</td>
<td>Understanding who are the main actors that we cannot do without</td>
<td>• (In relation to the answers to questions above) What is your opinion of partnerships as a way to deliver urban/environmental services in the context of Maputo? • Are there other forms of government/service delivery which are more effective? Explain. • Who would you need to reach your objectives? Is there anybody in the way of reaching your objectives? • (If you were going to do a partnership for climate change (or environmental management) in Maputo, who are the main actors you would need to enrol?) • (Are there any actors that you would exclude? Why would you exclude them?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shape the results according to their own interest. The risk of co-optation is the main challenge for partnerships. Sometimes efforts to bring a partnership only advance the interests of some of the actors involved, for example when the partnership approach is used as a means to privatise services. Simultaneously, some partners will need to take leadership to move events in a particular direction away from a stalemate situation in which dialogue leads to no action (or even hinders action possibilities).

If communities are seen as being at the centre of climate compatible development, then issues of power need to address the extent to which they can be represented as having a strong identity within a partnership. PAPD can contribute to the creation of such strong identity in two ways: 1) by organising themselves through a representative committee; 2) by developing a strong message of proposals for climate compatible development as synthesised in the action plan. These are both necessary conditions for the community’s participation in the partnership. However, they are not sufficient conditions. For example, the community – and the committee – could be understood as clients, posing demands that either the government
or business actors should meet (e.g. passing new regulations, providing employment). Communities could find through the PAPD process that some of their demands are indeed this kind of demand, for which there is already an organisation that can respond. In such cases PAPD can contribute to highlight ineffectual institutions or lack of resources. This, however, is not conducive to a partnership agreement.

Most often, however, as it was the case in Maputo, the PAPD process will reveal a series of proposals in which the community can intervene, but only with the support of other institutional actors. In those cases, the community cannot be understood as a client that demands certain actions, but as a partner with crucial knowledge of how climate change interacts with current vulnerabilities. In these cases, gaining identity requires both developing the means for community representation (through a process like PAPD) and for community recognition.

Counting on the support of a champion or institutional backing is only one of the possible means of gaining recognition. Within the project, we focused on integrating mechanisms for recognition within the development of the project (see Box 16).

Cooperative strategies may be sufficient to draw in the interest of potential partners, particularly when there is already institutional support for ongoing work. In these situations, communities need to reassess their demands through the development of a solid common front – that is, a clear collective message – emerging through PAPD.

---

**Box 16 Strategies to gain community recognition**

We used three strategies to gain community recognition:

- Within PAPD this is done through the incorporation of secondary stakeholders who could eventually become partners for the communities from the beginning of the process.
- Towards the end of the PAPD process we organised a learning workshop with multiple stakeholders identified through the actor mapping. The workshop was led by the community committee and backed up by strong presentations from local residents.
- We drew on FUNAB’s capacity to act as a champion of the project facilitating the establishment of networks through interviews and informal meetings.
The question here is how to move from gaining recognition to obtaining a commitment from the parties involved. Engaging actors may require an ongoing process of transmitting information and discussion of common areas where a mutual interest can emerge. This is however different from getting partners to agree to do something and to commit to a future course of action. Public and private declarations of commitment may be sometimes enough to work towards partnership goals when these can be achieved by the discrete actions of its members. Forms of collective action with high transaction costs may require formal means of commitment – from a memorandum of understanding to a contract. The precise arrangements will depend on the nature of the action proposed and the relationships between partners.

In Maputo, as in other locations, recognition is not always a given. Sometimes communities will need to work towards being noticed. This may mean it is necessary to create awareness or even to put pressure on political and business leaders to join in the demands of the community. In these cases, community representatives become activists, committed to their goals of pursuing social change. However, before engaging in such activity it is important to ensure that there is a clear goal and shared message that the community wants to put forward. PAPD is designed as a process to define such a goal and defining it to an extent that the details are worked out. The clearer the path for implementation, the more likely some actors will be able to commit to it. Once the goal is defined there are three strategies to create awareness and pressure: 1) by developing forms of local organisation such as, for example, organising a network and leveraging local resources so that there is a wide base of support for the proposals; 2) by communicating broadly the message through local and translocal media; and 3) by undertaking symbolic actions which may target specific organisations and individuals. What strategies are most appropriate will depend on the context of intervention. Overall, any actions that show the local capacity for mobilisation are likely to generate a response from concerned institutions and authorities. For those aiming to work towards a partnership, evaluating those responses (especially if they are negative) will be key to developing negotiation pathways.

Sometimes visibility can be gained just by being opportunistic, that is, by dovetailing ongoing debates. For example, as waste management has already been a long-term concern in Maputo, it helped to build an entry point for a future partnership between FUNAB, the local communities, and other organisations which have already been intervening in this area. This helped further understanding of how this previous partnership experience could be broadened to address climate compatible development concerns.
4.5. Key lessons

- What differentiates partnerships from other forms of environmental governance is the partners’ commitment to work towards a common goal.

- Partners’ roles within a partnership depend on the needs of the partnership rather than on the interests of the partners.

- When joining a partnership, less powerful actors should develop a strategy to prevent co-optation. Key aspects of such strategy are establishing a clear position and developing methods to gain visibility and recognition.