Working effectively through partnerships

Lessons from Institutions for Inclusive Development in Tanzania

Ed Laws

March 2020

Key messages

- This short paper draws out lessons for working effectively with and through partners, based on the experience of the Institutions for Inclusive Development (I4ID) programme – an adaptive, politically smart governance programme in Tanzania.

- Cultivating effective partnerships can be a key part of delivering locally legitimate projects that have the potential to create sustainable change. Adaptive and politically informed ways of working create specific opportunities and challenges for doing this well.

- Flexible and adaptive programmes are deliberately designed to experiment and to make small investments in different areas, to see what will work. While this is often important for making headway on complex challenges, it can also leave partners exposed and can undermine trust.

- It can also be challenging to balance the need to meet accountability commitments to donors while allowing local partners to take the lead in pursuing their own objectives.

- Co-creating plans, priorities and activities with partners has the potential to resolve some of these tensions. But the time and patience required to do this successfully should not be underestimated, and can be difficult to maintain in the face of pressure from donors to see results within a confined timeframe.

Introduction

This short paper draws out lessons from the experience of the Institutions for Inclusive Development (I4ID) programme in Tanzania of working effectively with and through partners. The focus of this paper is primarily local delivery partners, including Tanzanian government actors and bodies, private sector actors and associations, civil society groups and research institutions. At points, the discussion also broadens out to include the I4ID consortium partners.

A central part of I4ID's overall theory of change is that meaningful institutional reform in Tanzania requires the efforts of multiple stakeholders. Working with a small, centralised team of core staff in Dar es Salaam, the I4ID management identifies potential high-impact issues where there is a realistic chance of reform, and reaches out to motivated actors – either working with them directly to achieve shared goals, or enlisting their participation in a coalition for change.

Cultivating effective partnerships can be a key part of delivering locally legitimate projects that have the potential to create sustainable change. This is not only central to I4ID's theory of change, but is also a core principle of adaptive, politically smart programming more generally. Partnerships can create opportunities for collective action to address problems that cannot be solved easily (or at all) by a single organisation, group or individual, as well as an institutional legacy for a programme and the promise of more sustainable change. Good partners may also be well-positioned to understand local dynamics, identify changes in circumstances that may be relevant for programming and help mobilise coalitions, bring different stakeholders together or open doors to key political or private sector actors.

In principle, good partnerships can be mutually beneficial arrangements. Table 1 summarises the partnership models that I4ID has cultivated, categorised respectively according to examples of the functions that partners have fulfilled for I4ID, and examples of the functions that I4ID has fulfilled for its partners.

Identifying and maintaining partnerships that can contribute to high-impact reform requires a structured process of relationship management and planning. Adaptive and politically informed ways of working create both opportunities and challenges for doing this well. As an issue-based adaptive programme that is explicitly designed to work with and through a wide range of local partners from different sectors in Tanzania, I4ID provides a valuable test-case for examining these issues, and for reflecting more generally on the kinds of partner relationships, networks and ways of working that need to be established for effective issue-based adaptive management. A brief review of programme documents and interviews with staff and local and consortium partners in Dar es Salaam highlights two closely related areas where I4ID is generating valuable learning.

Trust and credible commitments. Flexible and adaptive programmes have greater latitude for experimentation, which often takes the form of a preference for shorter-term planning cycles and smaller bets over longer-term commitments and large upfront investments. In the face of complex challenges, this experimental approach has the potential to deliver better results than traditional predesigned projects because it introduces greater scope to search for novel ways of achieving progress, and allows programmes to learn from experience and adapt as they go along. However, it can also leave both local and consortium partners exposed and can undermine trust, particularly if programme adaptation leads to an area of work being dropped abruptly or de-prioritised without sufficient explanation.

Local leadership and accountability. Adaptive programmes tend to place a strong emphasis on convening local actors and working constructively with partners to find solutions to locally defined problems. However, I4ID also has its own overarching objectives and areas of interest agreed with its funders. These goals and objectives will often align – but not always. As such, one of the potential challenges for the programme is allowing local actors to take the lead and nurturing their capacity to work in these ways, while meeting its accountability commitments to funders. To what extent should I4ID's principal role be to create local partnerships or marshal coalitions to advance its own objectives and satisfy its donors, as opposed to supporting local partners to deliver

the activities, projects or innovations they are committed to?

This paper elaborates on these issues, identifying key lessons for other development actors looking to work effectively with local and consortium partners in the course of taking an adaptive and politically smart programming approach.

Trust and credible commitments

Key lessons

- There are aspects of flexible and adaptive programming that can undermine trust among both local and consortium partners. To mitigate this, adaptive programmes may

Table 1   I4ID partnership models

What functions do partners fulfil for I4ID?	What functions does I4ID fulfil for partners?
Government	
• Help convene stakeholders/open doors to key political or market actors • Help progress a policy process • Provide local knowledge and insight	• Stimulate sectoral and/or regional investment • Help progress a policy process in ways that respond to constituents' concerns • Help convene stakeholders • Build connections with donors and other international actors
Private sector	
• Help unlock a problematic market dynamic, e.g. by bringing different actors into a coalition • Provide seed or matched funding for prototyping interventions • Stimulate sectoral investment • Help convene stakeholders/open doors to key political or private sector actors • Help progress a policy process • Provide local knowledge and insight	• Help unlock a problematic market dynamic, e.g. by bringing different actors into a coalition • Help convene stakeholders/open doors to key political or private sector actors • Provide seed or matched funding for prototyping interventions • Stimulate sectoral investment • Help progress a policy process • Help refine or accelerate a business model • Build capacity with technical advice or financial support • Expand a business's customer base
Civil society	
• Help convene stakeholders • Open doors to key political or private sector actors • Help connect I4ID to a particular constituency • Help progress a policy process • Provide local knowledge and insight	• Help refine their strategy • Build capacity, e.g. through technical advice • Help convene stakeholders/open doors to key political or private sector actors • Generate political momentum around key issues
Education/research	
• Provide research skills and capacity • Provide local knowledge and insight • Provide sectoral experience and expertise	• Provide funding through commissioning research and knowledge products • Provide quality assurance, technical support and capacity-building
Consortium members	
• Provide research skills and capacity • Provide local knowledge and insight • Provide sectoral experience and expertise • Provide technical resources • Help convene stakeholders/open doors to key political or private sector actors	• Build capacity, expertise and sectoral or country experience through implementation • Provide an opportunity to draw on the knowledge and expertise, sectoral or country experience and key contacts of other consortium members • Help convene stakeholders/open doors to key political or private sector actors

need to invest more heavily than conventional ones in communicating their decision-making to partners, and in co-creating activities and objectives.

- Adaptive programmes should invest in a gradual exit strategy in case they decide to move on from a local partnership. This should principally consider the legacy of the relationship from the partner's perspective, and include efforts to find a replacement for the funding or support that is withdrawn, where appropriate and feasible in terms of time and resources.

- The inherent uncertainty in adaptive programmes can complicate arrangements between consortium partners. As such, adaptive programmes need to think hard about governance and commercial arrangements that can foster collaboration and involvement across the consortium partners. In particular, leading partners need to be mindful of keeping smaller partners engaged and informed.

Trust in an adaptive programme

I4ID was designed explicitly to be a flexible, adaptive and problem-driven programme. One of the ways in which the team delivers this approach is by frequently reassessing partnerships and making relatively quick decisions about whether to scale up, continue, change, pause or terminate support. In principle, this allows I4ID to respond to changes in the local context and the emerging needs of local organisations.

However, there is a risk that this adaptation could also undermine the trust that may be required to create and sustain good working relationships with local and consortium partners. Trust is typically generated partly through one organisation or individual making a credible commitment to another organisation or individual, and then either following through on the terms agreed or else taking sufficient time and care to explain why the commitment can't be honoured. In the absence of this, the risk is that partners may regard a decision to change course, to pivot away from a particular area of work or end a partnership as tantamount to bad faith.

Ending partnerships is an almost inevitable by-product of adaptive programming, and teams need to think carefully about their exit strategy if and when it becomes necessary. At the very least, adaptive programmes need to be conscious of the legacy of their partnership and ensuring as far as possible that they do not actively set partners back, if and when the time comes to stop working with them. This might involve designing a phased exit process that is gradual enough that partners have an opportunity to find an alternative source of funding or support, and are assisted in that process. I4ID staff concede there is room for improvement in how they manage these processes, for example through taking a more patient approach and explaining more carefully the reasons behind the decision to move away from a relationship. But there are also cases where the management team has successfully approached organisations from the wider consortium to help find substitute partners for organisations they have parted ways with. During an interview for this report, one former local partner expressed confusion over why the institutional relationship with I4ID had been brought to a close, while also recognising that the partnership had been beneficial to them on the whole, and that they had been left with useful contacts that they might not otherwise have thought to work with. In this particular case, it is important to note the role that specific I4ID team members played in maintaining good personal relationships with the former partner, despite the institutional relationship ending on terms that may have been less than ideal.

Partners that are not dropped can still find the adaptive approach difficult to reconcile with their preferred ways of working and their expectations about how development assistance is delivered. Several I4ID staff felt that the programme has at times struggled to establish or maintain good relations with some local partners because they have been seen to 'chop and change' their plans too often and abruptly. This has been compounded by the fact that adaptive programming is still an unusual programming approach, in Tanzania and in development more generally. As such, local organisations may be unaccustomed to being partners in the

fast-moving policy experiments that I4ID is set up to undertake. This has made it challenging in some instances to explain and get buy-in for the adaptive methodology in a way that sustains trust in the face of seemingly rapid course corrections. It also suggests that local partners may not always feel closely involved in shaping these decisions, and that I4ID's flexibility can reinforce the inherent power imbalance between the programme and its partners. In connection with this point, the importance of co-creating activities and priorities is discussed in more detail below.

A number of local partners have also found it difficult to understand why I4ID is generally unwilling to agree to a longer-term joint workplan or provide more clarity on budget parameters. This frustration can be exacerbated by the fact that I4ID workstreams are expected to demonstrate clear potential for results within 6–12 months. For example, I4ID partners working on longer-term and slower-moving policy objectives in areas such as agriculture have at times found it hard to work at the quicker pace encouraged by the programme. This speaks partly to the pressure the programme is under from its donors to show relatively quick returns on their investment – a point discussed in more detail in 'Trust and good relations across a consortium', below.

In addition, I4ID has struggled at times to build trust or get 'buy-in' from partners (particularly from the public sector or civil society) who are accustomed to receiving tangible upfront investments or core grants from development actors. Partly in an effort to avoid contributing to the entrenched culture of aid dependency in Tanzania, I4ID prefers to keep 'money off the table' when working with partners. Rather than providing direct funding or large capital investments, I4ID usually performs a brokering or facilitation role, provides technical support to partners by contracting expert consultants directly, or provides small amounts of financial support through a reimbursable expenses model. These approaches do not always align with prospective partners' expectations, which has reportedly been a barrier at times to generating interest in the programme from local actors (Green and Guijt, 2019: 28).

Understanding types of partner

Interviews with programme staff and local partners suggest that the issues outlined above are more pressing for some kinds of local actors and organisations than others. For example, I4ID's experience is that private sector organisations and individual entrepreneurs have tended to be more comfortable with partnering on short-term conditions as part of a 'small-bet', in comparison to political actors, public sector organisations, civil society groups or larger trade and business associations.[1] This comes through particularly strongly in conversations with the smaller start-ups and sole traders that I4ID has partnered with in the digital technology and solid waste management sectors. In Tanzania, civil society and government officials and organs may be more accustomed than their private sector counterparts to the conventional development approach involving longer-term financing agreements and a clearer, more rigid workplan setting out agreed activities, milestones and timeframes. This may partly be a consequence of the fact that, in Tanzania, civil society has largely been created through, and continues to be heavily dependent on, donor financing. It may also help account for the fact that I4ID has found more 'policy entrepreneurs' to partner with from the private than the public sector.[2]

Establishing relationships with government actors has occasionally called for I4ID staff members to draw on valuable political capital, which has reportedly made it harder for I4ID staff to then back away from the partnership or

---

1   This is to be expected, given the fact that adaptive management shares some core ideas with private sector innovation thinking, based around starting with small experimental investments and making incremental improvements to a product or project, through rapid cycles of testing and learning.

2   Policy entrepreneurs are defined by Booth and Faustino (2014) as individuals committed to an outcome that may have a transformative impact in development terms, and who are willing and able to test out initiatives through making a series of small bets, instead of seeking large 'all-or-nothing' opportunities.

otherwise alter its terms in accordance with a more general programming course-correction. However, I4ID staff also pointed to instances where their own (conditional and relatively short-term) workplans have been upset by the unpredictability of government or public sector counterparts – almost the inverse of the issue described above. I4ID workstreams focused on inclusive education and regional investment facilitation, for example, have both found that the ministers and bureaucrats they have engaged with have insisted abruptly on shifting course in response to new political developments, such as the President announcing a new priority or expressing interest in a new sector.

Trust and good relations across a consortium

Part of the promise of adaptive programming is that these kinds of shifts should pose less of a threat to a programme's overall outcomes because of the greater freedom they have to redirect efforts in response to new circumstances. But this may rest partly on the degree to which core programme staff and consortium partners are not only comfortable with an adaptive approach and with a greater degree of uncertainty than is normal in development programming, but also have the resources to programme in this way. Adaptive management can often be more onerous in administrative and managerial terms than conventional programming. Among other demands, it calls for implementers to keep abreast of a complex and often fast-moving set of strategic and political factors. Conversations with some of the smaller consortium partners in I4ID suggest that they can find it challenging to participate fully in strategy and policy conversations because – contrary to their expectations when the proposal was originally developed – they don't feel the programme represents a sufficient portion of their overall portfolio to justify regularly investing the necessary time.

The I4ID consortium is led by Palladium, a large private contractor that has a strong pedigree in implementing adaptive governance programmes. Smaller partners include BBC Media Action, SNV Netherlands Development Organisation and ODI. This is a conventional consortium arrangement for a programme of this size and ambition, and the partners each bring distinct and valuable expertise. However, there is a risk – particularly when an adaptive programme is as heavily focused as I4ID on placing small bets and generating quick wins – that the smaller partners feel as if they are trailing in the wake of the programme, unable to contribute in a meaningful way and struggling to adapt the nature of their support to the programme as strategy changes.

The potentially corrosive effect on both partnership trust and full consortium participation that may result from some elements of adaptive programming could be addressed in principle if the leading partner and senior management took more time and care in explaining the approach and communicating, to all of the consortium partners, the reasoning behind course corrections, changes in programming strategy or shifts in the conceptual language used to articulate the programme's approach. However, in practice it may be challenging for them to find this additional time, particularly given the considerable pressure that the I4ID management team is under from its donors to generate results quickly. This pressure is also an important factor that shapes two other prominent, related issues in terms of partnerships: local leadership and accountability. The following section looks in more detail at whether and how I4ID has worked with and through Tanzanian partners to identify local problems and co-create ways of bringing about change.

Local leadership and accountability

Key lessons
- Adaptive programmes such as I4ID are typically committed to supporting local partners to deliver locally driven change. However, they also have their own views on how to achieve more inclusive development outcomes, which may not always align with the specific sector-level ambitions of their partners.
- All development programmes are under substantial accountability pressures from their funders. This can lead to the direction and timeframes of partnerships being driven by top-down results frameworks, instead of the momentum and vision of local actors.

- I4ID has found that co-creating plans, priorities and activities with partners has the potential to resolve some of these tensions. But the time and patience required to do this successfully should not be underestimated, and might itself be difficult to preserve in the face of pressure from donors to see results within a confined timeframe.

Does I4ID's partnership and consortium model promote local leadership?

Adaptive programmes tend to place a strong emphasis on convening local actors and working constructively with partners to find solutions to locally defined problems. However, it is notable that the I4ID consortium does not include any Tanzanian organisations. The programme also tends to rely on non-Tanzanian consultants to provide specific technical inputs – albeit usually attached to local counterparts. Is this problematic for a governance programme trying to take a politically smart, locally led approach? It is worth noting that one of the consortium partners, SNV, has operated in the country for over 20 years, and the majority of core staff are either Tanzanian or have long-standing ties to or involvement with the country. In their case study on I4ID, Green and Guijt (2019: 24–25) discuss the implications of these arrangements, and whether I4ID has a sufficiently Tanzanian identity to undertake adaptive and locally led programming. While they express concern about what they regard as the programme's 'foreign expert-dominated model', they also concede that 'reality is a good deal more complex than a simple "Tanzanian v foreigner" binary'.

There is evidence in the wider literature on adaptive management that finding capable national staff with the right kinds of skills and networks can be an important success factor when undertaking problem-driven, in-country experimentation (see, for example, Booth, 2018). However, there are also examples of adaptive programmes (such as the second phase of the Somalia Stability Fund (SSF) – see Laws (2018)) where non-national leaders and consultants played important roles that may have been hard to fill from the pool of local candidates available at the time. This indicates that, while it may be reasonable to have a presumption in favour of local over international staff and organisations,

what is required in any programme is a reasonable justification of the value of a particular team structure. This has to be judged on a case-by-case basis (Laws and Valters, forthcoming).

In the case of I4ID, Green and Guijt (2019) provide what may be valid general points about staffing and partnerships for adaptive management, but don't give specific examples where the national identity of the consortium member organisations, staff or consultants has either helped or hindered the programme. A case can be made that, with the current consortium set-up, I4ID actually has more freedom to partner with a broader range of local organisations and actors than if the programme was limited to drawing principally from the networks and connections of an anchor Tanzanian consortium member. This is critical, as being able to partner with a potentially diverse range of local sector specialists is arguably essential for bringing about sustainable change through issue-based programming.

Some I4ID team members describe the key ambition of the programme in terms of nurturing local processes of change that can take on a life of their own. In keeping with this, there are examples where Tanzanian advocacy organisations have benefited directly from their partnership with I4ID in terms of delivering on their objectives. For example, according to I4ID staff some local campaigning groups working for more inclusive educational outcomes have found that their association with I4ID has opened doors for them in government that would otherwise have remained shut. There are also examples where I4ID has been supported by its partners in the same way. Navigating the politics of local contexts and sectors often means building coalitions and bringing different groups or actors together. I4ID's experience indicates that local civil society organisations (CSOs) and other partners can hold the key to these kinds of arrangements by virtue of their political capital, networks and connections. For example, Kivulini, a local women's rights organisation based in Mwanza, helped I4ID set up a dialogue with local politicians and vendors' associations, eventually leading to an agreement between them to work together to find solutions to issues affecting urban vendors. Similarly, I4ID's former partnership with the Agricultural Non

State Actors Forum (ANSAF) was instrumental in building links with the Tanzanian Ministry of Finance and Planning.[3]

Taking a commitment to locally driven change seriously means decentralising decision-making to partners to a significant degree. However, I4ID also has a responsibility to exercise quality control and ensure a strong overarching vision, and to push back if there is a risk that the partnership might enable what the I4ID management team regards as counter-productive activity. This requires striking a delicate balance which, in some instances, has led to tensions between I4ID and its local partners. In a workstream focused on menstrual health management, for example, I4ID has struggled to persuade a local Tanzanian provider of menstrual products to diversify its range. While I4ID has an understanding of what the company should do to help widen access to affordable products, this does not align neatly with the convictions and social ethos of the partner in question. This underscores the fact that I4ID's ultimate objective is about improving governance and generating more inclusive and pro-poor institutional dynamics, rather than achieving any specific sector outcome (such as improved access to particular menstrual products) as a goal in itself. This can present challenges in terms of partnership dynamics, particularly if the approach or attitude of partners does not fit easily with the overarching development philosophy driving programme management, or the institutional changes they think will deliver more inclusive and socially equitable outcomes.

Accountability pressures

The challenges outlined above can be magnified when there is a strong demand from donors for quick and easily demonstrable results. I4ID's obligations to its local partners are usually agreed in broad terms in a memorandum of understanding (MoU). This typically describes the programme's ambitions to support and add value to the work of the partner in question, along with a fairly light-touch set of respective roles and responsibilities. However, I4ID (like most, if not all, development programmes) is subject to much more extensive upwards accountability pressures than those set out in MoUs with partners. In effect, the programme management needs to face in two directions – delivering results for the donor, as in a conventional programme, but in a way that protects the space local partners need to shape interventions according to their own context, knowledge and learning. Maintaining an appropriate balance between these demands can be challenging.

There is a danger, common to any externally financed development intervention, that pressure to demonstrate results can upset this balance by encouraging partnerships to be viewed in a predominantly extractive way. In other words, partners can be used primarily to deliver results for the programme and its donors, rather than being given the support to respond to opportunities and momentum in their own context. This is a danger that is particularly acute in the case of I4ID, given that the programme is under considerable pressure to achieve results as it enters its final two years. Again, some partners may be less willing than others to cede control over the direction and timing of activities. I4ID has found that government officials and organs are more comfortable partnering in activities that are led by a government institution according to their own priorities and timeframes, in comparison to private sector organisations (I4ID Annual Report, 2019).

One way I4ID has tried to reconcile these conflicting pressures is through engaging partners in the co-creation of ideas, priorities and activities. This can give I4ID and its partners a sense of mutual ownership, but it has also proved effective at times in reorienting partners' attitudes in ways that I4ID regards as more productive and pro-development. For example, in a workstream focused on urban spatial development, I4ID undertook joint stakeholder analysis and developed risk mitigation strategies with Kigamboni

---

3   In return for leveraging these connections or using this capital, there may be an expectation or agreement that the development programme will deliver something tangible in return for the partner, such as infrastructure. As noted above, at times I4ID has found this challenging to reconcile with its 'money off the table' approach.

municipality. This reportedly encouraged the municipal authorities to gradually moderate their previously hostile view of certain local citizens' groups, and to eventually agree to enter into a productive (though still not entirely harmonious) partnership with them. Similarly, in the regional investment facilitation workstream, the I4ID team spent considerable time in Iringa, co-creating, with the regional authorities, an understanding of the principal investment challenges in the region. The team believe that this time was well-spent, because it helped bring the Regional Commissioner on board with I4ID's investment facilitation approach (I4ID Annual Report, 2019).

These examples raise broader conceptual and normative questions concerning what constitutes an 'effective partnership' for a development programme like I4ID. Is it one that delivers a specific project goal or initiative, in line with a particular understanding of what constitutes a desirable development outcome? Or is it one that has a certain robustness that might enable it to continue in some form beyond the lifespan of the programme, and deliver longer-term and potentially more sustainable change? While these understandings are not necessarily mutually exclusive, all development programmes need to be mindful of the risk that achieving the former does not come at the expense of creating the conditions for the latter.

Conclusion

Working effectively with partners can be a key part of delivering locally legitimate projects that have the potential to create sustainable change. Adaptive and politically informed ways of working create specific opportunities and challenges for doing this well. Based on I4ID's experience, Table 2 categorises some of the factors that may be important for a productive partnership with an adaptive, issue-based governance programme. A productive partnership is defined here in broad terms, as one which delivers some of the functions described in Table 1.

The experience of I4ID suggests that two broad thematic issues are particularly significant for adaptive programmes looking to establish and maintain productive partnerships: trust and credible commitments, and local leadership and accountability. This paper has explored these in turn and suggested some general lessons for how adaptive programmes can address them.

First, flexible and adaptive programmes are deliberately designed to experiment and to make small investments in different areas, to see what will work. While this is often important for making headway on complex challenges, it can also leave partners exposed and can undermine trust, particularly if they are used to more conventional aid models where there is often greater predictability and larger up-front investment. To mitigate this, adaptive programmes may need to devote more time and resources than conventional programmes in communicating their methods and decision-making to partners, and developing gradual and careful exit strategies in the event that a partnership comes to a close.

Second, adaptive programmes tend to place a strong emphasis on convening local actors and working constructively with partners to find solutions to locally defined problems. However, aid programmes also have their own overarching objectives and areas of interest that are agreed with their funders. These objectives may not always align. As such, one of the potential challenges for the programme is balancing the need to meet accountability commitments to donors while also allowing local actors to take the lead in pursuing their own objectives and sector-specific goals, according to their own needs and timeframes. I4ID has found that co-creating plans, priorities and activities with partners has the potential to resolve some of the tensions this can present. But the time and patience required to do this successfully should not be underestimated, and might itself be difficult to maintain in the face of pressure from donors to see results within a confined timeframe.

Table 2   Important factors for a productive partnership with an adaptive programme

Factors
Government
• Willingness to co-create ideas, priorities and activities with development partners
• Previous experience of partnering with an adaptive programme OR
• Clear communication, on the part of donors/implementers, of the adaptive methodology
• Willingness to partner on potentially short-term policy experiments AND/OR
• Willingness, on the part of the donor/implementer, to let go of some control over the direction and timing of the work
• Commitment to the expected project results
Private sector
• Willingness to co-create ideas, priorities and activities with development partners
• Previous experience of partnering with an adaptive programme OR
• Clear communication, on the part of donors/implementers, of the adaptive methodology
• Willingness to partner on potentially short-term policy experiments
• Willingness to work in a coalition with competitors to achieve shared policy objectives
• Agreement to start with small investments, followed by larger investments if partners perform well/commit to the original plan
• Commitment to the expected project results
Civil society
• Some historic independence from donor financing and reporting
• Alternative funding, should the partnership come to a close
• Ability to work at a quicker pace than partners may be accustomed to
• Willingness to co-create ideas, priorities and activities with development partners
• Previous experience of partnering with an adaptive programme OR
• Clear communication, on the part of donors/implementers, of the adaptive methodology
• Willingness to partner on potentially short-term policy experiments
• Commitment to the expected project results
Education/research
• Willingness to co-create ideas, priorities and activities with development partners
• Ability to work at a quicker pace than partners may be accustomed to
Consortium members
• Sufficient time and resources to keep abreast of and involved with the programme, particularly if there are frequent shifts in strategy or activities
• Regular communication between all partners concerning the evolving strategy, priorities and key decisions
• Time, resources and willingness to co-create ideas, priorities, strategies and overall programme vision with other consortium members

References

Booth, D. (2018) *Incubating policy for economic transformation: lessons from Nepal*. ODI Report.
   London: Overseas Development Institute

Booth, D. and Faustino, J. (2014) *Development entrepreneurship: how donors and leaders can foster
   institutional change*. Working Politically in Practice Series. London: Overseas Development Institute

Green, D. and Guijt, I. (2019) *Adaptive programming in fragile, conflict and violence-affected settings.
   What works and under what conditions? The case of Institutions for Inclusive Development,
   Tanzania*. Action for Empowerment and Accountability (A4EA) Programme. Sussex: Itad and Oxfam

Laws, E. (2018) *Thinking and working politically in Somalia: a case study on the Somalia Stability
   Fund*. London: Overseas Development Institute

Laws, E. and Valters, C. (forthcoming) *Rethinking value for money: lessons for adaptive programmes*.
   London: Overseas Development Institute

Acknowledgements