1. Introduction: partnerships for sustainable development

Philipp Pattberg, Frank Biermann, Sander Chan and Ayşem Mert

Partnerships for sustainable development are often hailed as a vital new element of the emerging system of global sustainability governance. In policy and academic debates alike, partnerships are promoted as a solution to deadlocked intergovernmental negotiations, to ineffective treaties and overly bureaucratic international organizations, to power-based state policies, corrupt elites and many other real or perceived current problems of the sustainability transition. Partnerships for sustainable development are now ubiquitous. They have been promoted in particular at the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), where partnerships have emerged as a 'type-2 outcome' of the summit, along with the traditional outcomes of the intergovernmental diplomatic process. As of August 2011, 348 partnerships for sustainable development have been registered with the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD). In addition, many similar agreements are in place across the globe but not formally registered.

And yet, the role and relevance of these partnerships remains contested. Some observers view the new emphasis on public–private partnerships – also referred to as multi-stakeholder or intersectoral partnerships (see Bitzer, Francken and Glasbergen 2008; Morsink, Hofman and Lovett 2011) – as problematic, since voluntary public–private governance arrangements might privilege more powerful actors, in particular 'the North' and 'big business', and consolidate the privatization of governance and dominant neo-liberal modes of globalization (Ottaway 2001; Corporate Europe Observatory 2002; IISD 2002; SDIN 2002). Also, some argue that partnerships lack accountability and (democratic) legitimacy (Meadowcroft 2007). Yet others see public–private partnerships as an innovative form of governance that addresses deficits of interstate politics by bringing together key actors of civil society, governments and business (e.g. Reinicke 1998; Benner, Streck and Witte 2003; Streck 2004).

In this perspective, public–private partnerships or similar governance networks for sustainable development are important new mechanisms to help resolve a variety of current governance deficits. Such governance deficits have been discussed from different conceptual perspectives (e.g. Andonova and Levy 2003; Haas 2004; Martens 2007). While some scholars regard governance deficits as a generic phenomenon in international relations (Haas 2004), others focus on a particular governance deficit, for example, the democratic deficit and problems of legitimacy (Bäckstrand 2006).

This book seeks to contribute to resolving several of the questions and debates in the current academic and policy discourse, as laid out in more detail in this introduction. The following section discusses existing definitions within and beyond the context of the WSSD and introduces our conceptualization of public–private partnerships. Then, a review of existing scholarship on partnerships for sustainable development is provided. Here we outline in what way this book goes beyond existing studies on partnerships for sustainable development. In the section that follows, we introduce the various methods employed to study partnerships for sustainable development, including a large-*n* database, while the final section provides an outlook on the remainder of this book.

DEFINING TRANSNATIONAL PUBLIC–PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Public–private partnerships are by no means a novel phenomenon. Before taking centre stage in scholarship on global governance and international relations in the early 2000s, public–private partnerships have enjoyed sustained attention in domestic policy, in areas ranging from health to infrastructure and urban services. Public–private partnerships have been promoted as an instrument to increase governance effectiveness as part of New Public Management that gained ground in the early 1980s. Since the 1990s, public–private partnerships at the international level have been promoted as tools for good governance, increasing the legitimacy and effectiveness of multilateral policies. Partnerships in areas ranging from environmental protection and sustainable development to global health have even been analysed as instruments to promote global deliberative democracy (Börzel and Risse 2005). However, despite this rather long-standing tradition of research on public–private partnerships, the vast and growing literature on public–private partnerships suffers from conceptual confusion, rival definitions, disparate research traditions and oftentimes a normative and value-laden agenda of promoting partnerships. This state

of conceptual vagueness has led some scholars even to dismiss the term 'public–private partnership' as 'conceptually empty and merely politically expedient' (Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff 2011: 31).

The conceptual broadness of the term, with its multitude of usages, has not prevented a prolific literature on these novel entities of global governance. Public–private partnerships, both national and transnational, have been analysed in multiple ways as hybrid governance arrangements for the provision of collective goods that lead to the transformation of political authority from government and public actors towards non-state actors, such as business and NGOs (Pattberg and Stripple 2008; Schäferhoff, Campe and Kaan 2009). In this book, we are interested in public–private, multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable development as a form of global governance beyond traditional forms of international cooperation.

Despite the lack of a broadly agreed definition of this phenomenon, most scholars agree on several features that constitute public–private partnerships (see also Schäferhoff, Campe and Kaan 2009: 455). Important shared characteristics of partnerships include: transnationality (involving cross-border interactions and non-state relations); public policy objectives (as opposed to public bads or exclusively private goods); and a network structure (coordination by participating actors rather than coordination by a central hierarchy). While this common understanding is quite narrow, it still covers a wide range of phenomena. For example, the functions of partnerships are varied and include agenda setting, rule making, advocacy, implementation, and service provision (Bull and McNeill 2007; Martens 2007). Furthermore, public–private partnerships appear in different sectors such as sustainable development, health, human rights, development, security and finance and vary in degree of institutionalization and permanence. Finally, partnerships have different geographical scopes from the local, national, regional to the global level (see also Appendix, this volume). It is therefore necessary to further delimit the empirical scope of this book. We are interested here predominantly in a specific sub-set of transnational public–private partnerships, namely those that (1) operate in the field of sustainable development, and (2) aim at the implementation of agreed international policy goals (such as the Agenda 21 or the Millennium Development Goals). While the overall number of these partnerships is unknown, we further limit our empirical analysis to the sub-set of partnerships that have been agreed upon in the context of the 2002 WSSD, and consequently have been registered with the UNCSD. For this specific sample, we use the term 'partnerships for sustainable development' throughout the book ('WSSD partnerships' and 'UNCSD partnerships' being used synonymously).

STATE OF THE ART AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

While there are frequent claims that partnerships for sustainable development offer a viable solution to real or perceived deficits in sustainability governance (both in terms of effectiveness and legitimacy), there is surprisingly little systematic research in their support. Evidence for the actual role and relevance of partnerships in global sustainability governance is scarce and inconclusive. This lacuna impairs a better understanding of transnational public–private partnerships in global governance. Are partnerships a sign of a new model of world politics in which intergovernmental negotiations are complemented and sometimes even replaced by networked governance of non-state actors? Or is the contribution of partnerships rather limited? To what extent, if at all, are partnerships superior to traditional ways of international cooperation, such as the negotiation of legally binding agreements among governments and their subsequent national implementation? To what extent are partnerships for sustainable development new and additional initiatives designed to address pressing problems of global governance, or are they rather 'old wine in new bottles'? And to what extent do partnerships for sustainable development democratize current structures and processes of environmental governance beyond the state?

The current literature on transnational public–private partnerships is still not sufficiently evolved both theoretically and empirically to answer these questions, even though important pioneering work has been done (Andonova and Levy 2003; Witte, Streck and Benner 2003; Hale and Mauzerall 2004; Bäckstrand 2006). Yet the literature continues to be hampered by fragmented research agendas, inconsistent conceptualizations across different studies, and the absence of large-*n* studies.

A quick glance at the existing case study literature on partnerships (in and beyond sustainable development) illustrates this point. Most empirical studies on partnerships differ, for example, regarding the policy level they analyse. Some studies examine partnerships that work at the local level (Bassett 1996; De Rynck and Voets 2006), others those at the national level (Jimenez et al. 1991; Selin 1999), others again transnational partnerships, while only few papers discuss interaction between levels (Börzel 1997). At local and national levels, the focus is on patterns of shifts in governance, namely towards non-regulatory policy instruments and voluntary measures that have emerged with the debate on government-overload in the 1970s. At the level of governance 'beyond the nation state', many studies look at the European Union (Marks 1993; Bache, George and Rhodes 1996). In these studies, the necessity to research pieces of a complex framework led to a strong emphasis on very specific aspects, such

as on notions of centre and periphery (Bomberg 1994); on structural funds (Heinelt and Smith 1996); or on the role of European agencies (Dehousse 1997).

Empirical studies also differ in terms of the functions of partnerships that are studied. Some partnerships serve as mechanisms of rule and standard setting. An example is the Forest Stewardship Council, in which stakeholders from industry, environmental organizations and local communities set standards for sustainable forest management (see Pattberg 2005). Other partnerships serve as mechanisms of rule implementation and service provision (Börzel and Risse 2005). Again, other partnerships function as mechanisms for information provision and dissemination. Tully (2004), for example, suggests that partnerships typically emerge out of operational requirements for information through informal contacts and mature into a formal memorandum of understanding on the conditions of engagement including the use of information. Also Glasbergen and Groenenberg (2001) suggest, in their definition of product-oriented partnerships, that partners mostly focus on exchanging knowledge and information. In any case, it is open to debate whether findings on partnerships in one functional arena can be generalized to other arenas as well.

Empirical studies further differ regarding the policy area in which partnerships operate, ranging from studies in the various fields of sustainable development and environment, to a variety of other issues including security (Considine 2002; Krahmann 2003), economy (Kenis and Schneider 1987; Considine and Lewis 2003), tourism (Selin 1999), or health (Jimenez et al. 1991; Altenstetter 1994). The predominant case-study approach often results in a bias towards the most visible and most successful public–private partnerships, which tends to paint a universe that is more partnership-dominated than reality may warrant.

This book remedies a number of shortcomings in the existing literature on partnerships for sustainable development. First, the research reported in this book is based on a clearly defined sample of partnerships (the overall universe of UNCSD-registered partnerships), thereby avoiding conceptual and empirical confusion. Second, by employing a large-n database in combination with qualitative approaches such as expert interviews and comparative case studies, we are not only able to observe and explain variation in partnership effectiveness, but also analyse the precise functional pathways of how partnership success is realized. Third, the research presented here provides a holistic overview of the partnership phenomenon by analysing the total universe of partnerships for sustainable development along with sectoral and geographic samples. Finally, our aspirations with this book do not stop at explaining observations, but

focus on a critical assessment of the fundamentally normative questions underlying partnerships for sustainable development.

In particular, our research is motivated by the existing knowledge gaps in relation to three distinct areas (see also Schäferhoff, Campe and Kaan 2009 for a recent literature review): first, our research scrutinizes the *emergence* of partnerships for sustainable development, including questions such as: What was the political context surrounding the emergence of partnerships for sustainable development? Who benefitted from the emerging partnerships regime? How can the observed variation in sectoral, functional and geographic spread of partnerships be explained?

Second, we are interested in measuring and explaining the *impacts and effects* of partnerships for sustainable development (both as an aggregate phenomenon of more than 340 partnerships and as individual partnerships), including questions about their concrete problem-solving effectiveness (i.e. partnerships' contribution to the Millennium Development Goals, Agenda 21 or the Johannesburg Plan of Action) and their broader influence in global environmental governance (including unintended effects).

Third, we analyse the *legitimacy* of partnerships for sustainable development, including questions such as: how do partnerships perform in terms of their input and output legitimacy? Are partnerships for sustainable development effectively closing the participation gap in global environmental politics? Are partnerships democratizing environmental governance? How legitimate are specific technologies and practices promoted through partnerships for sustainable development? Taken together, this book offers a comprehensive assessment of partnerships for sustainable development, inquiring into their historic and political context, their effectiveness and broader influence as well as into the question of legitimacy of governing beyond the state.

METHODS AND APPROACHES

In this book, we employ four methods to understand the partnership phenomenon in global sustainability governance: a database approach, an expert survey, semi-structured interviews and narrative analysis. Each approach will be outlined in more detail below.

Database Approach

Most research on transnational public–private partnerships has so far been conducted in the form of single- or small-*n* case studies. We believe

that this is insufficient to generate convincing knowledge on the role and relevance of partnerships in local and global politics. The existing clusters of case studies suffer from the lack of a consensus definition and are thus difficult to compare in their results. All single and small-*n* case studies cover only a part of the entire kaleidoscope of partnerships with regard to the level, policy area, and function of partnerships. It is thus unclear whether findings from one level, policy area or function can be extrapolated to a more general understanding of the partnership phenomenon. A database has here a number of advantages: it allows for a better understanding of the entire phenomenon of transnational governance beyond the restricted look at single cases. In addition, a database can help to put into perspective individual, intensively studied cases, thus making sense of the relevance of particular partnerships within the overall universe of partnerships. Likewise, database research can help to understand correlation between variables, and thus allow for the generation or rough testing of hypotheses that would later be complemented by qualitative work.

A first and important step towards such a quantitative study programme has been made by Liliana Andonova and Marc Levy (2003) with their early analysis of WSSD partnerships as a potentially innovative governance mechanism. However, at that time, their work remained limited to only a relatively small set of variables at the level of the partnerships themselves, and it has been largely discontinued after publication of first results, which were at that time based on only roughly half of all partnerships that are now officially registered with the UNCSD. Given the speed of developments in this area, most data in their database is now increasingly outdated. In addition, Andonova and Levy's work concentrated on the partnerships themselves and hence did not include systematic information on the output and outcome of partnership policies.

To overcome these limitations, we have embarked upon a large-*n* research programme that evolved around the Global Sustainability Partnerships Database (GSPD) that was developed between 2006 and 2009 at the Institute for Environmental Studies, VU University Amsterdam. Based on data provided by the UNCSD, extensive desk studies, and numerous expert interviews, the GSPD provides information on descriptive categories such as partnership name, existence of website, number of countries in which partnerships implement their activities, number of and type of partners, type of lead partners, area of policy implementation and functions performed, geographical scope, duration, date of establishment, and resources reported to be required for each of the 330 partnerships registered with the UNCSD at the time the coding was completed in 2009. In addition, the GSPD also contains information about individual partnership output, that is, the concrete activities and programmes of

partnerships for sustainable development. All data was coded by a team of researchers for whom an inter-rater reliability check has been performed.

Partnerships registered with the UNCSD are rather comparable on issue areas and geographical scope, actor constellation and so forth, although they are diverse in terms of the concrete policies and organizational models employed. More importantly, their main goals are comparable, in the sense that these are defined by the Millennium Development Goals and the other documents resulting from international summits and negotiations.

At a practical level, the UNCSD website and database provide information regarding the basic characteristics of partnerships. However, the data on partnerships provided through the UNCSD is not necessarily accurate, up-to-date, or complete. More importantly, many details are interpreted differently by each partnership when reporting to the UNCSD. While including some of this information into the GSPD, it was crucial that a limited group of researchers have coded partnerships. In many cases, the categorization that was used by the UNCSD has been changed. For instance, while the UNCSD statistics often show abundant major group participation, a closer analysis reveals that most of these major groups belong to only a few of the categories and that the most vulnerable groups are often excluded. On the other hand, most of the data on the dependent variables, such as functions and output originated from the partnership websites, professional publications, contact with partnerships, as well as the expert surveys conveyed throughout 2007–08 (see below). The experts' insights into partnerships have been included in order to critically refine our data.

The measurement of our main dependent variable, the function-output fit, is derived almost exclusively from sources independent of the UNCSD database. By comparing what the partnerships claim as their goal and function with their actual activities and products (output), the function–output fit reveals the accuracy and consistency of these declarations without bringing in another set of biases resulting from our own ideas of effectiveness. To do this, a group of researchers studied the UNCSD information pages and websites of partnerships and subsequently categorized their declared goals, aims, and functions (Table 1.1). Up to three declared functions were coded in the GSPD. Then, different types of output (ranging from publications, training, fund raising, to technology transfer) were conceptualized, and the outputs of each partnership were coded according to this list, adding new types of output when necessary (Table 1.2). Finally, these two lists of 15 types of outputs and 11 functions were linked, on the basis that the presence of a specific output would indicate at least partial fulfilment of the related functions (Table 1.3).

The database approach of the GSPD is complemented by a range of

Table 1.1   List of functions of partnerships in GSPD

Function	Explanation
Knowledge production (innovation)	Production of knowledge, information, innovation (scientific or applied)
Knowledge dissemination	Dissemination of knowledge, including dissemination of 'good practices'
Technical implementation	Implementation of previously existing technologies, plans, and policies, including pilot projects
Institutional capacity building	Building new social institutions (with or without legal status) or expanding existing support organizations
Norm setting	Setting up new norms or standards or spreading the use of such new norms, including the certification of products
Campaigning	Campaigns, including raising public awareness on a given topic, and education of the public at large
Lobbying	Lobbying, restricted to pressure applied on governmental actors from non-governmental ones
Technology transfer	Transfer of technology and methodology (including the transfer of science-based evaluation or monitoring methods)
Participatory management	Participatory management and involvement of local communities in policy programmes
Training	Training of employees, other social actors, or students (including school training if new curriculum is introduced with a specific sustainable development content)
Planning	Planning at national or regional levels (including the production of large policy plans, development or planning of policy instruments)

additional research methods such as expert surveys, in-depth and semi-structured interviews, text analysis and narrative analysis.

Expert Survey

Throughout 2007 and 2008, the research team conducted expert surveys to collect detailed information on partnerships and their perceived effectiveness by experts. Respondents to these surveys were representatives of partnerships, major groups or sectors, as well as UN officials and diplomats or academics that work on partnerships or the UNCSD process. To this end, all partnerships were categorized into 14 clusters based on their thematic focus. Each expert was shown a list of partnerships in their respective area of expertise.

Table 1.2 List of output codes and their explanations in GSPD

Output code	Explanation
OUT_PUB	Publications (research, advocacy, standards, training, policy and reports); Documents found on the Internet and at partnership meetings pertaining to:
_RES	Research: Any publication by the partnership (not by individual partners) documenting academic research, data-gathering for implementation and policy, and action research.
_ADV	Advocacy and public awareness-raising: Any publication by the partnership (not by individual partners) arguing in favour of the partnership cause with a wider audience than policy makers (public); campaign material, newsletters, petitions, and promotion material (posters, leaflets, brochures).
_STA	Standards: Any publication by the partnership (not by individual partners) setting out policy and/or procedural standards (except internal operating procedures) for application to a sustainable development issue.
_TRA	Training: Any publication by the partnership (not by individual partners) aimed at training, including best practice manuals; and instruction materials.
_POL	Policy: Any publication by the partnership (not by individual partners) arguing for specific policies (whether regional, national, or trans-national) with policy makers (public) to regulate and manage sustainable development issues.
_REP	Self-Reports: Any publication by the partnership (not by individual partners) pertaining transparency and accountability towards the partners, stakeholders and wider audiences (such as annual reports, and evaluations of the partnership).
_OTH	Other publications.
OUT_DTB	Database and systematically organized retrievable information (except databases of self-reports).
OUT_WSC	Workshops/seminars/conferences including training seminars, exhibitions, stakeholder consulting events and courses organized by the partnership (excluding events organized during the 2002 WSSD).
OUT_ITT	Infrastructure and technology transfer: Construction or improvement of new and existing physical facilities as well as the application and transfer of new technologies (including the exchange of grassroot innovations).
OUT_WBS	Website: An active and operational website.
OUT_CNS	Consultancy service (excludes implementation).
OUT_PRT	Conference and workshop participation (excluding conferences and workshops organized by the partnership or the UN CSD, WSSD processes).
OUT_NEW	New institutions, organizations and new partnerships.
OUT_OTHER	Other activities and fundraising.

Table 1.3 *Functions and fitting outcomes*

Function	Fitting outputs			
Knowledge production (innovation)	Output_PUB_RES	Output_DTB		
Knowledge dissemination	Output_PUB_TRA	Output_DTB	Output_WSC	Output_PRT
Technical implementation	Output_ITT			
Institutional capacity building	Output_PUB_TRA	Output_WSC	Output_NEW	
Norm setting	Output_PUB_STA			
Campaigning	Output_PUB_ADV	Output_WSC		
Lobbying	Output_PUB_POL	Output_PRT		
Technology transfer	Output_PUB_TRA	Output_WSC	Output_ITT	Output_CNS
Participatory management	Output_PUB_REP	Output_WSC		
Training	Output_WSC			
Planning	Output_PUB_POL	Output_WSC	Output_CNS	Output_PRT

In line with a predetermined Expert Survey Protocol, respondents were asked about their affiliations, areas of specialization, and roles and functions in the partnerships they work with. Subsequently, experts were asked to rate (on a scale from 1, low, to 5, high) the performance of each partnership within their area of expertise in terms of

- their contribution towards the achievement of one of the Millennium Development Goals;
- their achievement in addressing a problem that is insufficiently covered by intergovernmental agreements;
- their achievement in mobilizing additional financial resources for sustainable development;
- their performance in generating innovative solutions for sustainable development;
- their contribution towards addressing an urgent issue within this area;
- and finally, their achievements in including all relevant stakeholder groups.

The survey continued until all thematic clusters were evaluated by at least one expert. A total of 34 surveys have been completed in 2007 and a total of 30 surveys in 2008. In total, 64 experts have evaluated the thematic partnership clusters, providing assessments on 149 partnerships in 2007 and 158 partnerships in 2008, respectively. Of the total data points, 71 were self-assessments. As they were in line with the assessment of other experts, they are included in our assessment. In sum, 210 partnerships were assessed through our expert survey.

Semi-structured Interviews

In addition to the GSPD and the expert survey, the research team conducted more than 50 semi-structured in-depth interviews with partnerships experts and policy-makers in order to supplement the quantitative data with background information and to shed light on the formation process out of which UNCSD partnerships emerged. The respondents were representative of various viewpoints, but were mostly involved in the WSSD process, the UNCSD, or both. Interviewees included government delegates, non-governmental organization (NGO) representatives, representatives of major groups during the PrepComs to WSSD and the WSSD summit, employees of UNCSD and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), representatives of individual partner organizations of UNCSD partnerships, representatives of

environmental NGOs, representatives of business groups and representatives of partnerships not registered with the UNCSD. Most interviews were held during the UNCSD 16 and 17 meetings at the United Nations Headquarters, New York.

Text and Narration Analyses

In addition to the quantitative and qualitative approaches described above, we have also employed text and narrative analyses on a wide range of documents, including scientific reports, texts resulting from major UN Conferences on the environment (Stockholm, Rio and Johannesburg Summits), texts from the PrepCom meetings, as well as relevant documents on partnerships such as brochures, websites of partnerships and websites of donor agencies. This data has been used to reconstruct the emergence of the partnerships regime, contextualizing the diverse accounts revealed by the in-depth interviews.

STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

This book is organized in four parts, following this introduction.

Part I analyses the emergence of partnerships for sustainable development and the political bargains behind the WSSD summit. Part II then focuses on the overall influence and problem-solving effectiveness of partnerships. Part III addresses partnerships for sustainable development beyond the OECD world, with a particular focus on Asia and Africa. Finally, Part IV engages with the question of the legitimacy of partnerships for sustainable development.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the political negotiations in and around the Johannesburg Summit and the resulting type-2 agreement on partnerships for sustainable development. In more detail, while partnerships have been portrayed by the United Nations as mere implementation instruments in global sustainability governance, they also have a strong political dimension. The negotiation process that resulted in partnerships as the type-2 outcome of the WSSD was marked by contestations over partnerships between different country, business and civil society delegations. In addition, partnerships exert considerable influence on sustainable development at different levels of governance and in different issue areas.

Chapter 3 takes a closer look at the existing geographical and functional patterns of partnerships for sustainable development. Based on hypotheses derived from major theoretical perspectives in political science, such as functionalism, institutionalism and policy network theories, this

chapter explains the observable patterns of partnerships with regards to their geographical scope, the policy area in which they operate and the participation of various actors. We find that, in contrast to many functionalist accounts, partnerships are not necessarily filling functional gaps; in particular, they do not necessarily emerge in the geographic spaces where they are most needed. Policy network accounts go a long way in explaining the geographic dimension of emergence, with partnerships emerging in countries that are member to many international organizations and most activities being implemented in urban, densely populated areas. However, especially the transnational advocacy network account does not seem to be applicable to the participatory dimension of partnerships.

Chapter 4 analyses the overall partnerships for sustainable development regime, i.e. the more than 340 partnerships that emerged from the Johannesburg summit and have been registered with the Commission on Sustainable Development. The assessment of the overall effectiveness and influence of the partnership regime is based on three hypothetical global governance deficits that partnerships are supposed to close: the regulatory deficit, the implementation deficit and participatory deficit.

Chapter 5 takes a sectoral approach and subsequently scrutinizes the problem-solving effectiveness of partnerships in the renewable energy sector. The key puzzle addressed is the following: why do some partnerships within the issue area of renewable energy perform remarkably well while others have hardly any traceable output? In more detail, this chapter argues that the variation in the problem-solving effectiveness of public–private partnerships in the energy sector is predominantly explained by organizational variables such as decision-making procedures, staff and organizational resources, while power and material capabilities of individual actors have less influence on the effectiveness of partnerships.

Chapter 6 compares two leading Asian countries – India and China – with regards to their role and relevance in the overall partnerships for sustainable development regime. In particular, this chapter investigates whether partnerships can be successfully implemented in a political/administrative context that is different from the one in which partnerships have originally developed. In more detail, we provide a comparative analysis that allows for an assessment of political and institutional contexts as factors in the transposition and organization of partnerships beyond the OECD context. We find that the potential for partnership governance in sustainable development varies by country, depending on the political, societal and economic contexts. In China, where formal political participation exists but there is a lack of political pluralism, the potential for partnerships on the basis of equality between governmental and nongovernmental partners is rather limited. In contrast, the relative freedom

and autonomy of civil society allows for more partnership initiatives that include NGOs and social organizations in India. Within the same partnership, organization can be differentiated depending on whether activities take place in China or India.

Chapter 7 provides a second perspective on partnerships for sustainable development beyond the OECD world, with a geographical focus on Sub-Saharan Africa. This chapter concludes that, while partnerships attracted a growing academic attention since 2002 and enjoyed widespread popularity among policy-makers, they are by no means the magic wand for overcoming Africa's development and governance conundrums, contrary to what several observers have expected. Partnerships for sustainable development in Africa are largely as effective as states and national elites allow them to be, and their development as a policy instrument should not distract our attention from the persistent challenge of state reform on the continent.

Chapter 8 addresses the question of the legitimacy of partnerships for sustainable development and contends that partnerships can be considered democratically legitimate if they fulfil core democratic values such as participation, accountability, transparency and deliberation. A conclusion from almost a decade of research on the Johannesburg partnerships is that their democratic credentials are weak in terms of incorporation of core democratic values. The Johannesburg partnerships consolidate rather than transform asymmetrical patterns of participation between North and South, between established and 'marginalized groups', and between state and non-state actors. Furthermore, the accountability mechanisms are weak and the deliberative potential of partnerships is limited.

Chapter 9 addresses the broader implications of private sector involvement in UNCSD water partnerships for input and output legitimacy. The chapter concludes that partnerships with private sector participation have particularly good prerequisites for high performance and thus output legitimacy: they tend to have more resources available than other water partnerships, they produce more output, and also implement more effectively, as it is indicated by their higher function–output fit. However, this does not necessarily translate into a focus on project activities that actually benefit the groups and regions with the lowest level of water access.

Chapter 10 takes issue with the widely held assumption that the legitimacy of partnerships can be assessed independently from the technologies and governance practices that are embedded within individual partnerships. In more detail, technology transfer through water partnerships is often presented as a tool not only to combat water scarcity, but also to alleviate poverty, ensure gender equality and improve health and environment indicators. However, the implications of technological improvements are

not straightforward, as different technologies have varying implications for the autonomy, flexibility and self-reliance of communities.

Chapter 11 summarizes the overall findings of this volume along the three main research questions presented in the introduction and presents a number of policy recommendations.

REFERENCES

Altenstetter, C. (1994), 'European Union responses to AIDS/HIV and policy network in the pre-Maastricht era', *Journal of European Public Policy,* **1**(2), 413–40.

Andonova, L.B. and M.A. Levy (2003), 'Franchising global governance: making sense of the Johannesburg Type II Partnerships', in O.S. Stokke and O.B. Thommessen (eds), *Yearbook of International Co-operation on Environment and Development*, Oxford, UK: Earthscan, pp. 19–31.

Bache, I., D. George and R.A.W. Rhodes (1996), 'Policy networks and policy making in the European Union: a critical appraisal', in L. Hooghe (ed.), *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-Level Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 367–87.

Bäckstrand, K. (2006), 'Multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: rethinking legitimacy, accountability and effectiveness', *European Environment*, **16**(5), 290–306.

Bassett, K. (1996), 'Partnerships, business elites and urban politics: new forms of governance in an English city?', *Urban Studies*, **33**(3), 539–56.

Benner, T., C. Streck, and J.M. Witte (eds) (2003), *Progress or Peril? Networks and Partnerships in Global Environmental Governance. The Post-Johannesburg Agenda*, Berlin: Global Public Policy Institute.

Bitzer, V., M. Francken and P. Glasbergen (2008), 'Intersectoral partnerships for a sustainable coffee chain: really addressing sustainability or just picking (coffee) cherries?', *Global Environmental Change,* **18**, 271–84.

Bomberg, E. (1994), 'Policy networks on the periphery: EU environmental policy and Scotland', in S. Baker, K. Milton and S. Yearley (eds), *Protecting the Periphery: Environmental Policy in Peripheral Regions of the EU*, London: Frank Cass, pp. 45–61.

Börzel, T.A. (1997), *Policy Networks. A New Paradigm for European Governance?* Florence, Italy: European University Institute.

Börzel, T.A. and T. Risse (2005), 'Public–private partnerships: Effective and legitimate tools of international governance?', in E. Grande and L.W. Pauly (eds), *Complex Sovereignty: Reconstituting Political Authority in the Twenty-first Century*, Toronto, Canada: Toronto University Press, pp. 195–216.

Brinkerhoff, D.W. and J.M. Brinkerhoff (2011), 'Public–private partnerships: perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance', *Public Administration and Development*, **31**, 2–14.

Bull, B. and D. McNeill (2007), *Development Issues in Global Governance. Public–Private Partnerships and Market Multilateralism*, New York: Routledge.

Considine, M. (2002), *Joined at the Lip? What Does Network Research Tell us*

About Governance? Knowledge Networks and Joined-Up Government, Melbourne, Australia: University of Melbourne, Centre for Public Policy.

Considine, M. and J.M. Lewis (2003), 'Bureaucracy, network, or enterprise? Comparing models of governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand', *Public Administration Review*, **63**(2), 131–40.

Corporate Europe Observatory (2002), *From Rio to Johannesburg: Girona Declaration*. London: Corporate Europe Observatory.

De Rynck, F. and J. Voets (2006), 'Democracy in area-based policy networks: the case of Ghent', *The American Review of Public Administration,* **36**, 58–78.

Dehousse, R. (1997), 'Regulation by networks in the European Community: the role of European agencies', *Journal of European Public Policy*, **4**(2), 245–61.

Glasbergen, P. and R. Groenenberg (2001), 'Environmental partnerships in sustainable energy', *European Environment*, **11**(1), 1–13.

Haas, P.M. (2004), 'Addressing the global governance deficit', *Global Environmental Politics,* **4**(4), 1–15.

Hale, T.N. and D.L. Mauzerall (2004), 'Thinking globally and acting locally: can the Johannesburg Partnerships coordinate action on sustainable development?', *The Journal of Environment and Development*, **13**(3), 220–39.

Heinelt, H. and R. Smith (1996), *Policy Network and European Structural Funds*, Survey, UK: Avebury.

IISD (International Institute for Sustainable Development) (2002), *A Snap-shot of the Summit: General News.* WSSD Info. Linkages Series, Winnipeg, Canada: International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Jimenez, R., M.I. Scarlett, et al. (1991), 'Improving community support for HIV and AIDS prevention through national partnerships', *Public Health Reports*, **106**.

Kenis, P. and V. Schneider (1987), 'The EC as an international corporate actor: two case studies in economic diplomacy', *European Journal of Political Research*, **15**(4), 437–57.

Krahmann, E. (2003), 'Conceptualizing security governance, cooperation and conflict', *Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, **38**(1), 5–26.

Marks, G. (1993), 'Structural policy and multilevel governance in the European Community', in A. Cafruny and G. Rosenthal (eds), *The State of the European Community II: The Maastricht Debates and Beyond*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, pp. 391–410.

Martens, J. (2007), *Multistakeholder Partnerships: Future Models of Multilateralism?* Occasional Paper Series, Berlin.

Meadowcroft, J. (2007), 'Democracy and accountability: the challenge for cross-sectoral partnerships', in P. Glasbergen, F. Biermann and A.P.J. Mol (eds), *Partnerships, Governance and Sustainable Development: Reflections on Theory and Practice*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 194–213.

Morsink, K., P.S. Hofman and J.C. Lovett (2011), 'Multi-stakeholder partnerships for transfer of environmentally sound technologies', *Energy Policy,* **39**(1), 1–5.

Ottaway, M. (2001), 'Corporatism goes global: international organizations, non-governmental organization networks, and transnational business', *Global Governance*, **7**(3), 265–92.

Pattberg, P. (2005), 'The institutionalization of private governance: how business and nonprofit organizations agree on transnational rules', *Governance*, **18**(4), 589–610.

Pattberg, P. and J. Stripple (2008), 'Beyond the Public and Private Divide: Remapping Transnational Climate Governance in the 21st Century', *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics,* **8**(4), 367–88.

Reinicke, W.H. (1998), *Global Public Policy. Governing without Government?* Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Schäferhoff, M., S. Campe and C. Kaan (2009), 'Transnational public–private partnerships in international relations: Making sense of concepts research frameworks, and results', *International Studies Review*, **11**(3), 451–74.

SDIN (Sustainable Development Issues Network) (2002), *Taking Issue: Questioning Partnerships*. SDIN Paper No.1, Sustainable Development Issues Network.

Selin, S. (1999), 'Developing a typology of sustainable tourism partnerships', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **7**(3–4), 260–73.

Streck, C. (2004), 'New partnerships in global environmental policy: the clean development mechanism', *The Journal of Environment and Development,* **13**(3), 295–322.

Tully, S.R. (2004), 'Corporate–NGO partnerships and the regulatory impact of the Energy and Biodiversity Initiative', *Non-State Actors and International Law*, **4**(2), 111–33.

Witte, J.M., C. Streck and T. Brenner (2003), 'The road from Johannesburg: what future for partnerships in global environmental governance?' in T. Benner, C. Streck, J. Martin Witte (eds), *Progress or Peril? Networks and Partnerships in Global Environmental Governance. The Post-Johannesburg Agenda*, Berlin: Global Public Policy Institute, pp. 59–84.

Introduction. With the adoption of the Global Goals for Sustainable Development (Global Goals), the line between what is good for business and what is good for development has changed. At KPMG International, we believe that partnerships will play an important role in achieving development impact while at the same time meeting the business needs of a rapidly changing world. As a partner of organizations in the public, private, and NGO/ civil society sectors, we have a deep appreciation for the transformative power of cross-sector partnerships to create a world that is more prosperous, inclusive Request PDF | On Jan 1, 2012, P. Pattberg and others published Introduction: Partnerships for sustainable development | Find, read and cite all the research you need on ResearchGate.Â The topics judged to be essential were; sustainability and sustainable development theories; international trade theory and policy; the role of SMEs in commerce; and technology and online commerce. The framework is to a great extent based upon prior work by Ashford & Hall (2011), Harris (2003, Khalili (2011) and Rogers, Jalal & Boyd (2005), as well as the capital model and triple bottom line concepts (Henriques & Richardson, 2004). Sustainable development is defined as â€œdevelopment that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. From: Encyclopedia of Ecology, 2008. Related termsÂ Johannesburg put the thrust on publicâ€"private partnerships for sustainable development through an endorsement of some 500 such partnerships but most of these agreements failed to be implemented.