PARTNERSHIP IN THE CONSORTIUM

SOUTH RESEARCH

1 Why partnerships

To reach the objectives of the consortium i.e. to guarantee the rights of the right holders and to make duty bearers more accountable, the consortium members work with a whole range of partners. With some partners the relation focuses more on the execution of projects or programmes, with others the objective is to support civil society development by the development of a broad set of civil society actors, network development and institutional development for a strong civil society. Also the consortium members feel a need for being member of networks and alliances for social change and to play specific roles (funding, convenor, capacity builing, producing content, role in sensitising and lobbying at european and international level) in these networks
In a relation all partners have to gain. The gain can be a greater impact of the work (1+1=3), better service delivery, increased legitimacy, effectiveness in Lobby and Advocacy, increased policy influencing, capacity building and learning.

2 Values in the relationship that are important

In the relation with other partners following values or principles are very important:

- **solidarity** , which can be materialised in different ways e.g. in a long term relationship, by helping in solving some problems, by bringing the partners in contact with others etc. but also on commitment and reenforcing the positiontaking
- **mutual respect and trust taken into account the differences between the organisations**
- **transparency** in decision making and frank communication between those involved
- **a shared vision and mission** based on a common understanding of the issues and the context
- (long term) **commitment** (doesn't have to be long term, the commitment can be linked to programmes without having bigger ambitions)

3 Added value looked for in the partnership

The added value of the Northern consortium partner has to be more than finances. The added value can be mutual capacity development and learning, linking to other networks or partners, increased legitimacy, increased policy influences, etc.

Capacity building is not a top down business but a process of mutual strengthening each other. It is not limited to organisational development i.e. strengthening the organisational structures, the planning, monitoring and evalution activities, the HR and financial management but includes capacities to network with other organisations, to deal with the institutional environment the organisations are working in, to analyse and formulated alternatives to lobby for and to participate in negociations etc.
However, given the requirements of donors regarding programme management, the capacity building to improve access to funding is also seen as important. This kind of capacity building is done by putting emphasisi on the requirements of programme management and coaching of the partners in improving these management skills.

4 Different kind of partnerships

It is acknowledged that the consortium members have relations with different types of organisations and that they have to manage[1] a "portfolio" of partners. Following table presents the different types of partners they work with. The table has to be looked at in a dynamic way, partners can evolve from one level to another level. Although it is acknowledged that funding is important partnerships have to be seen outside of the funding relation

	Sub categories	Management of the partnership
Institutional partners: they influence and some take part in decision making at institutional level (on vision, mission,..) by being member of the board, by pooling finances etc.		
Strategic partners: a long term relation that goes beyond the programmes and related finances and influences on the strategies to reach mission and vision with a specific win-win • for research • for campaigning • for sharing experiences and knowledge • for networking • for developing strategies in specific countries	• strategic partners at organisational level • strategic partners at country level	
Programme partners: a relationship defined in function of the execution of a programme: • feeling of co-responsible for the overall objective and the specific objectives of the programme • co-creation for the formulation and the execution of the programme: decisions are taken together (feeling because in the end the consortium member is the final responsible towards DGD) • financial relation (dependency)	• high feeling of co-responsibility : decisions are taken together and it can include sharing of resources • less feeling of co-responsibilities (co-creation of the programme but afterwards everybody is only responsible for his part/ logframe) • distinctions between relations has to be made in function of the history of the relation, the core-business and mission of the organisation, the organisational development and the scale of the partner organisation	
Project partners are responsible for the results and manage their own logframe that fits within the programme logframe	•	
The categories below are not considered as partners but organisations we have contact with		
Sub contracting: only responsible for specific activities	•	
More and more contacts with organisations to look for synergies	•	

[1] the management of partner relations includes things such as : communication and process management, negotiation, agreement and financial management including reporting and participation in negotiation processes, risk management, management of the accountability etc.

and complementarity for specific actions (networking)		

5 The differences between the three organisations:

VIVA SALUD: 95% of the partners they work with are strategic partners with whom they have a long term relation characterised by a co-definition of strategies although Viva Salud takes the final decision. The partnership is seen as a process where partnership becomes over time more intense and strategic. Viva Salud aims at having a portfolio of partners that helps them in reaching their mission. The reporting (financial and narrative) is in first instance, focussing on the needs of Viva Salud for advocacy and fundraising.

KIYO is not making any difference between their partners: all are treated in the same way and have to follow the same rules for reporting. The programme management is seen as capacity strengthening: by being rigorous, partners become better in applying themselves for funds for other partners. The process and the regulations are very clear and transparent and everybody knows what to do. There is no tension between partners because they feel treated differently. Also partners claim that in the end the way KIYO accompany them is good.

Solidagro developed following table showing the differences of management:

<table>
<tr><td>Characteristics</td><td colspan="4">All are taking part in participatory decision making</td></tr>
<tr><td>history</td><td colspan="4">Old & new: same contracts, same obligations and procedures</td></tr>
<tr><td>Core business, mission</td><td>Services:
• monitoring of executions
• easier to plan</td><td colspan="2">Capacity building :
• More difficult</td><td>Advocacy:
• more horizontal relationship, more teamwork
• more flexible planning
• more actors to manage</td></tr>
<tr><td>Organisation development</td><td colspan="2">Weak: very close monitoring, capacity building
Smaller budgets</td><td colspan="2">Strong: more flexible, valorisation of experiences and capacities to capacitate other partners and to reinforce programme management</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source of funding</td><td colspan="2">No demands: minimum reporting demands</td><td colspan="2">Many demands</td></tr>
<tr><td>scale</td><td colspan="2">Small: relations more direct and often with director and board
Support in diversification of funds</td><td colspan="2">Big: relation with other persons than director and board
Less dependent of funds : coordination with other financing agencies</td></tr>
</table>