

15

**NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS' PARTNERSHIPS FOR
POVERTY ALLEVIATION IN ADDIS ABABA**

Gutata Goshu

**A thesis submitted to the school of Graduate Studies of Addis
Ababa University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of Masters of Public Administration in the
Department of Public Administration and Development
Management**

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

JULY 2007



Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies


Title: Non-Governmental Organizations' Partnership for Poverty Alleviation in Addis Ababa

By: Gutata Goshu
Faculty of Business and Economics
MPA Program

Approved by the Board of Examiners

DR. V. VENKATAKRISHNAN

Advisor



Signature

Dr. Tholada V.S. Pradord

Examiner



Signature

Teferi Regassa

Examiner



Signature

Acknowledgment

Words cannot really express what God did for me! He arranged everything for me! His mercies proved new every morning and His faithfulness never wavered even when mine did. I truly know that whose strength helped me in under taking this work.

Hallelujah!

My deepest gratitude goes to Dr Venkatakrishnan, my advisor, for his unreserved advise and follow-up, who has given me constructive comments without which this work would not have reached this stage. Thank You Very Much!

My family: Mam, Dad, and all my brothers and sisters: were it not for your prayer, encouragement, love, and investment, this would not have come true!

I would like to extend my appreciation to managers of different NGOs on different levels for their unreserved support during the data collection as well as for providing all information required for the study.

I record my thanks to the Addis Ababa University and the Department of Public Administration and Development Management for having provided an opportunity to us to undertake this research work.

Had it been possible, I would have listed all the names of my friends who have supported me in one way or the other, + MKY stationary, I Thank You All!!!

I thank you all!!!!.

Gutata Goshu

Table of Contents

	Details	Pages
Acknowledgments		i
Table of Contents		ii-iv
Abstract		v-vi
Acronym		vii
Chapter 1: Introduction		
1.1 Background		1
1.2 Statement of the problem		2
1.3 Research question		4
1.4 Objectives of the study		5
1.4.1 General Objectives		5
1.4.2 Specific Objectives		5
1.5 Significance of the study		5
1.6 Methodology		6
1.6.1 Data types and sources		6
1.6.2 Data collection methods		6
1.6.3 Sampling methods		7
1.7 Time schedule of the study		7
1.8 Scope of the study		8
1.9 Organization/outline of the study		8
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework and Review Literature		9-33
2.1 Partnership and its benefits		9
2.1.1 Partnership Defined		9
2.1.2 Why Partnership?		10
2.1.3 Public-Private Partnership (PPP)		11
2.2 The concepts of civil society and partnerships		15
2.2.1 NGO Partnerships		18
2.2.2 Public Non-Profit (PNP) Partnership		19
2.2.3 Factors contributing for the success of PNP Partnership		21
2.2.4 Non-Profits role in Multi Sector Partnerships		21
2.3 Obstacles To Partnering		22
2.3.1 Key Partnering Principles		23
2.4 Building Partnerships		24
2.4.1 Identifying Partners		24
2.5 Managing The Partnering Process		25
2.6 Poverty and Partnerships in Poverty Reduction		26
2.6.1 Poverty Defined		26
2.6.2 The Poverty Line		27
2.6.3 Poverty reduction		29
2.6.3.1 Civil Society Participation in Poverty Reduction		30

Chapter 3: Partnerships for Poverty Reduction

34-56

Introduction	34
3.1 Profile of Addis Ababa	34
3.2 Dimensions of Poverty in Addis Ababa	35
3.2.1 Income	35
3.2.2 Employment	36
3.2.3 Land Access	37
3.2.4 Housing Problems	37
3.3 NGOs and Partnership in Poverty Reduction in Addis Ababa	37
3.3.1 NGOs' operating environment	37
3.3 Profile of respondents	40
3.3.3 Roles played by selected Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs)	41
3.3.3.1 Service delivery areas of NGOs	41
3.3.3.2 Types of partner organizations for NGOs	41
3.3.3.3 Aspects of urban poverty in which NGOs are having partnership	42
3.3.3.4 Who initiated the partnerships?	43
3.3.3.5 Nature of partnership among NGOs	44
3.3.3.6 Rationale/Purposes of the Partnership	45
3.3.3.7 Role of the organization in partnership	46
3.3.3.8 Types and Extent of partnership	46
3.3.3.9 Benefits of partnership	47
3.3.3.10 Basis for sharing resource	48
3.3.3.11 Specific benefit from sharing resource	48
3.3.3.12 Major problems in partnership	49
3.3.3.13 How problems were addressed within the partnership?	50
3.3.3.14 Articulation and decision making procedure	51
3.3.3.15 Utilization of partnership	52
3.3.3.16 Partnership with government	53
3.3.3.17 Nature of NGOs' partnership with government	53
3.3.3.18 Problems encountered while developing partnership with government	54
3.3.3.19 How problems between NGOs and government were addressed?	54
3.3.3.20 Participation in policy making	55
3.4 Summary	55

Chapter 4: Conclusions and Recommendations

57-62

4.1 Conclusions	57
4.2 Recommendations	60

Bibliography	63-67
Appendix – 1 : Questionnaire for the institutions	68-77

List of Figures

Figure 1: NGOs Service Delivery Areas	41
Figure 2. Types of partner organizations for NGOs	42
Figure 3. Aspects of urban poverty in which NGOs are having partnership	43
Figure 4. The force behind partnership initiation	44
Figure 5. Bases for sharing the resources	48
Figure 6. Benefits in sharing resources	49
Figure 7. Problems hindering the development of partnership	50
Figure 8. Means of addressing problems among NGOs	51
Figure 9. Factors contributing for full realization of partnership	52
Figure 10. Means of addressing problems between NGOs and Government	55

List of Tables

Table ** Forms of obstacles to partnering	22
Table 1. The Nature and Duration of Partnership	45
Table2. Purposes of the Partnership	46
Table 3. Nature of exercising partnership	47
Table 4. Partnership with government	53
Table 5. The nature of partnership with government	54

Abstract

Poverty is a multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral phenomenon. Hence no single institution can address all the dimensions of poverty. Further, no single problem can be solved by any one institution. On the other hand, there is ample evidence of success due to partnerships where joint efforts have proved a worthwhile option than merely shouldering the responsibilities by either public, or private or non-profit sectors. Partnership between various sectors in public services delivery has become a viable option in different parts of the world. Business sector and civil society are getting increasingly involved in social development through reduction of unemployment, elimination of social inequalities and exclusions. Indeed, partnership processes unlock diverse potentials and make available innovative solutions.

This research attempts to delineate the range of partnership pattern for poverty alleviation among Civil Society Organizations and between them and Governments, and Private sector in the Addis Ababa city. This study followed qualitative strategy to a large extent. Survey method was used to gather information from forty-three representatives from Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs). Interviews were also held with the concerned officials of different government institutions such as Addis Ababa City Administration covering Houses Development Project Office and Addis Ababa Housing Agency. At the sub-city level, Arada Civil and Social Affairs and Cooperative Offices were also covered. A few community based organizations such as *Iddirs*, Councils of *Iddirs*, and Cooperatives such as Saving and Credit Cooperatives, and Construction Cooperatives were also contacted for various other information needed for this study.

Currently, governments at various levels are trying to alleviate poverty from the country. Poverty in Addis Ababa has also received considerable attention from various stakeholders. In this endeavor, the contribution of stakeholders cutting across all the sectors is crucial. NGOs are trying their best to incorporate the voice of the poor in policy cycle. In addition, NGOs are directly intervening on different areas to end up poverty from Addis Ababa. A substantial number of NGOs have developed partnership among themselves in the last five years.

Nevertheless, they could achieve very limited partnership with the private sector institutions. Their partnership with the public sector is largely confined to implementation of projects together. However, it could be observed that the partnership between the Public and Non Profit sector is very much limited compared to the range of areas in which they can collaborate.

Though the concept of institutional partnership is relatively new, many NGOs could realize the benefits of partnership such as reduced costs, sharing workload and increased efficiency. Most of the partnered organizations also faced problems such as lack of cooperation from their partners, lack of partnership experience, and misuse of resources are some of the problems that hinders the smooth development of partnership. To overcome these problems, constant progress report, and frequent audit could reduce the abuse of resources and may strengthen the partnership. In addition, once some problems occur, all the stakeholders should take immediate action to resolve the problems rather than leaving it unresolved for good.

Acronyms

- CRDA - Christian Relief and Development Association
- CSA- Central Statistical Agency
- CSOs- Civil Society Organizations
- DPPC- Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission
- FSS- Forum for Social Study
- FSSF - Forum for Social Studies
- GDP- Growth Domestic Product
- GO-NGO- Government- Non-Government Organization
- HRDC- Human Development Canada
- IPRSP - Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
- LNGOs- Local Non-Government Organizations
- MoCB- Ministry of Capacity Building
- MoFED- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
- MOJ- Ministry of Justice
- NGOs- Non-Governmental Organizations
- PANE - Poverty Action Network of Civil Society in Ethiopia
- PNP- Public Non-Profit
- PPP- Public Private Partnerships
- PRSP-Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
- UNCHS- United Nations Center for Human Settlements
- VENRO- Association of German Development NGOs
- VENRO- Association of German Development NGOs

Chapter 1: Introduction

"..... we know that peace and prosperity cannot be achieved without partnerships involving governments, international organizations, business community and Civil Society. In today's world we depend on each other"

Kofi Annan, former UN Secretary General (Peter 2000 p: 1)

Partnerships for urban poverty alleviation between nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations (CBOs), and local government began emerging in the 1980s (Falk and Smith, 2000 p: 12). This was due to the inability of public agencies to cope up with the needs of the poor and the success of certain self-help projects and these resulted in NGOs being seen as complementary or alternatives to, or even substitutes at times for the public agencies.

Urban poverty alleviation programmes initiated by central governments and funded by bilateral and multilateral agencies during this period called for the participation of NGOs and CBOs. This occurred within the prevailing environment of structural adjustment and reforms towards free markets and a reduction in the role of the state to increase productivity and efficiency (Falk and Smith, 2000 p: 12).

Economic liberalization, structural adjustment and globalization may have improved urban economic growth prospects in some countries. However, they have widened the gap between the rich and the poor, and in many cases condition for the urban poor have

worsened (Wiley, 2001 p: 32). Structural adjustment policies, commercialization and deregulation have reduced the scope for governmental intervention on behalf of the poor, or made that intervention more indirect. Yet what governments (central or local) do or do not do still has a crucial impact on both urban economic growth and poverty, inequality and exclusion. Faced with these new challenges, coupled with greater public demand for efficiency and effectiveness, local governments have begun to utilize relationship with both for profit and non-profit nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (Evans, 2005). At the same time, the range of actors, NGOs, CBOs-some times called-grassroots organizations (GROs) play more roles that are significant.

1.2 Statement of the problem

There is no doubt on the scarcity of resources of any type. Therefore, it is necessary to make use of these resources efficiently and effectively. By the same token, if a penny is to be spent for the purpose of urban poverty alleviation, we are expected to properly channel these resources for the intended purposes. In these times of scarcity, where there are two or more actors for the achievement of same objective-urban poverty alleviation, there could be better achievements when all actors are cooperative to each other.

No one institution can solve all the problems affecting a nation (Agevi, 2002). There is ample evidence of partnerships for success of partnerships where joint efforts have proved a worthwhile option than merely shifting burdens between public and private sector. Business communities and civil society organizations are getting increasingly involved in social

development through reduction of unemployment, social inequalities and exclusions. Indeed, partnership processes unlock diversity of potential and enhance innovative solutions.

Both development practitioners and theorists are increasingly recognizing the significance of civil society. Civil society organizations are said to have a critical role in both directly reducing poverty and in ensuring that inclusive development strategies are secured. Both development agencies and governments are increasingly seeking to work in partnership with such civil society organizations in order to increase the effectiveness of their work. However, not much is known about the role of civil society in addressing urban poverty and their partnerships in this regard.

Civil society is recognized to be a nebulous and far-reaching entity. For those primarily concerned with addressing urban poverty, perhaps the most important groupings are the associations of the intended beneficiaries such as membership groups, self-help groups, community based organizations, neighborhood associations and grassroots organizations. The role of such associations in development projects and programs has been recognized as being important in two respects. First, they have an important role in planning and in directly implementing development projects, which address the basic needs of low-income groups. Second, they seek to influence government agencies and other powerful groups to use resources effectively in development programs which address poverty and ensure poverty reduction, and may engage with issues of democracy and governance as a part of this activity.

Here again, we are considering relationships between civil society and state agencies, examining the ways in which civil society organizations interface with state agencies and institutions to obtain access to resources, influence over state policies and practices and enabling "the voice of the poor to be heard" (Diana, 1999). The concentration here is "from the bottom-up", that is the discussion is towards studies of relationships between grassroots organizations of the poor and the State.

This research does not attempt to cover all aspects of the relationship between civil society organizations, private sector and the State. Rather it focuses specifically on the interfaces where the NGOs are collaborating within themselves and other actors including public sector on various aspects of poverty alleviation in Addis Ababa. In this context, we look particularly at strategies used by the actors for finding out the nature of present opportunities through seeking amendments in policies, procedures and practices where applicable.

1.3 Research questions

In this research paper, an attempt had been made to review the determinants of partnership among the concerned body of the society in Addis Ababa City for the purpose of urban poverty alleviation. The following are some of the research questions that have been addressed:

1. Why should there be partnership in poverty alleviation?
2. What is the nature and extent of partnership on the matters of urban poverty among NGO actors in Addis Ababa?
3. What is the significance of civil society's participation in the policy cycle?

4. What lessons about civil society and government-civil society relations can be drawn from the experiences?

1.4 Objectives of the study

1.4.1 General Objective

The objective of this research is to critically assess the level of partnership within Civil Society Organizations and between them and Private Sector and Government towards urban poverty alleviation. In addition, this research attempts to explore both the opportunities and potential shortcomings of the existing partnership on the same issue.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

1. To uncover the type of partnership that is existing among non-governmental organizations to mitigate urban poverty
2. To identify the root cause that has hindered the smooth development of effective partnership among non-governmental organizations for urban poverty alleviation.
3. To suggest ways of strengthening effective partnership development that enables all the stakeholders reach their target that is to mobilize their resources in cooperative and organized manner to alleviate urban poverty.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Understanding the level and the types of partnership among different actors for the purpose of urban poverty alleviation is important for strengthening the partnerships. This may result in efficient use of resources that are channeled for the poor. Further it may also help in reaching many more poor people. In addition to this:

1. It may give the highlights of the advantages of partnership to alleviate the urban poverty thereby informing the stakeholders to act accordingly.
2. It will be very helpful resource material for the policy makers involved in both poverty reduction and partnership building
3. This research could be valuable document for the up-coming researchers.

1.6. Methodology

1.6.1 Data types and sources

This study followed qualitative strategy to a large extent. This study utilized both secondary and primary data. Various publications, different journals, working papers, various books, and other online materials have been used for collecting secondary data. Primary data were collected from various organs of Addis Ababa City Administration covering Houses Development Project Office and Addis Ababa Housing Agency, NGOs affiliated to the Poverty Action Network of Ethiopia (PANE) and Christian Relief Development Association (CRDA). At the sub-city level, Arada Civil and Social Affairs and Cooperative Offices were also contacted. Primarily, qualitative data have been collected. Thus, the data obtained from the above source have been processed using methods related to qualitative data. Wherever possible the data have been presented in the form of charts, figures and tables.

1.6.2 Data collection methods

Structured discussions with selected local government officials, NGOs, CBOs, and some selected private sector organizations were held. Primary data were collected using

questionnaires and in-depth interviews. From NGOs, there were 43 respondents. They represented various categories such as Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Program Coordinator, Division Head and Public Relations Officers. There were eight respondents from the Cooperatives. Further, 12 respondents were drawn from a few private sector organizations. Twelve government officials from different departments in Addis Ababa City Administration were also interviewed. Interviews were also held with the concerned officials of different government institutions such as Addis Ababa City Administration. Population was largely limited to only government bodies and civil society organizations that have got direct involvement in urban poverty alleviation.

1.6.3 Sampling methods

Purposive sampling method was used. The NGOs affiliated to the Poverty Action Network of Ethiopia (PANE) and Christian Relief Development Association (CRDA) specifically working on poverty related issues were purposively selected. Similarly, various departments of Addis Ababa city administration were identified based on their focus on urban poverty alleviation related issues.

1.6 Time schedule of the study

The research process started in the first week of February 2007 when the research proposal was prepared. After reviewing the relevant literature, the instruments for data collection were prepared. Data were collected from April 2007 to the third week of May 2007. Data analysis was completed in the second week of June 2007. The drafting of the report

followed and the first draft was finalized in the fourth week of June 2007. The revised and final draft incorporating the suggestions was ready in the second week of July 2007.

1.8 Scope of the study

Partnership could have different types such as bilateral and multilateral and could have different motives such as partnership for profit making, for world peace, for games and for rural poverty alleviation. However, this study exclusively concentrated on aspects of partnership on urban poverty alleviation among actors. Geographically, this study was confined to Addis Ababa City only, due to time and financial constraints.

1.9 Organization/outline of the study

This study reviews the development of partnerships between government and other sectors for urban poverty alleviation from the 1980s. This study has four chapters. The first chapter gives a brief introduction. The second chapter reviews the previous literature, which highlights the concepts of the topic. Key concerns and the framework of the study that includes the public-public, public-private, and public-civil society partnership for urban poverty reduction have been discussed in this chapter. Further, the role of civil society organizations in poverty reduction in general and in particular, Ethiopia and Addis Ababa were mentioned. In the third chapter, the findings have been presented. It has been found out that very limited partnership exists between various sectors in urban poverty alleviation related issues. The partnership between NGOs and the State is to a large extent is limited to consultations mandated by the multilateral organizations. The fourth chapter presents the conclusion and recommendations.

Chapter Two

Theoretical Framework and Review of Literature

This chapter initially focuses on the various concepts related to partnership, different types of partnership such as Public-Private Partnership (PPP), Public-Non Profit (PNP) Partnership, NGO Partnership, Community Partnership and the factors contributing to the partnership. It also dwells on the reasons for partnership, obstacles to partnering, building and managing the partnerships, and the role of NGOs in building the partnership. The second part of this chapter is devoted for definition of poverty, poverty reduction measure and NGOs role in poverty reduction.

2.1 Partnership and its benefits

2.1.1 Partnership Defined

Brinkerhoff, (2002 p:3) defined the ideal type of partnership as follows. “Partnership is a dynamic relationship among diverse actors, based on mutually agreed objectives, pursued through a shared understanding of the most rational division of labour based on the respective comparative advantages of each partner. Partnership encompasses mutual influence, with a careful balance between synergy and respective autonomy, which incorporates mutual respect, equal participation in decision making, mutual accountability and transparency”.

According to Gray, Partnership refers to any intentionally collaborative relationship between two or more organizations from multiple sectors (that is, public, private and non-profit) which joins resources to identify and subsequently pursue a joint approach to solving one or more common problems. Joint ventures, multilateral collaborations,

public-private and public-nonprofit alliances are just some examples of this phenomenon. Partnership can also be perceived as a social exchange that involves commitment of knowledge, skills and emotions by leaders and staff of participating organizations. From an organizational standpoint, partnership entails the commitment of organizational resources to an initiative that involves two or more entities that come together and act in recognition of the fact that they cannot accomplish their missions and their goals alone (Gray 1985 cited in Kapucu, 2006: 207)

Alternatively partnership can be defined, as "A partnership is a strategic alliance or relationship between two or more people. Successful partnerships are often based on trust, equality, and mutual understanding and obligations. Partnerships can be formal, where each party's roles and obligations are spelled out in a written agreement, or informal, where the roles and obligations are assumed or agreed to verbally. You may be able to choose your partner or, as is often the case, your partner may be assigned to you"(http://www.seasite.niu.edu).

2.1.2 Why Partnership?

Tennyson (2003 p: 6) feels that single sector approaches have been tried and have proved disappointing. Working separately, different sectors have developed activities in isolation - sometimes competing with each other and/or duplicating effort and wasting valuable resources. Working separately has all too often led to the development of a 'blame culture' in which chaos or neglect is always regarded as someone else's fault. While partnership provides a new opportunity for doing development better - by recognizing the

qualities and competencies of each sector; and finding new ways of harnessing these for the common good.

What does each sector - whether the public sector, business sector or civil society - bring? The 'core business' of each sector leads to quite different priorities, values and attributes. Faye, Dinkar Rachana and Agnes (2005 p: 601) in their study on an urban university working collectively with a faith-based organization, industry partners and the government to better the livelihood of individuals in a community has forwarded the idea that 'As the independent service groups begin to meet with some frustration due to limited success and the identification of participant challenges that are beyond the scope of the individual service providers, efforts to organize the resources of each contributing organization to best serve the needs of the targeted population spawned. This group organization, also known as a collaborative partnership, gains importance because the dissolution of an existing problem is greater than the resources of any single stakeholder. Thus, the function of community interdependence binds all participants to the greater goal with individual agendas being secondary to the process.

2.1.3 Public-Private Partnership (PPP)

In the past, there have been combinations of government, community, the poor themselves, NGOs, the civil society sector, and the business and corporate sectors. It is time to reduce the role of the first player, government, and increase the roles of the other players, most importantly the business and corporate sectors. Certainly, government is still important.

The gap between the diversity and complexity of tasks, on the one hand, and budget deficits and government debt, on the other hand, is constantly widening (Andreas, 2006: 3). Thus, the challenges for governmental task fulfillment are increasing, and they require an orientation toward outcome, thinking based on efficiency, and innovation. The government is changing its role from a service state to a warranty state. For this reason, private sector structural and procedural models are being used more and more frequently for the public sector. The boundaries between the government and private individuals, between the public and the private, are therefore becoming increasingly blurred.

Gary and Robert (2006 p: 892) state that 'the concept of the public and private sectors working in unison is not new. The term Public Private Partnership (PPP) itself can be traced back nearly 40 years to the urban renewal projects that spread across the United States in the 1960s. They also demarcated 'a four-stage establishment process of PPPs and show that within each stage there exists a specific managerial focus in conjunction with one or two main managerial challenges. Gary and Robert (2006 p: 914) further described that boundary spanners experience continually changing events and scenarios, and are subjected to a number of strategies that influence upon the narrowing (or otherwise) of autonomy, cultural and cautionary distances as negotiations unfold'.

Pamela, (2006 p: 400) claims that 'many widely publicized arrangements bearing the popular "public-private partnership" label are complex, long-term contracts between municipalities and private companies. In theory, these innovative contracts offer substantial public benefits, including improved service quality, risk sharing with the private sector, and cost savings.

Noble and Jones contend that, what is new is the rate at which PPP projects have gained favour with governments in different parts of the world over the last decade. In industrialized, transitional, and developing countries, interest in cooperation between state and non-state actors has grown appreciably over the last decade or so. Around the world, there is wide recognition that the societal problems cannot be solved by governments acting on their own (qtd in Derick, 1998:1). He further explains he need to reduce the scope of government intervention in developing world as well as in the transitional countries has been propagated by International Monetary Fund and World Bank economists as part of the gospel of structural adjustment.

Public-private partnership (PPP) is recognized globally as an important instrument for resource generation as well as inclusive governance (Maitra, 2005:99). Demand for basic services is ever increasing with increase in economic development, which automatically does not ensure balanced distribution of benefits. Income growth generally bypasses the vulnerable section of society, poor women constituting a significant part of it. Along with the income poverty, this section also suffers from a poor quality of life. Public sector alone is incapable of meeting their need and reducing their exclusion from the mainstream development. Public-private partnership offers tremendous scope of reducing this gap with increase in basic service delivery.

International objectives such as peace, security, sustainable development, human rights and poverty alleviation, are increasingly interlinked. They have ramifications for all sectors of society and their achievement requires complex and collaborative solutions

(Jane and Dave 2003:4). Whilst governments must carry primary responsibility for achieving them, it is increasingly in the interests of business to be part of the solution rather than part of the problem.

Over the past decade, domestic and foreign companies have become more important and influential actors in many developing countries as a result of privatization and market liberalization and they have a growing stake in the future progress of these countries. At the same time, there are growing international demands for companies to be more transparent and more accountable for their economic, social and environmental impacts everywhere they operate.

As a result of the development of the free-market economy, most countries are engaged in radical changes, not only in their economic functions, but also in the characteristics and the respective roles of the state and the private sector (Pongsiri, 2002: 487). The traditional concept of autonomous private sector acting in pursuit of its own immediate goals, notably profit maximization, and the public sector, with discretionary powers and multiple objectives that relate to the pursuit of long-term goal in public interest, has been challenging. This concept apparently no longer reflects the dynamics and interdependencies of economics and social environment. Murray (1975) asserted that the changing situation seems to be evolving toward a mixture of public-private and government-market decision making with a blurring of the lines rather than a distinct bifurcation of responsibilities. Presently, a concept of cooperation between public and private sectors to form an inter-organizational partnership has been widely acceptable and will continue to flourish, especially in the countries where the privatization process has

been actively undertaken. The potential benefits expected from PPP could be mentioned as below:

- Cost-effectiveness
- Higher Productivity
- Accelerated Delivery
- Clear Customer Focus
- Enhanced Social Service-
- Recovery of User Charges

2.2 The concepts of civil society and partnerships

NGOs are not a new phenomenon. Arguably, nongovernmental institutions probably predate governments in both form and function (Adil, 2000:3). What is new, however, is the rapid and sustained growth in their numbers across the globe.

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, development professionals began to acknowledge the contribution of NGOs, with particular emphasis on the ability of NGOs to work directly with the poor and with grassroots organizations (Diana, 2001: 9). In the urban context, Turner (1988) and UNCHS (1988) both emphasized the growing scale and significance of NGOs working on a range of housing and neighbourhood development issues in low-income settlements. In particular, NGOs were seen as being more participatory, people-led and responsive to local needs than more formal official development assistance agencies.

Nongovernmental organizations have an abiding interest in public policy. According to McCormick, “the fundamental objective of an NGO is to influence public policy from outside the formal structure of elected government” (qtd in Adil, 2000:6). He further elaborate that the nonprofit organizations firmly considered as policy entrepreneurs, as “a

body of individuals who associate for any of three purposes: (1) to perform public tasks that have been delegated to them by the state; (2) to perform public tasks for which there is a demand that neither the state nor for-profit organizations are willing to fulfill; or (3) to influence the direction of policy in the state, the for-profit sector or other nonprofit organizations". Indeed, NGOs can be defined as para-policy organizations on the basis of their principal normative characteristics: the bringing together in associations of actors with shared normative values, and the actualizing of particular social visions.

Similarly, the work of Smith and Lipsky (qtd. in Aidl, 2000, i–viii) on the rise of public service contracting in the United States strengthens this view of NGOs as policy entrepreneurs: "We believe that the experiences and behaviors of the people who work in nonprofit organizations and other parts of the service system, taken together add up to—in a sense, become—the nation's social policy"

In the last two decades, NGOs have become an increasingly significant group within civil society and development. Whilst the number of NGOs working on urban poverty issues is hard to assess, many of the larger towns and cities have a number of NGOs actively working in the field of urban poverty reduction. However, in many smaller towns there may be very few or none at all. NGO activities may include low-income housing, community development, support for micro-enterprises, preservation of the environment, popular education, health care and health-related education, and services for mothers, infants and children as well as projects for research, training and information dissemination (Diana, 2001: 158).

There appears to be a considerable diversity in NGO strategies for working with community residents and there is very little systematic information on the use and significance of these different strategies in any specific context. Diana, (2001, p: 159) suggests that there are four main strategies from experiences of a number of NGOs which are described below:

1. The NGO is demand-led at the level of the settlement that is they respond to a request from a neighborhood-level grassroots organization.
2. The NGO is demand-led at the level of the region or city that is they respond to a request from a city Federation of grassroots organizations to work in a new area either because the Federation has been asked by its membership or because it appears to be advantageous to the Federation leadership.
3. The NGO identifies the settlements through some kind of needs assessment (whether formalized or more informally undertaken).
4. The NGO is invited into the area by another external agency

Obviously, in the first and second strategies the NGOs are working with previously established grassroots organizations and hence, whom they work with is not such an issue. In the third and fourth strategies, NGOs may work either with existing organizations or they may seek to establish new organizations or work with individuals in the community. Alternatively, they may work directly with local residents, providing health or education, for example. Or they may work through community members who have a particular role designated by the state (such as community development workers or health volunteers).

Many NGOs working directly with low-income communities have the empowerment of the local community as one of their prime objectives and many take these skills for

granted. For many years, it was accepted that NGOs (or some organizations within this general categorization) work effectively with local grassroots organizations to achieve participative development (Diana, 1999 p: 56). More recently, NGOs have been criticized for doing little to build the capacity of the people they are working with. Increasingly, it is recognized that difficulties in relations between NGOs and grassroots organizations may be more widespread than was once thought.

2.2.1 NGO Partnerships

Commenting upon the partnerships of NGOs, Swarbrick (2004 p: 10) feels that 'NGOs by nature inhabit a world of relationships, whether working in emergency relief or in development'. Swarbrick also claims that relationships are foundational to everything the sector does, whether the relationship is between NGOs and beneficiaries, local NGOs and their northern partners, NGOs and donors, governments, the private sector.

Discussing on the partnership between Local NGOs (LNGOs) and northern NGOs, Swarbrick (2004 p 12) has listed the various pre-requisites for NGOs partnership. Based on the literature and the contributors to the research, Swarbrick states that "there are clear pointers towards some prerequisites for more effective NGO relationships, some of which relate to "purpose" and some to "process". Regarding "purpose", a number of contributors noted the transition that had occurred in their partner relationships reflecting the ongoing transformation across the sector. LNGOs were being viewed less as local implementing partners and increasingly as local agents intent on changing their own society. Where partners were viewed in this way, northern NGOs are more likely to support the organisational and technical capacity development of the local partner".

Mulroy on her study on the collaboration among seven nonprofit human service agencies in a very low-income urban neighborhood in Boston, Massachusetts, based on the review of various publications, has felt that 'managers of Non Profit human service organizations and their frontline program coordinators face increasing pressure from philanthropic and government funders as well as from their own internal strategic plans to collaborate with external actors at both organizational and program levels. She also points out to the argument 'that the third sector in the United States is at a critical juncture and the sustainability of civil society sectors should not be taken for granted. One of Salamon's recommendations is to use multisector, inter-organizational collaborations as a means through which nonprofit organizations, can better respond to societal needs (Salamon, 1999, cited in Mulroy, 2003: 47-8).

Connor, Kadel-Taras, and Vinokur-Kaplan (1999 p: 127) conducted various case studies to explore the theory that nonprofit management support organizations (MSOs) should consider taking on the role of convener and facilitator of community collaborations. They have stated that contemporary challenges facing nonprofit organizations and local communities—from government devolution to accountability movements to for-profit competition—have been met with increased calls for collaboration.

2.2.2 Public Non-Profit (PNP) Partnership

Kapucu (2006 p: 208) citing many authors has stated that 'Public-nonprofit partnerships constitute one particular form of them diverse array of existing inter-organizational systems and networks. Public-nonprofit partnerships have emerged, in the last several decades, as a new institutional arrangement through which to deal with a variety of key

societal concerns such as environmental improvement, regional and urban economic development and educational reforms.

Frank, and Smith (2000) have mentioned the following with regard to the partnership with the government. Partnering with government has begun to replace short-term programs and ad hoc projects. Many government staff roles have changed. Individuals, who previously responded to requests for funding with program dollars or grants, are now faced with developing or participating in partnerships. One of the realities around this is that both the government representative and others in the partnership group probably have previous history and associations that are not always consistent with working as equals in partnership. New skills and understanding are required on both sides in order to appreciate what can be achieved in this new type of relationship.

Dwelling further on the partnership with the Government, Frank, and Smith (2000) have said, "Government is often seen as the source of funding and the maker of the rules. In community-based partnerships, the needs of the partnership come first and the role of government (or any other funder) comes second. Basically, members must shift their thinking from fitting into program guidelines to looking at long-range goals and finding resources that are appropriate. Government representatives must consider what else they can contribute to the partnership besides money. They must view partnerships for what they are -- a sharing of risk, responsibility and resources".

What Keane mentioned about the relationship between civil society and state becomes relevant in this context. Keane states that 'The power of civil society and the capacity of

state institutions can increase together, in a positive-sum interaction, or they may also decline together, in a negative-sum way, as when the state's policymaking and administrative capacities stagnate along with civil society's capacity for independent self-determined activity' (Keane, 1988 cited in Uphoff and Krishna, 2004: 360)

2.2.3 Factors contributing for the success of PNP Partnership

Kapucu (2006 p: 208) states that 'since PNPs are based on a recognition of key interdependencies across sectors and organizations, and thus on the need for intersectoral, interorganizational collaboration to solve emergent problems, they also require effective mobilization and utilization of many available community resources, public as well as private. Given the voluntary nature of many PNPs, their effectiveness depends, for the most part, on the willingness of an array of individuals and organizations across sectors to participate in and contribute to the success of the collaborative endeavour.

2.2.4 Non-Profits role in Multi Sector Partnerships

Mendel (2003 p: 230) claims that 'two sources of scholarship provide a useful context for a discussion of nonprofits as bridging organizations participating in public-private partnerships. In 1958 Long defined the *ecology of games* as a territorial system of interrelationships in which the actors in one system with one set of goals and objectives use actors with other sets of goals and objectives to achieve their aims'. With regard to the second source of scholarship, Mendel has mentioned that Berger and Neuhaus (1977, 1996) defined *mediating structures* as institutions that stand between the private world of individuals and the large impersonal structures of modern society.

2.3 Obstacles to Partnering

Even if there are many good reasons for creating partnerships to tackle major development issues, it is not always obvious to all that this is the best way forward. It is also not always easy to promote collaboration in particularly unsympathetic cultural, political or economic contexts.

Table ** Forms of obstacles to partnering

Source of Obstacle	Example
General Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevailing attitude skepticism • Rigid/ preconceived attitudes about specific sectors/partners • Inflated expectations of what is possible
Negative Sectoral Characteristics (Actual or Perceived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public sector: bureaucratic and intransigent • Business sector: single minded and competitive • Civil society: combative and territorial
Personal Limitation (of individuals learning the partnership)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate partnering skills • Restricted internal and external authority • Too narrowly focused role/jobs • Lack of belief in the effectiveness of partnering
Organizational Limitations (of partner organizations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting priorities • Competitiveness (within sectors) • Intolerance (of the other sector)
Wider External Constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local social/political/economic climate • Scale of challenge(s)/ speed of change • Inability to access external resources

Source: adopted from Rose (2003)

Obstacles to partnering can, therefore, take many forms. When too many obstacles are stacked against a partnership it may be best to abandon the idea and wait for better times. But most obstacles are surmountable with enough patience, commitment and effort. And even those that challenge the partnership to the point of breakdown can be used to transform it into something better and stronger. Some argue (and many partnerships have experienced this as a reality) that a break-down or crisis can generate an unexpected and original response because it forces those involved to pay renewed attention and to see things more imaginatively. From this perspective an obstacle can, in fact, provide the partnership with an invaluable turning point (Rose 2003).

2.3.1 Key Partnering Principles

As well as a commonly agreed goal, all partnerships will need some guiding principles to hold them together. These principles should be worked out as part of the partnership-building process and agreed by all partners. If they provide the foundation upon which the partnership is built, then as things progress they continue to provide the 'cement' that holds the partnership together over time (Shyam, 2000). Each sector will have its own priorities and may struggle to accept the different priorities of others, but a robust discussion explaining why a particular principle matters to one or other partner may go a long way to reconciling apparent differences and to achieving compromise. Three core principles that have recurred time and again in cross-sector partnerships in many different parts of the world are the principles of Equity, Transparency and Mutual Benefit. These three key principles can be a useful starting point for discussion between potential partners prior to formalizing the partnership, even if they are subsequently replaced by

different principles developed by the group. What is important is that all partners accept and agree to abide by whatever the group itself decides is appropriate.

2.4 Building Partnerships

2.4.1 Identifying Partners

The strongest partnerships are those that have drawn together the best set of partner organizations. According to Rose (2003 p: 9), at an early stage after 'scoping' a partnership, it is critical to:

- Identify what types of partner organizations would add value
- Explore the range of options available either by building on existing and proven contacts or by seeking new ones
- Select the most appropriate partners and secure their active involvement

Rose (2003 p: 12) has also identified the following areas in which each organizational sector may face a risk:

- Reputation impact** - all organizations and institutions value their reputation and will rightly be concerned about whether that reputation can be damaged either by the fact of the partnership itself or by any fall-out in future should the partnership fail
- Loss of autonomy** - working in collaboration inevitably means less independence for each organization in the areas of joint work
- Conflicts of interest** - whether at strategic or operational levels, partnership commitments can give rise to split loyalties and / or to feeling pushed to settle for uncomfortable compromise
- Drain on resources** - partnerships typically require a heavy 'front end' investment (especially of time), in advance of any appropriate level of 'return'

•**Implementation challenges** - once a partnership is established and resources procured there will be a fresh set of commitment and other challenges for each partner organization as the partnership moves into project implementation.

Conditions for success of partnerships

The interdependency of stakeholders is a vital link for the project process and success as it sensitizes the partners to the reality that the challenge/theme/problem is too large for each partner to address independently. That same reality helps each partner to also recognize the value and worth of the resource it brings to the collaborative partnership table (Jackson, Dinkar and DeFranco, 2005: 612).

2.5 Managing the Partnering Process

Once a partnership is in place and a Partnering Agreement is signed, there are new challenges to face (Rose 2003 p: 21). Many people will be involved in the partnership in its different phases, taking on a range of roles as required. It is important to recognize the differences and to understand which roles are needed, at what stage and for what purpose. It is equally important to ensure that the best person is allocated to a particular role. Roles may change often during the life of a partnership and partners may 'grow' into new roles as they become more experienced in partnering. The important thing here is that, at an early stage of their partnership, partners agree on a number of indicators (both tangible 'deliverables' and broader 'process' indicators) and use these as a basis for tracking the effectiveness of their partnership over time. Ideally, indicators should cover partner-specific as well as shared goals. No partnership is ever easy, comfortable, secure, safe, quick or cheap. But with a lot of good management, some good will and a little

determination, cross-sector partnerships for sustainable development can work well and may achieve a great deal more than single sector approaches to the same issue.

2.6 Poverty and Partnerships in Poverty Reduction

2.6.1 Poverty Defined

There is no single, universally accepted standard definition of poverty. Modern definitions of poverty have moved away from conceptions based on a lack of physical necessities towards a more social and relative understanding. The European Union's working definition of poverty is 'Persons, families and groups of persons whose resources (material, cultural and social) are so limited as to exclude them from the minimum acceptable way of life in the Member State to which they belong' (<http://www.childreninwales.org.uk/2157.html>).

According to Simon (1999:7), Poverty is hunger. Poverty is lack of shelter. Poverty is being sick and not being able to see a doctor. Poverty is not having access to school and not knowing how to read. Poverty is not having a job, is fear for the future, living one day at a time. Poverty is losing a child to illness brought about by unclean water. Poverty is powerlessness, lack of representation and freedom.

José defined as a shortfall of a person's *level of receipts or resources* below some established poverty line. "Receipts" are usually proxied by the flow of income or, alternatively, by the flow of consumable commodities per person during a certain period (e.g. per year or per month) (José 1997: 10).

determination, cross-sector partnerships for sustainable development can work well and may achieve a great deal more than single sector approaches to the same issue.

2.6 Poverty and Partnerships in Poverty Reduction

2.6: 1 Poverty Defined

There is no single, universally accepted standard definition of poverty. Modern definitions of poverty have moved away from conceptions based on a lack of physical necessities towards a more social and relative understanding. The European Union's working definition of poverty is 'Persons, families and groups of persons whose resources (material, cultural and social) are so limited as to exclude them from the minimum acceptable way of life in the Member State to which they belong' (<http://www.childreninwales.org.uk/2157.html>).

According to Simon (1999:7), Poverty is hunger. Poverty is lack of shelter. Poverty is being sick and not being able to see a doctor. Poverty is not having access to school and not knowing how to read. Poverty is not having a job, is fear for the future, living one day at a time. Poverty is losing a child to illness brought about by unclean water. Poverty is powerlessness, lack of representation and freedom.

José defined as a shortfall of a person's *level of receipts or resources* below some established poverty line. "Receipts" are usually proxied by the flow of income or, alternatively, by the flow of consumable commodities per person during a certain period (e.g. per year or per month) (José 1997: 10).

Jenny (1995) defines poverty by the increasing inequalities, growing relative and absolute poverty, deteriorating environments and even the impacts of war. He further argues, "Poverty" is not measured only by assessing access to cash income; there are probably as many definitions of poverty as families living in that state. People may be poor in cash but rich in land, or poor in access to education but rich in life experience. Whether or not people are "genuinely lacking" in basic needs is a question, which frequently exercises the minds of development planners. The nature and measurement of poverty in any context are therefore always problematic.

Most definitions associate poverty with a "lack" or "deficiency" of the necessities required for human survival and welfare (Ellen, 1995:12). However, there is no consensus about what basic human needs are or how they can be identified. Poverty is obviously difficult to measure, whether one uses access to basic needs or its relative nature when compared with other people or countries.

2.6.2 The Poverty Line

The poverty line is in essence a welfare threshold: those whose resources do not allow them to cross it are considered to be poor Stefan (1997 p: 46). The threshold is usually arranged to be a bundle of commodities that would satisfy the minimum basic needs regarding nutrition, housing, clothing, education and health of an individual. The value of this basket is then the poverty line, and the poor are those whose income or consumption is below that minimum. The most common approach is to build the poverty line definition around nutritional requirements. A first step is to estimate the monetary value of a basic food basket, which reflects the daily minimum nutritional requirements of an

individual. The cost of the food basket is subsequently multiplied by the *inverse* of the share of food consumption in total consumption or income (Engel coefficient) to obtain the minimum income or poverty line.

As per the 'Ethiopia: Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program' document prepared by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2002), 'to determine the incidence of poverty (number of poor), one has to establish a poverty line, a threshold level of per capita income or consumption below which an individual is considered to be poor. Establishing the poverty line starts with defining and selecting a "basket" of food items typically consumed by the poor. The quantity of the basket is determined in such a way that the given food basket meets a predetermined level of minimum calorie requirement. This basket is valued at nationally representative average prices to reach at a consistent poverty line across regions and groups. Once this is done, an allowance is made for the non-food component consistent with the spending patterns of the poor. This method yields a representative poverty line as it provides a monetary value of a poverty line that accounts for the food and non-food components.

The food poverty line used in Ethiopia is based on a basket providing 2200 kcal per adult equivalent per day. In 1995/96 prices, this basket cost Birr 647.8 per year. After adjusting for the non-food component, the total poverty line (both food and non-food) was estimated at Birr 1075.0 in 1995/96. The same "basket" and poverty line is used in 1999/00 to maintain comparability between the two survey years (MOFED, 2002: 7).

2.6.3 Poverty reduction

According to the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (I-PRSP) of the Government of Ethiopia (2002 p: 16), the Government acknowledges that the magnitude of poverty is immense. However, the sum total of all the economic reforms undertaken by the Government under the Structural Adjustment Program since 1992 was important measures have been taken to reduce poverty and to protect the poor sections of society. In addition to the formulation of development policies that benefit the poor, many poverty-oriented measures have been undertaken. Among such measures were the Emergency Recovery and Reconstruction Program set to facilitate the utilization of existing capacities for production; the Ethiopian Social Rehabilitation Fund that was created to assist community-based income generating activities for displaced people, demobilized soldiers, and the other poor; the Safety-Net Program, targeted at retrenched workers, displaced people, returnee refugees, demobilized soldiers, female-headed households, the unemployed, the aged, orphans, and poor farmers with food insecurity; The Disaster Prevention and Management policy; and subsidies and enhanced credit provision and energy price regulation (PRSP 2002 p: 9).

Further, the PRSP explains that the Government has also established a Welfare Monitoring System to monitor the social consequences of its economic reform programs and policies, and the impact of targeted programs on the poor. As a result of these poverty reduction measures that addressed the objectives of the local government units and community needs, and that facilitated the direct participation of the local people, it was reported that poverty actually declined in the 1990s (PRSP 2002 p: 10). GDP grew at an annual average rate of 5.5 percent during 1992/93 – 1997/98.

Reduction of poverty has continued to be the core of the agenda of the country's development agenda, which consists of four building blocks: agricultural development-led industrialization, judiciary and civil service reform, decentralization and empowerment, and capacity building in public and private sectors. It is believed that judicial and civil service reforms, decentralization and empowerment, and capacity building will collectively bring about good governance and institutional development, which will help make public and private organizations effective and efficient.

While developing the Poverty Reduction Strategy, the process was participatory and comprehensive (PRSP 2002, p.17). The consultation process was undertaken at all levels of government (from wereda to federal levels) and many concerned partners participated in the discussions and forwarded their views and comments. The proposed beneficiaries themselves were consulted by the government, civil societies and others.

2.6.3.1 Civil Society Participation in Poverty Reduction

Falk and Eberlei (2003) have pointed out that in last few years, processes have been initiated to develop and implement national strategies to combat poverty in the overwhelming majority of the poorest countries. Forty-eight countries have already prepared an Interim PRSP or a Full PRSP. While the governments frequently prepared the Interim PRSPs on their own, the civil societies were consulted in all these countries when it came to preparing the Full PRSPs.

As per the MOFED document on SDPRP (2002, p: 163) document mentioned earlier, the Government of Ethiopia realizes that the desired accelerated development and poverty

reduction cannot be achieved merely through the efforts of the government. Given the magnitude and complexity of poverty in Ethiopia, its resolution requires the concerted and coordinated action of all concerned parties. The communities, the private sector, NGOs and Civil Society Organization (CSOs) have to play their part in a coordinated manner. Further, in that document it has also been stated that 'The government recognizes NGOs as an important development force and partner. They are already involved in the core poverty oriented sectors-agriculture, health, education, water, rural roads and other rural development activities. These experiences and resources must be brought in and coordinated with SDPRP. In the contributions of NGOs' paper for SDPRP preparation, it is indicated that operational NGOs are involved in around 1200 projects, with health, agriculture and rural development as the major sectors.

Another document prepared under the auspices of Ministry of Works and Urban Development and other organizations in 2000 declares that 'Poverty alleviation is a multi sectoral activity. As a result various actors at both the Federal and Municipal levels will have a stake in poverty alleviation in the city. Government agencies, civil societies, the private sector will have a role to play in poverty alleviation' (UNCHS, 2000: 39).

With regard to the Non-State actors role in participation in poverty reduction program development in Ethiopia it has been stated by the Association of German Development NGOs (VENRO) (2005) that Initially, the government was hesitant to approve a process of broad-based participation; however, when donors insisted on it, participation was taken seriously (World Bank OED 2004: 14; Bijlmakers 2003: 3). MoFED arranged for broad consultations at the "woreda" (district) level, and then followed by regional and

federal levels. A comparatively small number of CSOs, mostly those affiliated with the Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA), also participated intensively in this process. CRDA coordinated activities within the framework of its newly established NGO PRSP Taskforce. In March 2004 the taskforce was transferred into the new Poverty Action Network of Civil Society in Ethiopia (PANE). PANE pools CRDA members and non-members; its name clearly stipulates that poverty reduction requires long-term civil society commitment. Counted among its members, the Forum for Social Studies (FSS) and the Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce supplied the process with recommendations of its members (Gabriel 2002; Geda/Weeks 2003: 59-60). However, non-state stakeholder efforts to organize themselves and fully participate did not match the government's willingness to create an appropriate window of opportunity. Moreover, many criticized that the output of consultations did not feed into the final strategy document. World Bank OED (2004: 16) quoted a CRDA representative in July 2003: "We had expectations of greater transparency and policy change, especially on governance." Some critics claim that the NGO landscape has been "overwhelmed by government-infiltrated bodies" (Wood 2004: 20)'.

It is reported that numerous NGOs are involved in urban development projects in the city of Addis Ababa. The main focuses of these NGOs are income and employment generations and poverty alleviation programs. However, it is reported that the relation between NGOs and the Addis Ababa Municipality is identified as issue based contact instead of bigger policy dialogue (Thomas, 1997 cited in UNCHS, 2000: 41). It is also reported that NGOs often get in touch with Municipality (kebele, wereda, city level) to secure land for their use or other smaller issues concerning themselves. There is no

formal mechanism to relate NGOs with the Municipality. The fact there is weak relationship between NGOs and Municipality entails that there is under utilization of the potential of working together in addressing the issues of poverty'.

Chapter Three

Partnerships in Poverty Alleviation

Introduction

This chapter is based on the primary data collected from various stakeholders specifically for this study and secondary data sourced through various publications and reports. In the first part a brief profile of the study area, Addis Ababa has been presented. Based on the information available in various publications, the various dimensions of poverty in Addis Ababa are presented subsequently. The subsequent part presents the views of the respondents on partnership in poverty alleviation in Addis Ababa.

3.1 Profile of Addis Ababa

Addis Ababa has a history of a little more than 100 years. It was founded in 1886. Addis Ababa has served as the capital city of Ethiopia since the establishment. The role of Addis Ababa as a seat of government has helped the city to undergo various developments. It has emerged as a city that has both international and national significance. The international significance of the city is revealed as the city serves as seats of various international organizations and embassies. The national significance of the city comes as the city is the major commercial, industrial, education and political center of the country.

Based on figures from the Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia (CSA) published in 2005, Addis Ababa has an estimated total population of 2,973,004, consisting of 1,428,001 men and 1,545,003 women (CSA, 2005). Addis Ababa contains around one-third of all urban dwellers in

Ethiopia. With an estimated area of 530.14 square kilometers, this chartered city has an approximate density of 5,607.96 people per square kilometers. These estimates are based on the 1994 census, in which the population of Addis Ababa was reported to be 2.3 million. Addis Ababa has 10 sub cities, which are further subdivided into 103 kebeles. Kebele is the smallest administrative unit in urban area.

In Addis Ababa, there are more than 150 NGOs working on urban poverty. Most of them are members of the only one known umbrella group for NGOs which called the CRDA (Christian Relief and Development Association), and three networks among which PANE (Poverty Action Network of Civil Society Organization in Ethiopia) is the major one having 77 members including the umbrella organization CRDA as one of its member. The rest two has fewer members 44 and 8. Only few of the networked NGOs are working in Addis Ababa, most of them are working in other towns and in the rural Ethiopia.

3.2 Dimensions of Poverty in Addis Ababa

3.2.1 Income

Income is one of the indicators of poverty. The distribution of income at any one time displays the extent of poverty and its distribution over a period of time shows what is happening to poverty in time. The results of the survey under taken by UNCHS (2000 p.20)) in Addis Ababa in the year 2000 indicated that 45.5 % of the sample households had a monthly income of less than 300 birr; almost 33% had a monthly income of 300-800 birr and only 21.7% had a monthly

income of 800 or above. The distribution shows that a large number of people in Addis Ababa have low income.

The distribution of income, though it tells us how much income is available in the hands of households, it does not tell us whether the income is sufficient to meet the expected standard of living or not. In 1992, a World Bank study on urban areas estimated that the poverty line for urban areas is Birr 244 per month for a family of five. More recent studies by Mekonen in 1997, using a cost of basic needs approach found birr 58.61 and birr 96.08 per adult per month to represent food and total poverty line (qtd in UNCHS 2000, p.20). This equals to birr 293.05 and birr 480.4 per month for a family of five adults for food and poverty line respectively.

3.2.2 Employment

Increased labour force is a result of increased population growth and migration. Labor force in the city has grown by 6% between the 1984 and 1994 census. The employed population has grown by 4% in the same period. The unemployment problem in Addis Ababa is very serious and has increased at an alarming rate in recent years. According to Andergachew, in the year 1976, the total unemployment rate was 9.6 per cent (qtd in UNCHS 2000, p.20). In 1984, the unemployment rate was 10.5 per cent and in 1994 the total unemployment sharply rose to 34.7 percent. This is an increase of 24.2 percentage points between the two census periods. The unemployment rate is consistently higher for females than males in both 1984 and 1994.

3.2.3 Land Access

Land access forms an essential element in urban shelter. Urban land in Ethiopia is owned by government. The urban land lease holding regulations (proclamation No3/1994) of the region 14 administration specifies the terms and conditions of acquiring land in the city. The conditions attached to get land restricts access and ownership of land by the poor since potential allottees are expected to pay 250 birr registration fee and a deposit of 20% of the cost of construction. Such conditions are beyond the reach of the urban poor.

3.2.4 Housing Problems

The housing problem in Addis Ababa could be understood in terms of its qualitative and quantitative dimensions (UNCHS 2000, p: 25). The total housing stock in 1995 was 350,000. Of this 112, 000 houses are used for trade and businesses while the remaining 238, 000 houses are used for residential purposes. The housing demand of the 2.3 million people in the city with an average family size of 5 persons is 460,000. This indicates that there is a deficit of 222,000 houses in the city (AA city government, 1997). This shortage could be met by constructing 22, 200 houses each year for 10 consecutive years. This does not include the housing shortage due to population increase in the city.

3. 3 NGOs and Partnership in Poverty Reduction in Addis Ababa

3.3. 1 NGOs' operating environment

As per a document entitled 'Civil Society Organizations' Capacity Building Program Program Design, Zero Draft for Public Consultation' prepared under the auspices of Ministry of Capacity Building (MoCB) there were about 675 registered NGOs in Ethiopia as on 2004, with some 20

percent international. Further, NGOs were unevenly located across the country, with a bias towards the capital city and the relatively more developed regions (MoCB, 2004: 6-23). This document mentions that the SDPRP requires significant increase in the role Civil Society Organizations play in national development. It also mentioned that information gathered showed that a large gap exists between what is needed and what CSOs can presently contribute.

For operating within the City of Addis Ababa, NGOs shall have to fulfil the following requirement to be operational. A valid certificate of registration from the Federal Ministry of Justice (MOJ), a valid operational agreement from the Federal Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC) and a valid operational agreement from the federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs for adoption agencies.

A document entitled 'GO-NGO partnership guideline' sourced through the Addis Ababa City Administration officials provides its various important viewpoints about the partnership. They are listed below for an understanding about the operating environment of NGOs in Addis Ababa. This guideline has very clearly brought about the principles of partnership such as Shared vision and mission, Mutual trusts and confidence, Transparency, accountability and integrity, Complementarity, Legality, Good Governance, Fairness and Equity, Participation and Independence. What this document has to say on mutual trusts and confidence and complementarity show that the Addis Ababa City Administration has clearly understood the basic necessities of the partnership process.

With regard to a key element of partnership, mutual trust, the views of the Addis Ababa City Administration are as follows. “Mutual trust and confidence between NGOs, government partners & the community evolves through relationships between them. Each relationship needs to set out mutual rights and expectations as perceived by the parties involved. This is an exercise where each NGO writes down the right it believes the others to have and the rights it expects to receive” (Article 2.2). This clearly shows that Addis Ababa City Administration has a clear understanding of the needs of the partnership.

This document clearly states that ‘Complementarity is about achieving appropriate synergy between activities and the intended efforts of intervention by NGOs and other development actors. Complementarity is about fusion not a fixed division of labor between different levels of action. Shared appreciation of what each has to bring to the relationship in terms of competencies and comparative advantages, should work against disagreement on roles and division of labour-in addition to creating consistency between the rights and expectations of both parties, which reduces competition or duplication’ (Article 2.4). This view of the Addis Ababa City Administration is matching with the views on partnership between GO and NGOs worldwide.

However the partnership framework presented in the later part of the document betrays the spirit of the earlier parts of the documents. City of Addis Ababa Government Social and NGOs Affairs Office seems to be the major organ of the City Government dealing with the NGOs. Though some of the issues mentioned in this part of the document are favouring the development of GO-NGO partnership, most other elements tend to treat the NGOs as implementing agencies

of development projects and not as development partners. The titles of the major articles of this section of document such as Entry Point and application review, Project formulation, Project appraisal, Project Agreement, Duration and Amendment, Project implementation, Annual plan of operation, Reporting & Feedback, Monitoring and evaluation, Disengagement or Extension and Utilisation and Management of Resources are more or less indicate that the NGOs are treated as only implementing agencies. On the positive side, this document also clearly mentions Facilitation, support and encouragement and Networking as part of the partnership framework. These are conducive for the development of partnership.

Article 16.2 and its sub-articles related to the NGOs Affairs Board Establishment are worth appreciating with regard to development of the partnership between GO and NGOs. Mandate to oversee and follow up the GO-NGO partnership within the Addis Ababa City, representation to NGOs in this board, periodical meeting to review the status of GO-NGO relationship are some of the key elements of this article.

3.3.2 Profile of respondents


A total of 50 questionnaires were distributed for NGOs working in Addis Ababa-of which 43 were returned after duly filled. The target of the research as a respondents were either the Chairman or Program/ Project coordinator or Division head or Public relation of the respective NGOs. The rationality of selecting this target group was that they were expected to know with whom their specific organizations are having partnered.

3.3.3 Roles played by selected Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

3.3.3.1 Service delivery areas of NGOs

NGOs are generally engaged in wide ranging relief, service, development, advocacy, etc. activities. Some are involved in a mixture of these activities whereas some are specifically focused in one or more intervention areas. Service delivery is the most common role of NGOs. The primary services delivered by most NGOs of this study include education and childcare, followed by health care (see figure-1).

Figure 1: NGOs Service Delivery Areas




3.3.3.2 Types of partner organizations for NGOs

As can be observed from the figure 2, about 86% NGOs of this study have other NGOs as their partners for the achievement of their common objectives especially poverty alleviation. The other major development partner of NGOs is the government. Government, as a responsibly body to alleviate poverty, needs the support from other stakeholders too. Thus, 79% of NGOs are

working with government as partners. NGOs are also working in partnership with the segment of the community that they meant to serve and for which they were accountable. The proportion of NGOs that have partnership with the community is 58% followed by the level of partnership among NGOs and CBOs which is 41%. NGOs that had partnership with private sectors constituted only 4%. It has to be noted that some of these NGOs had partnership with multiple stakeholders. From the same figure-2, one can easily observe that private sector organizations did not yet get integrated with NGOs on poverty alleviation from Addis Ababa. At the same time, most of the NGOs were having partnership within themselves and with government.

Figure 2: Types of partner organizations for NGOs




3.3.3.3 Aspects of urban poverty in which NGOs are having partnership

The major aspects of urban poverty in which NGOs are having partnership include education and empowerment that constitute 72% each. This was followed by NGOs working on gender (67%). Still significant proportions of NGOs are working in partnership on child-care that constitutes 65%. Another significant proportion of NGOs are having partnership for employment generation

and health service delivery constituting 65% and 42% respectively. Few NGOs are having partnership on policy making and housing problem intervention that contribute 18.6% and 14% respectively. It could easily be observed from figure-3 that few NGOs are having partnership regarding policy intervention. It has to be noted again that many NGOs are having partnerships on various issues.


Figure-3: Aspects of urban poverty in which NGOs are having partnership



3.3.3.4 Who initiated the partnerships?

As can be seen from figure-4, 72% of NGOs claim that it is their organization which initiated and worked for the development of partnership. It was also reported that 41% of the partnership was developed by their initiative of the other partner in various aspects of poverty reduction. It is 6% of the cases, partnership that was initiated and developed due to the donor agency.

Figure-4: The force behind partnership initiation



3.3.3.5 Nature of partnership among NGOs

About 67.4% of NGOs had formal partnership where by each parties' roles and obligations are spelled out in a written agreement and the rest 32.6% had informal partnership where the roles and obligations were assumed or agreed verbally. That is, they were not legally bound to one another. One can also observe from table 1, that there were no new partnerships that were developed within the last two years. More partnership is recent origin, ranging between 2 and 5 years of age. In addition, from the table one can conclude that the partnerships neither had a long history nor many partnerships are developing in the recent past.

Table 1: The Nature and Duration of Partnership

Duration	NGOs' Nature of Partnership				Total
	Formal		Informal		
	Number	percentage	Number	percentage	
< 2 years	0	-	0	-	0
2-5 years	23	53.5	0	-	23
> 5 years	6	13.9	14	32.6	20
Total	29	67.4	14	32.6	43

3.3.3.6 Rationale/Purposes of the Partnership

Most of the NGOs in Addis Ababa working on the alleviation of poverty prefer to work in partnership. Some of their reasons are: they believed that holistic type of development could be achieved through integrated effort of all stakeholders. That is, one stakeholder only (government for example,) cannot address all aspects of poverty alone for it is of multi-sectoral and multi-faceted, thus required integrated effort. Partnership also enables to pool different types of resources. Sustainability of effort may also be guaranteed, that is if one institution failed to do what it has planned to, it might discontinue its efforts. However, if there were more organizations working on same project: i) they could raise more resources, ii) if one fails to contribute, it does not mean termination of the projects as other partners may pitch in to sustain the project. Thus sustainability could be guaranteed. As can be seen from table 2, the major purposes for partnering of NGOs in Addis Ababa were cost sharing, elimination of duplication, followed by deepening of out reach and increasing efficiency and effectiveness respectively. It is worth noting that these NGOs had indicated more than one benefit of partnership.

Table 2 Purposes of the Partnership

Purposes	Frequency	Percentage
Sharing cost	23	53.5
Eliminate duplication	17	39.5
To deepen out reach	15	34.9
Increase efficiency and effectiveness	6	13.9

3.3.3.7 Role of the organization in partnership

Technical assistance is the backbone (the most common reason) for the creation of most partnership. It applies for 74% of NGOs working in Addis Ababa. Of the NGOs working in Addis Ababa, 44% of their partnership was built on the donor-recipient base. Others have based their partnership on implementation of the intervention intended to be undertaken. This constituted 37% of the NGOs.

3.3.3.8 Types and Extent of partnership

From the table 3, one can observe that among NGOs in Addis Ababa that were assumed to be networked, only 13.9% were sharing resource, which could also imply that there is very little experience of resource sharing. However, sharing of work load constituted 53.5%, which could imply that the extent of their partnership begins and terminates on the stage of planning. That is they come together and decide who has to do what and then they all independently work on their own. They may also integrate on the stage of report writing. That is the sum total of all actors efforts will be integrated at the reporting stage. A little bit less than half (48.8%) of them are engaged in experience exchange while the level of information exchange is only restricted to a quarter (25.6%).

3.3.3.9 Benefits of partnership

About three-fourth of the NGOs replied that the major benefit they gained so far included, enabling to mobilize more resources, experience sharing, and strong advocacy for the poor. The voice of the poor could be heard more, when different institutions come together to amplify than when single institution was responsible. In addition, they could also reach needier than what single institution would have done for a few of them. It enabled NGOs to build their own capacity through trainings of different types and experience exchange held on different issues. The partnership has consolidated the capacity and the voice of the civil society. The level of community participation was increased as a result. In addition, establishment of GO-NGO forum through which a number of constructive dialogues were held, and the establishment of Network of NGOs were among the major benefits. The level of partnership with donor agencies has also improved [joint planning and evaluation].


Table 3 Nature of exercising partnership

Methods of partnering	Number of NGOs	Percentage
Sharing of workload	23	53.5
Experience exchange	21	48.8
Sharing of responsibilities	17	39.5
Information exchange	11	25.6
Sharing of resources	6	13.9
Others	16	37.2

3.3.3.10 Basis for sharing resource

Among those few 13.9% of the total who do share resources, their basis for sharing resource is mostly depends upon previous experiences and on the capacity to implement the intended purposes, constituting 74% and 72% respectively. The financial strength as a base on which one can share resource was also one of the factors for sharing the resources. It has to be borne in mind that there are multiple factors indicated by the NGOs. These factors have been listed as per their overall scores.

Figure-5: Bases for sharing the resources




3.3.3.11 Specific benefit from sharing resource

There are multiple benefits from sharing resources, among which increasing efficiency is the major one. That is, of the 13.9% who do share resources, 93% of them informed that working on partnership has resulted in increased efficiency. This increased efficiency enabled them reduce

time taken for completion and reduction in costs. Resource sharing also enabled them exhaustively use the resources. About 41% of NGOs who do share resources felt that, sharing resources enabled them to exhaustively use their resources. In addition, for 30% and 25% of them responded that, sharing resources has reduced workload and avoided redundancy respectively.

Figure 6: Benefits in sharing resources




3.3.3.12 Major problems in partnership

There are a number of problems that could arise when a number of individuals or institutions work together. The major problem faced among NGOs was the absence of responsible body to strengthen the partnership. It was expressed by 30% of the NGOs of this study. It was followed by lack of partnership culture among institutions at 28% rate. Lack of trust especially for individuals/ institutions working together; in this case was 18%. Some of NGOs were suffering

from lack of trust from their partner. Misuse of resources was another problem that hinders the smooth development of partnership. Once the other partner misused the resource, it would be very hard to work together subsequently. Misuse of resource has hindered the development of partnership among about 11% of NGOs working in Addis Ababa.

Figure-7: Problems hindering the development of partnership




3.3.3.13 How problems were addressed within the partnership?

As can be seen from figure-8, most (60.5%) of the problems that were encountered in the process of partnership were addressed though discussions. Significant proportion (39.5%) remains unresolved. Again, from their response, it was understood that the culture of using arbitration as a means of resolving their problem did not yet developed. In addition, they did not take their cases to the court regardless of the intensity of the cases; rather they prefer to keep silent if not solved between themselves. The suggested solution for the problems faced during resource and

responsibility sharing includes creating more awareness on the essence and importance of partnership and strengthening the financial systems that is strong follow-up and internal audit.

Figure 8: Means of addressing problems among NGOs




3.3.3.14 Articulation and decision making procedure

Most of the NGOs (95%) in partnerships were given equal opportunity for articulating their own view. In decision-making, sometimes in a few cases, one partner dominated the rest of other stakeholders. While still significant proportion 86% was, enabled to participate without discrimination on decisions regarding their common project. A little more than half of the NGOs [58%] confirmed that the partnership was fully utilized for realizing the intended objectives while the rest 41% did not believe that the partnership was fully utilized.

3.3.3.15 Utilization of partnership

There are a number of factors contribute towards the full utilization of partnership. The major factors contributing towards full utilization of partnership were (a) giving full commitment for the objective of the partnership being the major factor 44% followed by mutual trust that constituted 39%. In addition, for 34% of NGOs, mutual understandings among themselves enabled them to fully utilize their partnership.

Figure-9: Factors contributing for full realization of partnership



Despite the fact that there were a number of challenges faced by the partnership, all of the NGOs of this study were very much interested on the continuity of partnership. This implies that regardless of the problems, there was a benefit that outweighs the problems faced due to the partnership.

3.3.3.16 Partnership with government

Only 13.8% of the total networked NGOs had no partnership with government; and the rest 86.2% have got some kind of partnership with government. Once partnership was established, almost there was no probability of ending it. These days governments are favouring free market economy, and letting the other sectors take over some of social services delivery. It is very unlikely that government refuses to work with other sector, given that proper communication and purposes are there. In this case, only 2% of the NGOs approached and failed to develop partnership with regional governments while 4% of the NGOs approached the local governments and failed to develop partnership.

Table 4: Partnership with government

Do you have partnership with government?	Number of NGOs	Percentage
Yes	37	86.2
No	3	6.9
Tried but failed	3	6.9

3.3.3.17 Nature of NGOs' partnership with government

Of the total higher officials of NGOs interviewed, only 6.9% informed that they are sharing resource with government. But significant proportions amounting to 72.1% are working on same project with government.

Table 5: The nature of partnership with government

The extent of partnership with government	Frequency	Percentage
Resource sharing	3	6.9
Working on same project	31	72.1
Government as a facilitator	37	86.1
Others	2	4.7


3.3.3.18 Problems encountered while developing partnership with government

The type of problems faced while developing partnership with government includes mistrust from the government, delayed decisions, inaccessibility of high level officials, and lack of strong partnership and cooperation are among the major ones. In addition, government's and NGOs' working environment and culture have substantial differences. Sometimes, government officials consider themselves as supervisor of every other organization. Lack of clear framework for CSO-government partnership is another problem.

3.3.3. 19 How problems between NGOs and government were addressed?

Problems are inevitable when two or more individuals /institutions work together. However, it should be addressed in one or the other manner. Problems could be addressed in a number of ways, among which: round table discussion, arbitration and the court are the major one. Most of the problems between government and NGOs were addressed through discussion. Only in 14% cases the problems were not yet addressed.

Figure-10: Means of addressing problems between NGOs and Government



3.3.3.20 Participation in policy making

Regarding the participation of NGOs in the process of policy development, 67.4% of them have confirmed that they participate in policy process one way or the other, and the rest 32.6% have not yet started in participating in the policy process. Among who were privileged to participate in policy processes, most of them participated on the stage of formulation and implementation. There are still some few who responded, that they have been participating in all aspects of policy process.

3.4 Summary

This chapter brought out the environment under which the NGOs are operating in Ethiopia in general and Addis Ababa in particular. Though there are initiatives from the Addis Ababa City Government for development of partnership with a few positive appreciations of the benefits of the partnership, to a large extent the NGOs have been confined to the role of partners in

implementing projects. Due to the external stakeholders such as multilateral organizations and donors, the Government is trying to forge partnership with the NGOs. Many of the NGOs operating in Addis Ababa City limits have come together to develop partnership among themselves in the task of poverty alleviation. They have realized the benefits of partnership such as increased efficiency due to reduced cost and elimination of duplication. Nevertheless, they have also faced problems in furthering and sustaining the partnership within themselves and other sectors such as public and private as the building partnerships between various sectors and stakeholders is in an infant stage in this environment.

Chapter Four

Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

Partnerships for urban poverty alleviation between various stakeholders covering a range of actors such as public sector organizations, Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Community Based Organizations (CBOs), Private Sector organizations and local government have become an essential condition. There is a realization that players from either of these sectors alone will not in a position to alleviate poverty as there is a growing realization that poverty is multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral in nature. The present research tried to explore the partnerships that exist among NGOs themselves as well as the partnership they have with government and other stakeholders for urban poverty alleviation in Addis Ababa.

In undertaking this research, a total of 50 questionnaires were distributed for NGOs working in Addis Ababa. Of the distributed questionnaires 43 were duly returned after filling up. The target of the research was higher officials from respective NGOs for they could know the type and nature of partners' organizations their respective organizations have. In addition, information was collected from various institutions of Addis Ababa City Administration and documents and reports of various organizations were used. To some extent, information was collected from the websites of various organizations as well.

In Addis Ababa, there are more than 150 NGOs working to alleviate poverty. They are engaged in diversity of services like education, health care, and child care among others. Most of NGOs have formal partnership where by each party's roles and obligations are spelt out in a written agreement, while some other NGOs have informal partnership where roles and obligations of each are assumed or agreed verbally. That is, they are not legally bound to one another. The phenomenon of formal partnership is new. That is, formal partnership in poverty alleviation is of recent phenomenon of just five years old. However, the findings show that within the recent two years, there were no new partnerships being developed among NGOs working in Addis Ababa.

The major purpose of NGOs for being partnered includes, consolidating the voice of the poor and incorporating their feelings in the policy process. It also enables them to pool resources of different types. In addition to the reduction of duplication of efforts, it also deepens the outreach to the needy.

Though there are a couple of networks for NGOs working in Addis Ababa, only few of them share their resources. That is their partnership was limited to things like experience exchange, sharing of their workload, information exchange and the like.

The major problems that hinder the smooth development of partnership among NGOs includes but not limited to: communication gap, lack of trust among the groups, misuse of resource, and lack of partnership culture. These problems were also seen on the partnership that exists between government and NGOs. In addition, delayed decisions- bureaucratic red tape, inaccessibility of higher level officials, the difference in the culture

and working environment of government and the NGOs were some of the problems that hindered the development of smooth partnership between the two. Sometimes government officials consider themselves as superiors of every other organization. The focus of these partnerships between the Government and Non-Government Organizations seems to be restricted to project implementation.

Based on the information made available by the NGOs and the review of the policy documents on GO-NGO partnership, it could be concluded that NGOs have been considered as minor partners and the Government had an upper hand in deciding policy priorities and development issues. Added to that the operating environment of NGOs in Ethiopia in general and in Addis Ababa in particular seems to be a hindrance in development of partnership with the Government. Further, the private sector seems to be in a nascent stage. Though the views of the private sector have been sought on the poverty alleviation policies, the partnership between private and public sectors and partnership between private and non-profit sectors have not yet developed to the desirable extent. In general, the sum total of the above mentioned problems hindered flourishing of partnership among NGOs themselves as well as their partnership with government.

In the process of policy development, about three-fourth (67.4%) of the NGOs working in Addis Ababa were given an opportunity to participate in policy in one or the other way. Of this, most of them were given an opportunity to participate on formulation and implementation stage.

4.2 Recommendations

This sub-section presents possible options that might be applied as solutions to the problems identified in the smooth development of partnership among NGOs themselves and their partnership with the government in Addis Ababa. The bases of the recommendations are the conclusions of this study.

Partnership should be based upon on the free will and full commitments from the partners. Formulation of common objectives and the strategies could contributes a lot for the development of partnership. The base for partnership among NGOs, should start from formulation of common objective that is sharing common mission, vision and goal. The strategy through which the objectives accomplished should also be designed in the presence of all stakeholders. Having regular dialogue in which mutual respect and equal rights were granted is another important feature in which partnership should develop.

With the existing scarce resources, no one organization can be able to alleviate the diversified problems. Since the matter of poverty is not only a concern of government, all actors that have a role in poverty alleviation should act upon in a harmonized manner. That is, the objective of poverty alleviation could be achieved if all stakeholders complement one another and act as one whole.

Efforts have to be made by stakeholders belonging to various sectors to come to an understanding on the policies and projects related to poverty alleviation. Perfunctory consultations and participation of window-dressing type due to the pressures exerted by the external stakeholders covering multilateral organizations and donors can only help in

the initiation of the partnership process. To develop and strengthen partnership between NGOs, it would be better to start from problem identification so that they all set the objectives and design the strategy together. Formation of partnerships with various stakeholders representing the communities themselves and the different sectors right from the beginning would be necessary in this context. To address the problems of the poor, the Government and NGOs should assess the needs of the communities they wish to serve. In this case, the poor themselves should participate on the objective setting as well as on the designing of the means of addressing the problems.

To strengthen the level of partnership between NGOs, they should address the barriers that hinder the flourishing out of their partnership. The major ones include communication gap, lack of trust and misuse of resources. Communication gap could be cleared either by discussion or by checking the sources of the communication gaps. Trust could be developed by demonstrating the commitment to the causes. Strictly adhering to the code of ethics and conduct developed by the NGOs themselves should facilitate development of trust among themselves. This would incite various other organizations to seek partnership with them. Whenever there is a problem of perceived misuse of resources by the partners, there should be mechanisms to address them. Discontinuing the partnerships without taking efforts to resolve the differences might result in damage to the reputation of the sector. Possibilities for misuse of resources could be eliminated by having regular review of the implementation and by close coordination in all aspects related to the partnership rather than having partnership in sharing the work load or resources.

The public sector organizations have to provide a facilitating environment for development of partnership among various sectors for poverty alleviation. They have to address various problems faced by the NGOs while they undertake the projects focusing on the poverty alleviation. In addition to the present situation of providing representation to their views by accommodating their members in various committees, serious efforts have to be made to demonstrate that the governments are very much interested in forging an effective and lasting partnership with them. The legal environment for the development and functioning of the partnerships has to be made much more appealing than hitherto.

Unresolved problems in the partnership should be better solved within a short period of time as possible through discussions and if that is not possible through arbitration. Only when both means fail to redress the situation, such issues should be finally taken to institutions of justice than leaving the differences to persist and damage the partnership in the long run. Once the differences are resolved, it could still be possible to continue or re-establish new partnership. Efforts should be made to integrate the private sector as well in the efforts towards poverty reduction. At present, the private sector operates independently to a large extent without having a substantial partnership role in poverty reduction. A multi-sector partnership in the policy making aspects of the poverty reduction has to be started and this might lead in concerted efforts to alleviate poverty.

Finally, to enhance partnership for the purposes of poverty alleviation, and to end up with poverty, all partners should be committed, and trust worthy for the society they serve.

Bibliography/References

Abbi Mamo Kedir, (2005); Understanding urban chronic poverty: crossing the qualitative and quantitative divide, **Environment and Urbanization**.

Adil Najam, (2000) **The Four-C's of Third Sector– Government Relations Cooperation, Confrontation, Complementarity, and Co-optation, Nonprofit Management & Leadership**, (10): 4

Akalu Paulose (2000), Partnership for Poverty Reduction: The Case of Action Aid Ethiopia. A Paper Presented at the Fourth World Bank Conference on; “Evaluation and Development: The Partnership Dimension” from 23-24 July 2001 in Washington DC. USA, accessed on June 17 2007- <http://www.worldbank.org/html/oed/partnershipconference/akalu-paulos-tumebo.pdf>.

Andreas Lienhard, (2006) **Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Switzerland: Experiences—risks—potentials**, International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

Association of German Development NGOs (VENRO) (2005), Country Profile: Ethiopia, <http://www.prsp-watch.de/index.php?page=countries/ethiopia.php>. Accessed on 25 June 2007.

Brian Evans, 2005, (6) **Partnership Design for Metropolitan Governments**, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Brihanu Lodamo, (2006) **Low Cost Housing Technology**, Addis Ababa City Government, Information and Culture Bureau, Addis Ababa.

Brinkerhoff M. Jennifer (2002), **Government–Nonprofit Partnership: A Defining Framework, Public Administration Development**, George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA (22): 19–30, or see: (www.interscience.wiley.com)

Chris A. Spohr (2006), **Poverty Reduction in a New Era: Government-NGO Partnerships in the People's Republic of China and Global Experience**, Social Sector Economist, Beijing

Connor, A Joseph;Kadal-Taras, Stephanie and Vinokur-Kaplan, Diane (1999), **The Role of Nonprofit Management Support Organizations in sustaining Community Collaborations**, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 10(2): 127-136

David Hall, Jane Lethbridge, Emanuele Lobina, (2005), **Public–public partnerships in health and essential services**, Public Services International Research Unit, University of Greenwich.

Derick W. Brinkerhoff, (1998), **State-Civil Society Partnerships For Policy Advocacy And Implementation In Developing Countries**, Working Paper (12): 4 A publication of USAID's Implementing Policy Change Project

Diana Mitlin, 1999, **Civil Society and Urban Poverty**, International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Diana Mitlin, (2000), **Civil society and urban poverty –Overview of Stage One City Case Studies**, The University Of Birmingham, accessed from http://www.idd.bham.ac.uk/research/Projects/urbangovernance/resource_papers/crosscity_analysis/civilsociety_pov.pdf.

Diana Mitlin (2001), **Civil society and urban poverty - examining complexity**, *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(2): accessed from <http://eau.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/13/2/152.pdf>.

Diana Mitlin (2005), **Chronic Poverty in Urban Areas**; *Environment and Urbanization*, 17: 3

Elijah, Agevi, (2002), **Partnership Development in Urban poverty Alleviation** *Environment and Urbanization* (23): 31

Ellen, Wratten (1995), **Conceptualizing Urban Poverty**, *Environment and Urbanization*; (7): 11

Falk, Flo and Smith, Anne (2000), **The Partnership Handbook**, Labour Market Learning and Development Unit, Human Resource Development Canada, (HRDC), Qubec, Ministry of Public Works and Government Canada.

Falk, Gertrud and Eberlie, Walter (2003), **Civil Society involvement in PRS process, The gap between claims and reality, In Wardenbach Klaus (ed), PRSP-Prospects and Limits of civil society involvement**, Bonn.

Faye, Jackson; Dinkar Rachana, Hall; and Agnes, DeFranco (2005), **Collaborative Partnerships in Urban Environment: working together to benefit all**, International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 17(7): 600-613.

Gray. B (1985), **Conditions Facilitating Inter-organizational Collaboration**, Human Relations, 38(10): 911-936.

Gary, Noble And Robert Jones, (2006), **The Role Of Boundary-Spanning Managers In The Establishment Of Public-Private Partnerships**, Public Administration (84):4

<http://www.childreninwales.org.uk/2157.html>, -Accessed on June 22, 2007.

http://www.netaid.org/global_poverty/global-poverty/ -Accessed on 22, 2007

<http://www.seasite.niu.edu/lao/undp/whatisPartnership.htm>- Accessed on 28, 2007

Jane, Nelson and Dave, Prescott (2003), **Business and the Millennium Development Goals: A Framework for Action**. The International Business Leaders Forum, United Nations Development Programme

Jenny J Bryant-Tokalau, (1995), **The myth exploded: urban poverty in the Pacific**, Environment and Urbanization,

John Wiley, 2001, **Governance and Civil Engagement: Urban Economies, Poverty and Civil Society**; J. Int. Dev. 13, 985-988, Department of City and Regional Planning, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK.

José Antonio Mejía and Rob Vós, (1997), **Poverty in Latin America and the Caribbean. An Inventory: 1980-95**, Working Paper Series I-4, Washington, D.C.

Kapucu, Naim (2006), **Public-Nonprofit Partnerships for Collective Action in Dynamic Context of Emergencies**, Public Administration, 84(1): 205-220.

Mendel, Stuart (2003), **The Ecology of Games between Public Policy and Private Action; Nonprofit Community Organizations as Bridging and Mediating Institutions**, Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 13(3): 229-236.

Michael Porter (2002), **“Tomorrow’s Markets”**, Harvard Business School (WRI, WBCSD AND UNEP,)

Mulry, Elizabeth (2003), **Community as a factor in Implementing International Partnerships: Issues, Constrains and Adoptions**, Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 14(1): 47-66

Pongsiri, Nutavoot (2002), **Regulation and Public-Private Partnerships**, The International Journal of Public Sector Management, Manchester, UK. (15): 6

Peter Sutherland (2000), **“The Business Of Peace”**, IBLF, With International Alert And CEP.

Philippa Bevan (1997) **Poverty in Ethiopia**, Prepared for the Overseas Development Administration, UK

Rose, Tennyson (2003), **the Partnering toolbook**,. The International Business Leaders Forum (IBLF) and the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN)

Shipra Maitra, (2002)**Public-Private Partnership in Basic Service Delivery Women Empowerment Programmes In Delhi**, IHE, New Delhi

Shyam S. Dutta, (2000), **Partnerships in urban development: a review of Ahmedabad's experience**, Environment & Urbanization (12): 1

Stefan, Dercon (1997), **Poverty and Deprivation in Ethiopia**, Centre for the Study of African Economies, Oxford University

Swarbrik, Alex (2004), **People in Partnership: HR in NGO relationships**, London, People in aid.

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements UNCHS (Habitat) (2000), **An Overview Of Urban Poverty In Addis Ababa**, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Uphoff, Norman and Krishna, Anirudh (2004), **Civil Society and Public Sector Institutions: More than a Zero-Sum Relationship**, Public Administration and Development, 24, 357-372.

Wiley, John (2001), **Governance and Civil Engagement: Urban Economics, Poverty and Civil Society**; Journal of International Development. 13, 985-988

World Development Report (2001), **Attacking Poverty**, Published For the World Bank, Oxford University Press.

Annexure: Questionnaire

Addis Ababa University
Faculty of Business and Economics
Department of Public Administration and Development Management

May 13, 2007

Dear Sir/madam,

I am undertaking research on **"Non Governmental Organizations' Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation in Addis Ababa "** as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for Masters of Public Administration (MPA) of Addis Ababa University. In that context, I would like to collect relevant information from knowledgeable persons like you. I believe that the results of the study would bring out the different dimensions of partnership between the various stakeholders belonging to different sectors and result in the strengthening of these partnerships.

The information to be provided by you would be kept confidential and used for academic purpose only. I believe that the results of the study can be useful for all the stakeholders as well as for any interested group who are working to improve the partnerships in urban poverty alleviation.

I thank you for your kind cooperation.

Gutata Goshu

General instructions

- 1 This questionnaire consists of three sections.
- 2 For some of the questions, response choices have been provided. You can make a tick mark (✓) against the appropriate response choice.
- 3 For some questions, it may be possible that you select more than one response choice
- 4 In case of some other questions, where you do not find appropriate response choice, select the response choice "Others" and specify that.
- 5 Further, some questions need to be answered in your own words and response choices have not been provided for them

Section I: Organizational Background & partnership in general

1. Classify your organization among the following categories
 - Government
 - Civil Society Organization (NGOs/ CBOs)
 - Private Sector
 - Others (Specify) _____
2. Which aspect (area of specialization) of urban poverty are you trying to alleviate? (It is possible to select more than one response choice)
 - Employment Generation
 - Housing
 - Health
 - Education
 - Empowerment
 - Policy Making
 - Child care
 - Gender
 - Others (Specify) _____
3. What type of organization is/are your partner(s)? (It is possible to select more than one response choice) .
 - Non Government Organizations (NGOs)
 - Community Based Organizations (CBOs)
 - Government
 - Private sector
 - The community
 - Other (specify) _____

4. What are the aspects of urban poverty in which you are having partnership? (It is possible to select more than one response choice)

- Employment Generation
- Housing problem
- Health
- Education
- Empowerment
- Policy Making
- Gender
- Child care
- Others (Specify) _____

5. Who initiated the partnership?

- The other partner
- Our organization
- Government
- Donor driven
- Others (specify) _____

6. What is the nature of partnership between you and these organizations in urban poverty alleviation?

- Formal- where each party's roles and obligations are spelled out in a written agreement
- Informal-where the roles and obligations are assumed or agreed verbally
- Others (Specify) _____

7. When was the partnership established?

- Less than two years
- Two to five years
- More than five years

8. What was the starting point for partnership?

- Problem identification
- Project planning
- Implementation
- Evaluation
- Others (specify) _____

9. For what purpose(s) the partnership was established? (You can select more than one response choice)

- To share cost-otherwise we cannot afford to implement by ourselves
- To eliminate redundancy/duplication
- To increase efficiency and effectiveness
- To increase/deepen our outreach
- Others (Specify) _____

10. What is the role of your organization in the partnership? (You can select more than one response choice)

- Funding
- Technical assistance
- Implementation of the intervention project
- Other (Specify) _____

11. Why did you choose to work in partnership on matters of urban poverty?

12. How do you exercise the partnership? (You can select more than one response choice)

- Sharing of responsibilities
- Sharing resources
- Sharing work load
- Experience exchange
- Information exchange
- Other Specify _____

13. What are the benefits of the partnership so far?

14. What are the limitations/problems of the partnership so far? Specify if there is any.

15. What positive changes did you observe so far?

16. What negative changes did you observe since the partnership?

17. What was the procedure followed in sharing the resources? (If you do, if not skip to Q22)

- It is based on the capacity to implement
- Based on financial bases strength/weakness
- Previous experience of the organization/institution
- Others (specify) _____

18. What specific benefit was there in sharing the resources?

- Increasing efficiency
- Reduction of cost-or reduction of misuse
- Avoidance of redundancy
- Exhaustively using the resource
- Reduced the time of completion of the project
- Reduced the workload
- Other (specify) _____

19. What kinds of problems were faced in sharing the resources and responsibilities?

20. How these problems were addressed? If there was any.

- Through discussion
- Arbitration
- Court
- Not addressed

Other (specify) _____

21. Do you have any suggestion/recommendation to overcome the problems?

22. To what level did each party participate in articulating their own view?

- Equal opportunity for all participants-consensus based
- Dominance of one over the others
- Proportional to the level of contribution
- No participation-decisions comes elsewhere
- Others (Specify) _____

23. To what level did each party contribute in decision making?

- Equal right for all participants-consensus based
- Dominance of one over the others
- Proportional to the level of contribution
- No participation-decisions comes elsewhere
- Others (Specify) _____

24. If there is a dominant partner, what was the basis for that?

- It's a funding agency
- It's a government body
- They have more professionals than ours
- They have lobbying capacity
- Other (Specify) _____

25. From your experience, what was the major achievement earned from the partnership until now?

26. How did the partnership benefit the urban poor?

27. Do you believe that the partnership has been fully utilized for the intended purpose?

- Yes
- No

28. If the partnership has not been fully utilized, what are those problems that you believe hindered in achieving the expected outcomes?

- There is no responsible body to strengthen the partnership
- Communication gap-misunderstanding
- Lack of trust among member groups
- Misuse of resource
- Lack of partnership culture (lack of experience in working together)
- Other (Specify) _____

29. If the partnership has been fully utilized, what are those major factors contributing for the achievement of the purpose?

- Full commitment among member groups
- Mutual understanding
- Mutual trust among member groups
- Others (Specify) _____

30. Do you believe in the continuity of partnership?

- Yes
- No

31. If you do believe on the continuity of the existing partnership, what are the reasons?

32. If you do **not** believe on the continuity of the existing partnership, what are the major reasons?

- We did not accomplish our purpose
- Our resources was misused
- There was misunderstanding and conflicts
- Delay in project completion
- Other (Specify) _____

33. What do you recommend as a base on which to create and develop smooth partnership for successful accomplishment of the poverty alleviation?

Section II: Partnership with Government

34. Does this organization specifically have a partnership with government on matters of urban poverty alleviation?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Tried, but failed
- D. We used to have but not anymore.

35. If your answer to Q23 is either "C" or "D" what was the reason?

36. If you have tried to create partnership with government, and eventually failed, please specify the level of government with which your organization has tried to create partnership? (You may select more than one response choice, if applicable)

- Federal Government
- Regional Government
- Local Government

37. If your organization is not having any partnership with government, please specify whether you have felt the need for having partnership with government?

- Yes
- No

38. If you are having some kind of partnership with government, to what extent does it stretch?

- Resource sharing
- Working on the same project
- Government as a facilitator of our action
- Other (Specify) _____

39. What kinds of problems were faced while developing the partnership with the Government? (If there is any)

46. If you are allowed/given an opportunity to participate in policy issue, at which stage in the process do you have a say?

- Formulation stage
- Implementation stage
- Evaluation stage
- Others (Specify) _____

47. If your organization is/was allowed to participate on policy issue, how do you do it?

- Framing the policy together with government
- Providing a policy option
- Commenting on the policy draft before it becomes effective
- Other (specify) _____

48. If you are participating on policy issues regarding urban poverty, was there any problem faced in the process?

- Yes
- No

49. If you have faced some kinds of problem during the process of policy development, how do you describe them?

50. How did you solve the problem(s) if you have faced in the process of policy development?

51. What do you recommend/suggest on the process as to how to develop a pro-poor policy?

Thank You!

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

The thesis on '**Non Governmental Organizations' Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation in Addis Ababa**' is my original work. It has not been presented for a degree in any university and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Addis Ababa
12 July 2007



V Venkatakrisnan
Advisor



Gutata Goshu