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Conclusions and Recommendations

In this concluding chapter, we present the theoretical and empirical conclusions. Based on our study findings, we give recommendations for enhancing partnerships and suggest areas for further research.

8.1 Summary of major conclusions

8.1.1 Theoretical conclusions

There are two approaches that have been used to analyse urban environmental management issues and responses: the top-down, public management perspective and the bottom-up, community/local action perspective. Our study identified two types of partnerships: those that are process-type partnerships and address issues that are citywide. These kinds of partnerships use the top-down approach and are policy-oriented. The top-down partnerships lay much emphasis on the process, focusing on institutional reform. These partnerships originate from the public sector reform as a result of an official policy and/or a response to donor pressure. There also are partnerships that are deliberately based on social mobilisation and emphasis on community action. They are bottom-up partnerships engaging in local actions at the community or neighbourhood levels. Most of these partnerships focus on substantive outcomes and are concentrated in the low-income neighbourhoods. These partnerships originate from the residents out of some specific felt needs and are supported and implemented through community organisations and nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) and other partners. The partnerships that we analysed under the Local Agenda 21 (LA 21) process are partly related to the process, while we observed localised and spontaneous action-oriented partnerships in the low-income areas. A significant finding was the real gap between community-based partnership initiatives and the national and international policy setting. While local level partnerships are often very successful at addressing immediate problems, they often lack mechanisms to influence or change national policies that may have led to the problems in the first place. More attention needs to be paid to learning how community-based initiatives can leverage policy change.

Most of the literature on typologies of partnerships has often been organised around the types and numbers of actors in the partnerships (NGO/government/business). In this study, the examples discussed have shown that partnerships can be better classified by the work being undertaken and the desired outcomes of the partnerships. These examples therefore provide the beginnings of a partnership typology based on the scale and nature of the work rather than by sectors and organisations.
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**Process-type and top-down partnerships**
Public sector partnerships have been involved in the process-type partnerships aimed at reforming public policy. They possess the much required political support and official backing, though these partnerships have few substantive outcomes. The partnerships also tend to focus on the citywide interventions, and participating organisations take long to reach agreed modes of operation. We note that such partnerships are important as they address issues of public interest and ensure that there is coordination between government departments and agencies at the same level of government. Public sector partnerships are necessary structures for encouraging other forms of partnerships such as the public private partnerships.

**Action-oriented, localised and bottom-up partnerships**
One of the major conclusions drawn from the literature on local level environmental initiatives is that communities in the developing countries have done much to improve the quality of life in liveability of cities than other actors, including the government. Communities are able to mobilise a wealth of resources through their organisations, based on existing social networks, as is apparent in many examples of what organised people have been able to achieve (ibid.). However, for communities to succeed in their collective activities, they need to collaborate with other actors. Most of the analyses that have been done on community organisation have been done with respect to community-based organisations and our study has shown that these community-based organisations (CBOs) are concentrated in low-income areas or deprived neighbourhoods and that they are not always representative. They tend to address interests of specific classes of residents. Despite the bias in the composition of the CBOs, their activities benefit other residents in terms of, for example, cleaner and liveable neighbourhoods free of garbage.

Our findings have shown that not all citizens and communities have the intentions, abilities and/or resources to take on the responsibilities that partnerships entail, therefore thus the state should retain such mechanisms as ‘safety nets’ and compensatory mechanisms to protect the least active citizens and communities. We observe that citizens, communities and other actors from the popular sector cannot simply be left to go ‘their own way’ within a partnership, but that they need to be linked with other actors to achieve meaningful results. The virtual absence of the public sector in the community/local partnership arrangements is problematic in various ways. First, there is no actor that protects the interests of those excluded from the partnering. Second, there is no actor that protects the wider public interests or negative spin-off for neighbouring communities or for overall public health or environmental hazards that may result from local action. Another issue that we need to highlight here is that an increase of the local dimension in new partnerships
arrangements gives rise to complicated problems of coordination. This implies that the state has a key role to play in the delivery of strategic policy and governmental coordination. To make local action have more impact, it is often necessary to link it to other actions since there are limits to local actions. Further, for purposes of up scaling local action, the public sector becomes a crucial partner.

8.1.2 Re-defining partnerships

From the existing literature on partnerships, definitions of what constitute partnerships in urban environmental management are characteristically generalised and at times non-existent. However, various attempts have been made to come up with definitions that are specific to local situations, the actors themselves and the overall government policy. Given the various definitions that have been given in literature and those that were adopted for this study, we conclude that, indeed, the partnerships studied involve two or more actors. Most of the partnerships analysed had an enduring relationship guided by written agreements for instance, contracts, memoranda of understandings or urban pacts and commitment documents. Others were based on verbal agreements and on mutual trust for example those between the water vendors and households; those between waste pickers and waste buyers. Another aspect, which has been mentioned in literature is that all the participating actors in any partnership we analysed brought something to the partnership - both tangible and intangible contributions - and that they expect to get something out of the partnership activities. All the partnerships analysed had concrete activities and were all meant to serve a public interest. Several partnerships were involved in the joint development of action plans and had income-generating activities to implement the action plans. Concerning the different contributions that each partner puts into the partnership arrangement, they were of a different nature, ranging from financial capital to organisational, social, political and cultural capital. It was difficult, though, to quantify contributions of some partners in real terms.

Based on the results of our study, a partnership can thus be defined as typically two or more organisations working together to accomplish specific goals and objectives (which is more than simply networking for the sake of knowledge exchange); with decision-making shared among the partners (which goes beyond the contracting relationship); and with resources shared and leveraged (which goes beyond simple collaboration on a piece of work). But key to this is the ‘compelling motive’ – a felt need, an external driver, champion or challenge that organisations believe can only be addressed through actors working together. Partnership for the sake of partnership will not lead to outcomes or solutions. In our definition we need to capture the issue of voluntary collaboration. Partners therefore work hard to identify, clarify and understand the expectations of each partner and for the work they undertake collectively.
Conclusions on goals and obligations of partnerships

In conclusions, it is important to note that partnership arrangements are complex, operating along four distinct, but necessarily interactive, dimensions: (a) instrumental goals, i.e. what the relationship is expecting to do or produce; (b) maintenance goals, i.e. what holds the relationship itself together; (c) structures or the mechanisms available to set up and manage its activities; and (d) processes, i.e. how it decides, implements activities and sustains itself. Coupled with an often fluid, voluntary and geographically separated membership, such partnerships are also relatively unpredictable social arrangements. Indeed, effective partnerships are inherently flexible ones and those that are able to adapt to shifting internal and external environments. For the same reasons, any partnership has at least two sets of obligations: task-related – to produce better products – and organic – to mature a culture of trust and mutual respect, with partners communicating, exchanging and negotiating.

Partnerships are ultimately most sustainable when they reinforce the organic qualities, to:
(a) generate ownership, creating a shared identity around a common purpose to work with (not just for) the arrangement, ensuring members something meaningful to do together better than each would be able to do alone and helping them to grow and learn as individuals and collaborators;
(b) accept, seek out and make effective use of member diversities, while creating a culture of negotiation and cooperation;
(c) recognise that it is the individual that enter into a partnership, but that the organisation is key to providing an enabling environment;
(d) monitor and adapt to changing circumstances, within and outside the arrangement;
(e) accept a maturation process, which is gradual and meandering, practicing patience and tolerance for often ambiguous outcomes.

8.1.3 Empirical conclusions

We found that the field of partnerships for sustainable development is still fairly new, and that existing research and case studies exist only for the last decade or so, making it difficult to assess and draw conclusions with some measure of rigor and validity. This is an experimental field, full of opportunities for innovation. But if we believe that we must work together to move towards sustainability, it becomes all the more imperative that we learn how to work together. We need to compile and analyse the lessons learned on good partnership practice and further monitor the new partnership initiatives. Table 8.1 gives a summary of the characteristics of partnership arrangements that were discussed in chapter 6 and 7.
### Table 8.1 Comparing the components of partnership arrangements (experiences versus components)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Public/private</th>
<th>Private/individual</th>
<th>Public/civil society/external agencies</th>
<th>LA partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims and objectives</strong></td>
<td>clear/ but some clear uncertain</td>
<td>clear/ but some specific/ localised</td>
<td>clear and achievable many and localised</td>
<td>clear/achievable many and ambitious (planning, waste minimisation, development control, water supply)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>citywide and specific (water quality control) (waste minimisation and pollution control)</td>
<td>specific and city wide</td>
<td>specific/ localised (water supply and waste collection, minimisation and recycling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of intervention</strong></td>
<td>city-wide and regional</td>
<td>city-wide</td>
<td>selective neighbourhoods</td>
<td>neighbourhoods and community-based</td>
<td>city-wide/ localised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership-type</strong></td>
<td>top-down</td>
<td>top-down</td>
<td>bottom-up/ vertical</td>
<td>bottom-up</td>
<td>mixed top/ bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td>only public sector (exclusive)</td>
<td>formal public/private (exclusive)</td>
<td>private companies, water vendors, households waste pickers/buyers (not fully inclusive)</td>
<td>local authority, NGOs, CBOs, external agencies</td>
<td>government, local authorities, external agencies, CBOs, NGOs, Private sector, Universities (all inclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor's role</strong></td>
<td>defined</td>
<td>defined, fixed</td>
<td>defined, flexible</td>
<td>defined, multiple and flexible</td>
<td>defined, flexible and multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of relationships</strong></td>
<td>formalised through contracts</td>
<td>formal through MoUs/unbinding</td>
<td>contracts/informal based on trust</td>
<td>MoUs/unbinding and based on trust</td>
<td>urban pacts and commitment documents/unbinding expertise, financial capital, financial management, consultation, research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input of actors</strong></td>
<td>financial, management</td>
<td>financial, monitoring</td>
<td>labour, financial</td>
<td>labour, social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial arrangement</strong></td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>present but unclear</td>
<td>present but uncertain</td>
<td>present/CBOs weak</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and present but evaluation</strong></td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>present but unclear</td>
<td>present but uncertain</td>
<td>present but unclear</td>
<td>present and clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We observe that the role played by the Municipal Council Nakuru (MCN) in environmental management indicates the extraordinary complexity in the decision-making process. We note that other governmental actors in Nakuru can lead to confusion because of poor communication, lack of coordination and the tendency to adopt a sectoral approach. This is a major challenge to urban environmental governance and there is need for a new approach. There is the prevailing view that the MCN should be responsible for the provision of urban basic services. Its weak revenue base and the fact that many households do not pay taxes support this attitude. This depicts lack of civic responsibility that is usually seen as a prerequisite for successful collective action.

Most responses to poor environmental conditions involve collaboration between various actors: households as members of CBOs, CBOs that need to call upon the MCN for legal and technical backing and on external donors for funding, NGOs that always work with other actors and the private sector offering service where it is lacking. This means that most environmental action is always a matter of partnering. Collective action seems to rest on the dedication and enthusiasm of a rather limited group of people. Most tenants are not motivated to engage in collective action and this is a serious bottleneck. This raises issues of the difficulties of mobilising community members in low-income settlements. Many informal operators are involved in urban environmental service delivery, though they do not get the appropriate backing. Even CBOs and NGOs seem to be reluctant to engage the informal actors. We contend that the roles played by the informal sector, though fragmented, need to be recognised and supported. In the following section we give conclusions on the specific preconditions for effective partnering.

**Preconditions for partnerships**
A general conclusion that we come to for all the partnerships that we studied is that actors are able to pool their limited expertise and resources to address a common aim and objective. They represent a broad coalition among the public, private and voluntary sectors and can therefore develop more confidence and command more respect and resources than any actor working alone. There is, however, need for new rules and regulations and at times guidelines to support the partnering process. For partnerships to function and be effective, our study has shown that there are preconditions that need to be fulfilled. In all, we can conclude that the memorandums of understanding (MoU), contracts, urban pacts and commitment documents greatly benefit partnerships, clarifying roles and responsibilities and underpinning the governance structures. Well-thought-out governance structures can provide transparency to the partnerships, enhancing their legitimacy and effectiveness, improve accountability and also help redress some of the typical imbalances of power relations between partners from different sectors.
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First, there is the issue of appropriate legislation to support the formation and registration of all partnership initiatives. All the stages of partnership formation from the experimental stage to the operational stage must be supported by appropriate rules and regulations. However, even where these rules and regulations exist, they need to be adequately enforced and this is determined by another precondition.

Secondly, the organisational structure of the public sector should be revised to create an enabling environment and appropriate institutional frameworks that will encourage the formation and functioning of partnership arrangements. The public sector also needs to be reorganised to be able to work together with a wide array of actors and be able to monitor the process and outcomes of partnership arrangements. There is need to change the mentality of the public sector actors in a way that they can be able to effectively work with other actors and even accept any positions within a partnership activity. They therefore need to adopt a collaborative mind-set as they are no longer able to deliver on their own.

Thirdly, all partnerships have to address a specific felt need and the specific objectives should address these needs. Successful partnerships, as seen from our analysis, are those that have clear, short term, localised and achievable objectives.

Fourth, there is need for the existence of a champion within the partnering institutions. In Nakuru, such champions include WWF and the United Nation Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS). However, existence of a champion is a necessary but not sufficient precondition and all partnerships must ensure that there is commitment at the institutional level. If this precondition is not met, changes in personnel can be a destabilising factor for the partnership, as we observed in the LA 21 partnerships.

Fifth, political will is required from local, regional and central government. The case presented on the water company – Nakuru Quality Water and Sanitation Services (NAQWASS) – indicates that where there is lack of political support and will, any partnership arrangement, even with very good intentions, will not operate. Partnerships for urban environmental management operate in a political environment and when they are not politically supported, it is difficult for them to be functional.

Finally, one of the factors important for partnerships efficiency is accountability. Accountability is determined by the rate of information flow and exchange among partners. These stand out to be important conditions to enhance the trust and mutual understanding that are critical for any partnership arrangement. In the partnerships that we have studied, partners mentioned that lack of information flow and
exchange between the partnering organisations and actors led to misrepresentation of crucial facts. Most of the partnership initiatives that are being undertaken in Nakuru will take a long time for their impacts to be felt. For instance, within the PRTR initiative, partners need to know that the impacts of pollution control will take a long time to be seen.

Conclusions on identified partnership arrangements
A specific conclusion that we draw from the studied example of the public sector partnerships is that there is no institutional framework for collaborating stakeholders, and this affects the effectiveness of the Water Quality Testing Laboratory (WQTL). The key actors in this partnership have taken too long to agree on a joint memorandum of understanding, spelling out the roles and responsibilities of each other. The major issue that is hindering consensus seems to be who should claim ownership of the laboratory facility, and who should provide financial and logistic support for its operation. This clearly shows the ineffectiveness of the public sector organisations and it has more to do with lack of accountability.

From the discussion of two examples of public/private partnership arrangements, we conclude that there is lack of an effective legal framework to support and guide the new partnerships. The existing agreements are not effective in guiding the day-to-day operations and functions of the joint initiatives. As previously mentioned, there is need for the participating institutions to define their expectations from the onset and to have flexible work plans.

From our analysis of the private-private partnership arrangements we conclude that, although they are based on some formal contracts, there is need for the public sector to come in as a partner at a distance to ensure that specific rules and regulations are followed. We noted there is the tendency of the private service providers to deal with only those who are able to pay for the services, leaving out poor households who are not able to pay. There are also tendencies of exploitation because of the power relations between the partners. Regarding the process of partnering we conclude that while formal structures should be developed (including partnership agreements, contracts, pacts, commitment documents and memoranda of understanding) our study has shown that these must be sufficiently flexible. This is to adapt to changes in context (such as a change in government or economic situations), learning processes, staffing and degree of success. All the MoUs and other documents should be rigorous and not rigid. This is because needs and roles keep changing.

Public/NGO/community partnerships have localised partnership activities and they operate in the low-income neighbourhoods. This is where we have a lot of collec-
Conclusions and Recommendations

tive community action in Nakuru, as opposed to the middle-income and high-income areas. This can be explained by the fact that in the middle to high-income areas, there is less community spirit and hence a lot of individualism. There is also more provision of urban basic services in these areas and households here can arrange for any shortcomings through water tanks and hiring solid waste collection and disposal services, etc. We observed that membership of community organisations in the low-income areas was low and mostly dominated by house owners rather than tenants. Tenants are not involved in collective community activities. Some of the explanations for this are that:
- participation in community action has less direct personal gain;
- neighbourhood improvement is not felt as their responsibility, but that of the landowners; and
- they have no time to participate in community activities as they have to struggle to survive in a harsh environment.

The economic viability of public/NGO/community partnerships is endangered, as they are unable to work at optimal level due to lack of legal backing and official support. Though there is a lot of interest in this type of partnership arrangements by the MCN, NGOs and the external support agencies, the main actors (CBOs) have a very weak financial base. They eventually might become instruments of implementing other actors’ agendas as they end up being unequal partners. This, for instance, is deduced from the refuse truck project whereby even after the purchase and delivery of the truck to the MCN, it has not been delivered to the rightful owners: the Lakeview CBO. The MCN has been using the truck to collect garbage in the Central Business District (CBD), disregarding the provisions in the memorandum of understanding with the CBO.

An important conclusion on LA 21 is that there is lack of institutionalisation of the LA 21 working approach. There is need for a legal framework to guide this new approach to planning, accompanied by appropriate institutional frameworks and some specific rules and regulations. There is need for local government officials to change their attitudes and the traditional way of decision-making and incorporate a more consultative approach. The major achievements of the LA 21 in Nakuru have been the consultative processes, joint visioning and the development of the strategic structure plan. The LA 21 process has introduced new ways of addressing environmental problems through the consultative process and vision building. The process benefited more from a supportive local authority and a community that was willing to regain and restore the lost glory of Nakuru and make it “a peoples green city”. The LA success can be said to be as a result of the mobilisation and inclusion of a wide range of actors and its weakness is that not all relevant actors have been mobilised. Another weakness is the strong involvement and control by the MCN.
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This has both strengths and weaknesses. Its strength is that overrepresentation of the local government gives the LA 21 initiatives the required political support and official recognition. Its weakness is that actors see the MCN as a corrupt and ineffective institution that has previously failed to deliver and cannot be trusted as a partner. This causes apathy among potential actors.

The Nakuru strategic structure plan has outlined how to achieve the ultimate goal of sustainable development. The need to put in place an institutional mechanism for plan implementation has been recognised and the MCN will need to utilise and fully exploit the positive attributes of changes in planning and urban management legislation in Kenya. These regulations have decentralised powers to prepare plans, regulate land use and coordinate the actions of the public and private sector in land development to local authorities. The strategic structure plan has to be firmly integrated into a national planning framework. First and foremost, because the central government needs to deliver effective legal, budgetary and administrative measures that give local councils the legitimacy and resources to actually implement their local agendas. The greatest challenge in Nakuru is to connect the product of LA 21 to the mainstream decision-making processes of the council enabling the LA 21 to really changes the decision-making process and the way people live and relate to the environment.

Conclusions on assessment of outcomes

A conclusion we can draw regarding the assessment of partnerships is that they need to be looked at not simply in terms of with what they can or have produced (outcomes) but also ‘in the doing of them’ (process). This is to know, for example, if and how a partnership is making a difference to members and users through changes it has precipitated in knowledge: about issues, processes of decision-making attitudes and motivations. Critical, too, it seeks to clarify factors influencing results: motivation, congruence with felt needs of people and whether members feel ownership of the process.

In terms of inclusiveness, the public sector partnerships have least representation of different actors. By their nature and the specific issues that they address, they rely more on public organisations and have little room for consultation with the private and civil society sectors at their initial stages. Bottom-up type partnerships are confined to the low-income areas and are more inclusive. They seem to have a room for all other actors. One of the major goals of partnering is to develop synergy through complementarity of different inputs by the actors. However, there has to be political will to create synergy. Existence of political will depends on specific persons, leadership and the structure of the government. Politics tend to interfere with the partnering processes.
In all the partnership arrangements studied, there is lack of jointness, since all partners tend to remain in control of their own resources. Without jointly managing partnership resources, it is difficult to create synergy. Partners are inclined towards jointness if there is credibility, transparency, trust and accountability. At the initial stages of partnering, there tends to be hesitation on the part of the actors. Partnerships tend to enhance complementarity of resources and avoid duplication of initiatives. This builds synergy and with appropriate coordination, it can help improve the quality of life in Nakuru.

However, in all the partnership arrangements, there is no development budget associated with any of the partnership arrangements. Funding comes from budgets that individual partners control separately. We observed that in Nakuru, the main thrust is not to deliver new funds but to find better and new ways of managing existing resources and improve the environmental quality. Financial challenges are numerous, with funding where it is available, provided only on a short-term ‘pilot’ basis. Most of the partners stress that one of the strengths of the emerging partnership arrangements is that they seek to promote the process of networking and exchange of information. The voluntary partners, especially in the public/private and public/community partnership arrangements, stress that it is a means of establishing environmental management structures where even local communities and groups will freely participate.

Disparity among different actors in the partnerships was observed insofar as financial resources, information and political influence were concerned. Because of the disparity among partners within any of these collaborative working relations, several conflicts eventually emerge. It was the expectation of the study that we would find some conflict management strategies in the partnership arrangements studied. However, because of the lack of a clear organisational set-up, conflict management strategies were non-existent. This has implications for the sustainable development of all the partnership arrangements studied.

Legitimacy (both social and legal) is important for the sustainable development of the different partnership activities. However, in Kenya, it is noted that even where we have adequate legal provisions, the problem has been the inadequate capacity to ensure collaborative and collective action. MCN, a principal partner in most partnership arrangements assessed, frequently fail to play its active role due to inadequate capacity. Conflicts are likely to arise when those seeking change challenge those who benefit from the status quo. They also arise when affected partners differ on their definitions of the problem. The failure of the water company is much more related to conflicts among councillors and chief officers.
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Inadequate finances, skilled personnel and enforcement machinery. We conclude that there is an urgent need to build capacity in partner institutions. The new ways of working and recasting of power relationships implies that there is need to develop new skills and capacities among all participants to establish the new careers that partnerships require.

The MCN should ensure that an enabling environment is in place for partnerships to function effectively. The MCN has lately recognised that collaboration with other actors in attempts to improve the quality of the urban environment is yielding positive results and there is a lot of will and support on the part of MCN officers and councillors to work with other actors.

Finally, research findings suggest that partnerships require good coordination, administration, and a clear definition of the roles and identification of core objectives. Groups that commonly participate in decision-making, such as the educated, property owning and middle-class people continued to do so, whilst women, youth and poor people to a larger extent were excluded. Key concepts of partnership and participation did have some impact; yet successful capacity building and empowerment remain ideals rather than realities.

Table 8.2 Comparison of process-outcomes and substantive outcomes of partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Public sector partnerships</th>
<th>Public/private partnerships</th>
<th>Private/private partnerships</th>
<th>Public/NGO/community partnerships</th>
<th>LA 21 partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process-outcomes</td>
<td>1 Number of actors included/excluded</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Legitimacy (social and legal)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Political will</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Accountability</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>_?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Financial viability</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>--?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive outcomes</td>
<td>6 Presence of action plans</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>_?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Effectiveness</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>++?</td>
<td>+?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: + = Presence of the outcomes
- = Absence of the outcome
_? = More information is needed
8.2 Implications and Recommendations

Urban sustainable development is a process, which is ceaselessly dynamic, responding to changing economic, political, environmental and social pressures. Partnerships have been promoted as one of the approaches of striving towards sustainable development. Our findings have some theoretical and practical implications to this process and we outline them in this section. As for theoretical implications, the current study contributes to the on going debate on defining urban partnerships, the framework of analysing partnerships and that of assessing their process outcomes and substantial outcomes. Further the study outlines the preconditions of successful partnership arrangements. These frameworks could be adapted and utilised elsewhere based on specific local conditions. Our findings also indicate that a new typology of partnerships is possible: the one based on the nature and level of activities rather than the sectors and organisations.

The practical implications relate to recommendations that will ensure that partnership activities are promoted and enhanced. The first and foremost recommendation is that there is need to speed up the reform of local government administrative framework for planning and decision-making and move fast towards decentralisation. Subsequently, there is need to spend a good deal of effort in adapting the rules, regulations and procedures giving partnerships the necessary legal and official backing and to train officers and councillors in this new style of governance. The various examples of partnership arrangements can be involved in the formulation of specific guidelines utilising the vast experience that they have.

Secondly, there is need for the MCN to assess roles, responsibilities and institutional relationships of all other service providers and other stakeholders in the municipality and involve and incorporate them in planning for improvements in the form of a partnership. Here there is need to recognise the roles played by the informal sector in service provision. They should be encouraged and given appropriate incentives to operate in the low-income areas. Partnerships between different actors need to be promoted and strengthened where they exist, as they promise to be a possible option for improving the service provision in low-income neighbourhoods. Partnerships could be strengthened by the MCN by putting in place appropriate institutional frameworks to monitor partnership initiatives and offer the necessary advice. The roles and responsibilities of each partner need to be specified from the onset.

Third, this study has shown that the most effective partnerships are those that address a felt need and those whose activities are localised. We recommend that these partnership activities at different localities need to be supported while at the same
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time promoting the process-type partnerships with city-wide intervention. Concerning the LA 21 process, there is need for the local and national policies and politics to support the proposals and the ongoing activities. One can work on strengthening political will by direct capacity building of decision-makers by exposing them to new ideas, point at long-term effects and show examples of good practices elsewhere. We note, however, that where political will is not sufficient, it must be counterbalanced by an equally sound critical mass of professionals, community leaders and action groups (Verschure, 2000). Hence, there is need to strengthen the civil society institutions and promote democracy.

Fourth, there is need to develop financial systems together with the community representatives and other actors to find ways of improving the financial situation and transparency. This is a very sensitive issue, however, and normally there is mistrust between the MCN and other actors. This is because councillors and officers of the MCN have always been seen as corrupt by actors outside the MCN. For all the emerging partnership arrangements there is need for budgetary allocations by both the central and the local governments and external support agencies. We need to emphasise here that although over-reliance on external donors is discouraged, the external support agencies need continue to financially assisting partnership initiatives and to assist these arrangements to mobilise local resources.

Fifth, development initiatives in Nakuru should take into consideration the interconnectedness of the landscape units and therefore use a holistic approach. There is need to recognise both the limitations to physical development and the exploitation of the physical environment in a sustainable manner. We recommend that the current alienation of the Lake Nakuru National park from the locals by the KWS management be revised so that the MCN gets some benefits and part of the revenues collected. The MCN should be involved as a partner in policies and negotiations related to the future of the park as it is directly affected by the park and also directly influences the area concerned. The MCN should then be mandated to undertake specific environmental improvements in the surrounding area on a periodic basis. The community partnership initiative currently advocated by the KWS management should not only include the neighbouring communities, but also other institutions like the MCN that operate in a larger area surrounding the Lake Nakuru National Park. The Park is actually under MCN’s jurisdiction.

8.3 Areas for further research
The type of data analysed in this study is cross-sectional and studying processes like partnerships require a follow-up type of data collection approach. There is need to undertake a study focusing on the internal dynamics of partnerships highlighting such changes as those in aims and objectives, in partners over time and in
power relations and highlight how conflicts that are inevitable in any partnering are managed. There is also a need to undertake a comparative study on the advantages and disadvantages of partnering and collaborative working relations between and with many actors as opposed to the single actor service delivery model. This is because in the process and functioning of partnerships, there are tremendous transaction costs involved. Questions like, do the advantages of partnering justify the efforts and sacrifices that are being made to make them work and become effective, can only be answered by empirical research. It is only after such questions are answered with empirical data that partnerships can be promoted as an alternative model of service delivery.

As for the partnerships described and analysed in Chapter 6, it is imperative that they are monitored and their results evaluated regularly. This could help answer questions related to the cumulative social change as a result of partnership initiatives over time. The framework developed for assessing the substantive and process outcome could be adapted to undertake such an evaluation. Such research studies could be undertaken both by scholars and consultants and give appropriate implications and recommendations. LA 21 process has helped redefine the role of planners and introduced new approaches towards communicative planning. We recommend that specialized studies be undertaken to evaluate the way these roles have changed and have influenced the traditional planning approaches and methodologies over a period of time.
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