

## Quick Analysis of Consortium Partnering Practices

<b>Activity Domains</b>	<b>Program Delivery (SOs)</b>	<b>Human Resources Development</b>	<b>Resource Mobilization</b>	<b>Program Learning</b>	<b>Policy Advocacy</b>
	<i>Are all SOs addressed in all project areas in a quality manner? Do partner staff coordinate?</i>	<i>Is training of staff and volunteers appropriate, asset based, gender-sensitive, building self-confidence and empowerment?</i>	<i>Does the consortium work as a team to identify and allocate needed technical and financial resources?</i>	<i>Is there a program learning agenda across all SOs and all partners that everyone can contribute to?</i>	<i>Does the consortium have a plan / mechanism to share lessons learned and best practices across all actors and outside of the consortium?</i>
<b>Partnership Type</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are actors aware of each other but not working closely together or realizing their potential? (<b>Potential for partnership</b>)</i></li> <li>• <i>Are actors partnering but not in an efficient manner? (<b>Nascent partnership</b>)</i></li> <li>• <i>Do partners derive benefits and increased impact through a relatively fixed and limited set of shared activity domains, such as service delivery and resource mobilization? (<b>Complementary partnership</b>)</i></li> <li>• <i>Do partners derive benefits and increased impact by addressing complex, systemic development problems together through the use of multiple activity domains? (<b>Synergistic partnership</b>)</i></li> </ul>				
<b>Actors</b>	<p><i>Are the partners diverse in the assets and experience they bring to the consortium? A key principle is to look for the “maximum tolerable un-alikeness”.</i></p>				
<b>Process Factors</b>	<b>Common Goals</b>		<b>Trust</b>		<b>Complementary Principles</b>
	<i>Does the consortium as an “organization” have common goals shared across all partners?</i>		<i>Do the partners trust and respect each other? Is there an internal accountability mechanism in place?</i>		<i>Are partners called upon to help outside of their SOs or geographic areas? Are there common cross-cutting themes and agreed upon principles for programming across partners?</i>
<b>Value Adding Mechanisms</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation</b>		<b>Continuity</b>	<b>Comprehensive-ness</b>	<b>Coordination</b>
	<i>Is there a plan to address internal weaknesses related to design, technical capacity or management? Do partners have different spheres of influence and experience that they can draw upon to respond to external opportunities and threats?</i>		<i>Does the consortium work with its partners and actors to develop new skills as new challenges arise?</i>	<i>Is the intervention package as comprehensive as it can be across all project areas?</i>	<i>Is the consortium aware of other development actors and does it coordinate with them to have better coverage, develop more cost-effectives programs, create economies of scale, and build social capital?</i>
<b>Impact</b>	<i>Does the consortium have a monitoring and evaluation system in place to collect similar data across all project areas and partners? Is it looking at the impact on beneficiaries in terms of coverage, quality, equity?</i>				

The Figure on the first page presents a set of variables to be considered in an analysis of a consortium.

Consistent with this model, the following five questions provide a structure for predicting whether a given set of actors are likely to achieve MORE through JOINT rather than INDIVIDUAL effort.

- 1) To what extent does the partnership mobilize additional resources?
- 2) To what extent does the partnership organize its partners according to their comparative advantages?
- 3) To what extent does the partnership bring promising innovations to new beneficiary groups?
- 4) To what extent does the partnership allow beneficiary groups and partner organizations to build on previous gains?
- 5) To what extent does the partnership create conditions for sustainable developmental improvements?