

Introduction

Liliana B. Andonova, Moira V. Faul and Dario Piselli

As global issues have become increasingly complex and interdependent, public-private and multistakeholder partnerships have gained momentum as new mechanisms of governance. Ever since the endorsement of public-private initiatives among the official outcomes of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, this modality of governance has been promoted across efforts to eradicate poverty, ensure human health and well-being, and fight climate change and environmental degradation. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development gave further impetus to the role of partnerships as a key means of implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The turn to partnerships in global governance has been often driven or justified by their anticipated effects on overcoming collective action failures at a time of accelerating transformations at the interface of Earth and societal systems. In theory, partnerships can facilitate collective action by providing greater flexibility for smaller groups of interested actors to negotiate terms of engagement. They can create mechanisms to bring together public purpose and private incentives in a professed attempt to overcome barriers to welfare-enhancing innovation (Andonova 2017; 2010; Austin and Seitanidi 2012; Stadler and Probst 2012), and provide new instruments for addressing core issues on the sustainable development agenda such as health, education, humanitarian issues, or clean energy (Andonova 2017; Faul 2014; Pattberg et al. 2012; Szlezák et al. 2010; Westerwinter 2019). In turn, successful partnership experiments are thought to enlarge the scope of cooperation through learning-by-doing and by updating the beliefs and interests of relevant actors. In these ways, partnerships can be characterized as experimentalist institutions (De Burca, Keohane and Sabel 2014; Hoffmann 2011) with informal structures based predominantly on non-legalized or soft-law agreements. Thus, scholars and practitioners often expect partnerships to contribute to global public goods by pooling resources and mobilizing new types of collective action in an era of globalization and gridlock (Benner, Reinicke and Witte 2004; Börzel and Risse 2005; Hale, Held and Young 2013; Kaul and Conceição 2006).

However, despite the widely anticipated effects of partnerships on improving cross-sectoral collaboration and sustainable development outcomes, we still have limited knowledge on the extent to which such expectations have materialized. On the one hand, no general framework or agreed upon indicators exist at

the international level for evaluating partnerships, with the consequence that the notion of partnership effectiveness itself is often contested. On the other hand, despite the exceptional upsurge in theoretical and empirical research on partnerships in the past 30 years, an overall view of partnership effectiveness and the mechanisms through which these effects are brought about has yet to be elaborated.

The analytic motivation of this volume is precisely to examine the tension inherent in the existing disconnect between the many anticipated effects of public-private and multistakeholder partnerships and the limited systematic assessment of actual on-the-ground effectiveness. The objective is to advance a research agenda that is both of theoretical importance for understanding complex governance systems and the role of partnerships therein, and of pressing policy significance for sustainable development. Two broad questions guide this multidisciplinary inquiry. First, from a theoretical perspective, can we provide a more generalizable framework for understanding the pathways and effects through which partnerships contribute to global governance and problem-solving for sustainability? Second, from an empirical perspective, what can the application of such a framework to the systematic assessment of partnership arrangements tell us, in terms of their ability to support the implementation of sustainable development?

This volume aims to address these two questions and propose a future research agenda on partnerships as a form of governance in at least three ways. First the volume elaborates a multifaceted and interdisciplinary conceptualization of partnership effectiveness that should be broadly applicable across different issue areas and levels of governance. More specifically, it brings different literatures into dialogue with each other (including in international relations, economics, management studies and public policy), thus contributing an analytical framework that specifies different pathways to partnership effectiveness. These include not only the nominal attainment of a partnership's goals, but also the creation of value for partners, the impact of collaboration among partners and the effects of the partnership on other institutions and affected communities; and ultimately, the contribution of partnerships to addressing broader sustainable development problems, either directly or by creating synergies and co-benefits.

Secondly, we theorize plausible conditions for the variable effectiveness of partnerships, drawing on the literature on institutional effectiveness, decentralized governance, and complex interactive effects. In so doing, our theoretical approach can be applied across different issue areas and levels of governance to illuminate the design features and mechanisms of influence that have contributed to the successes or failures of existing partnerships. In particular, we focus on features that are internal to partnerships such as contractual arrangements, credible commitment of resources, adaptability, and fostering innovation. This approach allows us to critically examine plausible counterfactuals, alternative mechanisms, and a range of second-order effects, whether positive or negative.

Thirdly, the volume seeks to combine this innovative framework with a mix of interdisciplinary research methods to present new data and case studies on partnership effectiveness. More specifically, it draws insights from a broad range of thematic case studies and a series of crosscutting analyses that speak

to ongoing debates on partnership governance and adaptability, as well as their indirect effects on macro-level processes that shape sustainability and development. Contributors to the volume inquire into what facilitates cooperation across different sectors and what kinds of effects such partnerships produce, for whom, and with what implications for problem-solving. In the following sections of the introduction, we clarify key concepts and the scope of the study, situate our theoretical approach in relation to the existing international relations scholarship on questions of partnerships effectiveness, and provide a roadmap to the structure and objectives of the volume.

Partnerships for Sustainability

Public-private partnerships and multistakeholder partnerships have been defined as voluntary agreements that engage various constellations of public actors (such as states, international organizations, or subnational municipal and regional governments) and non-state actors (for instance advocacy organizations, societal or professional associations, businesses, foundations, financial institutions, etc.) in direct collaboration toward shared objectives with an explicit public purpose (Andonova 2017).¹ Throughout the volume we use the term *partnerships* (in short) broadly to capture the multiple possible arrangements of initiatives between private, civil society and public actors.

The concepts of public-private and multistakeholder partnerships are commonly used as umbrella terms in international relations to identify transnational voluntary initiatives that link different sectors across levels of governance and jurisdictions. Moreover, such initiatives are increasingly inscribed as part of formal intergovernmental processes of the UN and related treaties and agencies. For instance, Goal 17 of the SDGs explicitly states the need to “encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships” (UNGA 2015a, Target 17.17). Similarly, the UN General Assembly Resolution “Towards Global Partnerships” defines partnerships broadly as “voluntary and collaborative relationships between various parties, both public and non-public, in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task and, as mutually agreed, to share risks and responsibilities, resources and benefits” (UNGA 2015b, p.4). While the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development lauds the promise of “multistakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources” (UNGA 2015a, p.27), the complexity and challenges of cooperation across sectors is recognized by both researchers and practitioners.

The terms public-private partnerships and multistakeholder partnerships are frequently used interchangeably in the international relations literature and policy discourses; nonetheless there is an important analytical distinction. Public-private arrangements represent explicit hybridization of authority. They entail the articulation of specific shared purpose and the roles of public entities and non-state actors. In comparison, the idea of multistakeholderism captures a more general move toward multiple types of network-based authoritative arrangements

in international governance, beyond the traditional assumption of the monopoly of the state (Abbott and Snidal 2009; Avant and Westerwinter 2016; Barnett, Pevehouse and Raustiala 2021; Raymond and DeNardis 2015). These include public-private partnerships but also other arrangements that do not directly engage public authority, such as private regulations in the forms of market-based certifications, private standards, and disclosure and reporting schemes.² Partnerships are thus an increasingly salient and distinct modality of transnational relations and transnational governance in an evolving global institutional architecture.³

The use of the overarching term *partnerships* in this volume allows us to examine governance arrangements that include actors from at least two different sectors in order to elaborate a more generalizable theoretical framework on partnership effectiveness. It captures the growing prevalence of public-private and multistakeholder partnerships across scales of governance, but also cross-sector arrangements such as business and civil society partnerships, among others (Austin and Seitanidi 2012; 2014). In addition, it recognizes that the respective functions that public and non-state actors are expected to provide through partnerships are not fixed in time. For example, they are increasingly being affected by shifting discourses and evolving societal perspectives about the need to reassert the role of the public sector in shaping innovation and investments toward the provision of global public goods (Barbier 2010; Mazzucato 2013), as well as by growing arguments advocating a new approach by private companies to the creation of long-term public value (Henderson 2020; Mazzucato 2021; Ruggie, Rees and Davis 2021).

The volume thus puts forward a theoretical framework that could apply to different modalities of the phenomenon with respect to the scale and actors involved: from small groups of partners seeking to implement a local sustainability initiative, to large and often overlapping transnational partnerships. Such broad, overarching conceptualization provides the space for an interdisciplinary approach of inquiry. It enables a certain flexibility for the different empirical chapters in the volume to use terms that are specific to their subject of study (for instance, product development partnerships for health, cross-sector partnerships in public policy, or multistakeholder regimes for extractive resources transparency), while embedding their analysis with respect to a common theoretical framework on partnership effectiveness that we elaborate in the following chapter.

At the same time, the contributing chapters in this volume share a set of assumptions about partnerships as a contemporary mode of governance. To begin with, there has been an implicit assumption through the literature and policy discourses that cooperation across different sectors implies the pursuit of objectives that are additional to what each partner could realize by themselves. We posit that this is a constitutive assumption of the nature of partnerships, but also one that needs to be examined empirically against the possibility of window dressing by association, or reincarnating business-as-usual practices.

Moreover, we adopt the assumption already elaborated in the transnational governance literature that, in order to constitute a mode of governance, partnerships require an identifiable public purpose and a set of functions delivered

through formal or informal rules, norms or practices (Andonova, Betsill and Bulkeley 2009; Andonova, Hale and Roger 2017; Horton and Koremenos 2020; Rosenau 2002; Ruggie 2004). This implies a certain authoritative steering of partners who are affecting – directly or indirectly – the behavior of actors outside the partnership (Abbott, Green and Keohane 2016; Biersteker 2009; Bulkeley et al. 2014; Stadtler and Lin 2017). The element of public purpose distinguishes partnerships as governance from other collective initiatives that may involve multiple sectors, such as lobbying, advocacy campaigns and associations seeking to project norms, pressure and incentives to influence governance (Andonova, Hale and Roger 2017). Our study similarly does not explore public-private infrastructure partnerships, which are important instruments for implementing public projects, but are largely based on subcontracting agreements rather than on the collaborative elaboration of governance objectives and the means to advance them. We do not assume, however, that partnerships necessarily succeed in fulfilling their stated governance functions and objectives; rather, this is the subject of the critical inquiry pursued in this volume.

Finally, our study focuses largely on partnerships that engage with issues linked to sustainability and sustainable development. We define sustainability broadly, following Matson, Clark and Andersson (2016, p.199), as “inclusive social well-being [which] does not decline over multiple generations.” According to this conceptualization, sustainability depends on the integrative management of assets of natural, social, manufactured, human and knowledge capital. Clark and Harley (2020) further elaborate that such integrative management should aim to conserve the aggregate social value of these assets’ stocks, that is, their capacity to generate social well-being, while assuring the integrity of the Earth’s subsystems upon which the latter is ultimately built. Moreover, it should result in the concrete opportunity for all societal actors to equitably access these assets, and not just in their abstract availability. This conceptualization retains core elements of the idea of sustainable development as advanced by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987, and in addition, it highlights the complex interface between different sets of assets that are necessary for pursuing sustainability. Such understanding is in line with the recognition, including through the adoption of the SDGs, that sustainability is an overarching objective for high-, medium-, and low-income countries. Moreover, it critically depends on the integrity and complex interplay of societal, environmental, and economic systems (Biermann 2014; Clark and Harley 2020; Dietz, Ostrom and Stern 2003; Keohane and Ostrom 1995; Steffen et al. 2015; Young 2017).

The terms sustainability and sustainable development are therefore used interchangeably throughout the volume, albeit with understanding of their different connotations and scope. While our theoretical framework aims to be broadly applicable to governance through partnerships, sustainability is a particularly important area for investigating questions of effectiveness. Over the last three decades, partnerships have become a prominent modality of sustainability governance, including on issues such as biodiversity, clean energy, climate change, health, resource extraction, and access to innovation, among others. They have

materialized both as truly global initiatives and as projects localized in specific places and regions. In this way, partnerships across a range of sustainability issues provide sufficient inter-temporal and inter-spatial perspectives to explore different pathways to effectiveness and allow for rigorous comparative conclusions and generalizability.

The Unresolved Question of Effectiveness

The international relations literature has provided valuable insights on the politics and agency behind the rise of partnerships in contemporary global governance.⁴ Existing research has uncovered the tremendous diversity in partnership forms from large constellations with billion-dollar budgets and recently incorporated secretariats to smaller networks, platforms and projects implemented at the community level. Different partnerships provide widely variable functions – some focus on information and advocacy as the main instruments of governance, others build capacity and new forms of financing, still more seek to provide specific public goods such as access to technologies and services (Andonova 2017; Beisheim et al. 2014; Beisheim and Liese 2014; Kaul and Conceição 2006; Krasner and Risse 2014; Raymond and DeNardis 2015; Westerwinter 2019). The UN General Assembly has routinely announced that partnerships are intended to complement, not substitute, commitments made by national governments (UNGA 2015b, p.4). Yet, partnership governance is simultaneously put forward as a core instrument for the implementation of the SDGs (UNGA 2015a; b). Multistakeholder partnerships are thus increasingly recognized as a new paradigm that might integrate or compete with government action or with bilateral and multilateral efforts. This emphasis is reflected in many academic and policy debates around SDG 17, which often appear to conflate numerous implementation issues (including financing, technology, trade, capacity-building, policy coherence, and monitoring and accountability) into a narrative that simply promotes partnerships (Faul 2018).

Critical questions thus remain as to whether and how partnerships work, for whom, and with what effects. Controversial debates on the legitimacy of partnerships furthermore revolve around the extent to which they deliver on their promise of greater inclusiveness, providing public goods, and negotiating what many see as inherent tensions between the specific agendas of powerful stakeholders and the collective claim of public purpose (Börzel and Risse 2005; Bull and McNeill 2006; Buse and Harmer 2004; Bäckstrand and Kylsäter 2014; Mert 2015; Utting and Zammit 2009). Scholars have questioned the ways in which partnerships improve the participatory quality of governance (Bexell and Mörth 2010; Bäckstrand 2006; Dingwerth 2007; Storeng and de Bengy Puyvallée 2018), or contribute new and additional instruments and development outcomes (Faul 2016; Sethi and Schepers 2014). We argue that such debates cannot be resolved without a broader analytical framework and systematic focus on effectiveness.

In the existing international relations literature, two sets of methodologies have made important contributions toward increasing our understanding of the effectiveness of transnational partnerships more specifically. In a far-reaching volume,

Pattberg et al. (2012) develop a quantitative approach to assess the extent to which the partnerships registered at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development and related platforms have the necessary instruments and resources to be “fit for purpose” and produce a set of intended effects. Their study concludes that for a large proportion of the 210 partnerships examined through an expert survey, the activities, resources, and other inputs appear to be either lacking or insufficient to achieve their stated functions. The fit-to-function methodology has been extended to other large-*n* samples of public-private partnerships, but also to sets of data on transnational climate initiatives (Chan et al. 2016; Pattberg and Widerberg 2016). This approach has the important advantage of facilitating the comparative analysis of large numbers of partnerships, identifying the types of outputs they produce, and highlighting those that have limited possibilities of being implemented. In doing so, the approach lays the foundation for further in-depth studies of their effectiveness. However, its main limitation is that it uses measures of resource inputs, partnership activities and outputs as a proxy for effectiveness, instead of focusing on direct outcomes or impacts. This is in part due to constraints associated with limited availability of data on partnership implementation, particularly in the early decades of partnership governance. Similarly, in their study of business-humanitarian partnerships, Andonova and Carbonnier (2014) found limited data on partnership impacts, either in the literature or in policy documents, concluding that: “the evaluation of the outcomes of BHPs [business-humanitarian partnerships] in terms of effectiveness with regard to stated goals remains both weak and challenging” (p.364).

A second approach to partnership effectiveness applies an extended logical impact evaluation framework (logframe) to document the inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts of partnerships (Beisheim and Liese 2014; Stadler 2016; Szulecki, Pattberg and Biermann 2011; Ulbert 2013), providing an aggregate assessment of actual outcomes, as well as possible feedback loops that shape the overall effects of an initiative (van Tulder et al. 2016). Taken together, these contributions have offered comparable methodologies to track the full implementation chain of a partnership and assess its impacts against the governance functions it is expected to perform. Moreover, they have generated valuable new insights and data on implementation indicators. Beisheim and Liese (2014) and their colleagues use such a methodology to examine a mid-range sample of 21 transnational public-private partnerships. The study provides a qualitative classification of these initiatives according to their functions (service provision, standard setting, and knowledge transfer) and a ranking of outputs, outcomes, and impacts. This approach has also provided important reflections on the role of partnerships in providing services in political contexts that are characterized by limited state capacity, and on elements of institutional design that could shape variations in effectiveness (Beisheim and Liese 2014; Beisheim et al. 2014).

The input-output-impact methodology, while broadly informative across a range of studies, itself presents limitations for understanding important dimensions of partnership effectiveness. It implies a certain progression of outcomes and impacts and tends to overlook the assumptions built into how an output might

(or might not) lead to an outcome or impact. The approach is also less adapted to identifying relevant counterfactuals against which to scrutinize effectiveness,⁵ all of which makes it difficult to generalize beyond the contexts of the specific projects examined. The framework thus offers more limited scope for considering alternative explanations of observed outcomes, mechanisms leading to a set of outcomes and impacts, or partnerships' unintended or hidden consequences. We argue that an inquiry about effectiveness needs to move toward a conceptualization that considers the pathways through which different types of partnership effects are produced, as well as their unintended and second order effects.

In summary, while partnerships are touted in policy discourses as a promising mechanism to meaningfully address the complex problems inherent in achieving sustainable development, important questions remain around how to conceptualize, disaggregate, and measure the various aspects of partnership effectiveness. Moreover, while the academic literature provides valuable insights on the rise of partnerships, their diversity, and the instruments they deploy, we know considerably less about their actual effects, their distribution across actors, and the pathways through which such impacts are brought about. Do partnerships contribute new and additional outcomes to influence the actors that participate in them and the wider global governance ecosystem? Have existing initiatives been successful in achieving both their stated aims and broader sustainable development impacts? How can we understand and evaluate such effects?

Disaggregating Pathways to Partnership Effectiveness

Attributing effectiveness to partnerships as part of larger governance systems for sustainability implies the ability to disentangle the additional – if not truly independent – effects of their activities, as well as the specific pathways through which effects are achieved. How do we approach this challenge? In this volume, we adopt a multidisciplinary approach that brings different literatures into dialogue with each other, including international relations, business administration, economic assessments, public policy studies, and critical political economy perspectives. Building on the key patterns and trends in research on cross-sector partnerships across several academic disciplines, the volume introduces a broadly generalizable theoretical framework on partnership effectiveness that can be applied across multiple issue areas.

More specifically, Chapter 1 by Liliana B. Andonova and Moira V. Faul elaborates a multifaceted framework for disaggregating the meaning of effectiveness and the pathways that lead to different partnership effects, which are ultimately likely to shape partnerships' impact on societies and sustainability. It advances a conceptual meta-synthesis of existing approaches and proposes a new theoretical framework that specifies distinct pathways to partnership effectiveness. These include (i) the attainment of a partnership's self-declared goals; (ii) the creation of value for partners; (iii) productive collaboration inside a partnership; (iv) the impacts of a partnership on affected populations; (v) its influence on collaboration and institutions outside a partnership. Ultimately, we seek to establish the

problem-solving effect of a partnership and its contribution to overarching sustainability objectives, which may materialize (or not) to different degrees through the five pathways that we elaborate. In other words, we also consider the tensions and trade-offs that may emerge when aggregating the effects that a partnership has on different constituencies or issue areas, as these tensions could result in the narrow achievement of environmental, social, or economic goals at the expense of an integrated approach to sustainability.

Drawing on the broader literature on institutional effectiveness, the theoretical framework further identifies a set of conditions, related to the structuring of partnership arrangements, which are likely to shape their variable effectiveness. These conditions focus on the relevance of contractual features and information sharing for accountability, the credible commitment of resources, the degree of adaptability and learning-by-doing, and the ability to foster innovation. The book thus offers a broadly conceived framework on effectiveness that can be applied to different contexts to critically scrutinize the multiple dimensions and mechanisms through which partnership effects are produced. This allows us to engage with critical questions about the complementarity or contradictions of partnership outcomes and the extent of the cumulative effect of partnerships toward problem-solving. We explore different pathways of partnership effectiveness through a set of case studies drawn from several key sustainability issues and examine questions that cut across issue areas. The diversity of epistemological and methodological approaches is a key distinctive feature of our approach compared to earlier efforts in the study of partnerships effectiveness. The next section presents the structure of the volume and its empirical chapters, along with its overall contributions.

Overview of the Volume

Following Part I of the volume, which includes the Introduction and Chapter 1, Part II presents a broad range of thematic case studies which apply the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 1. Our empirical approach aims to contribute in-depth evidence about the actual, rather than the anticipated, effects of partnerships across multiple dimensions of effectiveness and issue areas. The thematic case studies focus on the environment (biodiversity, clean energy, climate change, land use and deforestation), health, and human rights (access to medicines and innovation, polio eradication and child protection). These issues provide us with empirical sites in which questions about partnership effectiveness have gained a particular salience and importance through their sufficiently long history of partnership governance to assure the availability of data to trace effectiveness. Through systematically documented analytic narratives (Bates et al. 1998), the different chapters in this section present fine-grained knowledge on partnership goals and the degree of their attainment, as well as their effects on partners, affected populations, and on institutions and cooperation for sustainability outside the partnership. They apply the theoretical framework of pathways to effectiveness in order to draw more generalizable conclusions with respect to a variety of partnerships straddling the lines between local, regional and global sustainability.⁶

The empirical analysis furthermore captures variation in impacts within cases and across different stages of the partnership implementation or failure to continue its activities.⁷

Furthermore, examining the different dimensions of effectiveness within sets of broadly comparable issue areas is a way to take into consideration important contextual factors (such as problem structure) while attempting to disentangle how partnership structuring and design features have shaped their effectiveness (Haas, Keohane and Levy 1993; Miles et al. 2002; Mitchell 2006). The case study analyses draw on primary data from partnership publications and related reports, as well as on semi-structured interviews, secondary research, and, in some instances, extensive fieldwork. These methodological approaches are elaborated in greater detail within individual chapters. The mixed methods approach to our empirical analysis is motivated by the multidisciplinary and multilevel nature of our inquiry. This methodological diversity is much needed to gain an insight on both micro-level pathways and effects of partnership cases, as well as on broader sustainable development impacts of clusters of partnership initiatives. The approach provides us with the possibility to measure or assess elements of effectiveness at different levels of analysis and draw a comparative synthesis. The following sections provide brief summaries of the focus and approach of the empirical and concluding chapters.

Chapter 2 (Part II), by Liliana B. Andonova and Dario Piselli, explores the mechanisms leading to the effectiveness of partnerships by conducting a comparative study of three partnerships in the field of biodiversity and clean energy, namely the Amazon Region Protected Areas Program in Brazil (ARPA), the Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad in Costa Rica (INBio), and the San Cristóbal Wind Power Project in Ecuador (Galápagos Wind). After analyzing the governance history and pathways to effectiveness across the three case studies, the chapter examines how the conditions of partnership structuring, proposed in the theoretical framework, shape the variable success or failure to sustain partnership outcomes. The findings reveal an important degree of interplay between the specific pathways to partnership effectiveness, and particularly the relevance of conditions such as sophisticated contracting for specifying partner commitments, establishing accountability mechanisms, enabling learning processes, and leveraging resources and institutional innovation for implementation.

Chapter 3, by Livio Miles Silva Müller and Moira V. Faul, shifts the focus to the implementation of partnerships at the local level. It analyzes the formal and informal collaboration between the public sector, civil society organizations and private foundations in the delivery of sustainable development outcomes inside the Uatumã sustainable use reserve in the Brazilian Amazon. Taking a sociological approach, the chapter combines semi-structured interviews, participant observation in a protected area and documentary analysis to argue that partnerships rarely operate in isolation. Multiple formal and informal partnerships may coexist and be nested inside the same issue area and geographical location, establishing a highly polycentric environment of multiple authorities with overlapping responsibilities. This means that civil society organizations active in the local

implementation of transnational partnership activities often play a crucial role in initiating and brokering new partnerships, complementing and mediating state activities, and translating information between local communities and different levels of regional, national and global decision making. The chapter sheds light on the effects of global partnerships on affected societies, their interplay with local power structures, and civil society entrepreneurship.

Turning to partnerships in climate change governance, Katharina Michaelowa, Axel Michaelowa and Liliana B. Andonova (Chapter 4) examine the brokerage role of the World Bank in mobilizing public and private actors to contribute to the development of transnational carbon markets through the shaping and piloting of methodologies, financing, and capacity. In particular, the chapter assesses the Bank's pioneering role in international carbon markets, which dates back to the establishment of the Prototype Carbon Fund (PCF) in 2000. The authors evaluate such a role against the conditions for effectiveness described in the volume's analytical framework, and then link it to the carbon markets' actual achievement of different dimensions of effectiveness. They demonstrate that the World Bank's involvement has led to a significant commitment of resources and facilitated the creation of sophisticated contracts and methodologies for international carbon markets, even though the Bank has found it increasingly difficult to mobilize private sector financing in recent years. In addition, they highlight that while the World Bank-brokered partnerships have often been effective in creating value for the partners, this has come at the expense of real additionality in carbon emission reductions, and thus hindered the partnerships' overall contribution to climate change mitigation.

In Chapter 5, Marcela Vieira and her co-authors probe the debate on partnership effectiveness in the context of access to medicine initiatives in global health governance. More specifically, the chapter focuses on public-private product development partnerships (PDPs), which were first created in the late 1990s to develop new drugs, vaccines, and diagnostics where market incentives had failed to induce the pharmaceutical industry to do so alone. After two decades, PDPs have demonstrated that it is possible to develop medicines through alternative business models, as evidenced by significant increases in funding for neglected disease R&D, a renewed pipeline, and a number of new medicines now reaching patients. The chapter, however, adds an additional element in assessing the effectiveness of PDPs against the traditional model of commercial product development in terms of the therapeutic value of their products, and the costs and efficiency of how they conduct R&D. The chapter assesses the extent to which PDPs are seen as no more than a way to fix a small broken corner of the competitive medicines R&D system, rather than as a more broadly disruptive model that could address growing concerns about the inability of the traditional medical product development to meet societal needs.

Chapter 6, by Mara Pillinger, analyzes how the pathways and conditions identified in the volume's analytical framework contribute to the effectiveness of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI), one of the first and longest-lived global health public-private partnerships. GPEI is discussed as a multilevel partnership,

with infrastructure and partners at the global (headquarters), regional, and country levels. Focusing on the global level, the analysis finds that GPEI demonstrates high goal attainment as well as significant value creation and collaboration among core partners. This is achieved through sophisticated contracting, the credible commitment of resources, and some degree of adaptability. The author identifies two paradoxes in this case study. First, the overall effectiveness of the partnership is enhanced by certain inefficiencies related to the intense and long drawn-out partner collaboration internally. Second, the very pathways and conditions that contribute to effectiveness at the global level simultaneously may detract from GPEI's effectiveness across regional and country levels by excluding non-core partners and other stakeholders from "club" decision making. Nevertheless, the chapter argues that the GPEI illustrates the significance of close collaboration among core partners for the sustained overall effectiveness of this initiative.

The final contribution contained in Part II (Chapter 7) is authored by Susan L. Bissell and David Steven. It examines the impetus to design and establish the Global Partnership to End Violence against Children and its associated Trust Fund. The authors look at the inherently complex processes that accompany the introduction of new ideas and structures that are initially hosted in international institutions. At the same time, they explore the catalytic role of novel approaches in international development, public health, and human rights in inspiring further innovations – in this case, the INSPIRE package of evidence-based strategies for violence prevention and response. The chapter focuses on organizational learning within the partnership and how the challenges of establishing a new entity may lead to significant hurdles in terms of collaboration between the partners. From this perspective, the chapter examines the challenges of starting up a partnership, how collaboration inside this partnership evolved over time, and the influence it had in facilitating some of the key outputs of the partnership, including the attainment of partnership goals at the level of country implementation.

In turn, Part III of the volume presents empirical analyses that explore a set of crosscutting themes, including the systematic challenges that partnerships encounter and the associated need for adaptability; the materialization (or not) of anticipated economic dividends and the promotion of transparency through partnerships; and the fragmentation within sector groupings on partnership governance boards, alongside some empirical tools that can be used to identify them. Such themes have been discussed in the literature before, but there is still limited analysis on their role in supporting or undermining effectiveness in partnerships. Because of their crosscutting focus, the chapters in this part of the volume tend to utilize large n datasets and quantitative methodologies, alongside analyses of specific cases. They further open our empirical exploration to a larger sample of partnerships for sustainability operating across levels of governance, as well as to issues such as resource extraction and global financing through partnerships, providing a broader understanding of the partnership process and additional systematic evidence on the conditions for effectiveness.

The first chapter of Part III, Chapter 8, by Amanda Sardonis and Henry Lee, uses the volume's analytical framework to analyze 43 local and transnational

cross-sector partnerships that were selected as finalists for the biennial Roy Family Award for Environment Partnerships, from 2003 to 2018. Through a survey of the partnership participants, the authors examine how these partnerships have fared in the years since they were initially evaluated for the award and, in doing so, explore the interface between the adaptability of partnership arrangements and their capacity to overcome challenges and remain effective over time. In addition, the chapter develops three comparative case studies, namely the Noel Kempff Climate Action Project in Bolivia, the Metrobús partnership in Mexico City, and the Alianza Shire Energy Access to Refugees partnership in Ethiopia. Overall, the analysis finds that adaptability in its various forms, ranging from changes in governance structures and business models to changes in a partnership's geographical or thematic scope, makes a difference in terms of partnership effectiveness. At the same time, they suggest that adaptability is intrinsically linked to other aspects of partnership structuring, including sophisticated governance arrangements and learning mechanisms that are flexible enough to accommodate changes in funding streams, political context, and partner composition.

Chapter 9, by Jamie Marie Fraser and Gilles Carbonnier, adds an important dimension to the volume by focusing on transparency as a key factor through which a partnership may influence institutions and collaboration outside the partnership itself. Specifically, this chapter examines the issue of natural resource revenue management by analyzing the effect of a country's membership of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) on the price of sovereign debt, as a measure of how investors' expectations may be influenced by the adoption of EITI principles. This is an important way to analyze the effectiveness of similar multistakeholder regimes, since it indicates whether the commitments a country makes under such regimes are perceived as material and credible or not. The econometric analysis uncovers a limited impact of EITI membership on the price of sovereign debt, which has broader development implications. Fraser and Carbonnier then examine EITI implementation and its interaction with country-specific institutional dynamics through two case studies, Indonesia and Senegal. These country studies are used to show that it is crucial to evaluate the effectiveness of a partnership in interaction with the specific political and economic structures in which it is embedded.

The final contribution in Part III (Chapter 10) is coauthored by Moira V. Faul and Younes Boulanguiem, who examine the role for governance boards in partnership effectiveness. They address yet another overlooked factor shaping partnership effectiveness: the faultlines that may cause fragmentation within groups of board members from the same sector, and the implications they have for board decisions and, therefore, on a partnership's sustainability impacts. Contributing a framework of analysis borrowed from the corporate governance literature – fault-line analysis – the authors compare 140 board members of three global financing partnerships addressing climate change with three that address health. Faul and Boulanguiem argue that while partnership members tend to be mobilized into a board on the basis of their stakeholder group, a focus on sectoral groups alone may hide other significant dimensions of diversity, which deserve greater empirical

attention. These actual dimensions of diversity – and the faultlines they may give rise to – matter. They provide the micro-foundations for partnership relations and decisions, and therefore have real-world consequences for sustainability.

In Part IV of the volume, the editors provide a concluding chapter that offers a comparative synthesis of the dynamics and patterns of partnership effectiveness explored in the previous chapters. It discusses their implications for the evolution of existing regimes, the design and governance of new partnerships, and their potential for advancing sustainability. The chapter further notes several remaining research questions on partnership effectiveness, and outlines the contribution of the volume to defining a future research agenda in this area.

Overall, the volume provides an important dual contribution to the study of sustainability partnerships. First, it elaborates a broadly applicable theoretical framework, which captures a number of specific conditions, dynamics, and elements that should be taken into consideration when trying to understand – and assess – partnership effectiveness. Secondly, it applies such a framework to the actual design and analysis of a wide range of cases in issues salient to sustainable development, deploying a variety of methodologies. This comparative approach allows us to produce generalizable findings about partnership effectiveness that are at the same time grounded and systematic with respect to a common theoretical framework. Moreover, different chapters examine different dimensions of the pathways to effectiveness outlined in the theoretical framework, depending on the specific governance objectives or aspects of sustainability the cases analyzed seek to address. In this way, we gain both theoretically informed and wide-ranging empirical perspective on the different pathways and the partnership design features that enable or undermine their effects, allowing us to draw broadly generalizable conclusions.

Notes

- 1 For comparable conceptualizations, see also Andonova and Levy 2003; Bäckstrand 2006; Clarke and Crane 2018; Pattberg et al. 2012; Schäferhoff, Campe and Kaan 2009; Wang et al. 2018; Westerwinter 2019.
- 2 On private authority as aspect of multistakeholder governance, see among others, Abbott and Snidal 2009; Abbott, Green and Keohane 2016; Auld, Betsill and VanDeveer 2018; Avant, Finnemore and Sell 2010; Büthe and Mattli 2011; Cashore, Auld and Newsom 2004; Green 2017; Hall and Biersteker 2002; Prakash and Potoski 2006; Raymond and DeNardis 2015; van der Ven, Sun and Cashore 2021.
- 3 On the evolution and different modalities of transnational relations and transnational governance, see Andonova et al. 2017; Andonova, Betsill and Bulkeley 2009; Auld, Betsill and VanDeveer. 2018; Börzel and Risse 2005; Bulkeley et al. 2014; Hale 2020; Hale and Held 2011; Kahler 2016; Keohane and Nye 1971; McGrew and Held 2002; Roger and Dauvergne 2016.
- 4 Among others, see Andonova 2017; Andonova 2014; Andonova and Levy 2003; Bull and McNeill 2006; Bäckstrand 2006; Börzel, and Risse 2005; Faul 2016; Glasbergen, Biermann and Moll 2007; Kaul and Conceição 2006; Pattberg et al. 2012; Reinsberg and Westerwinter 2019; Schäferhoff, Campe and Kaan 2009; Westerwinter 2019.
- 5 However, see Hale et al. 2021 on the importance of benchmarks, which can be used to relate outcomes and impacts to an overarching objective, as a means of alleviating such concerns in the application of a logframe approach.

- 6 For comparable approaches of systematically analyzing a set of case studies to shed light on a common theoretical framework and contribute further to theory building, see Barnett and Duvall 2005; Haas, Keohane and Levy 1993; Keohane and Ostrom 1995; Matson et al. 2016; Ostrom 1990; Young and Levy 1999, among others.
- 7 On case studies and within case variation to explore mechanisms of influence, see George and Bennett 2005; King, Keohane and Verba 2021; Mitchell and Bernauer 1998.

References

- Abbott, Kenneth W. and Duncan Snidal. 2009. The Governance Triangle: Regulatory Standards Institutions and the Shadow of the State. In Mattli, Walter and Ngaire Woods, eds. *The Politics of Global Regulation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 44–88.
- Abbott, Kenneth W., Jessica F. Green and Robert O. Keohane. 2016. Organizational Ecology and Institutional Change in Global Governance. *International Organization*, 70:2, 247–277.
- Andonova, Liliana B. 2010. Public-Private Partnerships for the Earth: Politics and Patterns of Hybrid Authority in the Multilateral System. *Global Environmental Politics*, 10:2, 25–53.
- Andonova, Liliana B. 2014. Boomerangs to Partnerships? Explaining State Participation in Transnational Partnerships for Sustainability. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47:3, 481–515.
- Andonova, Liliana B. 2017. *Governance Entrepreneurs: International Organizations and the Rise of Global Public-Private Partnerships*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andonova, Liliana B. and Gilles Carbonnier. 2014 Business-Humanitarian Partnerships: Processes of Normative Legitimation. *Globalizations*, 11:3, 349–367.
- Andonova, Liliana B. and Marc A. Levy. 2003. Franchising Global Governance: Making Sense of the Johannesburg Type II Partnerships. In Stokke, Olav S. and Oystein B. Thommessen, eds. *Yearbook of International Co-operation on Environment and Development 2003/2004*. London: Earthscan, 19–31.
- Andonova, Liliana B., Michele M. Betsill and Harriet Bulkeley. 2009. Transnational Climate Governance. *Global Environmental Politics*, 9:2, 52–73.
- Andonova, Liliana B., Thomas N. Hale and Charles B. Roger. 2017. National Policy and Transnational Governance of Climate Change: Substitutes or Complements? *International Studies Quarterly*, 61:2, 253–268.
- Auld, Graeme, Michele Betsill and Stacy D. VanDeveer. 2018. Transnational Governance for Mining and the Mineral Lifecycle. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 43:1, 425–453.
- Austin, James E. and Maria M. Seitanidi. 2012. Collaborative Value Creation: A Review of Partnering Between Nonprofits and Businesses: Part I. Value Creation Spectrum and Collaboration. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41:5, 726–758.
- Austin, James E. and Maria M. Seitanidi. 2014. *Creating Value in Nonprofit–Business Collaborations: New Thinking and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Avant, Deborah and Oliver Westerwinter, eds. 2016. *The New Power Politics. Networks and Transnational Security Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Avant, Deborah D., Martha Finnemore and Susan K. Sell, eds. 2010. *Who Governs the Globe?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bäckstrand, Karin. 2006. Democratising Global Environmental Governance. Stakeholder Democracy after the World Summit on Sustainable Development. *European Journal of International Relations*, 12:4, 467–498.
- Bäckstrand, Karin and Mikael Kylsäter. 2014. Old Wine in New Bottles? The Legitimation and Delegitimation of UN Public–Private Partnerships for Sustainable Development from the Johannesburg Summit to the Rio+20 Summit. *Globalization*, 11:3, 331–347.
- Barbier, Edward B. 2010. *A Global Green New Deal. Rethinking the Economic Recovery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnett, Michael N. and Raymond Duvall. 2005. Power in International Politics. *International Organization*, 59:1, 39–75.
- Barnett, Michael N., Jon Pevehouse and Kal Raustiala. 2021. *Global Governance in a World of Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal and Barry R. Weingast. 1998. *Analytic Narratives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Beisheim, Marianne and Andrea Liese, eds. 2014. *Transnational Partnerships: Effectively Providing for Sustainable Development?* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beisheim, Marianne, Andrea Liese, Hannah Janetschek and Johanna Sarre. 2014. Transnational Partnerships: Conditions for Successful Service Provision in Areas of Limited Statehood. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy*, 27:4, 655–673.
- Benner, Thorsten, Wolfgang H. Reinicke and Jan M. Witte. 2004. Multisectoral Networks in Global Governance: Towards a Pluralistic System of Accountability. *Government and Opposition*, 39:2, 191–210.
- Bexell, Magdalena, and Ulrika Mörth, eds. 2010. *Democracy and Public-Private Partnerships in Global Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Biermann, Frank. 2014. *Earth System Governance. World Politics in the Anthropocene*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Biersteker, Thomas J. 2009. Global Governance. In Cavelti, Myriam D. and Victor Mauer, eds. *Routledge Companion to Security*. London: Routledge, 439–451.
- Börzel, Tanja A. and Thomas Risse. 2005. Public-Private Partnerships: Effective and Legitimate Tools of International Governance? In Grande, Edgar, and Louis W. Pauly, eds. *Complex Sovereignty: On the Reconstitution of Political Authority in the 21st Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 195–216.
- Bulkeley, Harriet, Liliana B. Andonova, Michele M. Betsill, Daniel Compagnon, Thomas N. Hale, Matthew J. Hoffmann, Peter Newell, Matthew Paterson, Charles Roger and Stacey D. VanDeveer. 2014. *Transnational Climate Change Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bull, Benedicte and Desmond McNeill. 2006. *Development Issues in Global Governance: Public-Private Partnerships and Market Multilateralism*. London: Routledge.
- Buse, Kent and Andrew Harmer. 2004. Power to the Partners? The Politics of Public-private Health Partnerships. *Development*, 47:2, 49–56.
- Büthe, Tim and Walter Mattli. 2011. *The New Global Rulers: The Privatization of Regulation in The World Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cashore, Benjamin, Graeme Auld and Deanna Newsom. 2004. *Governing Through Markets: Forest Certification and the Emergence of Non-State Authority*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Chan, Sander, Robert Falkner, Matthew Goldberg and Harro van Asselt. 2016. Effective and Geographically Balanced? An Output-based Assessment of Non-state Climate Actions. *Climate Policy*, 18:1, 24–35.

- Clark, William C. and Alicia G. Harley. 2020. Sustainability Science: Toward a Synthesis. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 45, 331–386.
- Clarke, Amelia, and Andrew Crane. 2018. CrossSector Partnerships for Systemic Change: Systematized Literature Review and Agenda for Further Research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150, 303–13.
- De Burca, Grainne, Robert O. Keohane and Charles F. Sabel. 2014. Global Experimentalist Governance. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44:3, 477–486.
- Dietz, Thomas, Elinor Ostrom and Paul C. Stern. 2003. The Struggle to Govern the Commons. *Science*, 302:5652, 1907–1912.
- Dingwerth, Klaus. 2007. *The New Transnationalism: Transnational Governance and Democratic Legitimacy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Faul, Moira V. 2014. Future-perfect/Present-imperfect: Contemporary Constraints on the Implementation of a Post-2015 Education Agenda. *International Journal of Education and Development*, 39, 12–22.
- Faul, Moira V. 2016. Networks and Power: Why Networks Are Hierarchical Not Flat and What Can Be Done About It. *Global Policy Journal*, 7:2, 185–197.
- Faul, Moira V. 2018. SDG17: The Partnership Goal? *Université de Genève. Public-Private Partnership Center*. Available at <https://ppp.unige.ch/news/sdg17-partnership-goal>.
- George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Glasbergen, Pieter, Frank Biermann and Arthur P.J. Moll, eds. 2007. *Partnerships, Governance and Sustainable Development. Reflections on Theory and Practice*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Green, Jessica F.. 2017. Blurred Lines: Public-Private Interactions in Carbon Regulations. *International Interactions*. 43:1, 103–128.
- Haas, Peter M., Robert O. Keohane and Marc A. Levy. 1993. *Institutions for the Earth: Sources of Effective International Environmental Protection*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hale, Thomas N. 2020. Transnational Actors and Transnational Governance in Environmental Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 23, 203.
- Hale, Thomas N. and David Held. 2011. *Handbook of Transnational Governance: New Institutions and Innovations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hale, Thomas N., David Held and Kevin Young. 2013. *Gridlock: Why Global Cooperation Is Failing When We Need It Most*. Stafford: Polity Press.
- Hale, Thomas N., Sander Chan, Angel Hsu, Andrew Clapper, Cynthia Elliott, Pedro Faria, Takeshi Kuramochi, Shannon McDaniel, Milimer Morgado, Mark Roelfsema, Mayra Santaella, Neelam Singh, Ian Tout, Chris Weber, Amy Weinfurter and Oscar Widerberg. 2021. Sub- and Non-state Climate Action: A Framework to Assess Progress, Implementation and Impact. *Climate Policy*, 21:3, 406–420.
- Hall, Rodney B. and Thomas J. Biersteker, eds. 2002 *The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henderson, Rebecca M. 2020. *Reimagining Capitalism in a World of Fire*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Hoffmann, Matthew J. 2011. *Climate Governance at the Crossroads: Experimenting with a Global Response after Kyoto*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horton, Joshua B. and Barbara Koremenos. 2020. Steering and Influence in Transnational Climate Governance: Nonstate Engagement in Solar Geoengineering Research. *Global Environmental Politics*, 20:3, 93–111.

- Kahler, Miles. 2016. Complex Governance and the New Interdependence Approach (NIA). *Review of International Political Economy*, 23:5, 825–839.
- Kaul, Inge and Pedro Conceição. 2006. *The New Public Finance: Responding to Global Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph Nye. 1971. *Transnational Relations and World Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Elinor Ostrom, eds. 1995. *Local Commons and Global Interdependence*. London: Sage.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 2021. *Designing Social Inquiry. Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Krasner, Stephen D. and Thomas Risse. 2014. External Actors, State-Building, and Service Provision in Areas of Limited Statehood: Introduction. *Governance*, 27:4, 545–567.
- Matson, Pamela, William C. Clark and Krister Andersson. 2016. *Pursuing Sustainability: A Guide to the Science and Practice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mazzucato, Mariana. 2013. *The Entrepreneurial State. Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths*. London: Anthem Press.
- Mazzucato, Mariana. 2021. *Mission Economy: A Moonshot Guide to Changing Capitalism*. London: Allen Lane.
- McGrew, Anthony and David Held. 2002. *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mert, Aysem. 2015. *Environmental Governance through Partnerships. A Discourse Theoretical Study*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Miles, Edward L., Steinar Andresen, Elaine M. Carlin, Jon Birger Skjærseth, Arild Underdal and Jørgen Wettestad. 2002. *Environmental Regime Effectiveness. Confronting Theory with Evidence*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mitchell, Ronald B. 2006. Problem Structure, Institutional Design, and the Relative Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements. *Global Environmental Politics*, 6:3, 72–89.
- Mitchell, Ronald B. and Thomas Bernauer. 1998. Empirical Research on International Environmental Policy: Designing Qualitative Case Studies. *Journal of Environment and Development*, 7:1, 4–31.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pattberg, Philipp H. and Oscar Widerberg. 2016. Transnational Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Conditions for Success. *Ambio*, 45, 42–51.
- Pattberg, Philipp H, Frank Biermann, Sander Chan and Aysem Mert, eds. 2012. *Public-Private Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Emergence, Influence and Legitimacy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Prakash, Aseem and Matthew Potoski. 2006. *The Voluntary Environmentalists: Green Clubs, ISO 14001, and Voluntary Environmental Regulations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, Mark and Laura DeNardis. 2015. Multistakeholderism: Anatomy of an Inchoate Global Institution. *International Theory*, 7:3, 572–615.
- Reinsberg, Bernhard and Oliver Westerwinter. 2019. The Global Governance of International Development: Documenting the Rise of Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships and Identifying Underlying Theoretical Explanations. *The Review of International Organizations*, 16, 59–94.
- Roger, Charles and Peter Dauvergne. 2016. The Rise of Transnational Governance as a Field of Study. *International Studies Review*, 18:3, 415–437.

- Rosenau, James N. 2002. Governance in a New Global Order. In Held, David and Anthony G. McGrew, eds. *Governing Globalization. Power, Authority and Global Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 70–86.
- Ruggie, John G. 2004. Reconstituting the Global Public Domain: Issues, Actors and Practices. *European Journal of International Relations*, 10:4, 499–531.
- Ruggie, John G., Caroline Rees and Rachel Davis. 2021. Making “Stakeholder Capitalism” Work: Contributions from Business & Human Rights. HKS Working Paper No. RWP20-034. Available at <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/publications/making-stakeholder-capitalism-work-contributions-business-and-human-rights>.
- Schäferhoff, Marco, Sabine Campe and Cristopher Kaan. 2009. Transnational Public-Private Partnerships in International Relations: Making Sense of Concepts, Research Framework and Results. *International Studies Review*, 11:3, 451–474.
- Sethi, S. Prakash and Donald H. Schepers. 2014. United Nations Global Compact: The Promise-Performance Gap. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122:2, 1–16.
- Stadtler, Lea. 2016. Scrutinizing Public-Private Partnerships for Development: Towards a Broad Evaluation Conception. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135:1, 71–86.
- Stadtler, Lea and Haiying Lin. 2017. Moving to the Next Strategy Stage: Examining Firms’ Awareness, Motivation and Capability Drivers in Environmental Alliance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26:6, 709–730.
- Stadtler, Lea and Gilbert Probst. 2012. How Broker Organizations Can Facilitate Public-Private Partnerships for Development. *European Management Journal*, 30:1, 32–46.
- Steffen, Will, Katherine Richardson, Johan Rockström, Sarah E. Cornell, Ingo Fetzer, Elena M. Bennett, Reinette Biggs, Stephen R. Carpenter, Wim De Vries, Cynthia A. De Wit, Carl Folke, Dieter Gerten, Jens Heinke, Georgina M. Mace, Linn M. Persson, Veerabhadran Ramanathan, Belinda Reyers and Sverker Sörlin. 2015. Planetary Boundaries: Guiding Human Development on a Changing Planet. *Science*, 347:6223, 1259855-1–1259855-10.
- Storeng, Katerini T. and Antoine de Bengy Puyvallée. 2018. Civil Society Participation in Global Public-Private Partnerships for Health. *Health Policy and Planning*, 33:8, 928–936.
- Szlezák, Nicole A., Barry R. Bloom, Dean T. Jamison, Gerald T. Keusch, Catherine M. Michaud, Suerie Moon and William C. Clark. 2010. The Global Health System: Actors, Norms, and Expectations in Transition. *PLoS Med*, 7:1, e1000183.
- Szulecki, Kacper, Philipp H. Pattberg and Frank Biermann. 2011. Explaining Variation in the Effectiveness of Transnational Energy Partnerships. *Governance*, 24:4, 713–736.
- Ulbert, Cornelia. 2013. How to Hit a Moving Target: Assessing the Effectiveness of Public-Private Partnerships. In Hegemann, Hendrik, Regina Heller and Martin Kahl, eds. *Studying ‘Effectiveness’ in International Relations. A Guide for Students and Scholars*. Opladen: Barbara Budrich, 101–120.
- UNGA: UN General Assembly. 2015a. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A/RES/70/1. Available at https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_1_E.pdf.
- UNGA: UN General Assembly. 2015b. Towards Global Partnerships. A Principle-Based Approach to Enhanced Cooperation between the United Nations and all Relevant Partners. A/RES/70/224. Available at <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N15/452/14/PDF/N1545214.pdf?OpenElement>.
- Utting, Peter and Ann Zammit A. 2009. United Nations-Business Partnerships: Good Intentions and Contradictory Agendas. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90, 39–56.
- van der Ven, Hamish, Yixian Sun and Benjamin Cashore. 2021. Sustainable Commodity Governance and the Global South. *Ecological Economics*, 186, 107062.

- van Tulder, Rob, Maria M. Seitanidi, Andrew Crane and Stephen Brammer. 2016. Enhancing the Impact of Cross-Sector Partnerships. Four Impact Loops for Channeling Partnership Studies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135, 1–17.
- Wang, Huanming, Wei Xiong, Guangdong Wu and Dajian Zhu. 2018. Public–Private Partnership in Public Administration Discipline: A Literature Review. *Public Management Review*, 20:2, 293–316.
- Westerwinter, Oliver. 2019. Transnational Public-Private Governance Initiatives in World Politics: Introducing a New Dataset. *The Review of International Organizations*, 16, 137–174.
- Young, Oran R. 2017. *Governing Complex Systems: Social Capital for the Anthropocene*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Young, Oran R. and Marc A. Levy (with Gail Osherenko). 1999. The Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes. In Young, Oran R., ed. *The Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes: Causal Connections and Behavioral Mechanisms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–32.