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Building successful partnerships to bring about sustainable transformation is at the core of market development facilitation. Yet all Market System Development (MSD) programs struggle with how to do this.

For development practitioners, who are often more accustomed to doing things themselves rather than through actors within a market system, developing an offer and negotiating a partnership with private sector and government actors may not always be the most intuitive of processes. Even for those within our teams who already have some business background building win-win partnerships this may not come naturally. The aim of this guideline is to unpack the process of building and managing successful partnerships so that we can understand the key principles, the core elements and the mechanics of how this is done.

Successful partnerships are both an art and a science. It requires patience, creativity, and flexibility, alongside an entrepreneurial attitude and acceptance that our ability to build productive working relationships and conclude deals will improve over time with practice and experience. It also requires attention to process and systems that support this new way of working.

When developing these guidelines, we realised that there is limited publicly available guidance on partnerships in market development programs. Market development trainings tend to only lightly touch on the partnership process, focusing more on diagnostics, intervention design, and the management of interventions once they are up and running. Relationship management and partnership negotiations are also seldom taught in our projects, with staff often left to learn by doing.

Although each partnership will follow its own unique pathway and invariably each market development program will need to adapt any guidance to their specific program structures, this is a step towards capturing and embedding our knowledge in this space: to help ‘business unusual’ become ‘business as usual’. This is intended as a practical framework to help you think and to guide your actions, rather than a rule book: it is important that each partnership is ‘fit for purpose’ which means that each partnership may look and feel unique.

The first version of these guidelines was developed in February 2015 and revised in 2018. When the original guidelines were prepared, the emphasis was on ‘just making deals’ – the important initial stage of getting projects up and running with partners. It established the main do’s and don’ts and framed the essence of a deal. As PRISMA’s partnerships matured, there has been a shift towards “making a better deal” and building more collaborative, productive, and sustainable working relationships from our very first interactions with potential partners. The second version was developed, in 2021, as PRISMA’s partnerships progress through the project cycle, there is a need to pay attention to the management, maintenance, improvement and sustainability of partnerships in order to increase our outreach through a systemic change in our partners.

The updated guidelines aim to capture this evolution and ambition in partnership relationships and incorporate the rich experience of PRISMA, including around more strategic, systemic partnerships and women’s economic empowerment. PRISMA portfolio team members have shared their rich learnings and experience of helpful tools and approaches, and this is now reflected in the guidelines. We will continue to revisit these guidelines as PRISMA learns and evolves, capturing our practical lessons.

In developing these guidelines, we have had the great opportunity in PRISMA to build on the knowledge of a number of large MSD programs, as well as the practical experiences and perspectives of our senior management, MSD advisers, and technical team. I would like to thank Vanessa Valentino for preparing and updating these guidelines in PRISMA 1 and Prajwal Shahi in updating this in PRISMA 2, the PRISMA portfolio/sector teams and Core Management Team for their inputs, and particularly Rajiv Pradhan, and Jim Tomecko for their invaluable support and Lieanto Agnisetiadi for his formatting skills. Julie Mundy, PRISMA’s Partnership Specialist has supported the team in the most recent update.

I hope that this practical guideline will provide new and existing teams with the practical tools and ideas needed to help our partnerships become even more productive and impactful.

Best regards,

Goetz Ebbecke
PRISMA Chief Executive Officer
WHERE DOES IT ALL FIT?

PRISMA has a well-established Program Management Cycle for Market Systems Development (MSD), outlined below, and the identification, building, and managing of partnerships is a foundational aspect of this cycle. These Guidelines have been developed specifically to support implementation teams optimise PRISMA’s partnerships.

The Partnering Process is broken down into 6 discrete stages as outlined below, which are covered in detail in these Guidelines, providing a range of ‘lived’ PRISMA examples and case studies, along with a range of supporting tools which can be found in the Annex at the back of this publication (and via hyperlinks in the electronic version).
WHY PARTNERSHIP GUIDELINES?

Establishing and maintaining healthy, mutually beneficial partnerships throughout the project cycle is key to PRISMA’s success and requires careful attention to cultivating and nurturing healthy, respectful working relationships. It requires strong interpersonal skills, attention to process, and dedicated time and effort to build and maintain effective working relationships with partners and potential partners who may have diverse values, opinions, and organisational cultures.

The relational aspects of our partnerships are equally as important as the technical aspects. Relationship management begins from our first interactions with potential partners and continues beyond our written agreements with partners. We need to establish a trusting and respectful relationship before we can negotiate with our partners. The more we focus on good partnerships, the greater the possibility of better and more impactful deals. The eventual aim of all of these partnerships is greater outreach through systemic change. These Guidelines remind us of the importance of paying attention to our partnerships’ relationship aspects, not just the project itself.
Establishing a partnership involves developing an agreement and forming a productive working relationship with an intervention partner to establish or strengthen the delivery of products or services necessary to make the market system function more effectively for our target group. When PRISMA first commenced, we focussed on ‘making a deal,’ reflecting the stage of the project cycle we were concentrating on. ‘Making a deal’ focuses on the start of the partnership. It is very transactional in tone, whereas establishing and maintaining a partnership conveys the dynamic, two-way nature of the engagement throughout the project cycle. It conveys a sense of commitment and joint responsibility, along with the shared value.

Respect for differences refers to our recognition that partners may have different values, approaches, systems, knowledge, experience, ways of working, and perspectives that they bring to a partnership. We embrace and respect differences as an asset that can help us solve problems that we have not been able to address unilaterally. Still, we also appreciate that it can take additional time and respect to work through differences productively.

Equitable relationships refer to a commitment to justice and fairness when dealing with partners (organisations and individuals), regardless of their size, power, seniority, social or political standing, or gender. It also means we will uphold and respect each other’s commitments while also recognising each other’s constraints.

Shared Value and Shared Accountability refers to our recognition that each partner has personal reasons for engaging in the partnership in addition to our shared goal. As a result, we should ensure that the partnership is working towards achieving specific benefits for each partner alongside the shared goal. Where there is mutual benefit, partners are more likely to continue engaging and developing solutions together. It also refers to PRISMA being accountable to its partners for what we say we will do and expecting accountability from our partners.

Open Communications refers to openness, honesty, and no hidden agendas or surprises in our working relationships. This is important for establishing trust, which in turn leads to improved accountability and risk mitigation. This means we will not intentionally withhold information from partners. We will also ensure that decisions are made together through open discussion and identify areas that require commercial confidentiality. It also means that we will flag and resolve any differences of opinion or challenges respectfully as they arise.

Courage to innovate and adapt recognises that every partnership will be different and require us to be open-minded and to innovate and adapt our approaches, style, and processes were needed to leverage maximum value from and for partners.

PRISMA’s ability to establish and maintain successful partnerships is improving with practice and experience, and with the sharing of knowledge across teams, about what does and does not work. Partnering is an iterative process that requires attention throughout the project life cycle, rather than a ‘set and forget’ activity that can be completed in a single meeting once an agreement is signed. As a result, it requires patience, persistence, creativity, and flexibility to identify and build on shared value with our partners.

Through this process, we aim to define and achieve win-win outcomes for all organisations involved jointly. This, in turn, allows us to strategically invest PRISMA resources to cost-effectively support a sustainable transformation in our partner’s business model.
WHAT WILL THESE GUIDELINES COVER?

These Guidelines will work through what is required at each stage of the project cycle to establish and manage successful partnerships.

- **Stages 1-4 Partnership Scoping and Building processes:**
  - Stage 1: Identification and assessment of potential partners, including the private sector and government partners.
  - Stage 2: Framing and making an initial collaboration pitch.
  - Stage 3: Agreeing on the business model and the broad strategy.
  - Stage 4: Negotiating the details of the partnership, including the detailed activity plan and budget, and developing a formal collaboration agreement that is signed by both parties.

- **Stage 5 Managing and improving our partnerships:**
  - How to build and maintain strong and effective relationships through establishing a positive, principles-based partnership culture
  - Addressing challenges of communication and commitment collaboratively
  - Thinking proactively about managing partnerships remotely
  - Extra considerations when working with government partners
  - Conducting regular health checks of the partnership together to adjust and improve the partnership.

- **Stage 6 Sustaining outcomes and Systemic Change**
  - Considers the options available as the partnership progresses: embed practices as business as usual, innovate, scale up and out and aim for greater outreach through systemic change through next-generation interventions, including brokering new and more strategic, systemic deals, including more complex multi-party partnerships
  - Where a decision is made to exit, guidance on doing so effectively is provided.
A series of tools to support the partnering process’s various stages, developed and tested by the PRISMA team, are included to provide support and rigour to the partnering process. The table below highlights the multiple tools and whether they are essential or optional/recommended. It is important to note that tools are not an end in themselves but provide useful frameworks for thinking about and progressing partnerships and opening more in-depth conversations with partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Partnership Process Cycle Tool</th>
<th>Additional Supporting Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Identify and assess partners</td>
<td>SAFIRA Partner Selection Criteria (for general criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1A</td>
<td>Guiding questions for assessing partners</td>
<td>Finance Sector Potential Partner Scoring (for technical criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid Institutional Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1B</td>
<td>Additional questions and tools for assessing WEE partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1C</td>
<td>Partnering Potential (History-Momentum-Scale-Drivers-Capacity)</td>
<td>SWOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 1D</td>
<td>Willingness and capacity matrix</td>
<td>Political Economy Analysis – Stakeholders Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Make the initial collaboration pitch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 2A</td>
<td>Framing the initial collaboration pitch</td>
<td>PRISMA Introduction Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Agree on the Business Model &amp; Broad strategy</td>
<td>WEE Business Language Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3A</td>
<td>Who does? Who pays? during the project and in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 3B</td>
<td>Business Model Canvas</td>
<td>Ansoff Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4P and 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Model Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOE-LOC, Commercial Case Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Economy Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Agree on the detailed activity plan and budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 4A</td>
<td>Decision tree for when and how to use PRISMA funds</td>
<td>PRISMA Standard Costs sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 4B</td>
<td>Allowable and non-allowable partner contributions</td>
<td>PRISMA Budget Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 4C</td>
<td>Developing a Collaboration Agreement (with/without payment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Reviewing and improving our partnerships</td>
<td>Partnership Health check: Include Local, Cultural Context of Implementation in the partnership health check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 5A</td>
<td>Partnership health check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Sustaining Outcomes &amp; Systemic Change</td>
<td>Policies, Guidelines, Templates, Procurement, Guideline, Plans, PN, PARTNERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool 6A</td>
<td>Options to Sustain Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 1: Identify and assess potential partners

**THERE IS NO FORMULA FOR FINDING AND SELECTING THE RIGHT PARTNERS.**
This involves trial and error and continuous assessment of potential partners.

During the development of the *Growth Strategy Document* (GSD), we would have discovered some of the key firms operating in our market. We may have even had some initial conversations with them. As we continue identifying partners, we should build on these initial contacts while also broadening our search for additional partners.

**WHO ARE WE LOOKING FOR?**

As the starting point for this guideline, we assume that the GSD process has effectively identified the needs of the target group and the priority weaknesses in the market system in delivering solutions for these needs. We also assume that research, analysis, and strategy setting has been conducted through a gender lens (see Guidelines on Women’s Economic Empowerment). Our vision and potential interventions should take advantage of both men’s and women’s knowledge, capacities, and contributions in the system and reflect desired changes for any identified gender-related problems.

As part of that analysis, we should have considered which types of market actors are best placed to perform these market functions and drive the changes needed to realise our future vision for systemic change in the market system. These market actors could be public or private sectors and range from input suppliers, processors, traders, collectors, business service providers, business member organisations, government agencies and public bodies, research organisations, and even educational institutions. We should have also considered at what level of the value chain we want to partner with.

**Consider the range of possible solutions**

We should start with a broad view of the market functions that we are trying to fulfil and the possible solutions. This means making sure: (i) we know what related products or services are prevalent in the current system, and (ii) we have some evidence of the success of such products or services. For example, if the missing or weak service area for our target group is around feed, we should consider all different feed options before narrowing our search to providers of a specific type of feed.

Partners are instrumental to the systemic change that PRISMA is attempting to bring about. By engaging market actors who have the potential to deliver changes that will lead to improved farmer incomes sustainably, we hope that these new market relationships, roles, and responsibilities will be engrained in the system and continue long after PRISMA’s support has concluded. This means that partnership identification is a continuous and iterative process that may result in dropping or including new partners at any stage of the intervention.

**WHERE DO WE FIND THEM?**

Potential partners can be identified through multiple channels, including:

- Internet & desk research
- Field visits
- PRISMA networks (other PRISMA programs, portfolios, or sectors; senior management; advisers; DFAT)
- Government networks and databases

**Stage 1: Think Partnership!**

The way we start engaging with potential partners will set the tone for any ongoing partnership. From the outset, we aim to establish a *principled approach* to how we work, and this involves modelling these principles in all of our engagements with partners. Throughout this initial identification and building stage, consider how you approach and communicate with your potential partners, the expectations you are setting, and the building of strong relationships.
Stage 1: Identify and assess potential partners

- Sector experts
- Other firms operating in the market, as well as industry associations and working groups
- Exhibitions, conventions, or other industry events

Aim to identify multiple potential partners

Ideally, we should work with more than one partner to improve our chances of success. The reality, however, is that we may only have the option of working with a single firm. Despite this, we should invest in expanding our options upfront by:

- Identifying at least three or more potential partners
- Not limiting ourselves to target districts when looking for potential partners
- Not limiting ourselves to market actors whose core business is in our market

The list above is not exhaustive, and we should always remember to capitalise on our knowledge and networks as we search for partners. As PRISMA's credibility and visibility increases, we can also expect to be approached by various companies who may be interested in exploring opportunities for collaboration.

WHY DO WE ASSESS THEM?

There is no such thing as a perfect partner. We are looking for the best possible match that will enable us to get the highest returns (Net Attributable Income Change X Outreach) for our investment in terms of human resources and money, which will deliver value for the partner as well. We conduct a more formal assessment during the partner selection stage to decide which potential partners prioritise and target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>What do we want to achieve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During partner selection (Stage 1)</td>
<td>- Determine the risks of engaging with different types of potential partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Short-list potential partners for further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prioritise short-listed potential partners (if there are multiple options)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During negotiations (Stages 2-4)</td>
<td>- Inform how we should structure the initial offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inform the types of activities that may be needed to support the partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inform decisions on the size of our financial contribution and the most appropriate type of written agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

opportunities and react to changing market realities. Consequently, we need to be dynamic and flexible in understanding and engaging our potential partners.

WHERE DO WE GET INFORMATION TO ASSESS THEM?

The incentives of market actors are often intangible and may include hidden agendas. Information on business models, sales volumes and targets, new product plans, customer and supplier information, financial data, etc., can be challenging to obtain, especially when companies do not have to disclose such details publicly or when individual entrepreneurs do not maintain proper financial or business records. We need to be mindful that companies will be sensitive about giving away their enterprise secrets.

So, finding out about potential partners requires considerable creativity and a good deal of detective work and reflection. It also involves building trust and spending time with prospective partners; this can open the doors to sharing more sensitive information over time. The primary sources of company information include:

- Company websites, annual reports, brochures, etc.
- Personal websites, social media, etc. for entrepreneurs
- Initial interaction/fact-finding visits to the company or entrepreneur (formal and informal meetings with managers, field staff, etc.)
- Suppliers, distributors, and customers
- Government websites
- Sector experts
- Coordination bodies and professional organisations
- Competitors

An important, but occasionally overlooked, source of information can be to speak with the company or entrepreneur’s field staff and not just the managers and representatives at the headquarters. However, if the partner is hesitant to share information due to confidentiality. We can offer the partner to sign the Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) during this stage to address their concern. Make sure to triangulate information as different stakeholders may have their agendas.

Good practices for initial interactions with potential partners

- Actively listen rather than charging through our questions or only thinking forward to what we want
Stage 1: Identify and assess potential partners

What do we assess?

**Willingness**

- Incentives
  - Interests
  - Motivations
- Responsiveness

**Capacity**

- **Motivations for engaging or not engaging** are the factors that affect the potential choices partners make when deciding whether or not to follow a particular strategy to achieve their interests. Why would they want to or not want to engage with PRISMA? What are the benefits and risks for them? Even if there are factors that may be holding them back from wanting to engage with us, this does not mean we should not engage with them. Instead, we should be looking for ways to understand and address their concerns.

### Examples of interests and motivators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Motivators</th>
<th>Demotivators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic interests</td>
<td>Opportunities to increase smallholder (or specifically female) customer base</td>
<td>Poor history dealing with other development initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interests</td>
<td>Not wanting competitors to have the first-mover advantage</td>
<td>Reluctance with being associated with the Australian government through PRISMA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing momentum upon which to build</td>
<td>Reluctance to work with PRISMA because we work with their competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant for Women Economic Empowerment² (WEE) opportunities/business case : Reluctance to work with women (e.g. because of perceived negative social ramifications)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT DO WE WANT TO KNOW?**

Prospective partners and market systems are highly diverse and dynamic. There is no one method for selecting partners, but there are several questions that we can ask to help assess potential partners.

We should have already checked some basic information around their business and their potential relevance to the services we would like to strengthen in the market system during the early stages of partner identification. We can then undertake a more in-depth partner assessment of their commitment, willingness, and capacity to expand, test, adopt new innovations, change their business model, and lead the change process. The business opportunity depends on more effective or expanded engagement with women. We should also conduct an additional assessment of their willingness and capacity to engage women (see Tool 1B Additional questions for assessing partners WEE partners).

**When assessing willingness,** we look at both incentives and the level of responsiveness of the potential partners. We also consider their leadership appetite, and commitment. Ensure we are getting an overall picture of the company’s willingness and not just specific individuals within the company.

**Incentives** are the reasons and driving forces behind the market actor’s behaviour. They involve two key elements:

- **Interests** are what market actors want to achieve. They dictate the decisions and actions undertaken by potential partners. They can be formally expressed interests (statements of purpose, stated priorities, company mission or vision statements, etc.) or more informal objectives. They can also vary depending on the timeframe. Whether an interest is immediate, medium or long-term can affect how important it is to the partner.
Responsiveness is a measure of the actor’s readiness to act and develop a partnership with PRISMA. This can be judged by how proactive they are in developing a partnership and how easy it was to get an initial or follow-up meeting with them.

Example: PT AHSTI in the maize sector and PT SOLBI (a pest lamp trader) in the shallot sector were both proactive in gathering additional information from the field about potential ideas presented by PRISMA. In addition to sending their own team to the field to assess the market opportunity, PT AHSTI also presented their findings to the PRISMA team with a clear direction on how they wanted to enter the market. In short, these companies were taking the opportunities seriously and willing to invest time and resources even before entering a formal agreement with us.

When assessing capacity, we are trying to understand whether the actor has the ability to take on a new or expanded role in the market system.

In the case of WEE (women’s economic empowerment) partnerships, piloting with more experienced partners (e.g. those who already have strong female supply chains or a large female workforce where they cater to female needs) can be a great way to prove an initial model. While we should actively explore the opportunities that are currently arising in agriculture, because of the changing demographics in rural areas (more women customers), we should be careful not to push this agenda with our partners too early as it may reinforce their notion of PRISMA being more of a social project than one through which they can expand their business. When the relationship is more mature and we have built a solid business case for WEE, this is the time to present this opportunity.

We can unpack partner capacity into five main elements:

- **Technical**: relevant practical knowledge (know-how)
- **Physical**: assets and human resources (including collaboration skills and competencies)
- **Financial**: sufficient funds for additional investments

**Leadership**: the existence of internal champions who can drive, influence, and sustain proposed innovations and secure their organisations’ commitment.

**Networks and linkages**: intensiveness and extensiveness of relationships with relevant individuals, organisations, agencies, etc. This may include the size of their customer or supplier base and the reach of their distribution network.

**Essential characteristics of good partners**

- **Willingness**: They are interested and motivated to work with us to develop/strengthen business models that will deliver change to our target group.
- **Capacity**: They have the capacity (or are able to build the capacity) to deliver the kinds of changes to our target group that will increase their incomes.
- **Ownership**: They are prepared to invest their time and resources (indicator of ownership) in the new or strengthened business model and share the risks of the joint intervention.
- **Scale**: They have the potential to reach scale and/or influence other market actors (systemic change).

See Tool 1A Guiding questions for assessing partners for guiding questions and more examples for assessing general willingness and capacity. See Tool IB Additional questions and tools for assessing WEE partners for additional questions and tools for assessing WEE’s willingness and capacity. Tool IC Partnering Potential (History-Momentum-Scale-Drivers-Capacity) can be used to compare various potential partners. Tool ID Willingness and capacity matrix provide a matrix to determine our engagement strategy depending on the partner’s level of willingness and capacity.
Stage 1: Identify and assess potential partners

Tips for identifying & assessing potential partners

- **Don’t be desperate for partners & beware of being too opportunistic:** As PRISMA matures and gains a stronger reputation, we now have more options. If a candidate does not work out, keep the door open for potential future collaboration, and move onto other candidates. Also, in cases where we are being approached by a firm, we should look at whether there is a strategic alignment with our vision for change before pursuing a collaboration with them.

- **Beware of donor “darlings” or companies highly dependent on grants:** Beware of companies that play one donor off the other. While it is not always clear where a company may be getting their funding, we should try where possible to get a sense of how much of their financing is grant-based. Partners that are overly dependent on donors and grant money tend to be high risk in terms of commercial viability and sustainability.

- **Target the commercial division (not the CSR arm) of a company:** One of the challenges faced by market development programs is getting businesses to see MSD as relevant to their core business, rather than just being ‘social work.’ The ideal partner to work with is the commercial division of the business since it has the business incentives to embed, sustain and expand the innovation.

- **Don’t just default to the market leader:** We sometimes partner with the market leader or actors who have the strongest international reputation. However, market leaders may also be more complacent with their position and less interested in innovating or taking new risks. Make sure to assess the incentives of potential partners and identify those that are more proactive in terms of innovating or growing their market share; this is not always the market leader.

- **Don’t miss out on opportunities to innovate with smaller motivated organisations:** Larger companies can pose less risk and can be easier to work with when trying new ideas. As one PRISMA staff put it: “they have more flexibility because they have the experience, human resources, and budget to fail.” They also give us potential for higher outreach and scale. If the business opportunity that we are presenting is a low priority for them or only contributes to a small fraction of their overall business; this may not be a good fit. Consider how what we are offering might add value.

- **Make sure to coordinate with other sectors, portfolios, and PRISMA programs:** Market actors can become frustrated or develop a negative perception of PRISMA when multiple teams approach them without coordinating. By understanding PRISMA’s previous interactions with a firm or entrepreneur, we can (1) ensure better relationship management and (2) better assess the suitability of the potential partner for the proposed intervention. Also, if partners express interest in other PRISMA sectors, be sure to introduce them to our colleagues.

- **Be open-minded and prepared to consider different ideas:** Your potential partners may have other ideas and suggestions compared to the opportunity you present. Listen carefully and be prepared to explore the options: if the resulting idea is something that also works for PRISMA, it could lead to an innovation or improvement with greater commitment and sustainability.
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HOW CAN WE EFFECTIVELY ENGAGE POTENTIAL PARTNERS?
The initial agreement is an output of building a relationship with potential partners.

We need to allow time for relationships to evolve. This means we might have several interactions and meetings with potential partners before making an initial collaboration pitch.

For effective engagement, it is important that we establish our credibility, build trust and rapport with our partners, manage expectations, and are prepared.

**Credibility** comes from our expertise and how we present ourselves. Key tactics for building credibility include:

- **Be prepared:** Know the target audience. Do background research on the specific individual(s) with whom we will meet. For example, a financial director may be more interested in the numbers than a marketing director who may want to hear more about promotion tactics or opportunities.

- **Be professional & respectful:** Always be professional, respectful, and diplomatic in all our communications with partners. Also, be sure to dress professionally when meeting with them and ensure that the meeting is scheduled conveniently.

- **Acting & talking business:** Use business language while discussing with partners (e.g., profit and market share). Do not assume that the business people we are speaking with are interested in “helping the poor” or “women.”

- **Present success stories:** Talk about our track record and success stories with companies in other sectors. Show evidence of the positive impact on the business of our partners. We may also want to reflect on some of these experiences and share lessons learned through these previous engagements.

**Stage 2: Think Partnership!**

This is a critical stage to think about the values and incentives of your potential partner. Why would they engage? What is the benefit for them? This can take time and patience to explore and uncover and requires you to have a genuine interest in what they need and be open and clear about what PRISMA can or cannot deliver.

- **Leverage sector experts’ credibility:** Use experts that are known and credible among the private sector to help open doors to companies and decision-makers.

  **Trust** is built up through communication, the ability to deliver professional and creative ideas, flexibility in modifying ideas to accommodate the firm’s business interests and structure. Most importantly, it is built by following through on your commitments and doing what you say you will do. Key strategies for building trust and rapport include:

  - **Continuously engaging partners in formal & informal settings:** Where appropriate, invite potential partners for lunch or dinner and continue discussions in more relaxed environments, preferably with another colleague. Face-to-face communication is often preferable in Indonesia, and it is common to spend time asking about and getting to know the other person before delving into business topics. Regular warm greetings or check-ins by text or phone is also a good way to engage with partners.

  __“It is easy to communicate with my private sector partner because they feel like I listen to them and I am not teaching them what to do. I listen to them to see what area of their business I can fit into [while I] ensure my development goals can also be achieved.” –PRISMA Staff__

  - **Listening more and talking less:** It is important that partners feel that we genuinely care about them. So, take the time to actively listen to build an understanding of their views, perspectives, and concerns. Understand and appreciate the risks they are taking by making new investments and developing new relationships with poor farmers. Demonstrate a genuine understanding of the
challenges they face and recognise the positive steps or contributions they have made or are making. Be authentic in your engagement.

- **Think about the value-addition for the partner:** A meeting should always be a give and take situation. What will be of benefit or interest to them? This could include sharing relevant contacts, market intelligence, etc.

- **Do not make any promises or commitments that we cannot deliver:** This is about demonstrating reliability by being consistent in what we say we do and what we do. If we have promised to come back to them with some information, we need to make sure we do this on time or inform them if there are delays.

- **Ensuring business confidentiality:** by letting potential partners know we are aware of and committed to protecting sensitive business information and not revealing any confidential information from other partners during our discussions.

**Expectations** in relationships can be harmful when they are not aligned or adequately managed. Potential partners may have unrealistic expectations, especially since the MSD approach is relatively new. Most partners are used to direct delivery donor programs (where there do not have to engage proactively or where handouts are common). We need to proactively, rather than reactively, manage expectations by:

- **Presenting the opportunity as a co-investment & clearing up confusion as early as possible:** We need to emphasise that partnerships will be reciprocal, temporary, and based on shared benefits. We have limited financial funds, and we do not subsidise business operations. We can use examples of success stories from other sectors or MSD programs to help the potential partner understand more about the approach, process, and potential roles and responsibilities of each party in a partnership. We should also be meeting potential partners at their premises and on their terms, where Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) protocols permit.

- **Introducing early on, we intend to work with multiple partners and be specific about ownership questions:** Partners may want the exclusivity of solutions provided to target beneficiaries, but this can conflict with our objectives of scaling up innovations by encouraging adoption by other market players. A balance needs to be struck between the two during the negotiation process. We also need to be clear that we intend to work with other companies, including their competitors, and what that might entail (sharing evidence of the benefits, potential field visits to demo plots, etc.).

- **Clarifying that we are not market actors:** We neither sell products/services ourselves nor earn a profit from partnering with them. Furthermore, we are not hiring them, and we are also not available for hire.

- **Informing them that we have our own KPIs:** Be honest and clear about what we expect to get from the partnership (intervention evidence, outreach, and impact, etc.). This can alleviate concerns that we may have ulterior motives in the sector and reinforce how the partnership should be based on mutual benefits.

**Preparation** is critical for successful negotiations. The more preparation, the greater chances of success — there is no such thing as being over-prepared! Good preparation allows us to be more confident when speaking with partners, instilling them with greater confidence in our ideas and proposals. On the other

---

**Tips for mastering the facts & figures**

- **Come armed with accurate, up-to-date and well-researched business calculations:** See tip box below on more effective business calculations.

- **Come armed with relevant and successful examples:** Where has this business opportunity/model been successfully applied? Understand the key factors for success and the impact on businesses. Use these facts to help build our business case.

- **Be ready to address any potential misconceptions or misunderstanding:** For example, PRISMA found that banks often associate working with farmers as being a high risk and high transaction cost activity. As a result, a critical part of PRISMA’s interaction with banks is to ensure they are properly educated and informed about the reduced risk and lack of high transactions costs when using agriculture value chain financing to expand smallholder access to finance.

- **Come armed with insights about farmers and other market actors:** Insights from our market analysis can help us make a more compelling case to partners. Don’t just assume farmers or women will take every opportunity given to them—opportunities must match their incentives and needs. For example, before making an offer to partners, we may want to do a small demand survey or some action research to gauge interest levels from farmers: How much would they be willing to pay? Why are they or are they not interested in using or purchasing a particular input? etc.
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Tips for more effective business calculations

- **Keep it at high level market numbers**: Provide the partner with the number of new clients, additional sales volume, etc. In most cases, they will be in a better position to translate these into revenue and profit. All we need to do is give them a general idea of the size of the potential market or unmet demand.

- **Verify the accuracy of calculations**: Business calculations are only effective if they are accurate. Why not use sector experts to verify our calculations or assist with the financial modelling of more complex businesses?

- **Find relevant benchmarks**: We can use benchmarks from other contexts or countries to demonstrate the potential market size. For example, to estimate the unmet demand for fertiliser in Nigeria, another MSD program looked at the levels of fertiliser usage (volumes per hectare) in other countries and used that as a benchmark.

Hand, if we come across as uncertain or unknowledgeable, this may undermine their confidence in us and threaten any credibility or trust that we have built. We may lose the opportunity to continue discussions. Good preparation involves:

- **Mastering the facts & figures about the sector and business opportunity**: We cannot be fundamentally wrong on the business side. Be equipped with technical information and have a clear picture of the overall opportunity in our minds. Initial market assessments need to be sufficiently detailed to give us a good understanding of the trends, threats, challenges, etc. We also need to have a strong understanding of the demand side story. This means being well-equipped with answers to questions that the private sector may have about what the current practices are among farmers, why farmers are reluctant to change, what could help facilitate changes among farmers, etc.

While this is important when pursuing any partnership, this is particularly critical when presenting WEE business opportunities. For WEE opportunities/business case, make sure also to master the facts and figures about women’s role and contribution in the sector.

**Example:** While looking through the annual report of the potential partner, the deal maker noticed multiple references to managing the negative press around one of the company’s agro-chemical products. As a result, the deal maker made sure to also couch the initial pitch around the reputational benefits for the company.

**Example:** Before meeting with an input supplier, one of the teams conducted a small survey of 50 farmers in Ponorogo to see how many farmers were interested in using a particular input and under what conditions. This information was used to provide some initial evidence of demand for the product.

- **Understanding the partner better by finding out as much as possible**: We need to understand their current operations and the incentives and risks at play. By uncovering their underlying interests, we will have a better idea of the factors which may be holding them back from expanding their operations and exploring innovations. This can help us adapt our engagement strategy and allow for more productive negotiations.

When working on WEE opportunities/business case, this also includes understanding what the partner’s relationships and practices are related to women and any barriers (informational, motivational, capacity, etc.) that stand in the way of adopting practices that are more inclusive of women.

**Using the partner’s context to shape the initial collaboration pitch and build shared value**: Instead of merely imposing our development agenda, put ourselves in the partner’s position — if we were the private sector, what is our incentive? What can we give? what do we need? etc. As a starting point, understand their agenda and strategy and look at how we can align and integrate our goals into their vision, strategy, and KPIs. Use this perspective to frame our value proposition.

**WHAT BASIC PRINCIPLES SHOULD UNDERLY ALL OUR ENGAGEMENT?**

All of our engagement with partners should reflect our fundamental principles of effective partnerships:

- Respect for differences
- Equitable relationships
- Shared value and shared accountability
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Open Communication
Courage to innovate and adapt.

WHAT ARE THE MAIN COMPONENTS OF AN INITIAL PITCH?

As noted above, preparation is key for successful negotiations. An excellent initial collaboration pitch needs to build on the partner’s incentives and demonstrate the value of the relationship to them. This means that we cannot depend on a standard text when approaching potential partners.

We need to structure each pitch to the individual partner. This requires that we start with a clear understanding of the business opportunity. When combined with a strong knowledge of the partner’s incentives and capacities, we can tailor our message and ensure that we articulate a compelling value proposition.

**WEE Example: Using Data and “Seeing is Believing” Tactics**

One of the seed producers in the mung bean sector was initially reluctant to promote certified seeds through female agents. To demonstrate the business case, PRISMA used a gender study and organised business workshops with potential agents. The gender study provided evidence of the high involvement of women in input purchasing decisions in the sector, as well as data on their receptiveness to new technology and practices. With the business workshops, the team organised two separate sessions for the company—one with potential male agents and another with female cooperatives. The seed producer was able to experience first-hand the differences in motivation between the two groups and reached the conclusion that the female cooperatives were more driven. This interaction also corrected initial preconceptions he had about the financial management capacity of women.

A credible pitch will need to address four key questions:

- What is the business opportunity?
- Why should they be interested in this opportunity?
- What can they expect from the partnership?
- What do we expect in return?
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Defining the WEE Business Opportunity

Not all partnerships are equally or immediately relevant for WEE. However, where it is relevant, we need to be clear about the business opportunity around engaging women. By not pursuing gender inclusive business practices, the partners may be missing out on:

- Women as an important customer segment
- Improved productivity/efficiency
- Improved quality
- Improved service or supply chain reliability
- New markets (e.g. international orders)
- Diversification of distribution channels
- Enhanced reputation or brand recognition
- Untapped or under-utilised female employee talent

See Tool 2A Framing the initial collaboration pitch for examples and suggestions of how to prepare for the questions above and frame the initial collaboration pitch.

WHO SHOULD WE ENGAGE WITH WHEN MAKING THE INITIAL PITCH?

Getting buy-in from high-level executives in the company is often crucial for ensuring a successful deal and future sustainability of the changes we are trying to adopt. However, it is not always easy or necessarily the best strategy to go straight to the top.

We should try to understand the structure of the company and the different levels of decision-makers. We should also build off our initial contacts to identify the most relevant entry points in the organisations. These tend to be individuals within the organisation who are:

- receptive to engaging with us
- considered to be forward thinkers, innovation leaders, or visionaries
- highly influential over decisions made in the company or capable of mobilising support

These individuals are likely to have the most robust incentives to engage with PRISMA and champion the partnership opportunity.

Action Research

These can be mini-pilots or experiments to (1) gauge the commitment or capacity of the potential partner and/or (2) generate information necessary to continue the partnership discussion. In some cases, we may conclude that the opportunity or potential partner is not viable.

Example in ICT/soybean sectors: For the scale-up strategy of BASF’s soy doctor intervention, the team is exploring options to develop an ICT platform that would allow BASF to more cost-effectively provide embedded information to farmers. The intention is to partner with an ICT company and develop a commercially viable ICT platform.

There are a number of unknowns (e.g. around the viability of the product and ICT company) which need to be tested before getting approval for the intervention and proceeding to the next steps of the deal making process. As a result, the team has developed a small Collaboration Agreement to conduct action research (with a maximum budget of AUD 20,000) with a prospective ICT partner.

Example in mung bean sector: The mung bean team has signed two Letter of Intents with EWINDO and engaged in an action research phase with EWINDO. The first letter of intent stated EWINDO’s interest to venture into the mung bean seed business, with PRISMA’s facilitation support. The second letter of intent captures the roles and responsibilities of each party in conducting further market research and seed trials. As the research and trials showed clear business opportunities, EWINDO signed a partnership agreement with PRISMA to commence their mung bean seed business.

We can draw on our initial analysis of leadership capacity (Tool 1A Guiding questions for assessing partners) to identify potential champions. However, it will not always be easy or apparent who has real strategic value in an organisation. As a result, patience and repeated interactions will often be necessary to identify an appropriate champion. Sometimes speaking with their customers or stakeholders can help us to identify key entry points and influencers.

If this is an existing or former partner, we should coordinate with our colleagues to identify who we should target for the initial pitch. In some instances, it might make sense to make the pitch at our colleague’s next scheduled meeting with the partner’s management.

WHO SHOULD COMMUNICATE OUR INITIAL COLLABORATION PITCH?

Just as it is crucial to think through who to target within the company, we should also consider who will be the best communicator of our initial collaboration pitch. This will depend
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on the organisation’s size, the seniority of the individual we are engaging, and the experience of our partnership negotiators.

**Example:** PRISMA partners with selected banks to develop and formalise value chain financing. One of the decisions the team has to make for each partnership is which level they should approach (national, regional, provincial, etc.). Each level has the authority to make decisions up to a certain budget, and it is often easier and less bureaucratic to develop a partnership with the regional or provincial level of a bank. While this can make it easier to form an initial partnership, there are also implications in terms of scale and degree of influence on the bank’s wider operations. In practice, PRISMA’s first generation partnerships have targeted the provincial and regional levels of banks, and this has implications as to who PRISMA engages when making the initial pitch. If the proof of concept is successful, the intention is to present the opportunity to the national level in the next generation. This will require identifying different entry points for engagement.

We should be putting forward partnership negotiators who are persuasive, personable, and able to inspire potential partners' confidence. They should have a deep understanding of the business opportunity, as well as the overall sector. Our partnership negotiators must be experienced or have at least shadowed more experienced negotiators before making their first pitch to a potential partner.

Where relevant, bring in management to lend more credibility. For example, when pitching to a large firm or multinational company director, we would typically want a member of the PRISMA management team to be present. We can also bring a sector expert with us during these negotiations to bolster our credibility.

**WHAT IS THE NEXT STEP AFTER THE INITIAL COLLABORATION PITCH?**

We would wish to see an indication from the potential partner (whether from the champion, mid-level management, or in the "best case" scenario, the senior management) that they agree to proceed with further discussions around this partnership opportunity. This can be a simple verbal agreement to continue exploring the collaboration and to move into the next phase of discussing the business model and broader strategy. Depending on the potential partner, we may proceed directly into Stage 3 in the same meeting or schedule a separate appointment to discuss the business model and the broader strategy. In some cases, we may agree to jointly conduct action research before deciding whether to move into Stage 3 of the partnership discussions.

At this point, we may also want to determine who the focal point(s) should be for ongoing engagements. Depending on the firm, this may involve determining two different focal points — one for decision making and one for day-to-day communications as we work together to define the business model, etc.

However, not all pitches will be successful, and we need to be prepared to walk away if potential partners show limited interest. But, in this case, it is essential to agree not to proceed and maintain good terms, so that we can keep the door open for future opportunities.
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What is the business model?

The business model shows how different market actors can sustainably deliver the change that we envision for the market system. We can visually summarise the business model with a simple diagram. A good model builds on each market player's incentives and capacities while also bringing about the poor's discernible benefits.

HOW DO WE DEVELOP AND AGREE ON A BUSINESS MODEL?

The process of developing and agreeing on a business model is highly iterative. It requires patience, continuous discussions with the partner, and time to strengthen understanding and confidence in the proposed model and PRISMA. The partner will have an enormous influence on how the business model will function.

Partners will often have a good understanding of what will or will not work in their market (although this is less likely to be the case when dealing with WEE). For example, they may have ideas on which market actors may be better as intermediate service providers in the model. Their inputs can also be necessary for preventing costly mistakes or for ensuring broad-scale outreach.

In short, while we would have prepared an initial business model as part of the Intervention Concept Note (ICN), it is crucial to work closely with the partner to validate the business model. To do this effectively, we will need to ensure that we:

1. Understand the existing strategy and business model of the partner
2. Understand the incentives and capacities of each actor within the proposed model
3. Remain open, flexible, and creative while also keeping our development goals insight
4. Understand that delivery has to be sustainable and, in best cases, leads to crowding in and systemic change.
5. Use the Tool 3B Business Model Canvas as an Optional Tool if Applicable:

   This is also critical for when we craft a broad strategy and negotiate the details of the partnership.

For WEE partnerships, it is important that all members of the partnership are convinced by the WEE business case and able to articulate from a commercial standpoint why and how women are being integrated into the business model.

Example: The Crop Protection team conducted an assessment in the field to understand the business model of PT Mitra Kreasidharma (MKD) and their approach to marketing. This included interviews with successful MKD farmers, and sales teams in Central Java and East Java to discuss the constraints they face.

Example: Pak Heri, was a maize collector in Magetan, Central Java. He is buying maize from farmers, but in our proposed model, we believe that it would benefit the collector to go the extra mile to provide farmers with other supporting services in mechanization. He is investing in a Combine Harvester (Combi) for maize and rice. He is renting the Combi to other farmers and they now achieve a better-quality harvest in a shorter time period compared to doing it manually. Why would the collector want to invest more to do this? Our work is to understand what the business case is for the maize collectors in Magetan and to make sure we sell the idea by focussing on the better incentives.

Using the diagram as a starting point, understand the partner's plan and strategy, and look at how we can align and integrate our goals into their Business Model.
Understand the partner’s current strategy and business model as an essential starting point for developing and iterating a new business model. We need to be aware of how our partner currently operates to play on the partner’s strengths, understand what changes are required, and ensure alignment with their overall strategy and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Are the changes we are proposing going to cannibalise their core business? Are we asking too much of them? Do they have the will, skills, and capabilities to make and sustain the shift? Can we achieve our objectives through incremental steps, or will it require significant changes? In some cases, it can be helpful to do a pre-assessment in the field to gain a better understanding of their current business model and practices.

Example of Business Model Government

Example of Private Public Partnership (PPP) Business Model

Understand each actor’s incentives and capacities within the proposed model is equally important since we seek to change the relationships between various market actors in the system. We need a clear sense of our partner’s incentives and capacity and each actor in the newly proposed model — farmers, intermediary service providers, etc. This understanding will help us make the business case to each of the main actors involved in the model.

Remain open, flexible, and creative while also keeping our goals in sight. This is necessary for securing our partner’s buy-in in the proposed model while also generating the impacts we require. If we drive the business model’s development, we risk reducing the partner’s ownership of the change process and threatening the innovations’ sustainability. We should remain open-minded and resist entering discussions with the model’s fixed views: this reflects our principles – being courageous to explore different approaches. We should also be using creativity to expand the options for a solution. Finally, we should be firm on principles but flexible on the details. What is the broad strategy that we need to agree on with the partner?

The broad strategy (or high-level activity plan) builds off the proposed business model and involves defining the:

- Headline activities
- Desired impact/outreach target
- A time frame of the partnership
- Overall roles/responsibilities/accountabilities of the partner and PRISMA
- Information needs and parameters for business confidentiality
- Use Guiding Questions- Example of Guiding Questions below:
  1. Who are the actors in the value chain?
  2. What are the roles of each actor?
  3. What are the incentives of each actor?
  4. Are there other ways to engage with new actors in the value chain or improve existing market actors’ roles to increase their incentives?

Example: PRISMA collaborated with PT. NASA, one of national bio-pesticide company, on the development of a mobile app to improve agricultural knowledge of NASA’s distribution agents. The app provided inexpensive and effective promotional materials to be used by NASA’s agents. The concept evolved significantly from the initial pitch made by us, which had a narrow focus on pest and disease management for a single crop. In the initial six months, we tried to push our original concept and the interaction was largely one-sided. We realised the importance of listening more to the partner and being flexible around revising the concept and app design based on NASA’s actual needs and pain points. During this process, we discovered why NASA experienced difficulties in expanding to other provinces and revised the concept to also improve the efficiency of how NASA does business.

The headline activities needed to implement the business model will vary from one intervention to another. Below is an illustrative list of the types of activities that PRISMA could conduct when working with firms to expand product...
outreach, improve current products, and/or develop new products.

### SUPPLY GENERATION

- **Market research & studies**: Cost-benefit analysis of consumer, consumer behaviour studies, market segmentation, commercial or technological feasibility study, supplier study, Intermediary Service Provider (ISP) identification study, mapping of entrepreneurial women’s groups
- **Strategies/plans**: Procurement strategy, distribution plan, distribution strategy to reach women, ISP engagement plan, product packaging design briefs, strategies for outgrowing operations
- **Technology transfer/new product development**: Technical Assistance (TA), learning visits
- **Capacity building for systems or processes of the partner, intermediary service provider, or input supplier**: TA, training modules
- **Capacity building of farmers**: learning centre, training
- **Linkage facilitation**

### DEMAND STIMULATION: PRODUCT MARKETING AND SOCIAL MARKETING

- **Strategies/plans**: marketing plan, marketing strategy for targeting female consumers, consumer education strategy
- **Education & promotional materials**: radio, print
- **Education & promotional events**: demonstrations, farmer expo, field day, farmer exchange visit, farmer competition, farmer forums, farmer meetings, consumer education campaign

A preliminary results chain helps to guide our negotiations around the broad strategy

The results chain captures the causal logic of the intervention, including what we want to achieve through the intervention, what we would want the partner to do, and what support we intend to offer. It should show us how we expect the intervention to unfold as we move from activities to impact.

We should have already prepared a simple internal results chain as part of the ICN and should use it to inform our negotiations in this stage, but not share it with the partner. This results chain will likely change.

Use it to ensure we are designing activities that lead to the changes we want to see at the farmer level.

The outreach target will depend on the number of farmers in the target area, our partner’s capacity (production capacity, the reach of their distribution network, etc.), and the partner’s willingness to expand rapidly. Agreeing on an outreach target can be challenging. PRISMA typically wants to reach more farmers in a short timeframe and usually has more ambitious targets than private sector partners, who often prefer more incremental steps.

#### Partnerships involving WEE: Help businesses mitigate risk by starting small

WEE partnerships often require much more innovation and tend to be perceived as being higher risk and/or lower gain by partners. Many businesses are unlikely to agree to large-scale inclusion of women until they have tested the inclusion of women in their business strategy. As a result, piloting with smaller outreach targets will at times be necessary to mitigate the risk for partners. If successful, we can then work with partners to scale-up the initiative in subsequent partnerships.

As a result, we will likely have to negotiate with partners on the outreach targets. As we push for higher outreach numbers, we need to make sure these targets match their capacity. We can also start with smaller pilots and build in more increased outreach through the scale-up phase.

It can also be helpful to frame the outreach targets from their business perspective. For example, we can translate outreach numbers into sales targets for the company.

The overall timeframe will depend on the sector and the culture, mindset, and education levels of beneficiaries and other market actors involved in the model. In general, most interventions will have at least 1-2 seasons for piloting and at least 1 season for scale-up.

We may need to have a lengthier pilot phase if the innovation is untested or where farmers are unreceptive to change. For example, the widespread emergency mindset in provinces like Papua might mean that it would take longer for innovation to take hold there, and will require more time and attention to achieve sustainable change.

**Overall roles and responsibilities** between PRISMA and the partner must be agreed around each of the headline activities. Just as we assessed our partner’s overall capacity and willingness to engage in a partnership, we also need to be aware of their capacity and willingness to lead on the various headline activities. In some cases, we may find that an activity’s natural home would be better placed with PRISMA. These tend to be one-off activities that PRISMA could lead and implement without threatening the business model’s future sustainability.
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Information needs and parameters for business confidentiality need to be discussed upfront and incorporated into our written agreements. We must build results measurement (RM) into our overall strategy and understand how RM can benefit them. This requires that we know their existing KPIs and what information they already collect. This might involve developing a set of KPIs for the partnership and/or providing additional support to improve their MIS systems (e.g., incorporating business metrics that could better tailor their market to women).

Being explicit and agreeing on specific information requirements from the beginning is vital for ensuring that we will have access to the precise information we need to monitor progress; make timely and effective decisions, and capture evidence of the model’s viability/opportunity. This will include data after our intervention has started and key baseline indicators (sales, number of distributors, etc.).

We also need to discuss what information is business sensitive and should be treated confidentially and how we intend to use or repackage information to showcase the intervention’s success and/or develop a business case around the opportunity. Early discussions around information requirements and business confidentiality will be vital to maintaining the trust and good relationships with our partners as we progress into implementation.

**WHO SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD ON PREPARING THE BROAD STRATEGY?**

This can happen in parallel or after our discussions around the business model and is often an ongoing process. Three basic scenarios could happen before we have joint talks on the high-level activity plan:

- **Scenario 1:** Partner takes the lead to develop and share the first draft
- **Scenario 2:** No draft is shared between PRISMA and the partner in advance of discussions, and it is developed together during discussions
- **Scenario 3 PRISMA** takes the lead to develop and share the 1st draft.

We should encourage the partner to be more active and lead the process of developing the high-level activity plan if they are interested in doing so. This can ensure greater buy-in from the partner and that the proposed strategy is better matched to their capacity. However, when PRISMA creates the first broad strategy, it is part of our consultancy services for the partner to have a greater buy-in in engaging and implementing these activities. PRISMA’s templates and tools help us and partner get on the same page for the partnership.

Once the partner has developed and shared the first draft, we can then have joint discussions to iterate on the draft. This is when we can ensure that our outreach goals are met and that we have sufficiently considered sustainability issues. While mindful of the partner’s capacity and willingness, we should also encourage them to take on more responsibility where possible.

**Example:** For one partnership, the written agreement noted that the partner would share sales information with PRISMA. It was only during the implementation phase that the team realised that the partner had a different understanding of what that meant. The partner was sharing sales information related to the promotional events under the partnership but not wider sales information (i.e. indirect sales) which the team would need to assess the impact of the intervention. From this experience, they learned that they would need to be even more precise about their information needs during the deal making process.

However, some partners may need or appreciate more guidance and support. In this case, the next-best alternative is to have joint discussions to co-develop of the strategy and high-level activities which can also serve to help push innovation and develop partners capacity. This approach requires good preparation and strong facilitation skills to ensure that the discussion results in a clear goal and strategy.

Whether or not the partner takes the lead and shares the first draft or if not in advance of discussions, we should always be well prepared. This means taking the time to develop our draft (without being wedded to it), which we can use as a tool to guide negotiations.
WHAT IS THE NEXT STEP?

We would want to confirm the buy-in and agreement from the partner’s senior management before proceeding to negotiate the specifics around the detailed activity plan and budget (Stage 4), as not all partner representative have 'permission to partner'.
Stage 4: Agree the detailed activity plan & budget

WHAT IS THE DETAILED ACTIVITY PLAN?

Once the business model and the high-level activities are agreed upon, the next step is to break down each of these broad activities into smaller, more actionable steps. This forms the basis of the detailed activity work plan, which provides the specifics around what needs to be done and how it should be done in the implementation phase. We can visually represent this in a Gantt chart.

Example: Contributing to the salary of partner’s new field staff during probation period

When introducing a partner to a new market, our collaboration could involve supporting them with their marketing and distribution activities. Our experience has shown that for product usage and adoption of innovation at farmer level the business presence of the field staff is important. PRISMA could help trigger the partner to invest in new human resources in this area by cost sharing the salary of a staff member during their probation period. This activity will be part of the partners marketing and promotional strategy. This activity would help pilot the proof of concept to PRISMA’s partner. By doing so, PRISMA’s partner will hopefully have a sustainable business model in the area with embedded service towards its customers at the field level.

As with all plans, this is a detailed map of how to proceed, given the information we currently have. This is likely to change during the implementation phase as we integrate learnings from our activities and adapt to dynamic market conditions. For example, at present, we might think SMS blasts are the best promotional tool to reach our target group, but in the future, there may be evidence that other techniques work better. Also, be aware of activities that could potentially distort the market.

Besides, we need to think through how each activity is delivered. Illustrative questions are provided below for common activities such as training or demo plot. Who should lead in preparing the detailed activity plan?

If the partner is eager to prepare an initial draft, we should not hesitate to let them take the lead. Where we are leading the process, we need to ensure that we are open and flexible when discussing the details with the partner. In either case, we should have prepared our draft before organising a workshop with the partner to finalise the detailed activity plan.

Whether a partner is likely to take the lead will depend mainly on the capacity of the partner. For larger companies, they may be more interested or able to develop a detailed activity plan. For smaller companies, we would typically take the lead in preparing the detailed activity plan as this can be an intensive activity that requires significant thought and planning. However, in that case, we have to take time to work through it, adjust based on their inputs, working hard to ensure buy-in from the
partner to avoid the sense that this is ‘PRISMA’s plan and not ours’, which can often translate into a lack of ownership and accountability.

**WHAT IS THE BUDGET & WHY WOULD WE COST-SHARE ACTIVITIES?**

The budget estimates cost as accurately as possible for each of the activities set out in the detailed work plan. It is essential that there is an agreed budget and that both PRISMA and the partner are clear on their respective investment areas.

Cost-sharing refers to when PRISMA partially covers the costs of activities to facilitate market actors to change their behaviour. This could involve:

- Incentivising partners to try something new
- Reducing their risk of doing something new
- Temporarily reducing their investment (but preferably not their recurrent costs) for doing something new
- Developing their competence to do something new and sustainable

Each cost-sharing agreement is unique and is reached through consultation and negotiation with our partner.

**WHAT CAN PRISMA FUNDS BE USED TOWARDS?**

Ultimately, our goal is for the partner to lead and fund the change as part of their revised business model.

As a result, we do not want to subsidise their transaction costs with the target group or use our funds towards things they would have done anyway. We want to avoid paying (and performing) activities that are part of their current day-to-day operations or activities central to continuing future behaviour change. Instead, our support should focus on transformational one-off activities or activities that provide an initial big push to encourage partners to continue performing and investing in a new way of working.

Also, just because we can fund something does not mean we should invest something. This needs to be customised and justified for each intervention and partner. We should ensure additionality in the activities we sponsor (i.e., we are not replacing funds that the partner already has for a particular activity).

The following table outlines several items that we cannot fund, or which require a strong justification for PRISMA’s support. Where items ‘Need strong justification’ it requires the PRISMA CEO’s approval for any cost share of the partnership activity. (Please note that regardless of whether the CEO is an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs strong justification</th>
<th>Never justifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recurring operational and working capital costs of the partner, including personnel</td>
<td>Management fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assets, e.g., buildings, machines, or infrastructure</td>
<td>Subsidised credit for farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free discounted samples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs manufactured by the partner for use on demo plots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use [Tool 4A: Decision tree for When and How to Use PRISMA Funds](#), along with the tables above to determine what PRISMA can fund and under what circumstances we may fully fund, cost-share, or cost-share on a sliding scale.

**Additional tips for Collaboration Agreements:**

**Match our internal capacity to the items we are funding**

With Collaboration Agreements where there is no transfer of funds between PRISMA and the partner, some activities will be self-implemented and funded by PRISMA while other activities will be implemented and funded by the partner. It is important that the activities we fund match our internal implementation capacity.

Through experience, teams have learned that logistical activities (e.g. arranging meals, farmer transportation fees, meeting venues, invitations) can require significant investment in time and resources, which we often do not have. Our procurement processes are often less flexible than the partner’s. Make sure to take that into account when determining who should fund/implement particular activities in the Collaboration Agreement, to ensure that such expectations are achievable and realistic.
HOW DO WE ENSURE WE RIGHT-SIZE OUR CONTRIBUTIONS?

It is vital to right-size our contribution because too little support could fail to change the market system’s behaviours. Simultaneously, too much support may undermine sustainability — for example, if the intervention is seen as being owned by PRISMA. When determining when and how much to contribute, we should:

- **Aim to keep contributions minimal**: The best deal is when our partner takes the ideas presented and decides to finance it themselves. We should be complementing rather than substituting partner contributions.

- **Be strategic**: Be clear about our contributions’ objectives and determine who will pay and undertake services when our contributions end.

- **Do no harm**: Be wary of giving unfair advantages to one player over the other, eroding ownership, creating dependency, or diminishing incentives to pursue change independently.

**Rule of thumb**: Start by trying to get 100% partner contribution, but if it goes below 50%, speak to management.

Example: Potential justification for co-sharing or fully-funding irrigation infrastructure

While irrigation providers are usually willing to pay for irrigation equipment (e.g. pumps, related accessories, diesel engine or electric motors), they are often reluctant to invest in the canal infrastructure because of the high costs and risk. To recover their investment, they need to secure long-term contracts around the provision of water to villages. Typically, contracts with villages are between 3-5 years, and there is no guarantee that they will be renewed. This increases the risk for the irrigation providers and reduces their willingness to invest in the canal infrastructure. In such a scenario, we can potentially justify co-sharing or fully funding the canal infrastructure.

**Example: Potential justification for co-sharing or fully-funding irrigation infrastructure**

While irrigation providers are usually willing to pay for irrigation equipment (e.g. pumps, related accessories, diesel engine or electric motors), they are often reluctant to invest in the canal infrastructure because of the high costs and risk. To recover their investment, they need to secure long-term contracts around the provision of water to villages. Typically, contracts with villages are between 3-5 years, and there is no guarantee that they will be renewed. This increases the risk for the irrigation providers and reduces their willingness to invest in the canal infrastructure. In such a scenario, we can potentially justify co-sharing or fully funding the canal infrastructure.

**Key factors affecting the absolute or relative value of our contributions**

There is no formula to determine how much we should contribute, but there are several factors we should consider:

- **Partner’s financial capacity**: A start-up or small company will likely have fewer financial resources for additional investments.

- **Risk profile of partner**: The business track record, age of the company, reputation, legal status, etc. might give us an indication of whether we would be comfortable entrusting them with more funds.

- **Perceived risk of the intervention**: This depends on the type of intervention, whether the concept is tested or untested, and the current capacities of the partner. If we are expanding the geographic coverage of the firm’s existing product, this may be less risky for the partner than asking them to introduce a new product that is outside their current core competence or to integrate women in their supply chain or business practices.

- **Anticipated impact/outreach**: This relates to the potential development benefits that we can expect from the partnership.

- **Sustainability**: If many of the activities are one-off activities and not required in the future, we can justify a higher intensity of support. We can also justify higher contributions if our contributions are diminishing over the lifetime of the intervention.

**Right-sizing contributions for WEE opportunities**

Given the innovative nature of WEE initiatives for many partners, it is likely that our contribution will be larger for the initial deal. This is often necessary to mitigate the perceived higher risk and/or lower gains by partners and to help us build a stronger evidence base around the inclusion of women.
WHAT CAN BE COUNTED AS PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS?

When calculating the partner’s contribution, we should include only investments — or, in other words, additional resources spent by the partner towards achieving the partnership’s goals. The table below summarises some of the key costs that can and cannot be counted by the partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed: can be counted towards partner contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ New personnel for the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Existing personnel that have been fully reallocated to the partnership/partnership goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Assets purchased or rented for the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Consultants for partnership activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Operation costs towards the partnership (all costs/expenses related to the new personnel, travel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Raw materials (including samples provided to farmers) for partnership activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Loans from the partner to farmers or ISPs for partnership activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Direct activity costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not allowed: cannot be counted towards partner contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Management fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Staff &amp; management commitment from existing personnel (except if the staff or manager has been fully reallocated to the partnership/partnership goals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Tool 4B Allowable and non-allowable partner contribution for a more detailed breakdown on the precise cost items that can be included as part of the partner’s contribution.

While we cannot monetise and count pro-bono contributions in the budget, it is vital to acknowledge the non-financial contributions which partners are making to support the PRISMA initiative, which can be included in an Annex to the Collaboration Agreement.

WHO SHOULD LEAD ON PREPARING THE BUDGET?

Written agreements for Partnerships

The written agreement should be an enabler of the relationship and should not impose artificial WEE targets onto partners:

■ Make sure the agreement sets out a clear commercial case for WEE and the mechanisms to contribute to WEE. This ensures that over time (with management changes etc.) that each party remembers the core commercial centre of the deal.

■ Discuss with an experienced deal maker who has WEE experience about how to frame good clauses in the written agreement.

If necessary, we can take the lead in preparing the draft budget but should encourage and support the partner if they are willing and able to do this, to build ownership and engagement. Another good approach is to sit down and work through the budget together, which can help refine the budget and approach as ideas are brainstormed and discussed through the budgeting process.

General rules for budgeting & costing

■ Currency: Budget should be in IDR (discuss with Chief Operations Officer (COO) for any exceptions).

■ Valuing assets: Use the market or current resale value of the asset. There’s no need to account for depreciation, or write-off.

■ Tax: Incorporate taxes in partner’s contributions.

■ Valuing goods manufactured by partner: These should be valued at cost. This figure may be difficult to obtain, in which case we should take the retail cost and deduct a reasonable margin.

■ Keep contributions separate: Avoid splitting single transactions between the partner and PRISMA, e.g. don’t split a workshop 50/50 instead reallocate across budget lines so that each receipt corresponds to either PRISMA or the partner.
Stage 4: Agree the detailed activity plan & budget

WHAT IS THE NEXT STEP?

Once the approved budget and detailed activity plan are agreed upon with the partner, and the Collaboration Agreement is signed, the partnership negotiation process is complete, and implementation can commence.

Don’t rush the process — take the time to make sure they understand and buy-in to the partnership before signing the Collaboration Agreement. This includes making sure there is clarity around (1) the business opportunity, model, and strategy; (2) roles and responsibilities, activity plan, and budget; and (3) information sharing requirements and partnership confidentiality. The immediate post-negotiation phase involves preparing and signing a written Collaboration agreement to ensure everyone is on the same page.

Please refer to the Tool 4C: Partnership Agreement Guidelines (I:\Policies, Guidelines, Templates\Procurement\Guideline, Plans, PN\PARTNERSHIP) for information about the preparation and use of the two different types of Collaboration Agreements.
**Stage 5: Managing and Improving our Partnerships**

**Partnership building does not stop when we sign an agreement.** As part of our role as facilitators, we need to be active relationship managers not only during the initial negotiations but also as we move into and beyond the immediate implementation phase. It is common to make the mistake of thinking that 'partnership' happens at the start and then we can 'set and forget it'. This is not the case: our ongoing role is to develop, nurture and maintain healthy, collaborative working relationships which are supported by PRISMA’s principled approach to engaging with our partners (see page 13) for more about these values.

Although the guidance below focuses on managing our relations with partners, this needs to happen in parallel with managing our interventions, sectors, and/or portfolios. Here we are concerned with the relational aspects of working with partners, whereas the latter is concerned with financial, strategic, and/or technical aspects of the partnerships.

**WHY IS RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT IMPORTANT?**

As a market development program, we work through market actors to achieve inclusive and systemic market changes (please refer to the Results Measurement Manual for more guidance). **Partnerships are essential to achieving our objectives.** Given our high dependence on partnerships to success, good relationship management is critical for the success of our interventions.

When we move from negotiating the partnership to implementation, the realities of working together and the actual preferences and capacities of our partners will become more apparent. Challenges may arise from differences in interpretations, shifting expectations, changing priorities or leadership, turnover in staff, or even differences in organisational culture and systems. While our Collaboration Agreements may include some accountability tools (e.g. milestone payments), proactive and engaged relationship management will be vital for maintaining momentum and ensuring our partners’ continued interest, commitment, and ownership. A strong, collaborative working relationship can lead to:

- **Better cooperation during impact assessments or when showcasing the initiative:** Since impacts will be assessed up to two years after the end of PRISMA’s activities under the partnership, we must maintain a positive relationship with partners. This can ensure cooperation from partners and minimise chances that they may obstruct the collection of necessary data. During the contracting process, data sharing conditions should be discussed and stipulated in the contract. Over time, we should strive to customize the specific details of the timeline and required data to share with PRISMA or DFAT. In some instances, we may also be showcasing the initiative to other market actors or DFAT. Partners tend to be more receptive to such visits when relationships are healthy and a trusting, 'no blame' culture is established.

- **Opportunities for additional partnerships or to add further value to existing partnerships:** Finally, information flows more freely when there is a healthy relationship between partners. This can make it easier to explore other ideas and opportunities for improving or
extracting more value from the existing partnership or developing new additional alliances.

**WHAT CAN WE DO TO MANAGE & IMPROVE OUR PARTNERSHIP EFFECTIVELY?**

We need to manage relationships in a professional, transparent, and proactive way. As noted in Stage 2, it is important that we establish our credibility, build trust and rapport with our partners, manage expectations, and are well prepared. These approaches are effective engagement just as critical when engaging partners once we start implementing (see page 11).

In addition to these approaches, we should look to encourage and maintain positive relationships with our partners by:

1. **Agreeing on a partnering culture**
2. **Continue to Communicate**
3. **Conducting regular partnership health checks**
4. **Adapting and improving the partnership**
5. **Managing conflict and disagreements**

**1. AGREEING ON A PARTNERING CULTURE**

Although we have shared goals with our partners, we may have very different styles of working. This relates to our organisational and professional cultures, which can often be a source of tension and misunderstanding in a partnership. Ensuring agreement on how partners will behave, and work together can improve the efficiency of our partnerships and minimise potential misunderstandings and misalignment.

 Ideally, we would want to have an open dialogue with our partners and agree on behavioural norms, expectations, approaches and processes which will support and enhance the partnership. This may include:

- What principles or values should underlie our relationship (which is decided with each partner, and maybe unique, not just a copy of PRISMA’s partnering principles, though these could be used as a prompt to open a discussion)
- What risks we foresee to the relationship and how to manage these
- Expectations for behaviour during meetings
- Communication structures and schedules
- Partnership governance meetings and decision-making
- An approach to managing conflict etc

This approach also requires that we reflect on the culture of PRISMA and where that might be incompatible with our partners’. It also requires that we are open to learning about and from our partner’s organisational and professional culture.

It is crucial not only that we agree on a productive way of working together but that we also communicate this partnership culture to new individuals who join the partnership, and that we lead by example, modelling the behaviours we have committed to with our partners, even in times of stress.

**2. CONTINUE TO COMMUNICATE**

Regular, open communication is a cornerstone of a collaborative and productive working relationship and is critical throughout the project cycle, not just during negotiations. It allows us to foster understanding and conviction around our shared vision while also resolving misunderstandings before they escalate into more severe issues. Regular engagement with partners helps us to consolidate trust and gain the confidence of our partners. It also creates a space to share information and concerns openly and to problem solve collaboratively.

Ongoing communication can involve both formal and informal interactions (scheduled reviews, field visits, interactions at events, informal discussions in more relaxed environments, etc.), as well as multiple channels of communication (face-to-face
meetings, emails, phone calls, WhatsApp messages, etc.). Check with your partners which channels and methods they prefer and try and accommodate those where possible. The intensity of our engagement will vary depending on the partner and the organisational levels that are managing our partnership.

**Tips for ongoing communications**

- **Tailor the frequency and methods of our communication with our partners:** As noted above, the intensity of our engagement will differ from partner to partner. It will also vary depending on whether we are engaging field staff, task leaders, middle management, senior management, etc. Too many meetings can be disruptive while too few, or ineffective meetings can also be just as harmful to the partnership. Ensure sessions are well organised and run to time. Capture key decision points and actions and share those between all participants straight after the meeting. Find the right balance for a productive, collaborative working relationship.

- **Maintain communication with all levels of the organisation:** We often have more regular contact with field staff or mid-management. However, we need to ensure that we also build in opportunities to engage higher levels of management. This is important for achieving more embedded engagement, ensuring alignment with changing organisational strategies, and continued commitment from partners’ senior management.

- **Engage partners about topics beyond the specific intervention:** This could involve discussing the broader challenges faced by the company or their emerging interests and strategies. We can also share with them what we are doing elsewhere in other sectors. However, this does not need to be confined to speaking about their business. We should also explore topics of personal interest, where appropriate, as this will help build trust and rapport with our partners providing that we are authentic and genuine.

- **Use group-based communication tools:** WhatsApp groups can be a great way to increase interaction with partners and easily share updates, especially in a time of COVID travel restrictions. It allows for real-time feedback and sharing of pictures and videos. We may want to have different groups for different levels of the organisation. Agreeing to some informal protocols about its appropriate use can be helpful, e.g. out of hours use, direct messaging from within the group to individuals etc.

- **Coordinate with other sectors/portfolios/programs when working with strategic partners:** Where we have multiple partnerships with the same partner, this requires a lot more internal coordination to ensure our broader engagement with them is streamlined and as efficient as possible. There is a risk that the partner may experience PRISMA-fatigue, and it may be more challenging to ensure continued levels of commitment across all their partnerships with PRISMA.

- **Don’t act like donor representatives or their supervisors:** We must manage our image and treat our partners respectfully and equitably as real partners. This means that when we communicate with them, we should be careful not to order them around or treat them like subcontractors of a development project. Rather than trying just to monitor whether they are meeting the targets, we should be having conversations to understand what challenges they may be facing and how we can help to address any barriers and bottlenecks collaboratively.

- **Ensure a complete handover if the PRISMA focal point changes:** There are instances where the focal point from PRISMA may change. In these instances, it is critical that the handover also includes a briefing about the relationship (the health of the association; how the relationship was managed, including any agreed behavioural norms, expectations, and processes; etc.). If there is some cross-over between a focal point leaving and the successor starting, introducing the new person to the partners, and having them shadow some partnership meetings can be most helpful. Also, provide time for the partners themselves to orient and brief the new focal point on what they see as their priorities and issues. New perspectives can offer opportunities for fresh insights into existing relationships.

- **Consider how to communicate effectively when face-to-face meetings are not possible:** With COVID restricting travel and even office work from occurring, thought needs to be given to how to establish and maintain communications and relationships when it is not possible to meet existing, and new partners, face to face. Annex 1 outlines different approaches, ideas and technology platform solutions. Yet, where a safe opportunity exists at the PRISMA office, meeting face-to-face at least initially (or in video online) can help to establish a good foundation for the partnership.
3. A CULTURE OF CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT: CONDUCTING PARTNERSHIP HEALTH CHECKS

Partnerships are dynamic, which means that not only the operating environment may change, but partner interests, incentives, priorities and level of commitment might evolve over the lifetime of our partnership. Changes can occur in the leadership, as well as corporate priorities, strategies, and vision. Some of these changes may have positive impacts on our relationship, while others pose potential risks that would need to be actively managed. For example, if there has been a change in the partner’s leadership, does the new management have different priorities or a shared vision or understanding of the partnership?

Periodic partnership health checks allow us to take the pulse of our relationship with our partner, ensuring that the partnership does not lose momentum. Health checks can give us the time and space to reflect on what is working well and what may need to change to improve, potential relationship risks or sources of tension, and changes in our partner’s behaviour or external environment which may affect our working relationship and, in turn, the sustainability of the partnership. They may be combined with a project reflection, but if doing so, be careful not to neglect the relationship aspects of the partnership, as the natural tendency will be to focus on project activities.

Ideally, the health check should be co-designed and co-facilitated with the partners, in a reasonably informal manner, so they don’t have a sense of it being an evaluation or assessment, but rather a favourable opportunity to reflect, reconsider, recalibrate and refresh the relationship.

Partners may decide to share the lessons they have learned and identified during a health check with other PRISMA partners, or beyond, to help others benefit from their experiences. If this is the case, any external sharing of information must be agreed with the partners concerned. PRISMA itself can consider internal learning forums to share thematic lessons across portfolios resulting from partnership health checks which are of relevance for other interventions and partners.

Partnership health checks should be done 6 months into implementation and then at least annually thereafter. It is a mistake to think that the partnership is going well, so a health check is not needed; firstly, there may not have been other opportunities for partners to raise and discuss concerns, and secondly, health checks provide opportunities for continuous improvement and seeking new and more value from the partnership.

Health checks can also be useful when things are not working, as a structured and objective way to discuss how to get things back on track without laying blame (‘what, with the benefit of hindsight, would we do differently? What have we learned? What needs to change?’). Health checks can also be used as induction mechanisms following turnover of crucial individuals, as they are a suitable and informal opportunity to take stock and learn about the partnership culture and how PRISMA and the partner engage, as well as the intervention.

See Tool 5A Partnership health check for guiding questions to help you and your partners design a partnership health check.

Make sure to record and report any conflicts of interest or signs of fraud

Ensure that partners are aware of PRISMA and DFAT’s requirements around fraud from the outset and that you will be managing it proactively with them where possible. Inform management of potential/perceived conflicts of interest or signs of fraud as they arise and keep a written record of these issues. These can lead to reputational risks for the program and DFAT if not properly managed (refer to the Fraud Guidelines).

4. ADAPTING & IMPROVING THE PARTNERSHIP

To improve the partnership, increase ownership and commitment or mitigate any risks to the relationship, we may need to adjust how we work with our partners. We should use insights from our partnership health checks and ongoing communications to decide what we can do to maintain or improve the working relationship and take the courage to initiate a discussion about improvements that will support more effective intervention implementation.

Potential adjustments may involve:

- Understanding what is valuable to the partner that may come at little to no additional cost for us: These are other incentives that are not directly part of the business model or written agreement. For example, this could involve linking them with government, sharing information on new technologies, informing them of industry events, sharing our ‘soft’ (market) intelligence on other sectors, policy discussions etc. We have much information through...
our experiences, market research, and impact assessments which could be repackaged and shared in ways that could be helpful to our partner’s business. These gestures of sharing and mutuality can help build increased trust and credibility with our partners and build the value proposition for them to continuing their involvement.

- **Providing temporary bridging support:** External challenges or challenges in other parts of the partner organisation or core business may affect the implementation of our partnership. At the very least, we should try to understand what these challenges may be and consider together how we might help. In some instances, we may be able to provide some bridging support (e.g. in-house technical assistance, capacity building) to help resolve issues so that our partners can refocus their attention on our partnership.

- **Managing a change in our partner’s senior management or turnover in our staff:** Leadership changes in our partners or our turnover could result in changes in relationships, openness, priorities, level of commitment, etc. It is crucial that we meet the new management, or introduce our new team members, and build their support and understanding of the partnership. This may involve organising a field trip, conducting a health check/reflection together to review progress or presenting early evidence of success.

- **Managing partner concerns around competitors and confidentiality:** During the deal-making phase, we should have already set expectations that we will be working with competitors and that we are strongly committed to protecting sensitive business information. We may need to reinforce this message and demonstrate our trustworthiness through our behaviour throughout the partnership, to promote confidence with our partners. If required, we are also able to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) with our partner.

- **Bringing the partnership to an end when it is right:** While the decision may be difficult, there are some cases (e.g. non-performance, fraud, misrepresentation, or unviable business model) where ending the partnership may be the best option. Know when to pull the plug and avoid the mindset of keeping the partner at all cost. Make sure also to assess the risks of terminating the partnership early versus letting the agreement period run out. Stage 6 details further considerations for how to exit a partnership well.

### 5. MANAGING DISAGREEMENTS AND CONFLICT

Disagreements are a normal part of ongoing working relationships between diverse partners. In innovation, space can be an important and healthy opportunity for learning, breakthrough and improving, providing they are handled respectfully. This is key in partnerships: creating a partnership culture of trust and openness where people feel safe to air their concerns, issues and disagreement thoughtfully and respectfully. Space which invites curiosity and open, thoughtful questions aimed at building understanding and a way forward (e.g. *Can you please help me understand your concern? That’s an exciting perspective, and I would like to hear more. Can you give me an example of your situation, so I have a better sense of it? How can I help?*).
Sometimes conflict is a symptom of something more in-depth in the partnership: perhaps partners do not feel heard or are frustrated by the lack of progress, maybe there are pressures in other parts of the business impacting the partnership which they are not free to discuss, perhaps their family members are unwell, or there are other ‘invisible’ pressures. Dealing directly and sensitively with the person concerned to try and understand their perspective and what is the cause of the disagreement or conflict behaviour can then create an opportunity to address the problem collaboratively.

It is important to remember that conflict and poor behaviour in partnerships is rarely personal: individuals and partners usually have good intentions. Try not to take things personally or get defensive. Laying blame, or gossiping is highly destructive behaviour and will undermine trust and discourage partners from opening up, which of itself presents a risk to the partnership and intervention.

Sometimes, taking the opportunity to conduct a health check and revisit the partnering principles and values that you agreed together can open up a conversation about how well the partnership is working and provide structured and objective opportunities to change.

Suppose these approaches are unsuccessful in resolving the disagreements. In this case, it may be helpful to speak to colleagues or others with more experience or a pre-existing relationship with the partner concerned, to seek their advice on how to resolve things informally before triggering any escalation mechanisms in the Collaboration Agreement.

- **For the right partners, continue nurturing relationships even after the partnership has ended:**

  Make sure to maintain these relationships and to have periodic interaction with these partners. For example, we can continue providing them with market information or updates that are relevant to their business areas.

- **For the right partners, explore opportunities for further collaboration:** If the intervention was successful, we might explore a scale-up partnership with them. Even where the intervention may have failed, as long as this was not a result of a lack of willingness or integrity, we may want to look at other partnership opportunities with them. (See Stage 6)

**Example:** When prices crashed in the cassava sector, PRISMA had to terminate its interventions in cassava. The team explored opportunities to work with the partner in another sector, resulting in a new partnership in the vegetable sector.
As partnerships draw to the end of the project cycle, a number of options become available.

1. **We can choose to innovate and scale up into Next Generation Interventions**, where PRISMA will seek to expand outreach, and scale to achieve systemic change. This is PRISMA’s preferred option.

2. If this is not possible, **we can work with partners in the final stage of the partnership to help them embed the changes** they have made, and help them explore future opportunities for innovation, so that our interventions are sustained beyond our support period.

3. **We can exit the partnership intentionally and well**, to protect our relationships, reputation and legacy, even if a partnership has not been successful.

**OPTION ONE: NEXT GENERATION INTERVENTIONS**

Many of the basic principles of building successful partnerships presented in Stages 1-4 will still be relevant for all three options. Some critical differences for brokering next-generation interventions are highlighted below, along with tips and guidance specific to next-generation deals.

Where the pilot has been successful, we then look for opportunities for additional (next generation) partnerships that are more strategic and/or focused on systemic change. This could be partnerships that broaden or deepen change within the same sector (Adapt, Expand, and Respond) or strategic partnerships in other sectors with our initial partner. Whereas first generation interventions focus on demonstrating the viability of pro-poor (or WEE) market opportunities, next-generation interventions tend to be more about selling our experience and institutionalising change in partners.

**HOW DOES PARTNERSHIP BUILDING CHANGE FOR NEXT GENERATION INTERVENTIONS?**

As a result of our first-generation interventions, our understanding and knowledge of the sector and its actors have improved. Where pilots have been successful, we can build an evidence base which should make it easier to crowd-in other market players. Our credibility within a sector and as a program should also have improved over time. Initial partners, in particular, will often have a stronger appreciation of our core value and a better understanding of our facilitation approach. At the same time, through our interactions with initial partners, we should have developed a more robust version of their actual interests and capacity. These factors can make it easier to

Our first-generation interventions involve initial partnerships in a sector where the focus is typically around a pilot/proof of concept. When using the Adopt-Adapt-Expand-Respond (AAER) framework, these partnerships fall into the first quadrant around ‘Adopt.’
explore scale-up or new sector partnerships and to negotiate the details for follow-on partnerships with our initial partners.

There are, however, other factors which can make next-generation partnerships more challenging. As noted above, the focus of these partnerships should shift towards grander scale and sustainability, as well as institutionalising change within partnerships. This often requires different innovative strategies or activities to overcome barriers to scale, as well as increased ownership and contributions from partners. We may also be brokering relationships with multiple competitors at this stage or engaging in more complex partnerships and multi-party negotiations.

**WEE & Next Generation Partnerships**

Partners who have already worked with us on a successful WEE partnership will likely have stronger buy-in around integrating women. Existing partners who have yet to work with us on a WEE partnership might also be more receptive to incorporating women in their scale-up strategies since we now have a stronger relationship with them. This can make it easier to convince them of the business case for integrating women.

Finally, we will also be in a better position overall to make the case for integrating WEE. As a result of our first-generation WEE interventions, we should now have more evidence and experience, as well as visible examples of successful WEE initiatives. This can improve our credibility and strengthen the case for integrating women. It is important that we package this evidence and draw out general principles from these cases.

**IDENTIFYING & ASSESSING PARTNERS**

The types of market actors we will be targeting for next-generation interventions should be determined by our strategy and intervention design process. As a starting point for Stage 6 of this guideline, we assume that this process has been effective.

In particular, we assume that teams have a vision for their sector and of the pathways towards more systemic change. We also think that for strategic partnerships that involve other sectors that these opportunities fit within the vision of change for those sectors. When designing our next generation interventions, we should be taking into account not only our future picture for the market system but also whether we are addressing the right constraints and whether there are new priority constraints. We should also be evaluating which types of market actors are best placed to perform missing or weak market functions and drive the envisioned market system changes.

**WHO DO WE PARTNER WITH...**

This might involve working with different types of market actors (along the value chain or in related supporting functions) and/or same types of market actors. When working with the same types of actors, we would typically be working with competitors of our initial partner. We would also need to decide whether or not our scale-up strategy would involve our initial partner.

The identification and assessment of next-generation partners tend to be more comfortable:

- **Ease of identifying partners**: This is often easier for next-generation partnerships since we should have a deeper understanding of the market and key market players by this stage. In many cases, we may choose to continue working with our initial partner, and we may have already interacted with some of the other key market actors.

- **Ease of assessing partners**: Our experience from first generation interventions also makes it easier to evaluate potential partners. In addition to having a strong sense about the willingness and capacity of initial partners, we will likely have insights about other market actors which we can

### Advantages for + Change

- Evidence base from first-generation intervention
- Better understanding of the sector & its actors
- Credibility within sector
- Better understanding of the interests & capacity of existing partners
- Stronger relationships with existing partners
- Existing partners have a better understanding of our facilitation approach

### Challenges for + Change

- Emphasis on a grander scale and sustainability
- Institutionalising change within partners
- Working with (multiple) competitors
- Multi-party negotiations
- More complex deals

---
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capitalise on when we assess their suitability for our scale-up interventions.

**Tips for identifying and assessing next-generation partners**

- **Do not get too attached to initial partners:** There is a tendency to get connected to initial partners as it can often be more comfortable to negotiate additional partnerships with firms where we have a history of engagement. However, we need to think about what and why we are re-brokering the partnership, what we expect to be getting out of a next-generation deal with them. And what we may be missing out on by not working with new partners. Also, we need to reassess their incentives and responsiveness as there may be changes within the firm and their priorities which may impact on how they engage with us going forwards.

- **Revisit our former assessments of potential partners:** Companies that we previously discounted for first-generation partnerships may now be suitable partners. This could result from changes in their corporate priorities, as well as changes in market dynamics. At the same time, companies that may have ignored us initially might be more willing to explore a partnership with us now.

- **Aim to identify multiple potential partners:** Whether it is a first or next-generation intervention, we should always try to work with more than one partner to improve our chances of success. However, in reality, we often work with a single partner in the first stage when we are still establishing our credibility. Moving beyond one partner is a critical part of scale-up and sustainability.

- **Identify partners that can give us large-scale change:** The potential to reach scale and/or influence other market actors is even more critical for next-generation partnerships. While we may have piloted our initial interventions with smaller organisations, we would typically look towards market leaders, as well as scale agents such as industry associations, to achieve larger-scale change in this next phase. This identification is now bringing us back to Stage 1 of our original process.

**MAKING A COLLABORATION PITCH**

Now we are moving into Stage 2 of our original process but with the next generation of interventions. It can often be more comfortable to frame and make a collaboration pitch for next-generation interventions, especially when we are approaching existing partners or replicating a successful intervention. In some cases, we might not need to make a formal pitch. For example, our existing partners may approach us with scale-up ideas or other partnership opportunities. These opportunities could also result from a collaborative brainstorming session. Competitors who already see the value of a particular business innovation may take the initiative to approach us.

**Tips for pitching next-generation partnership opportunities**

- **Use our case experience and data to make a better pitch:** We should have a wealth of data, including our impact assessments, which can be used to strengthen the business case for change. We should also come armed with additional data that could be valuable to potential partners. We also have the opportunity, if the original partner is going to be part of the Next-Generation intervention, to have them engage in the discussion as peers to potential partners, which can be compelling in providing conflict of interest considerations are addressed. Finally, in some cases, we can also leverage our successes in related sectors.

**Example: From a CSR project to core business**

PRISMA’s first partnership with EWINDO was through the EWINDO Foundation. With the success of the shallot nursery intervention, EWINDO began to see shallots as a viable commercial product. By late 2015, following the success of the partnership in shallots, PRISMA approached EWINDO with a new business proposition to develop quality soybean seeds and market these to farmers. An important shift in EWINDO’s approach to working with PRISMA was that the meeting was held with EWINDO corporate and not the CSR arm of the company.

**Example: Case experience and data for a better pitch**

When approaching other feed companies to scale-up the pig feed intervention, the team shared with potential partners a list of large distributors in the target area and an assessment of the business capacity of these distributors. This information, along with the knowledge that PRISMA already had linkages to key distributors, helped to generate higher levels of interest from potential partners. The team also successfully leveraged their experience in pig feed to convince an existing partner to diversify into beef feed.

- **Coordinate with other teams when approaching existing PRISMA partners:** For example, there may be opportunities to make the pitch about the new business opportunity during another sector team’s meeting with the partner.
Make sure to choose the right moment to approach partners: We want to make our pitches when there is already momentum and when partners may be more receptive to new opportunities.

Target the commercial division if we previously worked with the CSR division: Ideally, we should always aim to work with the core business unit rather than CSR division. Where we have partnered with the CSR arm previously and want to continue the partnership, we need to ensure that our contact people are with the commercial division, as they have more incentive to sustain or expand the innovation.

Target higher corporate levels where possible: Embedding change in the core business of partners often requires that we involve the top management, who can make decisions that have broader reach (e.g. corporate-wide behavioural changes).

Ensure that we respect the business confidentially of initial partners when crowding-in competitors: Make sure the evidence/business case we share with competitors does not include sensitive business information from initial partners. As previously noted, what we can or cannot share should be part of the negotiations for each partnership and should be explicit in the written agreements with our partners.

Consider organising field visits to showcase the business opportunity: Field visits can be used to demonstrate a particular business opportunity and to allow the potential partner to make their assessment of the opportunity. However, if we intend to use this tactic with a competitor, it is crucial to make that clear to our initial partners.

Examples: Field visits to showcase business opportunities

**PRISMA: PIG**

To generate interest from other pig feed companies, PRISMA invited competitors to come to the field and make their own assessment of the business opportunity. While the competitors funded their own trip, PRISMA organised the schedule, which included a visit to the demo plot from their initial partnership and meetings with farmers and potential distributors/agents.

While this successfully attracted the interest of competitors, the team also learned the importance of upfront communications with the partner about their intention to conduct such field visits.

---

**AGREEING THE BUSINESS MODEL, BROAD STRATEGY, & DETAILS**

Once again, we are back to Stage 3 of our original process, but in this case, for the next generation of interventions. It is not always necessary to develop a new business model, particularly when we are trying to replicate a particular model with competing actors. However, in these scenarios, we should still be:

- Modifying the business model based on learnings from the first-generation intervention
- Tailoring the model and strategy to the specific partner context

**Example: Modifying the business model based on learnings and partner context**

During the first-generation soy doctor intervention, the soybean team learned that the distribution channel can be a serious bottleneck for a successful intervention. As a result, when scaling-up the soy doctor intervention with another agro-input supplier, they incorporated this learning by placing more emphasis on the development of the distribution network. The model was also adapted to how the new partner operates. While the initial partners wanted the soy doctor to sell agro inputs directly to farmers, the new partner came up with the idea to have soy doctors write a prescription and have farmers purchase from kiosks that were already part of their current distribution network.

There are also instances where it will not make sense to have a business model. Social marketing interventions, which are one-off campaigns, will not require a business model but could benefit from having a “partnership model” to clarify how various stakeholders will work together to launch the campaign.

**Tips for the business model and/or broad strategy**

Consider different strategies and activities to achieve greater scale and more embedded engagement: We should be exploring more strategic ways to reach larger numbers of farmers. This could involve launching social marketing campaigns or using technology to expand outreach. We may also consider providing partners support at the corporate level (e.g. on branding the company to increase their overall visibility and credibility, capacity building to senior/middle management to embed what is new and different about the intervention into the core business) or facilitating the development of alliances with supporting market actors.
Tips for Multi-Party Negotiations

Multi-party partnerships can be developed with competing actors, as well as with complementary actors. Negotiations for these types of partnerships are more challenging than two-party negotiations, although it can be easier if we have a prior history of working with the parties involved or if we are dealing with complementary actors rather than competitors. Multi-party negotiations often require a series of separate meetings with each of the parties before any possible joint meeting. When conducting multi-party negotiations:

- **Consider pitching the multi-partnership opportunity to our most trusted partner first**: It can be helpful to get the buy-in of an existing partner with which we have a strong relationship before approaching other parties. We may also want to test their receptiveness to working with particular companies.

- **Make sure to keep all stakeholders informed**: If key decisions which affect other parties are made during separate meetings, make sure to communicate these decisions to all parties.

- **Be respectful of each party’s confidentiality**: This is particularly important when dealing with competing actors. Have separate discussions upfront with each partner to clarify what information is sensitive and the parameters for joint discussions with all parties. It can also be helpful to draft a Code of Conduct or use the NDA template for the implementation stage, which makes it explicit what information can be shared (a) publicly, (b) with other parties in the partnership, and (c) with PRISMA only.

- **Understand the willingness/capacity of each party and create options for mutual gains**: We need to be even more proactive in understanding the interests of each party in order to identify and develop options for mutual gains.

- **Make sure benefits are comparable to each party’s investment**: This can help mitigate conflict among stakeholders during the implementation stage.

- **In multi-stakeholder partnerships, take time to consider how to orient and on-board any ‘new partners’** to avoid them feeling like ‘second-class citizens’, when compared to the familiarity and established relationships you already have with the original partner. Work hard to establish the partnership culture anew and to establish relationships with the new partners and between all the partners with reference to the partnership principles.

**Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competing Actors</th>
<th>Complementary Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maize Sector</strong>: Public Private Coordination initiative involving three big hybrid seed producers</td>
<td><strong>Pig Sector</strong>: Alliance between pig feed company and pharmaceutical company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples: Evolving strategies and activities

Pig: Developing alliances among market actors

In order to cement the income gains made through the initial feed intervention, the pig team brokered alliances between pig feed and pharmaceutical companies. As farmers raise more pigs, there are increased risks of disease outbreaks and pig mortality. This, in turn, can negatively impact the demand for feed. As a result, it is in the interest of feed companies to encourage their agents to also stock pharmaceuticals. When brokering this alliance, the team had to make the business case for collaboration and also understand potential points of synergy between the two types of actors. This led to exploring options where each partner could expand their outreach by piggybacking off the existing distribution network of the other partner.

Soybean GAP: Using ICT to accelerate scale-up

In the initial partnership, BASF provided embedded information on soybean GAP through selected lead farmers. With each lead farmer only able to support 10-30 farmers in their area, this constrained the ultimate reach of the model. As a result, for the scale-up strategy, the team explored options to use an ICT platform which would use videos to train farmers on GAP. Such a platform could allow BASF to rapidly expand their network of lead farmers, increase the reach of each lead farmer (80-250 farmers), and maintain the quality of information being passed down from lead farmer. It would also allow BASF to more cost-effectively manage the expanding network.

Pig: Using new marketing strategies to increase demand for feed

The initial partnership focused on using demo plots to introduce the new product to farmers. While this was effective for the first-generation intervention, a new marketing strategy was needed for the next generation partnership to stimulate wider demand and to more rapidly spread the word about the product and its benefits. The team looked at options which would not only attract more customers and create customer loyalty but also be a cheaper investment for feed companies when compared to demo plots. The new marketing strategy for the next generation partnerships involved using the following approaches: (1) encouraging feed sellers to have a selling point in traditional markets where they would also share their experience and the benefits of using feed and (2) using SMS blasts to reach a wider audience and create greater brand awareness.

Reconsider our role and responsibilities for the next generation intervention, along with the intensity of our support: Theoretically, we should have established a proof of concept through the first-generation intervention. As a result, our role should shift, and we should avoid replicating the same offer and intensity of support in the next generation intervention. For example, our support may be less around promotional activities and more around providing initial and new partners more information and market research.

Public-Private Coordination Initiatives

In the first-generation interventions, we often partner with individual agro-input firms and use promotional tactics such as demo plots and exhibitions to stimulate demand on input products. However, to reach our ambitions of scale, we may need to go beyond the classical demo plot approach and use strategies to reach a much larger audience. This approach includes coordination between the public and private sectors to achieve individual targets and collective goals.

Example: Madura island experienced low maize productivity (2 MT/Ha, less than half of East Java productivity average) due to low adoption of hybrid seeds. Target areas from government free seed program tend to overlap with the commercial seed market; hence hybrid maize cultivation areas are mostly concentrated in the same sub-districts.

PRISMA facilitated collaboration between the local government (the Agriculture Office) and three private seed companies (Corteva, Syngenta, and BISI) to improve free seed distribution. These players shared hybrid areas’ data through the partnership and agreed on targeting non-hybrid areas for free seed program. The seed companies provided GAP training for government extension service staff and worked together with them to provide training and assistance to farmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Partners</th>
<th>Competing Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We would want to be more hands-off to ensure that they take ownership and embed the change in their core business. We would also typically expect partner contributions to increase relative to PRISMA.</td>
<td>Although the willingness to engage may be higher now that we have proven the concept, new competing partners may still lack the skills to take advantage of the innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTION TWO: SUPPORTING PARTNERS TO EMBED CHANGES

Suppose your decision (ideally reached with your partners) is to focus on embedding and sustaining the changes from the First-Generation Intervention. In that case, it is important to start discussing this openly with your partners at least 9–12 months before the end of the formal partnership. Consider what additional support may need over this period (technical, advisory, other) to be provided to maximise the opportunities for sustainability so that the intervention becomes ‘business as usual’. Perhaps this might involve a pivot or reassessment of the remaining activities, but it should be discussed, and strategy agreed together with the partners. It is also an excellent opportunity to identify the lessons learned which could be shared with other PRISMA teams and partners. Still, this information must be agreed with the partner and commercial-in-confidence issues respected.

OPTION THREE: EXITING THE PARTNERSHIP WELL

Although our written agreements will specify the end date of the partnership and terms for early termination, it is important that we actively manage relationships when exiting a partnership. This may include relationships with everyone from field staff to the senior management and potentially other stakeholders affected by the intervention. Regardless of whether the partnership has reached a natural conclusion or has been terminated early, we should try to end the partnership on a positive note. Even when this is a planned decision, it is a good idea to remind them of our intention to continue engaging and collaborating with them in these areas and to secure agreement about how this can be facilitated going forward.

Tips for managing a partnership exit well

- **Do not make abrupt decisions when prematurely terminating a partnership:** There must be on-going communications, as well as opportunities for remediation before making the final decision to end the partnership.

- **Start discussing a close-out strategy with the partners early,** even when this is a planned decision 9–12 months before the end of the agreement to allow time to prepare for a smooth exit and to optimise chances for

- **Ensure a common understanding of the reasons for closure or withdrawal:** Remember the partnering principles! We need to be open with our partners and listen to their perspectives while trying to build a shared understanding of the reasons for termination. Be careful not to play the blame game and try to act as a partner, mostly if the intervention has failed because of technical reasons (e.g. business model or strategy was not viable). Still, we also need to be honest and clear about our decisions for withdrawing, while remaining sensitive to the potential negative impact this may have on partners.

  - **Reinforce understanding around the desire for their continued cooperation (e.g. with impact assessments or showcasing the initiative):** We need to ensure their continued support in data collection, as well as in identifying farmers and ISPs when we develop case studies or organise visits for BAPPENAS, DFAT, and/or Palladium. As these activities tend to occur after the official end of the partnership, it is a good idea to remind them of our intention to continue engaging and collaborating with them in these areas and to secure agreement about how this can be facilitated going forward.

  - **Have a wrap-up meeting or workshop and celebrate achievements:** Regardless of whether the business model has been successful, this can be an excellent opportunity to acknowledge the contributions of our partners, review the results and successes of the partnership, and celebrate the completion of the partnership.

Example: Responding to a change in partner priorities

As the maize team was about to start an intervention with a nursery, they found out that the nursery had received a large order from the government for paddy seed. Since the nursery would be using all of their land for paddy seed, the partner no longer had any interest in pursuing the partnership with PRISMA. In this instance, a decision was made to terminate the partnership early.

- **Consider developing a formal exit agreement/strategy.** Even the most effective and friendly partnerships can end badly if not enough attention is provided to the principled closure of a partnership. An exit agreement can be co-developed during the wrap-up workshop and could cover:

  - Agree shared public messaging about the intervention and its results think about how the intervention and PRISMA’s role in it will be represented once the intervention has finished. Will the PRISMA or DFAT logo be able to be used or our involvement referenced? Will PRISMA be able to use the partner’s logo? What will be the headline messages about the intervention?

  - Agree on post-intervention access for impact and outcome monitoring purposes. Consider how this will
also be able to benefit the partner (not just be an extractive process).

- Ensure any residual intellectual property or asset ownership issues are clarified and agreed before the formal end of the partnership and captured in the agreement.

- **If necessary, communicate with other stakeholders affected by the closure of an intervention:** This may be relevant in cases where the business model/strategy has failed. For example, we may need to explain to ISPs or farmers why a specific product or service will no longer be available. We should be looking for the best channel to communicate with affected stakeholders (e.g. having ISPs explain to farmers) and ensuring that engagement happens. This can be important for managing our reputation in local communities and among ISPs and securing the door remains open for us to reengage in the future.

- **Refer** [Tool 6A for an Exit Plan checklist](#)
I. Working with Government Partners

PRISMA is now working more widely with different organisations, beyond the private sector, and particularly with Government, whose drivers and reasons for partnering may be much different from those of the private sector. Nevertheless, the same principles we use in our engagement with the private sector apply.

- Adopt a principled approach from the outset and maintain this throughout. Remember how you engage with a government official or department can have broader implications for other and future interventions, both negative and positive, including the ability to influence public budget spend and policy. It may require more formal engagement sometimes, and at other times, informal/off-line communications to help things move. Seek advice from PRISMA colleagues with long experience of engaging with Government, who can provide helpful suggestions and strategies.

- Work to identify through formal and informal means, the incentives, influences and needs for the Government to engage in the partnership – don’t assume. Some additional drivers common to the Government sector which may not be such a consideration for the private sector can include: building reputation and positive public perception of their work; contributing to policy dialogue, offering value for money; being seen to deliver; political considerations in the lead up to an election (which may influence timelines and the need for announcing tables and good news stories)

- As a team, determine who is the best-placed person to lead the engagement with Government. Depending on the counterpart and the hierarchical nature of the government department you are dealing with, it may require more or less seniority, prior relationships, or a team of Business Consultants to work together. Consider how you can build the capacity of your less experienced team members to engage effectively with Government through mentoring and endorsement.

- The government may not have the capacity or skilled resources to taken on the work involved in developing the partnership in the way your private sector partners might do. If the PRISMA team take on more of this work, consider ways in which you can secure commitment and buy-in to support the sustainability of the initiative.

- Timelines, when dealing with the government may be longer than the private sector, as they are less influenced by market forces and more by political cycles. Or they may be fast and furious when budgets and elections deadlines are looming. It is important that we make every effort to understand the Government systems, constraint and budget cycles so that we can be both realistic in our expectations, and demonstrate our understanding

- Mapping the influencers or champions who can help PRISMA in influencing decision-makers in government

---

**GOI Partner Engagement – a case from ASF intervention in NTT**

Each level of government (national, provincial, and district or municipality) has its autonomy, development priorities, and decision-making process which subsequently affect the process and results of the engagement. Building an effective engagement with GOI at different levels requires us to understand their (1) planning, budgeting, and budget allocation priorities; (2) program’s target location, (3) bureaucratic decision-making mechanism, and (4) the leadership or champions in the government institution that we are going to engage or influence. Experiences showed that when the Pig team developed interventions to respond to the ASF outbreak in NTT, we did several consultation meetings at different levels at the national level with the Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health, at the provincial level with Livestock Agency of NTT, and with livestock agencies in several districts, which took a long time (around a year) before all parties reached the mutual agreement on activities and cost-sharing. These make the engagement work with GOI is more complex and become a challenging process. Furthermore, we need to expect also the rotation of leadership in government agencies that usually suddenly happened, and it has a great impact on the decision to be taken in a partnership.

In contrast to GOI engagement, engagement with private partners has a simpler process with the minimum bureaucratic process and faster in taking a decision. As an example, when we engaged with PT Sreeya Sewu to get involved in the ASF campaign in NTT through their promotional programs, it did not require a long and complex process. The negotiation process only took less than 3 months before we agreed on the partnership. The pig team only negotiated and got the agreement from the top management of PT Sreeya in the headquarter office in Sidoarjo, East Java to make the partnership happened.
2. Working Remotely (The COVID Factor!)

The COVID pandemic has required a fundamental shift in the way we are required to partner, with restrictions on travel, gatherings and working arrangements limiting our ability to meet face to face. This can represent significant challenges when trying to establish a new partnership in particular. While it may take more time and purposeful attention to partnership building, it is entirely possible. Be conscious that partners are dealing with additional stresses related to remote working and that it can take longer to work through the necessary processes. You may need to provide more active support and extra time to partners to help them progress through the various stages.

It may also be the case that your partners expect to meet face to face and do not understand that they have different standards of COVID-safe practices than PRISMA. In this case, you will need to explain why you are unable to meet openly but that you look forward to doing so at the soonest opportunity.

Use of online technologies

Online technology can provide good opportunities to open and build communications and relationships, providing both partners equal access to suitable platforms. WhatsApp, Google Meet and Zoom are appropriate for many more regional communities as they use lower bandwidth and tend to be more stable in areas with unreliable internet connectivity, compared to institutional platforms such as Microsoft Teams. The private sector widely uses Zoom. However, Palladium has security restrictions preventing us from using Zoom unless with prior written agreement from the COO. Try to be as flexible as Palladium will allow and meet your partners on their technical terms. The old-fashioned telephone is also good, but seeing each other face to face, at least at the start of a meeting, can help when getting to know each other.

Also, be aware that in times of COVID, many people are spending long sessions online and find this very exhausting. Be respectful of your partners’ time, and do not run over agreed meeting times. However, this does not just mean jumping straight to tasks. Relationship building, listening and getting to know each other as people are even more critical in an online world than face-to-face. Make time at the start of each meeting to connect with your partners, find out how they are, what they are experiencing, share an appropriate joke etc., ask about family if applicable, just as you would during an in-person meeting. While it is ideal to try to have at least some video communications (it is much easier to build empathy and relationships this way than voice-only), do be conscious that some safety and social considerations are as to why some people may choose not to have their videos.

Ensure you prepare well for all meetings online, just as you would a face-to-face meeting, invite your partners’ inputs into what they would like to discuss, and allow more time to get through the same amount of business than in an in-person meeting. Further information, tools and suggestions on remote partnering can be found on the below websites.

The following free websites (initiatives of the Partnership Brokers Association) provide extensive guidelines, suggestions and tools for supporting you to work effectively with partners remotely.

- [www.remotepartnering.org](http://www.remotepartnering.org) provides access to a comprehensive workbook sharing experience and insights of how to get the best out of partnerships that cannot meet face to face;

- [www.defyingdistance.org](http://www.defyingdistance.org) - specifically has a range of tools to help support remote partnering
3. Managing disagreements in partnerships

Partnerships are made up of organisations from different sectors with different drivers, objectives, work cultures, approaches, priorities, systems and processes. All of this diversity is what brings added value to partnerships. However, it is often the source of disagreement and misunderstandings when building and managing partnerships.

It is OK that there is disagreement, and even respectful conflict from time to time, as discussion of differences is often when innovation can occur if you are open to different ideas and opinions. The most important thing is to ‘separate the people from the problem’ (don’t allow it to become personal); to understand why disagreement has occurred; to listen deeply and respectfully to your partners’ concerns or position; ask questions to clarify, and eventually understand what the underlying reason behind their discontent is. Once this is known, then together, you can discuss different options for addressing the issue. This is an approach known as interest-based negotiation.

It is important that you also patiently explain your perspective on the issue and not consider who is ‘right and wrong’: what you are aiming to do is set egos aside and build genuine understanding. It is critical to good partnering to understand that every partner has a valid viewpoint, even if it is different to yours.

Finally, when dealing with disagreement, be informed by the principles of your partnership in how you behave during disagreements: are you all behaving in a way that:

- respects the differences (diversity),
- ensures that all voices are heard and respected (equity),
- encourages frank discussion and disclosure (openness),
- seeks to achieve a mutual understanding and solution in the interests of all partners (mutual benefit), and
- may require you to address uncomfortable issues sensitively to achieve a positive outcome and allow the partnership to move forward (courage)?

---

1 Interest-based negotiation: Drawn from the Harvard Business School approach, for further information: [https://www.pon.harvard.edu/tag/interest-based-negotiation/](https://www.pon.harvard.edu/tag/interest-based-negotiation/)
### Tool IA: Guiding questions for assessing partners

The following table provides some guiding questions and examples for assessing partners and notes on how to interpret this information. This list of questions is non-exhaustive and should only be taken as a guide to stimulate our thinking. It is essential that these are asked **only** after you have done prior research on the partner; do not waste your time with the partner by asking questions for information you can find on the internet or through basic research!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guiding questions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Notes on interpreting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For example, if they have no existing products that currently match or can be adapted to poor farmers' needs, we would have to introduce new products through the company. In this case, we may consider prioritising other partners if they have more relevant products. Some of these general questions can also give us some overall clues about their capacity and willingness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background information</td>
<td>- What is their current business and size of operation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do they have existing products or services that could match the needs of our target farmers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do they have other related (or non-related) businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there potential to adapt their existing products or services?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have they previously tried to do something to solve a problem in the market but failed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What is their growth trend? Is the company overgrowing, slowly but steadily, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have they invested in diversifying their portfolio?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is the business a one-person show? If so, is there a succession plan, or are there risk management measures in place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is the leadership of the company interested in engaging with PRISMA to explore a partnership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLINGNESS TO CHANGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Tool 4 on willingness &amp; capacity matrix Also, use findings to frame our initial pitch: For example, as a program, we tend to focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>- What are their immediate interests (3 to 6 months)?</td>
<td>- <strong>Economic</strong>: grow sales volume of existing products, enter new geographies, enter new sectors, grow customer base, reach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>- What are their medium-term interests (6 months to 2 years)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Longer-term

- What are their long-term interests (> 2 years)?

  - customers at the bottom of the pyramid, reach female customers, expand market share, become the market leader, upgrade processes or technologies, recover from a price fall, attract government investment, increase their profit margin, conduct R&D in new products or new sectors, etc.
  - **Social:** improve their reputation and prestige, increase their social license to operate, increase their attractiveness of potential employees etc.

### Motivations

#### Motivators

- Why might they think it is a good idea to partner with PRISMA? What are the benefits for them?

  - Opportunities to increase smallholder (or specifically female) customer base
  - Not wanting competitors to have the first-mover advantage
  - Existing momentum upon which to build
  - Securing inputs for their other business
  - Creating new market opportunities

#### De-motivators

- Why might they not want to partner with PRISMA? What are the risks for them?

  - Poor history dealing with other development initiatives
  - Reluctance with being associated with the Australian government through PRISMA funding
  - Reluctance to work with PRISMA because we are working with their competitors
  - May not have the time or resources to invest
  - May have other priorities at present

### Responsiveness

- Have they questioned us on the evidence of the success of our ideas?
- If this is their idea, have they been proactive to take us on field visits to areas where they have been successful?

  - Target potential partners who exhibit high responsiveness
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#### Stage 1: Identify and Assess Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CAPACITY TO CHANGE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Technical</strong></th>
<th><strong>Physical</strong></th>
<th><strong>Financial</strong></th>
<th><strong>Leadership</strong></th>
<th><strong>Networks &amp; Linkages</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How easy is it to get an initial or follow-up meeting with them?</td>
<td>Do they have practical knowledge (know-how) or previous track record to demonstrate they can or have the potential to deliver the required services or products?</td>
<td>Do existing staff have the time to take on new projects or new tasks associated with the change being proposed?</td>
<td>Do they have the financial resources to make additional investments?</td>
<td>Are there champions in the firm who have the power and influence to lead the company through the change process and ensure it is sustained?</td>
<td>Has the company previously worked with the target population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How proactive are they in trying to develop a partnership?</td>
<td>So existing staff and the capacity and interest to work collaboratively with PRISMA?</td>
<td>Is existing staff and the capacity and interest to work collaboratively with PRISMA?</td>
<td>Are there individuals in the firm who want to explore and break new ground (e.g. forward thinkers, visionaries, early adopters)?</td>
<td>Is it connected to the appropriate geographic areas (provinces, districts, etc.)?</td>
<td>Is it connected to the appropriate geographic areas (provinces, districts, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they investing resources to find out about the potential innovations before reaching an agreement?</td>
<td>Is the organisation able to hire and train new staff?</td>
<td>Is the use of existing physical resources restricted to other purposes?</td>
<td>What is the size of its customer or supplier base or reach of its distribution network?</td>
<td>What is the size of its customer or supplier base or reach of its distribution network?</td>
<td>What is the size of its customer or supplier base or reach of its distribution network?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**See Tool 4 on willingness & capacity matrix**

Also, use findings to frame our initial pitch and feed into the activity plan and budget

Consider the contributions (both financial and in-kind) that the partner and PRISMA are each bringing to the partnership, as part of the ‘offer’.
### Stage 1: Identify and Assess Partners

- **Does it have the potential to influence other actors in the value chain?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th>Is the company and its management (or entrepreneur) reputable? This means no known corruption charges or scandals, not on any DFAT or donor blacklists, no known associations with terrorist groups, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputation &amp; General Risk Profile</td>
<td>What is the general public perception of the company (or entrepreneur)? Is its brand famous? How do consumers receive their products and services? Are they engaged in responsible supply chain management? How do they treat their employees or distributors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it in the start-up, growth, expansion or maturity phase of the business life-cycle? How much experience does the management team have? Is it privately or publicly held, listed or unlisted, multinational or local etc.?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The legal status of a company (UD, CV, PT, International limited liability, etc.) is typically associated with a certain standard of supervision and audit within the company. For example, there will be lower risk to work with a PT rather than an individual. Suppose we choose to proceed with the partner. In that case, some of this information will feed into determining the size of our financial contribution and will be necessary for completing the due diligence review before a written agreement can be finalised.
**Tool IB: Additional questions and tools for assessing Women Economic Empowerment (WEE) partners**

These guiding questions for assessing Women Economic Empowerment (WEE) partners are in addition to the fundamental questions that we should be asking from Tool 1. This list of questions is non-exhaustive and should only be taken as a guide to stimulate our thinking as we do our detective work to find out more about potential partners. Again, these questions should not be asked unless it is perceived that the partner is ready to explore this opportunity.

### ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR WEE OPPORTUNITIES/BUSINESS CASE

| **Background information** | What are their current commercial relationships and practices with women (as customers, agents, field staff, labourers, etc.)?  
Are they aware of the potential roles and importance of women in their value chain?  
Do they differentiate between the needs of women and men?  
Are they aware of the business incentives of engaging women in their value chain?  

| These general questions can give us overall clues about their WEE capacity and willingness. |
| **WEE Willingness** | Do they exhibit any markers of capability in the WEE sphere? Examples include (1) high female workforces, (2) contact and understanding of women in their supply  

| For WEE opportunities/business case, trialling with more experienced partners is preferred. However, as this involves high existing levels of innovation, such partners may not already exist. In such cases, willingness to innovate around WEE will often be more critical than having existing capacity, and we should be open to working with less experienced partners who show a strong commitment to WEE.  
Use these questions to identify potential market actors that are proactive in WEE, as well as those who could be receptive to changing their practices. Try to distinguish between reluctance and resistance. The former is much easier to overcome. For some potential partners, while they may not be explicitly targeting women (and thus seem to have low willingness), this could simply be a result of limited information or understanding of the WEE business opportunities. In such cases, there is potential to change their willingness through better communication. At the same time, understanding where reluctance comes from can help us identify ways to change that perception and what data is needed to shift their views. |
| **WEE Capacity** | Do they exhibit any markers of capability in the WEE sphere? Examples include (1) high female workforces, (2) contact and understanding of women in their supply  

| As noted above, for WEE opportunities/business case, trialling with more experienced partners is preferred. However, as this involves high |
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- Do they have the practical knowledge of engaging women that would be relevant to the identified WEE opportunity? Make any points in their business (e.g. trading, marketing, sales) already have inherent practices and systems that are relevant for WEE activities?
- Have they previously tried to do something to solve a gender-related problem in the market but failed? If so, why?
- Are there champions in the firm who have the power and influence to build a more gender-inclusive business? Are there individuals in the firm who want to explore and break new ground related to WEE? If so, what is motivating them?
- Does the company have existing networks or linkages with women that are relevant for the identified WEE opportunity?

We can also plot partners along the continuum below. While it might be easier to work with partners that are already highly incentivised, we should not limit ourselves to such partners. In some cases, partners that may initially be less incentivised can become more interested and willing after they become aware of the business case for engaging women or options to more effectively engage women. In short, there is a large difference between perceived reluctance due to blind spots versus active resistance due to ingrained prejudice. The former is much easier to overcome.

**Partner incentives to work on WEE is a continuum**

where some of the following factors can influence whether partners are less or more incentivised

- **Less incentivised**
  - Lack of awareness of active or critical involvement of women in their supply chain or as their main consumer base
  - Lack of recognition of losses resulting from not engaging or not effectively engaging women

- **Low and ineffective engagement with women** despite trying to engage women in their supply chain or as a consumer

- **Recognises a strong WEE business case** and is often already actively engaged, with some initial successes in integrating and involving women
  - Women form majority of the workforce and the business is developed around their needs
  - Existing products aimed at women as part of their core business
  - Champions within the firm who are actively driving for women in the supply chain or as a key consumer group

Partner incentives continuum adapted from 2016 SEEP Presentation on Using Ex-Ante Evidence to Promote Gender-Responsive Market System Change
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Tool IC: Partnering Potential (History-Momentum-Scale-Drivers-Capacity)

This tool can be used to make initial comparisons of different potential partners before plotting them on the will/skill matrix in Tool 4. It compares their likelihood of collaborating (based on their history and momentum, drivers and capacity), as well as their potential for scale. This can be helpful when deciding which potential partners to prioritise.

Guidelines for completion:
- Capture notes to justify/explain your scoring
- Allocate one score to each of the 5 factors (History, Momentum, Scale, Drivers, Capacity) where 1 = very little potential 2 = Some Potential 3 = Good Potential, 4 = very good potential and 5 = Outstanding Potential
- Total the five 'score' for each partner to give an indication of their comparative value/priority as a PRISMA partner, to be considered alongside the Willingness-Skills matrix (Tool 1D). The quantitative score should not be considered alone, but along with the qualitative information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Partner 1</th>
<th>Potential Partner 2</th>
<th>Potential Partner 3</th>
<th>Potential Partner 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Score (1-5)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Score (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History:</strong> Track record &amp; performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does their track record indicate likely to support or resistance to the desired change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How open to change have they been in the past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are they adaptive/innovative or protectionist/stagnant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Momentum:</strong> Where are they going and how fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is there recognition or action aligned with the desired change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stage 1: Identify and Assess Partners

| **Is there any action aligned with what we would like to see happen?** |  |  |  |
| **Are they thinking about it or have they done it in the past?** |  |  |  |
| **Scale:** |  |  |  |
| **Do they offer a leverage point for achieving large-scale change?** |  |  |  |
| **How big is their footprint?** |  |  |  |
| **How influential are they?** |  |  |  |
| **Drivers:** |  |  |  |
| **Are the incentives for engaging in the partnership strong enough, e.g. Do they contribute to the partner’s bottom line?** |  |  |  |
| **Will the partnership contribute to the strategic vision of the company?** |  |  |  |
| **Is there a good alignment with PRISMA’s objectives?** |  |  |  |
| **Capacity:** |  |  |  |
| **Is there clear leadership buy-in and support for the partnership?** |  |  |  |
| **Does the team have the skills, time and capacity to collaborate and implement the project?** |  |  |  |

**'POTENTIAL' SCORE**

---

The Springfield Centre's History-Momentum-Scale Tool
Tool ID: Willingness and Capacity Matrix

Any market actor can be a potential partner for PRISMA (input suppliers, collectors, etc.). This matrix looks at the potential partner’s willingness and capacity to change, where each axis is a continuum going from low to high. It can be used to identify which players to target or prioritise and the type of support required to change their behaviour. For example, it is often easier to work with partners who exhibit a willingness to change even if they may or may not have the capacity to do so. At the same time, we may still choose to target a partner who lacks willingness if we find that the lack of willingness is a result of limited information or understanding of a business opportunity or model.

**SCENARIO**

**Low will, low skill**: In this scenario, a potential partner lacks both the incentive and capacity to change. Then, why engage them at all?

In some cases, this partner may be the only option (e.g. government body or water user association in the irrigation sector) or this partner may be of strategic importance to the target group and could be instrumental in delivering the desired change. For example, a mango collector could be vital to creating the market for a new chemical that will induce early flowering of mango trees, thus opening up the possibility of off-season production. In this case, this business model is unique for the collector, and at the same time, they have no experience with delivering the required chemical.

Engagement options include (1) reconsidering the feasibility of change or (2) using a hard-sell strategy to develop the competence and motivation of the partner. Note that intensive support to develop the willingness and capacity to achieve change may have high risks of distorting the market system.

Adapted from The Springfield Centre’s Will-Skill Matrix and Jim Tomecko’s Partner Engagement Matrix/Think Tool
High will, low skill scenario: In this scenario, a potential partner displays strong incentives and is highly responsive, but their capacity to pursue a change is underdeveloped. For example, a cocoa trader could easily make the connection between better use of fertiliser by cocoa farmers as a way to increase farmer productivity and therefore, his turnover. But he may lack the knowledge of how to deliver this cost-effectively.

Engagement should focus on building the partner’s skills and knowledge to operate outside their current comfort zone and deliver the change sustainably (e.g. through advice, training, mentoring, or linkages with market actors that have the know-how).

Low will, high skill scenario: In this scenario, a potential partner appears to have the capacity to change, but their interest and motivation is low. This may be because they do not see an economic return from their investment within a reasonable period. For example, a chemical company may have a product that has worked in one agricultural sector but not in one of ours. If we can show that the potential demand is high and of a commercial volume in our sector, then they may be more willing to engage with us as a partner. This was the case in our initial partnership with Syngenta in the mango sector.

Engagement should focus on making the business case for change to the partner or reducing the incremental risk associated with change. This may involve doing some market research to generate the data needed to convince the partner that there is an opportunity to be exploited. It may also involve co-funding trials around a proof of concept.

High will, high skill scenario: In this scenario, a potential partner appears to be both competent and willing to change. So, why aren’t they already doing it, and why should we be involved with them at all? The reason for their lack of action might be a result of dysfunctions elsewhere in the market system, such as the regulatory environment. Alternatively, it could be that they have developed a business model that has worked in one area of the country, but they have not used it in eastern Indonesia. For example, a seed company that has been using contract farming as their business model may be enticed to work with the same model, or a variation of it, in an area that, up to now, they have considered being pre-commercial.

Engagement options include (1) offering potential partners an opportunity to scale their business model up in pre-commercial areas that focus on our target groups (e.g. minimise their risks associated with moving into a new market) or (2) conducting further analysis on business enabling environment factors that could be tackled through PRISMA.
### Tool 2A: Framing the initial collaboration pitch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Generic examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the business opportunity?</td>
<td>◼ Understand the market, constraints, &amp; opportunities&lt;br&gt;◼ Prepare business calculations &amp; a compelling business case (see box on business calculations)</td>
<td>Opportunities may be around:&lt;br&gt;◼ Expanding coverage of existing pro-poor products or services (e.g. to another geography or commodity sector)&lt;br&gt;◼ Adapting existing products or services for smallholder farmers (or more specifically for female consumers)&lt;br&gt;◼ Developing or introducing new (potentially women-friendly) products or services&lt;br&gt;◼ Re-orienting supply chains to respond to opportunities in lower-income or female consumer market segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why should the partner be interested in this opportunity?</td>
<td>◼ Assess partner’s willingness &amp; capacity (use Tools 1-4)</td>
<td>Advances their company strategy&lt;br&gt;Provides additional profits, market share, recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can they expect from the partnership?</td>
<td>◼ Assess partner’s willingness &amp; capacity (use Tools 1-4)</td>
<td>Risk mitigation&lt;br&gt;Knowledge transfer&lt;br&gt;First mover advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do we expect to get in return?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of benefits&lt;br&gt;Information for decision making&lt;br&gt;Outreach and impact (higher income for significant numbers of farmers in eastern Indonesia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tips for effective engagement on WEE

WEE is often unchartered territory for many companies, where inherent resistance can be strong. As a result, how we communicate our pitch can be even more critical than regular deals. Our emphasis should be on showing them how they are missing out on a business opportunity, what could be done to take advantage of that opportunity, and how we might be able to support them with that. In addition to the key principles for effective engagement outlined above, here are a few specific tips for engaging partners on WEE:

- **Emphasise the business case, not gender targets:** Gender inclusion in deal making needs to make “business sense.” It is not about incorporating women into the partnership because PRISMA has gender objectives. There are plenty of untapped business opportunities for WEE. As a result, we should be seeking out strong, genuine commercial cases rather than artificially framing social opportunities as commercial ones. We should also avoid using development jargon around female empowerment, gender equality, gender targets, etc. Instead, focus on presenting viable business opportunities and use business terminology (increased sales, lower costs, improved service reliability, etc.) which is familiar and compelling to partners.

- **Understand the potential partner’s arguments against gender inclusive practices:** For example, there may be entrenched views on the role of women or even some limited evidence on women having lower levels of trust in technology. By identifying and understanding these viewpoints, we can develop a strategy to counter or manage them.

- **Use targeted evidence and data to support the business case:** Evidence needs to be grounded in the local context and specific to the sector. It also needs to be tailored to the potential partner (e.g. using it to address reasons behind their current, non-inclusive practices). This information should first and foremost be convincing about the business case – i.e. not be social research. However, sometimes softer information (e.g. women are uncomfortable about buying from certain ‘male’ trade centres) can be crucial for making the case. Use a good blend of quantitative and qualitative data in a manner that is convincing for the case. Also, make sure our business calculations around net gains account for any additional costs involved with targeting women.

- **Generate data to support the WEE business case before meeting the potential partner:** We may need to generate tailored evidence or repurpose available data. Beyond secondary sources, remember that our value addition as market systems advisors is often our rich field experience. We have a lot of knowledge about working with sectors from earlier cases and a wealth of data we can tap into. Don’t forget that partners themselves hold much more data than they even know they have (e.g. on sales, or via field agents, etc.). Overall, come up with a lean strategy for how to efficiently use different data that already exists. Avoid starting from scratch! This does not need to be a long, arduous, and costly task. Potential sources of data include gender focus group discussions, existing impact assessments, demand surveys, etc. If relevant, we may also want to conduct an initial mapping to identify the most active and entrepreneurial female groups in target geographies. The local departments of women empowerment (Dinas Pemberdayaan Perempuan) can be a good source of information, particularly for the initial mapping of female groups.

- **Do not assume (or over-estimate) awareness of women in their supply chain or consumer base:** Even where the potential partner’s product is predominantly purchased by women, they may not be aware of their female consumer base. Make sure we have the data to demonstrate the importance of women in their supply chain or as a key customer segment.

- **Use “seeing is believing” tactics when engaging potential partners:** This could be as simple as showing the potential partner pictures of women in their retail shops to reinforce the importance of women as their main consumer base. It may also involve organising exposure visits or gender focus group discussions for the potential partner so that they can see the opportunity for themselves. Another option is to conduct joint research or small-scale comparison tests of women and men target groups. Think tactically about what will convince the particular partner (the statistics, the case, the story). This is different in every case.
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Tool 3A: Who does? Who pays? during the project & in the future

This tool can be used to support both Stage 3 (agree on the business model and broad strategy) and Stage 4 (agree on the detailed activity plan and budget). Stage 3 can help us think through whether we have considered all the necessary headline activities and who will have overall responsibility to lead these activities. In Stage 4, we can also develop a detailed activity plan and determine how costs will be shared.

1. Type of agreement

- Grant
  - CGRG
    - Grant Guideline & Financial Handbook
  - INGO, NGO, Universities
- Partnership
  - GRG & CPR
    - Partnership Guideline & Claim Guideline
- MoU
- Sub-Contract
- Tech. Assistant
  - CPR
    - Proc. Practice Note
  - • Service Provider
    • Short Term Advisor
  - • Private Sector
    • Loc. Gov.
    • Individual
### Annex 2: Useful Tools

**Stage 3: Agree the Business Model & Broad Strategy**

#### Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities (or Tasks)</th>
<th>Doing</th>
<th>Paying</th>
<th>If the activities are required more than once in the project, will it be on the same term?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who will do this during the project?</td>
<td>What costs are attached to this activity during the project?</td>
<td>During stage 4, make a note of which Activities or Tasks are best paid through agreed output-based payments and reimbursed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be paid by PRISMA</td>
<td>To be paid by Partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (or Tasks)</th>
<th>Doing</th>
<th>Paying</th>
<th>What do we have to do during the intervention to make this happen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this activity need to be done in the future?</td>
<td>If yes, who will do this activity in the future?</td>
<td>What are their incentives to do this in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Swisscontact Indonesia & The Springfield Centre*
### Tool 3B: Business Model Canvas

#### Key Partners
- Who are the key partners?
- What role do they play?

#### Key Activities
- What are the key activities?
- How are they performed?

#### Key Resources
- What are the key resources?
- Where are they located?

#### Value Propositions
- What is the value proposition?
- How is it delivered?

#### Customer Relationships
- How do we interact with customers?
- What is the level of commitment?

#### Customer Segments
- Who are our target customers?
- What are their needs?

#### Channels
- How do we reach customers?
- What are the costs?

#### Cost Structure
- What are the main costs?
- How are they controlled?

#### Revenue Streams
- Where do we earn revenue?
- What are the risks?
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Tool 4A: Decision tree for when & how to use PRISMA funds

IS THE ACTIVITY.....

One-off

Building or purchasing equipment & infrastructure

Potential to cost share (if there is need to buy down risk) but preferably not more than 50%

Potential exceptions for going >50%:
- If there is a particularly strong business case, VFM, gender, and/or poverty justification

Check with manager

Other types of activities

Potential to cost-share or fully-fund

Potential exceptions:
- in cases where there may be sensitive intellectual property rights implications (e.g. training curricula, database of buyers) it would be preferable to get the partner to fully fund. If funded by AIP-PRISMA, DFAT will have ownership over the material.

Check with manager

Recurrent

Avoid funding as this can be unsustainable

Potential exception:
- If contributions are rapidly declining and scales down to zero (e.g. cost share agronomist 60% in season 1, 30% in season 2, and 0% in season 3)

Check with manager
### Tool 4B: Allowable and Non-Allowable Partner Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Existing partner resources</th>
<th>New partner resources for partnership activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel (staff or management)</td>
<td>No-except if they can prove that the personnel have been 100% reallocated to the partnership/partnership goals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets owned, purchased, or rented (including land, plant, and equipment)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional materials (banners, flyers, radio, advertising, etc.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building for ISP/Farmers (training module development, training tools, exposure/study visits)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop/Events/FGD (related meals, venue, entertainment, security, transport for participants)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants/Speakers/Trainers (including per diems, accommodation, travel costs)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics for Personnel (accommodation, meal, travel costs)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to farmers or ISPs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes-as per guidance from DFAT, the full loan value can be counted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution cost of products, services, inputs, etc.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging, branding, or certification costs of product</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs provided to out-grower schemes or promotional demo plots (seed, fertilizer, pesticides, labour for land clearing, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes-can count inputs that are already in stock as long as they are used towards the partnership</td>
<td>Yes-this can include free or discounted samples to farmers on demo plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to ISPs provided by the partner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Useful Tools
Stage 4: Agree the detailed activity plan and budget

1. ACTIVITIES
   Activity design ➔ target, how often etc

2. TECHNICALITIES
   How is it going to be conducted ➔ what does an activity group entail, who's the PIC etc

3. CONTRIBUTION
   Who's going to pay for what?

4. PROCUREMENT (1)
   Can the partner do/procure all activities by themselves from beginning to end? If yes, we negotiate for full PA

5. PROCUREMENT (2)
   If not, does it make sense (from sustainability and procurement angle) for PRISMA to carry out some of the activities? This means we will have PA hybrid

6. REIMBURSEMENT
   Task Leader to understand the difference between input based and output based for reimbursable items as this will be part of the negotiation for contracting process
## Tool 4C: Developing a Collaboration Agreement (with/without payment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Agreement Type</th>
<th>Forms and Templates</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Legally bonded</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>![Link](/policies/guidelines/templates/procurement/template, forms/09. General/01. Agreement Checklist and sign off)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implementation procurement provided by Partner</td>
<td>CA Hybrid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>![Link](/policies/guidelines/templates/procurement/template, forms/02. TOR-SOS-SOW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implementation procurement provided by PRISMA</td>
<td>CA Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>![Link](/policies/guidelines/templates/procurement/template, forms/01. Contract - Agreement/01. PSP &amp; MoU Agreement template)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Direct payment to partner after activities implemented and invoice received</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>![Link](/policies/guidelines/templates/procurement/template, forms/01. Contract - Agreement/01. PSP &amp; MoU Agreement template)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Direct payment to vendors or suppliers by PRISMA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>![Link](/policies/guidelines/templates/procurement/template, forms/01. Contract - Agreement/01. PSP &amp; MoU Agreement template)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PRISMA procurement SOP applied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Partner procurement SOP applied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** CA Hybrid is where some of PRISMA contribution will directed purchase by PRISMA, while the other PRISMA contribution still implemented by Partner and the cost reimbursed. Used when Partners have cash flow issues.
### Tool 5A: Partnership Health Check

The following table provides some guiding questions for assessing our working relationship with our partner. This list of questions is non-exhaustive and should only be taken as a guide to stimulate our thinking. Check with partners to see if there are any questions about the relationship which they would also like to ask? The questions should provide an opening to have a helpful discussion together, which is reflective of our partnership principles (diversity, equity, openness, shared value & mutual accountability, courage). Remember it is about reviewing and improving the partnership (which includes PRISMA!), not an assessment of the partner. The focus of health checks should be on improving and learning, never on blaming or punishing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>PRISMA response</th>
<th>Partner response</th>
<th>Agreed actions/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What has worked well so far in the partnership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have been some of our best achievements (in the project, in the partnership)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well have we demonstrated and integrated the partnering principles in our engagement with partners? And their engagement with us?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, with the benefit of hindsight, would we do differently next time? What could be changed or improved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have been some of the enablers and barrier of effective partnership? Is there anything we can do to reduce the barriers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective is our communication? Is there anything we could do to improve it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have there been changes in their level of commitment, interest, or ownership? If yes, explain what changes you have observed, why we think these changes have come about, and what the implications are for the partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have there been any turnover in the partner’s leadership or key contact points (e.g. new CEO, new PRISMA portfolio lead etc.)? If yes, elaborate and note any potential or actual impacts (negative or positive) on the partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have there been any changes to the partner’s priorities/corporate strategies/vision? If yes, please elaborate and note any potential or actual impacts (negative or positive) on the partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can we do to maintain or improve the relationship with our partners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we get more value-add from the partnership, both for our partners and for PRISMA?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the project is coming to a close in the next 12 months or is not meeting the expectations of either PRISMA or the partner despite our best efforts, is it time to discuss with our partners the various options, such as next-generation scaling, an exit plan or explore other options? Refer to Stage 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tool 6A: Options to Sustain Outcomes

When agreeing to close or withdraw from a partnership, it is important to discuss and agree to an exit plan, which should be done in an open and respectful way, keeping in mind PRISMA’s partnership principles. You should plan to discuss the following, and consider your partners’ perspectives, in order to achieve a mutually beneficial outcome, which protects both organisation’s reputations.

The plan should be agreed in writing and signed by PRISMA and the partner representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit plan components</th>
<th>Agreed/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Note the partnership’s successes and achievements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree a shared approach to the sharing of lessons learned from the partnership – what lessons will be shared and with whom (i.e. internal PRISMA/partner audiences only or external audiences)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agree on shared public messaging about the closure/exit and the project achievements, which can be used by both organisations after the project has completed. This will include ongoing use of brands, logos etc., and whether permission will need to be sought from each organisation before making any public statements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Confirm arrangements for any residual project activities, remaining assets, project branding, intellectual property;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What arrangements and permissions are in place to ensure later access to project data for monitoring and impact evaluation purposes – this needs to be sustainable even if your key contact moves on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are there any commercial in confidence or other sensitive issues to protect once the project has completed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Acknowledge each organisation’s contributions and commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adapted from the Practical Action’s Participatory Market Systems Development (PMSD) Roadmap

Gender Equality and Social Inclusion includes neglected market segments including women, indigenous communities, youth and people with disabilities. While all these topics require an underlying business case, the partnership guideline may vary to encourage partners to try these new initiatives.

The pandemic may not last forever

Based on Partnership Brokers Association principles of effective partnerships and the Principles of Partnership endorsed by the Global Humanitarian Platform in 2007

This section draws on various toolkits and papers written by TPI (The Partnering Initiative)