16. Effective collaborative climate change governance in urban areas¹

Lorena Pasquini, Dania Petrik, Balbina Nyamakura, Kate Strachan, Meggan Spires, Sheona Shackleton and Gina Ziervogel

INTRODUCTION

The negative impacts of climate change are steadily becoming more apparent, driving an urgent need for climate change responses (IPCC, 2014). Cities represent both areas of “concentrated” risk and critical arenas for taking action (Pasquini, 2020), and research suggests that city governments need to adopt a collaborative approach to the management of climate change and its impacts (e.g. Spires & Shackleton, 2018). The inability of urban governments to deal with climate change responses on their own stems from the fact that climate change drivers and impacts are multi-scale, cross-sectoral and involve a broad range of actors and stakeholders. As such, the management of climate change drivers and impacts is recognized to need collaboration and knowledge exchange from different governance levels and fields of expertise (e.g. Moloney & Füngfeld, 2015).

Reflecting this recognition, multi-level and collaborative forms of governance have emerged as important for ensuring that responses that increase the resilience of urban areas to climate change are selected, implemented and sustained (e.g. Brink & Wamsler, 2018; Kalesnikaite, 2019). “Collaborative governance” focuses on the formation of collaborations between organizations, institutions or groups (Vangen et al., 2015). Internationally, significant progress has been made on identifying and exploring the factors underpinning the success or failure of collaborative governance ventures. In this chapter, we discuss some of the crucial elements of effective collaborations that have emerged from international literature, and we illustrate their importance using empirical case studies of collaborations for climate resilience in three African cities, Lilongwe and Blantyre (Malawi) and Harare (Zimbabwe) (Table 16.1). We use the case studies to exemplify barriers and opportunities related to dif-

Table 16.1 Collaborations for climate resilience in Blantyre and Lilongwe (Malawi), and Harare (Zimbabwe)

Name of collaboration	Purpose of collaboration
Malawi	
1. Cross-sectoral budgetary support (horizontal collaboration between departments)	To provide adequate resources/budgetary assistance to solve or mitigate challenges of service delivery implementation, related to supporting different city departments meet climate resilient goals, e.g. management of sewer lines/waste.
2. Development of Nationally Developed Contributions (NDCs) through inclusive processes	Under the UNDP national climate change programme, support was provided for the development of Malawi's intended NDCs through national consultations with a broad spectrum of stakeholders. Through this experience, the National Planning Commission was established as an overarching institution to coordinate all the planning initiatives in the country and oversee synergy between national planning documents.
3. Community needs assessment collaboration with Blantyre City Council	This was an initiative to explore ways to improve service delivery for public sanitation, while ensuring that residents would be prepared for policy change (from free services to paid-for services). The willingness to pay resulted in creating interest amongst entrepreneurs to start engaging in sanitation business. The incorporation of water tanks in the project is an aspect of climate resilient development, related to mitigating impacts from climate hazards such as droughts.
4. Alignment of national development priorities to local level through Directorate of Planning and Development (Lilongwe City Council)	Collaboration at city level to ensure that developments that are being implemented in the city of Lilongwe through the Directorate of Planning and Development are also in line with the national goals, such that the Lilongwe City Development Strategy aligns with the overall Malawi Growth and Development Strategy.
5. Knowledge-sharing collaboration for effective decision making related to climate change, related to efficient cookstoves	The goal of the collaboration was to find co-developed solutions or collaborative solution generation to cross-cutting problems on climate change, and then also secondly to share ideas, knowledge and lessons for improved decision-making. Different projects were presented to the task force team, related to climate resilient development. The one example discussed in the interview was around energy-efficient cookstoves.
6. Think Tank collaboration	The goal of the think tank was to bring stakeholders together to find co-developed solutions to, and share knowledge on cross-cutting problems on, climate change, specifically related to waste-to-energy value chains.

Name of collaboration	Purpose of collaboration
7. Urban resilience pilot project	Collaborative effort between different ministries for mapping and identifying climate risk areas in Blantyre, especially those prone to flooding disasters, such as landslides. Pilot project, with Blantyre as a pilot city, to be implemented across all city councils if seen to be effective in terms of building resilience in urban areas.
8. Co-management of the environment between Blantyre City Council and city residents	To engage the civic, educate residents and citizens on the importance of managing the urban tree system and forests, to avoid deforestation for charcoal, wood fuel or brick burning, as well as to manage human settlement encroachment on reserve areas (related to subsistence farming).
9. Multi-sectoral coordinating committees	Multi-sectoral coordinating committees (working groups) that include stakeholders in the health, sanitation and environment sector, who come together to understand what scenarios would develop under different climate conditions, for example flooding or drought, and how this might affect residents and city service delivery mandates.
10. Environmental Affairs Department focal point deployment to town planning committee	Through deployment collaboration, the Environmental Affairs Department (at national level) acts as a member of the Blantyre Town Planning committee in order to ensure that the issues of environment and climate change related issues are integrated in the planning at the city level. The role is to advise the planners with regards to these issues.
11. Collaboration on dual carriageway for improving road infrastructure	Purpose was to expand/widen the road to increase vehicle capacity, to improve mobility for residents and decrease traffic, as well as to upgrade the road and improve drainage. Links to climate resilient development in terms of improving infrastructure, specifically related to stormwater flooding, which damages roads.

Zimbabwe

1. Establishment of the Environmental Management Agency	The Environmental Management Agency was established to ensure that issues emanating from climate change and the environmental issues in the city of Harare are appropriately dealt with through monitoring and reporting on, and collaborating with, relevant entities.
2. Climate change focal point deployment in Ministry of Local Government	Capacity building programme implemented through the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works, and National Housing – where there is a desk at local government from which awareness campaigns can be disseminated, and climate change training takes place.
3. Climate change focal point training and capacity-building	Training and capacity building programme that the national-level Climate Change Management Department coordinates for the purposes of localizing the NDCs into local-level activities, in order to build resilience.

Name of collaboration	Purpose of collaboration
4. Improving energy access through sustainable energy planning	The aim of the collaboration on electrification was to improve electricity access in the face of energy shortages, in order to mitigate against climate change induced energy shortages, as well as deal with energy access issues (specifically for rural schools or clinics).
5. Wetlands preservation and mapping through collaboration	The Harare town planning department has initiated collaboration in order to understand and incorporate all relevant issues and co-develop solutions on environmentally pressing issues related to the city's wetlands, which are its main water source.
6. Strategic plan for wetlands management and service delivery through stakeholder engagement	Collaboration initiated by Harare Water with affected stakeholders in order to create understanding and consolidate issues to do with wetlands, in relation to the city's by-laws, so that stakeholders have a document that addresses issues from their own point of view.
7. Environmental regularization through collaboration	As the regulatory authority on environmental issues, the Environmental Management Agency takes the lead on land planning issues in order to align with the Environmental Management Act. The Agency started implementing "regularization" to try and fix the issues related to land development, mainly via collaborative meetings that brought different stakeholders together to discuss the problems, including marginalized people who do not have access to the City's services.
8. Collaboration between the City of Harare and Harare Wetlands Trust	Sub-committees under the Harare Wetlands Trust help consolidate water-related issues across the 46 wards of Harare. The collaboration supports the respective community-based organizations under the Harare Wetlands Trust to participate in the local environmental wetland action plans in their locality, while feeding back to City of Harare on activities, issues and opportunities.
9. Collaboration between urban and rural local authorities	Local authorities make their own plans related to the national plans. Where necessary and there is need for association between the two, the Associations of Urban and Rural Councils make sure that they collaborate on shared issues related to climate or development needs. The structures are there for collaboration between the two and they report to one unit which is the ministry of local government.
10. Collaboration for the Revision of Zimbabwe's NDC	The revision of the NDC was spearheaded and coordinated by the national Climate Change Management Department and brought together a variety of different stakeholders and development partners, as well as the private sector, which had relevant technical and financial resources to contribute towards fine-tuning Zimbabwe's NDC.

Note: Barriers and enablers underpinning the effectiveness of collaborations were explored using in-depth interviews with 10 respondents in Malawi and 10 respondents in Zimbabwe. Interviews were conducted in English and lasted on average 1 hour.

ferent elements of the collaborative process (in the main, following Porter & Birdi's (2018) categorization of collaboration elements) and, consequently, to the implementation and maintenance of collaborative governance mechanisms for local-level urban climate resilience.

BARRIERS AND ENABLERS IN RELATION TO DIFFERENT CRUCIAL ELEMENTS OF COLLABORATION

Why do Stakeholders or Organizations Collaborate?

Incentives must exist for potential collaborators to want to work together (Emerson et al., 2012; Scott & Thomas, 2017), which can be negative – made up of problems, crises, resource needs – but also positive, representing interests or opportunities (for example, the availability of a grant or a new funding opportunity). Climate change presents obvious negative incentives for city stakeholders to collaborate, but also positive incentives as global attention and funding for addressing climate change drivers and impacts grows. One respondent in Harare drew attention to the importance of shifts in international agendas for stimulating cooperative governance on climate change issues: “it’s a fairly new concept so that is why we are saying that as the world now moves towards the NDCs [Nationally Determined Contributions], the call for participation by all sectors has now become pronounced” (Climate Change Management Department representative, Harare collaboration 3).

The motivation to take part in a collaboration will be low when stakeholders can achieve their goals by themselves, or through other means than engaging in a collaboration; therefore, interdependence (i.e. when individuals and organizations are unable to accomplish something on their own) is very important for collaborative action (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012; Nolte & Boenigk, 2013). Interdependence is also related to collective uncertainty about how to manage complex, “wicked” societal problems, such as climate change. Uncertainty that cannot be resolved by a single stakeholder can drive multiple stakeholders to collaborate in order to share risk.

What is Needed to Start Collaborations?

One obvious and major barrier to starting collaborations is the lack of financial resources (e.g. Lester et al., 2008; Porter & Birdi, 2018). For instance, many respondents in Blantyre and Harare mentioned this barrier. Porter and Birdi (2018) suggest providing ring-fenced funding to support the implementation of collaborations, but such suggestions do not provide concrete guidance as to how to source funds where they may be lacking. In this respect, respondents

from the Blantyre city council highlighted the importance of horizontal collaboration, that is, collaboration between departments of the municipality, to try and overcome financial constraints. They also highlighted how involving the private sector can be particularly important for overcoming the resource constraints of local government: the private sector can provide support for enhanced service delivery that might not otherwise be possible for the council, with its limited budget. Particularly relevant in the climate change space is the availability of funding from international organizations and frameworks for climate change and resilience-building projects, as one respondent from Blantyre articulated: “at the moment we have been receiving resources from international organisations [...] [and] there are some other institutions that are willing to support us. For example, there is COMESA [Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa] that has expressed interest, there is UNDP [United Nations Development Programme] that is also expressing interest to support [us]” (Environmental Affairs Department representative, Malawi collaboration 2).

More broadly, while the provision of dedicated resources can enable the start of collaborative ventures, these do not necessarily always have to be financial, for example freeing up staff time to take part in collaborative initiatives, and other types of in-kind support. Spreading the costs of involvement among all stakeholders and not requiring too large an investment up-front – which may be particularly difficult for local governments in developing countries – can both enable the start of collaborations.

Government legislation, policies or regulation can be a driver of collaborative ventures (Bryson et al., 2015; Porter & Birdi, 2018). In this context, Pettersson et al. (2018) note that formal arenas, such as those of the public sector, can require organizations to collaborate, for example through mandatory plans for services. In this respect, local governments can therefore be mandated to collaborate on climate change crises, as five collaborations in Harare exemplify, with one respondent noting “it is our mandate because the laws that govern planning, they mandate us to consult the community and organisations that are affected by the activities we do; so yes, collaboration is our mandate” (town planning department representative, Zimbabwe collaboration 5).

Who Should Take Part in Collaborations?

One issue with participation in collaborative ventures is that they may not include all relevant stakeholders who might nevertheless possess important skills, experience and knowledge. As such, every effort should be made to include as many stakeholders as possible, or at least provide them with the opportunity to participate, a criterion tied to the legitimacy of the collaborative process (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012; Porter & Birdi, 2018).

However, there is disagreement in the literature about the benefits of opening participation to all, because this approach can also cause collaborations to fail (Nohrstedt, 2018; Porter & Birdi, 2018). For instance, the inclusion of numerous stakeholders can bring additional process barriers, for example, the challenge of ensuring that everyone's views are heard and accounted for.

Including all stakeholders who are affected by and care about the issue at hand, needs to be balanced out by the fact that stakeholders must have the capacity to act, which includes the skills, experience, resources, time, energy and liberty to fully take part in the collaborative effort. If some stakeholders do not have these capacities to the same extent as others, it can lead to power imbalances, which will affect how stakeholders work together (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Related to having the capacity to act, the "openness of stakeholders to collaborate" should be high (Nolte & Boenigk, 2013), which requires stakeholders to be fully committed to the process. Commitment also entails that participants appreciate the roles and goals of other organizations (Hrelja et al., 2016). Commitment can be formalized through agreements such as MOUs or contracts (although these are only one indicator of commitment).

Pettersson et al. (2018) highlight further the issue of "who is the right person to include", noting that in large organizations – typical of public-sector agencies – this can be a complicated task because of staff turnover or unclear organizational mandates. One respondent in Blantyre, commenting on the issue of staff turnover, proposed a strategy for dealing with this barrier, suggesting that "one of the alternatives is to have the main member and an alternative member, so that when the main member is absent, obviously you target the next in line. So that would ensure that there's continuity within the system" (Environmental Affairs Department representative, Malawi collaboration 2).

In relation to the importance of the inclusion of the "right" stakeholders, respondents from two collaborations in Harare (Zimbabwe collaborations 3 and 7) emphasized how not having key stakeholders represented in a collaboration is a barrier to their effectiveness. The following quote is illustrative of this point:

the private sector, I do not know why they were not involved from the start ... having them on board will help to bring the business in to the strategy. Also, seeing things differently from an outsider point of view. The civil society organizations work with communities, but the private sector also works in another dimension. (City of Harare water department representative, Zimbabwe collaboration 6)

While ensuring the inclusion of the "right" people would seem an obvious requirement, in Blantyre seven out of the ten collaborations examined did not include the key stakeholders necessary for the collaboration. This omission is likely due in part to poor planning and stakeholder analysis at the beginning of

the collaboration, but in two cases it was linked explicitly to a lack of resources for the “right” stakeholders to be able to take part in the collaboration (i.e. stakeholders did not have the capacity to act).

In relation to the importance of including the “right” stakeholders, Camarinha-Matos and Afsarmanesh (2018) note that much collaboration-related research examines the extent to which the competencies of the involved parties are matched with the needs of the collaboration opportunity; in a related vein, Nolte and Boenigk (2013) highlight that organizations need to be aware of their needs, so they can coordinate with those organizations that can fulfil their needs. A respondent in Harare underscored that working with stakeholders that are already in fields relating to climate-resilient development made the collaboration easier: “I think the fact that we are working with people who are already in the field, it makes it sustainable because we are not bringing somebody out of the blue who is not doing this” (Climate Change Management Department representative, Zimbabwe collaboration 3). Given that climate change is still a relatively “new” topic for local governments to address, and characterized by high uncertainty and complexity, local governments in particular must consider drawing partners more experienced in climate change issues into their collaborations.

Camarinha-Matos and Afsarmanesh (2018) further mention that collaborative structures in natural ecosystems often involve a diversity of species, where each species (the actors) play different roles, reflected in different services. As such, it may be worth considering whether the parties selected for collaboration duplicate roles/services already provided by one party (and whether this is desirable to “future-proof” the collaboration against collaborators dropping out or staff turnover), or whether there are any roles/services being left unfulfilled.

In summary, in order to understand which partners to involve, collaborative ventures need to sketch out upfront: the objectives of the collaboration; the range of stakeholders that might be affected by or care about the issues the collaboration is designed to address; their needs, interests and competencies; their capacity to act; and their anticipated level of commitment.

How to Get Collaborators to Work Together Effectively?

A third set of criteria necessary for the collaborative process relates to getting collaborators to work together effectively. “Good” working relationships between collaborators would be characterized by low or medium levels of conflict or tension and high levels of trust (Porter & Birdi, 2018). In seven collaborations in Blantyre, having an explicit plan in place for how conflict will be resolved was noted as an enabler to collaboration. One respondent highlighted that clearly setting out partners’ roles and responsibilities was one way to minimize the occurrence of conflict. In this regard, efforts are needed

to identify any possible tensions between participants beforehand, find ways to address and resolve disputes, and take active steps to remediate low levels of trust and social capital among the stakeholders (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bryson et al., 2015). Generally a history of conflict between stakeholders creates a negative cycle of distrust, while a history of successful past collaboration can create a positive cycle of social capital and trust (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Therefore, if there is a history of conflict among stakeholders – which might potentially occur in cities with low levels of service delivery – then collaboration is unlikely to succeed unless they are highly dependent on each other or specific measures are put in place to address this problem.

Further, one interesting source of conflict that was noted in the local government in Blantyre was the lack of financial resources available to city councils, particularly due to competing needs from different departments. This reflects the fact that climate change is often mistakenly seen to compete against societal issues viewed as holding “greater priority”, such as job creation, service delivery, and so on. Such perceptions have been noted before, particularly – but not exclusively – in the context of developing countries (e.g. Pasquini et al., 2013). The idea that climate change competes with other needs reinforces the importance of explicitly fostering horizontal collaboration among local government departments, as noted above, as well as helping government stakeholders see climate change as a lens through which to view their existing work, and make adjustments that will not always require unlocking additional budget, but simply doing things differently.

As mentioned, high levels of trust (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012; Porter & Birdi, 2018; Tu & Xu, 2020) are a marker for good working relationships. Trust-building is a time-consuming process that requires a long-term commitment to achieving collaborative outcomes. Ansell and Gash (2008) suggest that if the necessary time and cost cannot be justified or sourced for building trust, then collaboration shouldn't be attempted. Given that trust takes time to develop, regular face-to-face interactions are encouraged, as noted by four respondents in Blantyre. Trust can also be built by sharing information and knowledge, demonstrating competency, good intentions, and follow-through (Bryson et al., 2006). In Blantyre, one respondent noted that previous experiences of working together also ensured the building of trust, in that stakeholders believed that other stakeholders were capable of doing the work that is assigned to them, as one respondent put it: “when you know that the people you've been working with before, maybe with different projects ... they are able to do what is right” (Blantyre City Council town planning department representative, Malawi collaboration 7).

A sensitivity to power imbalances is also necessary for collaborations to work effectively (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bryson et al., 2015; Nolte & Boenigk, 2013; Porter & Birdi, 2018). This sensitivity requires the awareness that some

stakeholders may have more or less influence in the proceedings: typically, government holds greater authority than do affected communities (Shergold, 2008), particularly in highly-unequal contexts such as those characterizing many developing countries. This sensitivity also requires having effective means for preventing the more powerful actors from unduly exerting their influence. Strong leadership or the use of a neutral facilitator (Porter & Birdi, 2018) can achieve this objective, but strong leadership might itself entail a power imbalance. As such, it might be opportune to spread leadership across a number of different actors (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

How Should the Process be Designed?

Numerous factors pertain to effective process design. Ziervogel et al. (2019) stress the importance of aligning and understanding different needs and expectations when collaborations are established, highlighting that the success of a collaboration is more likely when partners clearly understand what are, and how to meet, the desired or needed “return on investment” of different partners.

Poor planning in terms of time required, or scope of activities, can affect dropout rates, delays or lead to unfinished projects (Porter & Birdi, 2018). Detailed but flexible short-term plans (6–18 months) have been suggested as receiving higher buy-in and retention. Furthermore, the inability to document the processes followed in the collaborations were noted as barriers. For instance, in a collaboration that involved only one key focal person, the focal point noted that if she left, there would not be any continuity to the collaboration due to poor documentation processes: “we want to build something that is sustainable for our work, we need documentation of our work because I might decide to transfer and there would be nothing” (Ministry of Local Government representative, Zimbabwe collaboration 2). As such, appropriate plans and documentation can mitigate the potential problems that staff turnover (discussed above) can pose to collaborations, among other benefits.

There is also a need to build in time and opportunities for face-to-face dialogue between stakeholders (Ansell & Gash, 2008), given that such dialogue is at the heart of building trust, mutual respect, and shared understanding and commitment to the process. Holding frequent meetings was noted as an important enabler to facilitate effective collaboration in nine of the ten collaborations examined in Blantyre.

Collaborations must also realistically budget for and procure the necessary resources (e.g. funding, time, technical and logistical support; administrative and organizational assistance; requisite skills for analysis or implementation; needed expertise; Emerson et al., 2012) for the duration and aims of the collaboration. Given that establishing a collaboration is a time-consuming process

(Ansell & Gash, 2008), it is probably not a good strategy for situations in which stakeholders must make or implement decisions quickly. However, the up-front investment in effective collaboration can sometimes save considerable time and energy in downstream implementation. Once stakeholders achieve a working consensus, implementation can occur quite rapidly. Therefore, local government policy-makers might consider collaborative governance where they expect a difficult implementation process (Ansell & Gash, 2008). In any case, it is crucial that adequate time be built into any collaborative process.

A lack of accountability, transparency and legitimacy in how things are decided also limits the full contribution of participants (Lester et al., 2008; Ansell & Gash, 2008; Porter & Birdi, 2018). These factors will be particularly relevant in contexts where local governments might struggle with being perceived as accountable and legitimate. Such concerns can be ameliorated by establishing clear and transparent decision and process rules at the outset, which set out procedures for consulting, prioritizing and deciding on different courses of action. These rules must be agreed upon by all involved. The roles and responsibilities of each partner must also be made clear, to ensure ownership of the process.² In both Harare and Blantyre, having a diversified approach to distributing roles and responsibilities in the collaborations, based on the skill and expertise of partners, contributed to effective collaborations. The resultant decentralization of power (so that it is not concentrated in the hands of any one stakeholder) also greatly assisted with trust building.

Finally, clear objectives and clear evaluation and monitoring processes must be set. These are particularly important for stakeholders that have to justify their involvement by showing clear cost/benefit ratios – as might be the case where involving the private sector in public–private collaborations.

HOW TO KEEP THE COLLABORATIVE PROCESS ON TRACK?

There is a need to understand how to keep collaborative ventures on track. To this end, what is critical is to have a clear and strong vision, that helps to keep stakeholders moving in the same direction towards the same end goal (Bryson et al., 2015; Porter & Birdi, 2018). This vision should include the purpose of the collaboration, its priorities, long-term goals, and what is needed to resolve the problem(s) identified. For instance, the importance of having a shared understanding of the problem was emphasized by respondents from five of the Blantyre collaborations. In these collaborations, the shared vision was facilitated through working from integrated plans. Interestingly, orientation for new members was used to ensure that each stakeholder would understand the shared vision of the collaboration. In the words of one respondent, “when one has just joined they are oriented so that can contribute effectively”

(Researcher, Malawi Polytechnic-University of Malawi, Malawi collaboration 5). Leadership is widely seen as a critical requirement for bringing collaborators together and steering them through the process of ensuring that a vision is achieved (Ansell & Gash, 2008) (see preceding section).

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

While the sections above have sketched out some of the key factors influencing the success or failure of collaborative ventures, in closing we emphasize that the effective governance of climate change in urban areas also strongly requires close collaboration and cooperation between different governmental levels, in addition to collaboration between different types of stakeholders. Governance to build local-level urban climate resilience therefore needs to be both collaborative *and* multi-level. The importance of vertical collaboration between governmental levels is grounded in three main issues. The first, that higher levels of government set much of the framework and context in which lower levels of government operate, as the following example regarding climate-resilient buildings at the urban level makes clear. The respondent notes how local by-laws depend on the orientation of national laws, so the latter need to be oriented towards achieving climate resilience for local laws to be able to do so.

Local authorities normally tap from the national policies as they craft their by-laws, so we now need to revise our by-laws but we can't do so without the revision of the national laws. So that is the challenge that we are having and trying to address when it comes to the issue of climate change, because right now if I am to look at building, we now need to have these resilient buildings and climate-sensitive buildings but we can't do so without a change in the national laws. So that is one thing that I see as a stumbling block in building resilience in our cities. (Ministry of Local Government representative, Zimbabwe collaboration 2)

The second issue is that national governments drive a lot of the resource allocation to local governments, as a national government representative in Zimbabwe recognized: "what is important now is for us to be able to bring capacity to local government so that they start to participate at the same level as the ministries [on dealing with climate-related issues]" (mitigation expert, national climate change management department, climate change focal point deployment across ministries). The third issue is that, pragmatically, the actual implementation of adaptation options and climate-resilient development often takes place at the local level: "there is no way you can stop working with local authorities [...] basically the operational issues are done at that level" (Ministry of Rural Development representative, Zimbabwe collaboration 9).

Clear understanding of where national government's administrative power ends and local-level execution begins is thus vital for actual implementation.

In conclusion, this chapter, drawing on the literature and empirical work, has deliberated on a set of elements, and associated barriers and enablers, that need to be considered to support effective collaborations at the municipal level to promote urban climate resilience. Several of the elements highlight the importance of thorough preplanning of collaborative ventures, where time needs to be invested in determining such aspects as the purpose of the venture, framing objectives and goals, mapping stakeholder capacities and interests, selecting the "right" stakeholders, approaches for retaining collaborators, reducing power imbalances and building trust, and so forth. Dedicated attention to the elements outlined here can help improve the chances of success of collaborative ventures, and therefore, in turn, increase the resilience of cities to the effects of climate change.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All the respondents who gave up time to be interviewed are gratefully acknowledged. This work is based upon research carried out under the Improved Municipal Planning in African CiTies (IMPACT) for a climate resilient urban future project, a collaborative research project between ICLEI Africa, Chinhoyi University of Technology, the University of Malawi and the African Climate & Development Initiative (University of Cape Town). The work was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Ottawa, Canada (IDRC Grant Number: 108665-001). The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the IDRC or its Board of Governors.

NOTES

1. This is an open access work distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 Unported (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Users can redistribute the work for non-commercial purposes, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, as detailed in the License. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd must be clearly credited as the owner of the original work. Any translation or adaptation of the original content requires the written authorization of Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
2. See also https://africa.iclei.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/WEB_ICLEI-Impact-Poster.pdf.

REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Brink, E., & Wamsler, C. (2018). Collaborative governance for climate change adaptation: mapping citizen–municipality interactions. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 28(2), 82–97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1795>
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.x>
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C. & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: needed and challenging. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 647–663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12432>
- Camarinha-Matos, L. M., & Afsarmanesh, H. (2018). Roots of collaboration: nature-inspired solutions for collaborative networks. *IEEE Access*, 6, 30829–30843. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2845119>
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Hrelja, R., Pettersson, F., & Westerdahl, S. (2016). The qualities needed for a successful collaboration: a contribution to the conceptual understanding of collaboration for efficient public transport. *Sustainability*, 8(6), 542. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8060542>
- IPCC (2014). *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Edited by C. B. Field et al. Cambridge University Press. www.cambridge.org
- Kalesnikaitė, V. (2019). Keeping cities afloat: climate change adaptation and collaborative governance at the local level. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 42(4), 864–888. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2018.1526091>
- Lester, H., Birchwood, M., Tait, L., Shah, S., England, E., & Smith, J. (2008). Barriers and facilitators to partnership working between Early Intervention Services and the voluntary and community sector. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 16(5), 493–500. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2524.2008.00760.x>
- Moloney, S., & Fünfgeld, H. (2015). Emergent processes of adaptive capacity building: local government climate change alliances and networks in Melbourne. *Urban Climate*, 14(1), 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2015.06.009>
- Nohrstedt, D. (2018). Networking and crisis management capacity: a nested analysis of local-level collaboration in Sweden. *American Review of Public Administration*, 48(3), 232–244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074016684585>
- Nolte, I. M., & Boenigk, S. (2013). A study of ad hoc network performance in disaster response. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(1), 148–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764011434557>
- Pasquini, L. (2020). The urban governance of climate change adaptation in least-developed African countries and in small cities: the engagement of local decision-makers in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and Karonga, Malawi. *Climate and Development*, 12(5), 408–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2019.1632166>

- Pasquini, L., Cowling, R. M. & Ziervogel, G. (2013). Facing the heat: barriers to mainstreaming climate change adaptation in local government in the Western Cape Province, South Africa. *Habitat International*, 40, 225–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2013.05.003>
- Pettersson, F., Westerdahl, S., & Hansson, J. (2018). Learning through collaboration in the Swedish public transport sector? Co-production through guidelines and living labs. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 69, 394–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2018.07.010>
- Porter, J. J., & Birdi, K. (2018). 22 reasons why collaborations fail: lessons from water innovation research. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 89, 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.07.004>
- Scott, T. A., & Thomas, C.W. (2017). Unpacking the collaborative toolbox: why and when do public managers choose collaborative governance strategies? *Policy Studies Journal*, 45(1), 191–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12162>
- Shergold, P. (2008). Governing through collaboration. In J. O'Flynn, & J. Wanna (Eds), *Collaborative governance: a new era of public policy in Australia?* (pp. 13–22). ANU E Press.
- Spires, M., & Shackleton, S.E. (2018). A synthesis of barriers to and enablers of pro-poor climate change adaptation in four South African municipalities. *Climate and Development*, 10(5), 432–447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2017.1410088>
- Tu, W., & Xu, Y. (2020). The evolution of interorganizational trust in cross-sector collaborations: two comparative cases from China. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(4), 709–720. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21404>
- Vangen, S., Hayes, J. P., & Cornforth, C. (2015). Governing cross-sector, inter-organizational collaborations. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1237–1260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.903658>
- Ziervogel, G., Pasquini, L., & Lee, J. (2019). Understanding the role of networks in stimulating adaptation actions on the ground: examples from two African case studies. In W. Leal Filho, & R. Leal-Arcas (Eds), *University initiatives in climate change mitigation and adaptation* (pp. 57–75). Springer.