



Co-production: What Makes Co-Production Work? Evidence from Pakistan

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Public Sector Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJPSM-10-2015-0190.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Co-production, Resource strategies, Trust, Commitment, Context

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

View Only

Abstract

Purpose: In developing countries there is growing recognition that co-production offers more cost effective and responsive service delivery options in low income areas. This paper explores the way in which co-production initiatives are managed in a developing country, Pakistan.

Design: A qualitative comparative case study design is used. Data is collected through 25 semi-structured interviews and document analysis and applies Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) Framework for analysis.

Findings: The study suggests that challenges to co-production are more than a managerial problem which require a different set of capabilities on the part of the actors in order to achieve anticipated goals in the joint production of services. Co-production initiatives require formal structures and processes to involve the local community and third sector to work with the public sector as effective partners. Political and bureaucratic commitment in regional and local government and community willingness to engage act as a catalyst for the successful management of co-production.

Originality: The study extends understanding of what makes co-production work, a little researched area in the field, drawing on a comparative analysis of two different institutional arrangements of co-production.

Key words: Co-production, commitment, context, resources, trust

1. Introduction

Co-production contributes to an important debate in public management, which goes to the heart of efficient, effective and more inclusive approaches to service delivery and forms part of a broader framework, New Public Governance (NPG), which is underpinned by a ‘service dominant approach’ (Osborne et al., 2013). Increasing fiscal pressures are pushing the public sector to search for more innovative, efficient, effective and inclusive ways to deliver services (Pestoff, 2014) as a result of synergy between public employees and citizens (Ostrom, 1996; Warren et al., 1982). Ostrom examined co-production in developing countries and concluded that “*co-production is crucial for achieving higher levels of welfare in developing countries, particularly those that are poor*” (1996:357).

There is a renewed interest in co-production, both in the developed and developing economies (Bovaird and Löffler 2012; OECD, 2011), yet it is a little researched area (Cepiku and Giordano, 2014; Joshi and Moore, 2004; OCED, 2011; Verscheure et al., 2012). Most empirical research focusses on the motivation and drivers of collaborative initiatives (Alford, 2014) and less attention is paid to the ways in which co-production is managed which calls for more systematic empirical research on co-production to advance our understanding of the issues surrounding how to promote, manage, evaluate and sustain co-production initiatives (Pestoff, 2014). This paper aims to fill this gap by drawing on two case studies of co-production initiatives within the Changa Pani Program (CPP) undertaken by two City District Governments (CDGs) of Pakistan, City District Government Lahore (CDGL) and City District Government Faisalabad (CDGF).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Despite the emphasis on collaborative forms of service delivery in Pakistan, very few collaborative programmes are found in sectors such as health, education and water and sanitation. In particular, a limited number of NGOs operate in the water and sanitation sector in Pakistan (Bano, 2011). The most documented case study of NGO and public sector collaboration in the sanitation sector is the case of the Orangi Pilot Project (OPP), which was established by Akhter Hameed Khan in 1980, and is also known as the Component Sharing model, in low income areas of Karachi, the capital city of the Province of Sindh (Bano, 2011; Sansom, 2006). Punjab, one of the provinces of Pakistan, with a total population of 90 million, has overall Water and Sanitation Service (WSS) coverage of less than 50% of the total population (Government of Punjab, 2010). The Punjab Urban Water and Sanitation Policy (Government of Punjab, 2007) developed the Component Sharing model, referred to as the ‘Changa Pani Program (CPP)’, as a preferred strategy to include community and private participation in the planning, construction and maintenance of WSS provision. The CPP is based on the concept of co-production; its design and implementation emphasizes the “*shared character*” of service provision, with the involvement of direct users in the core production of services (Brandsen and Pestoff, 2006: 496), and it provides the public sector with ways through which they can achieve synergy and improve the quality of overall service provision (Ostrom, 1999). The data was collected from two co-production initiatives undertaken by CDGL, the 34th largest urban areas in the world, the second largest city in Pakistan and the capital of Punjab province, with a population of 10 million and CDGF, the third largest city of Pakistan, with a rapidly growing population of 3.5 million, and facing many challenges as a result of rapid urbanization. One of the major issues, particularly in the low income communities of these CDGs, is

1
2
3
4 inadequate WSS provision. The decision to select two different CDGs was based on the
5
6 assumption that they would provide a unique contrast to help understand the role of
7
8 context on CPP, as their CPP is not only structured differently and they have adopted
9
10 different strategies, but there are also different set of actors involved in each CDG,
11
12 which could highlight their role in the implementation and management of co-
13
14 production. The degree of formality and nature of user's involvement in CPP design,
15
16 construction and service delivery varies across CDGs and can be a source of variation in
17
18 its processes, which makes it highly relevant to study how co-production, when
19
20 managed differently, leads to various outcomes.
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 The paper proceeds as follows. In section 2, we explore perspectives on co-production
28
29 by reviewing the literature. In section 3, we outline our research methodology. In
30
31 section 4, we present our research findings and in section 5 we conclude the analysis
32
33 with a discussion of the implication of co-production initiatives. In section 6, we
34
35 provide some research limitations.
36
37
38

39 40 **2. Perspectives on co-production**

41
42 Co-production implies the shared character of the production process (Brandsen and
43
44 Pestoff, 2006), promoting greater citizen participation in the provision of services
45
46 (Pestoff, 2006). The literature on co-production offers several definitions, including the
47
48 simple one of the mixing of activities that involve both public service agents' and
49
50 citizens' contribution to the provision of public services. The former are involved as
51
52 "regular producers", while "citizen producers" contribute voluntarily to improve the
53
54 quality and/or quantity of the services they use (Parks et al., 1981 as cited in Pestoff
55
56 2006: 506). In a more institutionalized approach, the emphasis is on "*provision of public*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *services (broadly defined, to include regulation) through regular, long term*
5 *relationships between state agencies and organised groups of citizens, where both make*
6 *substantial resource contributions”* (Joshi and Moore, 2004: 40). However, this
7 definition limits itself to co-production with state agencies alone (Bovaird, 2007). The
8 recent work of Brandsen and Honingh (2015: 5) provides a revised definition of
9 coproduction, as the “....*relationship between a paid employee of an organisation and*
10 *(groups of) individual citizens that require a direct and active contribution to the work*
11 *of an organisation”*. Specifically, Brandsen and Honingh (2015) offer various forms of
12 coproduction depending on the extent to which citizens are involved in the design and
13 implementation of the core services of the service delivery organisations. Other have
14 distinguished coproduction on the type of user’s involvement in co-planning, co-design,
15 co-financing, and co-delivery of services (Bovaird and Loffler, 2012) suggesting that
16 co-production is not a fixed form (Van Eijk and Steen, 2014) and does not have a fixed
17 meaning (Ewert and Evers, 2014), but can be considered as a continuum (Joost et al.,
18 2015). The ways policies encourage citizens’ involvement in the coproduction of
19 complimentary or core services can affect the way these initiatives are consequently
20 managed. In our case study, we will use Ostrom’s (1996) definition as it provides a
21 broader view of co-production and incorporates a range of arrangements between
22 regular producers and users actively making significant contributions to the production
23 of services. We will also consider co-production as a continuum and will examine how
24 various institutional arrangements affect its outcomes, depending on the user
25 involvement in the design, delivery and implementation of water and sanitation services
26 (WSS).

1
2
3
4 In this paper we focus on co-production in service planning and delivery activities in
5
6 two cases where co-production 1) takes the form of long term institutionalised
7
8 arrangements between the stakeholders who make a significant contribution to the
9
10 design, construction and provision of the core service of WSS (CDGL-CPP), and 2)
11
12 where co-production remains a voluntary, non-formal arrangement based on a relational
13
14 element of trust (CDGF-CPP), involving users in the design and construction of
15
16 infrastructure development and leaving the provision of services to the service providers
17
18 (WASA), proposing that the way users are involved provide opportunities and
19
20 incentives for the partners to work together and consequently affect their institutional
21
22 arrangements and hence make co-production work in a more effective manner.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 ***How to co-produce? Issues of efficiency, effectiveness and inclusion***

30
31
32
33 Motives and drives for co-production affect the way users are involved. Co-production
34
35 based on governance drivers will give citizens a key role in service planning, design and
36
37 implementation and provides tailored solutions built around users' needs (Brandsen and
38
39 Honingh, 2015), while logistic drivers give citizens the key role in the direct delivery of
40
41 the service (Bovaird, 2007). The literature has emphasised the role of organisational or
42
43 institutional arrangements, since these arrangements may facilitate or hinder co-
44
45 production (Bifulco and Ladd, 2006; Ostrom, 1996; Parks et al., 1981). According to
46
47 Ostrom (1996), the design principles of co-production should let co-producers be part of
48
49 the decision making process, directly or indirectly, and provide a mechanism to resolve
50
51 conflicts. Alford (2009) emphasises the role of clients' motivation through directing
52
53 their attention to what co-production can offer them, designing the right organisational
54
55 structures that facilitate clients' engagement in the decision making and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 institutionalising client engagement in co-production as part of the culture. Moreover,
5
6 political support, the support of the service providers and active citizen engagement to
7
8 overcome the inertia to work together are considered significant factors for effective
9
10 outcomes (Alford, 2009; Bifulco and Ladd, 2006; Percy, 1984; Pestoff, 2006). Cepiku
11
12 and Giordano (2014) reach a similar finding when analysing a longitudinal case study of
13
14 the health sector in Ethiopia, arguing that appropriate institutional arrangements are
15
16 crucial if co-production is to progress. The literature on users motivation emphasise the
17
18 willingness and capacity of the users to coproduce (Alford, 2009; Bovaird et al, 2015;
19
20 Joost and Honingh, 2015) and motivation of the key actors critical for the effectiveness
21
22 and sustainability of coproduction initiatives (Cepiku and Giordano, 2014; Van Eijk and
23
24 Steen, 2014).
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 ***Institutional Analysis and Development Framework (IAD)***

32
33 In this section we will set out the IAD framework¹ proposed by Ostrom (2011) to
34
35 analyse the institutional arrangements of our case studies. The IAD framework provides
36
37 a conceptual map to understand and analyse the complexity inherent in policy problems.
38
39 Institutions are defined as “widely understood rules, norms or behaviour or a strategy
40
41 that creates incentives for behaviour in repetitive situations” (Crawford and Ostrom,
42
43 1995 as cited in Polski and Ostrom, 1999: 3). At the heart of IAD is the ‘action
44
45 situation’, the ‘black box’, in which individuals interact with each other, consider
46
47 alternative actions, make strategies, and implement actions within the context of the
48
49 physical and material conditions, the attributes of the community, and the rules in use
50
51 (McGinnis and Ostrom, 2004). Analysis of the action situation involves understanding
52
53 the set of actors, the rules in use, the level of control actors have on various choices, and
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ¹ Author is thankful for the comments of the reviewers, in particularly suggesting to use IAD framework which made significant contribution to this paper.

1
2
3
4 the cost and benefits which serve as incentives for the actors. However, the action
5
6 situation is constrained by contextual variables – biophysical, community attributes, and
7
8 rules in use (Polski and Ostrom, 1999). Biophysical variables (physical and human
9
10 resources) highlight the role of inputs such as technology, labour, capital and processes
11
12 related to production activity. A focus on community attributes such as demographic
13
14 features, community preferences, values and perceptions towards actions situation help
15
16 us understanding the extent communities are engaged in coproduction. The analysis
17
18 focuses not only the working rules written down in contractual agreement but also ‘rules
19
20 in use’; shared understanding of actors evolved over time towards action situation, not
21
22 necessarily written down in contractual agreements. The focus of IAD framework is to
23
24 provide an integrated multi-tier framework to analyse the factors that influence the
25
26 behaviour of individuals, associated patterns of interactions, and subsequently the
27
28 outcomes of these interactions (Ostrom, 2011). Our focus will be on understanding the
29
30 resources available in CPP and how they are linked to the action situation and program
31
32 outcomes, analysing community attributes such as demographic features, shared norms
33
34 regarding a policy or program, or degree of shared understanding regarding CPP. The
35
36 focus of IAD is on understanding these rules, formal and informal, which affect the
37
38 ‘action situation’, while analysing the rule-in-use, our focus will be on the operational
39
40 rules that participants use to achieve CPP objectives.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **3. Research Methodology**

51 *Data collection methods*

52
53
54 The study adopted a comparative case study approach (Yin, 2013) to capture the
55
56 contextual variation across two local governments and used a triangulation approach to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 collect data and carried out semi structured interviews and document analysis (Denzin,
5
6 1970). In 2010-2012, useful background information was gathered from documentary
7
8 sources such as Punjab Urban Water and Sanitation Policies, Local Government
9
10 Ordinance 2001, internal records of the NGO and Water and Sanitation Agencies
11
12 (WASAs) and from preliminary visits to the sites (CDGL and CDGF). In 2010
13
14 interviews were conducted with 25 informants across the public sector (WASAs), local
15
16 policy makers (councillors), and Anjuman Samaji Behbood (ASB-NGO), all involved
17
18 in the CPP. The first round of interviews was carried out in 2010² followed by follow up
19
20 interviews in 2012³ and a third round of interviews in 2016⁴. The interviews were semi-
21
22 structured, recorded and transcribed for further analysis using the NVIVO software.
23
24 NVIVO was used for systematic analysis and the flexibility to code, recode and cross-
25
26 reference the codes that emerged from the data. Ostrom's (2011) IAD framework served
27
28 as an analytical tool for data analysis to understand the complexity inherent in policy
29
30 analysis in a systematic and comprehensive manner.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *IAD framework for analysis*

39
40
41 In this section, we set out how we applied the IAD framework in order to discuss the
42
43 case study analysis and participants' perspectives on CPP. We start by providing the
44
45 case study description mapping contextual variables such as community attributes,
46
47 diagnosing the action situation and identifying the actors involved in CPP, making links
48
49 between their role and rules in use for structuring interactions. In the following section,
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 ² In 2010, the CPP project was completed in City District Government Lahore (CDGL)

57 ³ In 2012, the follow up interviews were carried out after completion of the CPP. The entire operation and
58 maintenance of the project was handed over to the local community itself by the creation of a WASCO
59 committee with a 10 year contractual agreement.

60 ⁴ Interviews were conducted with head of ASB to provide detail information about community
involvement in CPP as indicated by one of the reviewer.

1
2
3
4 we will discuss the outcomes using participants' perceptions as the main evaluative
5
6
7 criterion.

8
9
10 ***Case study 1: CPP – CDGL***

11
12 The CPP project in CDGL involved multiple levels of participation with diverse actors,
13 including the public sector at the regional level (URBAN Unit - UU), local level (Water
14 and Sanitation Agency - WASA), an NGO (Anjuman Smajhi Bahhood - ASB) and the
15 local community (Union Council (UC) 60) in the formulation and implementation of
16
17 water and sanitation provision. The formal governance of the CPP was managed
18 through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which created a Steering Committee
19 (SC) as a conflict resolution mechanism and an ad-hoc organizational structure as an
20 administrative entity for overall project management. The CPP distinguished itself from
21 mainstream interventions by placing an emphasis on community responsibility and
22 fostering a kind of civic consciousness, or 'urban modernity' (McFarlane, 2008), among
23 the community living in low income settlements. The actors and their roles are mapped
24 in figure 1.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

<<Insert Figure 1 Here>>

45 The process of CPP in CDGL started with sensitization of the regional department, UU,
46 key professionals after their visit to ASB's CPP project area in Hassanpura, and CDGF,
47 to see how CPP actually works. Our participants highlighted that after a thorough
48 discussion between ASB and UU, it was decided to sensitize WASA about the project
49 concept, as they were going to be the major player in the O&M of CPP. The preliminary
50 visits of the UU also enlightened regional government that besides regional and federal
51 governments water and sanitation policies which gave the community an active role in
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 service delivery, the local service providers lacked the capability to provide a platform
5
6 for community engagement and translate policy objectives into implementation
7
8 decisions and CPP can be an opportunity for relating and institutionalising community
9
10 engagement in service delivery through third sector (ASB) engagement. The NGO can
11
12 help government in bridging the gap between the service providers and local
13
14 community. Later, the partnership model could be added to WASA's service delivery
15
16 model as a way of providing WSS to areas which are not directly linked to WASA's
17
18 main trunk lines. The cost of linking them to the main line was considered very high, so
19
20 in this context CPP offered an affordable and efficient solution to such low income
21
22 areas situated at the periphery of the CDG, not linked to the city's main WSS. The NGO
23
24 visited the area and carried out a social survey, which revealed that the community
25
26 consisted of 3,000 households and a population of 22,000, with no access to WSS and
27
28 suffering from waterborne diseases. The survey also indicated that the community was
29
30 willing to pay for the internal components of the project. The next phase was to get the
31
32 community on board for the financing of the internal components. To initiate
33
34 community dialogue, ASB organised informal meetings at street level with the local
35
36 community, introducing their approach and CPP objectives, and explaining how it was
37
38 going to help the community gain access to WSS. ASB highlighted the active role of
39
40 local councillors and the head of the local council – Nazim of UC 60 in this process.
41
42 The local council facilitated ASB in community mobilisation and introduced them to
43
44 the community by organising meetings between ASB, local councillors and members of
45
46 the community. Nazim also accompanied ASB during their door-to-door visits to
47
48 convince the community for the financing of the internal components. During this
49
50 phase, according to the Head of ASB, they actively looked for volunteers (social
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 activists), and asked the community to nominate their representatives for the
5
6 Community Committee (CC) and their Lane managers (LM). These members enjoyed
7
8 respect and influence among local communities. The CC and LM were responsible for
9
10 the construction of the internal components. Later, this CC was given legal status
11
12 through the formation of a WASCO committee under an Article and awarded a contract
13
14 for 10 years to manage the O&M of WSS in their area.
15
16
17

18 19 ***Case Study 2: CDGF-CPP***

20
21 Hassanpura, CDGF, was not connected to the water and sanitation infrastructure until
22
23 1994. In this situation people were forced to purchase clean drinking water from private
24
25 suppliers who provided water quality at a premium rate, spending RS. 15000 monthly.
26
27 Clean drinking water and sanitation was a community need, which they shared with
28
29 ASB. The main water supply trunk line was only 1000ft away from the community.
30
31 ASB, representing the community, wrote a letter to WASA (CDGF) requesting them to
32
33 link the community to the main trunk line. According to WASA, the community was
34
35 included in Phase II of the development project, which was going to start in 2008; until
36
37 then the community had to wait. ASB contacted WASA, asking them what would be the
38
39 total cost of constructing the infrastructure to link the community with the main trunk
40
41 line. According to WASA, the cost of linking the community to the main trunk
42
43 line was RS. 32 million. The community was spending RS. 13 million annually on buying clean
44
45 drinking water. ASB discussed the cost estimation with the community, and their own
46
47 research indicated that the total cost of the project would be less than half that of
48
49 government estimates. The community indicated their willingness to construct their own
50
51 internal and external components. The total estimated cost was RS. 2 million, and ASB
52
53 was able to obtain this from another NGO (OPP/Water Aid UK) as a loan. ASB
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 provided this loan to the community to construct their infrastructure. To mobilise wider
5
6 community support, ASB contacted influential people in the community who were
7
8 respected by them, initiated informal discussions with them through home visits,
9
10 organised community meetings at street level, and orientated the local community
11
12 regarding 'how the project will work and its outcome' for the community at large.
13
14 Finally, once the NGO gained the community's willingness to finance the internal and
15
16 external components of the WSS provision, it approached WASA and CDGF to obtain
17
18 their certification (NO Objection Certificate – NOC) to start construction of the
19
20 infrastructure. Initially, WASA was reluctant to provide the NOC; from their
21
22 perspective it was a diversion from their routine way of doing things. However,
23
24 subsequent meetings and dialogues with ASB convinced them to issue the NOC and it
25
26 was agreed between WASA and ASB that WASA would supervise the construction
27
28 work to ensure that it met the government's technical specifications, and appointed
29
30 WASA's supervisors to oversee the community work and facilitate technical assistance.
31
32 ASB also collaborated with the another NGO (OPP/Water Aid UK), who were
33
34 extensively involved in sanitation projects in Karachi, and who agreed to provide an
35
36 interest free revolving fund of Rs 200,000 to provide loans to those households who
37
38 could not afford the cost of the project. Afterwards, for the project implementation,
39
40 ASB identified community activists to play a more active role in the process of
41
42 infrastructure construction and community engagement. After making contact, ASB
43
44 generated a list of 50 people and invited them to attend a meeting in the area. During
45
46 that meeting, people self-selected themselves into homogenous groups, and also
47
48 nominated 10 of the group to be part of a central committee. ASB highlighted that this
49
50 committee would be responsible for the management and supervision of the internal and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 external components and the role of ASB would be as facilitator. Furthermore, every
5 street/lane selected their own 'Lane managers' to supervise the work of infrastructure
6 development and money collection from the community. Overall, governance of CPP-
7 CDGF was based on a relational element: trust of the local community in their selected
8 representative committee and ASB and less emphasis on formal rules to govern the CPP
9 project.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *Diagnosis of the action situation*

20
21
22 The IAD framework stresses the significance of analysing the action situation to
23 identify the institutional arrangements and how the actors within an action situation
24 bring their perceptions, beliefs and values, and the strategies they use to manage their
25 interactions in generating different outcomes (Ostrom, 2011). The main actors involved
26 in CPP-CDGL consisted of the UU (regional department), WASA (the service
27 provider), ASB (the civil society organisation), and the Union Council (UC 60), the
28 representative of the local community. UU was the main financier and provided funds
29 for the project. WASA's main role was as provider and financier of the external
30 component of the project, and the role of ASB was community mobilisation and
31 provision of technical expertise for mapping trunk and sewer lines by the use of GIS
32 (Geographic Information System) technology and to act as liaison between the
33 communities and government actors. However, depending on the context of a particular
34 CDG, the type of actors and their roles varied over the course of the project. For
35 instance, in CDGF the main actors involved were UC, WASA, ASB, OPP/Water Aid
36 UK (donor organisation), and the main initiator of the project was the local community
37 itself. In CDGL, there was no involvement of donor organisations and the regional
38 department (P&D/UU) initiated CPP on the request of community and was mainly
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 responsible for it. This also reflects that the composition of the actors plays an
5 influential role in their power structure. On completion of the infrastructure, the roles of
6
7 WASA, ASB and UU became ones of facilitators and monitors of the service provision,
8
9 whereas the local community took over the role of WSS provider, in CDGL. This
10 highlights the shift in the roles of users from beneficiaries of WSS to capable co-
11 deliverers of services (Ewert and Evers, 2014). In the case of CDGF, the local
12 community was as financier of both internal & external components and community
13 was actively engaged in the construction while on completion of the infrastructure WSS
14 were mainly provided by WASA. This explains the variation in the institutional
15 arrangements in our two cases.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The community's willingness and motivation to initiate reciprocity underpins the
30 formation of trust, and this willingness for reciprocity can be a contextual matter, as
31 communities may differ in their willingness and hence motivation (Ostrom, 2000;
32 2009). In both our cases, the willingness of community, motivation and commitment of
33 the key actors was one dominant theme in developing trust and managing interaction in
34 both case studies; according to the Head of ASB, if the community is involved from the
35 beginning of the process and engaged in the consultation regarding technical, finance
36 and other issues, they have a sense of ownership in the project. This process of
37 engagement addresses their concerns and builds up their confidence in the public and
38 private sector. In both our cases, the respondents highlighted, "*the main attribute that*
39 *the community shared was their willingness to coproduce, their strong belief that there*
40 *may be a solution to their WSS issues, initiating reciprocity and developing a chain of*
41 *trust in themselves and in the partners*". From NGO perspective, both communities
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 were rich in social capital, reflected in community volunteering for the role of social
5
6
7 activists.

8
9
10 The rules were shared understanding between the actors about how to get things done,
11
12 defined their boundaries and developed an infrastructure for resolving conflicts
13
14 (Ostrom, 1990; Ostrom, 2011). The MoU, in our case study of CPP-CDGL, provided a
15
16 guiding framework to structure the interactions of the actors by providing them with an
17
18 institutional framework and by establishing the authority, position, scope and
19
20 implementation of the rules and norms for making decisions and taking action. All our
21
22 respondents were of the view that *“rules provided clarity and established each actor’s*
23
24 *jurisdiction”*. The SC was the forum where the actors negotiated their strategies and in
25
26 cases of conflict resolved their issues through deliberations. For instance, the Head of
27
28 ASB explained how conflicts were resolved and decisions made on revising the rules
29
30 over time; *“.....one of the major issues faced was the administrative control of the*
31
32 *program staff for the internal component between the ASB and WASA. This was solved*
33
34 *through an understanding reached at the steering committee that ASB would mobilise*
35
36 *community and provide them with technical support; therefore, all the relevant staff*
37
38 *would report to ASB. The staff salary release would be approved by the steering*
39
40 *committee based on their progress.”* This also reflects that although government work
41
42 involves following rigid rules to maintain its bureaucratic system, in both cases it can be
43
44 discerned that government tried to be more flexible in their approach to achieve the
45
46 anticipated outcomes. The MoU between the key actors was a significant departure
47
48 from ASB’s efforts in Hassanpura (CDGF), where actors relied on a shared understating
49
50 of their roles and no formal agreement was signed by the actors. Initially, ASB faced
51
52 resistance from various players: WASA, CDG, and the local community, particularly
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 local politicians in the area in case study of CDGF-CPP. There was an understanding
5
6 between the actors, but there was no formal agreement in the form of MoU among the
7
8 main actors. This may be one of the reasons why our interviews with WASA (CDGF)
9
10 indicated mixed perceptions about the project outcomes. In the case study of CPP-
11
12 CDGF, ASB had to work hard to convince WASA about the feasibility of the project
13
14 and secure their support to supervise the external components of the infrastructure. It is
15
16 evident from our interviews with the key actors that support from the providers or
17
18 regional departments is a key element in assuring commitment from the key actors and
19
20 for the success of such a project. This commitment is reflected in CDGL's efforts to
21
22 allocate office and administrative staff to give support to the day to day operations of
23
24 CPP, and a program director fully devoted to the project; lack of such support may be
25
26 one the reasons for participants' suspicions regarding the project outcomes in the CPP-
27
28 CDGF case.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 Another significant departure from the CPP project in CDGF was the formation of a
37
38 WASCO committee responsible for the provision of WSS in the area. The members of
39
40 this committee were elected by the local community, and the committee also had
41
42 representation from WASA and ASB; however, in limited role of supervision,
43
44 facilitation and expert opinion if the WASCO needed technical advice on the O&M of
45
46 the WSS provision. According to the Head of ASB, WASCO *"has an executive*
47
48 *committee consisting of six members: the General Secretary, President, Vice President,*
49
50 *Cashier and two Executive members. They are all volunteers. It has its own office, its*
51
52 *own billing system, and its own staff. It is a registered body under the Society Act 1800*
53
54 *through a Memorandum of Article. WASCO serves 4,075 households. In this way,*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 WASA is able to reduce its responsibilities, and the cost of operation and management
5
6
7 service provision in that area.”
8
9

10 ***Evaluative criterion***

11
12 We used the subjective perception of the respondents as an evaluative criterion. The
13
14 interviews with the government actors mostly emphasized efficiency and community
15
16 empowerment as main themes. The NGO's emphasis was on gaining the trust of the
17
18 government sector regarding community engagement projects and enabling local
19
20 communities to be a partner in service delivery. Their approach to co-production was to
21
22 understand the government's rules and regulations and to work within them as an
23
24 'insider' and a 'partner'. This enabled them to bring a change in the mind set of public
25
26 sector professionals towards communities and NGOs. The success of this project
27
28 contributed to changing the government's perception of NGOs as a threat, considering
29
30 them as a partner in responsive service delivery instead. ASB highlighted that the
31
32 change in government approach was reflected in their policies, which placed emphasis
33
34 on the inclusion of the third sector on various institutional boards, such as the Water
35
36 Board, for greater representation of communities. According to the Head of ASB, “*our*
37
38 *relationships with government have strengthened; government professionals have*
39
40 *become more open to our ideas as we have established our trust and credibility, and*
41
42 *they know we can deliver services.*”
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 However, political commitment in the form of policy initiatives and of allocating
53
54 resources in the Annual Development Plans (ADPs) for community initiatives may be a
55
56 push factor for service providers to search for ways to engage the community in WSS
57
58 provision and to obtain access to funds. The Managing director (WASA, CDGF)
59
60

1
2
3
4 highlighted, *“in this particular project, there is strong political commitment. It has been*
5 *included in the annual development plan. There is a separate section in the Planning*
6 *and Development Department for facilitation. Of course, it shows political commitment*
7 *to institutionalizing such initiatives. Examples of successful projects will help us to*
8 *mobilize the community and gain their trust. As it is new to us, it is new to the*
9 *community as well.”* From the community perspective (Nazim, CDGL), the outcome
10 was *“confidence in themselves, access to WSS services and a change in their thinking*
11 *towards government, as the success of this project helped them to be capable co-*
12 *producers, self-reliant, and able to act as change agents.”*

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 It was interesting to observe that our second and third round of interviews with WASA
28 (CDGF) revealed that there was a paradigm shift in the mind set of the professionals, as
29 they were in the process of making internal changes in their organisation by creating
30 Social Mobiliser (SM) post, with candidates needing a sociology background.
31 According to the Managing Director of WASA (CDGF), the role of SM will be to head
32 a team for the management of community initiatives. Implicit in his perception was the
33 idea not to be reliant on one single NGO and to be more active in community
34 engagement. He reflected, *“from CDGL experience we have learnt that we needed to*
35 *make WASCO, a water company, part of the local community from the beginning ad*
36 *work with them from the start rather than with the NGOat the moment we are relying*
37 *on the NGO and exploring if we can find volunteers from the community who can*
38 *actively participate throughout the project.”* Moreover, he was of the opinion that
39 *“community representation should be very extensive and all sections of the community*
40 *should be represented.”* To manage interactions, the professionals (WASA) considered
41 that *“trust among the partners and formal arrangements are both essential for*
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

managing partnerships.” Interestingly, besides both the NGO and WASA emphasising the role of trust, emphasis was more on governance through formalisation, to have clear roles and responsibilities, and rules, “every individual should work within his or her ‘circle’ and within that should work together and try not to interfere in others’ responsibilities. Once the roles and responsibilities are clearly described and there is no ambiguity about how to do things, then, in my opinion, trust is established” (Head ASB).

However, the literature suggests that co-production is not panacea for all problems (Bovaird, 2007), and the professionals (WASA) also indicated, *“for sustainability, it should be an independent project. If we share the water source with the rest of the WASA coverage area, then it becomes a risky project. A self-contained project is easy for cost management. The advantage is that if the infrastructure is fully independent, then it becomes easy to manage.”* This theme was also evident in our interviews with the NGO representatives. It can be argued that depending the nature of the project, one needs to take into account contextual or biophysical variables, such as resource availability and how to deploy these for optimum utilisation (Ostrom, 2011).

4. Discussion and Research Implications for Theory and Practice

The findings from this study offer valuable insights for the growing body of literature on co-production. It has contributed by providing interesting answers to the question “what makes co-production work?” Previous studies from developing countries have focused on NGO-government relations (Bano, 2011; Batley and Rose, 2011; Sansom, 2006). However, this study has mainly focused on comparing two case studies using Ostrom’s IAD framework to analyse institutional arrangements. In the case study of

1
2
3
4 CPP-CDGL, the focus was on formalisation aspects – MoU, the establishment of a
5 steering committee, an ad-hoc organisational structure, for improved coordination for
6
7 conflict resolution, and shared decision making. These institutional design arrangements
8
9 also enabled the public sector to gain more flexibility to overcome its internal focus on
10
11 compliance with rules and ways to engage communities and the third sector by
12
13 introducing the community perspective. It was evident that NGO involvement or
14
15 community participation on their own are not sufficient for sustainable outcomes. Much
16
17 depends on how relationships are managed by the partners (Joost, 2015), greater degree
18
19 of citizen representation, and how far due consideration is given to building the
20
21 capabilities of the public sector and local communities. Formalizing community
22
23 participation in planning and implementation processes for the sustainability of
24
25 development schemes is important for generating a sense of ownership and trust in the
26
27 community. This entire process needs to be carefully planned and managed by obtaining
28
29 the support of key stakeholders. It calls for policy makers and practitioners to revise
30
31 their strategies and develop structures and processes which can articulate community
32
33 needs to make service delivery more efficient.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Secondly, there was a strong realization in the public sector that NGOs had a
44
45 competitive advantage in their technological ability to map and survey the area with the
46
47 GIS system and their social skills for community mobilisation and bridging the gap
48
49 between the community and the public sector, bringing a change in the attitude of the
50
51 latter towards working with non-profit organisations and communities (Sanna, 2015).
52
53 The public sector considered the third sector and local communities as *partners* in
54
55 service provision rather than mere recipients of services. Since the attitude of the public
56
57 sector and politicians towards involving communities and the third sector influences the
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 extent to which coproduction occurs (Ewert and Evers, 2014; Roberts et al., 2013), we
5
6 found that this change in attitude, acceptance of the added value that co-producers
7
8 bring, was responsible for line agencies' efforts to make institutional changes in their
9
10 own organisational structure to create mechanisms for involving local communities and
11
12 third sector in service provision and for politicians to commit more resources to such
13
14 initiatives.
15
16
17

18
19 Thirdly, political and bureaucratic commitment (Parker et al., 1981; Pestoff, 2006) ,
20
21 along with community willingness (Van Eijk and Steen, 2014) to participate, was found
22
23 to be a strong contextual factor affecting co-production initiatives and the extent to
24
25 which trust, reciprocity and shared values could be initiated among the key actors.
26
27 Resource commitment in the form of allocation of development funds to community-led
28
29 initiatives were the push factors leading organisations to adopt community-led
30
31 initiatives for service provision. However, community pressure appear to be strong
32
33 determinant for policy implementation (Joost et al., 2015). There was wide recognition
34
35 among public officials that WASA (CDGF) lacked the expertise to interact with the
36
37 community and needed a new type of public professional; social mobilisers or boundary
38
39 spanners (Noble and Jones, 2006), who could help to bridge the gap between local
40
41 service providers, NGOs and the community, creating a paradigm shift from controlling
42
43 service delivery to engaging service users and individuals as potential contributors to
44
45 efficient and effective service provision.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Although the public and third sectors seemed satisfied with the initial outcomes, it
54
55 would be premature to conclude any real long term outcomes of the co-production
56
57 reported in our findings. However, what can we be certain of is that there was a change
58
59 in the traditional conception of public sector professionals, from sole service providers,
60

1
2
3
4 to an acceptance of the role of the community and the third sector in service provision.
5
6 More successful examples of such collaboration can bring a real indigenous change in
7
8 service delivery logic. Government work often involves a series of rules and procedures
9
10 to sustain its bureaucratic system. Therefore, practitioners need to understand that
11
12 challenges to co-production are more than a managerial problem, and that working with
13
14 NGOs and communities requires a different set of capabilities on the part of the actors
15
16
17 in order to achieve the anticipated goals in the joint production of services.
18
19
20

21 22 **5. Research Limitations** 23 24

25 We used a comparative case study design to capture the contextual variations and relied
26
27 on a diverse set of stakeholders, however, this research lacked a broader community
28
29 perspective and it is suggested that future research should incorporate the community
30
31 perspective for a better understanding of how co-production initiatives are managed.
32
33 This study, like other research studies on co-production, employed qualitative research
34
35 design, which helped to provide a more in-depth insight into how co-production is
36
37 managed. However, future research could benefit from more quantitative approaches for
38
39 methodological improvements. Moreover, this case study only compared co-production
40
41 initiatives in the water and sanitation sectors; we therefore suggest that further
42
43 comparative research into various sectors, different cultural contexts and legal and
44
45 institutional environments is needed for theory development, to develop an indigenous
46
47 approach towards managing co-production. Moreover, further longitudinal studies are
48
49 needed to study the extent to which co-production initiatives are sustainable options for
50
51 service delivery.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 **REFERENCES** 60

- 1
2
3
4 Alford, J. (2009). "Engaging public sector clients. *From Service Delivery to Co-*
5 *production.*" *Houndmills, Hamps and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.*
6
7
- 8 Alford, J. (2014), "The Multiple Facets of Co-Production: Building on the Work of
9 Elinor Ostrom." *Public Management Review*, Vol.16, No.3, pp. 299-316.
10
- 11 Bano, Masooda. (2011), "Negotiating Collaboration in Pakistan: Expertise, Networks
12 and Community Embeddedness." *Public Administration and Development* Vol. 31,
13 No. 4, pp. 262-272.
14
- 15 Bason, C. (2010), "Leading public sector innovation: Co-creating for a better society."
16 Policy Press.
17
- 18 Batley, R. (2011). "Structures and strategies in relationships between non-government
19 service providers and governments." *Public Administration and Development*, Vol.
20 31. No. 4, pp.306-319.
21
- 22 Batley, R. and Rose, P. (2011), "Analysing Collaboration between Non-governmental
23 service providers and Governments." *Public administration and development*, Vol.
24 31, No. 4, pp. 230-239.
25
- 26 Bifulco, R. and Ladd, H.F. (2006), "Institutional change and coproduction of public
27 services: The effect of charter schools on parental involvement." *Journal of Public*
28 *Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp.553-576.
29
- 30 Bovaird, T and Elke L. (2012), "From Engagement to Co-Production: How Users and
31 Communities Contribute to Public Services." *New Public Governance, the Third*
32 *Sector and Co-Production.* London: Routledge.
33
- 34 Bovaird, T. (2007), "Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community
35 Coproduction of Public Services." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 67, No. 5,
36 pp. 846-860.
37
- 38 Brandsen, T and Pestoff, V. (2006), "Co-Production, the Third Sector and the Delivery
39 of Public Services." *Public Management Review*, Vol. 8, No.4, pp. 493-501.
40
- 41 Brandsen, T. and Honingh, M. (2015). "Distinguishing Different Types of
42 Coproduction: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions." *Public*
43 *Administration Review*. Vol. xx No. xx, pp. xx-xx.
44
- 45 Brudney, J.L. and England, R.E. (1983), "Toward a Definition of the Coproduction
46 Concept." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 59-65.
47
- 48 Callanan, M. (2005), "Institutionalizing Participation and Governance? New
49 Participative Structures in Local Government in Ireland." *Public Administration*,
50 Vol. 83, No.4. pp. 909-929.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Cepiku, D and Filippo, G. (2014), "Co-Production in Developing Countries: Insights
5 from the Community Health Workers Experience." *Public Management Review*,
6 Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 317-340.
7
8
- 9 Denzin, N. (1970). "*Strategies of multiple triangulation. The research act in sociology:*
10 *A theoretical introduction to sociological method.*" New York: McGraw-Hill.
11
12
- 13 Ewert, B. and Evers, A. (2014). "An Ambiguous Concept: On the Meanings of Co-
14 production for Health Care Users and User Organizations?". *VOLUNTAS:*
15 *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 25, No. 2,
16 pp. 425-442.
17
18
- 19 Fledderus, J., Brandsen, T. and Honingh, M.E. (2015). "User co-production of public
20 service delivery: An uncertainty approach." *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol.
21 30, No. 2, pp.145-164.
22
23
- 24 Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (2009), "*The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies*
25 *for qualitative research*". USA: Transaction Publishers.
26
27
- 28 Government of Punjab. (2007), '*Punjab Urban Water and Sanitation Policy*', Punjab.
29
30
- 31 Government of Pakistan. (2009), '*National Drinking Water Policy*', Islamabad.
32
33
- 34 Government of Punjab. (2010), Changa Pani Program (CPP). *Urban Gazette*. Planning
35 and Development Department, Punjab
36
37
- 38 Haider, I. (2008), "Development of Community-Based Sanitation Infrastructure in
39 Hasanpura, Faisalabad." *Wicken, J.Et Al.Op.Cit.*
40
41
- 42 Hoddinott, J. (2002). "Participation and poverty reduction: An analytical framework and
43 overview of the issues." *Journal of African Economies*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp.146-168.
44
45
- 46 Jakobsen, Morten. (2012), "Can Government Initiatives Increase Citizen Coproduction?
47 Results of a Randomized Field Experiment." *Journal of Public Administration*
48 *Research and Theory*: mus036.
49
50
- 51 Joost, F. (2015), "Building Trust Through Public Service Co-Production", *International*
52 *Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 28, No. 7, pp. 550-565.
53
54
- 55 Joshi, A. and Moore, M. (2004). "Institutionalised co-production: unorthodox public
56 service delivery in challenging environments." *Journal of Development Studies*,
57 Vol. 40, No. 4, pp.31-49.
58
59
- 60 McGinnis, M.D. and Ostrom, E. (2014). "Social-ecological system framework: initial
changes and continuing challenges." *Ecology and Society*, Vol. 19, No. 2, p.30.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Mcloughlin, C. (2011), "Factors affecting State Non-Governmental Organisation Relations in Service Provision: Key Themes from the Literature." *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 31, No.4, pp. 240-251.
- Noble, G and Robert J. (2006), "The Role of Boundary-Spanning Managers in the Establishment of Public-Private Partnerships." *Public Administration*, Vol. 84 No. 4. pp. 891-917.
- OECD. (2001), "Citizens as Partners: Information, Consultation and Public Participation in Policy-Making." Paris: OECD.
- Osborne, S.P., Radnor, Z. and Nasi, G. (2013), "A New Theory for Public Service Management? Toward a (Public) Service-Dominant Approach." *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 135-158.
- Ostrom, E. (1996), "Crossing the Great Divide: Coproduction, Synergy, and Development." *World Development*, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 1073-1087.
- Ostrom, E. (2011). "Background on the institutional analysis and development framework." *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp.7-27.
- Parks, R.B., Baker, P.C., Kiser, L., Oakerson, R., Ostrom, E., Ostrom, V., Percy, S.L., Vandivort, M.B., Whitaker, G.P. and Wilson, R. (1981), "Consumers as Coproducers of Public Services: Some Economic and Institutional Considerations." *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 7, pp. 1001-1011.
- Percy, S.L. (1984), "Citizen Participation in the Coproduction of Urban Services." *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 431-446.
- Pestoff, V. (2006), "Citizens and Co-Production of Welfare Services." *Public Management Review*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 503-519.
- . (2009), "Towards a Paradigm of Democratic Participation: Citizen Participation and Co-Production of Personal Social Services in Sweden." *Annals of Public & Cooperative Economics*, Vol. 80, No. 2, pp. 197-224.
- . (2014), "Collective Action and the Sustainability of Co-Production." *Public Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 383-401.
- Polski, M.M. and Ostrom, E. (1999), February. "An institutional framework for policy analysis and design. In Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis." Working Paper W98-27. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Poocharoen, O.O. and Ting, B. (2015), "Collaboration, Co-Production, Networks: Convergence of Theories." *Public Management Review*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 587-614.

- 1
2
3
4
5 Radnor, Z., Stephen, P. O., Tony, K., and Jean, M. (2014), "Operationalizing Co-
6 Production in Public Services Delivery: The Contribution of Service Blueprinting."
7 *Public Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 402-423.
8
- 9
10 Roberts, A., Townsend, S., Morris, J., Rushbrooke, E., Greenhill, B., Whitehead, R.,
11 Matthews, T. and Golding, L. (2013), "Treat Me Right, Treat Me Equal: Using
12 National Policy and Legislation to Create Positive Changes in Local Health
13 Services for People with Intellectual Disabilities." *Journal of Applied Research in*
14 *Intellectual Disabilities* Vol. 26, No.1, pp. 14–25.
15
- 16
17 Sanna, T. (2015),"Learning to Co-Produce? The Perspective of Public Service
18 Professionals", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 28, No. 7,
19 pp. 1-33
20
- 21
22 Sansom, K. (2006), "Government Engagement with Non-State Providers of Water and
23 Sanitation Services." *Public Administration & Development*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp
24 207-217.
25
- 26
27 Van Eijk, C.J.A. and Steen, T.P.S. (2014). "Why People Co-Produce: Analysing
28 citizens' perceptions on co-planning engagement in health care services." *Public*
29 *Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.358-382.
30
- 31
32 Verschuere, B., Brandsen, T. and Pestoff, V. (2012), "Co-Production: The State of the
33 Art in Research and the Future Agenda." *Voluntas: International Journal of*
34 *Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 1083-1101.
35
- 36
37 Warren, R., Harlow, K.S. and Rosentraub, M.S. (1982), "Citizen Participation in
38 Services: Methodological and Policy Issues in Co-Production Research."
39 *Southwestern Review of Management and Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 41-55.
40
- 41
42 Yin, R.K. (2013), "*Case Study Research: Design and Methods.*" Sage Publications.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: Mapping Actors and their Role in CPP-CDGL

Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60