

Paper Title:

Value Co-creation in Local Regeneration Public Private Partnerships in Nigeria

Abstract:

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) are commended as a means of addressing local regeneration issues especially in developing countries such as is the case in Nigeria. These PPPs allow leveraging, combining, and capitalizing on the complementary strengths between organisations. Consequently, value creation from local regeneration PPPs form of policy intervention goes beyond the conventional approach of slum clearance and physical regeneration to one that addresses a broad range of socio-economic issues. The survival of local regeneration PPPs thus depends on the ability of the partners to create value and to determine if the local regeneration PPPs efforts are on the right track, they need to be able to show how well they are achieving their intended outcomes. This means that partnerships need to make full use of their collaborative advantage. This paper draws on empirical data, value research and the collaboration and network approach. It would also draw on Actors-Resources-Activities model as a framework to study how interaction connects resources over numerous organisational boundaries in a larger PPP network.

Keywords: Value Creation, Value Co-creation, ARA model, Public Private Partnerships, Local Regeneration, Nigeria

Author name: Osikhuemhe Okwilagwe

Paper Type: Work in progress paper

INTRODUCTION

The rising trends of reduced public funds and economic and technological change prevalent in many developing countries have led governments to seek private partners that can provide more extensive offerings or solutions. The reason for this is evident from the huge benefit of mobilizing private capital which helps to speed up the delivery of public infrastructure and on the other hand, they can be an instrument for reforming public procurement and service delivery (Barlow and Koberle-Galser 2008). Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) has thus emerged as one of the major collaboration strategies for delivering infrastructure service in developing countries in recent years and they have become popular as a strategic and operational approach in local regeneration projects especially with the constantly changing economic, social and political environment (Kwak, Chih and Ibbs 2009). The definition a PPP by HM Treasury, UK (1998) states that “Public- Private Partnership is an arrangement between two or more entities that enables them to work co-operatively towards shared or compatible objectives and in which there is some degree of shared authority and responsibility, joint investment of resources, shared risk taking, and mutual benefits”.

PPPs either involve the cautious exchange and sharing of knowledge or the collaboration for the development of products, technologies or services that addresses a specific need in the community (Le Ber and Branzi 2010). This perspective indicates that value emerges when individual partners integrate and apply resources in interaction with each other (Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013). According to Couch (2011 p. 3), “The process of regeneration is one in which the state or local community is seeking to bring back investment, employment and consumption and enhance the quality of life within an urban area”, and this is defined to include the economic, social, and environmental renewal and well-being of an area.

If properly formulated and managed, PPPs should set out to create value for the benefit of consumers for which it was set for and in the case of local regeneration the consumers are the members of the local community for which it was set up to serve (Selsky and Parker, 2005). By working together, PPPs undergo a process that supports the evaluation of differences, the potential to break new grounds, challenge conventional knowledge and also to discover creative solutions to issues.

It is argued that PPPs are a dynamic set of inter-organisational and interpersonal relationships such that the relationships within a partner organisation and another can either enable or obstruct meaningful collaboration (Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013). As such, the task of the private sector partner (is not to create value for the public sector partner; rather, the private sector partner should seek to co-create value with the public sector partner (Vangen and Huxham 2003, Huxham 1996). Value creation in PPPs thus does not proceed from bilateral interactions but instead it develops from network activities within the relationships among individuals, teams and organisations partners (Mele 2011, Ritter 2000). Studying value creation from the perspective of just the public sector or the private sector provides only a limited understanding, because the creation of innovative solutions typically involves resource integration by multiple participants in PPP arrangements. This leads to the question of conceptualising co-creation of value in the PPP literature.

This paper studies how value is co-created in PPPs networks. It explores how the networks of partners from both sectors integrate resources to develop innovative solutions, and identify the related benefits and risks perceived by individual partners from the network of partners in a PPP arrangement. It provides a new conceptual understanding of value co-creation that occurs in the collaboration of partners, resources and activities in PPP networks. This is

accomplished by drawing on value research, the collaboration and network approach as well as empirical data to study value co-creation within PPP business arrangements. This study aims to (i) extend the study of value co-creation in PPP arrangements and (ii) contribute to the management of PPP operations to enable value co-creation in these collaboration networks.

VALUE CREATION IN PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

Value creation is attained when partners jointly share commitment and ownership, resource and information sharing, confidence and trust, community involvement, collaborative communication and governing of partnership members contribute to and strengthen the partnerships' functioning. According to Huxham (1996 p.14),

“Collaborative advantage will be achieved when something unusually creative is produced that no organisation could have produced on its own and when each organisation, through the collaboration, is able to achieve its own objectives better than it could alone”.

The rationale behind value creation is such that mutually determined processes which allow partnerships to take advantage of their individual will in turn make it possible for the partners to reap the collaborative rewards of PPPs. Furthermore, value creation goes beyond giving an individual partner a voice, it involves enabling all partners create something new and valuable (Vangen and Huxham 2003) by stimulating them to relate and synthesizing their different ideas, challenge conventional ways of working and looking at situations differently and by finding effective ways to balance their skills and resources (Lasker and Wiess 2003).

Collaborative advantage is also derived when new knowledge is created and/or new information is produced that individually the partners would not come up with themselves Huxham (1996). The survival of PPPs also depends on their ability to command and create value (Cropper 1996), hence PPPs must seek to achieve two main objectives; the first is to improve cost savings, while minimising public debt and budget deficit (Appuhami, Perera and Perera 2011) and the second objective is to create value through the transfer of best practices, enhanced flexibility and capacity for collaborative activities, better decision making and innovative interventions (Cao and Zhang 2010, Broadbent and Laughlin 2003, Froud 2003).

value co-creation in public private partnerships

Extant literature considers value to be a jointly created process which involves a diverse number of actors who form networks through which the integration of resources between partners (Gummesson 2008, Vargo and Lush, 2008, and Vargo et al., 2008, Kothandaraman and Wilson 2001).

According to the Actors–Resources–Activities (ARA) model, organisations can be linked in three interconnected levels through their activities, connection of their resources and the actors bond, that affect and are affected by the constellation of resources, patterns of activities and the web of actors in the wider network (Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013, Ford and Mouzas, 2010). The ARA model functions as a framework to study how interaction connects resources over many organizational boundaries in a larger network and this is the underlying

mechanism in value co-creation within networks (Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013, Gummesson and Mele 2010).

Actors: These are the individuals or group of individuals in organizations that control the resources and direct the activities of the partnership (Cova and Salle 2008). Actor bonds are links developed between individuals, characterized by commitment, confidence and trust which contribute to and strengthen the relationship that influence and are influenced by resources and the activities through which they are integrated (Ball et al. 2003). The value creation potential of partners is not only as a result of their core competences or distinctive resources, but also from its capability to match, to distinctly position itself in a network as well as to contribute to its success and progression (Gummesson and Mele 2010). The position of each individual partner could be perceived differently by the other individual partner in the network, and this position is usually flexible in nature as they would always seek to improve their positions (Windahl and Lakemond 2006, Gadde et al. 2003).

Resources: These are the essential building blocks of PPPs and they are characterized into four types: firstly, the knowledge, experience, skills of individuals and groups, and secondly the organizational relationships, thirdly, products and fourthly the operation facilities that are passive, and it is by the combination of these resources in a variety of ways that partners are able to create something new and valuable that exceeds what they can achieve alone (Huxham and Vangen 2011, Hasting 1996). As interaction between the partners develop, their resources become mutually adapted. According to Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013, p 49, “at the network level, resources can be integrated with a larger set of resources available through a web of actors, resulting in a resource constellation that may represent a more compelling value proposition for a particular situation”.

Activity: As the relationships between the partners develop, their different activities may link, and in a networks context, activity patterns begin to emerge hence, it is important not to focus all attention to the partnership itself, it is imperative to focus on the value creating activities where the different partners (public officials, business partners, consultants, local community leaders) work together to produce value (Windahl and Lakemond 2006). The starting point in any partnership is to develop consensus among members, these may be expressed through a broad vision that allows for clarity around agreed values and principles (Slater et al. 2006). In order to achieve a specific set of objectives, better clarity of goals will need to be specified and agreed upon by partners to be confident of their meaning and to determine the most effective and efficient way to use the resources available to the partnership (Cao and Zhang 2010).

For this study value co-creation is a continuous collaborative process that occurs at three interrelated levels and hence involves value processes within organizations, in the relationships between actors and within a network of partners.

METHODOLOGY

research strategy

To understand this process of co-creation of value between the public sector partners and the private sector partners, a case study research is used. A case study research is extensively used to explore the opinions and behaviour of individuals groups within organizations (Gibbert, Ruigrok and Wicki 2008). Case studies rely on multiple sources of evidence, with

the data converging through triangulation and as a result benefits from the development of the theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. This helps to generate rich and contextual interpretations of the data collected (Yin 2009). This paper is aimed to gain a deeper insight into the phenomenon of value co-creation between the public sector partners and the private sector partners. It is a beneficial approach where there is little previous empirical research and also in situations where there are complex and multiple processes, hence necessitating the use of a qualitative, explorative approach (Yin 2009). Eisenhardt (1989, p. 534) defines a case study as "a research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamic present within its natural settings".

Case studies are advocated as methodological tools for providing descriptions and to test theories. Yin (2009, p. 13) also defines a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are not clearly evident and in which multiple sources of evidence are used". Case studies are the preferred strategy for asking "how" and "why" questions, the researcher has very little control over the events, and the entire focus lies on an existing phenomenon within a real life context (Yin 2009). Furthermore, the research context of this empirical study is important for three reasons, the developing country context provides an opportunity to study PPPs outside of the developed world and to test whether the models and frameworks developed in the developed world makes sense in this context. The existing PPP literature is skewed towards, studying mostly infrastructure PPPs and in contrast, this study considers PPPs for local regeneration. As well as a dearth of studies that investigates the relationship between the co-creation and PPPs.

research design, case selection and case description

This case was selected because it was a pioneering bridge design at a state level using the PPP model. One million motor vehicles are estimated to be stationed in Lagos, with a daily traffic flow between Lagos Mainland and Lagos Island of about 500,000 motor vehicles. The poor condition of roads throughout Lagos is quite evident. This PPP project was designed to deliver essential road infrastructure and services along the Lekki Peninsular of Lagos State Nigeria. It was mandated uses the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) model under a 30-year Concession Agreement uses the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) model with the Lagos State government of Nigeria, for the upgrade, expansion and maintenance of approximately 50km of the Lekki-Epe Expressway (Phase I), and construction of approximately 20km of the Coastal Road (Phase II) on the Lekki Peninsular.

The 2004 Lagos State "Roads Law" establishes the enabling framework for projects such as the Lekki Toll Road Concession. This legislation also formalizes the role of the new State Roads, Bridges and Highway Infrastructure (Public Sector Participation) Development Board. The PSP is the Regulatory Authority set up to oversee the Lekki Toll Road Concession, and other such PPP infrastructure projects in the Lagos State Roads Sector. The Lekki Toll Road Concession Agreement, which underpins the Lagos Infrastructure Project, will include upgrading and creating new Road Infrastructure along the first 49.4km of the Lekki-Epe Expressway (Phase I). Furthermore, additional private sector finance was deployed towards developing the first 20km of the Coastal Road with an option to do the Southern Bypass as well (Phase II). In this way, it is hoped that the users of the road will also

positively experience the service-based approach that will be adopted by the Concessionaire to deliver key benefits at affordable prices.

data collection and analysis

The data used for the research is from the pilot study of an on-going PhD research study. The primary method for this study was semi-structured interviewing. The data sources for this study comprised 7 organisations: 3 were from the public sector (this included government institutions, external experts and consultants) and 4 from the private sector (this included top management from financial institutions and other external consultants). This elicited 14 interviews to be conducted. The spread of the 14 participants was thus possible from both sectors, from different business units and at different organizational levels to ensure diverse perspectives on the PPP been studied (see Table 1 below). The interviews were conducted on the premises of each organisation and they varied between 42 and 125 minutes. The participants were extensively involved in the development of contractual arrangements and in the operations of the PPP and played various roles in the decision making regarding the PPP.

Sector	No. of Interviews	Position of Participants
Public- P1 Main PPP Partner	n = 4	Team leaders for core infrastructure, social infrastructure, contract administration and contract management and Infrastructure Engineer
Public -P2 An advisory body	n = 1	Assistant Director
Public- P3 A Regulatory Body	n = 1	Executive Director
Private- PR1 Main PPP Partner	n = 1	Managing Director
Private- PR2 External Consultant and PPP Expert	n = 1	PPP Expert and Consultant
Private- PR3 Consultant/Investment Adviser	n = 1	Managing Director
Private- PR4 Lenders	n = 5	Transport Specialist, Economist, Disbursement Officer, Procurement Officer, Private Sector Specialist

Table 1: Overview of the Semi-Structured Interviews

The names of the both participants and participating public and the private sector organisations are disguised to maintain confidentiality. The interviews followed a loose thematic guide this was to allow the participants the freedom to express their views and raise new issues which they felt were important (Yin 2003). The interviewees were asked to discuss their reasons for participating in the local regeneration PPP, their opinions related to local regeneration PPP and their experiences of collaboration especially in terms of expected and experienced in terms of benefits and challenges related to partnership interrelationships). Additional data were collected from some of the interviewees both from the public and private sector by way of reports on the partnership's activities.

Data analysis was conducted in line with the process of engaging inductive theory with the use of case studies. The researcher began the data analysis by initially reviewing the entire interview transcripts and reports to highlight the significant issues that arose and then identified the patterns in the data. This involved categorizing the data in terms of extracts which related to the partners, the resources and the activities which are the building blocks of value co-creation. Secondly, the researcher then reviewed the comments with regards to the expected or experienced and the risks of each actor. Thirdly, the researcher then identified the benefits and sacrifices across actors in each case and between cases as well as the identified benefits and risks in relation to actor bonds, resource ties and activity links. By employing these analytical methods, the researcher was able to draw conclusion regarding how the types of resources integrated affected value co-creation.

FINDINGS

resource integration in the PPP network

the local regeneration ppp network

The actors: represented different organisations that brought in expertise from construction, project management, financial and advisory consultancy. The main partners P1 or PR1 usually functions as an integrating actor and negotiates the PPP operations. The extent to which the actors perceived trust, commitment and mutuality increased as the partnership went on. There were different perceived roles of the actors with the PPP arrangement and some inter-organisational rivalry.

The resources: The private sector value propositions were a flexible constellation of top expertise in each area of construction, finance and consultancy. This vision was developed by the private sector partner (PR1) that was in charge of building, operating, maintaining and managing the partnerships operations. The resources contributed by each private sector organisation were specialist skills, expertise, knowledge and financial: so they were both tangible and intangible resources. Knowledge of and access to the consumer was a resource contributed by the larger firms in particular. The partners had varying opinions about the importance of and use of particular resources and had to reach consensus as to how to deploy these resources according to best practices. The resource constellation was to some degree determined by the partners' hierarchy in the network.

Activities: This is a complex pattern required in the local regeneration development, as there is the need for information and other resources to be employed smoothly between the different partners. The public sector partners shared some technical and regulatory links to facilitate information sharing. The intangible resources were integrated through mutual objectives, communication and mutual adaptation. The organisation of the activities is perceived to be rather complex, this is because the technology is project specific, thus the processes need to be flexible and so planning standardized activity patterns was a challenge. Furthermore, the partners represented different roles and responsibility so the partners needed to be in frequent communication.

benefits associated with the local regeneration PPP

The primary purpose for partners to be involved in the local regeneration PPP networks was the need to gain access to certain resources, such as expertise and finance to enable the construction of a road which would help decrease traffic congestion, easy access to other commuter roads as well as reduced travel time. However, over the years the government of the Lagos State had not been able to reach that mandate of the provision of such an amenity to the local residents living in that area.

In the words of a private sector partner (PR4);

"Government funding is no longer there, because the demands are multiple, they come from everywhere. So the private sector is much more suited to function better".

Also in the words of a public sector partner (PR1);

"There is deficit in infrastructure, any government knows the reality that there is no way your development, renewal, generation of infrastructure, PPP is becoming a fashionable, tested model".

So there is the sense that that there are numerous benefits to be achieved working with the private sector. There is also a keen sense of understanding from the private sector that they need to play an active part in local regeneration PPPs. Likewise, in the sharing of knowledge and expertise among partners is deemed as a benefit to the PPP operation.

In the words of a public sector partner (P1);

"It's like an exchange of knowledge as well, we are aware of the projects they have done before, so on the basis of that, company structure, skill set, experiences".

Due to the nature of local regeneration PPPs, there is great emphasis on the intended delivery of outcomes to positively affect the lives of the local community where the PPPs are operated.

In the words of a private sector partner (PR1);

"On the social side, the government is using the private sector to help it deliver its programmes. Where before they would be responsible, now they are leveraging the skills and financing other resources in the private sector essentially that describes what PPP is all about".

Also in the words of the Private Sector consultant (PR2);

"Value for money- the process guarantees that, if you do that proper procurement process, the public competitive process, then you can guarantee value for money".

In summary, all partners perceived that there were genuine benefits as a result of the collaborative efforts of the individual partners.

risks associated with the local regeneration ppp

The partners did perceive certain risks involved in local regeneration PPP. There was the risk that the public sector was not seeking expert advice needed for the execution of the PPP.

In the words of a private consultant (PR3),

"Unfortunately public sector in this country is poorly resourced, for some reason they don't like to pay advisers maybe they don't have the budget for it, so the agreement tend to be one-sided".

This was due to issues arising from recouping the financial investments, issues that related to trusting that each partner would honour the contracts and other agreements. In the words of the private partner consultant

"People fear change and very often people fear change either because they think they would be disenfranchised or I am going to lose money or I am going to get short down, they just simply don't understand".

There were also concerns about delays in the completion of the project and the willingness of the local residents and other commuters to pay toll fees for using the road.

In the words of a public sector partner (PR1),

"I say PPPs are like a long term marriage once the trust goes it's bounds to sooner or later lead to some kind of termination and there are always consequences when that happens".

Interesting, there was the mention of the involvement of the local community in the decision making process by seeking their views with regards to the construction of the road which is directly intended to impact their lives.

In the words of a public sector partner (PR1),

"What happens is that most of the time, there needs to be an involvement, to prevent a disconnect".

The private sector partners also indicated the importance of involving the local community in the words of a private sector partner (PR4),

"There you have a lot to benefit, by getting reactions on the project of the community members about what they are feeling about this project because they could take advantage of what the project is going to generate to improve their lives and to enhance the success of the project".

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

main contributions

The purpose of this paper was to study how value is co-created in Public Private Partnership (PPP) networks. Despite previous literature regarding the importance of relationships and collaboration between multiple suppliers to innovative outcomes (Davis 2004, Windahl and Lakemond 2006, Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013) previous studies have provide little by way of understanding how actors integrate resources in interaction to develop innovative solutions, and their perceived solutions. This paper provides a current perspective by applying the ARA-framework which is a collaboration based model to the study of all partners involved in the PPP networks with the empirical context of a developing country. This study thus describes how value co-creation ensues in the interaction between the partners, the tangible and in tangible resources employed and the activities involved in the process of the PPP network. The study thus demonstrated that the value processes within main public sector and private sector partners; those between the public sector and private sector consultants and financial advisers and the collaboration between the entire public sector and private sector organisations are continuous and very well interlinked. The empirical study combined with the perspectives of value co-creation and the collaboration and network approach contributes to the value creation literature with theoretical understanding and empirical insights into value co-creation within PPP networks.

limitations and research implications

The study demonstrates an extensive and intricate phenomenon from the empirical perspective of one PPP network. The use of a case study research strategy puts a limit on the extent to which the findings can be generalized beyond the studied empirical context thus statistical generalization is not possible in this study. However, there is the possibility for analytical generalization whereby the purpose is to reach an interpretation of the studied phenomenon that could be transferable to other similar empirical contexts (Yin 2009). The selection of the local regeneration PPP give a varied nature of actors, activities and resources needed to reveal a much broader picture of the studied phenomenon. Also, the selection of one case can also be subject to criticism as there is that need to study two or three cases of local regeneration PPP to provide more variability and new insights that may not have been discovered in this paper.

The length of study of the empirical case could be conducted over a longer time period so has to improve the quality of results. Another limitation has to do with the theoretical perspective and scope of the study. The study was the perception of the partners' value in the local regeneration PPP networks and their perceptions to benefits and risks. There is the opportunity to include the user/consumer network in the framework. This research draws on a range of issues involving the roles of individual actors, producing formal and informal processes for establishing and operating local regeneration PPPs within the Nigeria context. One suggested area for further research is to investigate how individual partners overcome sector differences in order to learn from each other and to encourage partners learning to create value.

managerial implications

This study demonstrates that the value creation processes of individual partners affect value co-creation in PPP networks. It is beneficial if these partners could identify with both the opinions of the benefits and risks they each perceive in the local regeneration PPP as the value co-creation processes are usually interlinked. It is important that partners identify their core capabilities and expertise at the very beginning of the local regeneration PPP negotiations and arrangement so as not to obstruct the value creation process. There is the need for clarity in roles and positions of the partners as this would ensure that communication channels are flexible and open and it would assist to hamper issues around trust and confidence in the local regeneration PPP.

REFERENCES

- Appuhami, R., Perera S. and Perera H., 2011. Coercive Policy Diffusion in a Developing Country: The Case of Public-Private Partnerships. *Sri Lanka Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 41 (3), 431–451.
- Ball, M., Le Ny, L. and Maginn P. J., 2004. Synergy in Urban Regeneration Partnerships: Property Agents' Perspectives. *Urban Studies*, 40 (11), 2239–2253.
- Barlow, J., and Koberle-Gaiser, M., 2008. Delivering innovation in hospital construction. *California Management Review*, 51 (2), 1 – 18.
- Broadbent, J. and Laughlin, R., 1999. The Private Finance Initiative: clarification of a Future Research Agenda. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 15 (2), 95-114.
- Cao, M. and Zhang, Q., 2010. Supply chain collaboration: Impact on collaborative advantage and firm performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 29, 163–180.
- Couch, C., Olivier, S. and Borstinghaus, W., 2010. Thirty years of urban regeneration in Britain, Germany and France: The importance of context and path dependency. *Progress in Planning*, 75, 1–52.
- Cova, B., and Salle, R., 2008. Marketing solutions in accordance with the S-D logic: Co-creating value with customer network actors. *Industrial Marketing Management*. (37) 270-277.
- Cropper, S., 1996. Collaborative working and the issue of sustainability. Huxham, C., ed. *Creating collaborative advantage*. London: Sage 80-100.
- Eisenhardt, K., M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*. 14 (4), 532–550
- Ford, D., and Mouzas, S., 2010. Networking under uncertainty: Concepts and research agenda. *Industrial Marketing Management*. 39 (6), 956–962.
- Froud, J., 2003. The Private Finance Initiative: risk, uncertainty and the state. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 28 (6), 567-589.
- Gadde, L., et al., 2003. Extending the service-dominant logic: from customer centricity to balanced centricity.
- Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., and Wicki, B., 2008. What passes as a rigorous case study?. *Strategic Management Journal*. 29(13), 1465-1474.
- Gummesson, E., 2008. *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science*. On value and value co-creation: A service systems and service logic perspective. 36, (15–17).
- Gummesson, E., and Mele, C., 2010. Marketing as value co-creation through network interaction and resource integration. *Journal of Business Market Management*. 4 (4), 181–198.
- HM Treasury, 1998. Partnerships for Prosperity: the Private Finance Initiative. London.

- Huxham, C., 1996. Collaboration and collaborative advantage. *In: Huxham, C., ed. 1996. Creating collaborative advantage.* London: Sage Publications, 1-18.
- Huxham, C. and Vangen, S., 2003. Doing things collaboratively: Realizing the advantage or succumbing to inertia? *Organizational Dynamics.* 33, 190–201.
- Jaakola., E., and Hakanen, T. 2013. Value co-creation in solution networks. *Industrial Marketing Management.*
- Kothandaraman, P., and Wilson D T., 2001. The future of competition: Value-creating networks. *Industrial Marketing Management.* 30 (4), 379–389
- Kwak, Y. H., Yingyi, C., and Ibbs, C. E., 2009. Towards a comprehensive understanding of public private partnership for infrastructure development. *California Management Review.* 51, (2), 51-78.
- Lasker, R.D. and Wiess, E. S., 2003. Creating partnership synergy: the critical role of community stakeholders. *Journal of health and human services administration,* (Summer 2003), 119-139.
- Le Ber, M., and Branzei, O., 2010. Towards a critical theory of value creation in cross-sector partnerships. *Organisation.* 17:599.
- Mele., C., 2011. Conflicts and value co-creation in project networks. *Industrial Marketing Management.* 40, 1377- 1385.
- Ritter, T., 2000. A framework for analyzing interconnectedness of Relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management.* 29, 317–326.
- Selsky, J. W .and Parker, B., 2005. Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: challenges to theory and practice. *Journal of Management.* 31, 849–73.
- Slater, R., et al. 2006. A critical evaluation of partnerships in municipal waste management in England. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling.* 51 (2007), 643–664.
- Vargo, S.L., and Lusch, R, F., 2011. It's all B2B...and beyond: Toward a systems perspective of the market. *Industrial Marketing Management.* 40 (2), 181–187.
- Vargo, S.L., Maglio, P.P., and Akaka M, A, 2008. On value and value co-creation: A service systems and service logic perspective. *European Management Journal.* 26 (3), 145–152.
- Windahl, C., and Lakemond N., 2006. Developing integrated solutions: The importance of relationships within the network. *Industrial Marketing Management.* 35 (7), 806–818.
- Yin, R. K., 2009. Case study research: designs and methods. 4th ed. US: SAGE Publication.