

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS, FIRMS, COMMUNITIES, AND NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

José G. Vargas-Hernandez, M.B.A.;Ph.D.
Instituto Tecnológico de Cd. Guzmán
Avenida Tecnológico 100
Cd. Guzmán, Jalisco, 49000, México
Telefax>: +52 341 41 33116
jgvh0811@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper is aimed to describe some types of partnerships between governments, communities, New Social Movements and firms.

1. Government-government partnerships

The unique public-private US-Mexico Partnership for Prosperity initiative was launched in September 2001 with initiatives to target economic development in Mexico in the areas, which generate the most migrants. US-Mexico Partnership for Prosperity delivers the Good Partner Award to recognize the role of the private sector in advancing social and economic development in Mexico. In 2004, the winners were General Motors de México and Comercial Mexicana de Pinturas (Consorcio COMEX).

US-Mexico Partnership for Prosperity has as a central program the social security agreement and promotes access to nutrition programs for the Hispanic population.

2. Government-firms partnerships

Partnerships between governments and private business are necessary in some cases for sustainability and development of micro and small enterprises.

The public-private sector partnership collaboration between the Konkola Copper Mines wealth creation partnership with the government, the World Bank Group through the International Finance Corporation and other organizations and agencies and corporate partners, like British Petroleum have a social development plan,

A public-private partnership between Timberland and City Year of Americorps has expanded activities to 13 regions across the country and a pilot program in South Africa.

Merck has a partnership with the Gates Foundation and the Botswanan government to support health services there.

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

Partnering with Business is a private sector partnership between the Business Council for Sustainable Energy (BCSE) and USAID, promote sustainable energy technologies and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries.

Firms and governments are very interested in looking for ways to establish partnerships in Mexico and other developing countries to implement pilot projects to achieve significant emissions reductions and bring investment opportunities to Mexico.

3. Community foundations

Community foundations (CFs) are public-private partnerships for grant-making towards community development, which manage resources to create wealth and improve the well-being of the community and society.

Some of the characteristics of community foundations are that they are primarily grant-making foundations. But many also do their own programs, have broad range of donors, diverse portfolio of local and external donors with high stability, geographically defined, community, city, county, district, economy of scale matters. Local board reflecting the community governs some, seek to build permanent endowment, element of perpetuity, broadly defined mission “ to improve quality of life in community“, “to strengthen social capital of community”.

A principal issue for community foundations that needs to be negotiated is the money being driven for the agenda. Firms and governments may provide seed capital or an agenda of the public good and the needs of the community. Among other tasks, community foundations, create opportunities of cooperation between governments, firms and civil society sectors, and promote the culture of participation and social responsibility and philanthropy. In this respect, Sanz (2004) lists the community foundation tasks: to promote the culture of participation, social responsibility and philanthropy; to bridge government with civil society sectors and to create opportunity for collaboration among sectors.

It is mobilizing around assets the starting point for a community initiative to drive the process. Community foundations have to take a leadership role in the community, need to do asset mapping in order to discern what the needs and demands are, and they also need to bring together different stakeholders and work together with other CFs to gain wider recognition. In asset mapping it is important to distinguish between identification of assets for their own sake and identification of assets for people to generate action. Community foundations and governments are collaborating - mainly on projects, but also in more comprehensive and complex ways, which are being tried.

Building community foundations may take several years and maybe decades. Community Foundations are not quick fixes; they have to go through a process of demonstrating accountability and building trust. Sanz (2004) highlights the existing mistrust between government and civil society. Communities from developing countries often lack trust in

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

government. Mesik, (2004) observed the fast growth of community foundations over the past decades, and explained that they are a specific model of public-private partnerships which can be an important vehicle for moving communities toward sustainable development. He described CF's as a combination of factors. Financial resources, material and social assets are all important for community foundations.

The policy environment, cultural traditions and economic potential are all factors, which have an impact in the development of the community foundation and affect their applicability. Community foundations have an impact on the enabling environment. The cultural sense of values must be taken into account for any development or improvement in the life standards of a people.

Organized community foundations form their own associations, which have an impact on the agenda of international NGOs, other groups, and government. There is a strong connection between the NGO community and community foundations because typically leaders of community foundations are people from the non-profit sector.

Relationships between community foundations and the public sector are influenced by history and have similar characteristics that can lead to positive or negative consequences. They both have broad and similar missions; they both act in a territory that has boundaries or a geographical focus, and they can have similar functions. A significant difference is that law or administrative decisions define the role of the government, while the community foundation has a role defined by altruistic motives or incentives. However, there are incentives for them to work together (Strecansky, 2004).

For government, the incentive is often utilitarian. Local governments in less developed economies are under financed and require support from community foundation as an instrument through which they can multiply resources for the benefit of the community. Communities need to mobilize their own assets and drive the development process but not to the point where government doesn't carry out its responsibilities. More important that the funds is the volunteer work around community foundations and the community effort to build, for example, a playground or some small improvement in infrastructure. CF's have a strong development component, which is strengthening over time and which builds capacity and responsibility.

For community foundations the motivation to work together with government is most often recognition and effectiveness. Instrumentalization of the community foundation by the local authorities may have a negative impact on the foundation's independence. A significant challenge is to change the local authorities utilitarian mentality – which can have a negative effect on a foundation's independence- to an empowering approach that aims to nurture rather than use community foundations (Strecansky, 2004)

One example is the Greater Rustenburg Community Foundation, in South Africa, a large local grant-making institution, launched in a large mining area in the northern part of the country to help communities address their own problems and shape their own destinies. The foundation has a “community conversation” with all tiers of society, which helps to

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

shape the grant-making process. The foundation deals with the challenges of a multi-stakeholder approach in a number of ways and from different angles: mapping the assets in the community, working with the local mining companies showing them the added value of contributing to a community in which they operate. Moreover, through a community foundation is possible to work with civil society, the non-profit sector and the communities, and talking to government officials and tribal authorities (Mulenga, 2004).

The inherited idea from the Spanish Crown that the State should provide for the satisfaction of basic needs of people has prevailed through history in Mexico, along with other practices that become obstacles for civil society participation, have resulted in the lack the culture of philanthropy. Several comprehensive and complex ways of collaboration between government and community foundations listed by Sanz (2004) in Mexico are:

1) A levy on local payroll taxes. In this model, the tax-collecting infrastructure helps the foundation raise the funds. The payroll tax levy in Chihuahua is 0.2 percent. These resources are provided to the social sector through community trusts, which actually operate as CFs. The balance of power is kept between the government representatives and CF participants, and the governments have respected the agreement and/or have negotiated with the foundation. The risk is that local government may decide that this tax should be managed entirely by local government, although that is not the case at present.

In Mexico there is a legal framework that allows tax credits for donations to community foundations and other civil society organizations which are recognized as entities of public interest, able to receive more public funds from the government and have more recognition for their work.

2) Another model of collaboration between community foundations and government is the direct financing. Direct financing from government in Guanajuato, has granted seed money to start the initiative.

3) A model of matching funds in Michoacan. The CF operates throughout the state in an agreement with the state and municipals governments who provide grants through matching funds. The government puts up 65% of the total cost of the project. In the previous 18 months they have mobilized 4 million dollars of which 1.4 million civil society organizations and the rest have contributed by local and state government.

Community Foundations in Mexico collaborate with local and state governments mainly through specific projects such as the cooperation case of Puebla Community Foundation's work in a very poor region named Tzoquitlan. It has brought together a group of CSOs, community groups, and industry, together with the municipal government, focusing on education, health, and job through productive projects (Sanz, 2004).

However, there are several obstacles in their relationship - jealousy, competition for control of resources, a narrow perspective of citizen participation, lack of clear

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

understanding of what CF's are, low implementation capacity of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)etc. (Sanz, 2004).

According to Sanz (2004), Community Foundations in Mexico have several tasks: To promote locally the culture of participation, social responsibility and philanthropy, to find ways for bridging governments and civil society sector, and to create spaces of collaboration among sectors in order to really achieve social development

4. Government-communities partnerships

Governments have a role in the promotion of partnerships between firms and communities. Firms across all industry sectors are forging partnerships with local and national economic development agencies.

Government pursuing partnership with community organizations in environmental sustainability

A partnership between the cities of Tijuana and San Diego facilitates the development of relationships and the exchange of important program information on vital civic issues.

Local cooperatives have formed "venture partnerships" with state-owned companies to manage tourism operations and logging services

Canadian government's development policy promotes partnerships between First Nations and established forestry firms to increase the benefits of communities livelihoods. The Canadian Centre for Philanthropy's Imagine gives annually the New Spirit of Community Partnership Award, which recognizes innovative partnerships between firms and communities (www.ccp.ca/imagine).

The Community Health Department of Main partners with the communities by providing financial assistance, staff expertise and health education, prevention and screening.

5. Partnerships between firms

The "Intel Teach to the Future" partnership with Microsoft, Hewlett-Packard, and other computer software and hardware manufacturers provide equipment, teacher training, and technical support to primary and secondary schools. Intel de México gives a prize, the Premio Intel, to reward Mexican entrepreneurs under the frame of US Partnership for Prosperity.

The Ronald McDonald House Charities of McDonlad's Corporaciona is involved in partnership with suppliers, McDonald's restaurant owner/operators, and customers.

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

The Harbor Bank of Maryland through the partnership, Stop, Shop and Save can compete effectively with larger chains that offer ATM/banking services in their stores. Based on this partnership the harbor bank is expanding services into other convenience stores.

Gonzalez Design Engineering, The Ideal Group and Uni Boring, Hispanic-owned manufacturers of major parts for the automobile industry, formed a partnership to expand operations.

Salomon Smith Barney in New York City and Wildcat Services Corporation formed Wildcat's Private Industry Partnership a job-training program tailored to the Wall Street firm's needs.

Tesco has a partnership program with AccountAbility's Innovation to explore and document the factors associated with the company's success.

Clinton-based Nypro Corp., in partnership with Sealaska Corp., an Alaskan company formed to help Native American businesses, operate a joint venture in Guadalajara, Mexico.

A CSR and Sustainable Competitiveness program run by WBI partnerships with local and multinational actors from the private sector seeks partners to meet learning development objectives. This program has a long-term partnership with Zicklin Center for Business Ethics Research at the Wharton School and Harvard Business School. Also the program has developed a partnership with CEMEX, a Mexican based Cement Company.

6. Firm-communities partnerships

Partnerships between firms and communities may improve business and livelihood Firm-community partnerships may be a means to expand and improve employment opportunities, reduce costs, enable business diversification, increases market shares, and take advantages of local and governmental financial and logistic support. Flexible development of firm-community partnerships may allow collaboration for mutual gains and benefits to the environment and society. Firm-community partnerships may bring economic pay-offs to partners, benefits to local livelihoods and public common good. Potential for business partnerships comes from communities that are able to register as firms themselves, securing mutual rights and controls. A community within the partnership tends to strengthen over time.

Power may not be well balanced between firm and community partnerships in such a way that a win-win relationship may be a concession to outside demands. Workings of the partnership may be overseen by representative community institutions. There are factors that encourage or prevent relationships between firm-community partnerships.

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

The Ford Foundation Corporate Involvement Initiative report models of wealth creating partnerships between corporations and communities. Long term firm-community partnerships with nonprofit organizations bring benefits for both partners: However, empirical research proves that close and long-term partnerships may not be the best model for firms and communities (Mayers and Vermeulen, 2002).. Some firms create community partnership teams as part of its philanthropy programs.

GlaxoSmithKline created community partnership teams as part of its philanthropy program with company representatives from North America, Europe and other parts of the world.

There is a growing partnership in forest governance. Firm-community forestry partnerships are worthy of support for community development. Forestry partnerships supported by government and non-governmental organizations bring new opportunities for community development. The lisaak firm- community partnership in British Columbia illustrate the potential for investments, expansion of local capacity and scale of production in forest markets to benefit some of the world’s poorest people. Partnerships are formed to foster community-based sustainable forest firms within rural communities in Mexico.

The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) has examined 57 firm-community forestry partnership in 23 countries covering a wide range of arrangements (Mayers and Vermeulen, 2002). Firm-community deals were undertaken in six countries that cover a range of forestry and governance contexts.

Table 1: Characteristics of country case studies of company-community partnerships

Country	Land tenure context	Types of schemes reviewed	Notable features
South Africa	Some community land; some large private plantations; many small-holdings - land redistribution is taking trend away from large-scale towards smaller-scale	Outgrower schemes - non-timber forest products and pulp Corporate social responsibility projects Joint ventures - pulp	Big companies run schemes providing significant local livelihood benefits; scheme-management in part contracted out to NGOs; cooperatives and unions also established as alternatives to big company partners; and communities forming trusts to enter into joint ventures
India	Many small-holdings and some commons; by law companies do not have any access to large tracts of land for	Farm forestry support - commodity wood and pulp Farm forestry crop-share - pulp	Rapid evolution of partnership schemes from free seed supplies, through bank loan contracts to looser buyer arrangements

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

	plantations so they must source raw materials from small-scale growers		with companies concentrating on developing high-quality tree clones
Indonesia	About 75% of land is classified as state forest and under government control though most is contested; otherwise small-holdings	Outgrower scheme - commodity wood Co-management for non-timber forest products and service contracting	Schemes dependent on high levels of government support which is not always forthcoming; some progress now towards revenue sharing in the long-established tenant farmer (taungya) schemes
Papua New Guinea	97% of land is held under customary ownership - companies must negotiate with communities to operate logging concessions or plantations	Concessions leased from communities Potential joint ventures Contracts from communities - commodity wood and outgrower scheme	Communities are able to register as companies but there are problems with accountability; novel legal mechanisms exist to foster forestry development on customary land
Ghana	Most land is under customary tenure - companies must reach government-sanctioned arrangements with local owners	Corporate social responsibility policy	Workable system for participatory planning of company (and community) social responsibility built into tender process for logging permits
Canada	80% of forest reserves are under customary tenure with varying splits of rights between customary groups and central government - companies often have to negotiate with both	Joint ventures, cooperative business arrangements and forest services contracting	Communities are able to register as companies; wide-ranging deals have allowed business diversification for both partners

Fuente Mayers and Vermeulen (2002).

Firm-community forestry partnerships can work in any variations of property rights and communal or individual land tenure. Sometimes partnerships serve to secure shaky land rights. Some expectations of firm-community partnerships may not be fulfilled or simply fail to deliver. Firm-community partnerships have produced unproven or neutral impacts in areas such as poverty reduction, conditions of employment and development of collective bargaining power. Firm-community partnerships have negative effects on both

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

partners in problems such as: High transaction costs, misunderstandings between partners, perpetuation of low-wage labor and inequitable land distribution, negative environmental effects and exclusion of disadvantaged members.

Firm-community partnerships in forestry fail to materialize due to specific local circumstances and other factors. They face some challenges

Five major challenges to company-community partnerships, with examples and some general ways forwards.

Table 2: Challenges to firm-community partnerships

Partnership stumbles	Partnership innovates	Some general ways forward
Complexity and transaction costs		
Partnerships fail in Canada owing to needs for high inputs of company staff and community time Difficulties of organization among clans in Papua New Guinea hold back development of deals	In South Africa, local grower and contractor groups achieve economies of scale while broader federations' work for small-holders' interests Joint ventures in China involve government forest bureaus as brokers	Company field staff with budget control, but working within core principles Community members form coalitions linked into local and national networks Small alliances to deal with immediate transaction costs Communities piggy-back on existing systems of collective organization Use of local brokering agents
Uncertainty and risks		
Outgrowers in India, Thailand, Indonesia and South Africa drop out of deals when yields and prices do not meet expectations Asia Pulp and Paper forced to hold back huge outgrower scheme in China owing to sudden change in government policy	Land leasing for forestry in Georgia, USA, incorporates risk prediction and management measures Contracts between Smurfit and small-holders in Colombia protect each party's investment	Schemes are introduced in phases with a learning cycle philosophy Both sides avoid becoming too dependent on a single commodity or single land use Early revenues from trimming trees, partial harvesting or inter cropping Government provides stable incentives and buffers such as soft loan and tax break Insurance companies expand their services to small-scale fiber producers or producer associations
Single versus mixed production systems		
Some South African outgrower schemes insist on monocultures Campesino groups in Honduras are able to	Flexible fiber buying policy in India allows small-scale planting along contours and field boundaries	Both sides consider forestry activities other than tree growing Farmers devote only part of their land, time and capital to partnership activities

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

sell only well-known timber species	Greater tree spacing in plantations in Indonesia gives more space for non-fibber crops	Companies maintain a diversity of sources of raw materials, and remain open to the advantages of inter cropping
Conflicts, mistakes and recourse		
550 court cases against Wimco in India by dissatisfied outgrowers Squatting and violence in taungya schemes in Indonesia	Regional dispute resolution committees support corporate responsibility in Ghana Special government office acts as firewall between investors and communities in Eastern Cape, South Africa	Contracts include conditions for arbitration, and a named arbitrator Companies do not overstate predicted positive outcomes at the outset of the deal Investment in developing good personal relationships Where possible, partners develop a culture of shared learning Small claims courts are used to settle disputes more efficiently
Limits to corporate responsibility		
Logging companies in Papua New Guinea ignore retention of community benefits by elite groups Boise Cascade in Mexico ignores protests from environmentalists	Buyers from campesino groups in Honduras sponsor certification to gain market edge Prima Woods in Ghana set up agreement with local community long before legislated requirements	Effective legislation on investment rules, fiscal incentives and disclosure requirements to complement voluntary codes Support for practical rules for alternative business structures Alliances to foster equitable and effective small- and medium-scale enterprises Promoting partnerships on their own merits rather than because a company needs to demonstrate social responsibility

Fuente Mayers and Vermeulen (2002).

Firm-community partnerships may come to an end due to changes in prevailing market conditions, sources of raw materials or new opportunities. The partnership break up may come with violence, such as the case of the Boise Cascade joint venture in Mexico.

7. Firms and nonprofit organizations partnerships

A strategy of some firms is to establish long-term relationships and partnerships with the nonprofit organizations they fund to develop an identity as being affiliated with a cause, issue or group, or to share information, resources and technological support. Long term firm and nonprofit organizations partnerships related to core business interests bring benefits to both partners.

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

The Union Bank of California (UBOC) launched a partnership with Operation Hope, Inc., a nonprofit credit counseling organization and Nix Check Cashing to offer banking services to under served neighborhoods in the inner city of San Francisco. UBOC is partnering with local nonprofit organizations, United Way, Neighborhood Housing Services, and the Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Orange County and conducting financial seminars aimed at the Spanish speaking community.

Stonyfield Farm has developed partnerships with several of the nonprofit organizations that it funds, sharing information, resources and technological support.

Firms looking for new solutions in the new economy, invest in innovative partnerships with nonprofit organizations involved with community education and training.

IBM has developed its Reinventing Education grant-investment initiative partnering with the Houston Independent School District to develop Watch-Me!-Read technology to improve the reading and comprehension skills of youngsters.

RBG Kew and UNAM's Iztacala formed a partnership to work with local communities and scientific organizations to research on germ plasm of indigenous plant species.

The Mexican Foundation for Rural Development (FMDR), the largest rural development NGO, has a partnership with Monsanto in smallholder initiatives to foster economic and social development among low-income rural families.

8. Partnerships between communities

Communities may aim for partnerships. Cornerstone Community Partnerships assist unified communities to preserve historic structures, cultural traditions and heritage in partnership with Hispanic and Native American communities throughout New Mexico and Northern Mexico.

9. Partnerships between non governmental organizations and communities

A partnership Un kilo de ayuda, provides food aid packages to families in the poorest villages throughout Mexico.

10. Partnerships between non governmental organizations

Verizon Foundation promotes and supports partnerships in technology with nonprofit organizations serving disabled the economically and socially disadvantaged communities.

Partnerships Online supports non-profit organizations to develop their own intranets including Community Action Network and also Ruralnet for rural organizations.

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

The International Community Foundation in San Diego in partnership with FINCOMUN (Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad), in Tijuana, Mexico provides an institutional space for cross-border collaboration to support community development efforts in low-income communities.

The Rural Coalition in partnership with Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute at the University of Medicine and Dentistry in New Jersey is investigating health and environmental problems among Chicano farm workers in the border of Texas-Chihuahua.

A bi partnership between Fundación Comunitaria del Bajío and the Center of International Understanding at the University of North Carolina provides cross-border cooperation to communities in the State of Guanajuato, produces two way learning and support community development programs..

CRS/Mexico supports cross-border initiatives and partnerships between the Catholic dioceses and Caritas, social action, migrant ministry offices, non-governmental organizations. Also, CRS supports social movements assisting natural disasters and supporting programs to assist migrants in the Northern and Southern communities of Mexico, small farmers and workers, to defend human rights and to promote peace building.

Partnership between U.S. and Mexican Presbyterians helped finance home repair after hurricane Pauline for those who can do it themselves and get work crews, both local and international into the communities of those who can't. Partnerships in Barajillas was facilitated by Barnhardt with the Presbyterian Church in America

11. Multiparty partnerships

There are many forms and types of partnerships among business, government, communities NGOs and aid agencies that can support the implementation of sustainable development. The National Corporate Leadership (NCL) Program is designed to increase funds from the corporate community by increasing partnerships between United Ways, firms and employees.

Investing in Communities (IIC) program emphasizes the role of partnerships between communities, the private sector, the public sector, NGOs and other groups.

Benefits of the public-private-community partnership model include direct benefits, involvement of all stakeholders as a broader base for development, and enhance social responsibility for the private sector. Business in the Community (BITC) is a British non profit organization works with member firms to promote partnerships between the public and the private sector matching business resources with community needs.

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

Konkola Copper Mines plc (KCM), the largest mining company in Zambia, has a social and community development plan in partnership among the government, the World Bank Group through the International Finance Corporation (IFC), other organizations and agencies and corporate partners, like British Petroleum (BP). Their projects include creation of small and medium enterprises (SME) and provide to the community with incentives and technical assistance for growing cash crops as an economic diversification program.

The Canadian Centre for Philanthropy focuses on building partnerships between foundations and corporations from the private sector and non profit charitable and voluntary organizations.

Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (TMS) partnered with the Los Angeles Urban League to establish the Los Angeles Urban League Automotive Training Center (ATC), to develop employment partnerships with more than 60 automotive service companies throughout Los Angeles County.

Laufer Green Isaac, an award-winning marketing communications and public relations firm, is leveraging partnerships between corporations, foundations and nonprofits for mutual benefit.

The National Congress for Community and Economic Development, a national trade association for community-based organizations, offers services to businesses interested in corporate community partnerships and brokering relationships with local community-based organizations.

National Minority Supplier Development Council (NMSDC) is the leading resource for finding and establishing successful partnerships with minority suppliers.

Brody / Weiser / Burns, a consulting firm, builds corporate-community partnerships, business plans for non profit ventures, and advises private placement social investors.

The International Community Foundation (ICF) and its Baja California-based foundation, Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad (FIC), members of the U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership, have released “Survey of Baja California’s Non Profit Organizations”, a community-based needs assessment and profile of the non-profit sector for Baja California. ICF has established the Baja Social Venture Partners Fund, aimed to support innovative charitable projects in the Baja California peninsula with a high social impact. ICF in partnership with FIC Ford Foundation and Packard Foundation started a donor outreach campaign for environment and conservation priorities..

Funding for the ICF- and FIC-sponsored needs assessment and NGO profiles was made with support of the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation; The Walton Family Foundation; Alliance HealthCare Foundation; Sempra Energy; the Reinhart Family Foundation and the Synergos Institute. The Synergos Institute, an NGO based in US, with over 200 grant-making foundations globally, explores private sector-community

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

partnerships in Mexico. Synergos works with a group of partners in Mexico, one of which is key the Vamos Foundation.

Synergos is also the managing partner of The U.S.-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership in bi-national strategic collaboration with nine corporate founders and twenty-one border community foundations dedicated to improve the quality of life of economic, social and environmental disadvantaged border communities in the rapidly growing U.S.-Mexico border region..

US-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership is an umbrella for Synergos collaborating in cross-border community development. The Partnership has the objectives to build and strengthen the organizational leadership, programs and institutional resources of border community foundations with the goal of rooting development efforts in local participation and building local social capital. Moreover, the partnership is aimed to encourage cross-border collaboration when such collaboration is likely to result in improved quality of life.

The objectives are pursued by nine strategies: strength leadership, governance and organizational infrastructure, program learning communities, inter-foundation exchanges in common issues, deploy grant making to acute poverty and environmental problems. The other strategies are: to enhance use of grant making programs, mobilize untapped and underutilized financial and human resources, facilitate interaction, encourage new partnerships and raise endowment and program funds.

The nine corporate founders are: Ford Foundation (U.S. and Mexico), Fundación Gonzalo Río-Arronte, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Houston Endowment, Inter-American Foundation, McCune Charitable Foundation, Meadows Foundation, Annie E. Casey Foundation and The Mott Foundation.. The participating Community Foundations are: Fundación Comunitaria de la Frontera Norte, Fundación Comunitaria de Tecate, Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad (FIC), Fundación del Empresariado Chihuahuense – Juárez, Fundación del Empresariado Chihuahuense – Ojinaga, Fundación del Empresariado Sonorense, Fundación Comunitaria de Matamoros.

Also, Arizona Community Foundation (ACF), Brownsville Community Foundation, Tejas Foundation, Cochise Community Foundation/ACF. Other participating foundations are: Community Foundation for Southern Arizona (CFSA), Texas Valley Communities Foundation, El Paso Community Foundation, New Mexico Community Foundation, San Diego Foundation, Santa Cruz Community Foundation/CFSA, Bi-national Border Women's Development Fund, Yuma Community Foundation/ACF. Two participating Community Foundations incorporated in the United States, focus their grant-making activities in Mexico: International Community Foundation and Mascareñas Foundation.

Partnerships to improve governance in Mexico are promoted by federal, state and local governments. These partnerships are designed and implemented at local and regional levels involving participation of civil society, local communities and business to foster

Co – operation and conflict between firms, communities, New Social Movements and the role of government

economic, social, cultural and environmental conditions. In Mexico., there are Public/Private Partnerships (PPP) for participatory planning such as Economic Councils (e.g. CODESIN in Sinaloa), Citizen Planning Councils and Neighborhood Committees (e.g FIDOC in Lyon) For instance, a new program (COPLADE AND COMPLADEM) designed to local needs, is instrumented through participatory planning to develop infrastructure in meso regions to foster self-reliance among the disadvantaged. Civil partnerships ensure continuity of development projects

Partnerships among firms, communities, municipal water agencies and water stockholder groups promote urban water resource management and delivery in Mexican cities.

Partnerships among large firms, small business enterprises, state and municipal governments and communities develop small and medium enterprises in Aguascalientes, Guanajuato and Querétaro.

Manpower Mexico has the program Caminemos Juntos (Let's walk together) in partnership with Secretary of Labor, non-government organizations (NGOs), firms and educational institutions aimed to bring job opportunities to disabled people at no charge to the company.

Partnerships formed among The Mexican Secretary of the Economy, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Mexican IT consulting firm ASISTE and several U.S. and Mexican companies to develop and market new technologies.

References

- Mayers, James and Vermeulen, Sonja (2002). Company community forestry partnerships: from raw deals to mutual benefits. London, UK, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED).
- Mesik, Juraj (2004) Introduction to community foundations. Local Development Conference, Washington, D.C. June, 2004.
- Mulenga, Sixtus C. (2004). Innovative wealth creation partnerships. A model for contributing for sustainable development of Zambia. International Conference on Local Development. Washington, June 2004.
- Sanz, Lourdes (2004). “Community foundations: Working with local governments: Mexico.” International Conference on local development. Washington, D.C. June
- Strecansky, Boris (2004). Investing in communities: Public – private partnerships and the role of community foundations. International Conference on Local Development. Washington, June 2004.