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Abstract

This research examines the ways in which collaborative advantage outcomes are successfully realized (or not) in innovative multi-sector partnerships between the public, private and third sectors. It builds upon existing research in both public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage by explicitly linking these two bodies of literature within an urban planning context. Document analyses and in-depth semi-structured interviews are used to examine how the theory of collaborative advantage can be applied to a unique case study – the Red Door Family Shelter partnership in Toronto, Ontario. By constructing an in-depth case study narrative of the formation of the Red Door partnership, this research examines how specific factors may contribute to the initial successful realization of collaborative advantage in a partnership context. These case study findings are then presented in the broader context of innovative multi-sector partnerships, with consideration given to the need to consider longer-term outcomes for these types of projects.
Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the many individuals whose invaluable contributions collectively made this thesis possible.

First, thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Matti Siemiatycki, whose academic insights and ideas helped to both shape my own research interests and ultimately inspire this research project. Your endless support, guidance and input undoubtedly contributed to making my Master’s degree an academically challenging and intellectually rewarding experience. I would similarly like to acknowledge my remaining committee members Dr. David Roberts and Dr. Susannah Bunce – your insights and feedback on this research were similarly critical in guiding my review process and strengthening my research.

Beyond academia, my sincere appreciation goes to the countless individuals who took time out of their busy schedules to participate in interviews as a distinct contribution to this research project. It is your unparalleled passion and pride for this innovative partnership that maintained my motivation and shaped my vision for this thesis. I am privileged to have had the opportunity to transform your stories and experiences into the narrative presented here.

I would also like to thank the generous donors and institutions that have financially supported my Master’s degree thus making this research a feasible endeavour – the University of Toronto Graduate Faculty of Geography and Planning, the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), and the Royal Bank of Canada (RBC).

Finally, and most importantly, thank you for the unwavering and unconditional support from my family, friends and colleagues who embarked on this journey with me. I am forever grateful for your limitless emotional reassurance, encouragement and enthusiasm which kept me grounded and focused, even when, at times, the writing process felt insurmountable. This thesis is as much a testament to your achievements as it is to mine.
# Table of Contents

Abstract .......................... ii

Acknowledgements ..................... iii

Table of Contents ........................ iv

List of Tables ........................... ix

List of Figures .......................... x

List of Appendices ...................... xi

List of Acronyms ......................... xii

Chapter 1: Introduction – Overview of Research and Thesis Structure ........................ 1

1.1 Background Context .................. 1

1.1.1 Introducing the Red Door Family Shelter Partnership .................. 3

1.1.2 Introducing the Transitional Housing Situation in Toronto .................. 4

1.2 Thesis Outline .......................... 4

Chapter 2: Public-Private Partnerships and Collaborative Advantage – Literature Review and Theoretical Framework ........................ 7

2.1 Contextualizing Public-Private Partnerships in Urban Development .................. 8

2.1.1 The Rationale Behind Public-Private Partnerships .................. 8

2.1.2 Defining Public-Private Partnerships .................. 8

2.1.3 Differentiating Between Public-Private Partnership Models .................. 12

2.1.4 Advantages of Public-Private Partnerships .................. 14

2.1.5 Critiques and Challenges of Public-Private Partnerships .................. 15

2.2 Public-Private Partnerships in Canada .................. 17

2.2.1 Situating Public-Private Partnerships within New Public Management in the Canadian Context .................. 17
2.2.2 A History of Public-Private Partnerships within Canada 18

2.3 Innovative Public-Private Partnerships in Urban Development 19

  2.3.1 Expanding the Public-Private Partnership Model to Social Services 19

  2.3.2 The Role of Different Actors: Involving the Third Sector in Public-Private Partnerships 20

  2.3.3 Research on Innovative Public-Private Partnerships 22

2.4 Collaborative Advantage and Public-Private Partnerships 23

  2.4.1 Collaborative Advantage as a Measure of Partnership Success 23

  2.4.2 Defining Collaborative Advantage 24

  2.4.3 Distinguishing Between Collaborative and Exchange Partnerships 26

  2.4.4 Defining Synergy as a Pathway for Successful Partnerships 27

  2.4.5 Forces Acting Against Collaborative Advantage: The Existence of Collaborative Inertia 29

2.5 Establishing a Theory of Collaborative Advantage 31

  2.5.1 Partnership Structure and Collaborative Advantage 32

  2.5.2 Partnership Process and Collaborative Advantage 33

  2.5.3 Partnership Participants and Collaborative Advantage 34

2.6 Leadership Activities to Address Collaborative Partnership Challenges 36

  2.6.1 Managing Aims 37

  2.6.2 Managing Language and Culture 39

  2.6.3 Managing Trust and Power 40

2.7 Conclusion: Situating My Research 42

Chapter 3: Research Methodology and Case Study Selection 44

  3.1 Selection of a Research Methodology 44
3.1.1 Opting for a Case Study Approach 44
3.1.2 The Red Door Family Shelter Partnership as a Unique Case Study 46
3.1.3 Use of Multiple Qualitative Techniques: Outlining Core Research Phases 47

3.2 Phase I: Document Collection 48

3.3 Phase II: In-Depth Semi-Structured Interviews 49
3.3.1 Selection and Recruitment of Interview Informants 49
3.3.2 Overview of Interview Questions 52
3.3.3 The Interview Process 53
3.3.4 Qualitative Data Analysis 54

3.4 Conclusion 55

Chapter 4: Case Study Research Findings – Understand the Role of Collaborative Advantage in the Red Door Family Shelter Partnership 57

4.1 The Red Door Family Shelter: Historical Context 58
4.1.1 Relationship with the WoodGreen United Church and the Local Neighbourhood 58
4.1.2 Start of the Crisis: Sale of the WoodGreen United Church 59
4.1.3 The Agreement with Rose & Thistle 60
4.1.4 The Site Enters into Receivership 61
4.1.5 Background on Harhay Developments 62
4.1.6 Relationship with the City of Toronto 62

4.2 Formation of a Multi-Sector Partnership 64
4.2.1 Innovative Mixed-Use Design: Development Proposal 67
4.2.2 Financial Component of the Partnership Deal 69
4.2.3 Current 875 Queen St. East Redevelopment Project Status 71
4.3 Exploring Key Facilitating Factors and Barriers Behind the Partnership 72

4.3.1 The Role of Community Support and Mobilization 72

4.3.2 The Role of the Save the Red Door Campaign 74

4.3.3 The Role of the Red Door Capital Campaign 76

4.3.4 The Role of Political Leadership and Support 78

4.3.5 The Challenge of Siloed Organizational Responses 79

4.3.6 The Challenge of Managing Partnership Project Risks 81

4.4 Securing a Private Sector Developer for the Partnership 83

4.4.1 Leveraging Red Door’s Community Support and Expertise 83

4.4.2 Public Sector Incentives 84

4.4.3 The Good Will of Harhay Developments 86

4.5 Realizing Synergy: Leveraging a Diversity of Partner Contributions in Both Resources and Expertise 86

4.6 Achieving Collaborative Advantage 89

4.6.1 Collaborative Governance via Structure 91

4.6.2 Collaborative Governance via Processes 92

4.6.3 Collaborative Governance via Partnership Participants (Actors) 92

4.7 Leadership Activities for Achieving Collaborative Advantage 94

4.7.1 Managing Aims in the Red Door Partnership 95

4.7.2 Managing Language and Culture in the Red Door Partnership 96

4.7.3 Managing Trust and Power in the Red Door Partnership 98

4.8 Conclusion 100
Chapter 5: Discussion of Research Findings and Conclusion – Lessons Learned and Directions for Future Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Summary of Key Research Findings: Reflecting on Core Research Objectives</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Contributions to Scholarly Research</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1 Limitations of the Research Study</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2 Directions for Future Research</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Replicating this Type of Innovative Multi-Sector Partnership Model</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Policy Recommendations</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1 The Value of Ongoing Public Awareness and Documenting Innovative Partnership Outcomes</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2 Exploring the Tools Available to Incentivize Developers</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3 Formalizing Partnership Procedures and City-Level Coordination</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Conclusion</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

Table 1: Commonly cited definitions of public-private partnerships 11
Table 2: Summary of the major benefits and concerns associated with public-private partnerships 16
Table 3: Commonly cited definitions of collaboration and collaborative advantage 25
Table 4: Key features of co-operation distinguishing collaborative and exchange partnerships 26
Table 5: Factors leading to collaborative inertia 30
Table 6: List of informants by affiliation and sector 51
Table 7: Timeline of key events – Formation of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership 65
Table 8: Summary of major roles and responsibilities for each partner in the Red Door partnership 67
Table 9: Red Door Capital Campaign leadership team 77
Table 10: Overview of the three main Deputy City Manager clusters within the City of Toronto 81
Table 11: Summary of key criteria of the most collaboratively successful multi-sector partnerships applied to the Red Door partnership 90
List of Figures

Figure 1: Horizontal integration continuum of partnerships

Figure 2: The scale of public-private partnerships in Canada: Risk transfer vs. private sector involvement

Figure 3: Synergy as the unique connection between partnership functioning and partnership outcomes

Figure 4: A framework for understanding aims in collaborative partnerships

Figure 5: The original development proposal for 875 Queen St. East

Figure 6: Design mock-ups of the proposed development for 875 Queen St. East

Figure 7: 2nd level floor plan highlighting designated service space within the purpose-built shelter

Figure 8: 875 Queen St. East construction site – start of construction period; 875 Queen Street East construction site – progress as of June 2017

Figure 9: Community members attend a local public consultation meeting; Former mayor David Crombie speaks at a Red Door event; A community member stands with her daughter at the Red Door offices; Red Door Board Members and employees show support at a City Hall meeting

Figure 10: Save the Red Door Family Shelter branding; Save the Red Door campaign on change.org
List of Appendices

Appendix A: List of Documents Analyzed
Appendix B: List of Media Coverage Analyzed
Appendix C: Introductory Email – Interview Informant Recruitment
Appendix D: Sample Interview Guide
Appendix E: Letter of Consent
## List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Design-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>Design-Bid-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>Greater Toronto Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Infrastructure Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARF</td>
<td>Land Acquisition Reserve Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td>Not-In-My-Backyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public-Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHA</td>
<td>Shelter, Support and Housing Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAW</td>
<td>Violence Against Women (as in the emergency shelter model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VfM</td>
<td>Value for Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNPOs</td>
<td>Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Introduction – Overview of Research and Thesis Structure

1.1 Background Context

Over the past decade, societies have increasingly come to terms with the reality that we live in environments characterized by complex, multidimensional problems with advanced socioeconomic and environmental components (O’Leary, 2016). In this environment, different multi-sector organizations have increasingly found that leveraging, combining and capitalizing on their complementary strengths and capabilities has been an essential means of achieving progress on such complex issues (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). Consequently, multi-sector partnerships are often debated as a form of a new public governance scheme aiming to better manage the necessary interdependencies amongst all societal areas (O’Leary, 2016; Teisman & Klijn, 2002). In fact, research has continually emphasized the extent to which we now live in a network society where the traditional boundaries between the public and private sectors have become increasingly blurred as a result of these common interdependencies between multi-sector organizations (Vangen, 2017b; Klijn & Teisman, 2000).

In this context, academics describe that “the sense of fragmentation and lack of appropriately coordinated or integrated services as a result of ‘siloed’ or traditional single agency responses are widely considered to be the most costly problems impeding effective and efficient government service provision” (Keast & Brown, 2007: 10). As such, it is evident that the complex societal problems we are faced with require unprecedented levels of multi-sector, multidisciplinary and multi-component effort, thus reinforcing the concept that comprehensive solutions will be necessary (Richardson & Allegrante, 2000; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). The resulting argument is that governments need better integrated systems and services; public-private partnerships represent one such way to achieve this integration through the theorized realization of collaborative advantage as multi-sector organizations work together to achieve outcomes greater than those that any one sector or organization could have achieved alone (Keast & Brown, 2007; Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Vangen & Huxham, 2013).

In line with this rationale, public-private partnerships have gained attention worldwide as governments are increasingly opting for new methods of procurement for projects that have traditionally fallen within the public sphere (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Hodge & Greve, 2007). Over the past decade, these projects have included partnerships in such diverse areas as
transportation and civil infrastructure, healthcare, education, entertainment facilities, and more recently social services, amongst others (Roberts & Siemiatycki, 2015; Vangen, 2017b).

In line with the broader trend, Canada has facilitated an increasing number of such multi-sector partnerships over the same time period. For example, since its establishment in 2006, Infrastructure Ontario (IO) – a crown corporation and Ontario’s regional infrastructure procurement agency – has overseen hundreds of infrastructure contracts, a significant portion of which have been completed as public-private partnerships (IO, 2007). Perhaps most importantly, Canada’s experience with public-private partnerships has mirrored other countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, where such partnerships have been executed almost exclusively between the public and private sectors for primarily civil or infrastructural project needs.

Therefore, for the purposes of this thesis, innovative multi-sector partnerships will be used to refer to those that move beyond our traditional understanding of public-private partnership arrangements as addressing civil and infrastructural project needs to instead understand public-private partnerships more broadly as a policy tool to address increasingly complex social service problems by engaging stakeholders from a broader range of relevant community organizations. In particular, this thesis is concerned with the increasing role of the third sector – referring collectively to voluntary, non-profit, and community sector stakeholders – as a conceivably equal partner to both the public and private sectors in social service partnership arrangements.

Although a limited number of such innovative partnerships do exist in the Canadian context, in the past they have primarily focused on integrating private spaces with generally sought after public use spaces such as schools, daycare centers or cultural facilities (for example, see Siemiatycki, 2015b; Roberts & Siemiatycki, 2015). As will be demonstrated through this case study research, studying the integration of social service facilities, such as homeless shelters, into private market-rate housing developments represents an additional layer of complexity for such innovative partnership endeavours. As opposed to many of the public uses integrated within Canadian public-private partnerships to-date, critically needed social service facilities, such as homeless shelters, often face strong not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) opposition from local residents, further challenging the viability of such partnerships. In this way, studying an innovative social service partnership as a unique case study represents a critical opportunity to examine how collaborative advantage is achieved (or not) in some of the most challenging partnership
circumstances (for more on the case selection process and the value of unique case studies, see Chapter 3). In line with this rationale, this thesis critically examines the recently negotiated voluntary integration of a not-for-profit homeless shelter into a private developer’s proposed mixed-use building with both residential and retail components.

1.1.1 Introducing the Red Door Family Shelter Partnership

Located in the heart of Leslieville, on the east end of downtown Toronto, the Red Door Family Shelter is a not-for-profit service provider that has been offering emergency housing support for women fleeing domestic violence, young mothers, refugees and evicted families for over 35 years. Historically, the shelter operated out of space leased from the Woodgreen United Church, while receiving funding from a variety of Municipal and Provincial sources in exchange for providing high-quality, integrated transitional services to its residents (RDFS, 2016). As one of the longest-operating and largest shelters in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) – handling as much as 17% of the City of Toronto’s permanent family shelter capacity with 106 beds and an over 95% average occupancy rate (RDFS, 2016) – the Red Door Family Shelter is undeniably a core institution in the local Leslieville community and city, more broadly. Moreover, of the 237 families who sought refuge in the shelter in 2016, 32% stayed at the shelter for five months or more, thus further exemplifying the shelter’s importance (RDFS, 2016).

It is against this backdrop of necessity that the Red Door community found themselves in early 2014 when the Woodgreen United Church decided to sell off the property as part of an asset offloading effort nationwide. Facing impending receivership and relocation of the Red Door Family Shelter after a number of initial deals fell through, a network of key stakeholders mobilized over the following two years to facilitate the establishment of an innovative, first-of-its-kind partnership between the Red Door, the City of Toronto, and Harhay Developments – a private family-owned developer based in Toronto. Based on first-hand stakeholder accounts, stories and experiences, this thesis presents the narrative of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership in an attempt to expand our understanding of how innovative urban planning partnerships and collaborative outcomes may come to co-exist.

In this context, through an analysis of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership case study, my thesis seeks to determine in what ways collaborative advantage outcomes are successfully realized (or not) in innovative multi-sector partnerships between the public, private and third
sectors. Moreover, in instances where collaborative advantage is achieved (or not), I focus on identifying what were the facilitating forces and factors (or barriers) at work. Finally, given these factors, I give consideration to how we might be able to more systemically pursue collaborative advantage outcomes in innovative public-private partnerships moving forward. These research objectives will be explored in-depth throughout the remaining chapters of this thesis.

1.1.2 Introducing the Transitional Housing Situation in Toronto

The Red Door Family Shelter partnership project is the first of its kind in the Canadian context, despite that Toronto is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis which has ultimately left the City’s homeless shelter system both chronically over-crowded and under-funded (Toronto, 2013; Davis, 2017). With over 78,000 households active on the social housing waiting list and significantly less than 30% of the Shelter, Support and Housing Administration’s (SSHA) annual budget going to homelessness services as of 2014 (Toronto, 2013; Davis, 2017), the environment is well poised for the exploration of such new innovative partnerships.

A recently published publically commissioned report, titled “Engaging Communities in First Step Housing and Services: Report of the Facilitator on Developing a New Framework for Siting Homeless Shelters in the City of Toronto,” reflects this reality well, noting the ongoing extent to which family shelters in the city are strained by budgetary and capacity constraints (Davis, 2017; Toronto, 2017). However, despite the rather laboured present situation for homeless shelters in Toronto, the same report goes on to identify the innovative mixed-use partnership discussed above as a potential model for future social service developments based on the initial successes the project has experienced (Davis, 2017). This research is consequently an effort to more critically examine and verify such a recommendation by examining more in-depth the opportunities and challenges that this type of innovative social service partnership model presents, in an effort to better inform policy makers and practitioners in consideration of future decision-making processes.

1.2 Thesis Outline

The following thesis is composed of five chapters, each divided into relevant subsections. The second chapter provides an overview of the existing academic literature on both public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage. This review of the literature seeks to narrow in on a
distinctly Canadian urban planning perspective whenever possible, however much of the theoretical research referenced has proven valuable and relevant across national contexts. Through critically examining this literature, the chapter ultimately provides a comprehensive overview of the theory of collaborative advantage as it relates to multi-sector partnerships thus providing the theoretical framework that serves as the basis for this research and analysis. In providing this framing, the chapter also simultaneously identifies a distinct gap in the academic literature – the absence of research explicitly linking public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage in both theory and in real world case settings – which this thesis accordingly seeks to address.

The third chapter builds on these theoretical understandings and provides an in-depth look at the two main qualitative methodologies – document analysis and semi-structured interviews – employed in this research study. Specifically, it outlines the data collection, informant recruitment, interview preparation, and analysis strategies as they are relevant to this research. In addition to this methodological overview, the chapter also examines the importance of case study research in strengthening social science knowledge. The Red Door partnership is then presented as a unique public-private partnership case study through which collaborative advantage can be analyzed. Discussions of academic rigour and validity are presented throughout.

The fourth chapter presents the core research findings of this thesis. It endeavours to construct a case study narrative of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership as was informed by the document analysis and interviews conducted throughout the research process. By way of this narrative, the chapter provides insights into how partnership participants perceive the realization of collaborative advantage throughout the initial stages of this innovative project. It then frames these experiences and research findings in relation to core themes of the theory of collaborative advantage as presented in earlier chapters.

The fifth and final chapter concludes the thesis by providing a critical summary of the key research findings and results. In particular, it establishes concrete ways in which this case study of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership may help us to better understand how the theory of collaborative advantage may be applied to multi-sector urban planning partnership projects that increasingly involve the third sector as an equal partner. Practitioner-oriented recommendations are then provided based on these findings. Potential limitations to these case study research findings are also identified. The chapter concludes with a consideration of areas for potential future research focus that would serve to further inform and strengthen these initial linkages between the
collaborative advantage and public-private partnership literature from an urban planning perspective. In doing so, it ultimately reiterates the ongoing importance and academic value of case study research in this area.
Chapter 2:
Public-Private Partnerships and Collaborative Advantage – Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, I explore the existing body of literature analyzing public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage in order to better contextualize where these interrelated bodies of research situate themselves in relation to one another. I begin by providing a broad overview of the literature analyzing public-private partnerships, including considerations of the most commonly cited theoretical arguments both in favour of and against the use of such a model for public service delivery. I then provide a more in-depth look at the public-private partnership landscape in Canada, with a particular emphasis on innovative partnership projects that increasingly involve the third sector as an equal partner. This overview helps to better situate the policy environment for multi-sector partnerships in Canada, helping to contextualize the environment as it relates to the Red Door Family Shelter case study studied in this thesis.

Building on these initial understandings of the public-private partnership model, I then explore the existing body of research analyzing how partnership success is measured. In particular, this second portion of this chapter focuses on collaborative advantage, which has been frequently cited as one of the most commonly utilized means of evaluating public-private partnership success (for example see Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Engel, Fischer & Galetovic, 2013). In this context, I endeavour to provide an overview of the theory of collaborative advantage in relation to multi-sector partnerships, with particular attention given to important supporting concepts such as synergy and collaborative inertia. Building on these understandings, I then explore partnership structure, process and participants as three core mediums through which leadership activities are enacted in an attempt to achieve successful collaborative outcomes.

Taken together, this review of the relevant literature provides a foundational framework for analyzing the ways in which collaborative advantage may (or may not) be achieved in the context of innovative public-private partnerships. In doing so, it also identifies a lack of academic literature that explicitly links these two bodies of theoretical research, thus positioning my thesis as a means of beginning to address this gap. Ultimately, establishing this linkage appears crucial given the extent to which collaborative advantage has consistently been cited as an underlying rationale in the adoption of the public-private partnership model.
2.1 Contextualizing Public-Private Partnerships in Urban Development

2.1.1 The Rationale Behind Public-Private Partnerships

In response to the increasing complexity and multi-dimensionality of societal problems as previously outlined, in recent years there has also been an increasing focus on making the public sector more efficient, flexible and cost-effective (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Weihe, 2008). From an economic perspective, Osborne and Gaebler (1992), O’Leary (2016) and Andrews and Entwistle (2010) each argue that a core reason for the formation of such inter-sectoral partnerships is the pursuit of collaborative advantage achieved through leveraging the strengths of different sectors. As a result, the study of public-private partnerships has gained increasing traction as it is often viewed as a new and promising way of managing and governing projects in order to more effectively procure and produce public services (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Hodge & Greve, 2007).

Ultimately, scholars have rationalized that, in theory, public-private partnerships assume that superior policy outcomes can be achieved when there is more intensive cooperation between the public and private sectors (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014). Roehrich, Lewis and George (2014: 117) ultimately summarize this well, explaining that:

“Public-private partnerships can combine the strengths of private actors, such as innovation, technical knowledge and skills, managerial efficiency and entrepreneurial spirit, and the role of public actors, including social responsibility, social justice, public accountability and local knowledge, to create an enabling environment for delivering high quality […] infrastructure and services.”

Consequently, inter-organizational decision-making through partnership arrangements has received increasing attention from scholars and practitioners over the past two decades as increasing numbers of public services are being delivered through combinations of multi-sector partners (Teisman & Klijn, 2002; Xu & Morgan, 2012; Grimsey & Lewis, 2007; Hodge, Greve & Boardman, 2011).

2.1.2 Defining Public-Private Partnerships

Despite this theoretical rationale, public-private partnerships (henceforth referred to as PPPs) have proven significantly more complicated to successfully utilize in practice, in part due to terminological difficulties. Although scholars appear to have reached consensus on the fact that
PPPs are intended to be beneficial for both the public and private sectors as specific strengths and capabilities are leveraged resulting in an end outcome that is better for all (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014), there does not seem to be much further consensus on what the entirety of the PPP model should encompass (Mendel & Brudney, 2012). This is problematic because PPPs are situated in interdependent networks such that the classical division between the public and private sectors does not tell us much about the context in which these types of partnerships operate (Klijn & Teisman, 2000).

It is also important to identify that the plethora of PPP literature that exists is drawn from several different disciplines, including urban planning and geography, economics, public management, sociology, and behavioural science, amongst others (Xu & Morgan, 2012). The field of inter-organizational collaboration and PPPs is further complicated by the fact that there is often negligible overlap and recognition of literature across disciplines (Huxham, 2003). Accordingly, a significant challenge in the study of PPPs has revolved around the lack of agreement over the usage and synonymity of terminologies such as: partnership, alliance, collaborative network, coalition, and consortium, amongst other terms (Hrelja, Pettersson & Westerdahl, 2016; Huxham, 2003). The lack of clarity surrounding these terminologies often impedes conceptual clarity (Cornforth et al., 2015).

In practice, the term “partnership” has now become commonplace in the rhetoric surrounding public sector management, with many arguing that its popularity has overtaken the concept of “privatization” which received similar prominence throughout the 1980s and 1990s (Wettenhall, 2003). Despite that many academics would argue these to be distinctly different concepts, it is often advocated that PPPs should be seen in relation to their basis in more traditional concepts such as “contracting out” and “privatization” that often receive greater public opposition in order to better contextualize the opportunities that successfully implemented PPPs may present (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Hodge & Greve, 2007).

In this new context, Huxham (2000) argues that the terms “partnership” or “alliance” are often used to describe multi-sector efforts, while terms such as “collaboration”, “cooperation” and “network” are more commonly used to describe partnerships or alliances themselves. Keast and Brown (2007) conceptualize “cooperation”, “coordination” and “collaboration” differently in relation to PPPs, instead referring to them as a scale of “horizontal integration arrangements” and focusing on how such collaborative efforts between multi-sector actors can offer new insights into
previously challenging social problems in the human services arena; this continuum is presented in Figure 1. This supports both Hrelja, Pettersson and Westerdahl’s (2016) and Huxham and Macdonald’s (1992) understanding that while cooperation and coordination may happen, at least to some extent, naturally in an organization’s work to achieve organizational aims, collaboration is outside of the normal domain of all partnership members and thus it must be actively pursued if it is to be pursued at all.

Figure 1: Horizontal Integration Continuum of Partnerships
(Source: Author; adapted from Keast & Brown, 2007)

Scholars often argue that distinct situations necessitate different uses of the aforementioned terms, however there is a general lack of consistency between authors in this respect (Boardman, Greve & Hodge, 2015). It is therefore crucial to understand where PPPs are specifically situated within this complex body of terminology. Table 1 compiles some of the most commonly cited definitions of public-private partnerships in the academic literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative institutional arrangements between public and private sector actors</td>
<td>Hodge and Greve (2007: 545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation of some durability between public and private actors in which they jointly develop products and services and share risks, costs, and resources which are connected with these products or services</td>
<td>Van Ham and Koppenjan (2001: 598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A long-term contract between a private party and a government agency, for providing a public asset or service, in which the private party bears significant risk and management responsibility</td>
<td>World Bank Institute (2012: 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A project that generally involves the design, construction, financing, and maintenance (and in some cases operation) of public infrastructure or a public facility by the private sector under a long-term contract</td>
<td>Campbell (2001) (as sourced in Hodge and Greve, 2007: 546)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More or less sustainable cooperation between public and private actors in which joint products and/or services are developed and in which risks, costs and profits are shared

More or less sustainable cooperation between public and private actors in which joint products and/or services are developed and in which risks, costs and profits are shared

More or less sustainable cooperation between public and private actors in which joint products and/or services are developed and in which risks, costs and profits are shared

A long-term contractual relationship that entails a level of risk-sharing and joint decision-making beyond the traditional government purchase of goods or services

A long-term contractual relationship that entails a level of risk-sharing and joint decision-making beyond the traditional government purchase of goods or services

A long-term contractual relationship that entails a level of risk-sharing and joint decision-making beyond the traditional government purchase of goods or services

Working arrangements based on a mutual commitment (over and above that implied in any contract) between a public sector organization with any organization outside of the public sector

Working arrangements based on a mutual commitment (over and above that implied in any contract) between a public sector organization with any organization outside of the public sector

Working arrangements based on a mutual commitment (over and above that implied in any contract) between a public sector organization with any organization outside of the public sector

Klijn and Teisman (2005: 96)

Landow and Ebdon (2012: 728)

Bovaird (2004: 200)

Table 1: Commonly Cited Definitions of Public-Private Partnerships
(Source: Author; compiled based on multiple sources cited within)

As can be seen from Table 1, despite the increasing popularity of PPPs there does not seem to be a full theoretical consensus on what the PPP model represents. As Hodge and Greve (2007: 545) describe,

“Some see it as a new governance tool that will replace the traditional method of contracting for public services through competitive tendering [while] others see PPPs as a new expression in the language of public management, one intended to include older, established procedures of involvement of private organizations in the delivery of public services.”

Wettenhall (2003, 2005) builds on this idea, arguing that the notion of PPPs is not entirely new and that there has always been some degree of cooperation between both the public and private sectors. For example, urban regime theory has long held that “collaboration exists between the public and private sectors and, in fact, is necessary to the achievement of important policy goals” (Landow & Ebdon, 2012: 731).

However, despite some differences in these core PPP definitions there does appear to be an underlying consensus that PPPs encompass multi-sector partnerships that help to achieve work that no single person, organization or sector could achieve alone (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; O’Leary, 2016). Additionally, to some extent, scholars appear to also agree that PPPs can be seen to be a form of co-production, whereby the public and private sectors cooperate in the hopes of generating mutually beneficial surplus value – although the extent to which the partnership is beneficial to individual stakeholders and organizations is likely to vary (Klijn & Teisman, 2005). For the purposes of this research, Cornforth et al.’s (2015: 777) definition of collaborative multi-sector partnerships captures these essential elements well:
“The terms collaboration and partnership [are used] interchangeably to refer to formalized, joint-working arrangements between organizations that remain legally autonomous while engaging in ongoing, coordinated collective action to achieve outcomes that none of them could achieve on their own.”

Teisman and Klijn (2002) argue, however, that this desired level of partnership is not always easily realized in practice. In their view, governments have also co-opted the term in an attempt to manage political language games, noting that “partnership gives the government a new legitimacy: the efficiency of the private sector and the involvement of civil society” (Teisman & Klijn, 2002: 197). Therefore, given this base theoretical understanding of PPPs, it is also important to recognize that the PPP model often varies significantly in scale and scope when utilized in practice and to understand the implications that this variation may have on evaluating PPP success. The following section attempts to unravel some of these intricacies.

2.1.3 Differentiating Between Public-Private Partnership Models

Scholars have established many frameworks and methods for identifying and studying PPP arrangements. Partnerships are usually initiated for an instrumental purpose, with a range of potential aims and scopes in mind; it is this foundational purpose that often helps to determine the appropriate PPP model (Boardman, Greve & Hodge, 2015). While some partnership projects will be focused on broad policy areas, such as education or health, others may be focused on a specifically defined project, such as upgrading or building a facility (Boardman, Greve & Hodge, 2015; Huxham, 2000).

Based on these varying goals, Figure 2 outlines the most commonly used scale of PPP models in the Canadian context based on varying levels of private sector risk and involvement. This model builds on Klijn and Teisman’s (2005) understanding that distinct differences in responsibilities and risk division often help to distinguish between different partnership forms. In this example, Design-Bid-Build (DBB) and Design-Build (DB) projects notably fall outside of the range of PPP projects, and can thus be seen to represent the more traditional “contracting-out” approach to private sector involvement. Moreover, many authors argue that these contract models are not truly PPPs at all given that they are very similar to more traditional forms of private sector tendering (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Boardman, Greve & Hodge, 2015). At the opposite end of the spectrum, full privatization also falls outside of the range of PPP models, highlighting the
important notion that PPPs do not represent full long-term privatization of public service provision (Hodge & Greve, 2007; Boardman, Greve & Hodge, 2015).

![Diagram: The Scale of Public-Private Partnerships in Canada: Risk Transfer vs. Private Sector Involvement](Source: Author; adapted from CCPPP, 2011)

Although other authors have expanded on this typology to include a more nuanced analysis of the PPP options available to public policy makers and practitioners (for example, for a typology based on organizational and financial dimensions see Hodge and Greve, 2007), for the purposes of this research the most important distinction lies in realizing what constitutes a PPP and what does not. More specifically, as previously alluded to, Boardman, Greve and Hodge (2015) argue that these arrangements are not always partnerships themselves, but sometimes just extensions of more traditional contracting-out arrangements. This is evidenced by the lack of joint decision-making, limited co-production and lack of continuity in cooperation that characterizes many supposed PPP projects (Klijn & Tesiman, 2005; Landow & Ebdon, 2012; Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014). As Klijn and Teisman (2000: 9) describe, “while contracting out is an attempt to hand over activities to the private sector in order to improve efficiency (cost reduction), partnership is in essence a joint venture aimed at innovation and improvement of quality.” In this context, partnership should be seen as a distinct alternative to traditional contracting-out and privatization, given its reliance on increasing levels of mutual obligation and trust (Wettenhall, 2003, 2005).

From a theoretical perspective, there are many different ways of viewing the partnership opportunities for co-production (Klijn & Teisman, 2005). Klijn and Teisman (2005) make this
distinction primarily between contracts and partnerships: while contracts involve a concession agreement outlining the required integration of value chain components, partnerships are more distinctly seen as organizational cooperative projects where partners are more wholly integrated with one another. Scholars have thus argued that contracting-out is not a true collaborative partnership since co-production is limited, risking-sharing does not occur, and the relationships are often strictly contractual (Weihe, 2008; Mouraviev & Kakabadse, 2016).

2.1.4 Advantages of Public-Private Partnerships

Due to the continuing popularity with which governments are adopting the PPP model as identified above, Hodge and Greve (2017) advocate for increased attention and research to evaluate and learn from existing PPP models, with a particular emphasis on how partnership success is measured and realized (or not). This is particularly important given that PPP outcomes are generally mixed – some demonstrate clear successes, some demonstrate clear failures, and others remain unclear (Landow & Ebdon, 2012; Hodge & Greve, 2007, 2017). Despite these concerns with PPP outcomes, over 1600 projects – spanning transportation, health, education, energy and justice, amongst others – have been delivered globally using a PPP approach between 1985 and 2010 alone, representing a combined value of over US$700 billion (Public Works Financing, 2010). This implies a clear need to better understand how the PPP model functions in practice and to properly assess project-specific scenarios before opting for a PPP approach (Verweij, Teisman & Gerrits, 2017; Hodge & Greve, 2017). Given this reality, understanding the opportunities and challenges that the PPP model presents is critical, leading to an increasing body of academic literature in this area.

At the start of this chapter, an overview of the broad societal rationale for the adoption of multi-sector partnerships was presented. Although this overarching rationale is complicated and multi-faceted, it is often based on commonly cited advantages of such partnerships, such as: efficiency, sharing of learning, transfer of good practice, co-ordination, and, perhaps most commonly, a financial imperative to share both costs and risks (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Engel, Fischer & Galetovic, 2013; O’Leary, 2016). In theory, proponents have therefore argued that the PPP model improves the procurement of public services by: improving service delivery, improving cost effectiveness, increasing overall investment, reducing public sector risk, delivering capital projects faster, improving budget certainty, and making better use of assets (CCPPP, 2011;
From a governmental perspective, PPPs also include unique opportunities for: lowering costs, lowering taxpayer risk, reducing initial capital costs, reducing budget deficits, and increasing effectiveness and equity (Landow & Ebdon, 2012; Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Boardman, Poschmann & Vining, 2005; Chung, 2016; Chung & Hensher, 2015; Klitgaard & Treverton, 2003).

### 2.1.5 Critiques and Challenges of Public-Private Partnerships

In direct opposition to this growing governmental interest in and support for PPPs, academics have historically been more critical of this approach. At the urban level, scholars claim that the use of the PPP model is a form of neoliberal urban governance that prioritizes private profit over public interest thus contributing to increasing gentrification, rising inequalities and social polarization through the creation of enclaves (Harvey, 1989; Fainstein, 2010; Miraftab, 2004).

At a functional level, researchers further argue that governments have shown a tendency to promote many of the aforementioned benefits of the PPP approach without citing adequate empirical evidence to support such claims (for examples see IO, 2007 and Partnerships BC, 2003). In fact, contrary to popular belief, studies have shown that many presumed benefits of PPPs, such as value for money (VfM) (Hellowell & Vecchi, 2012; Grimsey & Lewis, 2005), risk transfer (Chung & Hensher, 2015; Chung, 2016; Grimsey & Lewis, 2002) and off-balance-sheet financing (Heald & Georgiou, 2011), do not always materialize as expected. Moreover, the academic literature has repeatedly shown that the realization of many PPP benefits is not always guaranteed (Hudon, 2011; Garvin & Bosso, 2008; Hodge & Greve, 2010; Siemiatycki, 2015a; Siemiatycki & Farooqi, 2012; Vining & Boardman, 2008; Whiteside, 2011).

Considering the many challenges associated with PPPs, it is not surprising that many partnerships fail to deliver on the proposed benefits (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014). Estimates based on PPPs in the United Kingdom found that up to half of all multi-sector partnerships that form fail within the first year (Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). Such unrealized benefits are primarily due to difficulties in successfully implementing multi-sector partnerships, in part due to their inherently more complex relationships, procedures and structures that require significant time and resource investments (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014; Vining & Boardman, 2008; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). As Huxham (2000) explains, implementing partnerships carries its own significant transaction costs, which are widely considered to be one of the strongest barriers to PPP
success. In some cases, partnerships may prove to be detrimental to some weaker partners who are unable to effectively bear the costs and navigate the intricacies of the partnership process (Vining & Boardman, 2008).

Beyond transaction costs concerns, many critiques of PPPs tend to relate to structural or contractual issues (Landow & Ebdon, 2012; Mouraviev & Kakabade, 2016). Research has repeatedly suggested that such partnerships are often more difficult to manage (Boardman, Greve & Hodge, 2015; Madhok, 1995). For example, some scholars have expressed concerns regarding the flexibility and capacity for governments to make future decisions that reflect the public interest given considerations of the long-term “lock-in” associated with many PPP arrangements (Landow & Ebdon, 2012; Hudon, 2011; Engel, Fischer & Galetovic, 2013; Boardman, Greve & Hodge, 2015). Another concern relates to cases where the use of PPPs leads to unelected officials operating public facilities thus raising concerns regarding accountability, transparency, fairness, control, mismanagement, and corruption (Reynaers & Grimmelikhuijsen, 2015; Wu et al., 2016; Landow & Ebdon, 2012; Reynaers & DeGraaf, 2014; Forrer et al., 2010; Weihe, 2008; Bourdeaux, 2007; Diller, 2002; Leigland, 1992). In response to such realities, some scholars have expressed concerns that PPPs are not appropriate for the public sector as the proposed benefits are far from guaranteed, particularly when considered against such concerns (Xu & Morgan, 2012; Wang, 2009; IMF, 2006). Given this mixed evidence, Hodge and Greve (2017: 54) acutely suggest that “governments may stress [PPP] success more on the basis of political and governance strengths, than utilitarian characteristics.” A summary of the major benefits and concerns associated with PPPs can be found in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Benefits</strong></th>
<th><strong>Concerns</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower costs</td>
<td>Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower taxpayer risk</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced initial cost</td>
<td>Service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced budget deficits</td>
<td>Ability to identify and manage risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximization of user charges</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased effectiveness</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased efficiency</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mismanagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Summary of the Major Benefits and Concerns Associated with Public-Private Partnerships*  
(Source: Landow & Ebdon, 2012)
Ultimately, given these tensions, researchers often suggest that these partnerships should be used sparingly as a governance tool, and that when they are, they should be managed with extreme care and attention (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014). Moreover, it is important to note that the literature does not suggest that all endeavours should be collaborative in nature, nor should everyone be engaged in partnerships at all times, even if they were all non-overlapping (Hodge & Greve, 2017). This is because the amount of resources and attention that managing this level of partnerships would require would render them ineffective from a public policy perspective (Vining & Boardman, 2008). Therefore, it is important that these partnerships are used in moderation, only when there is real opportunity to achieve surplus value greater than what any partner could have achieved alone (Huxham & Vangen, 2004; Hodge & Greve, 2017).

2.2 Public-Private Partnerships in Canada

2.2.1 Situating Public-Private Partnerships within New Public Management in the Canadian Context

From a theoretical perspective, the rise of the New Public Management (NPM) movement can be seen to be particularly responsible for the increasing interest in PPPs in Canada by encouraging market-oriented private-sector solutions for issues that have proven to be administratively inefficient from a public perspective (Hudon, 2011; Clifford & Tewdwr-Jones, 2013; Savas, 2000; Xu & Morgan, 2012; O’Leary, 2016). Moreover, a growing body of theoretical literature supports the assumption that the traditional separation between the public and private sectors is gradually disappearing (Clifford & Tewdwr-Jones, 2013; Teisman & Klijn, 2002). Castells (1996) and Grossman (2012) therefore argue that the increasing intertwining of the public and private sectors has been the driving force behind this call for new forms of public governance. Given this reality, NPM broadly emphasizes the importance of economic markets while denying any special role for the public service (Clifford & Tewdwr-Jones, 2013; Hudon, 2011; Wettenhall, 2003). This stands in direct opposition with the more traditional body of public thought, termed Governance, which is focused on the more traditional view of the necessity for state and civil society to balance out market forces (Clifford & Tewdwr-Jones, 2013; Hudon, 2011; Wettenhall, 2003).
Widespread international NPM-inspired reforms can be seen from the 1980s onwards leading to a distinct shift from the 1990s onwards as international governments began increasingly commissioning non-profit and community sector agencies to drive public service delivery in core areas (Rees, 2014; Grossman, 2012). Scholars note that this is especially unique in the Canadian context given that Canada has historically been less enthusiastic than Britain, New Zealand or Australia in adopting such NPM reforms (Wettenhall, 2005; O’Leary, 2016; Clifford & Tewdwr-Jones, 2013). Within Canada there appears to be a belief that supporting PPPs in a more holistic sense beyond traditional contracting-out arrangements may help to avoid what many see as the shortcomings of NPM-style thinking (Hudon, 2011; Wettenhall, 2005).

2.2.2 A History of Public-Private Partnerships within Canada

Although the PPP approach to public service delivery is increasingly rising to prominence worldwide, the model has proven particularly relevant in the Canadian context as governments at all levels and of all political affiliations have shown overwhelming support of the PPP model in recent years. This rising preference for PPPs in the Canadian context can be predominantly traced to trends and shifts in government spending and service delivery. In line with similar transformations seen in governments worldwide, the Canadian government has seen significant changes over the past decade as the cost of building and maintaining public infrastructure has steadily risen (Siemiatycki, 2015a).

As a result, Canadian governments across all levels are continually searching for new methods of procurement, leading them to increasingly turn to PPPs as the solution for large-scale public projects. In practice, there has been a simultaneous downsizing of government departments and direct responsibilities, coupled with the development of alternative multi-sector models of public service provision (Osborne & Murray, 2000). This is primarily due to a combination of the increasing costs of direct government service provision and the growing distrust of the public regarding ‘big government’ over the same period (Osborne & Murray, 2000).

In this context, the rapid growth of the PPP model can ultimately be traced to the release of a Canadian International Development Agency document titled “Partnership for Governance” in 1999, which signalled the beginning of an ongoing shift towards private partnerships in public sector projects (CIDA, 1999; Wettenhall, 2003, 2005). Based on the initial ideas presented in this document, governments have increasingly favoured the consideration of PPPs as a potentially
viable alternative procurement method. For example, a federal mandate now requires that all infrastructure mega projects in Canada valued at over $100 million be, at minimum, considered as PPPs (Canada, 2014). The result has been that over 200 large-scale Canadian infrastructure projects have been completed as PPPs to date, with many more increasingly innovative and diverse projects in the pipeline (Service Works Global, 2014).

2.3 Innovative Public-Private Partnerships in Urban Development

2.3.1 Expanding the Public-Private Partnership Model to Social Services

Historically, PPPs have been formed in many different areas, however they have tended to primarily focus on tackling urban problems, such as regeneration, economic growth and accessibility, or on infrastructural needs (Klijn & Teisman, 2005). Common examples of public sector services and projects being increasingly completed as PPPs include: transportation, hospitals, and civil infrastructure such as municipal buildings, courts and jails, amongst others (Siemiatycki, 2015a; Hodge & Greve, 2007; Bovaird, 2004). Despite such potentially diverse models, within the urban sphere in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States – all of whom have been at the forefront of PPP development – the PPP model has often become synonymous with infrastructure projects (Hodge & Greve, 2007; Garvin & Bosso, 2008; Grimsey & Lewis, 2002). However, as previously described, some academics have argued that it is now a moral imperative that more complex social issues must also increasingly be addressed through such multi-stakeholder partnerships (Roehrich, Lewis & George, 2014). This is because PPPs provide an opportunity to transform governments from being exclusively passive providers of public services to active participants in the planning and implementation of the delivery process (Siemiatycki, 2015b).

In an era of fiscal austerity, collaborative responses to addressing pressing social issues is becoming more commonplace, leading organizations to use such partnerships to more effectively address issues that sit within the “inter-organizational domain” (Trist, 1983; Vangen, 2017b; Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Hardy & Phillips, 1998). In this context, there has been an increasing trend towards leveraging PPPs to finance and deliver essential urban social service facilities, particularly in relation to addressing pressing social problems such as healthcare or affordable housing provision (Vangen, 2017b; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b; Hardy and Phillips, 1998). It is therefore essential to recognize that this rise of PPPs is undoubtedly one of the most important
In the types of partnerships, the importance of engaging relevant community groups and initiatives is often emphasized thus making inter-organizational relationships distinctly more complex to manage than in traditional infrastructure projects (Hodge & Greve, 2017; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b; Huxham & Macdonald, 1992).

Despite the need to better understand multi-sector partnerships in this context, PPPs for capital projects have commonly been the focus of the vast majority of academic research in this field, while PPPs for social and human services have been distinctly under-researched by comparison (Xu & Morgan, 2012; Grimsey and Lewis, 2007). Moreover, there are only a very limited number of studies that have endeavored to research both types of PPPs in unison (for an earlier overview see Rosneau, 2000). This is particularly important to note since studies have found that transplanting successful capital program PPP models to human and social services projects does not always produce the desired results (Xu & Morgan, 2012).

### 2.3.2 The Role of Different Actors: Involving the Third Sector in Public-Private Partnerships

Given that PPPs for complex social service problems are increasingly being considered by governments, many academics have concluded that such partnerships must involve increasing cooperation between public, private, and voluntary sector organizations for the benefit of the public at large (Mendel & Brudney, 2012; Szymankiewicz, 2013; Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Hudson et al., 1999). For example, modern government directives regarding partnerships often emphasize the need for participation from the community, business organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), amongst other actors (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Vangen, 2017b; Andrews & Entwistle, 2010). By engaging community and non-profit organizations, this new type of PPP model is distinct from traditional PPPs which primarily involve arrangements between solely the public and private sectors (Rees, 2014). For the purposes of this research, these voluntary, non-profit, and community sector stakeholders will be collectively referred to as the “third sector”, in direct contrast to the more commonly referenced public and private sectors.
As Trist (1983) asserts, significant social issues are inherently situated within the inter-organizational domain making it crucial that organizations act collaboratively in addressing these issues (for a more recent interpretation of the inter-organizational domain, see Vangen, 2017b; Huxham, 2000). Specifically, Trist (1983: 269) claims that “complex societies in fast-changing environments give rise to sets or systems of problems (meta-problems) rather than discrete problems … [that] are beyond the capacity of single organizations to meet.” In some cases, particularly involving the public or voluntary sectors, authors have also argued that it may be possible to define and achieve “meta-objectives” that do not represent any one particular organization in the partnership, but rather represent societal objectives more broadly (Hrelja, Pettersson & Westerdahl, 2016; Huxham & Macdonald, 1992).

Given the immense complexity of the social, environmental and economic problems facing local communities, non-profit organizations have also begun to increasingly enter into these types of multi-sector partnerships with public authorities (Cornforth et al., 2015; Szymankiewicz, 2013; Andrews & Entwistle, 2010). This context is further complicated by the fact that there is now a distinct blurring of the boundaries between sectors, as well as a broader permeability of organizational boundaries; for example, it is no longer simple to distinguish between public and community organizations, as in many cases they may share overlapping mandates or memberships (Mendel & Brudney, 2012; Vangen, 2017b; Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Wettenhall, 2003). Third sector partnerships thus allow for more explicit increased community engagement as community members may be included directly as partners in the partnership and indirectly as they are involved in outreach activities managed by partners (Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). Although there has been some research that examines direct public-private, private-nonprofit, and public-nonprofit connections independently in this context (for example see Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Wettenhall, 2003), there is a distinct lack of research examining public-private-nonprofit outcomes holistically, as will be the focus of this thesis.

The increasing involvement of the third sector is also important since it implies an increasing shift in governing power away from exclusively elected public bodies to a balance of power shared between many different stakeholders (Huxham, 2000; Vangen & Huxham, 2013). Literature in this area tends to focus predominantly on either supporting or challenging the rhetoric of this type of collaborative governance, rather than focusing on the skills needed to effectively manage collaborative partnerships in this context (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Mendel &
Brudney, 2012). This is important because as this plural model of public service delivery involving social service, voluntary and non-profit organizations is developed further, it will be essential that governments are able to effectively implement the PPP model and achieve collaborative outcomes for such projects (Szymankiewicz, 2013; Andrews & Entwistle, 2010).

Although these types of arrangements have proven increasingly essential, research into third sector collaborations in PPPs is significantly more limited (Cornforth et al., 2015; Stone & Sandfort, 2009; Szymankiewicz, 2013). As Mendel and Brudney (2012) describe, the majority of existing PPP research views PPPs as predominantly a government-business endeavor. As a result, most research on partnerships involving public and community organizations tends to focus on assessing the relevance and value of governmental policies and initiatives or on evaluating the different types of relationships, structures and processes that partnerships involve (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Huxham, 2003; Klijn, 2002; Vigoda, 2002). Osborne and Murray’s (2000) research on third sector partnerships represents one such exception, as they study empirical case studies intended to analyze the role that voluntary and non-profit organizations (VNPOs) play in PPPs; it is further research of this type that is needed. This limited scope of third sector PPP research is problematic since it is this body of research that may provide increasing agency to non-profit organizations and community groups to advocate for their own goals and needs when partnering with more powerful public and private authorities (Cornforth et al., 2015; Szymankiewicz, 2013).

2.3.3 Research on Innovative Public-Private Partnerships

In this policy context characterized by increasing third sector involvement, a number of innovative and unique PPPs have emerged. Over time, scholars have demonstrated increasing interest in the practices and outcomes of applying the PPP approach in an attempt to develop mixed-use urban spaces (Sagalyn, 2007; Fainstein, 2010; Harvey, 1989; Grant, 2002), however the body of literature examining the planning implications of such innovative mixed-use PPP approaches is limited (Rowley, 1996). As Siemiatycki (2015a; 2015b) explains, most mixed-use urban projects to date focus on mixing uses at the neighbourhood level while individual buildings remain entirely private or public; as discussed here, the rise of innovative PPPs in urban development represents a gradual shift to attempt to better integrate public and private land uses
This distinction is important because in the Canadian context the emergence of such new forms of innovative PPPs has most commonly taken the form of unique mixed-use buildings that seek to combine uses of public and private space (Siemiatycki, 2015a; Roberts & Siemiatycki, 2015). The increasing trend towards these types of arrangements reflects what Wettenhall (2003, 2005) sees as the disappearing binary between the public and private sectors in many types of public use projects. Given this understanding, Siemiatycki (2015a; 2015b) examines examples of how public value may be delivered through these types of innovative partnership arrangements that combine private residential or commercial space with large-scale public use amenities. Examples of this approach include the integration of market housing, grocery stores or corporate offices with large-scale public schools, recreation centers, museums, sports stadiums or cultural facilities (Siemiatycki, 2015b; Roberts & Siemiatycki, 2015). Initial results from these case studies appear largely positive, however there is an evident need for more research in this area.

For the purposes of this thesis, such innovative partnerships will therefore refer to those that move beyond our traditional understanding of PPP arrangements as addressing solely civil and infrastructural project needs. Instead, this thesis conceptualizes PPPs more broadly as a policy tool to address increasingly complex social service problems by engaging stakeholders from a broader range of relevant community organizations. This research seeks to explore another such innovative social service PPP arrangement – the incorporation of an emergency homeless shelter within a market condominium building in the City of Toronto – as will be discussed throughout the remainder of this thesis.

2.4 Collaborative Advantage and Public-Private Partnerships

2.4.1 Collaborative Advantage as a Measure of Partnership Success

Although public and private sector actors are increasingly turning to PPPs as a potential solution in planning and delivering public services, it is important to reiterate that these types of inter-organizational endeavours place significant demands on those involved and that the probability of failure is often high (Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2013; Huxham and Vangen, 2000c). A variety of literature has consequently emerged assessing the many ways that multi-sector partnerships may generate concrete value for stakeholders (for an overview of different holistic
measures of partnership success, see Grossman, 2012). One of the most common ways that scholars increasingly conceptualize the achievement of such value is through the attainment of collaborative advantage and surplus value (Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2005).

In addition to being a potential measure of partnership success, collaborative advantage is also more commonly a significant rationale behind why actors choose to enter into multi-sector partnerships in the first place (Vangen & Huxham, 2012, 2013). This is important because Trist’s (1983) concept of inter-organizational domain asserts that a “meta-problem” – that is, a problem that no one organization could handle alone – must exist before collaborative advantage becomes relevant. Therefore, in order for successful collaborative advantage to be a possibility, it is necessary that the PPP model is being used exclusively in cases where organizational objectives can be better approached through a collaborative partnership than they otherwise would be by individual actors working alone (Vangen & Huxham, 2010; Huxham, 1993).

Given this reality, studies of collaborative advantage and partnerships have tended to vary significantly in specificity and scope (Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2010). While some studies are more general and take a broad approach to collaborative management (Kanter, 1994), a more significant portion of studies focus more directly on fostering successful collaborative outcomes in PPP projects (Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2010; Gray, 1985). As a result, researchers have predominantly focused on understanding and improving partnerships as a means of improving the outcomes that such partnerships achieve (Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001); this ultimately suggests that fostering the achievement of collaborative advantage is a significant, yet often implicit, goal in the study of PPPs.

### 2.4.2 Defining Collaborative Advantage

Given that collaborative advantage is a commonly cited measure of PPP success as demonstrated above, it is important to understand what collaborative advantage entails in practice. Table 3 compiles many commonly cited definitions of collaboration and collaborative advantage in the academic literature on inter-organizational partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can explore constructively their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible</td>
<td>Gray (1989)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerned with developing synergy between organizations towards the achievement of common goals; … the term, collaborative advantage, is, of course, deliberately intended to contrast with the more familiar ‘competitive advantage’ … achieving collaborative advantage thus means meeting an objective which no individual organization could have met alone and achieving the objectives of each collaborating organization better than it could alone.

A process that enables independent individuals and organizations to combine their human and material resources so they can accomplish objectives they are unable to bring about alone.

The synergistic and otherwise unreachable outcomes available through cooperation.

A form of competitive advantage which stems not from natural or historical endowment but simply from the various elements of the local economic system working together more effectively than their counterparts in competitor cities.

Table 3: Commonly Cited Definitions of Collaboration and Collaborative Advantage
(Source: Author; compiled based on multiple sources cited within)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative advantage reflects the idea that advantage can be gained when members of different organizations work together to achieve something that could not have been achieved without such a collaboration (O’Leary, 2016; Huxham &amp; Vangen, 2004; Huxham &amp; Vangen, 2000c; Huxham &amp; Macdonald, 1992). For the purposes of this research, Huxham (1993: 603) summarizes these ideas well: “Collaborative advantage is concerned with the creation of synergy between collaborating organizations; it will be achieved when something unusually creative is produced – perhaps an objective is met – that no one organization could have produced on its own and when each organization, through the collaboration, is able to achieve its own objectives better than it could alone.”</td>
<td>Huxham and Macdonald (1992: 50-51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One important distinction lies in the contrasting of “collaborative advantage” with the more commonly cited notion of “competitive advantage”. Scholars generally agree that the pursuit of collaborative advantage does not necessarily need to involve a competitive element – that is, the advantage does not necessarily have to be over another organization (Szymankiewicz, 2013; Huxham &amp; Macdonald, 1992). Illustrative of this point is the fact that collaborative advantage is</td>
<td>Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001: 183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A form of competitive advantage which stems not from natural or historical endowment but simply from the various elements of the local economic system working together more effectively than their counterparts in competitor cities.</td>
<td>Hibbert and Huxham (2005: 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3: Commonly Cited Definitions of Collaboration and Collaborative Advantage (Source: Author; compiled based on multiple sources cited within)</td>
<td>Macdonald (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also often referred to as “surplus value” due to its fundamental reliance on the achievement and creation of new value (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Vangen & Huxham, 2013).

Ultimately, given these diverse understandings it is important to note that the notion of collaborative advantage appears to imply a level of intrinsic meaning, suggesting that collaborative advantage may look somewhat different for each individual and organization that uses of it (Huxham & Macdonald, 1992); this distinction is important when beginning to analyze how collaborative advantage is pursued in practice.

### 2.4.3 Distinguishing Between Collaborative and Exchange Partnerships

Based on case study research, scholars distinguish between two distinct types of inter-organizational partnerships that tend to occur in practice: collaborative partnerships and exchange partnerships (Weihe, 2008; Kanter, 1994). A chart comparing major characteristics associated with these two models can be found in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The collaborative partnership</th>
<th>The exchange partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Distrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity, tit-for-tat strategies</td>
<td>One-sidedness, non-mutual approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentiveness/empathy for partner</td>
<td>Incomprehension, minimal attentiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive and proactive attitude/mindset</td>
<td>Unenthusiastic and reactive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close relationships</td>
<td>Distanced relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared purpose/joint goals</td>
<td>Split purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High intensity/connection</td>
<td>Low intensity/connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Key Features of Co-operation Distinguishing Collaborative and Exchange Partnerships (Source: Weihe, 2008)*

Drawing on the above characterizations, Klijn and Teisman (2005) describe this distinction in terms of the difference between striving for the achievement of standard cost savings, which is typically associated with exchange partnerships, and striving for the achievement of real synergy, which is typically associated with collaborative partnerships. Founded in exchange theory, exchange relationships were historically the more dominant model for inter-organizational partnerships given their focus on emphasizing goal attainment as the foundation for inter-organizational interactions (Hall et al., 1977; Mouraviev & Kakabadse, 2016). In this understanding, cost savings involve both the public and private sectors continuing to operate more
or less separately while only coordinating necessary operations; no true surplus value is realized in this case (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Weihe, 2008).

Conversely, if significant surplus value is achieved, this is referred to as synergy (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Vangen & Huxham, 2013). Research has shown that in practice collaborative partnerships are more likely to achieve real synergy – and accordingly higher levels of material value – than simple exchange partnerships (Weihe, 2008; Kanter, 1994). As Klijn and Teisman (2005) demonstrate, there is significant potential for innovative products to be created within the public service provision sphere making collaborative partnerships a real possibility in many instances. It is important to note, however, that just because a case is not a pure collaborative partnership does not necessarily mean that no real synergy is achieved; instead, it suggests that the highest scale of real synergy is not realized and that there is opportunity for the partnership to develop further and to deliver additional value (Weihe, 2008; Kanter, 1994).

Although Weihe’s (2008) primary conceptualization presented above (Table 4) implicitly depicts these collaborative and exchange partnerships as a strict dichotomy, it is important to acknowledge that in reality, many partnership cases appear to lie on a spectrum between the two extremes. Klijn and Teisman (2005) acknowledge this reality, noting that an alternative conceptualization can be modeled by showing increasing levels of surplus value, with the lowest being cost savings, followed by substantive improvement, and finally the realization of truly innovative products and services. Given that one of the main aims of PPPs is to achieve an advantage by delivering extra material value that could not have been achieved without collaboration (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2000c), partnerships in the context of this research will focus strictly on those that seek to generate surplus value and synergy.

2.4.4 Defining Synergy as a Pathway for Successful Partnerships

The term synergy has broadly been used thus far to refer to beneficial collaborative outcomes where surplus value is achieved; however, within the theoretical framework of collaborative advantage it is important to understand specifically what synergy entails. Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001: 183) define synergy as “the power to combine the perspectives, resources, and skills of a group of people and organizations” such that synergy is the intermediary that explains the pathway through which the functioning of a partnership may serve to influence the
success of the partnership long-term. This relationship between synergy and partnership success is depicted in Figure 3.

![Diagram of Partnership Functioning, Synergy, and Outcomes](image)

**Figure 3: Synergy as the Unique Connection between Partnership Functioning and Partnership Outcomes**  
(Source: Author; adapted from Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001)

Fundamentally, collaborative advantage requires the creation of synergy (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Vangen & Huxham, 2012; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). Synergy in this context is seen to be more than a simple exchanging of resources; it is the combining of individual perspectives, resources and skills from partner organizations and individuals to create something that is greater than the sum of its individual parts (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Taylor-Powell, Rossing & Geran, 1998; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). Successful PPPs can thus be seen as the creation of extra value as a result of the cooperation of partners from multiple sectors each bringing their own unique set of skills to the partnership (O’Leary, 2016; Klijn & Teisman, 2000). This is the unique notion of the “synergy effect” – the idea that partners can create extra value that could not have been achieved without the partnership (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010; Klijn & Teisman, 2000).

Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001) argue that this synergy manifests itself in the thinking and actions of the partners and in the ways that the partnership interacts with the community more broadly. Synergy can only truly be achieved if partners are willing and able to cope with the open and unspecified nature that a partnership inherently involves (Vangen, 2017b; Klijn & Teisman, 2000). Vangen and Winchester (2014), Weihe (2008) and Kanter (1994) further argue that the extent to which real synergy is achieved depends on various behavioural and operational aspects of the collaboration between partners. In this view, Weihe (2008: 153) claims that “partnerships that demonstrate certain behavioural characteristics are more likely to produce synergistic results than partnerships that do not show such characteristics.” For example, achieving synergy inherently requires trust between partners, which can be generated and secured through governance.
strategies, as will be discussed in further detail later in this chapter (Klijn & Teisman, 2000; Weihe, 2008; Contractor & Lorange, 2002).

The ability to achieve synergy often also relies on the diversity of the members involved in a partnership, since it is their differences that are assumed to form the basis of the synergy (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015). It is important to note that, if not actively managed, this diversity is more likely to produce a negative effect than to lead to the desired collaborative advantage (Vangen & Winchester, 2014). When considering the challenge that partnership diversity may entail, Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001: 186) explain that:

“To create synergy […], partnerships need a process that makes good use of different perspectives, resources, and skills so the group, as a whole, can develop better ways of thinking about problems and addressing them. This is one of the greatest challenges of collaboration, because diversity can lead to tension and conflict, [while] also plac[ing] great demands on the leadership, coordination, and management skills of a partnership.”

The collaborative process is notoriously conflict ridden, as previously described, meaning that the intended synergy may be difficult to achieve in practice (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006, 2015; O’Leary & Bingham 2009; Vangen & Huxham, 2012; Huxham & Vangen 2004). This can be difficult to determine though as no single widely accepted measure of synergy exists (Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). Given the lack of comprehensive measurement standard, “evaluations tend to focus on individual components of collaborative effort [producing] fragmented or episodic evaluations [that] may miss the effects of the interactions among people, perspectives and programs that denote the true value of collaboration” (Taylor-Powell, Rossing & Geran, 1998: 10). Consequently, further research aimed at generating robust measures of synergy is warranted.

2.4.5 Forces Acting Against Collaborative Advantage: The Existence of Collaborative Inertia

If the achievement of collaborative advantage and true synergy is the ideal goal for collaborative partnerships, why is it that this is so rarely the realized outcome? The following section seeks to explore this question, given the substantial body of literature that has emerged examining why this paradox exists (Vangen, 2017b; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Beech & Huxham, 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a).

In practice, there is a fundamental and practical tension between aiming for collaborative advantage and the challenges in achieving it successfully – these challenges are often referred to
as collaborative inertia (Vangen & Huxham, 2013). Collaborative inertia reflects the reality that collaborative advantage can be difficult to achieve and that even successful outputs may come slowly and appear painful to achieve (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Beech & Huxham, 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2004, 2000c). Moreover, even when partnerships are successful, practitioners often suggest that any positive outcomes happen in spite of the partnership rather than because of it (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2000c). Table 5 outlines commonly cited factors that lead to collaborative inertia and prevent the successful achievement of collaborative advantage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative inertia may result due to difficulties in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• negotiating joint purpose because of the diversity of organizational and individual aims which those involved bring to the collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• communicating because of differences in professional (and sometimes natural) languages and organizational (and sometimes ethnic) cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing joint modes of operating given that the partner organizations inevitably operate quite different internal procedures from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• managing the perceived power imbalance between partners and the associated problem of building trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• managing the accountability of the collaborative venture to each of the partner organizations and to other constituencies while maintaining a sufficient degree of autonomy to allow the collaborative work to proceed; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• handling the sheer logistics of working with others who are based in physically remote locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Factors Leading to Collaborative Inertia**  
(Source: Huxham & Vangen, 2000a)

Numerous researchers have supported these findings, drawing out detailed understandings of how the above factors play a role (for more on these factors see Huxham & Vangen, 2000a; Eden & Huxham, 2001; Huxham, 1993). Although not all of these factors are at play in all cases, they often act in some combination to prevent the achievement of collaborative advantage in cases where it is absent (Hibbert & Huxham, 2005; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013). These tensions accordingly underline key challenges in the practice of pursuing collaborative advantage and will be discussed in further detail throughout the remainder of this thesis.
2.5 Establishing a Theory of Collaborative Advantage

Given these above understandings of collaborative advantage and collaborative inertia, Huxham and Vangen have conceptualized a broader body of work on the theory of collaborative advantage that has shaped much of the theoretical debate in the field of inter-organizational partnerships and their perceived collaborative value (for an overview of key works summarizing this theory see Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Huxham & Vangen 2000a, 2005; Hibbert & Huxham, 2005; Huxham, 1993). Other authors who study collaborative advantage and PPPs have primarily built upon this foundational research (as an example, for research linking the theory of collaborative advantage to organization game theory see Osborne & Murray, 2000), making it generally accepted as the most comprehensively available framework for studying the collaborative outcomes of PPPs.

The theory of collaborative advantage is a practice-oriented theoretical perspective built upon two contrasting, yet central, concepts: collaborative advantage and collaborative inertia (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013). Collaborative advantage is concerned primarily with opportunities to achieve synergy amongst partners, while collaborative inertia is concerned with the often disappointing outcomes that partnerships experience in practice (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Huxham, 2003). This theory has been shaped emergently through a significant body of action research compiled over time (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Huxham, 2003). The research has centered primarily on analyzing social issues related to community planning, the environment, economic development, unemployment, special education, community care, criminal justice, health promotion and health service provision, and poverty alleviation (Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Huxham, 2003). In this respect, it varies significantly from collaboration research conducted in exclusively private sector settings, thus making the theory particularly applicable in cases involving innovative multi-sector partnerships, as will be discussed in this thesis.

The theory of collaborative advantage conceptualizes leadership in the formation and implementation of partnership agendas in terms of three key interlinked components: (1) the partnership structure, (2) the partnership process, and (3) partnership participants (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). These three components will be discussed in the following sections.
2.5.1 Partnership Structure and Collaborative Advantage

In the context of this research, partnership structure will be built on Vangen, Hayes and Cornforth’s (2015: 1246) understanding that “the structure is the totality of partners (individuals, organizations and other collaborations) involved in the collaboration and the formal interconnections between them for the purpose of the collaboration.” Given this understanding, structural issues tend to be most important in the way that they influence how collaborative agendas are formed and implemented (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham, 2000), and in how they affect the ways that participants act in a partnership setting (Huxham & Vangen, 2000b).

Collaboration memberships can be seen to be inherently ambiguous, complex and dynamic (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a). This is, in part, due to the fact that the goals of PPPs are often ambitious, meaning that the necessary organizational structure and management effort must also match (Klijn & Teisman, 2005). This is further complicated by the fact that achieving true surplus value inherently requires a more sophisticated organizational form (Klijn & Teisman, 2005), which is primarily due to the need to deal with environmental factors and other external influences while simultaneously attempting to balance what may be mutually incompatible considerations amongst partners (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a; Huxham, 2000). Moreover, because of the dependence on external funding and policy imperatives, public sector and not-for-profit organizations are more likely to evolve over time, making partnerships involving these groups more susceptible to many of these ambiguous, complex and dynamic forces (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a).

Designing the membership structure of a partnership itself is also an inherently complex task, as decision-makers must ensure they achieve the right mix of individuals and organizations while also ensuring that competing interests are adequately represented (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a). One important step involves distinguishing between internal and external stakeholders (Huxham & Vangen, 2000a). The literature advocates including organizational representatives from all affected communities and groups; although on the surface this appears relatively straightforward, in practice that is not always the case (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015). Moreover, scholars imply that an ill-defined or constantly changing membership is often one of the biggest challenges that collaborative partnerships face (Huxham, 2000; Huxham & Vangen, 2000a).
The structural complexity of partnerships is also further complicated by the governance structures of the partnership itself (Xu & Morgan, 2012; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham, 2000). Working groups and subcommittees are common examples of how these varying governance structures play out (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Huxham, 2000). If members are unclear as to the structure of the partnership itself, they are likely to be uncertain as to where individual accountabilities lie (Huxham & Vangen, 2000a). Research has found that effective shared governance can best be realized through joint decision-making and consultative processes in the strategic planning and program management stages (Xu & Morgan, 2012; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015). Since many parties and stakeholders may be involved in a PPP arrangement, an effective decision-making process is dependent on some level of coordination amongst different stakeholder perceptions and strategies (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Klijn & Teisman, 2005). Studies have repeatedly shown that in the case of third sector partnerships, shared governance is often best achieved through having government or private sector individuals serve on the board of directors of the relevant nonprofit or community organizations they partner with (Xu & Morgan, 2012).

To further complicate these structural concerns, many of these issues amplify as the size and scope of the partnership increase; for example, Osborne and Murray (2000) note that the complexity of a partnership arrangement can be argued to increase geometrically, not arithmetically, as additional partners are included. Partnerships involving more than two main partners are thus inherently more complex as more stakeholders and interests must be taken into consideration (Hibbert & Huxham, 2005).

2.5.2 Partnership Process and Collaborative Advantage

In addition to these structural factors that may inhibit collaborative advantage from being achieved, there are also a number of process-oriented factors that may also inhibit a partnership’s success (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000c). In fact, some authors suggest that differences in process often play a more significant role in achievement of collaborative advantage than differences in structure or form (Hibbert et al., 2008).

In the context of this research, partnership processes will be narrowly defined according to Vangen, Hayes and Cornforth’s (2015: 1246) understanding that they “include ways of communication, sharing responsibility and taking decisions via instruments such as plans,
committees and workshops.” Processes are most important because they determine how members communicate, how often they communicate, and how easy it is for them to do so (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). Furthermore, these types of processes may give certain participants more power whilst stripping power from others, making them a critical equity component in the study of collaborative advantage and PPPs (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b).

Academics have long hypothesized that dissatisfaction with the outcomes of collaborative relationships stems from a tendency to focus on studying the performance and outcomes of collaboration without giving equal consideration to the process (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013). This is problematic since, in reality, the outcome and the process are inseparable (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Madhok, 1995). Moreover, this ignores the opportunity for process itself to add potential value to the partnership (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Madhok, 1995).

As Osborne and Murray (2000) note, it is important to manage the competitive tensions associated with PPPs as opposed to ignoring them. Managing these tensions is complicated though by the fact that seamlessness in the partnership process is often difficult to achieve due to the inherent complexity and diversity of partnerships (Vangen & Winchester, 2014; Huxham, 2000). As many scholars have noted, in order to achieve collaborative advantage, practitioners must be equally committed to continually nurturing the collaborative processes in the pursuit of building trust amongst partners (Vangen & Huxham, 2003) and to establishing a well-planned process management approach (Roberts & Siemiatycki, 2015).

**2.5.3 Partnership Participants and Collaborative Advantage**

In the context of this research, partnership participants are broadly considered to include “anyone with enough power and know-how to influence and enact the collaboration’s agenda” by taking on a leading role (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015: 1246). In this respect, Huxham and Vangen (2000b) and Vangen, Hayes and Cornforth (2015) conceptualize the role of participants almost exclusively in terms of the leadership activities they may undertake to move a collaborative agenda forward. This focus on leadership is important because as Xu and Morgan (2012: 283) describe, “it is conceivable that the collaborative leader must exhibit behaviours that are substantially different than practices in a hierarchical setting.”
The assumption in much of the existing research is often that leadership activities involve a formal leader responsible for guiding an organization and its followers to achieve specific goals (Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). This is problematic in a collaborative partnership for two main reasons. First, the leader-follower dynamic may be difficult to apply in situations where partnership participants come from multiple different organizations and do not always have direct lines of reporting to each other (Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). Second, the notion of working towards pre-specified goals can be problematic as the process of goal-setting in partnership settings is often complex, iterative and ongoing (Mendel & Brudney, 2012; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). As a result, academics have argued that new types of leadership paradigms are needed to complement these types of partnership arrangements (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015); in particular, a strong emphasis has been placed on the need for shared leadership and shared responsibilities amongst a diverse range of participants (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2006, 2015; Murrell, 1997; Chrislip & Larson, 1994).

Research by Hibbert et al. (2008) builds on this understanding of the role of participants by exploring the ways in which “successful” inter-organizational collaborations employ similar characterizations of significant actors within the partnership. A significant body of literature examines these types of characteristics more broadly within the generic organizational context, however there is a more limited body of work examining the role that such characterizations play in a collaborative context, and even more so specifically in relation to PPPs (Hibbert et al., 2008).

In reality, participants in PPPs in the collaborative advantage context are often characterized according to commonly ascribed traits of successful leaders. For example, Huxham (2000) describes single-mindedness and perseverance as two of the most important leadership characteristics that contribute to successful partnerships. It is further argued that those who take leadership roles in collaborative endeavours need to be actively reflective practitioners who recognize the need to actively manage the dynamics of the collaborative endeavour (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Argyris & Schon, 1974). Although all actors are likely to play a leadership role to some extent, it is crucial to note that many of those involved will not possess the characteristics required to successfully see the partnership through (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Huxham, 2000). Identifying and empowering those who are likely to be key collaborators, either explicitly or implicitly, is believed to be a common first step to success (Huxham, 2000).
The notion of identity formation in relation to participant actions within partnerships has also received some attention by academics in recent years (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Beech & Huxham, 2003). Beech and Huxham (2003) find that actions, whether conscious or subconscious, are, at least in part, determined by the identities that participants assign to themselves and others. They further suggest that issues of identity formation are particularly important in collaboration studies since they have direct ties to issues of trust, leadership, power, and communications – all of which play crucial roles in the achievement of collaborative advantage (Beech & Huxham, 2003). Moreover, such identities are often formed for participants based on deep-rooted predispositions about what their identity is and about what the identity and role of others should be (Hibbert & Huxham, 2005).

Ultimately, in Huxham and Vangen’s (2000b) conceptualization, partnership structure, process and participants are seen to be three distinct, yet interlinked media through which collaborative partnership agendas may be formed. Given this understanding, it is important to note that both structures and processes may often be determined, at least partially, by external sources, thus making them difficult for participants to wholly control (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). It is therefore the common contention that such agendas are formed in reality based on a variety of leadership activities carried out by participants, given the leadership opportunities and constraints that such media present (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). Examples of such leadership activities will be discussed in further detail in the following section.

2.6 Leadership Activities to Address Collaborative Partnership Challenges

Although some examples of successfully innovative PPPs do exist, it is more common that individuals involved in such inter-organizational partnerships describe progress as inhibitively slow or negligible due to the existence of collaborative inertia (Vangen & Huxham, 2013). As previously described, collaborative inertia most commonly arises due to difficulties associated with partnership structure or process. In other words, these forces – partnership structure, process and participants – offer a collection of constraints and possibilities that members of the partnership must navigate in their attempt to achieve successful collaboration (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b). In an attempt to minimize the forces that work to prevent the achievement of collaborative advantage in inter-organizational
partnerships, scholars have historically commonly advocated for practitioners to focus their leadership efforts on three main areas: (1) managing aims, (2) managing language and culture, and (3) managing trust and power (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2005). More recent scholarly research has sought to build upon these areas by exploring other key sub-themes related to collaborative advantage in more depth (examples of current themes of collaborative advantage research focus include: the paradox lens – see Vangen, 2017b; cultural diversity – see Vangen & Winchester, 2014; communication and the culture paradox – see Vangen, 2017a; and cross-sector governance – see Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015). Although these additional sub-themes offer a potentially more nuanced understanding of multi-sector partnership outcomes, for the purposes of scope within this research project, the remainder of this chapter will focus on providing an overview of the three core traditional themes as they are relevant to an understanding of the collaborative advantage framework.

2.6.1 Managing Aims

The first leadership approach, managing aims, deals with reconciling the varying goals and objectives of different collaborators. As Vangen (2017b) describes, collaborative advantage often involves partners bringing distinctly different resources to the partnership; in reality, this is typically also reflective of distinctly different organizational purposes (Eden & Huxham, 2001; Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2000c). This is important since it means that although partners may agree on a broad objective for a partnership, they necessarily have different reasons for being involved (Huxham & Vangen, 2005; Szymankiewicz, 2013). Klijn and Teisman (2005) and Vangen and Huxham (2010, 2013) therefore argue that one precondition of partnership success is the ability for partner goals to be linked, at least to some extent, and that rules should consequently be laid out to guide partner interactions.

There is significant debate on to what extent it is sensible for actors to fully disclose their organizational goals; on the one hand, disclosing such information may foster openness and trust while also helping to secure partnership goals, while on the other it may unearth irreconcilable differences between organizations that cannot be overcome (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013). In the case of the latter, it can be pragmatic for partners to find a way to move the partnership forward without explicit initial agreement on where the partnership is going, as long as there is enough of a sense of direction; scholars argue that this may evolve into
a clearer sense of purpose over time (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013).

An adaptation of Vangen and Huxham’s (2013) and Huxham and Vangen’s (2004) framework for understanding varying layers of aims within the partnership context is shown in Figure 4. This framework helps to identify the extent to which individual and organizational goals exist at multiple levels – explicit, assumed and hidden – such that stakeholders may not always be aware of the true intentions of other partners at all times (Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2004). Based on this understanding, Osborne and Murray (2000) and Vangen (2017b) advocate for being explicit and upfront about organizational and personal goals in the partnership setting. This provides ample opportunity to identify critical goal congruence between partners while also highlighting areas where goal differences exist, thus allowing partners to reasonably come to terms with these differences, if possible (Vangen, 2017b; Osborne & Murray, 2000).

Figure 4: A Framework for Understanding Aims in Collaborative Partnerships
(Source: Author; adapted from Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2004)

Research suggests that a “goals paradox” exists, where both congruence and diversity in partnership goals play a part in achieving successful collaboration (Vangen & Huxham, 2012, 2013; Vangen, 2017b). On the one hand, congruence ensures that partners’ goals are clearly aligned ensuring adequate commitment to the project (O’Leary and Bingham 2009; Ansell & Gash, 2008; Provan & Kenis, 2008; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2012, 2013), while on the other hand diversity is perceived as critical in providing the necessary resources to achieve truly
synergistic results (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2012, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; Lasker, Weiss & Miller, 2001). More importantly, too much congruence or too much diversity can also be detrimental to the collaborative process (Vangen & Winchester, 2014); for example, excessive homogeneity may lead organizations to be reluctant to share private information (Provan & Kenis, 2008; Vangen & Huxham, 2012, 2013), while excessive heterogeneity may lead organizations to pursue irreconcilably different outcomes (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Vangen & Huxham, 2012, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2005).

### 2.6.2 Managing Language and Culture

The second leadership approach, managing language and culture, deals with the ways in which varying organizational and individual lexicons and cultures may inhibit effective communication between partners. Vangen (2017a) identifies three multifaceted and interrelated components of culture as it is relevant to multi-sector partnerships: national culture, professional culture, and organizational culture. Given the local nature of the partnership under examination combined with its relatively limited domestic scope and membership structure, the focus of this research will be on the implications of professional and organizational cultures, which are concerned with the expertise that individuals bring and the characteristics and attributes of partner organizations respectively (Vangen, 2017a). This understanding of culture is most readily exemplified through the lens developed by Vangen and Winchester (2014: 687), whereby culture refers broadly to “partners’ ‘habitual ways of being and acting’ that stem from the distinct professional, organizational and national cultures to which they belong.” This distinction is important because it speaks to the significant cultural diversity that exists between public, private and third sector organizations.

There are inherent differences in the cultural norms and values of private sector businesses compared with those of public service and not-for-profit organizations (Vangen & Winchester, 2014; Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Huxham & Vangen, 2000c). As Huxham and Vangen (2000: 297) summarize, “significant misunderstandings can happen between business organizations, between public organizations and between not-for-profit organizations because of the different professional languages and associated values that they work with.” For example, some of these key differences in procedural public values – including the potential loss of public values such as accountability, transparency, and fairness – were previously identified as one potential drawback.
to increasing private sector involvement in public sector projects (Wu et al., 2016; Landow & Ebdon, 2012; Forrer et al., 2010; Reynaers & Grimmelikhuijsen, 2015).

On the one hand, while cultural diversity via multi-sector representation can be a source of stimulation, creativity and reward by leveraging a variety of organizational expertise and resources, it can also lead to challenging conflicts of values, behaviours, practices and beliefs (Vangen, 2017a; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Vangen & Winchester, 2014). For example, formal procedures – often associated with public sector bureaucracies – can inhibit partners from reaching timely agreements and may serve to make the partnership process unnecessarily tedious (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen, 2017a; Huxham & Vangen, 2000c). Ineffectively managing the tension between public, private and third sector cultures can inhibit the realization of collaborative advantage outcomes by further contributing to collaborative inertia; researchers commonly refer to this tension between the simultaneous need for both cultural similarity and cultural diversity as the “culture paradox” (Vangen, 2017a; Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Vangen & Winchester, 2014). Managing this paradox is key on the journey to successfully achieving collaborative advantage (Vangen, 2017a; Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Vangen & Winchester, 2014).

2.6.3 Managing Trust and Power

The final leadership approach, managing trust and power, deals with the relationships and power imbalances between partnership stakeholders. Collaborative advantage theory commonly “conceptualizes the process of trust-building in collaborations as involving the management of risk and the careful nurturing of relationships” (Beech & Huxham, 2003: 30). Beyond this literature, trust has also repeatedly been emphasized across academic disciplines by scholars from fields as broad and diverse as psychology, sociology, economics and organizational sciences, thus serving to further reiterate its importance (for an overview of the diverse academic coverage of trust as it relates specifically to public-private partnerships see Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2010; Grossman, 2012).

Trust is often described as one of the most essential components to building a successful partnership and as one of the most important prerequisites for successful collaboration, particularly since PPPs often require the exchange of information and ideas with others (Grossman, 2012; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Beech & Huxham, 2003; Huxham & Vangen, 2000c; Klijn & Teisman, 2000). Theories on trust are commonly built on a
fundamental understanding of interdependence between the actor who must hold trust and the actor they must hold trust in (Hrelja, Pettersson & Westerdahl, 2016; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2013). In this manner, Vangen and Huxham (2003: 10) conceptualize trust to be “best understood in terms of the ability to form expectations about aims and partners’ future behaviours in relation to those aims.” In this respect, the process of managing trust and power has clear links to the process of managing partnership aims, reinforcing the extent to which these approaches are interrelated.

The notion of trust-building requires a particular balance between forming expectations and being able to live up to them (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013; Hardy, Phillips & Lawrence, 1998). Expanding of this understanding, authors note that the creation of trust is either rooted in anticipation of future outcomes or based on satisfactory past experiences (Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2010). In these examples, partners often strive to build trust over time, aiming to achieve larger successes as the partnership grows (Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Huxham, 2000). The ongoing management of trust, and the gradual establishment of a foundation for trust to build upon, are both parts of effective process management aimed at securing collaborative advantage (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Grossman, 2012). Truly collaborative relationships take a significant amount of time to set in as trust builds over time – Huxham (2000) suggests that this period of trust-building may even be as long as two years. Therefore, it is essential to build upon existing relationships whenever possible and to allow adequate time for relationships to develop, to the extent possible, before beginning the collaborative process (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Osborne & Murray, 2000).

Based on this understanding, many scholars suggest that trust is a necessary precondition for successful collaboration, however as Vangen and Huxham (2013) explain, this is necessarily limiting since it ignores the opportunity for successful partnerships to emerge where no pre-existing relationship is in place. There does not appear to be consensus on this topic, however, as other research has focused on the reciprocal relationship between trust and risk, noting that “trust leads to risk taking, and providing that initial expectations materialize, risk taking in turn buttresses a sense of trust” (Vangen & Huxham, 2003: 11). Given that PPPs are inherently risky endeavours, this implies that some level of initial trust is required to initiate them (Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2010, 2013; Hrelja, Pettersson & Westerdahl, 2016).

Linking trust with the notion of power, Trist (1983) explains that when dealing with socioecological problems of the kinds society is facing today there is an involved surrendering of
sovereignty so that power is seen to be considerably diffused amongst stakeholders. More specifically, the overriding purpose that may bind stakeholders into formal partnerships in such scenarios is based on their arriving at a shared understanding of the issues at hand (Trist, 1983; Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015).

On the other hand, mistrust often stems from issues concerned with power struggles and perceived imbalances (Boyer, 2016; Szymankiewicz, 2013; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2013). As Boyer (2016), Vangen and Huxham (2013) and Cornforth et al. (2015) all describe, PPPs rarely involve fully equal relationships. However, despite any inequalities, it is crucial to the success of the partnership that each of the partners is still able to make an indispensable contribution to the project (Osborne & Murray, 2000; Boyer, 2016). As Huxham and Vangen (2000: 298) note, one key issue associated with power and trust in multi-sector partnerships is that “those who hold the purse strings or formal ‘lead’ positions generally do behave as though they hold the power,” often leaving individuals from community organizations to feel disempowered when working with larger public agencies and private organizations.

A final, related issue concerns the notions of power in relation to the tensions between collaboration and competition. As Madhok (1995: 65) summarizes, “interfirm collaboration is a mixed motive game where the relationship is characterized by a spirit of collaboration (for creation of the pie) and competition (for distribution of the pie).” As such, knowing the difference between when to collaborate and when to compete is essential (Hrelja, Pettersson & Westerdahl, 2016; Madhok, 1995). It is important to note that some conflict is considered healthy, as it often helps to strengthen the relationship between partners by demonstrating their respective commitment (Osborne & Murray, 2000; Madhok, 1995). In this way, the process of competing is seen to be equally as important as the process of collaborating (Szymankiewicz, 2013; Madhok, 1995). This ultimately demonstrates a need for flexibility in the bargaining, problem solving and conflict resolutions stages of the partnership, amongst others (Madhok, 1995).

2.7 Conclusion: Situating My Research

This review of the relevant literature surrounding public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage has served to provide a foundational framework through which innovative multi-sector partnerships may be analyzed. In this respect, the theoretical contributions, frameworks and ideas presented in this chapter form the theoretical basis of this research project.
My research seeks to primarily draw on the theory of collaborative advantage – as developed by scholars such as Huxham, Vangen, Boardman, Klijn, Teisman, Macdonald, Beech, Osborne and Murray, amongst others cited throughout this chapter – by applying it the study of the Red Door Family Shelter – an innovative public-private partnership in Toronto that has uniquely involved the third sector as a primary stakeholder.

Although, as Huxham (2000) notes, no two partnerships are ever entirely similar in reality, it is certainly possible to establish a general set of best practices that partnership practitioners can learn from going forward. As presented throughout this chapter, a significant body of academic research has devoted itself to demonstrating the importance of behaviours that are supportive of multi-sector partnerships. This thesis is an attempt to build upon this work by expanding our understanding of how third sector involvement in public-private partnerships may (or may not) contribute to the realization of successful collaborative advantage. Establishing this linkage appears crucial considering both the extent to which collaborative advantage has consistently been cited as an underlying rationale in the adoption of the public-private partnership model and the extent to which third sector actors are increasingly becoming involved in such multi-sector partnership projects.

By endeavouring to leverage the expansive body of collaborative advantage literature and apply it to the study of innovative urban partnership models, this research ultimately seeks to strengthen, expand and challenge some of the main ideas presented here. Despite the varying underlying connections identified throughout this chapter, public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage are routinely presented as two distinct bodies of research studied by scholars in two relatively siloed domains of academia. This is most readily observed by the fact that the collaborative advantage literature almost never refers to multi-sector collaborations using the kinds of urban planning terminologies that are commonly associated with public-private partnership models. There is consequently a distinct gap in the academic literature linking these two bodies of theoretical research; this thesis is a step in beginning to address this gap.
Chapter 3: Research Methodology and Case Study Selection

In this chapter I provide an overview of the qualitative research methodologies used in the data collection and data analysis for this research. As identified in Chapter 2, although there is significant existing qualitative and quantitative research in both public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage, there is a notable absence of studies in the existing literature aimed specifically at explicitly linking these two bodies of theoretical knowledge. For this reason, a primary goal of this research is to effectively bridge this gap by exploring how a unique case study – the Red Door Family Shelter partnership in Toronto, Ontario – can help us to better understand how the collaborative advantage framework can be applied to urban planning projects, and, in particular, to those that involve multi-sector partnerships involving the third sector.

I begin the chapter by describing how a case study research approach was employed to build on existing grounded theory research in the collaborative advantage field. In doing so I situate the Red Door Family Shelter as a unique case study that can be used to better understand the ways that collaborative advantage is realized (or not) through the establishment of innovative public-private partnerships. I then describe the details of the data collection and interview processes. In particular, I outline two main qualitative research techniques used to gather relevant data: the systematic collection of relevant case documentation and in-depth semi-structured interviews. In this discussion, I highlight important considerations regarding the types of interview questions asked as well as the process of informant recruitment. Finally, I provide a brief overview of the approaches used to analyze this data, thus helping to situate the research findings as presented in Chapter 4. Techniques and approaches employed to improve the academic rigour and validity of this research are discussed throughout.

3.1 Selection of a Research Methodology

3.1.1 Opting for a Case Study Approach

The majority of existing literature on collaborative advantage in multi-sector partnerships has been the outcome of practice-oriented grounded theory research (Vangen, 2017b; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, 2010; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; Gray, 1989). Researchers in the field have predominantly sought to establish a foundational theory based on the systematic analysis of real
world partnerships to explore the ways that practitioners perceive the achievement (or lack thereof) of collaborative advantage. As Strauss and Corbin (1998) describe, grounded theory research is a commonly employed social science research methodology that is beneficial in allowing us to develop theory based emergent trends in real-world data.

While this significant body of grounded theory research has helped to formulate the theory of collaborative advantage as we currently understand it (see Chapter 2 for a full overview), from both a practical and theoretical perspective it is important to also consider how this theory may (or may not) apply to other cases beyond the scope of those that informed its creation. Reflecting this point, researchers increasingly recognize that it is crucial that case-based knowledge be produced in order to complement the more traditional rule-based knowledge that has historically dominated the social sciences (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Moreover, case studies are seen to be an effective means of testing the validity and applicability of previously established theories, leading Flyvbjerg (2006: 219) to conclude that “social science may be strengthened by the execution of a greater number of good case studies.” Although a significant portion of PPP literature adopts a case study approach (for recent examples see Wu et al., 2016; Chung, 2016; Chung & Hensher, 2015; Verweij, Teisman & Gerrits, 2017; Hellowell & Vecchi, 2012; Siemiatycki, 2015b), Roehrich, Lewis and George (2014) highlight that there remains a clear research gap in scholarly and practitioner understandings of how collaborative advantage theories have been applied to specific PPP cases.

For these reasons, this research seeks to build on the traditional grounded theory approach to collaborative advantage research. By employing a case study approach, it seeks to better understand how an existing theoretical framework – in this case, the theory of collaborative advantage – can be used to distinctly understand urban planning projects, and in particular multi-sector partnerships. Similar to other research in the field of multi-sector collaborative advantage studies, this case study research is informed by and seeks to contribute to practice-oriented literature that “both derives directly from data collected during practice and is intended to inform practice” (Huxham & Vangen, 2000b: 1162).

In this context, a case study research approach is seen to be distinct from more traditional action research approaches such as ethnography or participant observation. Yin (2003: 13) defines a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.” Case studies are therefore a useful research method for understanding complex and
multi-dimensional social phenomena, such as the Red Door Family Shelter partnership (Yin, 2003). As an example of how a case study approach allows for a more in-depth understanding of experienced outcomes, Hibbert et al. (2008: 61) describe how “analyzing these [case] stories reveals much about the experience of organizational participants, as it is through stories that they communicate their attitudes and identities, at both an individual and collective level.” This case study approach is therefore particularly relevant as case-specific contextual conditions are hypothesized to be particularly relevant to understanding how collaborative advantage manifests itself (or not) in innovative public-private partnerships.

Ultimately, the case study approach is widely considered to be a comprehensive overarching research methodology that incorporates a plethora of potential design, data collection, and analysis techniques that may be used in the research process (Yin, 2003). The remainder of this chapter therefore seeks to outline the specific techniques and methods that were applied in the Red Door Family Shelter case study presented here.

3.1.2 The Red Door Family Shelter Partnership as a Unique Case Study

Using an information-oriented selection approach (Flyvbjerg, 2006), the Red Door Family Shelter partnership was selected as the research case study based on my expectations of the value of the information that the case would provide. In particular, following Yin’s (2003) classification approach, the Red Door partnership can be viewed as an extreme or unique case given that it is the first and only example of a partnership where a private for-profit developer willingly chose to incorporate a homeless shelter into a development that will contain market-rate condominium units.

By studying this unique partnership model, this single case study has the potential to provide previously unavailable insight into how collaborative advantage may be realized (or not) in innovative urban planning PPPs that involve the third sector as an equal partner. Moreover, research has demonstrated that, given an appropriately selected case study, we can often generalize, to an extent, from a single case in order to contribute to the development of broader scientific knowledge (Yin, 2003; Flyvbjerg, 2006).
3.1.3 Use of Multiple Qualitative Techniques: Outlining Core Research Phases

Generally speaking, case study research can employ both quantitative and qualitative techniques where appropriate, meaning that academics conducting case study research must demonstrate a high level of methodological versatility (Yin, 2003). Despite this significant variability in potential research techniques, qualitative research is widely understood to be a valuable means of understanding complex and multi-dimensional issues that cannot easily be quantified, as is the case in the Red Door partnership (Robinson, 1998). For this reason, qualitative techniques were utilized for the purposes of this research.

Robinson (1998) identifies four broad categories of qualitative geographic research, including: questionnaire surveys, non-directional interviews, participant observation, and interpretation of supporting documentation and texts. In parallel, Yin (2003) identifies six main sources of evidence that may be particularly relevant in qualitative case study research: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observation, and physical artefacts. Drawing from a combination of these overlapping options, two main qualitative and complementary phases were involved in this research: document collection (Phase I) and in-depth semi-structured interviews (Phase II). These were considered to be the most appropriate research techniques for this case given time and budget constraints as well as the retrospective nature of the research questions being addressed.

The choice to use multiple sets of data collection to analyze the same case – specifically, document analysis and in-depth interviews – was also important since it allowed for cross-verification of important research findings. Denzin (1978) refers to this phenomenon as methodological triangulation, whereby using multiple methods to gather data can help to strengthen the overall validity and credibility of research findings. Yin (2003: 97) also discusses the importance of triangulation in the specific context of case study research, noting that “a major strength of case study data collection is the opportunity to use many different sources of evidence.” Ultimately, such an approach allows for the emergence of corroborating evidence (Kitchin & Tate, 2000) – also referred to as converging lines of inquiry (Yin, 2003) – to support key research conclusions.
3.2 Phase I: Document Collection

Phase I of this research involved compiling and analyzing documents related to the formation of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership. This initial form of secondary data collection was seen to be a critical entry point into this case study since it allowed an initial means of interpreting and understanding the timeline of key events. More importantly, as Kitchin and Tate (2000: 227) describe, “documentary data can provide valuable insight into the structure and mechanisms of socio-spatial thinking and practice.”

Documents were initially gathered from openly available public sources, including the Red Door Family Shelter website and the City of Toronto website and archives. With respect to City documents, I was able to obtain the relevant permits, reports and by-law amendments by tracing the publicly available meeting records on the City’s archival website. These documents were used to inform my initial understandings of how the partnership came to fruition, as well as to understand what role different actors played. In addition to this initial process of document compilation, a snowballing technique was also utilized to augment my dataset (Flowerdew & Martin, 2005). At the end of each interview, informants were asked if there was any additional documentation they were aware of or had access to that may be beneficial to better understanding this case. In general, Phase I of the research was completed before Phase II since the collection and analysis of relevant documentation helped to inform the primary data collection and interview preparation process. However, in several instances where new documentation arose as a result of the interviews both phases of data collection and analysis also occurred concurrently.

A full list of non-academic documents analyzed, categorized by type of document, can be found in Appendix A. In total, 58 documents were analyzed, including: 9 City reports, 20 letters sent to the City of Toronto, 5 official plan or zoning by-law amendments, 2 Toronto-Danforth Ward 30 newsletters, 9 Red Door Family Shelter documents, 9 Smithcom Public Relations Ltd. documents, 3 reports from Schonfeld Inc. Receivers and Trustees, and 1 flyer from Harhay Developments.

In addition to this formal documentation, the partnership was also widely covered by local, regional and national media sources. This media analysis was important in complementing my initial findings from the core document analysis by providing insight into the role that public discourse played in this project’s trajectory. In many cases these articles also contained direct quotes by key individuals involved in the project, all of whom were eventually interviewed as part
of this research. In this way, this media analysis also helped to inform my understanding of how different actors sought to publically present themselves in relation to this project. A full list of the relevant media coverage that was consulted can be found in Appendix B.

By incorporating documents from varying sectoral sources (i.e. public, private and non-profit), I was able to obtain a more representative and well-rounded sample of viewpoints regarding this project. It is important to acknowledge that these documents represent inherently varying levels of authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning and that, as a result, they also represent varying levels of data validity (Kitchin & Tate, 2000; Yin, 2003). Obtaining a diverse sample of documents was one means of mitigating some of these validity concerns. Moreover, in light of these concerns, it is also worth acknowledging that all documents were analyzed carefully and critically, and that these initial findings were not always taken at face value. The interviews conducted in Phase II of the research were used to seek clarity in instances where events were unclear or uncertain, reinforcing the benefit of using a multi-technique research approach.

3.3 Phase II: In-Depth Semi-Structured Interviews

Phase II of the research involved conducting in-depth semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders involved in the Red Door Family Shelter partnership. As Hay (2005) describes, two of the core benefits of interviewing include the ability to investigate complex motivations and behaviours and the ability to collect a greater diversity of experiences and understandings. Interviews also allow for the researcher to better understand themes that are most important to the individuals being interviewed (Hay, 2005). Semi-structured interviews in particular fall on the spectrum between fully unstructured interviews on one end and fully structured interviews on the other thus allowing the researcher to function in more of an interventionist role (Hay, 2005). For these reasons, semi-structured interviews tend to be most common in case study research since they allow for a more fluid line of inquiry (Yin, 2003).

3.3.1 Selection and Recruitment of Interview Informants

Prior to the start of the interview recruitment process, ethics approval was obtained from the University of Toronto’s Social Science, Humanities and Education Research Ethics Board to ensure that the research design adequately complied with University policies in place to help
minimize risk to research participants. Informants were selected given their perceived expertise and personal experience working on the Red Door Family Shelter partnership project. This was important because, as Yin (2003) describes, experts in case study research are considered key sources of insight into how events unfolded. Given the relatively limited size and scope of this project and given that all key stakeholders were predominantly associated with three key organizations all based in Toronto, Ontario – the Red Door Family Shelter, the City of Toronto, and Harhay Developments – it proved to be feasible to reach out to, and ultimately interview, all key expert stakeholders identified to have been significantly involved in this project. This comprehensive interviewing approach was essential in helping to build the academic rigour of this research while also strengthening the validity of the research findings. A full list of all 24 individuals interviewed as part of this research, including their positions and affiliations, can be found in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Patterson</td>
<td>Retired Deputy City Manager</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gord Tanner</td>
<td>Project Director, Transition and Change Management</td>
<td>Shelter, Support and Housing Administration (SSHA), City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Lintern</td>
<td>Director, Community Planning - Toronto and East York District</td>
<td>City Planning, City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Smith</td>
<td>Director, Hostel Services</td>
<td>Shelter, Support and Housing Administration (SSHA), City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Abrahams</td>
<td>Retired General Manager</td>
<td>Shelter, Support and Housing Administration (SSHA), City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Rossini</td>
<td>Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Gadon</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Office, City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Scioli</td>
<td>Chief Corporate Officer</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Woolfson</td>
<td>Planner, Community Planning</td>
<td>City Planning, City of Toronto</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Elliot</td>
<td>President and Chair (also: Red Door Capital Campaign Committee Member; Independent Human Resources Consultant)</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter Board of Directors</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: List of Informants by Affiliation and Sector
(Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Campbell</td>
<td>Board Member and Former President (also: Independent Systems Implementation Consultant and Certified Management Accountant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernnitta Hawkins</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Mapp Batchelor</td>
<td>Board Member (also: Senior Advancement Officer, United Way Toronto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn McKechnie</td>
<td>Senior Fund Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Radovanovich</td>
<td>Director, Human Resources and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Simmie</td>
<td>Board Member (also: Red Door Capital Campaign Committee Member; RBC Investment Advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Latchford</td>
<td>Director, Client Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Harhay</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sheldrake</td>
<td>Senior Manager (also: Red Door Capital Campaign Committee Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan Schonfeld</td>
<td>Founder and President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Odette</td>
<td>Vice President, Investments (also: Red Door Capital Campaign Committee Member; Developer; Philanthropist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Smith</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Murphy</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Fletcher</td>
<td>City Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harhay Developments (Site Developer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schonfeld Inc. Receivers and Trustees (Site Receiver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kipling Group Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smithcom Public Relations Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smithcom Public Relations Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 30, Toronto-Danforth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial interview list was compiled based on key individuals identified during Phase I of the research. In particular, key planning documents, public letters and news articles associated with the project often highlighted key stakeholders and contact points. In many cases these documents included direct contact methods for the relevant individuals. In the cases where no immediate contact information was presented, additional online research was used to collect this
information. All informants were initially contacted via a brief, yet structured, cold email (Appendix C); following the briefing approach outlined by Kitchin and Tate (2000), this email introduced myself as the researcher, outlined the core purpose of my research and requested their participation in an interview. In the event that no response was received to the first cold email, follow-up emails and calls were utilized, as appropriate.

This initial means of informant recruitment was augmented with a snowballing technique whereby, after each interview had formally concluded informants were encouraged to identify other key stakeholders and individuals that were essential to the partnership (for an overview of this technique see Flowerdew & Martin, 2005). In many cases this process served to reinforce the importance of key individuals who were already on the interview list, however in a handful of cases it also served to identify additional individuals to reach out to. Interviews were completed until all key individuals had been contacted and a saturation of viewpoints was reached, thus ensuring that adequate corroborating evidence was available to support the final research conclusions (Kitchin & Tate, 2000; Yin, 2003).

In addition to the above considerations, it is also crucial to note that interview informants were intentionally selected in a manner that sought to establish relatively balanced representation between the public, private and non-profit sectors. This balance was considered critical since a primary goal of this research was to better inform the ways that the public, private and third sectors interact in innovative partnership settings. Furthermore, as Madhok (1995) and Weihe (2008) describe, it is crucial to interview actors from all partner organizations in a multi-sector partnership since a diversity of viewpoints in qualitative case study research helps to strengthen the validity and applicability of the research findings.

### 3.3.2 Overview of Interview Questions

A sample compilation of the types of interview questions asked may be found in Appendix D. Following the approach described by Hay (2005), the guide was set up to include a smaller number of primary, over-arching questions, each of which is followed up with more detailed potential follow-up questions should the theme appear important to the informant being interviewed. As recommended by Hay (2005) and Robinson (1998), these guiding questions were developed based on an understanding of the relevant literature as described in Chapter 2.
It is also important to note that the interview guide was adapted for each individual informant to match their perceived expertise. More importantly, the semi-structured nature of the interviews was intended to give informants adequate capacity and space to help guide the conversation by bringing up matters that they felt were most important. Each interview was often adjusted in real-time as relevant probing questions were asked as follow-ups on key themes or experiences expressed by informants. As Hay (2005) recommends, the wording and the order of questions in the interview guide were also adjusted as the research progressed in order to improve clarity based on feedback from many of the initial interviews. In this way, the preparation of relevant interview guides was an iterative process.

3.3.3 The Interview Process

The interviews were all completed over a one-and-a-half-month period between May and July 2016 – the first interview was held on May 31st, 2016 and the final interview was held on July 19th, 2016. All interviews were completed face-to-face with the exception of one interview, which was completed via a telephone call since a face-to-face meeting was deemed infeasible given time and scheduling constraints. The face-to-face interviews took place either on the University of Toronto campus in the Sidney Smith Building, where this research project is based, at the informant’s place of work, or at a third, neutral location, such as a local coffee shop. During the recruitment process, all interview informants were given these three location options and were encouraged to select a location that would be most convenient and comfortable for them to share their experiences in a relaxed and open environment (for an overview of the importance of interview location see Flowerdew & Martin, 2005).

As Kitchin and Tate (2000) describe, face-to-face interviewing allows the researcher to benefit from non-verbal cues, body language and facial expressions, all of which allow the researcher to more effectively follow up with relevant probing questions that help to draw out key themes and experiences based on the informant’s initial responses. This format was particularly relevant giving the semi-structured nature of the interviews, thus helping to maximize the quality and depth of the interview data.

Each interview was scheduled to last approximately 45 to 60 minutes, as was communicated to all informants ahead of time. In several cases the interviews ran over the 60-minute allotment – in one instance reaching nearly 100 minutes – as many informants were
generally eager to share their experiences with and thoughts on the project and were happy to spend the additional time on the interview.

Before commencing each interview, informants were provided with a consent form (Appendix E). In compliance with the University of Toronto’s ethics policy, this form outlined the nature of the research project to each informant while also explaining any potential risks involved in their participation. Additionally, the form requested each informant’s permission to record the interview audio and to be referred to by name and affiliation in any research findings. All informants agreed to both of these points. The form also provided all interview informants with the ability to withdraw their participation from the research study at any time during or after the interview, up to two weeks from the interview date.

Prior to commencing each interview, it was important to begin building rapport with interview informants (Kitchin & Tate, 2000; Hay, 2005; Flowerdew & Martin, 2005). This was achieved by re-introducing both myself and the purpose of the research project, as well as inviting any initial questions they may have had regarding the research. Rapport was further built throughout the interview process through an interview guide and question order based on a pyramid structure (Hay, 2005). Following this structure, each interview started by focusing on easy-to-answer questions based on an informant’s duties or responsibilities as related to the case in question. This was intended to establish a sense of ease for the informant while also allowing each informant to become accustomed to the interviewer. Then, throughout the course of the interview, the questions ideally required increasingly deeper levels of thought and reflection.

### 3.3.4 Qualitative Data Analysis

Following each interview, the recorded audio files were transcribed verbatim by hand to aid in the analysis process. All interview files were stored on a secure password-protected hard drive. Hand-written notes were also taken during each interview in order to help guide relevant follow-up questions; these notes were used in conjunction with the audio recording transcriptions to aid in the analysis process. In combination with the document analysis completed in Phase I, interview data from Phase II of this research was analyzed using a universal approach as described by Kitchin and Tate (2000). In this approach, which emphasizes interpreting meanings from the data, qualitative analysis consists of three core components: describing the data, classifying the data, and considering how elements of the data interconnect (Kitchin & Tate, 2000).
Drawing on the approach employed by Hibbert et al. (2008), interviews were analyzed using labels for particular characterizations to help identify core recurring characteristics of this story of collaboration. The first stage of analysis was first carried out using a manifest content analysis technique, whereby interview transcripts were analyzed for visible, surface level references to core themes and ideas (Hay, 2005). This analysis was then complimented using a latent content analysis technique to analyze the transcript documents in search of deeper hidden themes (Hay, 2005). To do so, simple text coding was applied to relevant interview sections in Microsoft Word (for an overview of text-based coding techniques see Flowerdew & Martin, 2005). Codes and sections of code were then amalgamated and re-read as a single file to draw out key themes and findings. These were then converted into a nuanced narrative that highlighted core elements of the Red Door partnership case study; these findings will be discussed in Chapter 4.

While these codes and labels are intended to be a useful tool for reflection, it should also be noted that they are by no means a comprehensive overview of all potential categorizations. Furthermore, it is important to establish that there is a level of inherent bias involved in semi-structured interviews as any interviewer brings a level of personal subjectivity to the qualitative data collection and analysis processes. In this example, as a Graduate Researcher at the University of Toronto, it is important to acknowledge the role that my academic positionality plays in the analysis of qualitative interview data and in the production of the case study narrative that is constructed as a result.

3.4 Conclusion

Ultimately, given the inherent subjectivity associated with qualitative research it is important to acknowledge the potential limits to transferability of any research study (Hay, 2005). It is therefore necessary to properly document the research design and methodologies so that other researchers and practitioners can assess the transferability and validity of the study for themselves. For such reasons, this chapter has sought to comprehensively outline the relevant methodologies – document collection and in-depth semi-structured interviews – utilized in Phase I and II of this research project. In particular, I examined the rationale behind these qualitative methodologies, including considerations of how informants were recruited, how interviews were structured and how this data was ultimately analyzed. Steps taken to strengthen the validity and rigour of the research findings were also presented. Finally, this chapter provided a broad overview of the
backgrounds and affiliations of all key interview informants, while simultaneously situating the Red Door Family Shelter project as a unique case relative to our existing understandings of collaborative advantage and public-private partnerships. This context is key in helping to position my research findings presented in the following chapter.
Chapter 4:  
Case Study Research Findings – Understanding the Role of Collaborative Advantage in the Red Door Family Shelter Partnership

The following chapter endeavours to explore the key research findings of this thesis. In particular, it constructs the narrative of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership as informed by the document analyses and key semi-structured informant interviews outlined in Chapter 3. As previously identified, these findings are presented from an academic case study perspective; as such, the narrative is framed in a manner that distinctly considers the role that different relevant factors played in relation to the achievement (or lack thereof) of collaborative advantage in this innovative multi-sector partnership.

The chapter begins by providing a historical background context for the Red Door Family Shelter, with specific consideration of the role that crisis played in setting the stage for the innovative first-of-its-kind partnership that was ultimately formed between the Red Door, Harhay Developments, and the City of Toronto. With this background context in mind, I provide a detailed overview of the partnership itself, highlighting the key roles and responsibilities of all major stakeholders. I then explore the key enabling factors and barriers involved in the collaborative processes associated with this partnership. In particular, I give consideration to the importance of community mobilization, a diversity of organizational strengths and contributions, and the political component to the partnership, amongst other important elements.

Building on this initial narrative, I then apply the Red Door Family Shelter case study specifically to the theory of collaborative advantage as outlined in Chapter 2. I begin by discussing the common characteristics of successfully collaborative partnerships, including assessments of how these characteristics apply to the Red Door case study. Given this understanding, I then explore the role that partnership processes, structure, and participants played in pushing forward the collaborative agenda in this case. Finally, I examine the distinct role that various leadership activities – managing aims, managing language and culture, and managing trust and power – played in supporting or hindering these collaborative outcomes.
4.1 The Red Door Family Shelter: Historical Context

4.1.1 Relationship with the WoodGreen United Church and the Local Neighbourhood

Founded in 1982, the Red Door Family Shelter provides emergency shelter services and support for families, refugees and women who are fleeing domestic violence. The name derives from local Reverend Ray Mcleary who, during the Great Depression of the 1930s, painted the door of his manse red as a symbol of hope and help so that women and children would know that they had a safe place to go. Drawing on this vision, a congregation of WoodGreen United Church volunteers first named the shelter Red Door after Rev. Mcleary’s vision. From its humble beginnings as a group of volunteers working out of a church basement, the Red Door Family Shelter has grown to become one of the largest family shelters in the City of Toronto. Operated as an independent non-profit, the shelter manages 106 beds – equal to approximately 10% of the crisis care beds in the City of Toronto – while supporting over 500 families every year.

Historically, the Red Door has operated two shelters in Toronto: one Violence Against Women (VAW) emergency shelter at an undisclosed location and a family shelter at 875 Queen St. East in Leslieville. While the VAW shelter receives funding directly from the Province of Ontario, the family shelter is funded directly by the City of Toronto on a per diem basis. As a result, the family shelter has historically faced a significantly more unreliable funding model. The following case study focuses exclusively on the family shelter (henceforth referred to as the Red Door Family Shelter, or more colloquially, Red Door).

Beyond the core housing provision, the Red Door Family Shelter also provides additional programmatic support that is not covered by government funding; instead, Red Door undertakes independent annual fundraising efforts to support this work. These programmatic support services are intended to address many of the more systemic elements of homelessness in an attempt to break the cycle. Examples of services provided by Red Door include: on-site medical assistance and referrals, child care, counselling, case management, safety planning, legal and immigration assistance, youth educational programming, a weekly food bank, housing search assistance, and parenting and life skills training, amongst other relevant services. As a result of these diverse service offerings, the Red Door Family Shelter has historically offered an exceptionally high level of service quality as exemplified by the small number of returning families, particularly when compared against the city-wide average.
It is important to note however that Red Door’s location in a converted space in the WoodGreen United Church was generally haphazard and poorly fitted to residents’ needs. The space was not purpose-built as a shelter, and as a result it was not uncommon to find two or three families, who may speak different languages or have children of very different ages, sharing one room. Bathrooms in the shelter were likewise shared between multiple families. In this respect, despite Red Door’s best efforts, the space in the WoodGreen United Church was notably not ideal for shelter service provision, and in some ways may have made elements of the healing process for families even more difficult.

In relation to service and programmatic work, the Red Door Family Shelter’s location in Leslieville, in the east end of downtown Toronto, has been particularly beneficial to the shelter’s success. The shelter is well located in relation to the reliable 24-hour Queen St. streetcar route, Moore Street public school, Jimmy Simpson park, South Riverdale Community Health Centre, as well as a number of other important community services that make Red Door’s high level of quality service provision possible. Over the past 30 years, many of these local institutions have built invaluably deep relationships with Red Door. As a result of these institutional ties, the Red Door Family Shelter has become extremely significant for the neighbourhood and its history. The Leslieville region of Toronto was historically a low to middle-income working class neighbourhood, however the area has seen rapid shifts towards gentrification in recent years. However, despite this shifting landscape, the neighbourhood continues to remain more community driven than ever, exemplifying the extent to which community ties are embedded in the neighbourhood’s identity. It is in this context of community support and integration that Red Door’s crisis first begins.

4.1.2 Start of the Crisis: Sale of the WoodGreen United Church

Beginning in 2010, the WoodGreen United Church began undertaking a widespread asset offloading effort nationwide in an attempt to raise capital. Over the course of this offloading, a number of potential sales for 875 Queen St. East were considered. Given the potential impending sale of the site, Red Door was left in a situation where they would potentially be without a home if they were unable to make a solution work. Given Red Door’s immense community support and neighbourhood ties, in addition to the sizable costs in both time and money to relocate the shelter, the initial preference was to maintain the shelter’s location at 875 Queen St. East, if possible. In
this context, Red Door’s ideal scenario from a stability and independence standpoint would have been to purchase the space directly from the WoodGreen United Church in order to own and operate it themselves. This option was even more attractive given that the WoodGreen United Church was committed to giving Red Door a preferred price on the site due to their shared history and mandate. The original price for the site was consequently offered to Red Door at a price around $4.25 million.

Despite the discounted price on the site itself, Red Door undertook a feasibility study on the potential cost of the overall project and it was determined that in order to acquire the necessary financing, buy the site and furnish the new shelter themselves Red Door would need to raise upwards of $8-10 million dollars all in – a nearly impossible goal given the relatively small size and limited fundraising capacity of the shelter. As a result, it became clear to Red Door early on that it would be much easier and more secure to proceed with a developer on board.

4.1.3 The Agreement with Rose & Thistle

At this stage, Red Door entered into a preliminary agreement with the development firm Rose & Thistle. At previously outlined, the WoodGreen United Church agreed to sell the property to Red Door at a favourable price pending their ability to raise the necessary capital. By proxy, this made the project highly attractive to Rose & Thistle as they would receive a valuable section of property at a discount. What was informally agreed upon in this case was essentially a financial arrangement where the developer would pay for all of the upfront costs and the shelter would have a certain amount of time to raise the necessary capital for the purchase in order to buy their portion of the site at a discount. Under this scenario, the agreement of purchase and sale for the site was assigned to Rose & Thistle on Red Door’s behalf.

Although the original plan was to re-incorporate Red Door into any new development on the 875 Queen St. East site, a number of alternative ideas were later floated by the developer. As the significant cost of developing a purpose-built shelter on-site became increasingly clear, Rose & Thistle put forth proposals to relocate Red Door to any number of other sites that they had also acquired throughout the city. While Red Door had very few options open to them at this late stage, this pushback from the developer reinforced Red Door’s desire to stay on site given their strong community support in the Leslieville neighbourhood as well as the strong possibility of facing NIMBY opposition in other neighbourhoods throughout the city.
Then, in November 2013, prior to the enactment of any of the development plans for 875 Queen St. East, Rose & Thistle was taken to court over a shareholder dispute. As per public records released following the trial, the original business partnerships under the guise of Rose & Thistle went south due to what the court referred to as fraud and misrepresentation. As a result of losing this shareholder dispute in court, Rose & Thistle was eventually forced into bankruptcy, ultimately sending the 875 Queen St. East site into receivership and leaving Red Door’s future uncertain once again.

4.1.4 The Site Enters into Receivership

It was at this stage that Schonfeld Inc. became involved in the project. As a receiver, trustee, and licensed insolvency practitioner, Schonfeld Inc. brought 25 years of experience in the area of insolvency, mostly involving court-mandated engagements, as was the case with the 875 Queen St. East site. Simply put, the receiver’s obligation in this scenario was to get the best value possible out of the property. Therefore, from the receiver’s perspective, Red Door’s situation began as tangential to their work since the legal mandate was to realize on the property to sell the site and use the funds to help settle the shareholder dispute.

Despite this primary legal mandate, it quickly became evident to the receiver that nothing productive could happen without, at the very least, engaging in a dialogue with Red Door. Given the immense outpouring of community support and opposition to relocating the shelter, it became clear that Red Door was a sort of encumbrance to any potential developers looking to acquire the site. In this case, the challenge became how to deal with Red Door as a tenant in the face of a terminating lease, while also considering the limited financial options available to them as a non-profit shelter. With this context in mind, by January 2014, less than three months after entering into receivership, a new purchaser of the site had been identified: Harhay Developments.

Although it is widely agreed that the failure of this initial deal with Rose & Thistle worsened Red Door’s crisis situation at the time, it was also critical in buying Red Door some of the additional time and space that they needed in order to build a stronger case for support and to better understand the realistic options available to them. Moreover, as will be discussed later in this chapter, these earlier deals also allowed Red Door to familiarize themselves with the idea of a multi-sector agreement while also demonstrating some of the important challenges they should seek to manage. It is also important to note that although this preliminary deal featured many of
the elements of the partnership that Red Door eventually engaged in, there was never any formal partnership solidified at this stage, and perhaps most importantly, the City was had not yet provided any financial backing to Red Door’s prospective purchase of the site.

4.1.5 Background on Harhay Developments

Harhay Developments (henceforth referred to as Harhay) is a private for-profit real estate developer that has been doing business for over 25 years, with a specialization in developing condominiums in downtown Toronto. As a small family-owned boutique developer, Harhay has focused primarily on responsible urban intensification, urban development and quality architecture, with a particular inclination towards responsible mixed-use mid-rise developments.

This preference for mixed-use is readily evident in the number of past projects they have completed which combine office or retail space into larger condominium buildings. As the Harhay family themselves explain, their projects have historically always sought to take a holistic approach to how buildings integrate into the broader neighborhood – something that becomes particularly important when you consider Red Door’s community embeddedness.

Harhay had previously developed other properties in the nearby neighbourhood – such as 90 Broadview Ave. – which helped to foster their original interest in pursuing another development in the Leslieville area. Throughout the receivership process, Harhay was not permitted to speak with any of the tenancies during the due diligence process, including Red Door, and so when they first submitted their tentative bid for the site in the receivership process, they were not yet aware of the specifics or extent of Red Door’s situation. However, as previously described, it became readily apparent through the receivership process that any development on the site would have to, at the very least, consider Red Door. It was at this stage that Harhay, through a combination of goodwill and public sector incentives, became interested in the opportunity to find a solution that would help Red Door find a new home.

4.1.6 Relationship with the City of Toronto

In this crisis period, it is also important to understand how Red Door’s situation fits into the broader homeless shelter context. The City of Toronto operates nearly 60 shelters, the majority of which are publically subsidized but not City owned or run. This reality reflects an acknowledgement that the City cannot effectively operate all shelters so they rely on competent
operators like Red Door to support in that area. Given this relationship and the inherent links between Red Door and the City, it became clear to Red Door early on that a good option would be to try and convince the City of Toronto to buy the 875 Queen St. East site on their behalf.

With this goal in mind, Red Door began organizing meetings with the City in an attempt to establish a deal in which the City would agree to help raise the necessary funds for such a project. From the Red Door’s perspective, owning the shelter outright was seen to be the most ideal scenario since it would allow the Red Door wholly independent control over their management and operations long-term. Unfortunately, from the City’s perspective, such a deal was considered unrealistic and unfeasible from a public budgeting standpoint, given the additional risk this would place on the City to secure shelter service provision long-term should anything happen to the Red Door organization.

At this early stage, prior to entering into receivership, there was no precedent for the City having ever stepped in to provide money to help a shelter continue to operate, ultimately leaving the General Manager at the time feeling as if there were no options. In terms of funding, making this type of arrangement work was particularly complicated given the funding structure for shelters in the city. In particular, in the City of Toronto, shelters are funded on a per diem basis meaning that the City essentially purchases the provision of service from a shelter operator – in this case Red Door. The problem is that in instances of financial hardship such as this, the funding model does not easily allow for an injection of extra funding to help cover the costs of emergency projects, such as the purchase of a new shelter space. Instead, City Council must approve those types of funding requests and there is typically a very limited pool of funding available for these types of large ad hoc projects.

Another part of the reason the City of Toronto was hesitant to become involved in the earlier deals stemmed from the fact that federal money for affordable housing support and services had dried up in the period leading up to the sale of the WoodGreen United Church. As a result, the initial sale of the site to Rose & Thistle coincided with a time in which the SSHA was more interested in closing shelter beds to cut down on costs. Red Door was told that the City had enough family shelters, so if they were to close then this would not be an impediment to the system. As a result of the City’s lack of initial support in attempting to secure the site, Red Door entered into the original agreement with Rose & Thistle on their own.
After the site went into receivership, there was a change of leadership in the SSHA division. Red Door’s crisis had left the City acutely aware that whatever alternative shelter solution they may be able to provide if Red Door were to close would not include the level of comprehensive programming and community support that Red Door had fostered over the past 35 years. Therefore, it was not until the crisis reached its climax, and many alternative models had been exhausted, that the City themselves became active members at the table. There was a general sense at this point that the City should be more involved in these types of dealings and that there was a clear need to better understand the vulnerabilities of non-profit agencies when entering into conversations with private sector stakeholders. At this stage, the new Deputy City Manager along with management from the SSHA worked closely with the receiver to explore the options available; this ultimately led to the formation of the Red Door partnership.

4.2 Formation of a Multi-Sector Partnership

There was a nearly unanimous understanding that in this case the realization of this innovative multi-sector partnership was borne out of crisis. This is perhaps most readily apparent by the fact that neither the City, nor Harhay, nor Red Door initially sought to enter into this type of multi-sector partnership. Instead, as previously described, each stakeholder had alternative preferences for how the situation could have been addressed, and it was only when crisis forced them them to work together at the same table that the formation of the partnership began.

As one senior public sector official explains, by the time the crisis had reached its climax it had become almost obvious that this type of multi-sector partnership would be the solution to the problems these stakeholders were facing:

“In this particular case, the facts on the ground almost made it a no brainer that this should happen. There's a need for shelter service, the City couldn't afford to lose the shelter service, it was already settled in the neighbourhood, there was an opportunity to keep it in the neighbourhood, and there was an amenable development partner who was going to take all the development risks.”

It was at this stage in early 2014 when the partnership first began to take form. Following the receivership process, the City realized the extent of the crisis facing the Red Door Family Shelter; it consequently became clear that the City would need to continue to provide shelter services and beds if the Red Door were to close. It was in this context that these three diverse stakeholder groups – Harhay as the developer, Red Door as the non-profit shelter operator, and the
City of Toronto as the funder – were first able to collectively explore what the potential options were, thus laying the foundation for the Red Door partnership.

In this exploration process it became crucial that there were individuals involved who saw beyond the status quo and could conceptualize the types of innovative and unique solutions necessary to make this project work. In particular, it was beneficial that the Deputy City Manager in charge of the SSHA division had a significant background of previous experience working on unique childcare partnership projects where the City was involved. Although the Red Door partnership was not modeled directly after any past partnership due to the added complexity of homeless shelter provision, there was a general sense amongst public sector stakeholders that having this past experience was critical in providing the public sector with an idea of where to start.

A timeline associated with the major activities involved in the formation and realization of the Red Door partnership may be found in Table 7; the significance of many of these activities will be discussed in more depth throughout the remainder of this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2013</td>
<td>875 Queen St. East site first enters into receivership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Harhay Developments expresses initial interest in the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td>Smithcom public relations firm gets on board to support Red Door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Initial community meeting to “Save the Red Door”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Residents praise shelter at emergency City meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Former Mayor (David Crombie) joins cause to support Red Door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Council Motion passes to Community and Recreation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Petition to “Save the Red Door” amasses over 50,000 signatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>City Council vote unanimously in favour of saving the Red Door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Formal partnership agreement reached to save the Red Door Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Toronto-East York Community Council approves development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>City Council approves development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter finds temporary home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 2016</td>
<td>Construction begins on new mixed-use development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Timeline of key events – Formation of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership  
(Source: Author)

In the final partnership agreement that was reached between the City of Toronto, Harhay Developments and the Red Door Family Shelter, Harhay will construct a new mixed-use development that will incorporate market-rate housing and retail components. The development will also include a new purpose-built shelter, which will be sold to the City of Toronto at cost. The
City will then own the shelter space on the property and will lease it to the Red Door at a nominal fee of $1 per annum. Red Door will then be required to fundraise an additional $3 million to purchase the equipment, furnishings and materials that will be needed in the new shelter space. To formalize this arrangement, after City Council agreed on a purchase price as per negotiations with Harhay, the City of Toronto entered into a letter of understanding with Harhay Developments. In this formal agreement two main conditions were outlined as preconditions for the partnership to proceed. First, City Council had to approve the required planning amendments as per the negotiations and Harhay had to successfully get through the planning process. Second, Harhay had to adequately pre-sell the condominium units to secure the necessary financing and make the project financially viable from their perspective. As these conditions were met by late 2016, the project has now officially proceeded into the construction phase.

As part of the finalized partnership arrangement, there were clearly defined partnership roles for each of the key stakeholders. In terms of the development process itself, Harhay was responsible for efficiently designing and constructing the architectural components of the building, Red Door was responsible for advising on the specific design elements that would be most beneficial in a purpose-built shelter space, and the City of Toronto was responsible for funding the project in line with City objectives and providing shelter oversight both in the interim and following the completion of the project. A summary of major partnership roles and responsibilities may be found in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red Door Family Shelter</th>
<th>Harhay Developments</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Continue to provide service provision for the shelter; will lease the new space from the City of Toronto long-term at a nominal annual fee</td>
<td>- Design a mixed-use building (including both residential and commercial components, in addition to incorporating a new purpose-built shelter space for the Red Door Family Shelter)</td>
<td>- Purchase and maintain the new shelter space from Harhay and lease the space to Red Door long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Responsible for fundraising $3 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide oversight with respect to the mandated shelter standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to furnish the new shelter (over 5 years)  
- Finance the overall development  
- Manage Red Door’s move to an interim shelter space

Table 8: Summary of major roles and responsibilities for each partner in the Red Door partnership  
(Source: Author)

4.2.1 Innovative Mixed-Use Design: Development Proposal

While adhering to mandated area-specific urban design guidelines as outlined in the Queen Street East-Leslieville Planning Study (Toronto, 2014), the proposed development will seamlessly incorporate market-rate housing, retail space and a homeless shelter into one development (for the original development proposal for 875 Queen St. East see Figure 5; for approved design mock-ups of the building see Figure 6). The proposed retail space will face onto Queen St. while the shelter space will face onto the arterial road – an important privacy design element given the at-risk nature of some of the residents at the shelter. The remainder of the building’s upper floors will then be devoted to market-rate condominium units. The proposed building is midrise – only seven stories – and relatively small in a redevelopment context. As a result, the incorporation of so many different elements is even more complicated and unique given the limited scope available in the planning pro forma to make this work.

Figure 5: The original development proposal for 875 Queen St. East  
(Source: RDFS, 2014a)
This seamless integration of land uses into one building is also critical in ensuring that the Red Door shelter remains connected to the broader Leslieville community. By developing a space where families at the Red Door Family Shelter will be living adjacent to other families and community institutions, it presents an important opportunity to maintain and strengthen the positive perceptions of Red Door as a community organization.

From the shelter perspective, the new development will be purpose-built and will incorporate a total of 94 shelter beds in a 20,000 ft² facility. Although this is a slight reduction from the original 106 beds on site in the original facility, this was seen to be an acceptable trade-off for the more efficient design of service space that the reduced number of beds would allow. To help offset this reduction, the SSHA will add housing allowances to account for providing these additional beds elsewhere in the city so as to not reduce overall shelter provision levels.

The most important component of a purpose-built shelter is the seamless integration of service delivery spaces. For example, by better integrating services such as food banks into long-term dedicated spaces within the shelter, it is widely considered to ameliorate the shelter’s ability to improve overall resident care. As can be seen in Figure 7, a significant component of the new purpose-built Red Door shelter space is that it will incorporate these types of permanently allocated spaces for service provision. For example, the new Red Door shelter space will include important amenity spaces such as a: preschool, resident meeting and programme room, food bank, computer and homework room, and housing outreach programme space. Moreover, the new space will incorporate private bedrooms and bathrooms – a significant improvement over the original converted space in the WoodGreen United Church.
4.2.2 Financial Component of the Partnership Deal

It is crucial to reiterate that from a financial perspective the Red Door relies heavily on the City for its continued operations. With a top line just over $6 million, the majority of which comes from public transfer payments with a small augmentation from philanthropic donations, it became clear early on that the Red Door was inherently financially reliant on a deal that involved partners with access to greater financial resources. Although Red Door will still be responsible for fundraising $3 million as part of the final partnership deal, this was a drastic reduction from the original estimates of what it would cost to undertake the entire project alone; this reduction in the financial burden was important since it has allowed Red Door to return the majority of their focus to the day-to-day service provision at the shelter which is where their core capabilities lie.

In the initial receivership process, the viability of the partnership all came down to whether Harhay could acquire the property at a price point that was financially feasible for this project. As expressed by a number of interview informants, this ultimately was a make or break component to this partnership. Harhay ended up not bringing any institutional partners on board, ultimately opting to fund the project alone given the increased risks associated with the condominium sales and politics of the project. In this sense, it was critical that Harhay was a private family-owned developer with adequate capacity and willingness to bare all of the financial risk alone.

In this context, in order to make the project economically viable for Harhay there needed to be an appropriate business case for the developer to bring to the bank to get the necessary construction loans to fund the project. To be specific, from the developer’s perspective there was

Figure 7: 2nd level floor plan highlighting designated service space within the purpose-built shelter
(Source: RDFS, 2015)
an inherent trade-off between what revenue the building components would make, how much the shelter space could be sold for, how much the unit price would be reduced by, and ultimately what provisions the City would be able to provide to help offset some of these inconveniences. A key part of this partnership was therefore finding a unique balance of these components that made financial sense for the developer, despite that many of these elements are difficult to quantify fully in advance; the various incentives leveraged by the City will be explored in detail later in this chapter.

When it became clear that the City was going to be involved in some financial capacity in the partnership between Harhay and Red Door, the first question they looked at was whether Red Door would be able to get financing on their own. It was at this point that it became clear that Red Door would require, at minimum, a guarantee. From the upper management level, the initial plan from the City’s perspective was to explore different opportunities that might exist in terms of funding this partnership. More specifically, the Deputy City Manager originally explored opportunities to leverage a model of loan guarantees as had been previously utilized in some childcare program partnerships in the city. This is when the City Finance Department first formally became involved, since they are required to approve all guarantee requests.

At this stage, three initial models were formally considered: loan guarantees, mortgaging, and flat-out purchasing. The City Finance Department considered trade-offs between a guarantee versus a mortgage, ultimately concluding that their foreclosure rights would be stronger as a mortgage holder than a guarantor since it would give them a direct lien on the property. In this case a major trade-off was that it would require a lengthy legal process to foreclose if ever required, leading the City to conclude that they would flat out buy the space and then contract out with Red Door to run the facility. This progression from a potential guarantor to lender to owner was seen as the best way to secure payment while ensuring the lowest level of risk exposure for public funds.

More simply put, from the City’s perspective, purchasing the shelter space was ultimately the best business case. This is because purchasing the site was seen as immensely valuable in terms of the asset appreciation that the new development will provide, as the City will realize immediate book value on this purchase upon its completion. As the owner of the new shelter space, the City effectively reduced their long-term real estate risk by opting to own this crucial piece of infrastructure. Ultimately, the City will get to own a brand new permanent purpose-built shelter facility at well below market price.
The purchase of the site for nearly $7 million will come from the Land Acquisition Reserve Fund (LARF). Initially, it was planned that the SSHA would have to pay back this purchase amount in full out of Red Door’s operating subsidies over a 20 to 25-year period, but it was ultimately decided that this did not make sense from the City’s perspective. As a result, the site will be purchased through the LARF with no requirement that the amount is paid back over time. In this respect, just as the partnership required a unique structural setup, finding an innovative financing approach was just as crucial in making the partnership viable.

4.2.3 Current 875 Queen St. East Redevelopment Project Status

Over the past three years since Harhay first expressed interest in the site, each of the stakeholders have worked primarily on finalizing the preliminary partnership responsibilities and negotiations. The 875 Queen St. East redevelopment is currently in the early phases of construction, which commenced in late 2016 (for a visualization of the start of construction versus current construction progress see Figure 8). In the interim, the Red Door Family Shelter has successfully relocated to a temporary location for the duration of the two to three-year construction period. The market-rate condominium units are now fully pre-sold and as per conversations with the developer not a single purchaser had a problem with the shelter during the sales process. Finally, at this early stage, Red Door has fundraised nearly half of the required $3 million.

![Figure 8: Left: 875 Queen St. East construction site – start of construction period; Right: 875 Queen Street East construction site – progress as of June 2017](source: RDFS, 2014c; Author)

The subsequent sections of this chapter explore the key success factors and barriers involved in establishing this partnership, including specific consideration of how collaborative advantage was achieved (or not) in relation to partnership structure, processes, and participants. As such, these research findings are based exclusively on the years during which the initial
partnership agreement was conceptualized and negotiated amongst stakeholders. As the project is not yet complete, this research does not consider the construction, operation or maintenance stages of the partnership; this is an important limitation to these research findings, as will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

4.3 Exploring Key Facilitating Factors and Barriers Behind the Partnership

4.3.1 The Role of Community Support and Mobilization

The first key factor that partnership stakeholders repeatedly identified as being crucial to the successful realization of the partnership was the role of community support and mobilization. Although support for the partnership ultimately manifested itself in many ways and at many levels, there was a clear sense that much of the support this partnership received started with the community. In fact, this remarkable support from the local community was reiterated by all 24 informants interviewed as part of this research, making it explicitly clear the extent to which this was a non-negotiable factor in making this partnership possible. For example, this importance of the local community was outlined clearly in the following exert:

“So I would say the community, the actual community of Leslieville, and how they view themselves and how they understand themselves as a community, was a critical success factor. They're very thoughtful and openly support the shelter in their community, right.”

There was a general understanding amongst stakeholders that the immense public support for the project was ultimately what solidified both the public and private sector support for this partnership. For example, even the developer himself discussed the critical role that the public support played in securing his initial support for the project. This experience mirrors research by Xu and Morgan (2012), which found that environmental factors played an important role in the creation and success of PPPs. In particular, the research found community need and scarcity of resources to be strong motivating factors; in these circumstances, PPPs can be seen to be, at least in part, attributed to the social environment and the existence of community demands (Xu & Morgan, 2012).

Research has also repeatedly shown that it is crucial that the community be involved as early on in the process as possible, ideally before a development or site is even proposed (Davis, 2017). Although there was a general awareness amongst the Red Door management team that they had a phenomenal level of public support, it was equally as important that Red Door was able to
mobilize this support in strategic ways that helped to further their cause. As one approach to achieve this, during the initial receivership process the Local Councillor worked with Red Door to distribute the receiver’s and developer’s names, phone numbers and emails to everyone they could to mobilize this community support and put pressure on any potential purchaser to include Red Door in the proposed development. Both the developer and receiver remembered this distinctly, commenting on the “hundreds of emails and voicemail messages” they received imploring them to save the Red Door Family Shelter. The Red Door Senior Fund Development Manager similarly reflected on the staggering degree to which this community support manifested itself:

“Red Door's been here for 30 years and we've always felt like a part of the community. We never felt like we weren't welcome, or weren't supported, or weren't liked. But when we had the 'Save the Red Door' campaign, we really saw the depth of affection for Red Door, and the depth understanding of what it was doing, and the importance that we are here... like here here. And people came out to our meetings, and people spoke up, and social media blew up.”

As a general practice, research has found that proactive consultation is critical. For example, Davis (2017) suggests that holding non-mandated public meetings at a diversity of sites – including condo board meetings, school councils, ratepayer meetings, and drop-in centers – is a good approach to increase community engagement and support for potentially controversial projects. This was true in this case study, where Red Door’s ability to engage stakeholders in town hall meetings, via door-to-door canvassing and through a variety of community platforms was crucial in maintaining a constant presence of support (Figure 9). As one example, a Red Door Board Member highlighted the extent to which the sheer volume of support was impactful in Red Door’s various meetings at City Hall:

“So that really was a key factor in our success, that we were able to completely fill you know, a large room, standing room only, people spilling out the doors, to support us. So that does make a difference, that your community is behind you. And I think we've been a great neighbour in our community so they came out when we needed them.”
4.3.2 The Role of the Save the Red Door Campaign

When reflecting on where this support originated, stakeholders referred predominantly to Red Door’s strong network of community ties, including long-standing relationships with local schools and community centers, with the local healthcare center, and with the Local Councillor, amongst other institutions. As a result of these relationships there was a general feeling that the Red Door had become an “integral part” of the local Leslieville community; this is perhaps even more unique and impressive when considering the extent of NIMBY opposition other homeless shelters in the city have faced.

Although this community support appears to have built up gradually over time for the Red Door Family Shelter, it was equally as important that Red Door was able to appropriately leverage this support and mobilize the community to demonstrate this support in a meaningful way when needed. In this respect, the Save the Red Door Campaign was widely seen to be a critical
component in convincing both the developer and the City of Toronto to come to the table as a potential part of this partnership. By working with the Local Councillor and relevant external communications experts to launch and manage this campaign, Red Door strategically leveraged the existing community support they had fostered over the past 35 years.

In practice, the Save the Red Door Campaign was borne out of a strong initial fundraising campaign connected to a very strong social media presence and platform on change.org (Figure 10). The campaign was initiated in early 2014 at the peak of the crisis by Red Door’s management team in collaboration with the Local Councillor. Then, shortly after its commencement, the public relations firm Smithcom was brought on to help manage Red Door’s public profile and brand messaging. Contracted on at a discounted rate through a personal connection with one of the Red Door Board Members, Smithcom’s involvement was widely seen to be crucial in supporting Red Door with the necessary public relations expertise to make this partnership viable.

![Save the Red Door Campaign on change.org](change.org)

**Figure 10:** Left: Save the Red Door Family Shelter branding; Right: Save the Red Door campaign on change.org  
(Source: RDFS, 2014b)

This type of proactive public relations campaign work was important in creating the call to action and urgency that Red Door needed amongst its community support group, while also engaging key media in their journey. In reflecting on their role in the Red Door partnership, the President of Smithcom remembered:

“It was a longstanding shelter of great reputation that helps women and children, of course it has a voice. Plus, it was well integrated. I knew the shelter, many people did. I think they had a lot of community outreach over the years, a lot of kids had done projects for them, or fundraising drives, so it's not that they were an unknown entity. They had a
very strong public-facing persona, brand if you will. And so we figured out a couple of things that would get the media to pay attention to them.”

In this role Smithcom engaged in a number of strategies to help further leverage Red Door’s profile, including: developing a key stakeholder list, creating a concrete action plan, organizing media relations, and crafting the initial communications to the developer and receiver. In addition, Smithcom also supported Red Door with the change.org petition. As the main visual culmination of the campaign’s efforts, the change.org petition encouraged local community members to sign their support for keeping Red Door at the 875 Queen St. East site. Achieved through a combination of virtual outreach and door-to-door canvassing, the Save the Red Door campaign was ultimately the largest petition even put forth to City Council, amassing over 50,000 signatures. The sheer volume of support this campaign received was repeatedly mentioned by interview informants as being a key component in building the necessary support at the city-level in order to make sure the partnership got approved.

4.3.3 The Role of the Red Door Capital Campaign

In addition to the Save the Red Door public relations campaign, Red Door also simultaneously formalized a Capital Campaign committee following the initial partnership discussions in mid-2014. From a financial perspective, the purpose of the Capital Campaign was specifically to allow for a one-time injection of capital to help fundraise the furnishing of the new building. This was intended to complement Red Door’s separate ongoing annual fundraising efforts to support with their programmatic work. Although the Save the Red Door campaign was primarily intended to generate awareness and secure the public and private sector support necessary to make the partnership feasible, it proved to be extremely beneficial from a fundraising perspective as well. Not only did it raise the general profile of Red Door, but it was also significant in getting so many high profile, influential people involved in the Capital Campaign, including former Mayor of Toronto David Crombie in his role as Honorary Chair.

A full list of the Capital Campaign leadership team can be found in Table 9. It is important to note that these are all volunteer committee positions. The diversity and seniority of individuals on the committee is important since it further demonstrates the ability of the Red Door Family Shelter to leverage their network to acquire the necessary skills to make this partnership work. In particular, through the networks of various board members, the Red Door was able to secure a
strong team of volunteer financial professionals, with a particularly strong contingent of volunteers from BMO Financial Group – a major Canadian financial institution. As noted by numerous research informants, this additional expertise and fundraising capacity, as well as the expanded professional network of potential donors, has been crucial in helping Red Door to work towards its $3 million goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Crombie</td>
<td>Honorary Chair</td>
<td>Civic Leader and former Mayor of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viki Pearce</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Managing Director, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian C. Lang</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Associate General Counsel, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Odette</td>
<td>Cabinet Executive</td>
<td>Vice President, Investments, Kipling Group Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dann Cushing</td>
<td>Cabinet Executive</td>
<td>Investment Advisor, RBC Dominion Securities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sheldrake</td>
<td>Cabinet Executive</td>
<td>Senior Manager, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Steele</td>
<td>Cabinet Executive</td>
<td>Partner at Osler, Hoskin &amp; Harcourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Elliott</td>
<td>Cabinet Executive</td>
<td>President and Chair, Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernnitta Hawkins</td>
<td>Cabinet Executive</td>
<td>Executive Director, Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Beards</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Loyalty Manager, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechelle Bradshaw</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Manager, Impact Analysis &amp; Change, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Desgagnes</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Senior HR Business Partner, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Hall</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Partner Relationship Manager, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aneesa Mohamed</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Consultant, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Montes</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Product Manager, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risa Prenick</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Senior Marketing Manager, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Tremblay</td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>Director, Office of the COO, BMO Financial Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9: Red Door Capital Campaign leadership team*
(Source: Author)
Beyond its crucial impact in helping to secure the financial success of the partnership itself, there was also a belief amongst Red Door Capital Campaign committee members that the campaign allowed Red Door to foster additional fund development skills and capacity in tandem with the project. In addition to its importance throughout the construction and operations phases of the partnership, this skill set is something that will also remain valuable for Red Door in the future, even outside of the scope of this partnership.

**4.3.4 The Role of Political Leadership and Support**

Although it has been alluded to throughout this narrative thus far, it is important to explicitly highlight the role that the local political environment, headed by a passionate and savvy Local Councillor, played in fostering this partnership deal. Although there was a general sense that the community support and political backing evolved in tandem over time, there was simultaneously a clear awareness amongst stakeholders that without political action the community support would likely not have been sufficient on its own. This is primarily due to the fact that the City’s priorities in Toronto are to a large extent driven by the direction that City Council provides. One participant reflected on the marvel of this political feat as follows:

“So when it came to City Council, and there was the gallery packed full of people, and there were councillors in the meeting reading out letters and petitions, and submitting them from all over the City of Toronto, it was quite a spectacle. We've never seen anything like it before. Never seen anything like it before. It was a masterful piece of political organizing.”

Therefore, having a supportive Councillor with mature political skills backing this project meant that Red Door did not have to hire a lobbyist or meet with other Councillors individually to garner their support, both of which would have been more labour intensive in exchange for a less certain outcome.

In relation to this specific case study, all 24 interview informants commented on the critical role that this individual Local Councillor played, commonly citing her immense perseverance, dedication, and savvy knowledge of the political environment. A select group of phrases used to describe the Councillor and her role include:

“She is a fascinating woman. She's tough, she's really tough. She's just amazing and quite a powerhouse.”

“She cared about the services, she cared about the families, she supported the Red Door before it was in danger at all. So I think she was more forward thinking. She showed a
lot of leadership. Without her, we would have never gotten this deal.”

“She's a bit of a force.”

“The Councillor was a great protector and proponent.”

“The Councillor really was key to driving awareness to political action.”

“She's very strong and makes things happen. So she's impressive as a Councillor.”

In terms of where this political support originated, it is important to recognize that the Local Councillor has historically been very committed to social justice and social service projects in the community; as such, the Red Door Family Shelter has historically aligned closely with the types of causes she has run her platforms on. To be certain: the Local Councillor’s support for the Red Door Family Shelter extends back beyond the current partnership project, however it was only after the earlier deal with Rose & Thistle fell through, when the profile of the project was suddenly raised, that her immense level of political support transformed into action. Although not the primary rationale behind her involvement, it is also crucial to note that the timing of the partnership formation coincided with an election year. As such, a reasonable conclusion by many stakeholders was that the Councillor’s involvement in the project was doubly beneficial since not only was it a long-standing commitment and priority of hers, but it also gave her a strong foundation on which to run her campaign for re-election. Moreover, her strong support and vocal desire to save the Red Door was a key distinguisher between her and her main candidate at the time, whose platform largely overlooked Red Door’s situation.

4.3.5 The Challenge of Siloed Organizational Responses

As identified in Chapter 2, traditional single-agency responses to complex, multi-dimensional problems are one of the most significant barriers impeding the realization of effective solutions (Keast & Brown, 2007). This was similarly the case in this partnership where the public sector bureaucracy and red tape appeared, at times, overwhelming to some external stakeholders. This was ultimately embodied in the belief that the approval process did not move quickly enough, despite that this was theoretically perceived to one of the most significant potential benefits of having the City on board with the partnership, especially from a private sector perspective. In fact, contrary to expectations, in many cases participants discussed how the complexity of the partnership made the negotiation process, at times, lengthier and more difficult. For example, while
development proposals should usually take nine months for approval, there is a standard understanding that at the city-level these approvals usually take between 12 and 18 months in most projects; however, with this project, final approvals took over two years from the time of Harhay’s first application. Similarly, it was a common sentiment that, at times, it was overwhelming to have over 20 people from the City sitting around the table with Red Door’s and Harhay’s limited staff representation. Multiple individuals commented on the specific extent to which working with multiple, sometimes disconnected, City departments was a key challenge impeding the timely realization and delivery of the partnership deal – for example:

“It took a very long time, in my opinion, because you had the Real Estate division, you had the Legal division, you had the Finance division, and you had Shelter, Support and Housing, and they're siloed. And it was the Councillor getting senior City staff involved to pull all these disparate silos together that made it happen. And if we didn't have somebody like that, I don't think it ever would have happened. To me they were like these separate entities going like this, and each of them figuring out why they shouldn't do it. And it was senior City staff that forced them to come together.”

Acknowledging the extent to which these City divisions are siloed is important because it emphasizes the extent to which successfully advocating for such innovative partnerships necessarily must come from a more senior and strategic level, where a diversity of stakeholders across functional areas can more effectively buy in to the project. Historically, the City of Toronto operated six main departments that operated predominantly in silos. In an attempt to address this, in recent years the City of Toronto moved to a “Deputy City Manager model” whereby divisions are aggregated into three main clusters – human services, hard services, and financial and internal services – each of which has a Deputy City Manager overseeing the independent departments and divisions within that cluster (for an overview of the three clusters see Table 10). It is then each Deputy City Manager’s job to make sure that cross connections and conversations across City divisions occur so that programs, policies, capital budgets and operating budgets are well integrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster A (Human Services)</th>
<th>Cluster B (Hard Services)</th>
<th>Cluster C (Financial &amp; Internal Services)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Affordable Housing        | Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination Office | Corporate Finance  
Children’s Services                     | Finance & Administration              |
As can be seen in Table 10, a number of diverse city divisions and departments across all three clusters were involved in facilitating the Red Door partnership, thus making it crucial that there was adequate coordination between clusters and divisions. Therefore, having a senior level individual tasked with coordinating the necessary departments was invaluable in helping to overcome some of these public sector organizational complexities. In this case, this leadership was embodied through the Deputy City Manager of Cluster A who was tasked with overseeing the partnership at a high level. In practice, this leadership was important in coordinating the different concessions that the City was able to offer as part of this deal. For example, this approach was necessary in coordinating the necessary planning approvals for the project. While the Deputy City Manager of Cluster A was on board and could make provisions regarding the services within her cluster, it was more difficult to make these provisions for the types of services that fell within Group B, which was generally less directly involved in the formation of this deal. Therefore, having someone who could bring all of these necessary public sector representatives to the table was an important starting point in attempting to overcome some of these coordination challenges.

4.3.6 The Challenge of Managing Partnership Project Risks

In addition to the challenge of managing siloed organizational responses, another important
challenge associated with the Red Door partnership was the ability to adequately manage partnership project risks – a theme that is repeatedly referenced in literature on multi-sector partnerships. In this case, one of the most significant risks associated with the project, as expressed by stakeholders across all three sectors, was the inherent real estate market risk associated with the uncertainty of selling the condominium units. This is significant since pre-selling the units was a precondition to the project receiving adequate financing to proceed and since there was no precedent on which to judge the potential sales of the units beforehand.

In the financial partnership model that was agreed upon between Harhay and the City, construction risk falls with the developer, meaning there is theoretically no risk of cost escalation for the public sector. The purchase price of the shelter space is fixed and no money will be exchanged until construction is completed. To balance out this risk transfer, from a private sector perspective there was significantly less risk for the developer since the City of Toronto was on the hook financially for the shelter space, as opposed to Red Door themselves. In this respect, the ability to get covenant from the City was crucial in securing lenders for the project to support the developer’s plan. Interview informants repeatedly expressed that this financial involvement and leadership on the City’s part was a critical component in balancing the risk in the partnership structure.

From the City’s perspective, entering into such a partnership was beneficial since it allowed the City to transfer high-level risks such as cost overruns and completion delays to the private sector, thus avoiding many of the public relations nightmares that these issues have historically caused. Some stakeholders actively reflected on how some of these risks and trade-offs align with commonly cited benefits of PPP projects:

“I think one advantage is with a private sector developer, you don't have the systemic issues that lead to all the overspending that the City does. So I think it is a way to mitigate against some of the problematic aspects of the City building something. So it makes the process more efficient.”

One risk that the public sector will retain in this partnership model is that inherent risk of real estate ownership. This additional risk is considered acceptable since it is largely balanced out by the ability to transfer operation risk to a reputable operator while also being able to change the target market or usage of the shelter space in the future, pending changes in public sector needs.

For the Red Door, a major risk associated with this partnership relates to the standards and design of the new shelter space. Although Red Door shared input in the design process, there are
no guarantees that their ideal specifications will be incorporated into the final design, particularly considering that they are not on the hook financially for the shelter space. As a result, there is a perceived risk that they could end up with lower quality standards that are not up to par with what would be ideal in high-use shelter spaces. In theory, the City’s oversight with respect to shelter standards should help mitigate this risk.

One final over-arching risk inherent to this partnership model is the risk associated with the temporary relocation of the shelter for two to three years during the construction period. This scenario was particularly complicated given the sheer volume of families that the shelter supports combined with the fact that the City wanted to keep the shelter fully operational during the move. To address this risk, moving risk mitigators and project managers were brought on board by the City to help facilitate the process.

Therefore, despite some additional risks associated with the partnership model, it is also important to recognize that Red Door undertaking this project alone would have been a significantly riskier endeavour. Ultimately, managing many of these risks in an acceptable manner for all partnership participants is strongly linked with the importance of balancing trust and power amongst stakeholders, as will be discussed later in this chapter.

4.4 Securing a Private Sector Developer for the Partnership

Another essential component in successfully establishing this partnership relates to securing a private sector developer who was interested and willing to take part in this project. This is perhaps one of the most complicated components of this partnership, particularly considering that at no stage was Harhay Developments legally mandated to include the Red Door in the redevelopment. The following section therefore seeks to explore how Red Door and the City of Toronto were able to get Harhay on board, with a specific focus on the three most prominent components involved: Red Door’s community support and expertise, public sector incentives, and Harhay’s underlying goodwill.

4.4.1 Leveraging Red Door’s Community Support and Expertise

First, it is crucial that Red Door was able to leverage their own community support and expertise to build Harhay’s interest in the project. As previously expressed, Red Door was able to leverage significant community mobilization for this project, as exemplified by the over 50,000
signatures received through the Save the Red Door campaign. This visual flood of public support, in combination with the outpouring of calls and emails to the developer, put pressure on Harhay to include Red Door in initial discussions for the site. At the same time, this massive level of public support and media coverage experienced so far suggests that Harhay will undoubtedly continue to receive significant amounts of positive publicity for their participation in the project moving forward.

In addition to this community support, there was also a sense that Red Door themselves did a strong job of connecting Harhay with their work and their vision for the shelter. As the most prominent demonstration of this, members of the Red Door management team personally took the Harhay family on tours of both the original Red Door Family Shelter and the John Ross Robertson Shelter – a new purpose-built shelter in the City of Toronto – to demonstrate the immensely visceral difference that a purpose-built shelter can make. Multiple stakeholders commented on the extent to which this tour of the Red Door facility was a tipping point in solidifying Harhay’s commitment to the project. In these cases, individuals referenced a general feeling that Harhay was truly taken with the work that Red Door was doing, particularly as a father himself, and that he was actively imagining all of the things he could do to improve the shelter space for the kids and families residing there. In line with these observations, the President of Harhay Developments himself recalled the tour with fondness:

“We toured the shelter and, you know, I think with anything that we're doing in this city there's got to be motivation. And it's not necessarily financial all the time. We went through, and I went with my children, and I saw a lot. A mom came out with a little five-year-old with a little stuffed panda bear, and it just pulled your heartstrings because you saw the situation that they were in. And to be honest, you saw the living conditions that they were in, in the current shelter, which is well run and clean, but it's an antiquated, dated facility. And so I think there was a bit of a desire on the part of my family, as a family business, to say let's do something here to help the shelter, let's come up with a plan to help them.”

4.4.2 Public Sector Incentives

In addition to Red Door’s work in convincing Harhay to join the project, it was also crucial that the public sector was able to amalgamate a unique and innovative offering of incentives that made the potential deal financially feasible from a private sector perspective. Beyond agreeing to personally purchase the property as previously described, the City was also ultimately able to offer other attractive incentives that built the business case for this partnership.
Early on in the preliminary discussions, Harhay tried to request the waiving of a number of fees and levies – such as development charges, education levies and parks levies – but given the way the City and its legal system is structured it became clear that many of these options were not going to be viable. In this specific case, Harhay first ended up getting Section 37 benefits waived. These are a public contribution that developers in Toronto are required to provide either as a direct investment of money or as a provision of space. Usually Section 37 benefits end up being financial contributions from developers, however in this case Harhay’s were waived under an acceptance of the shelter space as a direct provision of facility space. Fulfilling or waiving these benefits in unique circumstances where developers work with the City to contribute to community infrastructure projects has historically been a common approach in the City of Toronto.

Another more innovative provision provided by the City was an allowance for a marginal increase in gross floor area (GFA) combined with an option to build above the as-of-right building height zoned for the neighborhood. Together these options are important since they help to unlock valuable additional density on the site. As a result, the developer was allowed to incorporate an additional seventh floor on the residential component of the development valued at up to $250,000.

Achieving these concessions required immense levels of flexibility and coordination between public sector departments, as well as innovative thinking. This is primarily because making these types of concessions can quickly become a slippery slope; for example, if you allow one developer a significant density and height bonus, there is a probable chance that other developers might come along in the future and request similar allowances based on this precedent. In this case, these risks were mitigated by basing the concessions on a caveat in the Queen Street East-Leslieville Planning Study which stated that the City would aspire to maintain social service providers in the area as a way of fighting against rapid gentrification in the neighbourhood (Toronto, 2014). As a result of this condition, the City was effectively able to ask for a one-time official plan exemption that secured this additional space for Harhay, without resulting in undue future planning risk for the neighbourhood.

From the developer’s perspective, each of these three components – having the City as the purchaser, waiving Section 37 benefits, and providing an additional density bonus – were all critical. Without any one of these the project would likely not have been viable from a financial perspective.
4.4.3 The Good Will of Harhay Developments

Finally, beyond the active role of Red Door and the City in getting Harhay on board, there was also a sense that Harhay harboured a significant level of underlying good will that made this project possible. A common view amongst stakeholders was that without the willingness of a developer to consider a partnership like this in the first place, it would never have gotten off of the ground. Nearly all interview informants commented on the seemingly strong social conscience of the developer, as well as his openness and receptiveness to the initial idea of a multi-sector partnership due to an interest in creating a legacy for their organization; this sentiment was repeatedly expressed by stakeholders from both the City and Red Door. As one participant succinctly expressed:

“I think Harhay Construction isn't your average developer. They're a niche group, or niche player, and he is the second generation. So it's his father's business. And he wanted the Red Door - once he got his head around it - he wanted the Red Door to be part of being seen as doing something socially responsible.”

This goodwill is perhaps best exemplified through the fact that it was widely believed that many other developers, particularly larger multi-national developers, would likely not have opted for the same partnership deal in this scenario. The fact that Harhay is a family-owned mid-sized company with deep family roots in the development industry in Toronto was important. This structure meant that Harhay’s management team could unilaterally make the decision about whether to become involved in this project and, perhaps more importantly, they could opt to bear the bulk of the investment risk themselves if necessary. Although the existence of this good will was ultimately an equally essential component in securing Harhay’s interest in the partnership, there was a general understanding amongst stakeholders that the community support and public sector incentives forced Harhay to mobilize this good will that may otherwise have remained unused.

4.5 Realizing Synergy: Leveraging a Diversity of Partner Contributions in Both Resources and Expertise

At a foundational level, it is important to recognize that “the general premise underpinning [...] collaborative arrangements is that differences between organizations — including their areas of expertise, assets, know-how, priorities, cultures and values — constitute unique resources that, when brought together, create the potential for synergies and collaborative advantage” (Vangen,
Similarly, as Andrews and Entwistle explain (2010: 680), “theories of sectoral difference suggest that the public, private, and non-profit sectors each possess unique advantages.” In this respect, a key to establishing any successful partnership is that stakeholders are able to bring the appropriate resources and expertise to the table to promote successfully synergistic outcomes. The following quotes from a diversity of stakeholders exemplify the extent to which relevant stakeholders unanimously recognized the importance of strategic multi-sector contributions to this partnership:

“It's a very complex solution that speaks to the excellence that each party can deliver. So each party gets to do what they do really well.”

“So each of the partners I think is bringing their own particular kind of expertise.”

“It's always good to know what your weaknesses are, and look for whatever resources you need to increase your skills, or increase your edge if you will.”

In the case of the Red Door partnership, these diverse resources and expertise manifested themselves in a number of different ways, thus confirming many past research findings on comparative advantage across sectors (for an overview of the theory of sectoral difference see Andrews & Entwistle, 2010). For example, in this case the City of Toronto held clear mandates and planning powers, which enabled them to target larger structural issues related to the partnership, such as zoning bylaw amendments or redevelopment approvals. At the same time, Harhay brought experience in maximizing value for money in mixed-use developments while ultimately delivering the project at an overall lower cost. Finally, Red Door brought a stronger capacity to communicate with important community stakeholders and groups, thus providing a foundation for the continued provision of superior shelter service outcomes moving forward.

Expanding on these base-level benefits, another core area of expertise that the City was able to provide was in helping Red Door and Harhay navigate the bureaucracy of the public sector approval and permit processes. Having upper-level managers at the city-level as key stakeholders in this process ensured that partners were able to, at times, undertake these processes more efficiently. As one individual astutely explained:

“The City’s got the brokering ability. They've got the ability to make sure that all the right departments and people are involved. You've got to have someone who knows the City and knows how the planning works. You need the City support or you just wouldn't be able to do it.”
Moreover, it is important to recognize that the City itself is a diverse organization with many subdivisions and departments. As a result, different departments of the City brought distinctly different resources and skill sets to this partnership as well. While the Real Estate division brought expertise in relation to negotiating the sale and purchase, the SSHA brought shelter standards and oversight, and the financial department brought experience working with the different innovative financing models and incentives that were ultimately able to make this project financially viable. Taken together, these expansive bodies of expertise made the City’s involvement in this partnership invaluable.

With specific consideration of Red Door as the non-profit service provider, it is often acknowledged that in public-private partnerships “apparently weaker partners are uniquely able to provide some form of essential – though not financial – resource […] in the form of, for example, expertise or access to immunities or markets that other partners could not substitute” (Huxham & Vangen, 2000c: 298). While it was clear early on that the Red Door did not have the technical expertise necessary to adequately build the business case for this project alone, the Red Door Executive Director’s advocacy on the necessity of purpose-built shelters and the needs of Red Door clients was considered a particularly important skill set. Furthermore, research has consistently found that non-profits are often able to bring forms of brand and recognition that the public sector cannot typically garner (Andrews & Entwistle, 2010). To this point, many stakeholders commented on the unique importance of the Red Door’s brand and reputation:

“I think that the inspiring and the uplifting part is the shelter. People identify with the Red Door, remember its long history in the community. People feel it’s our shelter, we look after people here, in our community. Their outreach, their relationships, they're so good at that. So it's not something you could replicate without that kind of partner as your social agency.”

Beyond the partners directly involved in the project, it appears clear that each partner’s ability to bring on external support as necessary was equally important in this process. For example, Red Door worked closely with a number of public relations consultants, lawyers, advocate architects, and other professionals that provided invaluable support and guidance, particularly during the period of crisis in the lead up to the formation of the partnership. In many of these cases, these services were leveraged via the relationships and networks of Red Door’s Board Members; as a result, they were often provided either for free or at a highly subsidized cost to the Red Door. Working through this partnership deal with these sources of support allowed Red
Door to build capacity in many valuable areas where they did not have as strong of a skill set or capacity before. For example, many members of the Red Door team expressed that they were much more confident in their ability to manage and foster community outreach as a result of this experience and their interactions with Smithcom. This experience therefore seems to have, at the very least, taught them when to reach out and who to reach out to – this was viewed by many stakeholders as being equally as valuable.

4.6 Achieving Collaborative Advantage

As noted throughout the research process, stakeholders repeatedly described the level of collaboration in this project as being particularly high, implying, at least to some degree, the achievement of collaborative advantage. As suggested by past research on multi-sector partnerships, it is important to consider these outcomes from the perspective both of the public sector – intended to represent societal interests more broadly – but also from the perspective of other external stakeholders, including both the private and non-profit sectors (Osborne & Murray, 2000). This is because in order for such partnerships to remain a viable option for future developments it is important that we are pursuing and achieving collaborative outcomes that benefit each of the stakeholders involved.

When discussing specific conceptualizations of successful collaborations, there are two main approaches employed by researchers: one focuses explicitly on performance metrics while the other focuses on a range of more complex, socially-embedded outcomes (Hibbert et al., 2008). In the case of the Red Door partnership, at this early stage there is a general sense that positive collaborative outcomes have been achieved in both of these areas. In line with these conceptualizations, past research has sought to clearly identify the factors that support the achievement of successful collaborative advantage (Huxham, 1993). Based on characterizations of partnership experiences as described by informants during the interview process, Table 11 presents an overview of the Red Door partnership’s relatively strong outcomes vis-à-vis these factors. Essentially, despite some challenges along the way, stakeholders from the public, private and third sectors each appear to be unanimously satisfied with the collaborative outcomes achieved thus far. Following Huxham and Vangen’s (2000b) conceptualization as outlined in Chapter 2, the following sections examine how partnership structure, processes and participants act as distinct, yet interlinked media through which the collaborative outcomes are realized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Contributing to Successful Collaborative Advantage</th>
<th>Perceived Level of Achievement thus far in the Red Door Partnership (to a high extent, to a moderate extent, to a low extent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participants involved share a common:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. sense of mission and strategy</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. set of values</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ability to manage change</td>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants involved share:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. power among those involved</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. decisions about how to manage the collaboration</td>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the resources themselves</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants involved agree over:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the legitimacy of participants to be involved in the collaboration including the convener</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. perceived stakeholder inter-dependence</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the values of collaboration per se</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the importance of the issue over which collaboration is to occur</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the organizations involved reflect:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. through their different roles and values, the complexity of the issue</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. the participants are geographically proximate</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is supportive communication and evocative leadership to promote:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. good interpersonal relationships between individuals involved</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. high awareness of each organization's goals, services and resources</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. mutual trust</td>
<td>To a high extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Summary of key criteria of the most collaboratively successful multi-sector partnerships applied to the Red Door partnership  
(Source: Author; factors adapted from Huxham, 1993: 605)
4.6.1 Collaborative Governance via Structure

Given the relatively clearly defined membership of the Red Door partnership, the totality of partners in the project is easy to identify. However, despite this relatively straightforward organizational membership, the formal structure and interconnections between actors within the partnership itself are relatively more complex given the unique ways in which the stakeholders are required to interact.

Partnership participants described two clear conceptual components to the Red Door partnership structure: the legal agreement and the social agreement. In terms of the formal legal structure of the partnership, from a financial perspective the business deal is exclusively between the City of Toronto and Harhay Developments. As the strata-type owner, the City then will formally lease the shelter space to Red Door at a nominal fee long-term, a situation which is further complicated by the fact that the City is also Red Door’s primary funder. Given this reality, this disconnected legal structure between the partners appears to have worked well in this arrangement, particularly since it allows for less complicated formal partnership structures. This ability to separate out the formal structures of these two legal components of the partnership is an important means of mitigating the fact that formal partnership structures involving more than two main partners are typically inherently more complex and difficult to manage (Hibbert & Huxham, 2005).

Perhaps the more complicated of the two agreements, the social agreement reflects many of the broader goals and objectives of the partnership. At the same time, the social agreement is less formal in terms of partnership structure, and as a result manifests itself more predominantly in the ways in which shared governance was achieved through joint decision-making and consultative processes early on in the strategic planning stages (Xu & Morgan, 2012; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015).

Although the main financial structure is between Harhay and the City, there is a clear belief that in order for the partnership to successfully leverage the relevant knowledge and expertise of all stakeholders, Red Door needed to be actively at the table for discussions surrounding the design of the shelter space. In this respect, the effective coordination of the partnership decision-making processes thus far appears to stem primarily from the structured coordination that took place amongst stakeholders in the initial negotiation processes, prior to formalizing the financial component of the deal (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Klijn & Teisman, 2005).
4.6.2 Collaborative Governance via Processes

Of the three mediums through which partnership agendas are formed, partnership processes were perhaps the most distinctive in relation to the Red Door partnership. In particular, individuals repeatedly referred to the collaborative process as consistently iterative. Rather than walking into the partnership with a clear long-term vision of what the partnership process would look like, stakeholders were constantly making and updating decisions on a day-to-day, week-by-week basis. In this respect, there was a clear openness to address issues as they arose along the way and an understanding that everything would not go right the first time necessarily, but that there would be some flexibility needed as each of the stakeholders figures out what will work and what will not. This need to be flexible in the decision-making process was subtly acknowledged by a number of stakeholders, such as in the following exerts:

“If one is to think of it from a process perspective, it was all about capitalizing on opportunities as they presented themselves.”

“So there's an example of, in construction development, where things never work out exactly as you planned and you have to be pragmatic and practical.”

A clear example of this was the understanding that loan guarantees were not going to work at which point there was the need to go back to the drawing table early on and reassess other financial options that could work from the City’s perspective. This ability to be open about what is and is not working and to be willing to go back and make adjustments proved critical.

Stakeholders attempted to navigate this complexity at best they could by proactively engaging with one another in the decision-making process. For example, this is reflected through the fact that Harhay met with the City Planning Department prior to submitting a formal application in order to better understand how a collaborative solution could be reached. This proactive approach mirrors past research suggesting that practitioners must be equally committed to continually nurturing the collaborative processes in the pursuit of building trust amongst partners and to establishing a well-planned process management approach (Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Roberts & Siemiatycki, 2015).

4.6.3 Collaborative Governance via Partnership Participants ( Actors)

Finally, in relation to partnership participants, there was a significant group of individuals with sufficient power and know-how who were involved, whether explicitly or implicitly, in
pushing the collaborative agenda forward and in achieving partnership success. In this case, given the immense diversity of individuals involved, there was a clear sense that it was critical that everyone understood the role they should play and when. This need to have the right stakeholders at the table was repeatedly recognized by individuals involved in the project:

“It’s important to make sure that you do get the right stakeholders around the table to actually work through it.”

“I think it’s critical to have the right players at the right time at the table.”

“You need to invest the right people and skills into the actual program.”

“So much of it depends upon the willingness of the key actors.”

“I also think the leadership of the discussions was with the right people. There’s no way that stuff would happen if the right people weren’t at the table.”

Similarly, there was also a clear desire amongst partnership participants to work together and establish a collaborative agenda that worked for each of the stakeholders involved:

“I think a big part of this was, we really had three willing partners, and partners who are willing to work together. You're not going to always have that. So that was a big part of it, was just our willingness to all work together to come up with a structure that worked.”

One of the biggest challenges in relation to partnership participants was the degree to which it was time consuming to get all the right people to the table simply given the large number of people working on this project. From the City’s perspective, early on it fell to upper level management – and in this case the Deputy City Manager – to oversee the project from a high level and make sure that it was functioning from all the appropriate public sector levels. This role is then likely to shift more directly to the SSHA towards the end of the construction phase as the shelter space becomes functional. This ability to identify and empower those actors who are most likely to be effective key collaborators is an important component in driving partnership success (Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Huxham, 2000).

To further complicate this, there was also some turnover in partnership membership over the duration of finalizing the agreement. For example, the Deputy City Manager tasked with coordinating the project from a senior public sector perspective retired partway through formation of the partnership. As a result, her duties in relation to this project were redistributed to the two remaining Deputy City Managers, while the Director of Affordable Housing took over much of
the coordinating role. Similarly, many members of the leadership of SSHA also changed positions over the same period. The ability to manage these shifting partnership memberships in a productive way demonstrates the successful single-mindedness and perseverance required to achieve successful collaborative advantage (Huxham, 2000).

4.7 Leadership Activities for Achieving Collaborative Advantage

Participants in this case study exhibited several key characteristics of successfully collaborative leaders, including the existence of collaborative mindsets and an ability to frame the issue at hand in a manner that can be easily understood by all key stakeholders (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015). However, as Vangen, Hayes and Cornforth (2015: 1258) conclude, possessing these characteristics is not enough on its own since “the governance of collaborations is highly resource intensive and requires continuous energy and commitment and a great deal of skill from those who are in charge of them.” Therefore, as hypothesized based on previous research, it is clear that in this case the collaborative agenda was predominantly pushed forth through a variety of leadership activities – managing aims, managing language and culture, and managing trust and power – that were continually carried out by partnership participants (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Vangen, Hayes & Cornforth, 2015; Huxham & Vangen, 2000b).

In this context of leadership activities, perhaps one of the most important understandings to flag is that there was no single mastermind behind this partnership – a sentiment that was repeatedly expressed by the stakeholders involved. While a number of stakeholders played key and irreplaceable roles, no single individual or organization could rightfully be attributed with masterminding this partnership by themselves. This reflects Hibbert et al.’s (2008) research, which found that successful collaborations were most often the result of “effective collectivities” rather than a handful of enthusiastic individuals. One important point of distinction, as identified by a stakeholder involved in this project, was the reality that although there were a number of “big champions” for the partnership who overtly pursued these leadership activities, there were also a number of more “subtle champions” who also pursued collaborative outcomes in more strategic, low-key ways. The remainder of this chapter will explore the leadership activities of these various champions in greater depth.
4.7.1 Managing Aims in the Red Door Partnership

With respect to managing aims, in the case of the Red Door partnership individuals identified a clear benefit to highlighting important goal congruence between stakeholders upfront (Vangen, 2017; Osborne & Murray, 2000). Despite that many participants entered the negotiations stage with distinctly different resources and expertise, there was a clear sense that over-arching partner goals were ultimately able to be linked, at least partially, because of the unique opportunity for goal alignment that this partnership presented (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013). As previously expressed, stakeholders from all sectors highlighted their shared commitment to facilitating an innovative partnership project that will positively contribute to the local community while securing high-level shelter space and service provision long-term; this was the general framework within which more specific, organizational-level objectives were situated.

Coordinating the necessary strategic conversations amongst participants early on in the partnership process was important because it allowed stakeholders to openly discuss the potential for a shared vision, while also ensuring that there was satisfactory alignment between their individual objectives. In discussing these fundamental shared values, the President and Chair of the Red Door Board of Directors noted:

“I think all parties share a common desire to provide support to these families and children, so I think our values – that would be something that I think would be an important thing to highlight – our values are really consistent. So if you had a developer who didn't share that value, the value to provide support to disenfranchised communities, this project would have never got off the ground. So in that way I think we're really super aligned.”

This tied into the notion of being upfront and honest about organizational and personal goals within the partnership setting; as another stakeholder explained:

“My sense was that everybody was pretty honest with what they wanted. And it's so much easier if you're not trying to manage each other and the outcome. You don't waste a lot of time playing games.”

In this respect, it is important to make sure stakeholders are clear on outcomes and on what they hope to achieve – a multi-sector partnership should simply be one potential vehicle for getting there.

This broad alignment of top-level partnership goals was repeatedly referenced by project stakeholders as a key foundation upon which the partnership was built. In fact, in this partnership
context, individuals from each of the three partner organizations appeared to become more and more passionate for the project as they increasingly realized the extent to which it was seen as being something new and innovative. Moreover, it was generally believed that to some extent the partnership stemmed from partners sharing similar sets of values while demonstrating genuine concern about the work that Red Door is involved in. These sentiments can be clearly seen in each of the select excerpts below:

“I think everyone has the same end goals for the project. I think everyone wants a successful project in the end and a great space for the new Red Door.”

“I think if you ask the majority of people who were involved, everyone has a sort of baseline that they believe that the Red Door does a lot of great work and that it's really helping the community, helping people who are in times of need.”

“I think at this point we have very strong and supportive and aligned views of where we all want to go. And everybody would like to do anything they can to help move this forward.”

“I think what was important was the fact that all of the different stakeholders were able to recognize there was an opportunity, and grab the opportunity, and that was dependent on people recognizing clear objectives.”

Ultimately, given the sheer extent to which participants focused on emphasizing these shared partnership aims and objectives when reflecting on their partnership experiences, it is clear that this was a significant component in successfully advancing the collaborative agenda.

### 4.7.2 Managing Language and Culture in the Red Door Partnership

Beyond this critical goal congruence, there was also a distinct understanding that managing the diverse languages and cultures of the different partners was equally important in furthering the collaborative agenda. As mirrored in the literature on collaborative advantage, there was a clear sense in this case study that significant cultural diversity existed between the public, private and third sector organizations involved in the partnership (Vangen & Winchester, 2014). In fact, many of the interview informants themselves reflected on the clear ways in which partners’ different habitual ways of being and acting stemmed from distinctly different professional and organizational cultures and values (Vangen & Winchester, 2014; Huxham & Vangen, 2000). One public sector stakeholder emphasised the importance of this diversity, flagging the potential opportunities that these differences can present if managed appropriately:
“The private sector tells a story, they speak a language that we don't speak, right. And they have connections we don't have. Yeah, I certainly think there’s a lot of opportunity there that is untapped.”

In the case of the City’s participation, it was particularly important that the City had the upper-level support necessary to push through a project of this complexity and magnitude. As was noted in multiple interviews with stakeholders involved in the project, there was also a general sense that although public sector staff wanted to help earlier on in the planning process, there was not a lot they could do without a formal mandate. This is an important point to note as it reflects the extent to which it is important to manage expectations in terms of the different sectoral and organizational cultures that exist in multi-sector partnerships.

Moreover, as previously expressed, there was also significant evidence of different expectations among stakeholders regarding the level of formal procedure that should be required to make this type of partnership work (Vangen & Huxham, 2010, 2013). In particular, in this case the public sector bureaucracy exemplified this well, with many stakeholders describing the process as somewhat tedious and time consuming. The challenge was that while this cultural diversity acts in some ways as an inhibitor to achieving collaborative advantage, this diversity of stakeholder perspectives and cultures is also simultaneously one of the most important elements that makes these types of partnerships so valuable by encouraging stakeholders to bring unique resources and expertise to that table.

As a result, there was a clear sense in the Red Door partnership that being able to effectively manage this “culture paradox” and weather through these types of challenging organizational circumstances was important in making such collaborative partnerships work (Vangen & Huxham, 2013; Vangen & Winchester, 2014). Moreover, despite the existence of these inherently diverse organizational cultures and tensions, there was a clear sense of respect for varying organizational cultures and capacities amongst partnership participants in this case. As noted by a member of Red Door’s senior management team, there was a general sense that in this case partners were treated equally at the table, thus signifying a significant respect for the resources and expertise that different stakeholders have to offer:

“What I kept saying to my team is we have no skin in the game, right, so I can't jump up yelling and screaming because I don't have any money on the table. So given that we didn't, I think we were treated very respectfully by both the City and Harhay. We did not
bring any capital to the table but we weren't treated like the poor cousin. We were treated, I think, in a responsible manner.”

Beyond the immediate benefits, there was even a sense amongst many of the individuals interviewed that this close engagement and collaboration with stakeholders from across sectors may allow for the development of additional skills and valuable expertise – for example:

“I think having an social service agency interact with the commercial aspect of it... To be exposed to some for-profit thinking is not a bad thing for a not-for-profit. So I think the exposure to new thinking that the collaboration brings is beneficial for everybody.”

This reflects the notion that not only are stakeholders ideally achieving collaborative outcomes throughout the partnership’s life cycle, but that a significant longer-term benefit of such diverse partnerships is the ability for each of these partners to learn from one another.

### 4.7.3 Managing Trust and Power in the Red Door Partnership

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there were also a number of distinct ways in which stakeholders sought to manage trust and power for the overall benefit of the partnership. In the literature on collaborative advantage, trust is repeatedly described as one of the most recurrent behavioural factors required to achieve partnership success (Weihe, 2008; Grossman, 2012; Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015; Beech & Huxham, 2003). This is because trust is believed to “lower transaction costs, enhance co-operation, increase information-sharing, facilitate dispute resolution and reduce the amount of formal contracts and harmful conflict between co-operating organizations” (Weihe, 2008: 155). This conceptualization of trust is particularly relevant to the Red Door partnership, where the importance of building and maintaining trust was repeatedly referenced by stakeholders, unanimously making it the most common leadership approach employed by participants in managing the collaborative agenda. The following exerts highlight this well:

“The trust of the partners becomes really important, so the players who you have in leadership roles become really critical here.”

“I think everyone's really bargained in good faith, and got a deal that's going to work at the end of the day. So there hasn't been any mistrust, I guess. And that can happen a lot between private and public sector too. So the relationships have been really good right from the get-go on this project, I think.”

“I think trust is huge. It's intangible but the relationships and the agreements are based on an ability to trust one another.”
In line with past research on collaborative advantage, there was also a clear sense in this case that a previous track record was important, both for the developer, Harhay, and the third party service provider, Red Door. For example, prior to entering the partnership both Harhay and Red Door had long histories of high quality service provision, signifying their potential roles as trustworthy partners and establishing a foundation upon which trust could later be built. In addition, given that trust historically builds up over time, in many ways the initial failed deal with Rose & Thistle also allowed Red Door to begin establishing a level of trust with the Local Councillor and with the City of Toronto that was similarly an invaluable part of the foundation for the partnership (Klijn & Teisman, 2005; Grossman, 2012).

In the Red Door partnership, there were a number of active and vocal champions for the project who were each indispensable to its successes, as previously described. However, the existence of “subtle champions” appears to be of particular importance in relation to the trust-building process. In particular, the Red Door Executive Director had a crucial, albeit less frontline, role in managing the distribution of power and support for the project. As one Red Door Board Member noted:

“At the head of all things at all times was the Executive Director. She’s just passionate. She's a very smart woman, she's very strategic and visionary. And quite unusually, she is intelligent enough to know when she needs help and to ask for it. So she listened to the Local Councillor, she listened to other people at the City, she listened to the PR people she spoke with, she listened to some other people from whom she sought advice, so she's not one of those people who are sort of megalomaniacs. She really does know how to listen to other people, and listen to their advice and then weigh it and take it. I fully credit her, yeah.”

In relation to the links between trust and power, a common contention, as Klijn and Teisman (2000: 89) explain, is that “the importance of the resources that actors possess gives them more or less power in the network.” Therefore, the fact that Red Door was repeatedly perceived to be treated equally at the negotiations table, as previously described, is important since it demonstrates the extent to which power relationships were appropriately managed. This balancing of power was key to the overall success of the partnership since it ensured that each of the partners was able to make indispensable contributions in both resources and expertise to the partnership, ultimately resulting in genuinely synergistic outcomes as described earlier in this chapter (Osborne & Murray, 2000; Boyer, 2016).
4.8 Conclusion

As a culmination of the outcomes of this research process, this chapter framed the key research findings of this thesis by presenting the Red Door Family Shelter partnership as a unique case study through which we can better understand the theory of collaborative advantage. Two main approaches were taken in presenting the research findings. First, the document analyses and semi-structured interviews were used to produce a detailed case narrative that highlighted how the Red Door partnership came to exist, with specific consideration of the key facilitating factors and barriers that impacted its progress. Then, building on this initial narrative, the chapter sought to present the research findings under the specific guise of the theory of collaborative advantage, specifically exploring how successful collaborative agendas were pursued. In this way, at this early stage in the partnership process, the Red Door partnership was presented as a generally successful example of the achievement of collaborative advantage. Given this understanding, the final chapter of this thesis considers these research findings more critically, highlighting important lessons learned, limitations of the case study, and directions for future research.
Chapter 5: Discussion of Research Findings and Conclusion – Lessons Learned and Directions for Future Research

The final chapter of this thesis provides a critical summary of the key research findings and results as presented in Chapter 4. In doing so, it elaborates on how the primary research objectives have been addressed, including broader discussions of how the Red Door partnership has contributed to the existing body of academic research on public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage. Theoretically speaking, consideration is also given to how this case study research expands our conceptual understanding of the collaborative advantage framework and the ways in which collaborative agendas are conceptualized and ultimately achieved.

The chapter then provides a number of practitioner-oriented recommendations based on the initial research findings. These recommendations are intended to address some of the potential limitations of this research while also considering potential ways in which the positive outcomes of the Red Door partnership can be brought to scale. In particular, discussions of the potential replicability of the partnership model are included.

Finally, the chapter concludes by highlighting important areas for future academic research, thus identifying ways in which such research could further inform and strengthen these initial research findings. In particular, it demonstrates ways in which public-private partnerships and collaborative advantage could be better linked from an urban planning perspective, while also flagging the broader research value of establishing such linkages. By way of these areas of analysis and discussion, the chapter ultimately reiterates the academic value of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership case study research that has been conducted here.

5.1 Summary of Key Research Findings: Reflecting on Core Research Objectives

The primary objective of this research study was to present the case study narrative of the Red Door Family Shelter partnership using the theory of collaborative advantage as a guiding framework for analysis. In doing so, the research primarily sought to better understand the ways that collaborative advantage outcomes are successfully realized (or not) in innovative multi-sector partnerships between the public, private and third sectors. Moreover, in instances where collaborative advantage was achieved (or not), the research sought to identify the facilitating factors (or barriers) at work.
As presented in Chapter 4, the Red Door case study narrative systematically demonstrates how many of the important elements of the theory of collaborative advantage may be relevant to multi-sector partnerships involving the third sector within an urban planning partnership. Specifically, the research demonstrated the ways in which factors such as community support and mobilization, political leadership, innovative financing models, siloed organization responses, and appropriate risk management techniques all contributed to (or hindered) the successful realization of partnership synergy. Then, specifically considering these enabling factors, the partnership was examined in terms of the structures, processes and participants that helped to form the collaborative agenda. Finally, the importance of leadership activities in the form of managing aims, managing language and culture, and managing trust and power were all presented as key mediums through which collaborative outcomes were proactively pursued.

Given these initial research findings, this final chapter therefore completes the research process by giving consideration to how we might be able to more systematically pursue collaborative advantage outcomes in innovative public-private partnerships moving forward.

5.2 Contributions to Scholarly Research

5.2.1 Limitations of this Research Study

It is essential to recognize that any partnership venture is situated within its own unique context and process which are influenced by a number of external factors (Osborne & Murray, 2000). Although some conclusions can be drawn from case research in this area, it should be noted that the applicability of the research to other cases may be limited depending on the situational context. As Osborne and Murray (2000: 80) explain, “each new venture continues to be embedded within its own context and the pressures engendered by that context are significant in its development.” Further to this point, research on collaborative advantage case studies has repeatedly found that the types of key lessons and best practices produced through the research process are often difficult to enact in reality, thus complicating studies of partnership effectiveness (Huxham, 2000).

As Hibbert et al. (2008) found, collaborations are rarely enacted as coherent narratives. As such, it is reasonable to assume that some significant nuance to the collaborative experience may be omitted in the case narrative that was presented here, particularly since this narrative was presented predominantly through the lens of the theory of collaborative advantage. In this way,
important complementary research outcomes could likely be achieved by examining this same case study using an alternative theoretical approach. Acknowledging these research limitations is important when considering the ways in which these research findings produce lessons and key learnings that are meant to be transferrable to other partnership contexts, as will be presented throughout the remainder of this chapter.

5.2.2 Directions for Future Research

Moving forward, there is a clear need to follow these types of partnerships through to the end of the partnership agreements. Generally speaking, many PPPs are still in their very early stages, meaning it will be important to track these projects as progress continues. In the case of the Red Door partnership, it will be particularly interesting to follow what happens to the partnership as the construction phase completes within the next two to three years and residents of both the shelter and the condominium units begin to move back in to the final mixed-use building. For example, one clear future risk at this stage would lie in how the condominium and retail spaces interact with the shelter in practice. As different stakeholders astutely commented:

“You talk about collaboration and it doesn't just end at putting this whole package together. It ends when the first women and children move into that space. So there's still a lot of work to be done, a lot of collaboration to be done.”

“The other risk I think would be if it doesn't go well, like if the people who ultimately purchase these condominiums are complaining all the time about the shelter; if you don't manage that, then you could create a very negative environment for the next shelter that's in the same situation.”

This reality of future challenges that any partnership may face is important because as research has shown in the past, what works in theory may not always work in practice. Therefore, in the push to secure more robust research outcomes, there is a general push for research that takes a dynamic, multilevel systems view and that makes use of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies (Bryson, Crosby & Stone, 2015). In this way, there is an evident need to assess projects more holistically. It is also important that future research projects continue to explicitly consider the contextual situation of any partnership under examination, while recognizing that performance outcomes mean very little without the broader scope and context (Grossman, 2012).

More importantly, there is a distinct need to conduct long-term longitudinal comparative case studies of these types of partnerships as a valuable follow-up on the successes and challenges
realized through different phases of PPP projects; this is particularly important for innovative PPP arrangements, such as the Red Door partnership, where no precedent for analysis exists (for examples of case study research examining risk in the long-term concession stages of a PPP project see Chung & Hensher, 2015; Chung, 2016; Verweij, Teisman & Gerrtis, 2017). By considering collaborative advantage outcomes over a longer timeframe, this type of research approach would ultimately be a valuable contribution in strengthening the body of academic literature linking collaborative advantage and public-private partnerships in an urban planning context, as was initiated through this research project.

5.3 Replicating this Type of Innovative Multi-Sector Partnership Model

Throughout the research process, it was clear that many participants from across sectors were interested in the precedent that this type of project would set. For example, this sentiment was often reflected in the way stakeholders described their high-level vision for the partnership, without any specific prompt to use this type of language:

“From a citizen’s perspective, I think it's precedent setting and hopefully will serve as a model going forward for many of these social services.”

“For me, it's one of the most exciting things that I've ever been able to do in the City, and probably will be able to do.”

“This is precedent setting for the City of Toronto.”

“We can use this as an example to do this again, and again, and again. So how can we showcase this when it's done to say this is a good news story?”

As a result, a natural theme that emerged from the research was the extent to which the model itself is replicable.

This replicability is most readily limited when considering the types of common challenges facing other shelter services. In Toronto, a shelter bylaw defines particular geographical locations where a shelter can be located. This is important because even in cases where a partnership model could work, it is important to first have a prerequisite understanding of where shelter services are most needed, including areas that are currently over- and under-served. Furthermore, although there is no requirement to conduct a public consultation in siting shelter services, there is a clear understanding that community support is a unique and tricky thing to build. As is often the case, shelters face intense NIMBYism within local communities, making siting such projects politically
complicated endeavours. Therefore, by first recognizing where the need actually exists and where there is an opportunity to build the necessary community support, we can develop a stronger understanding of when there is actually true opportunity for this type of partnership model to be most beneficial.

From a more practical perspective, the reality is also that this type of partnership structure employed in the Red Door partnership tangibly cost the City significantly more upfront, despite that the City will benefit from the land’s asset appreciation over time. As a result, there is a clear need to be highly selective when considering employing this type of partnership model where the City takes on ownership given the limited financial resources of the public sector devoted to these types of projects. Therefore, from a public sector perspective, it is important that government departments learn from successful case examples, such as the Red Door, in order to more systematically understand the types of workable solutions available to them.

As partnership research has repeatedly shown, being able to evaluate when and where to collaborate is just as important as managing the collaborative processes themselves (O’Leary, 2016). To be sure, public-private partnerships are not a panacea for public and third sector funding shortfalls. Although they offer a number of potential benefits when employed appropriately, they also present a number of additional risks, as previously described. As such, it is crucial that projects are evaluated on a case by case basis to determine when a partnership approach is appropriate, and when it is not.

More specifically, in the context of innovative multi-sector partnerships involving social services organizations, it is important that any proposed solutions be adapted depending on context-specific elements. This need for flexibility was repeatedly expressed by research informants. For example, the types of incentives that may be appropriate for a partnership involving a homeless shelter may be different than those that are appropriate for other social service organizations in similar partnerships. Even within shelter services themselves there is likely to be significant variability, with the majority of individuals commenting on the extent to which a family shelter is likely to be considered a more palatable neighbour than a single men’s or youth shelter. Ultimately, this case reiterated the extent to which successfully achieving collaborative advantage is an inherently case-specific endeavour.
5.4 Policy Recommendations

Building on the approach employed by a number of other academics in this field (for example see Huxham & Macdonald, 1992), it is important to note that the findings highlighted here are presented with equal consideration of their contribution to academic insight and practice. Therefore, given that there are still lots of issues with PPP projects in practice, it is important that we continue to conduct research like this to better understand ways in which we can more systematically pursue more positive outcomes from a public sector perspective. Although the lessons from this case study most readily translate to other potential partnerships involving shelter service operators, many of the practitioner-oriented outcomes of this research are likely applicable to partnerships involving any range of third sector social service organizations. The following section outlines three key policy recommendations derived from the key lessons of the Red Door partnership.

5.4.1 The Value of Ongoing Public Awareness and Documenting Innovative Partnership Outcomes

Being able to clearly and concisely demonstrate and communicate the collaborative successes of innovative partnership projects should by a key component to any research conducted in this relatively new academic space. While this thesis is a first attempt at exploring and presenting these outcomes from an academic perspective, there is an equally strong need for both media and the public sector to also report on the clear outcomes and benefits of projects such as these. Through a recently commissioned report titled “Engaging Communities in First Step Housing and Services: Report of the Facilitator on Developing a New Framework for Siting Homeless Shelters in the City of Toronto,” the City of Toronto has begun to support in communicating some of the project outcomes for the Red Door partnership within the broader shelter context (Davis, 2017), however it is important that outcomes are also communicated explicitly at the case study level where possible.

An initial recommendation, as supported by the findings of this research study, is the need to provide stronger educational support to citizens to better educate them regarding the immense need for siting transitional housing services, and the potential opportunities that innovative mixed-use partnerships could provide at a societal level in this context (Davis, 2017). The accurate promotion and publicity of successful partnerships may be one first step in initiating this
educational process; the Red Door is a particularly good example of this type of educational
approach as the organization benefited from a plethora of positive media coverage before, during
and after the establishment of the partnership, as previously expressed. It is therefore very
important that this project is able to maintain visibility throughout the remainder of its life cycle
so as to ensure that any updates to the project outcomes are also clearly communicated to the
public.

Participants generally agreed that documenting both positive and negative partnership
outcomes, as this thesis has sought to do, is a good first step in generating additional awareness
and interest in these types of innovative partnership models. This is beneficial because, by showing
the model in action there is a strong opportunity to build acceptance amongst other developers and
potentially foster an openness to trying similar types of models in the future. To this end, it is
important to capitalize on opportunities to do evaluations of the project at regular intervals every
few years to determine what is still working, what is not, where the project sits financially, and so
forth. For example, several stakeholders commented that it would be beneficial to demonstrate the
extent to which the inclusion of the shelter had an impact on the sales of condominium units (if
any). As the City of Toronto preliminarily reported in a recent shelter services report referencing
the Red Door partnership, “inclusion of a shelter did not appear to have any detrimental impact on
the marketability of the development” (Davis, 2017); more rigorous academic research could be
used to support these claims, making this a good starting place for conducting future follow-up
research on the same case study. Providing up-to-date communication regarding the measurable
outcomes of partnership projects is important since it demonstrates how the outcomes are changing
over time, allowing us to better understand the ways in which we should alter our approach to
pursuing these types of innovative partnership arrangements. Furthermore, given the necessity of
trust and the ways in which it builds up over time, it is clear that initial partnerships such as this
one help to begin laying the foundation for potential future collaborations at a more significant
level (Osborne & Murray, 2000).

This need for clear communication of outcomes is even more clear when considering that
there is very much still a “public good, private bad” sentiment resonating among many individuals
working in the social service sphere, predominantly as a lingering response to the NPM-style
reforms experienced throughout the 1990s and early 2000s. This challenge is further complicated
by the fact that, independent of the partnership model, social services such as homeless shelters
often also face intense opposition at the community level, implying that in addition to education and awareness surrounding partnerships, there is also a need for greater education surrounding general shelter service provision before this type of model could be considered for social services more broadly. In this respect, education regarding both partnerships and homeless shelter provision should be pursued in tandem, since the benefits are likely to be mutually reinforcing.

5.4.2 Exploring the Tools Available to Incentivize Developers

Beyond public awareness, something that was repeatedly emphasized throughout this research process was the general feeling that any push to systematically increase the uptake of this type of innovative partnership model could not be driven by the private sector alone – it is something the public sector will need to take an active lead on. The commonly cited means through which the public sector is seen as being able to incentivize private developers to potentially consider these types of partnerships include a diverse range of tools and policies, such as: expediting planning approvals, unlocking density bonuses, reducing development charges, providing tax breaks, and waiving public contribution requirements, such as Section 37 benefits, or other levies (Davis, 2017); a combination of many of these incentives was ultimately leveraged throughout the negotiation process in the Red Door case study as previously identified.

Although the allowances Harhay received worked in this specific case given the structure of the partnership, it was felt that in other case scenarios it is highly plausible that the same tools would not necessarily have achieved the same results. To be certain: there is no silver bullet of public sector incentives that will work for all partnership projects. Therefore, having a more flexible toolbox of incentives or waivers that the City is able to systematically leverage on a case-by-case basis to address these types of unique partnership projects would be greatly beneficial in increasing private sector interest in these projects and making them more readily financially viable.

From a public sector perspective, there is a belief that by pursuing some of these incentive structures, although it may be lost revenue in the short-term, ideally it will create a new tax base and support other public goods projects in the long-term, as was the rationale in this case study. From a private sector perspective, given the lower margins of the project when compared with a typical for-profit development, there is a clear need to better understand upfront what the obligations and expectations are. As the private sector stakeholder in this case explained:
“As someone goes to acquire property, if they understand the obligations and the commitments that they're going to impose upon them on the front end, the value is adjusted to reflect that and therefore it will make it a viable project.”

This highlights the fact it would be beneficial to have a clearly identified toolbox of potential incentives upon which the City could reference in the negotiations process for similar projects.

There is also a general sense that there are increasingly more developers in the city who have some level of social interest and are increasingly willing to look at these types of partnership models. Setting precedents, such as with the Red Door Family Shelter partnership, is a good first step. Ultimately, although these types of innovative partnerships would still require a case-by-case assessment, there would be a clear set of tools for the City to quickly draw upon to systematically make this assessment up front, ideally helping to determine whether such a project would be financially viable for the private sector right from the start.

5.4.3 Formalizing Partnership Procedures and City-Level Coordination

In addition to an incentives toolbox, there is also a potential benefit to establishing clear processes, procedures and policies that people can rely on in such innovative partnership endeavours. Formally establishing this type of community of practice within the City of Toronto in particular is important. As expressed in Chapter 4, the most significant concern related to the Red Door partnership was the existence of relatively siloed organizational responses that slowed down or impeded the realization of some successful partnership outcomes. Reflecting on the reality of the complexity of this coordination process, one public sector stakeholder described the challenge as follows:

“A lot of people are over extended and sometimes when I'm working with a big group, everybody assumes the other guy is taking care of it. I think the project needs a very strong central project management role. Too many things can go wrong when things are being done more in a collective environment. At the end of the day, where does the buck stop?”

Although the newly implemented Deputy City Manager model, organized into three main clusters, has helped to mitigate some of the challenges associated with siloed organizational responses to public sector problem solving, it is clear that a more formalized city-level coordination mechanism, specifically for these types of cross-cutting multidisciplinary partnerships, is needed. In practice,
this is most readily evidenced by a need for clear public sector champions and coordinators who are able to oversee and guide these partnerships from a high-level.

In relation to the Red Door partnership, the Deputy City Manager, and later the Director of Affordable Housing, were excellent high-level managers of the project; however, their initial involvement was somewhat ad hoc, implying that it would be beneficial to formally establish an institutional framework for this oversight. For example, based on these initial research findings, it appears that it would be beneficial to formally designate an individual whose job it is to oversee these types of potential partnership deals from a high-level. In cases where the model makes sense, this innovative partnership champion would then be able to bring the relevant stakeholders together while specifically focusing on enhancing the capacity and outcomes of the partnership.

Although the City of Toronto has an existing partnerships office, it appears necessary that this champion should be independent of the city-wide clustering system so as to provide the necessary flexibility and opportunities for high-level oversight. An appropriate term for this type of coordinating position may fall under the guise of “strategic projects” in reference to the more entrepreneurial approach the position would follow. If such a position were to function at a level independent to, and ideally above, the three main clusters, there would be even greater opportunity to identify and coordinate public sector efforts between clusters, while better reconciling the potential competition between different City objectives and departments. It remains unclear whether this role would best be optimized out of the City Manager’s or Deputy City Manager’s office; additional academic research based on other complex and innovative multi-stakeholder projects within the City could help to determine many of these details.

5.5 Conclusion

As we continue to look for new and innovative approaches to addressing the complex, multi-dimensional problems society is currently faced with, there is a clear sense that multi-sector partnerships may be part of the solution. In particular, there is an emerging opportunity for partnerships that increasingly involve the third sector as a conceivably equal partner to the public and private sectors. A common rationale behind employing these types of partnerships is the potential realization of collaborative advantage, despite that it is clear that collaborative advantage is often not the experienced outcome. As a result, there is a clear need to better understand how such multi-sector partnerships involving the third sector can successfully realize synergy
throughout the collaboration process. Developing this understanding is crucial since it offers the potential to more strategically identify appropriate potential partnership projects and to systematically communicate this in a way that meaningfully impacts decision-making and policy to benefit the broader societal good. Ultimately, this research involving the Red Door Family Shelter partnership is a pivotal first step in better understanding the ways that innovative partnerships between the public, private and third sectors may realize successful collaborative advantage outcomes in an urban planning environment.
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## Appendix A: List of Documents Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2014</td>
<td>Red Door Shelter Update [Supplementary report from the General Manager, Shelter, Support and Housing Administration on Red Door Shelter Update]</td>
<td>Phillip Abrahams (General Manager, Shelter, Support and Housing Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2015</td>
<td>875 and 887 Queen Street East – Preliminary Report</td>
<td>Gregg Lintern (Director, Community Planning, Toronto and East York District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2015</td>
<td>875 and 877 Queen St. E. – Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment Applications – Preliminary Report</td>
<td>Gregg Lintern (Director, Community Planning, Toronto and East York District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 2015</td>
<td>Securing a Future for the Red Door Shelter [Report from the General Manager, Shelter, Support and Housing Administration and the Chief Corporate Officer on Securing a Future for the Red Door Shelter]</td>
<td>Phillip Abrahams (General Manager, Shelter, Support and Housing Administration), Josie Scioli (Chief Corporate Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 2015</td>
<td>Under One Roof: A Housing Solution for Women and Children at 389 Church Street</td>
<td>Phillip Abrahams (General Manager, Shelter, Support and Housing Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17, 2015</td>
<td>875 and 887 Queen Street East – Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment Applications – Final Report</td>
<td>Gregg Lintern (Director, Community Planning, Toronto and East York District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 2016</td>
<td>875 and 887 Queen Street East – Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment Applications – Supplementary Report</td>
<td>Gregg Lintern (Director, Community Planning, Toronto and East York District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29, 2016</td>
<td>Acquisition of Shelter Space at 875 Queen Street East – Securing a Future for the Red Door Shelter [Supplementary report from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer on Acquisition of Shelter Space at 875 Queen Street East - Securing a Future for the Red Door Shelter]</td>
<td>Roberto Rossini (Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2017</td>
<td>Engaging Communities in First Step Housing and Services</td>
<td>Bruce Davis (Consultant and Facilitator on Developing a New Framework for Siting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2014</td>
<td>Paula Fletcher (City Councillor)</td>
<td>Toronto-Danforth, Ward 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2014</td>
<td>David Willis (President)</td>
<td>South Riverdale Community Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2014</td>
<td>Ruth Gilson (Executive Director)</td>
<td>Toronto Hostels Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2014</td>
<td>Cheryl Rowe, M.D. (Physician)</td>
<td>Inner City Health Associates (ICHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2014</td>
<td>Debbie Hill-Corrigan (Executive Director)</td>
<td>Sojourn House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13, 2014</td>
<td>Sylvia Braithwaite (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Toronto Shelter Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2014</td>
<td>Charlene Catchpole (Chair, Board of Directors)</td>
<td>Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Housing (OAITH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2014</td>
<td>Joyce Kalsen (Executive Director)</td>
<td>East End Community Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2014</td>
<td>Glen Brown (Interim Executive Director)</td>
<td>Ralph Thornton Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2014</td>
<td>Peggy-Gail DeHal-Gurraj (Community Legal Worker/Clinical Instructor)</td>
<td>Parkdale Community Legal Services Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2015</td>
<td>Rachel Grinberg, Ann Elliott, Barbara Campbell, Bernnitta Hawkins, Christine Ernst, Christine Mapp Batchelor, Sandra</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 17, 2015</td>
<td>Draft Zoning By-law Amendment to By-Law No. 438-86 - 875 and 887 Queen Street East - Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment Applications - Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17, 2015</td>
<td>Draft Zoning By-law Amendment to By-Law No. 569-2013 - 875 and 887 Queen Street East - Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment Applications - Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2016</td>
<td>Amendment to the Official Plan (By-Law No. 107-2016) – Lands Municipally Known in the Year 2015 as 875 and 887 Queen Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2016</td>
<td>Amendment to the Official Plan (By-Law No. 108-2016) – Lands Municipally Known in the Year 2015 as 875 and 887 Queen Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2016</td>
<td>Amendment to the Official Plan (By-Law No. 109-2016) – Lands Municipally Known in the Year 2015 as 875 and 887 Queen Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6, 2016</td>
<td>Ted Radlak (Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2016</td>
<td>Ann Elliott, Rachel Grinberg, Barbara Campbell, Christine Ernst, Christine Mapp Batchelor, Sandra Bussin, Denise Gordon-Mohamud, Catherine Playford, Elizabeth Simmie (Board Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2016</td>
<td>Carol Watson (Chairperson) – on behalf of the Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2016</td>
<td>Dann Cushing (Investment Advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2016</td>
<td>Elizabeth Simmie (Investment Advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2016</td>
<td>Emma Nichols (Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2016</td>
<td>Joel Farber (Lawyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2016</td>
<td>Marc Odette (Vice President, Investments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2016</td>
<td>Nneka MacGregor LL.B. (Executive Director)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Red Door Family Shelter Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Save the Red Door: Change.org Campaign</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2014</td>
<td>Community Meeting: Save the Red Door</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2014</td>
<td>The Community is with Us!</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2014</td>
<td>Message from Bernnitta</td>
<td>Bernnitta Hawkins (Executive Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 2014</td>
<td>Save the Red Door – Key Step Forward</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2014</td>
<td>City Council Votes to Secure the Future of Red Door!</td>
<td>Bernnitta Hawkins (Executive Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Wonderful News! We’ve Secured the Future of our Shelter!</td>
<td>Bernnitta Hawkins (Executive Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Building a Community of Hope: Case for Support</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2016</td>
<td>Toronto City Council Approves Development!</td>
<td>Morgan Murphy (Account Manager, Smithcom on behalf of the Red Door)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Toronto-Danforth Ward 30 Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Agreement Reached to Save the Red Door Family Shelter</td>
<td>Paula Fletcher (City Councillor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26, 2015</td>
<td>Fall-Winter 2015 Newsletter, Councillor Paula Fletcher, Ward 30, Toronto-Danforth</td>
<td>Paula Fletcher (City Councillor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Harhay Developments (Developer) Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>HCM Developments Flyer</td>
<td>Chris Harhay (President)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schonfeld Inc. Receivers and Trustees (Receiver) Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 2014</td>
<td>Eighth Report of the Manager, Schonfeld Inc.: Motion for Approval and Vesting Order with respect to 450 Pape Ave</td>
<td>Harlan Schonfeld (President and Founder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2014</td>
<td>Ontario Superior Court of Justice Commercial List (Court File No. CV-13-10280-00CL)</td>
<td>Harlan Schonfeld (President and Founder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 2014</td>
<td>CITATION: DBDC Spadina Ltd. v. Walton, 2014 ONSC 4644</td>
<td>Harlan Schonfeld (President and Founder)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Smithcom Public Relations Ltd. Documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 2014</td>
<td>Red Door Communications Plan</td>
<td>Contact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 2014</td>
<td>Draft LTR to Receiver</td>
<td>External Email Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2014</td>
<td>Red Door Shelter Threatened by New Development</td>
<td>News Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Agreement Reached to Save the Red Door Family Shelter</td>
<td>News Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2016</td>
<td>Toronto City Council Gives Final Approval to Ground Breaking Mixed Use Development Proposal: The Red Door Family Shelter to Remain at 875 Queen St. E.</td>
<td>News Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4, 2016</td>
<td>The Red Door Family Shelter Media Report</td>
<td>External Email Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 2016</td>
<td>Save the Red Door</td>
<td>Internal Email Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter Case Study Summary: Media and Community Relations</td>
<td>Internal Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter: Save the Red Door Campaign Case Study</td>
<td>Internal PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B: List of Media Coverage Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>News Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2014</td>
<td>East End Community Rallies Around Red Door Shelter</td>
<td>Z. McKnight</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2014</td>
<td>Real Estate Dispute Threatens Future of Red Door Family Shelter</td>
<td>L. Monsebraaten</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 2014</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter’s Queen Street East Site is Facing an Uncertain Future</td>
<td>J. Lavoie</td>
<td>InsideToronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28, 2014</td>
<td>Toronto-Danforth Politicians Seek Legal Tools to Save Red Door Family Shelter</td>
<td>L. Monsebraaten</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 2014</td>
<td>Former Red Door Residents Praise Shelter at Emergency Meeting</td>
<td>T. Alamenciak</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2014</td>
<td>Efforts Increase to Save Red Door Family Shelter; Former Mayor Joins Cause</td>
<td>J. Lavoie</td>
<td>InsideToronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 2014</td>
<td>Community Rallies to Save Red Door Shelter</td>
<td>D. Cole</td>
<td>Torontoist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 2014</td>
<td>Toronto Should Rally to Save Red Door Family Shelter: Editorial</td>
<td>L. Monsebraaten</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2014</td>
<td>Toronto City Councillors get Along in Rob Ford’s Absence, Agree to Rescue Red Door Homeless Shelter</td>
<td>P. Kuitenbrouwer</td>
<td>National Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2014</td>
<td>Council Votes to Save Red Door Shelter</td>
<td>B. Spurr</td>
<td>NOW Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2014</td>
<td>Toronto Council Voted Unanimously to Support Red Door Shelter</td>
<td>D. Nickle</td>
<td>InsideToronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2014</td>
<td>Red Door Shelter Finds Support from Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>M. McAllister</td>
<td>Global News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2014</td>
<td>Toronto Council Votes Unanimously to Help Save Red Door Shelter</td>
<td>P. Moloney</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter Finds New Home as Developer Chips In</td>
<td>D. Shum</td>
<td>Global News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Red Door Shelter in Leslieville to Get New Home in Deal with Developer</td>
<td>J. Freeman</td>
<td>CP24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter to be Part of Leslieville Condo Development</td>
<td>L. Monsebraaten</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2015</td>
<td>Red Door Shelter Could Be Part of New Queen Street Condo Building</td>
<td>N. Kalata</td>
<td>CBC News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 2015</td>
<td>Great Model for the City: Editorial</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2015</td>
<td>Red Door Family Shelter’s New Digs Aim to Correct Old Challenges</td>
<td>S. Depetrillo</td>
<td>Torontoist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 6, 2016</td>
<td>Council Approves Leslieville Homeless Shelter for Men, Despite</td>
<td>D. Nickle</td>
<td>InsideToronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns Raised by Neighbours; Red Door Shelter on Queen Street Also</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22, 2016</td>
<td>Red Door Eschews Location Secrecy in Favour of Public Support</td>
<td>K. McIntyre</td>
<td>Torontoist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2017</td>
<td>Red Door Shelter Finds a Home</td>
<td>M. Chen</td>
<td>Toronto Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2017</td>
<td>Toronto Urged to Revamp its Approach to Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>E. Mathieu</td>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 2017</td>
<td>Solutions to Homelessness Require Community Engagement</td>
<td>S. Depetrillo</td>
<td>Torontoist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Introductory Email – Interview Informant Recruitment

SUBJECT: University of Toronto Research Project - Innovative Public Private Partnerships: The Red Door Family Shelter

Dear [Sal.] [First Name] [Last Name],

This email is to provide you with an overview and request your participation in research being conducted by graduate student Matthew Hunter and Professors David Roberts and Matti Siemiatycki at the University of Toronto. We are currently conducting a study on the recent development and implementation of the innovative public-private partnership (PPP) between the Red Door Family Shelter, the City of Toronto, and Harhay Developments with the hopes that this case will shed light on the possibilities and challenges of the use of the public-private partnership model to provide for social services.

Through examining the emerging Red Door Family Shelter PPP, we hope to shed light on the factors that motivate both the private and public sectors to enter into a complex partnership that differs from the established paradigm. In recent years, there have been urban development partnerships that integrate land uses such as schools, theatres, grocery stores and condominium apartments into the same building. For the most part, these are land uses that are desired in communities, and as such when designed with care they can gain local community support and create win-win conditions between the partners.

Studying the integration of a homeless shelter into a new development represents an additional level of complexity. These facilities are much needed and chronically underfunded, yet they also often face not in my backyard type opposition from local neighbours and may not necessarily be seen by developers as a partner land use that is viable in a mixed-use project that includes a market housing component. As such, we will examine the unique challenges that emerge for attempting to design and implement such a partnership as well as the strategies that various partners use for dealing with these challenges.

The research results will be published in academic journals or reports, and may also be reported in popular forums.

Interviews will last approximately an hour. They will be informal and in a conversational style. We want to hear your thoughts and experiences, so you are encouraged to introduce issues that you feel are important.

The interview will tape recorded. All information you provide will be treated confidentially. Unless you give your permission, your name will not appear in any publications stemming from the research, nor will it be associated with any information you provide.

We hope that you will agree to participate in our study. Should you have any questions, please contact Matthew Hunter – mr.hunter@utoronto.ca or (514) 826-6207.

Best,

Matthew Hunter
MA Geography Student
Department of Geography and Planning
University of Toronto
Appendix D: Sample Interview Guide

1) How did this complex deal come about? How did you become involved with this project? What were the motivating factors for the City to enter into a public-private partnership?
   a. Were there any models you looked at to structure this partnership? Where did the idea come from? Who facilitated the creation of the partnership?
   b. Why a partnership as opposed to other models – i.e. renting a space, constructing a stand alone shelter space, etc.?
2) Were there any individuals who were essential to securing this partnership?
3) From the City’s perspective, what are the major benefits of this partnership (i.e. What opportunities has it presented)? What are the major risks?
   a. How did the City view the mix of uses in the development?
4) At the City level, were there any barriers that made this partnership difficult to achieve?
   a. What do you think were the key success factors that made this partnership work?
5) How was Red Door able to secure such strong support from the City?
6) How were Red Door and the City able to get the support of the private developer (Harhay Developments)?
   a. Were any incentives offered to Harhay to encourage this development? Was the inclusion of the Red Door mandated?
   b. What other tools does the City have to potentially encourage similar developments in the future?
7) In your view, how do different stakeholders see this as a partnership? Do the partners all share the same end goals for the project?
8) What skills does the City bring to this partnership? The Red Door? Harhay? (i.e. What was each partner able to contribute to this partnership?)
   a. Can the City negotiate the complex deals? Were external people hired to negotiate?
   b. What skills and abilities are required to make this partnership work?
9) What level of collaboration did you see playing out here (i.e. How have the public and private sectors worked together (collaborated) in this partnership)?
   a. In addition to new resources, has this partnership allowed the City to benefit from any new skills or knowledge as well?
10) What role has the community played in this process (i.e. how has Red Door leveraged community support)?
11) What challenges have you faced or do you anticipate facing as part of this partnership?
12) In your experience with the City, have you seen any other projects similar to this one?
   a. Do you think this partnership is unique? Could the model be replicated?
13) What is best-case scenario for this partnership?
14) Do you believe that public-private partnerships that include social service organizations like the Red Door are a good practice or policy?
   a. Should the city or province be encouraging or discouraging this type of partnership? Why?
   b. If the City were to encourage this type of development moving forward, what might that look like?
Appendix E: Letter of Consent

CONSENT FORM: PARTICIPATION IN INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW
The Political Geography of Innovative Public-Private Partnerships: The Red Door Family Shelter

I, __________________________ (please print name), agree to participate in this research project examining the innovative public-private partnership design and the provision of social services.

I understand that, as a participant in the study, I will be asked to participate in an interview. During the interview, I will be asked questions about my experience in the planning and implementation of innovative public-private partnerships and the challenges and opportunities that arise from inclusion of social services in such a partnership.

The interview session is scheduled to last between 45-60 minutes, and will be transcribed from either tape (with my permission) or from hand-written notes. I am aware that the transcripts will only be seen by the principal and co-investigator and possibly a research assistant and that no other person will have access to them. The completed interview transcripts and other research data will be stored in a secure location. No information will be released or printed that would disclose my personal identity unless I give permission to do so (below), and all such research data will be destroyed after five years of use.

I understand that I am under no obligation to agree to participate in this study and may choose not to answer specific questions during the interview. Any questions I have asked about the study have been answered to my satisfaction. Any risks or benefits that might arise out of my participation in the study have also been explained to my satisfaction. I understand that my decision to participate or not to participate will be kept completely confidential. I further understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time until two weeks after the interview with no explanation.

Although this research may not benefit me directly, by participating in this study I will be contributing to a better understanding of the motivations for using public-private partnerships, the structure and functioning of the public-private partnership industry, and the opportunities and challenges of delivering social services through innovative public-private partnerships. The research results will be published in academic journals or reports, and may also be reported in popular forums.

Upon my request, a summary of the results of this research will be distributed. I understand what this study involves and agree to participate. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

If I have any questions or concerns about this study, I can contact Dr. Matti Siemiatycki, University of Toronto at 416-946-5146 or siemiatycki@geog.utoronto.ca. I may also contact the Office of Research Ethics at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273, if I have questions about my rights as a participant in this study.

I agree to the use of a tape recorder during the interview YES NO
I agree to be identified by name and affiliation in any final written report YES NO
I agree to be identified by affiliation only in any final written report YES NO

_________________________________ _____________________
Signature Date

Room 5047, Sidney Smith Hall, 100 St. George Street, Toronto, ON M5S 3G3 Canada
Tel: +1 416-978-3375 • Fax: +1 416-946-3886 • geography.utoronto.ca