Abstract
Governments constrained by resources and driven by citizen expectations have been turning to private enterprises to leverage their efficiencies. This has led to public private partnership (PPP) initiatives in e-governance. However, partnerships have often not delivered the expected outcomes. Research has reported intangible factors like leadership, shared goals, open communication, trust, willingness to compromise and collaborate, respect etc. as critical success factors in PPP. This paper illuminates the mechanisms, and develops propositions to explain how and why the intangible factors influence the PPP outcomes. It also applies this framework to an e-Governance project to exemplify and discuss the insights drawn. A social capital paradigm is used to develop the theoretical framework.

1. Introduction
Several organizations in the public and private sectors find partnership projects as a valuable means to implement their organizational strategy. Several of these projects span over diverse sectors like education, healthcare, infrastructure, citizen services like passport and statutory certificates etc. and have partnerships involving multiple organizations located in different geographical locations. One such type of partnerships is the Public Private Partnership (PPP), which involves collaborations with partners coming from public and private sectors. PublicPrivate Partnership (PPP) is an arrangement between a public (government) entity and private (non-government) entity by which, services traditionally delivered by the public entity are provided largely by private entity under a set of terms and conditions well defined at the outset. UK Commission on PPP defines PPP as “a risk sharing relationship between the public and private sectors based upon a shared aspiration to bring about a desired public policy outcome” [25]. Of late, PPP projects have become popular in a number of countries. Governments keen to reduce government spending and borrowing and aware that private enterprise can provide services at lower cost, have introduced PPP programs in place of or to supplement direct state investment. e-Governance initiatives have gained momentum on account of heightened citizens’ expectations for government services in the light of widening ICT (information and communication technology) deployment in various sectors. In. recent times e-Governance projects are being implemented through PPP [11, 27]. According to Sharma [27] e-Governance projects often face roadblocks with regard to availability of finance and technical resources and Public Private Partnership (PPP) has become a viable model to overcome these factors. PPP combines accountability of the public sector with the efficiency of the private entities and helps in sharing risks.

However, partnerships have often not delivered the expected outcomes in practice. The intangible factors of the ‘soft’ kind have been observed to influence the outcomes more than the ‘hard’ success factors of PPP projects (i.e. financial and technological aspects). This is more so in the e-governance projects due to their inherent complexity as they also involve ICT innovation adoption. In this paper, we adopt the social capital framework [14] to explain the influence of the intangible factors. The purpose of this paper is twofold – (i) development of a theoretical framework to understand ‘how’ and ‘why’ the intangible factors influence PPP project outcome; (ii) application of this framework to an e-Governance project to exemplify and discuss the insights drawn from the framework.

PPP is a contractual agreement between public sector agencies and private sector entities for developing a public facility, product or service by sharing resources, skills, competencies, risks and rewards [8, 20]. It is also viewed as a co-operative venture between public sector and private sector partners [6]. The other attributes of PPP covered in the literature
are that it is a complex relationship [29], and an enduring and stable relationship [23]. The distinction drawn between a ‘traditional public works relationship’ and PPP, is that the latter embodies a ‘team-building philosophy’ driven by a ‘shared vision’ [4].

Klijn and Teisman [8] have highlighted that partners face difficulty in joint decision-making and organizing and this results in reverting to traditional methods of separation of responsibilities and emphasis on contractual relations. Jacobson and Choi [4] have identified ten critical success factors (CSF) of PPP projects – namely, open communication, trust, willingness to compromise and collaborate, respect etc. The other intangible factors reported are leadership, and shared goals. The emphasis on intangible factors is also reflected in trust & commitment [28], information sharing among the partners [13], conflict resolution [2], partnership quality [12], mutual trust, risk/ reward sharing [7]. However, little theoretical attempt has been made to explain the mechanisms by which these intangible factors influence the project outcome. In this paper, we attempt to address this gap.

We have divided our paper into six sections. Section 1 is an introduction to PPP relationships. In Section 2 we explain why PPP is viewed as an organization. In Section 3 we argue that Social Capital framework is very useful to explain the PPP outcomes. In Section 4 we establish the role of collective knowledge in solving problems encountered during ICT implementation. We, then, integrate these three sections into a conceptual framework. In the fifth section we exemplify the developed framework using an e-Governance project based on the PPP model. In the sixth section we discuss the implications, limitations of our research and suggest directions for future research.

2. PPP as an organization

We argue that a public private partnership (PPP) is set up to bring together two entities as one organization. Although, it begins as the public partner acquiring resources from the market, the intent of a PPP is to orchestrate the pooled resources to take advantage of structure and process characteristics of an organization. Katz and Gartner [15] characterize the essential properties of an organization to be intentionality, resources, boundaries, and exchange. They explain the properties as the following:

- Intentionality: Goals distinct from those of the agents and the environment as indirectly evidenced through common belief structures regarding the goals, purposes, history, traditions, and methods that emerge within the organization.
- Resources: Physical components that combine to form an organization i.e. human and financial capital, property (real estate, equipment, raw materials), and credit.
- Boundary: Barrier conditions between the organization and its environment. It establishes the organization's identity beyond that of the creating agent.
- Exchange: Cycles of transactions across the borders of subsystems, within an organization as in the example of managing human relations, or across the organizational boundary with individuals, the environment, or other organizations.

These properties, which have both structural (resources and boundaries) and process (intentionality and exchange) characteristics, enable the basic existence of an organization.

We, then, analyse the key features of a PPP, and note that it conforms to the aforesaid organisational properties. The public and the private partner begin as two separate entities coming together to form a special purpose entity with a common boundary. This special entity has an identity totally distinct from that of its promoters/ sponsors/constituents/ shareholders. A PPP is capable of acquiring, holding and disposing of assets. It controls its own resources. This signifies it conducts exchange internally, and with its business environment. A PPP is set up for a particular purpose. Every action of the firm is defined by pre-specified contracts. It undertakes only the activity for which it has been set up and no other activity; thus portraying intentionality. Thus we conclude that although it is constituted by two separate entities, a PPP is designed to function as one independent organisation.

3. PPP and Social Capital

Social capital is generally understood as the goodwill that is engendered by the fabric of social relations and which can be mobilized to facilitate action. In Nahapiet and Ghoshal’s treatise [14], social capital is defined as the access and resources available in an exchange relationship. Social capital is “the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through and derived from the network of relationships” and is collectively owned [14].
We argue that the social capital framework is very useful to explain success of a PPP project due to three reasons.

**Firstly**, as mentioned earlier, the critical success factors (CSFs) of partnership engagements point towards many intangible factors – e.g. open communication, trust, willingness to compromise and collaborate, respect etc. [4, 28, 13, 12, 7]. All these factors are covered by the structural, cognitive, and relational aspects of social capital developed by Nahapiet and Ghoshal [14]. Their structural dimension refers to the pattern of connections – ‘who you know and reach and how you reach them’. They posit that among the most important facets of this dimension are the presence or absence of network ties between actors; network configuration describing the pattern of linkages in terms of measures such as density, connectivity, and hierarchy; and appropriate organization – that is the existence of networks created for one purpose that may be used for another. These connections promote information sharing, willingness to collaborate, conflict resolution etc. Nahapiet and Ghoshal’s relational dimension describes the kind of personal relationships people have developed with each other through a history of interactions. This concept focuses on the particular relationships people have such as respect and friendship that influence their behavior. Among the key facets in this cluster are trust, norms and sanctions, obligations and expectations, and identity and identification. These facets explain the mutual trust, commitment, willingness to compromise, and respect identified as CSFs. The cognitive dimension [14] facilitates a common understanding by relying on shared context, representations and systems of meanings among parties. The shared goals and common vision as success factors map on to this dimension.

**Secondly**, since PPP consists of two separate entities that have come together, the highest costs involved are of co-ordination costs, and risks of opportunism [31]. Social capital in the form of high levels of trust serves to bring down both these costs, and improves the expected outcomes from the partnership [14]. Social Capital also increases the efficiency of action by increasing information diffusion. Therefore, the social capital framework can be used to explain partnership outcomes both through allocative and adaptive efficiencies. Social capital encourages cooperative behaviour, thereby facilitating new forms of association and innovative organisation.

**Thirdly**, Nahapiet and Ghoshal [14] opine that organisations as institutional settings are more conducive to the generation of social capital. Intended to function as one organisation, PPP is expected to facilitate social capital formation. The factors affecting the development of social capital are time, interaction, interdependence, and closure. In Sec 2, we demonstrated that a PPP displays properties of intentional, exchange, resources, and boundary. These properties integrate very well with the factors affecting development of social capital – time, interaction, interdependence, and closure [14]. Time refers to the stability and continuity of the social structure. Interdependence refers to the co-ordination between various parts of the organisation. Interaction refers to exchange of ideas between individuals or communities. Closure refers to a sociological boundary that separates members from non-members. The factors of interaction, and interdependence are derivatives of organisation properties of resources, and exchange; and closure, is derived from the property of boundary.

Based on these reasons, we argue that social capital development is necessary for a PPP organisation.

**PROPOSITION-1**: PPP is an organizational arrangement conducive for the creation of social capital which influences project outcomes.

### 4. Social capital, Intellectual capital and ICT implementation:

In this section we argue that ICT implementation, as an innovation process, is fraught with challenges and problems, which can be addressed only through collective knowledge. Social Capital creates the conditions favorable for the development of intellectual capital which is collective knowledge [14].

Schumpeter [30] characterizes innovation as involving either a new combination of existing resources or novel ways of achieving the existing combination. We argue that ICT implementation is an innovation, as it involves a new way of delivering (i.e. electronically) a government service. The diffusion of innovation within organizations is a complex process, taking place over a period of time, going through several stages viz. adaptation, acceptance and routinization [26]. This is essentially an organizational learning process involving understanding the potential of the innovation, identification and development of sophisticated user/s of the innovation, modification of work practices to suit the innovation and develop suitable organizational control procedures to manage the
innovation and the new work environment [9]. ICT implementation comprises activities culminating in the innovation becoming an integral part of the organizational routine, ceasing to be new or simply abandoned [3, 16]. The magnitude of the challenges faced during the implementation of ICT adoption is reflected in the low rate of success of ICT adoption globally – a mere 15% of the initiatives had been successful [10]. This indicates the critical need to address the challenges through collective learning and knowledge development. Scholars, from the perspective of organizations as knowledge systems, have referred to knowledge creation as happening in either incremental or radical manner [18, 17, 1]. Drawing from this literature, Nahapiet & Ghoshal [14] report “there appears to be a consensus that both types of knowledge creation involve making new combinations – incrementally or radically – either combining elements previously unconnected or by developing novel ways of combining elements previously associated”. We infer from the above that ICT implementation involves, fundamentally, creation of collective knowledge in the process of addressing the challenges/problems encountered during the diffusion of innovation within an organization. In our discussion, collective knowledge refers to meanings, understandings, appreciation of the ways of solving problems, competence to coordinate multiple activities and skills, information and experience held by different parties, knowing the ‘possibilities for action and the ways in which action can be taken’ [14, Penrose, 1959:5]. Nahapiet & Ghoshal [14], following Moran and Ghoshal [21], had proposed that social capital, through its three dimensions, facilitated the creation of collective or social knowledge through the two generic processes of combination and exchange, by influencing the four conditions necessary for the latter to occur, namely – access to the parties and their knowledge, expectation of value from the engagement, existence of the motivation to engage and the existence of the capability to combine.

PROPOSITION-2 Social Capital is essential for organizational learning and development of collective knowledge in order to address the challenges encountered during ICT implementation.

These propositions are integrated in Figure 1 to portray the linkages. The attributes of constructs are represented in the figure. As discussed earlier, the organisational attributes of PPP correspond to the facilitating conditions of social capital [14]. We view time as an extrinsic factor, which is common to organisations and markets, as different from N and G’s depiction of the same among those factors ‘shaping the evolution of social relationships’.

![Figure 1. Social capital framework for influence of intangible factors on PPP outcome](image-url)
PPP outcomes are captured by project objectives. Effective and efficient achievement of these objectives depends on the ICT implementation process. The latter is, essentially, organizational adoption of innovation as argued earlier. The challenges and problems encountered demand collective knowledge development. This is captured in terms of the attributes mentioned in the figure. The collective knowledge creation is, in turn, facilitated by social capital [14]. Thus, social capital framework illuminates the mechanism behind the CSFs.

5. Project Nemmadi – PPP in E-governance

Nemmadi was an e-governance project initiated in 2004 by the government of the state of Karnataka located in the southern part of India [19]. Aimed at improving the transparency, accountability and efficiency of the government administration at the village level, Nemmadi was the first and the largest G2C (referring to information, interactions, transactions, etc., between the Government and Citizens) e-governance project. It was an ambitious project conceived to offer digital services to rural citizens across 800 hoblis (cluster of villages) in the state. These services were delivered through telecentres located at the hoblis.

A PPP model was adopted for the Nemmadi project. The two key entities operationalizing Nemmadi were the e-Governance department of the Government of Karnataka as the public partner, and Comat Systems Solutions, a private equity-funded IT software services organization as the private partner. The partners had put in an initial investment of INR300 million (USD $6 million) with the private partner bearing almost 90% of the cost. The two entities set up a PPP named Comat Technologies, which was responsible for setting up the telecentres in hoblis, and operating them to provide rural digital services to citizens. ‘Rural digital services’ was a generic term used for any electronic service delivered to citizens in the rural areas. The services included issue of certificates of several kinds, which entitled the citizens belonging to economically and socially backward sections of the society to avail of benefits and concessions under various government schemes conceived as part of affirmative action by the state.

Nemmadi project [19] was executed over a 6 year timeframe - 2004 and 2010. After the implementation, there were complaints about the longer cycle time. Earlier the village accountants could help to get the certificates in 3–4 days. Now it took approximately 2 weeks. There were complaints about the whole process having become more cumbersome for users. In the words of a villager, ‘Furnishing school leaving certificate or transfer certificates has become compulsory. This makes it difficult for many of the citizens who are illiterate. They need to provide special affidavits’. Citizens also complained about facilities at the telecentre. There was no enquiry counter, and people again had to depend on middlemen who provided information at a price, for example list of enclosures for different applications. Information dissemination regarding the status of one’s application was also poor. No one had an idea when their certificates would be ready. There were times when the villagers had to make several visits to the telecentre just to know the status of their application. The telecentres were still fraught with infrastructure issues such as power problems and internet connectivity problems, the brunt of which was borne by the villagers. In the light of this, the project outcomes of transparency, efficiency, and accountability were not accomplished. In 2012, there was a change in the private partner. Subsequently, the PPP was terminated, with the Government taking over the entire operations.

We, now, analyse how and why PPP in the Nemmadi project did not result in the expected outcomes.

5.1 Lack of social capital development due to weak organizational characteristics:

Nemmadi was governed by comprehensive SLAs signed between Comat Technologies and the e-Governance Department of Karnataka with rigid non-performance penalties. This is indicative more of arm’s length market characteristics than those of an organization. This eventually resulted in poor interaction and interdependence, therefore, hampering formation of social capital. Table 1 illustrates a deficiency on various dimensions of social capital and the causes thereof.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Examples of absence of Social Capital from Nemmadi PPP Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Structural               | Building individual ties across teams is difficult in the presence of a strong champion. “The Principal Secretary was the main force behind Nemmadi. The mandate had been provided by the Chief Minister of Karnataka, and had been taken up by Principal Secretary very seriously. He was involved in it right from the inception, to the details of execution.

The decision was centralized and made almost entirely by the Principal Secretary of the e-governance department on the behest of the Chief Minister.
“No efforts were made to connect with the private partners or seek any inputs from them.” Government processes were rigid and do not easily allow incorporating suggestions for change.
“A learning orientation was missing. Private partner’s knowledge was not leveraged.” |
| Cognitive                | Limited shared context between private partner and government department.
“Comat did not share the infrastructure context of the government. No efforts were made by E-Governance department to share the infrastructure context and build a common ground regarding PPP.”

Clash of cultures Govt functionaries perceived the private partner as threats.
“Non-cooperation of local government functionaries affected the performance of private partner – while setting up telecentres as well as operating them.”

“Public Interest” - obligations to be carried out by the ‘private’ partner |
| Relational               | SLA formulation done unilaterally no discussion with private partner

Strict adherence to SLAs and penalties levied.
“SLA-bound, hands-tied, no access for discussions / negotiation / adjustment – a stonewall, helplessness – no principle of partnership!”
“A commitment to the success of a new model was not visible”

Make up for infrastructure and government process insufficiencies.
“Private partner had to support and handhold the government functionaries. This was just a gesture on our part to increase adoption of technology, and therefore Nemmadi. However, this was often not acknowledged and we ended up doing a thankless job.”

No identification of the private partner with the government. Attrition was common. |

5.2 Lack of collective knowledge development due to poor social capital formation:
The challenges and hurdles encountered during ICT implementation were not adequately addressed due to inadequate development of collective knowledge within the PPP. Table 2 illustrates what happened in the absence of collective knowledge, and also suggests possibilities of actions based on combination and exchange of experiences, understanding, capabilities etc.

<p>| Table 2. Examples of Challenges from Nemmadi PPP Project | 2194 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was the challenge / problem encountered during implementation</th>
<th>How and What happened, often in the absence of collective knowledge?</th>
<th>What collective learning / social knowledge developed through combination &amp; exchange could have addressed the challenge effectively / solved the problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up 800 telecentres in as many hoblis in a short span of 4 months as part of the big-bang approach to implementation</td>
<td>Sr.VP – Comat said: “We had targets like - 100 telecentres in the first month, 250 in the second and so on. The SLA requirement was 150 sq. ft. with a pucca roof, and on the ground floor, near a bus stand or a gram panchayat office etc. There were no pucca buildings at all in many hoblis! If we did shortlist some locations – by the time we went back for negotiation, the place was not available! The moment they came to know it was a government project with some private partner, they would back out when we called them next time. On one side, our meter was running – monthly targets were laid down. Till long after, we were paying penalty inspite of the fact that we declared that there was no place of 150 sq. ft. space as per the SLA, in that particular hobli. Nobody anticipated these – no one has implemented a project of this kind. Just setting up 800 centers in 4 months flat was a humongous exercise.”</td>
<td>The local knowledge and network of contacts of the taluq level government functionaries could have been leveraged through a TASK FORCE mechanism wherein the private partner and the local government functionaries are represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment, training &amp; retention of local computer-literate telecentre operators. These operators also had to have the skills to interact with the citizens and help the illiterate among the citizens to fill out the application for the certificates sought by them</td>
<td>Comat Technologies had also to recruit and deploy 800 telecentre operators. Recruitment of operators who were computer literate was a challenge in the hoblis. Hurdles were faced in training them on Nemmadi application software too. Nemmadi was meant to serve the rural citizen - often illiterate or semi-literate. In order to interface with them, the telecentre operator required patience and understanding. The citizen-applicant often could not fill in an application form on his own. The telecentre operator would need to explain to them the necessary details and elicit the data from them. It was quite challenging to manage such transactions and enter data simultaneously. Moreover, there were deficiencies in data entry skills in many of the telecentre operators. This resulted in numerous data entry errors, which cascaded down the process resulting in acrimonious exchanges between the telecentre operators and taluk administration.</td>
<td>The government policy to encourage local employment and computer literacy coupled with a deeper local social network could have been combined with the private partner’s computer operator selection and training skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid SLA covering roll-out, operation and maintenance of telecentres</td>
<td>Sr.VP–Comat “Despite our bringing the matter to their notice, the e-governance department continued to hold on to the SLAs in the request for proposal. We should have been given some leeway in SLA formulation. It should have been a consultative and flexible process rather than a rigid one like it was. Looking at this mammoth project and its nature, the government should have relooked at the SLAs from time to time. We were jammed. Penalty PPP model for a citizen-service project on this scale was the first-of-its-kind for both the government and the private partner. Drawing up a contract governing the operations in such...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Firm or permanent roofing, as against roofs of straw and leaves found on huts in villages.
| Motivation of taluq level functionaries like case workers | Tehsildar of a taluq said: “Classroom training of my personnel on Nemmadi project did not prove very effective. My caseworkers have had an experience of at least 20-22 years in the old system. It is difficult to train them for the new one. Some of them have been appointed on sympathetic grounds - on the demise of a serving functionary his or her family member is offered employment by the government. These recruits do not have the aptitude or attitude to use the computerized system. Only those who have the right attitude learn. There are very few like that. I forced them to use the computer system. If I depend on them for a report, then I get only some stories! I should know the status of the application – with whom it is pending and why it is pending. If they do not listen, I have to resort to holding their salary or even issuing a suspension notice” | The Taluq office constituted the bedrock of the implementation of the innovation. Hence a system of incentives & rewards coupled with application of change management-related techniques could have been attempted |
| Ensuring the Transparency, Efficiency and Accountability of the government functionaries at the taluq level, down to the village | The attitude of the village functionaries was a challenge to Nemmadi implementation. The village accountants, revenue inspectors, and taluk level officials like the tahsildar were lukewarm in their approach to Nemmadi. Even at a pilot stage, the tahsildar had to be reprimanded by the project champion to approve requests for certificates, else the applications lay in his drawer unattended. After Nemmadi implementation too, these functionaries did not follow the queue system i.e. the first-in-first-out mode, for serving the rural digital services applications. Speeding up the service, and out of turn delivery of the service served as an additional source of income for them. There were reports of instances of the telecenter operators demanding extra payment from the applicants in collusion with the Revenue Inspectors. Comat Technologies had to expend time, effort, and money to act quickly against such operators and ensure the so called ‘government’ culture did not seep into their organization. | A key premise of PPP is that both partners combine their best innate characteristics to offer a public good. This presupposes a degree of transformation in the work ethics of the government and a public-service orientation of the private partner. This demands a novel system of governance with appropriate checks and balances combined with incentives to promote transparency, accountability and efficiency |
| Managing the Process inefficiencies | The urgency with which the Nemmadi system was implemented resulted in automating the as-is government processes without reengineering them. Therefore, the process inefficiencies continued and resulted in erroneous certificates, delayed responses etc. This manifested the most during April to June during which all admissions to schools and colleges were scheduled. This period saw the maximum number of applications. There was a huge pressure on end dates due to limited availability of school/college seats. During this period Process improvement and refinement are an integral part of the ‘mutual adjustment’ of the process – people combine are commonly reported during the implementation of most innovations. This requires significant |
citizens did not accept errors or delays; some of them got middlemen and political pressure to get their job done. The impact of any error during this time was hugely magnified. This, in turn, eroded the confidence of citizens in the e-governance system.

The Nemmadi exemplification demonstrates the causal mechanisms linking PPP and its outcomes. The unfavorable outcomes could be explained in terms of the nature of the contract discouraging creation of the facilitating conditions for social capital formation between the public and the private partners. The implementation process was plagued by challenges and problems that could have been better addressed by collective knowledge of the partners.

6. Discussion and implications:

We have sought to provide an explanation as to how and why certain factors, which have been reported in the PPP literature as CSFs, influence the success of PPP models in ICT adoption initiatives. We have uncovered the conceptual linkages between PPP as an emerging organizational form, its influence on social capital formation, the development of collective knowledge in the process of addressing the challenges during the implementation of a major innovation and the success of implementation of the innovation. We look at PPP as a powerful platform in facilitating the process of combination and exchange of the distinctly different resources of the private, and the public partners resulting in richer learning and knowledge development. However, the power of the platform lies in the organizational features of the PPP, which create the climate conducive for the creation of social capital. This could well recommend PPP as an appropriate model for ICT adoption in an e-Governance context especially when the scope and innovativeness of the project is high. Implementation of such projects is typically fraught with challenges and uncertainties on account of the novelty of the project, demanding new ways of thinking and acting.

We have noted the limitations of our exposition. Our explanation is anchored purely in social capital framework since we are interested in the how and why of the intangible critical success factors. We recognize there are other factors, especially the ‘hard’ ones e.g. financial and technological, which could also influence project implementation success. It is reasonable to presume that both ‘hard’ and ‘intangible factors together determine outcomes. We hope to have illuminated at least one significant part of the path to success. We wish to highlight that a PPP does not automatically acquire the characteristics of an organization as distinct from market. It demands deliberate attention to the structure and process aspects to infuse the spirit of a healthy partnership and provide the requisite stability over time. We take note of the caution sounded by other scholars that the cost-benefit balance might not be always in favor of social capital, resulting in resistance to change, stifling creativity, hampering innovation and encouraging conformity through ‘groupthink’ (Bolino, Turnley, Bloodgood, 2002 ; 22, 14).

We hope this paper provides additional ‘flesh’ to Nahapiet & Ghoshal’s [14] framework with regard to the intellectual capital, by indicating evidence of ‘knowledge content, including its quality’. We have also shared some insights on how the knowledge could be exploited towards addressing the challenges and solving some intractable problems encountered in the course of implementation of the ICT innovation. By choosing to focus on PPP as a phenomenon, we have responded to Nahapiet and Ghoshal’s [14] ‘potential to extend our fundamental analysis to other institutional settings, including those existing between organizations’.

We have used the Nemmadi PPP model only as an exemplification of the conceptual framework proposed by us. Future research should validate this framework through multiple-case designs considering “success” as well as “failure” cases. We hope we have initiated a small beginning in the study of PPP, which is gaining currency as a model to implement major e-Governance projects in developing countries constrained for resources – physical, human and intellectual. Social Capital could be effectively leveraged to achieve social goals by harnessing private-partner resources.
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