**The Bundian Way: An Indigenous-led cross-sector partnership in place through time**

Cross-sector partnerships offer great potential by bringing public and private organisations together to share resources, knowledge and expertise as they work to address complex economic, social and environmental issues. Yet, despite this potential, the diverse perspectives and approaches inherent in cross-sector partnerships can make cross-sector partnership work complicated. This is particularly the case in partnerships where Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders are collaborating to create value for Indigenous communities, as different priorities of partners can lead to tensions in how work is conceptualised, organised, and experienced (Henry and Dana 2019; Hindle and Lansdowne 2005; Murphy et al. 2020; Peredo and McLean 2013). How partners overcome these tensions to promote the long-term engagement required for effective cross-sector partnership work is therefore a critical matter of concern, and an area with significant potential to enhance both academic theory and partnership practice.

This research draws on a longitudinal case-study of the Bundian Way, an Indigenous-led cross-sector partnership bringing together over 40 organisations to establish a cultural tourism initiative on the Far South Coast of New South Wales, Australia. The Bundian Way Advisory Committee is one of an increasing number of cross-sector partnerships between Indigenous organisations and non Indigenous partners (Agius et al. 2007; Murphy and Arenas 2011; Murphy et al. 2020; Pearson and Helms 2013). However, too often these partnerships position Indigenous communities as stakeholders to be managed (Banerjee 2000, 2018), rather than right-holders with historical and ongoing cultural attachments to place with rights about the nature of community rebuilding activities (O'Bryan 2018; O'Faircheallaigh 2017; Sarkki et al. 2020; Zurba and Bullock 2018). Further, failure to acknowledge the role of place in which Indigenous-led cross-sector partnerships operate risks replicating past injustices (Galbraith et al. 2006) and further disempowering Indigenous peoples (Banerjee and Tedmanson 2010). This paper highlights the complex place-based relations of cross-sector partnerships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous partners (Murphy et al. 2020).

The paper submitted to this PhD Academy investigates the indivisibility of time and place central to Indigenous ways of knowing (Yunkaporta 2019), and details how non-Indigenous partners and I undertook a reflexive journey that involved story-telling, listening and walking ‘on Country’ and helped us to appreciate the indivisibility of time and place for Indigenous Australians. Engaging in these practices, and embracing the discomfort of not knowing enabled non-Indigenous partners and myself as a researcher to question taken for granted assumptions and confront the effects of settler colonialisation.

Importantly, this research is situated within a PhD thesis which looks more broadly to interplay of emotions and temporal work in cross-sector partnership engagement. The methodology I adopted in the PhD and in this paper are in alignment. Bringing together techniques of participant observation, document analysis, and interviews and adopting a methodology guided by Indigenous researchers (Kwaymullina 2016, Nakata 2007, Foley 2003), local protocols, and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies [AIATSIS] *Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research* (2020), this research explores not only the sources of tensions between partners, but also processes that may be drawn upon to shift partner perspectives in ways that promote, maintain and sustain long-term engagement in ethical cross-sector partnership work. In particular, learning from observational data and documents, engaging in reflexive cross-referencing, and continuous member-checking helped to ensure that the data collected and the findings they generated were refined and evolved through an abductive approach in partnership with the people participating in the research.

In my PhD, I develop a model of emotio-temporal work that illustrates how exploring different temporal orientations generates a mix of emotions for cross-sector partners which underpin partnership engagement and disengagement (Zietsma et al. 2019; Jasper 2011). I demonstrate how certain emotions pave the way for reflexive questioning of culture and history, ways of working, and white privilege, and show how emotions serve as the foundation for the temporal work needed for important partnership outcomes; these outcomes include fuelling a desire for change, driving new ways of working in collaboration, and evolving partners into allies. While exploring the indivisibility of time and place is one element of this work, I highlight that there are many additional Western perspectives, entrenched through the continuous nature of colonialism (and therefore often taken for granted), that need to be surfaced and challenged to promote effective cross-sector partnership activities.

The research in this paper makes a contribution to an ethics of custodianship by demonstrating how Indigenous and Western ways of understanding place through time can both be juxtaposed and integrated. An openness to Indigenous understandings of place/time, experiencing place, and engaging with place-based storytelling can foster greater dialogue between cross-sector partners, contributing to potential for new partnership models to develop. Theoretically, the research in my PhD contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the nexus between emotions and temporal work, and articulates a conceptual model that contributes to literatures on temporal work, mixed emotions, cross-sector partnerships and Indigenous organisational studies. My PhD research reinforces the findings of this paper by illustrating a principled process by which longer-term cross-sector partnership engagement, required as a precursor to an ethics of custodianship, can be developed and sustained.
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