REVENUE OPERATIONS & AI

A channel needs governance before it needs another partner

A channel does not need another partner by default: first define power, monitoring, coordination, conflict, and the management question.

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED
1 September 2026

READING TIME
7 min

WORDS
1,449

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/a-channel-needs-governance-before-another-partner/

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Adding another distributor, reseller, or marketplace connection can be an expensive response to a governance problem. Frazier's review of distribution-channel organization and management finds strong progress on behavioral relationships and persistent gaps in managerial issues and constructs, including interfirm monitoring, communication, conflict, vertical integration, and multiple-channel decisions. The article calls for research that reconnects channel-management questions to marketing's fundamental domain. This piece turns that agenda into a synthetic channel-architecture card: diagnose the work, power, information, and coordination boundary before expanding the partner list. It does not assess a live channel, recommend vertical integration, or replace contract and market-specific analysis.

Keywords: Distribution channel · Channel power · Interfirm monitoring · Vertical integration · Channel governance · Channel conflict

Adding another distributor, reseller, or marketplace connection can be an expensive response to a governance problem.

The short answer is that channel expansion should follow a diagnosis of coordination, information, and control. A partner can add reach, capability, or local access. It can also add another handoff, another source of conflict, and another place where performance becomes difficult to observe.

Frazier's review of distribution-channel organization and management finds substantial progress in understanding behavioral relationships and persistent gaps in managerial issues and constructs. The review points to questions around interfirm power, control, monitoring, communication, conflict, vertical integration, and multiple-channel decisions. The managerial lesson is not to avoid partners. It is to identify the work that governance must make possible before adding one.

Two empirical boundaries make that diagnosis more concrete. Homburg et al. (2020) show that the performance association of a governance mechanism can differ across direct and indirect route designs. Sa Vinhas and Anderson (2005) show why concurrent routes can create destructive competition, putting order ownership, differentiated offers, and double compensation inside the governance problem. Expansion should therefore follow a residual gap, not a partner-count target.

Why is a partner list not an effective channel design?

A channel design answers how value moves from the firm to the customer and how the participants coordinate to make that movement reliable. A partner list only names relationships.

Keep these objects separate:

Table 1 Why is a partner list not an effective channel design?

Channel object	Question
Reach	Which customer, geography, segment, or use case becomes accessible?
Activity	Who creates demand, sells, implements, services, and learns?
Power	Which participant can influence decisions, standards, access, or resources?
Monitoring	Which behavior, outcome, and information can each firm observe?
Coordination	Which handoffs, rules, incentives, and data keep activities aligned?
Conflict	Which goals, territories, prices, or responsibilities can pull the channel apart?

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

If the problem is missing reach, another partner may be relevant. If the problem is unclear ownership, weak information, misaligned incentives, or unexamined power, another partner can multiply the problem.

Table 1 The channel-governance-before-expansion card

Synthetic channel question	Governance work first	Partner expansion only if
Reach	Define the missing customer or market access	A specific access gap remains after the current channel is understood
Activities	Assign demand, sales, delivery, service, and learning work	A capability cannot be built or accessed through the current design
Power	Make decision rights and dependencies visible	The new relationship has an explicit control and escalation boundary
Monitoring	Specify observable behavior, outcomes, and data	The partner can produce information needed for the declared decision
Coordination	Set handoffs, standards, incentives, and review points	The added interface has a manageable coordination cost
Conflict	Name territory, price, goal, and responsibility tensions	The conflict has an owner, rule, and resolution path

Author's synthetic decision framework grounded in Frazier (1999), Homburg et al. (2020), and Sa Vinhas and Anderson (2005). The architecture is illustrative and does not describe a live channel.

The final column is deliberately conditional. Partner growth is a response to a residual gap, not a default expression of ambition.

Behavioral knowledge is not managerial control

Frazier observes that channel research has developed knowledge about behavioral relationships. The field has learned more about how power originates and is applied, how control is facilitated, and how conflict, satisfaction, trust, commitment, and relational norms shape interaction.

The review also argues that important managerial issues and constructs remain underexamined. This creates a familiar operating failure. A team can describe that a channel relationship is tense without knowing which decision rights, information gaps, incentives, or standards make it tense. It can observe conflict without knowing whether the cause is territory, pricing, service responsibility, or a change in the channel's economics.

The distinction matters because governance is not a mood. It is an arrangement that determines who can decide, see, act, challenge, and escalate.

Interfirm monitoring deserves a design

Frazier identifies interfirm monitoring as an area that has received limited attention. Monitoring is not simply surveillance. It is the information arrangement through which participants learn whether the channel is behaving as intended.

Write down four monitoring boundaries:

Table 3 Interfirm monitoring deserves a design

Monitoring boundary	Design question
Behavior	Which actions are within the partner’s control and worth observing?
Outcome	Which results matter, and over what time horizon?
Context	Which market or customer conditions change the interpretation?
Response	What decision follows when the signal crosses a declared boundary?

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

Without the response rule, a metric can create more reporting without creating more control. Without the context, a partner can be penalized for an outcome it could not influence. Without the behavior boundary, the channel may optimize a visible activity while the customer experience deteriorates.

Power is not the same as ownership

A channel can have powerful participants without one participant owning every activity. Power can arise from customer access, scarce capability, information, brand demand, switching costs, or control over a critical interface. Ownership changes some rights and risks, but it does not automatically resolve coordination.

That is why vertical integration should be treated as one possible organizational response rather than as the definition of governance. Homburg et al. (2020) show that route design changes the relationship between governance and performance, while Sa Vinhas and Anderson (2005) show how concurrent routes can create destructive competition. The decision depends on what must be controlled, what can be contracted, what information can be observed, and which capabilities the firm can build or access.

The same discipline applies to multiple channels. Adding a direct channel alongside partners can increase reach and create channel conflict. The question is not whether a direct route is strategically attractive in the abstract. It is which customer, activity, price, data, and service boundary the routes share.

How should commercial teams conduct a channel review before adding a partner?

Use this sequence:

1. State the channel problem in customer and activity terms.
2. Map participants, roles, dependencies, and decision rights.
3. Separate behavior, outcomes, and context in the monitoring design.
4. Identify power sources and unresolved conflicts.
5. Estimate the coordination cost of the current design.
6. Test whether a new partner closes a specific residual gap.
7. Define the review, escalation, and exit rules before the relationship starts.

This sequence makes an additional partner answerable to a mechanism. It should expand access, capability, or information in a way the current channel cannot provide at acceptable coordination cost.

The unresolved questions are the work

Frazier's review is partly a research agenda. It calls for channel organization and management questions to be reconnected to marketing's fundamental domain. For operators, that agenda is useful because it identifies where a channel decision may be running on inherited assumptions.

Ask:

Table 4 The unresolved questions are the work

Open managerial question	Why it matters
What exactly is being governed?	A relationship, an activity, an outcome, or an interface?
Which power is legitimate for this task?	Influence without a clear task can look like arbitrary control
What information is missing?	Unobserved behavior and context weaken both coordination and accountability
Which conflict is productive?	A difference can reveal a design tradeoff rather than a partner defect
What would justify integration?	Ownership should solve a defined coordination or control problem

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

The questions do not produce a universal channel architecture. They make the architecture discussable.

Three claims to resist

First, do not say that adding partners automatically creates distribution capacity. It may create interfaces faster than it creates reliable execution.

Second, do not treat channel conflict as evidence that a relationship should simply be terminated. Conflict can reveal an unresolved decision right, incentive, or activity boundary.

Third, do not call a channel governed because it has contracts and dashboards. Governance requires a working arrangement for power, monitoring, coordination, conflict, and response.

For adjacent decisions, compare channel conflict as a multidimensional measure with the channel ownership boundary.

Boundary

Frazier reviews progress and unresolved managerial questions in distribution-channel organization and management, distinguishes behavioral knowledge from underexamined managerial issues, and calls for a research agenda connected to marketing's fundamental domain. Homburg, Vomberg, and Muehlhaeuser add a route-design performance boundary, while Sa Vinhas and Anderson add the conflict created by concurrent routes. The channel card and review sequence are author-owned translations. They do not assess a live channel, recommend a partner, or determine whether vertical integration is appropriate.

Frazier, G. L. (1999). Organizing and managing channels of distribution. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27(2), 226-240. DOI

Homburg, C., Vomberg, A., & Muehlhaeuser, S. (2020). Design and governance of multichannel sales systems: Financial performance consequences in business-to-business markets. Journal of Marketing Research, 57(6), 1113-1134. DOI

Sa Vinhas, A., & Anderson, E. (2005). How potential conflict drives channel structure: Concurrent direct and indirect channels. Journal of Marketing Research, 42(4), 507-515. DOI

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, September 1). A channel needs governance before it needs another partner. Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/a-channel-needs-governance-before-another-partner/

KEEP READING

Revenue operations & AI

What are forecast categories? Names need stable decision rules

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-are-forecast-categories/

Revenue operations & AI

What is AI demand forecasting? A forecast is a system, not an oracle

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-ai-demand-forecasting/

Revenue operations & AI

What is CRM data governance? Revenue control before reporting

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-crm-data-governance/

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

Online version: https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/a-channel-needs-governance-before-another-partner/