

Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation
Monitoring Framework

INDICATOR 3:

QUALITY OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE

Methodology

Draft for consultation

Summary:

Maximising private sector contributions to development requires an effective engagement between the public and private sectors. Good public-private dialogue is recognised as a precondition for enhanced collaboration between the two actors.

The original indicator 3 measured the quality of public-private dialogue through a multi-stakeholder process, which produced an agreed assessment of the country's situation. However, the original methodology focused on identifying whether the basic conditions for dialogue were in place, without delving into the quality and results of the dialogue.

The revised indicator addresses these shortcomings, by providing a more complete, actionable picture of the quality of public-private dialogue in the country (in terms of relevant content, inclusive and transparent processes, and actual results and joint action).

Note: The following draft methodology, put forth by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, builds on the Nairobi Outcome Document, the technical advice of the Monitoring Advisory Group, the lessons learned in the 2016 monitoring round, as well as on Global Partnership work on private sector engagement through development co-operation.

Background

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda recognise the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (Global Partnership or GPEDC) as a solid foundation to drive more effective development co-operation. To meet the ambitions of the 2030 Agenda, the Global Partnership must deliver evidence and data that address the needs of countries in better monitoring the effectiveness of their development efforts. In the [Nairobi Outcome Document](#), the international development community stressed the need to “update the existing monitoring framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind”.

To address these challenges, the Steering Committee of the Global Partnership outlined an inclusive strategy to refine the monitoring framework, following a three-track approach:

1. Strengthening the current 10 indicators to ensure their relevance for the 2030 Agenda context;
2. Adapting the scope of monitoring to address major systemic issues critical to the 2030 Agenda, such as climate change, gender equality, conflict and fragility as well as progressively reflecting all the modalities and development co-operation actors;
3. Enhancing the impact of the monitoring process by improving the quality and inclusiveness of country-level monitoring and facilitating follow-up and action on the results.

The refinement of the Global Partnership monitoring framework is guided by the Nairobi Outcome Document, the [technical advice](#) of the Monitoring Advisory Group and the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team, and lessons learned in the 2016 monitoring round, including feedback from participating countries. The refinement began in April 2017 and is drawing on the technical assistance of expert groups, related to specific thematic areas, paired with iterative consultations with relevant stakeholders and country-level testing.

The refined indicators will be used in the third Global Partnership monitoring round, scheduled to be launched in May 2018. Further revisions will be incorporated in subsequent monitoring exercises. Findings from the third monitoring round will feed into high-level political processes, in particular the 2019 High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSAL
INDICATOR 3: QUALITY OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE

1. Introduction

This document presents a proposal to refine the Global Partnership indicator measuring the quality of public-private dialogue as an enabler of private sector engagement and contributor to development [indicator 3]. The indicator is part of the current Global Partnership Monitoring Framework, which is undergoing a refinement process to respond adequately to the effectiveness challenges of implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. To inform the refinement of the indicator methodology, the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team is consulting with experts and a broad range of development stakeholders.

The document presents the current indicator methodology, an assessment based on expert feedback and analysis, and concludes with a proposal for a revised approach, including a revised questionnaire. This proposal is open for general consultation and will be piloted in four countries during March 2018. Based on feedback received and lessons learned from the consultation and pilots, the methodology will be further refined and finally submitted to the Global Partnership Steering Committee. Upon Steering Committee endorsement, the refined indicator will be rolled out as part of the third monitoring round starting in May 2018.

2. Rationale

Collaboration between government and business actors is most beneficial when it can achieve both development impact and business benefits—going beyond what could have been achieved individually. In this way, good public-private dialogue (PPD) can help to identify sets of issues, design workable solutions, better implement these solutions and monitor their implementation. By finding areas of common interest, the government and private sector can create opportunities and partnerships that build trust, strengthen the overall environment and produce “shared value”.

Public-private dialogues are described as structured mechanisms anchored at the highest relevant level, sustained by a light support structure, which facilitate a discovery process on the required policy reforms and opportunities for collaboration between public and private sector actors; these PPDs involve a balanced range of public and private sector actors, as to reflect the perspectives of all relevant actors, and are used to identify, filter, accelerate and/or implement actions or policy reforms (Herzberg et al 2006).

Box 1. Why focus on the quality of Public-Private Dialogue (PPD)?

PPDs are beneficial in improving business environments, gaining broad-based ownership of policy reforms, stimulating competitiveness, increasing trust and fostering governance through joint co-ordination, transparency, and shared responsibility (Bettcher et al., 2015). Once the dialogue is operational, inclusive and sustained, cross-country evidence shows that the quantity and quality of public-private collaboration considerably expands (IDB, 2016). Thus, PPDs contribute directly to promoting greater, effective public-private collaboration, as called for in SDG 17.17.

Broad-based, inclusive, sustained forms of public-private dialogue are in contrast with forms of public-private sector engagement characterised by ad hoc lobbying or advocacy mechanisms, where better-resourced actors have greater access and influence, and where detrimental collusion and rent-seeking behaviour takes place. From a development effectiveness perspective, inclusive, results-oriented public-private dialogue modalities are a precondition for public-private sector collaboration that is pro-developmental and pro-poor.

An increasing number of studies on PPDs show their multiple benefits. Public-private dialogue and collaboration are shown to contribute to the effectiveness and sustainability of countries' productive development policies (Eslava et al, 2013) as well as firms' productivity (Qureshi et al, 2013). Industrial policies and re-emerging industrialisation efforts are also more successful when tailored PPD mechanisms are used as a steering and problem-solving mechanism that ensures good governance and effectiveness of these policies (Schneider, 2013; Devlin, 2014). Productive development policies are also enhanced by PPD where the organisational design of these dialogue platforms is adapted to whether they aim at the provision of a public, club or private good (Pittaluga et al, 2014). When conditions are ripe, the PPDs serve to generate transparency and co-ordination to inform policy design and monitor the good use of public funds (Bisang et al 2014). PPDs can also evolve into public-private co-governance of competitive sectors (Cornick et al, 2014), and can bring a long-term perspective to development policies, avoiding political cycles (Devlin, 2014). They can transform the entire developmental path and economic model of a country by becoming ubiquitous instruments of economic and social dialogue, and by adopting longer-term time horizons, as in the successful story of South Korea (Cornick, 2013: 8). When conditions are more difficult, such as in fragile and conflict-afflicted situations, identifying champions and achieving inclusiveness of PPD is more difficult, but the dialogue is more effective when communicated as a transparent process that can help to restore trust and stability in the country, and when focused on key sectors (e.g. agribusiness, extractives) in order to attract investment (World Bank, 2014). Finally, inclusiveness of the dialogue can also help reformist policy-makers create broader winning coalitions. These broader coalitions can help overcome the opposition of entrenched interests, such as in effectively taxing non-competitive, powerful industrial sectors (Sidel, 2014).

Ultimately, virtuous PPD dynamics are self-reinforcing: better dialogue leads to more collaboration, which in turn generates mutual trust and further dialogue. Good PPDs also act as an early warning system to prevent or address economic crises and as an instrument to promote inclusive, sustainable growth. PPD also helps private and public sector actors stay informed about each other's plans and needs, and to remain accountable to each other and to other societal actors on the progress made in areas of mutual interest.

As a result of the intense discussions in the 4th High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011, the resulting Busan Partnership Agreement recognises the central role of the private sector in advancing innovation, creating wealth, income and jobs, mobilising domestic resources and in turn contributing to poverty reduction (GPEDC, 2011: §32). Governments made a specific commitment to enable the participation of the private sector in the design and implementation of development policies and strategies to foster sustainable growth and poverty reduction (GPEDC, 2011: §32b), along with a commitment to improve the enabling environment for private investment, private sector development, public-private partnerships, strengthening of value chains, and strengthening of development impact of private sector operations. Governments and representatives from the private sector endorsed the Joint Statement on Expanding and Enhancing Public-Private Partnership for Broad-based, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth, guiding their shared commitments in this area (OECD, 2011).

In the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD), the international development community recognises all stakeholders as interdependent partners in development and commits to improving ways of working

together. In order to promote inclusive development partnerships, it agrees to foster enabling policy environments for the business sector to support responsible, inclusive and sustainable business practices; and support structured dialogue and partnership to promote these approaches (GPEDC 2016a: §11).¹ Dialogue and partnership between government, the private sector and other stakeholders are seen as enablers of engagement in the pursuit of inclusive and sustainable economic growth. While partner countries will promote an enabling environment for businesses, the private sector will work to align their engagement to national development strategies of partner countries (GPEDC 2016a: §49) and to support effective development co-operation principles within their countries of operations (GPEDC 2016a: §80).

The universality of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development also implies that all stakeholders are expected to contribute to the realisation of the sustainable development goals. Through inclusive partnerships, governments, civil society and private sector can mobilise and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries (SDG 17).²

3. Current Methodology

The current methodology for indicator 3 focuses on the quality of public-private dialogue (PPD) at the country level, recognising the importance of inclusive dialogue with the private sector to build a policy environment that is conducive to growth and sustainable development. The current methodology was developed in 2015, first in collaboration with the World Bank Institute, and then refined under the guidance of the Global Partnership's Monitoring Advisory Group (GPEDC 2015: 56-60). The global indicator was rolled out in 59 countries as part of the 2016 monitoring round.

The indicator was structured in three modules, relying on a combination of quantitative and qualitative data, drawn from selected global indicators and from country-generated qualitative information. The modules covered the following building blocks for quality public-private dialogue:

Module 1: Legal and regulatory context for PPD assessed to what extent the country's laws and regulations enable effective public-private dialogue. It presented a dashboard of country scores from international indices, including the Public Engagement Index from the Open Budget Survey, Voice and Accountability, Rule of Law and Control of Corruption indices from the Worldwide Governance Indicators and Citizen Engagement in Rulemaking Index. This information was presented as context information to provide background to the discussions and responses in module 2. Trends on these indicators were used to show progress over time in the global progress report (OECD/UNDP, 2016).

Module 2: Country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process assessed the potential for dialogue at the country level and if the conditions existed for a quality dialogue process to happen. It was comprised of four questions³ (including guiding questions for each question) to be answered under the overall co-ordination of the government, in multi-stakeholder dialogue with representatives from the private sector, from providers of development co-operation, from trade unions and from civil society organisations. Respondents would qualify the situation in the

¹ <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/OutcomeDocumentEnglish.pdf>

² <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/globalpartnerships/>

³ The four questions included in the previous methodology were: (1) Is the private sector ready and willing to engage and interact with the government? (2) Is the government ready and willing to engage and interact with the private sector? (3) Is there a potential champion who can facilitate the dialogue process, activate political will and reduce the trust gap between public and private sector stakeholders? and (4) Are logistical, financing and capacity building instruments available to support PPD?

country for each of the four questions, with scores ranging from 0 (weak) to 10 (strong). They were also invited to provide an open-ended narrative to complement the quantitative score. Guiding sub-questions were facilitated to ensure that responses covered all the relevant issues. The methodology encouraged reaching an agreement in the responses. If consensus proved elusive, participants were allowed to report their level of agreement [Agree / Partially agree / Disagree] and specific observations or disagreements.

Module 3: Organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform was optional. It required hiring a consultant to carry out a comprehensive study of a significant PPD platform, relying on a predefined methodology (see GPEDC 2015a). The module included questions addressing several dimensions of organisational effectiveness such as mandate structure, facilitation and management, quality of outputs, communication and outreach activities, monitoring and evaluation and degree of autonomy. The optional module was aimed at helping actors see the value of assessing the effectiveness of specific PPD platforms through case studies, as well as facilitating global peer-learning of different PPD approaches, and disseminating best practices and lessons.

4. Overall Assessment

The 2016 monitoring round provided the first opportunity to roll out the indicator in a large number of countries. Several lessons emerged from the exercise (GPEDC, 2017b). In the same year, the Monitoring Advisory Group reviewed the methodology of this indicator and provided technical advice to improve it (GPEDC, 2016c). The ongoing work of the Global Partnership on private sector engagement through development co-operation has also shed light on characteristics of existing platforms and country cases. These different sources of input, complemented by commitments made in the NOD, provide valuable guidance to the refinement of indicator 3 and are further explored below.

Lessons from rolling out the indicator in the 2016 monitoring round

- **‘Public-Private Dialogue’ as primary theme:** Participants highlighted the importance of quality PPD as a catalyst of collaboration. Stakeholders have also raised that there may be other entry points for assessing the effectiveness of the private sector as a development actor in the context of development co-operation. As PPD is being kept as the main focus of the revised indicator, the revised methodology should provide a better indication of the exact linkages between PPDs and the role of private sector in development.
- **Overall indicator 3 implementation:** Fifty-five countries (68% of 2016 monitoring round participants) undertook country-level assessment of PPD, organising country-level, multi-stakeholder dialogues to respond to the indicator 3 questionnaire. A two-third participation rate indicates that a majority of countries consider this a relevant and valuable endeavour. The fact that 32% of participating countries did not carry it out can be related to capacity constraints, since this required organising meetings involving different actors, but can also indicate that public-private dialogue is not present or unsystematic. The latter does not diminish the relevance of this indicator; on the contrary, it shows that there is room for improvement on private sector engagement at country level. Overall the 2016 monitoring round allowed for a mapping of the status of public-private dialogue platforms across participating countries, identifying underlying factors affecting the engagement among these actors (e.g. lack of champions, resources and logistical issues).

- **Multi-stakeholder process:** Participants indicated that the multi-stakeholder dialogue approach to answering the questionnaire provided an entry point or an opportunity to strengthen collaboration between public and private sector.⁴
- **Assessing the performance of a specific public-private dialogue platform (module 3):** Although several participating countries expressed interest in the optional module 3, no country undertook the resource-intensive assessment proposed by the module. Countries cited lack of resources and complexity as major deterrents. As a result, only the three country pilots (Philippines, Ethiopia and Colombia) were reported in the last round.

Technical guidance from the Monitoring Advisory Group⁵

In preparing for this review of the monitoring framework, a Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) set up in 2015 identified the overarching parameters informing the review, and generated specific indicator recommendations to address issues of relevance, efficiency and usefulness of the indicators (GPEDC 2016b; GPEDC 2016c). Key elements of the technical advice on indicator 3 include:

- **Assessing the inclusiveness of the participation in public-private dialogues:** Inclusiveness of public-private dialogue can be evaluated by seeking to understand who participates in existing platforms, particularly with regards to small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), small producers and sectors where informality prevails. It is important to understand to what extent stakeholders around the table represent enterprises of different sizes and sectors, from domestic firms to multinationals. Local governments can also play an important role in dialogue with the private sector on issues of local taxation, infrastructure and markets, they should therefore also be part of such discussions. The position of large private foundations (non-corporate private sector) could be clarified in the revised methodology, potentially considering a separate indicator.
- **Assessing the openness of the dialogue process:** As a principle for effective development co-operation, transparency can enhance inclusion, relevance and impact. The indicator could assess whether PPDs are open to other stakeholders. Since PPDs relate to areas of public benefit, there could also be a question on whether these platforms make publicly available their materials such as lists of participants, agendas, preparatory documents and outcomes.
- **Capturing the enabling conditions for good public-private dialogue:** The MAG suggested capturing these specific conditions, going beyond the current limited focus on the basics. The conditions and co-ordination (or voice) mechanisms that enable SMEs to engage effectively could be considered.
- **Considering different forms of dialogue:** Different forms of PPDs should be taken into account, from informal arrangements to structured social dialogues, as long as they achieve their intended results.
- **Focusing on results:** A revised methodology should capture the results of PPDs generating outcomes, and not just the intention to engage. It is important to understand what the

⁴ However, it is important to note that the multi-stakeholder process was quite limited in some of the countries carrying out this indicator, as other simpler methods were sometimes used to collect answers to the questionnaire without an actual conversation taking place.

⁵ The Monitoring Advisory Group (MAG) was established in 2015 to provide technical expertise and advice to strengthen the Global Partnership monitoring framework and ensure its relevance in the evolving post-2015 landscape. The group is composed of 12 high-level experts from developing country governments, development co-operation providers, think tanks and civil society organisations. From mid-2015 to late 2016, the MAG performed a full assessment of the 10 indicator monitoring framework and the monitoring process.

different actors expect public-private dialogue to achieve, in terms of both purpose and actual outcomes.

- **Future iterations may consider the effectiveness of greater private sector engagement – particularly that facilitated through development co-operation.** As the importance of private sector engagement in development efforts continues to grow, with new modalities of development co-operation aimed at catalysing that participation, assessing the extent to which those forms of collaboration align with the principles for effective development co-operation could provide a sensible approach to ensure their impact and sustainability.

Outcome of Global Partnership work on private sector engagement

Since 2017, the Global Partnership has been working to identify challenges and opportunities to scale up private sector engagement through development co-operation at country level. The [PSE concept note](#), the [mapping of 66 private sector platforms](#) and the Bangladesh private sector case study⁶ provide several relevant considerations that can serve as input to the review of indicator 3:

- **Broad-based private sector participation:** Large firms tend to participate more in private sector platforms if compared to SMEs. The Bangladesh case study (GPEDC 2018) shows that SMEs are less represented in business associations, trade bodies and chambers of commerce. They tend to appear as beneficiaries of PSE projects but less as active partners in such platforms. Empowering SMEs to engage in dialogue opportunities may increase their effectiveness and impact. Finance and capacity seem to be some of the hindering issues but also the way PPD mechanisms are often structured does not seem to facilitate SME participation. The review shows a participation deficit from partner country governments in global, regional and sectoral platforms. Civil society, trade unions and parliaments are also less represented in these fora.
- **Effective, transparent mechanisms:** In line with the observations above, understanding PPD mechanisms and how they are structured can improve understanding why there is low representation from specific groups. There is limited information made available to the public which indicates that transparency of these platforms shows room for improvement. Availability of capacity building instruments and accessibility of information may also influence participation.
- **Results:** The majority of platforms assessed provide information on their results in terms of the activities they carry out such as research, events, and growth in their membership, but not necessarily in terms of outcomes (GPEDC 2018). Most platforms do not tend to monitor activities of their members and have no accountability systems in place. Few private sector engagement projects focus on social sectors or explicitly target the poor. This suggests an opportunity to enhance the focus of private sector engagement projects on addressing social challenges.

Relevant commitments in the Nairobi Outcome Document (NOD)

In addition to recognising the role of the private sector in maximising the effectiveness and impact of development co-operation for development, the NOD also states specific commitments from the development community towards business and from the private sector towards other stakeholders in the countries where it operates (GPEDC, 2016).

⁶ To be published after February 2018 workshop in Bangladesh

- The private sector committed to align their efforts to national development and strategies (NOD§ 49). It will also work to support effective development co-operation **principles and commitments**; and become increasingly transparent and responsive to all sections of society within their countries of operation in accordance with International Labour Organisation labour standards, United Nations Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD guidelines for multinational enterprises. (NOD§ 80)
- National governments commit to engage in **dialogue** with the private sector and trade unions (NOD§ 42) and to promote an enabling environment, especially for **small and medium scale domestic** enterprises. (NOD§ 64) There is also an overall commitment from the Global Partnership to utilise effective development co-operation to attract business investment benefiting both business strategies and development goals. (NOD§ 60)
- Development partners commit to increase engagement with the private sector, ensure transparency in financial transactions and encourage compliance with national and international laws and policies. (NOD§ 65)
- **Informal private sector** actors are also mentioned in the context of having an enabling environment to operate in countries. (NOD§ 16, 64) Commitments to advance **gender** equality and promote decent **youth** employment are also found in the NOD. (NOD§ 88, 90)

5. Refinement Proposal

Based on the considerations detailed above, the following parameters have been selected to define the refinement of indicator 3:

- Maintaining the focus on the quality of public-private dialogue as the stepping stone that enables greater private sector engagement in sustainable development;
- Keeping elements from the current methodology that have worked successfully and have been assessed positively (both substance and process);
- Discontinuing module 3 in its current format but bring some elements covered in module 3 into the refined methodology.
- Bringing key additional elements that have been raised by stakeholders as critical for increasing the relevance of this indicator going forward, including considering issues of relevance, results and inclusiveness of current public-private dialogues in the country.

Maintaining a focus on Public-Private Dialogue

The Busan commitments focused on the quality of development relationships with the assumption that improvements in these areas increase the chances for better development outcomes. The Global Partnership indicator 3, in its original methodological approach, followed this line of thought, presuming that public-private dialogue enables better private sector engagement and contribution to development. Dialogue and partnerships with the private sector are seen as essential in furthering inclusive growth and sustainable development.

By providing structured, inclusive processes to inform policymaking, PPDs are used as a sounding board to assist national governments in designing reforms that are guided by bottom-up approaches and credible evidence, and are more widely supported (Bettcher et al, 2015).

The contribution of the private sector to development can take many different forms such as job creation, investment in infrastructure and other sectors, transfer of know-how, expanding access of the poor to finance, goods and services. There are certainly other indicators of private sector engagement or entry points for assessing their effectiveness as a development actor in the context of development co-operation. However, measuring and quantifying the specific contribution of the private sector to sustainable development is quite difficult and goes beyond the scope of the Global Partnership. Since the Busan principles are country ownership, focus on results, inclusive partnerships, transparency and accountability, it makes sense to focus on elements related to these principles.

In addition to echo the principles of country ownership and inclusive partnerships, the emphasis on public-private dialogues helps identifying whether the private sector has a space in policy-making. Such platforms can facilitate exchanges between the private and public sectors on issues of relevance to both sides, such as taxation, productivity, skills development, financial access, trade, regulations, labour laws, environmental regulations, and others. The Busan principles on results, transparency and accountability also permeate PPDs and will gain more prominence in the revised methodology.

Proposed elements for a revised questionnaire

The revised questionnaire combines elements from the current methodology with additional ones that are considered critical for the engagement and contribution of the private sector to development.

An initial question will invite participants to identify the thematic focus of recent public-private dialogue initiatives in the country.

This will be followed by an assessment of the overall quality of those public-private dialogue processes, structured in three building blocks:

1. Enablers for public-private dialogue: An environment that is conducive for dialogue and collaboration between public and private sectors, characterised by mutual openness and trust. Two sub-dimensions:

- Mutual trust: Assesses the overarching status of public-private relations in the country and the willingness of both sectors to engage with one another.
- Readiness to engage: Assesses the extent to which all parties are effectively organised and have the capacity to engage.

2. Broad-based, relevant public-private dialogue: Dialogue that addresses issues of importance to both public and private sectors and that are effectively used by them to consult each other.

- Inclusiveness of dialogue: Assesses whether dialogue brings to the table all the relevant actors that need to be involved in the dialogue.
- Relevance of issues: Assesses the extent to which existing dialogue is meaningful and address issues of concern to the different actors.

3. Effective public-private engagement: Dialogue that is well organised and produces results enabling joint collaboration of public and private sectors. Existence of concrete examples of partnerships that recognise and tap on the different and complementary roles of actors involved.

- Organisational effectiveness: Assesses whether the current arrangements support quality dialogue towards tangible outcomes stemming from the dialogue.

- **Results:** Assesses whether joint public-private collaboration is being expanded as a result of current dialogue processes.

The core of the revised indicator is built around a six-item questionnaire covering these different elements. When these building blocks are present, they progressively bring about the conditions for stronger partnerships between the public and the private sector, which could contribute jointly to sustainable development, as shown in figure below:



In practice, the relationship between public-private dialogue and joint development efforts that are developmental and help reduce poverty and inequality is not as linear as suggested in the figure above. There are certainly other factors that contribute to private sector impact in development, many beyond the scope of this monitoring exercise. However, the Global Partnership indicator 3 does not aim at being exhaustive. It needs to remain feasible and realistic so that national co-ordinators can implement it fully and inclusively, in a truly multi-stakeholder process as envisioned.

6. Methodology

Data sources

Country context (*secondary data*). A dashboard of the country's performance against 30 SDG indicators where private sector engagement is most needed will also be offered as background material to inform the discussion, to provide participants with a picture of the country's performance in areas of mutual interest and potential public-private dialogue. As in the former methodology for indicator 3 (i.e. module 1), country scores from international indices related to the enabling environment for private sector engagement will continue to be presented to the national co-ordinator as background material to inform the discussion⁷.

Quality of Public-Private Dialogues (*Questionnaire*). A proposed multi-stakeholder questionnaire builds on technical suggestions, further research and the original work in developing the original methodology (see details in section 4):

- The questionnaire for **module 1** is a single question where participants identify key topics that have been the focus of public-private dialogue in the country in the last four years. This module provides the substantive basis for the quality assessment included in module 2.
- The questionnaire for **module 2** is structured around six questions, clustered in three building blocks to be answered also based on the ongoing PPD initiatives: (i) an enabling

⁷ Specifically, the following indexes: Public engagement, Voice and Accountability, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption, and Citizen engagement in rulemaking.

environment for PPDs, (ii) broad-based relevant dialogue processes, and (iii) effectiveness of the PPD processes.

Proposed questionnaire

The questionnaire is composed by one basic question identifying the focus areas of recent PPD initiatives, followed by six questions related to the quality of PPD (Box 2).

Box 2. Key dimensions in the revised multi-stakeholder questionnaire

Module 1: Focus of Public-Private Dialogue

Q. FOCUS. Which topics have been addressed in public-private dialogue initiatives taking place in the country in recent years (i.e. over the last 4 years)?

Module 2: Quality of Public-Private Dialogue

1. Enabling context for public-private dialogue:

Q1. MUTUAL TRUST: To what extent is there mutual trust and willingness from the public and private sectors to engage with one another?

Q2. READINESS: To what extent are public and private actors able and ready to engage with one another?

2. Broad-based, relevant public-private dialogue:

Q3. INCLUSIVENESS: Who typically participates in existing public-private dialogues?

Q4. RELEVANCE: To what extent does the existing dialogue address issues of concern to both sides?

3. Effective public-private engagement:

Q5. ORGANISATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: To what extent existing public-private dialogue arrangements are organised towards achieving results?

Q6. RESULTS: To what extent existing public-private dialogue initiatives are actually increasing joint collaboration?

Responses to questions in module 2 are organised around a 4-level scale, reflecting progressive 'degrees of progress' for the element being assessed.⁸ Each level within the scale is accompanied with 'best practice' characteristics to help respondents identify whether the description of the level corresponds with the situation in the country.

Data collection method for the questionnaire

As in the previous round, the reporting guidance will suggest a multi-stakeholder dialogue process led by government and including private sector representatives and social actors:

⁸ The advantages of a scale rather than 0-10 scoring (current methodology) are twofold: 1) Scales provide a minimum of consistency and standardisation due to the pre-defined descriptive levels (scenarios) while scores can be interpreted in different ways in different countries leading to discrepancies in the results; 2) the national co-ordinator and focal points can focus on the substance of the discussion rather than having to jointly draft an open-ended response to each question.

1. A first step will involve identifying focal points for private sector groups, and trade unions or other social agents. Given the different realities and challenges experienced by large firms and small and medium enterprises, it is encouraged to invite two (2) private sector focal points – one representing SMEs and another representing large business groups and companies. A focal point for trade unions or other social agents is also suggested.
2. Next, the government's national co-ordinator will convene the parties to the multi-stakeholder dialogue process, sharing the questionnaire materials in advance for intra-constituency consultations.
3. The government's national co-ordinator will invite parties to agree on the questionnaire responses. The national co-ordinator will register the responses that have reached greater consensus.⁹

⁹ If there are particular observations or disagreements on the responses, invited parties are allowed to reflect these remarks in an additional sheet.

ANNEX I. METHODOLOGY FOR INDICATOR 3

1. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Data Collection Method

Contextual data sourced from existing global indicators is provided as context to the national co-ordinator by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team. This dashboard of indicators provides a proxy to an enabling legal and regulatory framework for good public-private engagement, as well as provides a picture of the country's performance in several areas which are relevant for private sector engagement. The dashboard will serve as background information to contextualise the discussion of the indicator questionnaire.

A government-led multi-stakeholder dialogue process will be implemented to provide agreed answers to the proposed questionnaire. As a preliminary step, it is suggested to identify focal points for private sector groups, and trade unions or other relevant social agents, prioritising their ability to convey representative views of their constituency.

Given the different realities and challenges experienced by large firms and small and medium enterprises (SMEs), it is encouraged to invite two (2) different private sector focal points – one representing SMEs and another representing large business groups and companies. A focal point for trade unions or other social agents is also encouraged.

Modules

The revised indicator builds on two complementary modules:

Module 1: "Focus of Public-Private Dialogue" includes a single question where participants are invited to identify areas that have been addressed as part of public-private dialogue initiatives taking place in the country over the last 4 years. The purpose of this module is helping participants develop a shared view of the instances of public-private dialogue taking place in the country, as to guide their responses in module 2 towards assessing the quality of these PPD initiatives.

Module 2: "Quality of Public-Private Dialogue" is organised around a six-item questionnaire. Responses are to be discussed and agreed in a multi-stakeholder setting. These closed-ended responses have been organised in ordinal 4-point scales, reflecting incremental steps towards the Busan and Nairobi commitments concerning greater inclusion and engagement of the private sector in development. Participants in the dialogue are invited to seek an agreement on the responses that better fit the country's current reality, taking into consideration the PPD initiatives taking place in the country over the past 4 years. Particular observations or disagreements on the final response can be reported in a separate sheet.

2. PROPOSED QUESTIONNAIRE

2.1. Questionnaire overview

MODULE 1: FOCUS OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE

Q. FOCUS. Which topics have been addressed in public-private dialogue initiatives taking place in the country in recent years (i.e. over the last 4 years)?

MODULE 2: QUALITY OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE

1. Enabling context for public-private dialogue:

Q1. MUTUAL TRUST: To what extent is there mutual trust and willingness from the public and private sectors to engage with one another?

Q2. READINESS: To what extent are public and private actors able and ready to engage with one another?

2. Broad-based, relevant public-private dialogue:

Q3. INCLUSIVENESS: Who typically participates in existing public-private dialogues?

Q4. RELEVANCE: To what extent does the existing dialogue address issues of concern to both sides?

3. Effective public-private engagement:

Q5. ORGANISATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: To what extent existing public-private dialogue arrangements are organised towards achieving results?

Q6. RESULTS: To what extent existing public-private dialogue initiatives are actually increasing joint collaboration?

2.2. How will it look to participants?

Q1. To what extent is there mutual trust and willingness from the public and private sectors to engage with one another?

Step 1

L1. Current interactions are limited and characterised by reciprocal mistrust.	L2. Current interactions are characterised by mistrust, and only one side is currently making efforts to increase the dialogue.
L3. Both sides (public and private) are making efforts to increase the dialogue in some areas.	L4. High-level support backs the efforts to increase public-private dialogue, which is becoming comprehensive and characterised by mutual trust.



Click to read the characteristics of practice that help you to answer the question

Step 2

Q1. To what extent is there mutual trust and willingness from the public and private sectors to engage with one another?

Characteristics of good practice

- * There is a degree of reciprocal trust between public and private sector actors, and willingness from both sides to increase dialogue and collaboration.
- * Some areas of government and parts of the private sector are particularly willing to engage further in specific issues.



L1. Current interactions are limited and characterised by reciprocal mistrust.	L2. Current interactions are characterised by mistrust, and only one side is currently making efforts to increase the dialogue.
L3. Both sides (public and private) are making efforts to increase the dialogue in some areas.	L4. High-level support backs the efforts to increase public-private dialogue, which is becoming comprehensive and characterised by mutual trust.



Characteristics of good practice

- * There is a general lack of trust and mutual understanding between public and private sector actors.
- * Nevertheless, one of the parties - either the government or private sector leaders - is willing to increase the dialogue and taking action in that direction. This may include increasing communication and transparency on priorities, strategies and investment plans, and/or creating entry points for dialogue and collaboration.

Q1. To what extent is there mutual trust and willingness from the public and private sectors to engage with one another?

Step 3

L1. Current interactions are limited and characterised by reciprocal mistrust.	L2. Current interactions are characterised by mistrust, and only one side is currently making efforts to increase the dialogue.
L3. Both sides (public and private) are making efforts to increase the dialogue in some areas.	L4. High-level support backs the efforts to increase public-private dialogue, which is becoming comprehensive and characterised by mutual trust.



Choose your answer



Go to next question!

Q2. To what extent are public and private actors able and ready to engage with one another?

Step 4

L1. There is limited capacity and co-ordination within both public and private sectors to fully engage in dialogue processes.	L2. Both sides have fair levels of internal co-ordination, capacities and resources to engage in structured dialogue - with some room for improvement.
L3. There are capacities and certain co-ordination mechanisms within the government or among private sector entities to engage in structured dialogue, but the other side is less prepared.	L4. Both sides have good levels of internal co-ordination, capacities and resources to engage in structured dialogue, often supported by champions or established institutional mandates.

2.3. Detailed questionnaire

MODULE 1: FOCUS OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE IN THE COUNTRY

Before answering the following questions in a multi-stakeholder setting, please consider the different initiatives of public-private dialogue that have taken place in the country recently (i.e. over the last 4 years). These can be formal platforms or informal events, national or subnational, country wide or sector-specific, permanent or temporary.

Q. From the following list of potential topics, which ones have been addressed in public-private dialogue initiatives taking place in the country in recent years (i.e. over the last 4 years)? (Focus)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boosting national economic growth | <input type="checkbox"/> Decent work: including on job creation, women & youth inclusion in labour market, child labour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Raising productivity | <input type="checkbox"/> Workplace safety |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic diversification | <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting tourism |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Access | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmentally-sustainable growth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrialization | <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting inclusive growth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trade promotion | <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic taxes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure development, including transport | <input type="checkbox"/> Use of foreign support (foreign direct investment, development assistance) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> IT infrastructure , including mobile and internet | <input type="checkbox"/> Fighting corruption and bribery |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Research & development | <input type="checkbox"/> Sector-specific issues and regulations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Innovation and entrepreneurship | <input type="checkbox"/> Other issues #1: {Please describe} |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reducing firm or job informality | <input type="checkbox"/> Other issues #2: {Please describe} |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy , including access, affordability or clean energy | <input type="checkbox"/> No public-private dialogue has taken place in the country |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water , including access or sustainability | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Skills development & education in the country | |

Methodological notes:

- The issues for public-private dialogue presented above cover a comprehensive range of typical entry points for public-private dialogue. These issues are also directly related to 28 SDG targets, where public-private sector dialogue and collaboration might be most needed to help boost the national implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
- To inform the multi-stakeholder dialogue, participants will be provided with a country profile with the latest SDG results for each of these themes. Specifically, the following SDG indicators will be presented in the one-page dashboard of country status, clustered around the different topics: 6.1.1, 6.4.2, 7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.2.1, 7.3.1, 8.1.1, 8.2.1, 8.3.1, 8.5.1, 8.5.2, 8.6.1, 8.7.1, 8.8.1, 8.9.1, 8.10.1, 8.10.2, 9.1.2, 9.2.1, 9.2.2, 9.4.1, 9.5.1, 9.5.2, 9.a.1, 9.b.1, 9.c.1, 10.1.1, 10.4.1, 16.5.2, 17.1.2, 17.3.1, 17.6.2. In selecting these indicators, two criteria were taken into account: (i) whether private sector engagement was relevant to address the issue, and (ii) whether the UN Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDGs indicator has classified the indicator as Tier I (good coverage and data quality) or Tier II (country coverage was reasonable among participating countries) by November 2017.
- The purpose of the above question is to help participants establishing a shared view of areas where public-private dialogue is (or is not) currently taking place in the country. This initial exercise will help respondents in describing the characteristics (i.e. quality) of the identified public-private dialogue process (es) through a 6-item questionnaire described below. At a more practical level, the mapping exercise can help participants identify unaddressed areas where they would like to promote public-private dialogue initiatives going forward.

MODULE 2: QUALITY OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE IN THE COUNTRY

Again, please consider the different initiatives of public-private dialogue that have taken place in the country recently (i.e. over the last 4 years). Although these dialogues may differ in terms of quality, please refer to the most typical experience as you answer the questions below.

1. Enabling context for public-private dialogue

Q1. To what extent is there mutual trust and willingness from the public and private sectors to engage with one another? (Mutual trust)

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your country's situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1: Current interactions are limited and characterised by reciprocal mistrust.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a general lack of trust and mutual understanding between public and private sector actors. ➤ There is limited exchange of information regarding priorities, strategies and investment plans. ➤ Current opportunities for dialogue are limited and parties do not see entry points or usefulness of further exchange.
Level 2: Current interactions are characterised by mistrust, and only one side is currently making efforts to increase the dialogue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a general lack of trust and mutual understanding between public and private sector actors. ➤ Nevertheless, one of the parties - either the government or private sector leaders -is willing to increase the dialogue and taking action in that direction. This may include increasing communication and transparency on priorities, strategies and investment plans, and/or creating entry points for dialogue and collaboration.
Level 3: Both sides (public and private) are making efforts to increase the dialogue in some areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a degree of reciprocal trust between public and private sector actors, and willingness from both sides to increase dialogue and collaboration. ➤ Some areas of government and parts of the private sector are particularly willing to engage further in specific issues.
Level 4: High-level support backs the efforts to increase public-private dialogue, which is becoming comprehensive and characterised by mutual trust.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Interactions are generally characterised by mutual trust and willingness to engage. ➤ Mutual trust is facilitating a reciprocal flow of information on plans, priorities, and entry points for collaboration and investment opportunities. ➤ There is high level political support for public-private dialogue, at the president/prime minister's or ministers' level; and/or ➤ There is high level support from private sector associations (e.g. chambers of commerce, trade/competitiveness councils, SME associations, trade unions). ➤ Both sides are investing time and effort to engage with each other to work together, recognising their complementary strengths.

Where attention will be needed:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Identifying neutral facilitators
<input type="checkbox"/> Finding areas of mutual interest
<input type="checkbox"/> Increasing information exchange
<input type="checkbox"/> High level support from government
<input type="checkbox"/> Support from major business associations | <input type="checkbox"/> Expanding dialogue to new areas
<input type="checkbox"/> Expanding dialogue to new partners
<input type="checkbox"/> Other
..... |
|--|--|

Q2. To what extent are public and private actors able and ready to engage with one another? (Readiness)

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
-------	-----------------------------

Level 1: There is limited capacity and co-ordination within both public and private sectors to fully engage in dialogue processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Both sides lack the experience, skills and champions that could help them engage in public-private dialogue processes effectively. ➤ Each side approaches actors in the other sector in a dis-co-ordinated, fragmented manner. ➤ As a result, it may be unclear whether the views of government officials or private sector participants expressed in dialogue processes are representative or broadly supported within their respective sides.
Level 2: There are capacities and certain co-ordination mechanisms within the government or among private sector entities to engage in structured dialogue, but the other side is less prepared.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ One side is investing in developing capacities, identifying champions and allocating resources to engage in public-private dialogue, but the other side lags behind. and/or ➤ Views from one side of the dialogue are relatively coherent and broadly representative, but the other side lacks the same level of internal co-ordination and representativeness. ➤ As a result, the dialogue remains unbalanced and often parties approach each other in an unstructured, informal way.
Level 3: Both sides have fair levels of internal co-ordination, capacities and resources to engage in structured dialogue - with some room for improvement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Both sides have basic experience and developed basic capacities and internal resources to engage with each other. ➤ In participating in public-private dialogue processes, both sides have developed mechanisms to seek and aggregate the views and positions from across relevant government offices or relevant private sector actors or associations. ➤ Nevertheless, there is a need for more institutionalised, sustained co-ordination to public-private dialogue processes, and/or for the support of champions who could mobilise each side. ➤ Level of capacity is uneven within the private sector (across sectors or organisations) or within government (across ministries).
Level 4: Both sides have good levels of internal co-ordination, capacities and resources to engage in structured dialogue, often supported by champions or established institutional mandates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Both sides have sufficient levels of co-ordination, capacities and resources to engage in public-private dialogue processes in a variety of areas - often as a result of years of engagement, or due to the presence of champions committed to invest in strengthening capacities. ➤ Views expressed in public-private dialogue processes tend to be broadly representative of the government or the various private sector actors.

Where attention will be needed:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clear mandate / authorising environment
<input type="checkbox"/> Government's internal co-ordination
<input type="checkbox"/> Private sector representativeness
<input type="checkbox"/> Identifying champions and facilitators
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial and technical resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Light support structure for PPDs
<input type="checkbox"/> Communication instruments and tools | <input type="checkbox"/> Institutionalising dialogue
<input type="checkbox"/> Uneven capacity levels within private sector (e.g. SMEs vs multinationals)
<input type="checkbox"/> Uneven capacity levels within government
<input type="checkbox"/> Other
..... |
|--|---|

2. Broad-based, relevant public-private dialogue

Q3. Who typically participates in recent public-private dialogues? (Inclusiveness)

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1: Participation in recent dialogues is very limited and selective, normally some high-profile actors, associations or large firms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Only some government offices or officials typically engage in public-private dialogue. ➤ Only some high-profile business associations, large firms or actors engage or are typically invited to public-private dialogue processes.
Level 2: Participation in recent dialogues is broader but still unbalanced, with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A broader range of representatives from either the public or the private sector participate in public-private dialogue processes, but the participation is more limited or selective on the other side.

broader representation of one side and more limited/restricted in the other.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As a consequence, the scope and effectiveness of the dialogues is limited by the absence of key players. ➤ Excluded actors or non-participants may question the legitimacy of those public-private dialogue processes.
Level 3: Participation typically includes most relevant actors from both sides, although their role and level of influence in the dialogue is uneven.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Public-private dialogues include most relevant actors on both sides and are open to broad participation. ➤ However, the levels of influence and respective roles within the dialogue processes are unevenly distributed, with some actors controlling the agenda and decision-making process. ➤ As a result, less influential participants tend to disengage or to limit their contributions.
Level 4: Participation typically includes most relevant actors from both sides, with similar role and level of influence in the dialogue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Public-private dialogues include most relevant actors on both sides and are open to broad participation. ➤ Most participants share similar roles and levels of influence, encouraging them to remain engaged and active along the process.

Who typically participates in recent public-private dialogues in the country:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government officials | <input type="checkbox"/> Parliamentarians |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Large domestic firms and multinationals | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Society Organisations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Small and medium firms or associations | <input type="checkbox"/> Academia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Foundations | <input type="checkbox"/> Media |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trade unions / co-operatives | <input type="checkbox"/> Others |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local governments | |

Q4. To what extent do the existing dialogues address issues of concern to both sides? (Relevance)

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1: Both sides largely focus on opposing issues of concern, resulting on further conflict, and limited substantive dialogue or action.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Parties approach attempts to establish public-private dialogue processes around issues where positions are very distant. and/or ➤ As a consequence, existing public-private dialogue efforts are abandoned, or do not address a combination of issues of concerns for both parties.
Level 2: Existing dialogues address a mix of concerns from both sides, although one side has more leverage in setting the agenda(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For most public-private dialogue processes, parties are able to form an on-going agenda that meet some of their concerns. ➤ However, one side normally tends to have more leverage in setting the agenda and purpose of the dialogues. ➤ As a result, the range of public-private dialogues is still limited.
Level 3: Existing dialogues address a balanced mix of concerns from public and private sectors, although some actors within each side have more leverage in setting the agenda(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For most public-private dialogue processes, parties are able to form an on-going agenda that meet several of their concerns, resulting on a balance of issues being discussed. ➤ Nevertheless, some actors or sectors within the public and/or the private sector are more successful in driving the agenda. ➤ There is room to expand the scope and range of public-private dialogues even further.
Level 4: Existing dialogues address a balanced mix of concerns from both sides, including from smaller actors, ensuring that most relevant issues are part of the agenda.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In general, parties are able to form an on-going agenda that meet most of their concerns, resulting on a balance of issues being discussed. ➤ Public and private sector actors of all sizes are able to bring issues of concern as part of the agenda of on-going dialogue initiatives.

Where attention will be needed:

- Identifying entry points of mutual interest
- Ensuring that dialogues reflect issues raised by all concerned parties
- Opening up participation
- Balancing content of agendas
- Increasing diversity of speakers/panellists/negotiators to be representative
- Increasing transparency of dialogue
- Using participatory mechanisms
- Including issues of concern for other social actors
- Other

3. Effective public-private engagement

Q5. To what extent existing public-private dialogue arrangements are organised towards achieving results? (Organisational effectiveness)

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1: In general, public-private dialogue initiatives are informal and lacking stable support. While dialogue may happen, few outputs or results are generated through the process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In general, most public-private dialogue initiatives are informal and spontaneous, lacking any explicit structure or established mandate. ➤ In most cases, the public-private dialogue initiatives are used as networking opportunities or as "talk shops". ➤ Normally, little tangible outputs are produced as a result of the process (e.g. no studies or agreements/consensus informing policy-making or regulations).
Level 2: Some public-private dialogue initiatives have become more structured and stable, while most are still informal. Some initiative(s) manage to produce outputs or inform policy decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In general, most public-private dialogue initiatives are informal and spontaneous, lacking an explicit structure or mandate. ➤ However, there are some initiatives that are more regular, supported by small secretariats and defined mandates. ➤ Some of the initiatives manage to produce studies, carry out negotiations, or support analysis that informs policy and regulatory decisions in their areas of focus, or generates joint public-private collaboration in implementation.
Level 3: Most public-private dialogue initiatives are structured and stable. Several initiative(s) manage to produce outputs or inform policy decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In general, most public-private dialogue initiatives are regular and well-established, supported by small secretariats and defined mandates. ➤ Several initiatives (but not all) manage to produce studies, carry out negotiations, or support analysis that informs policy and regulatory decisions in their areas of focus, or generates joint public-private collaboration in implementation. Other initiatives are still more a "talk shop" or a networking setting.
Level 4: In general, public-private dialogue initiatives in the country are structured and stable, and effectively geared towards results and towards shaping public policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Public-private dialogue initiatives in the country are regular and well established supported by small secretariats and defined mandates. ➤ Most of these initiatives produce studies, carry out negotiations, or support analysis that informs policy and regulatory decisions in their areas of focus, or generates joint public-private collaboration in implementation. ➤ Many initiatives have been operating for more than 5-10 years.

Where attention will be needed:

- Formalising and aligning with existing institutions and decision-making processes
- Creating support secretariats
- Explicit missions or visions
- Facilitators to intermediate dialogue
- Flexible design for dynamic dialogue
- Clear mandates and responsibilities
- Fostering regular, predictable meetings
- Encouraging evidence-based dialogue through studies, surveys, etc.
- Operational and financial stability
- Other

Q6. To what extent existing public-private dialogue initiatives are actually increasing joint collaboration? (Results)

SCALE (Choose the level that best matches your situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1: In general, little joint action is produced as a result of dialogue initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is little evidence that the dialogue processes are generating instances of joint public-private collaboration (e.g. influencing policy, co-producing and co-investing in infrastructure and public service delivery, public-private partnerships). ➤ When action occurs, it is generally one-sided and unco-ordinated rather than collaborative between sectors.
Level 2: In general, joint action resulting from dialogue initiatives is limited - although there are some incipient examples of collaboration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In most cases, the dialogue processes do not translate into joint public-private collaboration (e.g. influencing policy, co-producing and co-investing in infrastructure and public service delivery, public-private partnerships). ➤ However, there are some promising examples of joint collaboration resulting from country-level public-private dialogue.
Level 3: Joint action resulting from dialogue initiatives is mixed - several dialogue initiatives that are driving joint collaboration, while many still are not as effective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Many dialogue processes manage to mobilize actors to support joint public-private collaboration (e.g. influencing policy, co-producing and co-investing in infrastructure and public service delivery, public-private partnerships). ➤ However, there are as many instances of dialogue initiatives that remain at the dialogue level and do not manage to move to joint action or collaboration.
Level 4: Joint public-private action is progressively increasing, driven by public-private dialogue initiatives in the country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In general, public-private dialogue processes manage to mobilize actors to support joint public-private collaboration (e.g. influencing policy, co-producing and co-investing in infrastructure and public service delivery, public-private partnerships). ➤ These initiatives are creating a positive dynamic of collaboration in between the public and the private sectors, which is increasing over time in number and quality.

Where attention will be needed:

- Focusing the dialogue on concrete results
- Embed dialogue initiatives as part of consultative or advisory bodies of regular policy-making and regulatory-making.
- Setting policy or strategic frameworks to help initiatives identify entry points or investment needs
- Support pilots of joint collaboration

- Strengthen public-private partnership units
 - Strengthen national investment planning systems
 - Drive external support (e.g. aid) to help in the transition from dialogue to action
 - Other
-

3. SCORING METHOD

While the position of a country in the various scales provides substantive information around the individual elements being addressed, it does not allow for a quick and direct comparison. In order to follow the performance of participants over time and to be able to compare countries, it seems useful to have an overall score for this indicator. Readers tend to find it easier to interpret composite indicators rather than identifying trends across several separate indicators (Saltelli, 2007).

The concept being measured by this indicator is the quality of public-private dialogue and whether it contributes to development. The following qualitative categories are proposed:



For each question of module 2, the position in the scale will determine the number of points achieved (outlined in the table below). The sum of points will give a score that falls within a qualitative category.

Position in scale	Score
Level 1	0 point
Level 2	1 point
Level 3	2 points
Level 4	3 points

Quality of Public-Private Dialogue	Range of scores
Weak	Total score from 0 to 4
Emerging	Total score from 5 to 9
Consolidating	Total score from 10 to 13
Effective	Total score from 14 to 18

Possible ways of showing results:

Quality of dialogue			
Weak	Incipient	Consolidating	Effective
Country A	Country B	Country E	Country G
	Country C	Country F	
	Country D		

	Status of PPD		
	2018	2020	trend
Country A	Weak dialogue	Weak dialogue	►
Country B	Weak dialogue	Incipient dialogue	▲
Country C	Incipient dialogue	Incipient dialogue	►
Country D	Consolidating dialogue	Incipient dialogue	▼

While a composite score offers a big picture quite quickly, it can also send simplistic and misleading messages (OECD, 2008). In order to draw relevant analytical conclusions, the composite score needs to be contextualised and rely on substance from the various levels of each element. Composite indicators can stimulate public interest on the topic but relevant discussion and action planning will benefit from the granularity provided in the scales for each question.

An indicative way to present the disaggregated data could be:

	SUB-DIMENSIONS						Total score	Status of PPD
	Mutual trust	Readiness	Inclusiveness	Relevance	Effectiveness	Results		
Country A	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	Weak dialogue
Country B	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Emerging dialogue
Country C	2	2	1	1	1	0	7	Emerging dialogue
Country D	2	2	2	2	1	0	9	Emerging dialogue
Country E	3	2	0	3	2	1	11	Consolidating dialogue
Country F	3	2	1	2	2	2	12	Consolidating dialogue
Country G	3	3	3	3	2	1	15	Effective dialogue

Dynamic narratives for each of the different ‘levels’ reached by the country would help understand the specific areas of strength and weaknesses, as well as the underlying causes for current levels of public-private collaboration.

REFERENCES

- Bettcher, K., Herzberg, B. & Nadgrodkiewicz, A. (2015). *Public-Private Dialogue: The Key to Good Governance and Development*. Available at http://www.cipe.org/sites/default/files/publication-docs/FS_Jan2015_PPD%20World%20Bank.pdf
- Bisang, R., González, A., Hallak, J. C., López, A. F., Ramos, D., & Rozemberg, R. (2014). *Public-private collaboration on productive development policies in Argentina* (No. IDB-WP-478). IDB Working Paper Series. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Cornick, J. (2013). *The organization of public-private cooperation for productive development policies*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Cornick, J., Jimenez, J., & Román, M. (2014). *Public-Private Collaboration on Productive Development Policies in Costa Rica* (No. IDB-WP-480). IDB Working Paper Series. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Devlin, R. (2014). *Towards good governance of public-private alliance councils supporting industrial policies in Latin America*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Eslava, M., Meléndez, M., & Perry, G. (2014). *Public-private collaboration for productive development policies in Colombia*. IDB Working Paper Series 479. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- GPEDC (2011), *Busan Partnership Agreement*. Busan: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation; Available at http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/OUTCOME_DOCUMENT_-_FINAL_EN2.pdf
- GPEDC (2015). *Monitoring Guide 2015-2016. Technical Note*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2015-2016-GPEDC-Monitoring-Guide.pdf>
- GPEDC (2015a). *Indicator 3: Module 3. Terms of reference to support monitoring the quality of public private dialogue in the country*. Paris/New York: GPEDC. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Engagement-and-contribution-of-the-private-sector-to-development-Terms-of-Reference-Indicator-3-Module-3.pdf>
- GPEDC (2016a). *Nairobi Outcome Document*. Nairobi: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation: Paris/New York. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/OutcomeDocumentEnglish.pdf>
- GPEDC (2016b). *A GPEDC monitoring framework fit for purpose: Delivering effective development cooperation in support of Agenda 2030*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/MAG-Final-Report.pdf>
- GPEDC (2016c). *Assessing the Current Indicator Framework: A compendium of MAG advice on the ten indicators*. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Assessing-the-Current-Indicator-Framework-Annex-Six.pdf>
- GPEDC (2017a). *The Global Partnership Monitoring Framework for 2030 - Concept Note*. Technical note 1. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Concept-note-Global-Partnership-Monitoring-Framework-2030.pdf>
- GPEDC (2017b). *2016 Monitoring Round: Multistakeholder Engagement and Comprehensiveness of Reported Information*. Dhaka: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/t709xvndj4jlij0/Technical%20note%2020-%202016%20Monitoring.%20Engagement%20and%20Comprehensiveness%20of%20Data.pdf?dl=0>

- GPEDC (2017c). Agenda 2030: Promoting effective engagement through development cooperation. Dhaka: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Available at: http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PSE-Concept-Note_17Oct.pdf
- GPEDC (2018). Private Sector Engagement through Development Co-operation in Bangladesh. Paris/New York: Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Forthcoming
- Herzberg, B., & Sisombat, L. (2016). *State of Play—Public-Private Dialogue*. Washington: World Bank. Available at <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/24378>
- Herzberg, B., and Toland, M. (2006). *The PPD Handbook: A Toolkit for Business Environment Reformers*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- IDB (2016). *Two to Tango: Public-Private Collaboration for Productive Development Policies*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- OECD (2008). *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and user guide*. Paris: OECD Publications. Available at <https://www.oecd.org/std/42495745.pdf>
- OECD (2011). Expanding and Enhancing Public and Private Co-operation for Broad-based, Inclusive and Sustainable Growth A joint *Statement* for endorsement by representatives from the public and the private sectors at the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. *4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness*. Busan: OECD. Available at <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/49211825.pdf>
- OECD-UNDP (2016). *Making Development Co-operation More Effective: 2016 Progress Report*. Paris: OECD/UNDP Publishing. Available at <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/development-impact/making-development-co-operation-more-effective--2016-progress-re.html>
- Pittaluga, L., Rius, A., Bianchi, A., & González, M. (2014). *Public-Private Collaboration on Productive Development in Uruguay* (No. IDB-WP-501). IDB Working Paper Series. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Saeed Qureshi, M., & Velde, D. W. (2013). State-business relations, investment climate reform and firm productivity in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of International Development*, 25(7), 912-935.
- Saltelli, A. (2007) Composite indicators between analysis and advocacy, *Social Indicators Research*, 81:65-77.
- Schneider, B. (2013). *Institutions for effective business-government collaboration: Micro mechanisms and macro politics in Latin America*. IDB Working Paper Series IDB-WP-418. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Sidel, J. T. (2014). *Achieving reforms in oligarchical democracies: The role of leadership and coalitions in the Philippines*. London: Development Leadership Program.
- World Bank (2014). *Public-Private Dialogue in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations: Experiences and Lessons Learned*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/25202>