Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation
Indicative Terms of Reference
Focal point for trade unions at the country level

1. Background

Since its establishment in 2011, more than 160 countries and 46 international organisations have endorsed the **Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation** (the Global Partnership) with the aim of improving the impact of development efforts. To that end, a monitoring framework, comprised of a set of 10 indicators, serves to keep all parties mutually accountable and generates evidence on ways to improve development effectiveness.

The Global Partnership 2018 monitoring round has taken off, with 70+ partner countries about to lead national monitoring exercises (see list of participating countries at www.effectivecooperation.org/2018monitoring). These monitoring exercises are led by partner country governments through an appointed national co-ordinator sitting in the ministry of finance, planning or foreign affairs, and involving all types of development actors. **Active participation of trade unions in the monitoring process at the country level is crucial to ensure the inclusiveness and success of the collective effort to increase the country's development effectiveness.**

Domestic and international trade unions and associations can engage in national exercises organized by governments participating Global Partnership's 2018 monitoring round, specifically: in the assessment for indicator 3 ("*Quality of public-private dialogue*"), and by engaging in dialogue around the monitoring results. Their participation in the process will be facilitated by the designation of a "trade union focal point" in each participating country.

> Trade unions/trade union networks in partner countries interested in engaging in the Global Partnership's 2018 monitoring round are invited to participate by **proposing a country-level *trade union focal point*** to the national co-ordinator.

2. Profile

The ideal focal point for Trade Unions:
- Is affiliated to a country-level trade union/trade union network engaged in labour policy advice, labour market negotiations and/or labour rights protection. In particular, individuals and organisations that are part of national trade union platforms are encouraged to participate;
- Maintains a solid network of contacts across other trade unions in the country;
- Possesses a good understanding on the current enabling environment for trade unions and unionisation at the country level.

3. Role

The selected focal point for trade unions will be expected to:
- Represent and co-ordinate with country-level trade unions during consultations with the government's national co-ordinator and the focal points for other stakeholders (e.g. private sector, civil society organisations, development partners), particularly during the kick-off and validation meetings;
- Participate in the assessment of indicator 3;
- Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results.

The trade union focal point will find the relevant questionnaire for indicator 3 in **Annex 2**, and may refer to part 2 of the Monitoring Guide that provides an overview of the roles played by different stakeholders throughout the country-level process.

4. Key Activities

The trade union focal point is invited to engage in the monitoring exercise by following the steps outlined below. These Terms of Reference are conceived as to provide guidance to the trade union focal point, but the process allows for flexibility and encourages that the proposed activities be – to the extent possible – grounded in the country's own frameworks and processes. In particular, the engagement of the trade unions in this process can build on existing social dialogue platforms.

- **1) Multi-stakeholder consultation kick-off meeting.** The national co-ordinator is expected to convene a kick-off meeting with relevant partners, with the aim of raising partners' awareness on the monitoring process, agreeing on which stakeholders should be involved and agreeing on a timeline and on roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. The trade union focal point will be invited to participate in this meeting.

- **(2) Data collection and validation (September – October 2018).**

  Data collection: the trade union focal point is invited to actively participate in the assessment for indicator 3, which will be coordinated by the national co-ordinator. The trade union focal point is expected to consult with his/her constituency (i.e. trade unions and trade union networks), and to provide consolidated feedback to the national co-ordinator.

  Data validation: the trade union focal point is expected to participate in the validation of data collected for indicator 3. The national co-ordinator can decide to carry out the validation process during a multi-stakeholder meeting.

  Please refer to the Monitoring Guide for more information on the data collection and validation process (page 68 for indicator 3). Complementary information to help identify the answer that best reflects country reality is available at: http://bit.ly/2018_indicator3.

- **(3) Final review (November - December 2018).** Upon receiving final data sets from the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team, the national co-ordinator ensures a final review in consultation with different stakeholders. The private sector focal point will be expected – if need be – to facilitate engagement of other trade union representatives and associations in the process.

- **(4) Multi-stakeholder dialogue around findings (starting in January 2019).** The trade union focal point is invited to initiate and/or actively participate in discussions on the findings from the monitoring exercise. Reviewing progress in consultation with stakeholders can serve to boost dialogue and help ensure that all co-operation partners match commitments with actions.

5. Process to identify the Trade Union focal point

While there is no predetermined focal point designation process (in the interest of flexibility and adjustment to country contexts), the OECD-UNFP Joint Support Team invites trade unions/trade union networks at the country level to agree with the government on who can best play the focal point role.

Existing trade union platforms are particularly encouraged to participate as focal points. The OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team also invites other global trade union platforms (e.g. International Trade Union Confederation) to provide recommendations on the best suited candidates at the country level.

6. Duration

The trade union focal point is expected to participate in the country level process from September (or the effective date of appointment) to December 2018.

ANNEX 1

Overview of stakeholders' responsibilities in the overall monitoring process

Who?	What?
Government (Nat. co-ordinator, engaging relevant ministries/ gov agencies)	- Oversee and coordinate data collection and validation - Provide data for indic. 1b, 5b, 6, 7, 8, and commentary to 4, 9b, 10 - Coordinate the assessment for indicators 2 and 3 - Facilitate dialogue around monitoring results
Development partners	- Provide data for indic. 1a, 5a, 6, 9b and contribute to data validation - Participate in the assessment for indicator 2 (only the focal point) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results
CSOs	- Participate in the assessment for indicator 2 (focal point) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results
Private sector	- Participate in the assessment for indicator 3 (focal points) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results
Trade unions	- Participate in the assessment for indicator 3 (focal point) - Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results
Parliamentarians	- Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results
Subnational governments	- Participate in dialogue around the monitoring results

ANNEX 2

INDICATOR 3: QUALITY OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIALOGUE

WHAT THIS INDICATOR MEASURES

This indicator helps governments assess the quality of public-private dialogue (PPD) in the country, by looking at the enablers for such dialogue, the inclusiveness and relevance of these processes, and their effectiveness towards creating more joint action. By focusing on PPD, the indicator recognises the importance of dialogue for building an environment conducive to leveraging the full potential of the private sector's contribution to sustainable development.

WHY THIS IS IMPORTANT

The 2030 Agenda acknowledges the important role of a diverse private sector in the achievement of sustainable development and "calls on all businesses to apply their creativity and innovation to solving sustainable development challenges". Maximising the private sector's financial and non-financial contribution to sustainable development requires effective engagement between the public and private sectors. Good public-private dialogue is recognised as a precondition for enhanced collaboration between the two parties.

HOW IT IS CONSTRUCTED

The indicator is built around two modules covering elements that are crucial for effective public-private dialogue and collaboration. The first module aims to identify recent public-private dialogue experiences and the issue-areas addressed in these initiatives. The second module assesses the quality of these recent experiences by looking at the:

Enablers of public-private dialogue:
- Mutual trust and willingness to engage
- Readiness for public-private dialogue (e.g. co-ordination, capacity)

Relevance of issues addressed and participation:
- Broad-based, inclusive dialogue
- Relevant public-private dialogue

Results and action yielded:
- Producing results from the dialogue
- Leading to joint public-private action.

Complementary information to help respondents identify the answer that best reflects the reality in their own country is available here: http://bit.ly/2018_indicator3. The information also appears automatically in the Country Excel when your mouse scrolls over the different levels.

STEP BY STEP GUIDANCE

In order to answer the questionnaire below, it is suggested, as the most inclusive and productive methodology, to carry out a multi-stakeholder dialogue to address the questionnaire. Such a dialogue could involve the government and focal points from private sector associations and trade unions who are able to convey representative views of their respective constituencies. In many countries, this approach also provides for a useful entry point to discuss further collaboration between the public and private sector in the country, and helps strengthen trust building and mutual understanding of existing needs and challenges. Where relevant/possible, the national co-ordinator is encouraged to use existing in-country/national platforms or ongoing engagement processes to engage in dialogue with the selected focal point(s).

The suggested steps to undertake a multi-stakeholder dialogue approach in reporting to this indicator are the following:

1. Focal points representing the diversity of the private sector are identified, prioritising their ability to convey representative views of this diverse constituency. Given the different realities and issues concerning large firms as compared to small and medium enterprises (SMEs), it is recommended to invite at least two (2) different private sector focal points – one representing SMEs and another representing important business groups and large firms. Similarly, it is highly recommended to engage a focal point representing trade unions and other social agents, given the importance of promoting inclusive growth and development.

2. The national co-ordinator reaches out to the focal points of the different constituencies and shares the questionnaire materials and guidance with them.

3. In preparation for the dialogue, focal points are encouraged to consult with their constituencies in order to provide responses to the questionnaire that represent the views of each constituency.

4. The national co-ordinator convenes these focal points in a multi-stakeholder dialogue or exchange. The following steps are suggested to guide the conversation:

   a. Names and contact details of participants are recorded in the questionnaire (tab 3);

   b. To inform the initial discussion around the indicator questionnaire, the national co-ordinator shares with participants country results on enablers and results of public-private engagement, contained in a printable tab ("CI-3") included in the **Country Excel**. This tab provides a picture of the country's performance in areas which are relevant to enable public-private dialogue engagement. It also illustrates current country results in sectors and areas of potential public-private collaboration.

   c. Participants identify the topics covered in public-private dialogue activities that have happened in the country in the last three years (module 1).

   d. Next, and on the basis of that sample of public-private dialogue experiences, participants discuss the most fitting responses to a six-item questionnaire. In responding to each question, participants should indicate which one of the four levels or situations presented best reflects the average experience in those recent public-private dialogues in the country.

   e. The national co-ordinator and the focal points register their specific answers to each question in the **Country Excel**.

INDICATOR 3 QUESTIONNAIRE – CHARACTERISTICS OF PRACTICE

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 3 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 3 years)? (Focus)

☐ Boosting national **economic growth**

☐ Raising **productivity**

☐ Economic **diversification**

☐ **Financial access**

☐ **Industrialization**

☐ **Trade** promotion

☐ **Infrastructure** development

☐ **Regulations** for doing business

☐ **IT infrastructure,** including mobile and internet

☐ Domestic **Research & development**

☐ **Innovation** and **entrepreneurship**

☐ Reducing firm or job **informality**

☐ **Energy**, including access, affordability or clean energy

☐ **Water**, including access or sustainability

☐ **Skills** development & **education** in the country

☐ **Decent work:** including on job creation, women & youth inclusion in labour market, child labour

☐ Workplace **safety**

☐ Promoting **tourism**

☐ **Environmentally-sustainable** growth

☐ Promoting **inclusive growth**

☐ Domestic **taxes**

☐ Use of **foreign support** (foreign direct investment, development assistance)

☐ Fighting **corruption,** bribery and illicit financial flows

☐ **Gender** equality

☐ **Other sector-specific issues and regulations** (e.g. health, education)

☐ Other issues #1: .... {Please describe}

☐ Other issues #2: .... {Please describe}

☐ **No public-private dialogue has taken place in the country**

Methodological notes:

- *The issues for public-private dialogue presented above cover a comprehensive range of most frequent entry points for public-private dialogue related to the SDGs. 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. Other issues not listed can be included under the 'Other' question.*
- *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.*

Again, please consider the different initiatives of public-private dialogue that have taken place in the country recently (i.e. over the last 3 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 unwillingness to engage.	➤ 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 generally characterised by mistrust, however one side is making efforts to increase the dialogue.	➤ 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.	➤ 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.	➤ 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:

☐ Identifying neutral facilitators   ☐ Support from major business associations
☐ Finding areas of mutual interest   ☐ Expanding dialogue to new areas
☐ Increasing information exchange   ☐ Expanding dialogue to new partners
☐ High level support from government   ☐ 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 country's 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.	➢ 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 disco-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.	➢ 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.	➢ 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.	➢ 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:

☐ Clear mandate / authorising environment
☐ Government's internal co-ordination
☐ Private sector representativeness
☐ Identifying champions and facilitators
☐ Financial and technical resources
☐ Light support structure for PPDs

☐ Communication instruments and tools
☐ Institutionalising dialogue
☐ Uneven capacity levels within private sector (e.g. SMEs vs multinationals)
☐ Uneven capacity levels within government
☐ 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 country's 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.	➢ 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 broader representation of one side and more limited/restricted in the other.	➢ 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. ➢ 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.	➢ 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.	➢ 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:

☐ Government officials   ☐ Trade unions
☐ Large domestic firms   ☐ Local governments
☐ Foreign multinational enterprises   ☐ Parliamentarians
☐ Small and medium firms or associations   ☐ Civil Society Organisations
☐ Co-operatives   ☐ Academia
☐ State-owned enterprises   ☐ Media
☐ Foundations   ☐ Others ……………………………………………………

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

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

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1: Both sides largely focus on opposing development issues of concern, resulting on further conflict, and limited substantive dialogue or action.	➢ 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 development concerns from both sides, although one side has more leverage in setting the agenda(s).	➢ 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 development concerns from public and private sectors, although some actors within each side have more leverage in setting the agenda(s).	➢ 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 development concerns from both public and private sectors, including from smaller actors, ensuring that most relevant issues are part of the agenda.	➢ 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 country's 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.	➢ 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.	➢ 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.	➢ 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.	➢ 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? (Joint Action)

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

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
Level 1: In general, little joint action is produced as a result of dialogue initiatives.	➤ 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.	➤ 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.	➤ 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.	➤ 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

☐ Embedding 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

☐ Supporting pilots of joint collaboration

☐ Strengthening public-private partnership units

☐ Strengthening national investment planning systems

☐ Driving external support (e.g. aid) to help in the transition from dialogue to action

☐ Other