

## 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 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 <b>economic growth</b>                        | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Decent work:</b> including on job creation, women & youth inclusion in labour market, child labour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Raising <b>productivity</b>                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Workplace <b>safety</b>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <b>diversification</b>                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting <b>tourism</b>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Financial Access</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Environmentally-sustainable</b> growth   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Industrialization</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting <b>inclusive growth</b>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Trade</b> promotion  | <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic <b>taxes</b>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Infrastructure</b> development, including transport          | <input type="checkbox"/> Use of <b>foreign support</b> (foreign direct investment, development assistance)                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>IT infrastructure</b> , including mobile and internet        | <input type="checkbox"/> Fighting <b>corruption</b> and bribery  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic <b>Research &amp; development</b>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Sector-specific issues and regulations</b>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Innovation</b> and <b>entrepreneurship</b>                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other issues #1: .... {Please describe}   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reducing firm or job <b>informality</b>                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Other issues #2: .... {Please describe}   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Energy</b> , including access, affordability or clean energy |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Water</b> , including access or sustainability               | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No public-private dialogue has taken place in the country</b>                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Skills</b> development & <b>education</b> 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
<b>Level 1:</b> Current interactions are limited and characterised by reciprocal mistrust.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There is a general lack of trust and mutual understanding between public and private sector actors.</li> <li>➤ There is limited exchange of information regarding priorities, strategies and investment plans.</li> <li>➤ Current opportunities for dialogue are limited and parties do not see entry points or usefulness of further exchange.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2:</b> Current interactions are characterised by mistrust, and only one side is currently making efforts to increase the dialogue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There is a general lack of trust and mutual understanding between public and private sector actors.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3:</b> Both sides (public and private) are making efforts to increase the dialogue in some areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There is a degree of reciprocal trust between public and private sector actors, and willingness from both sides to increase dialogue and collaboration.</li> <li>➤ Some areas of government and parts of the private sector are particularly willing to engage further in specific issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4:</b> 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"> <li>➤ Interactions are generally characterised by mutual trust and willingness to engage.</li> <li>➤ Mutual trust is facilitating a reciprocal flow of information on plans, priorities, and entry points for collaboration and investment opportunities.</li> <li>➤ There is high level political support for public-private dialogue, at the president/prime minister's or ministers' level; and/or</li> <li>➤ There is high level support from private sector associations (e.g. chambers of commerce, trade/competitiveness councils, SME associations, trade unions).</li> <li>➤ Both sides are investing time and effort to engage with each other to work together, recognising their complementary strengths.</li> </ul>

**Where attention will be needed:**

- ☐ Identifying neutral facilitators
- ☐ Finding areas of mutual interest
- ☐ Increasing information exchange
- ☐ High level support from government

- ☐ Support from major business associations
- ☐ Expanding dialogue to new areas
- ☐ Expanding dialogue to new partners
- ☐ 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
<b>Level 1:</b> 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"> <li>➤ Both sides lack the experience, skills and champions that could help them engage in public-private dialogue processes effectively.</li> <li>➤ Each side approaches actors in the other sector in a disorganised, fragmented manner.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2:</b> 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"> <li>➤ 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</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ As a result, the dialogue remains unbalanced and often parties approach each other in an unstructured, informal way.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3:</b> 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"> <li>➤ Both sides have basic experience and developed basic capacities and internal resources to engage with each other.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ Level of capacity is uneven within the private sector (across sectors or organisations) or within government (across ministries).</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4:</b> 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"> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ Views expressed in public-private dialogue processes tend to be broadly representative of the government or the various private sector actors.</li> </ul>

**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 situation)

Scale	Characteristics of Practice
<b>Level 1:</b> Participation in recent dialogues is very limited and selective, normally some high-profile actors, associations or large firms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Only some government offices or officials typically engage in public-private dialogue.</li> <li>➤ Only some high-profile business associations, large firms or actors engage or are typically invited to public-private dialogue processes.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2:</b> Participation in recent dialogues is broader but still unbalanced, with broader representation of one side and more limited/restricted in the other.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ As a consequence, the scope and effectiveness of the dialogues is limited by the absence of key players.</li> <li>➤ Excluded actors or non-participants may question the legitimacy of those public-private dialogue processes.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3:</b> 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"> <li>➤ Public-private dialogues include most relevant actors on both sides and are open to broad participation.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ As a result, less influential participants tend to disengage or to limit their contributions.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4:</b> 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"> <li>➤ Public-private dialogues include most relevant actors on both sides and are open to broad participation.</li> <li>➤ Most participants share similar roles and levels of influence, encouraging them to remain engaged and active along the process.</li> </ul>

#### *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
<b>Level 1:</b> 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"> <li>➤ Parties approach attempts to establish public-private dialogue processes around issues where positions are very distant. and/or</li> <li>➤ As a consequence, existing public-private dialogue efforts are abandoned, or do not address a combination of issues of concerns for both parties.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2:</b> 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"> <li>➤ For most public-private dialogue processes, parties are able to form an on-going agenda that meet some of their concerns.</li> <li>➤ However, one side normally tends to have more leverage in setting the agenda and purpose of the dialogues.</li> <li>➤ As a result, the range of public-private dialogues is still limited.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3:</b> 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"> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ Nevertheless, some actors or sectors within the public and/or the private sector are more successful in driving the agenda.</li> <li>➤ There is room to expand the scope and range of public-private dialogues even further.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4:</b> 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"> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>

#### 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
<b>Level 1:</b> 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"> <li>➤ In general, most public-private dialogue initiatives are informal and spontaneous, lacking any explicit structure or established mandate.</li> <li>➤ In most cases, the public-private dialogue initiatives are used as networking opportunities or as "talk shops".</li> <li>➤ Normally, little tangible outputs are produced as a result of the process (e.g. no studies or agreements/consensus informing policy-making or regulations).</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2:</b> 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"> <li>➤ In general, most public-private dialogue initiatives are informal and spontaneous, lacking an explicit structure or mandate.</li> <li>➤ However, there are some initiatives that are more regular, supported by small secretariats and defined mandates.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3:</b> 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"> <li>➤ In general, most public-private dialogue initiatives are regular and well-established, supported by small secretariats and defined mandates.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4:</b> 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"> <li>➤ Public-private dialogue initiatives in the country are regular and well established supported by small secretariats and defined mandates.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> <li>➤ Many initiatives have been operating for more than 5-10 years.</li> </ul>

**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
<b>Level 1:</b> In general, little joint action is produced as a result of dialogue initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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).</li> <li>➤ When action occurs, it is generally one-sided and unco-ordinated rather than collaborative between sectors.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2:</b> In general, joint action resulting from dialogue initiatives is limited - although there are some incipient examples of collaboration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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).</li> <li>➤ However, there are some promising examples of joint collaboration resulting from country-level public-private dialogue.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3:</b> 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"> <li>➤ 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).</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4:</b> Joint public-private action is progressively increasing, driven by public-private dialogue initiatives in the country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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).</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>

**Where attention will be needed:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Focusing the dialogue on concrete results   | <input type="checkbox"/> Support pilots of joint collaboration   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Embed dialogue initiatives as part of consultative or advisory bodies of regular policy-making and regulatory-making. | <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen public-private partnership units   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Setting policy or strategic frameworks to help initiatives identify entry points or investment needs                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen national investment planning systems                                     |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Drive external support (e.g. aid) to help in the transition from dialogue to action |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other .....   |