

Regional and National Public-Private Dialogue Structures in Tanzania: Design, Agenda and Challenges

Goodluck Charles*

Abstract

The main purpose of this study is to analyse the design of regional and national public-private dialogue (PPD) structures in Tanzania, and investigate their main agendas and challenges. The study adopted a qualitative approach that entailed 83 in-depth interviews with senior government officials, representatives of the East African Community (EAC), private sector organisations (PSOs), and development partners. The findings indicate that while the EAC Secretariat and the Regional Summit provided a platform for member states to dialogue on regional issues, the private sector agenda was aligned to the EAC agenda through the East African Business Council (EABC), and regional and national PSOs. However, the private sector-driven PPDs, which included informal forums, prioritised agendas that interested their members. The identified PPD platforms faced challenges of resource limitations; inappropriate design, coordination and representation; inadequate link between regional and national PPDs; inadequate link between sectoral and formal PPDs; and inadequate integration of gender and youth issues. Overall, the study indicates that PPDs create a platform for integrating formal and informal actors into governance processes, especially where both formal and informal systems are functioning together. It recommends bridging the gap between public policy imperatives and the private sector views by encouraging a diversity of voices, and fostering a broad range of interactions through informal and formal PPD structures.

Keywords: *public-private dialogue, private sector organisations, public policy, business council, East African Community.*

<https://dx.doi.org/10.56279/NJIY8787/TJDS.v22i1.4>

Introduction

Interactions between governments and the private sector have largely been studied by economic and political scientists from the 1970s, with emphasis on analysing rent-seeking, collusion and corruption (Pinaud, 2007). However, from the early 1990s, the focus shifted to the role of the state in the economy, and the scope for fruitful interaction between political elites, bureaucracy and the private sector (Wanzala-Mlobela & Banda, 2018). More recently, there has been growing interests to analyse the public-private dialogue (PPD) with emphasis on the participation of the private sector and civil society in designing public policy and improving quality and effectiveness of government policies (Pinaud, 2007; Charles, 2023; Charles et al., 2017). Recent evidence shows that PPDs facilitate and drive reform agendas, and help governments in their pursuit of improved investment climate conditions (Charles, 2021). Consequently, PPD is increasingly being

* Department of Marketing, University of Dar es Salaam Business School: charles.goodluck@udsm.ac.tz
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0227-9933>

advocated to improve government policies and create a conducive business environment (Wanzala-Mlobela & Banda, 2018). As such, through regular PPDs, the government and private sector can build a mutual understanding and trust, which means there will be collective agreements on identifying national interests and priorities (Khine, 2018).

PPD refers to a structured interaction between public and private sector stakeholders to promote the right conditions for private sector development, improvements to the business climate, and economic development (Herzberg Lili, 2016; Anderson et al., 2017). Ideally, it is a form of collaborative governance where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented and deliberative; and that aims to make or implement public policy (Wanzala-Mlobela & Banda, 2018). It brings together the private sector, government, civil society, and others who share common interests or concerns surrounding specific development issues (Herzberg Lili, 2016; Hetherington, 2016). In view of this, reforms that are designed through PPD are better conceived and more effectively implemented because they arise from increased mutual understanding between the government and non-state actors (OECD, 2007; Sen, 2015; Rijkers et al., 2015). Undoubtedly, the private sector depends on bureaucrats and politicians for a successful design and implementation of policies, and the government depends on the private sector to ensure that private firms make profitable investments that are necessary for economic growth (Taylor, 2012; Sen, 2015). Consequently, the literature suggests that PPDs, when done well, can give stakeholders a voice which they otherwise would not have, and give governments a sounding board which can improve the quality of policy-making (Herzberg & Wright, 2006).

While scholars have contributed some evidence on the significance of PPDs in policy-making, there is scant knowledge on how PPDs are structured and function, especially in emerging economies (Hetherington, 2016). Indeed, research on institutional arrangements in policy processes requires an empirical inquiry for scholars, policy makers and participants in the PPD processes to understand how to design and operationalise dialogues (Emerson et al., 2012). For several years, scholars have connected the concept of collaborative governance with the study of inter-governmental cooperation, with emphasis on understanding and conceptualising the conditions of the complicated processes of developing governance, while the platforms for stakeholders collaboration have not received the desired devotion (Plotnikof, 2015). Whereas PPD structures can range from highly formal and structured to more informal and ad-hoc; and initiatives may last from only a few hours or continue over several year (OECD, 2007; Bannock, 2005), we lack sufficient evidence to show how existing PPD structures are integrated into formal collaborative governance structures. Instead, a collaborative government is largely perceived as formal processes and structures that engage public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres to carry out a public purpose. This leaves a knowledge gap on how PPDs that entail both formal

and informal structures are connected to formal collaborative governance structures (Dovlo et al., 2016). Further, it is unclear on how national PPDs are connected to regional PPDs; and how various policy issues escalate from one level to another. For instance, even as African countries participate in various regional trade negotiations, it is not clear how public and private sector actors are organised and structured to participate in those negotiations, let alone their agendas and the challenges they experience.

In response to the existing research gap on the nature of PPDs, this study analysed existing regional and national PPD structures in Tanzania, and investigated their main agendas and challenges. The study provides evidence on the structure of state and non-state multi-actors' collaborations, which is a crucial aspect in collaborative governance (Lemma & Willem, 2015). As Ulibarri et al. (2020) put it, a study on PPD can contribute to a better accounting of how collaborative governance develops, sustains, evolves, and declines over time. Besides observing how collaborations evolve, it is important to consider their structures and the challenges facing them (Irwin, 2019b), and explore the mechanisms that can help to improve private and public sector collaboration (Charles, 2021). Academically, this study advances knowledge on collaborative governance by identifying PPD structures in the context of a developing economy. It shows the agendas discussed at the various levels of PPDs, and how they escalate to the formal governance structures. The study adds the PPD component to the collaborative governance literature (Huxham et al., 2000), and extends it by taking into account how policy decisions escalate from informal PPDs to formal structures. On top of that, it reveals the PPD challenges at the various levels; and recommends an integration of formal and informal structures as a strategy to address those challenges and enhance collaborative governance.

The second section presents the literature review, followed by the study methodology in section three. Section four presents the key findings regarding national and regional PPD frameworks. This is followed by a discussion of the findings in section five; while section six dwells on the implications, study limitations and areas for further research.

Literature Review

Traditionally, government and businesses have had few incentives to actively collaborate in policy decision-making. For the most part, government regulated business; and business lobbied government on areas of economic interest. Classical political scientists readily assumed that public policies—defined as courses of action and inaction, regulatory measures, social welfare programmes, and funding priorities promulgated by democratically elected governments—would be smoothly implemented by efficient public bureaucracies, and eventually solve the problems they were meant to do (Ansell et al., 2017). Nevertheless, with the growing complexity and diversity of socio-economic challenges, the nature of public-private collaborations has seen a fundamental change as both sides have realised that business problems are now government problems, and vice versa; and both are

proactively intensifying new approaches to forging partnerships at the highest level (Huxham et al., 2000). In line with this, attempts to improve policy implementation must begin by looking at policy design, which can be improved through collaboration and deliberation between upstream and downstream actors (Ansell et al., 2017).

Accordingly, a new form of collaborative governance has emerged (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Huxham et al., 2000), evolving, in part, from a growing recognition of the limitations of traditional policy solutions, particularly command-and-control/state-driven policies and management (Gerlak et al., 2013). Collaborative governance brings multiple stakeholders together in common forums with public agencies to engage in consensus-oriented decision-making (Huxham et al., 2000). It is a growing governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative; and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programmes (Ansell & Gash, 2008: 544). As such, public management scholars inscribe these developments within a broader diagnosis indicating changes from 'government' to 'governance'; and from hierarchy to networks of collaboration across public, private and non-profit sectors (Plotnikof, 2015).

In line with the view of Emerson et al. (2012), we conceptualise collaborative governance broadly as the processes and structures of policy decision-making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished. Unlike the view of Ansell and Gash (2008), we do not limit collaborative governance to only formal, state-initiated arrangements; and to engagement between government and non-governmental stakeholders. Instead, we view collaborative governance as formal and informal partnerships among the state, the private sector, civil society, and the community; as well as joined-up government and hybrid arrangements such as public-private and private-social partnerships and co-management regimes (Gerlak et al., 2013). Accordingly, we argue that to improve policy development and execution, we must consider how policies can be more effectively designed by connecting actors vertically and horizontally in a process of collaboration and joint deliberation (Ansell et al. 2017). Our emphasis is that collaboration facilitates a joint exploration of policy problems that allows the relevant and affected policy actors to agree on novel ways of defining a problem that both emphasize its urgency and make it solvable. However, despite the promises and challenges of collaborative governance and practices (Plotnikof, 2015), the platforms that can be used to facilitate engagements of the multi-actor processes need to be explored (Amsler, 2016).

One of the mechanisms that facilitate collaborative governance is PPD (Charles et al., 2017). PPD facilitates an efficient and effective implementation of regulatory reforms, and can be crucial to enable governments to successfully undertake active reform agendas (te Velde, 2013). Especially in transition economies, private sector development reforms for inclusive growth are more effective when there is PPD

that allows multi-stakeholder beneficiaries to be involved in the stages of diagnostics, strategy formulation and execution, and monitoring and evaluation (Khine, 2018). It is worth noting that PPDs can take place at various levels within different timeframes, and they can address issues at local, national, or international levels; or be organised by industry sector, or value chain: all in an effort to promote better governance practices and collective action solutions to development problems (Herzberg & Lili, 2016). They can be structured or ad-hoc; public sector or private sector driven; third party brokered or locally driven; focused on broad economy-wide issues or sector-specific; permanent institutions versus a temporary initiative; have multiple goals versus a specific goal; and many actors versus a few actors (Wanzala-Mlobela & Banda, 2018). In any case, as a mechanism for diagnosing the problems and opportunities of private sector development, PPD is useful at all levels where public and private sector entities meet: be it at the national, sub-national, local or sub-sector levels (OECD, 2007).

However, the structure of PPD is manageable when it enables balanced and effective participation, and reflects the local private sector context (Herzberg & Wright, 2006). Herzberg and Wright add that appropriate PPD structures should entail the participation of relevant representative stakeholders as an inclusive process. A setting that seems to be prevalent in the most productive PPDs is characterised by a dedicated secretariat and working groups that meet often to devise policy recommendations (Herzberg Lili, 2016). The function of the secretariat is to organise meetings, coordinate research efforts and other logistics, set agendas, rally members, manage communication and outreach strategies, and be a point of contact for others who want to join.

Although empirical research on PPD as a mechanism for collaborative governance is limited, a promising development is observable. For instance, a meta-analysis of the literature on collaborative governance by Ansell and Gash (2008) identified critical variables influencing collaborative governance, namely the prior history of conflict or cooperation, the incentives for stakeholders to participate, power and resources imbalances, leadership, and institutional design. The identified factors that were crucial within the collaborative process were face-to-face dialogue, trust building, and the development of commitment and shared understanding. Still, it is reported that the political and economic context of a country determines the kind of partnership that is feasible and likely to succeed, and there is no one-size-fits-all approach to collaborative governance (Herzberg & Wright, 2006).

Further, various authors (e.g., Irwin, 2014; Charles, 2016; Wanzala-Mlobela & Banda, 2018) have identified factors accounting for the success of PPDs, namely: host by the government; available resources; availability of credible champions; existence of a structured private sector; capacity of public and private sector to engage in constructive dialogue; good relationship built on trust, respect and transparency; and readiness of stakeholders to move from discussion to implementation. Relatedly, Anderson et al. (2017) investigated the nature of PPD initiatives in Tanzania based

on data from the tourism and hospitality sector. The study revealed that while some PPD initiatives were not regular forums, few had been institutionalized in the Tourism Act of 2008. The well-known PPD platforms were the Tourism Facilitation Committee, Technical Advisory Committees, and the Tanzania National Business Council. In their analysis of PPD practice in Tanzania, der Poel et al. (2005), Charles (2016) and Charles et al. (2017) found that the PPD frameworks included horizontal and vertical linkages among associations and the government from village to national level; of which dialogue took place through a range of structured and informal mechanisms. Some of the PPD platforms identified were the Tanzania National Business Council (TNBC), Regional and District Coordinating Committees, the local and national government budget cycle, governance structures for business-environment-reform programmes, and sector PPD forums.

Also, an exploratory analysis of PPDs by Dovlo et al. (2016) in Cabo Verde, Chad and Mali showed that bottom-up participatory approaches were used to organise dialogues. The specific factors that contributed to the success of dialogues included good facilitation, availability of resources for dialogues, good communication, and the consideration of different opinions. Among the barriers were contextual issues, delays in decision-making and conflicting coordination roles and mandates. Charles (2021) explored lessons on integrating research evidence into PPDs, and found that collaborative arrangements of researchers, the private sector, media and policy makers promoted the use of research findings in PPD processes. The author suggested a multi-disciplinary network of academia and policy actors as a tool to bring about effective utilization of research findings in PPDs. Khine (2018) evaluated the design, implementation, and benefits and risks of PPD before and after the change of the government in Myanmar. Drawing on qualitative interviews of 26 key participants, the study demonstrated the need for creating the right conditions, and being able to establish a collective purpose for successful cross-sector collaboration.

With regard to regional PPDs, the literature shows that regional policy makers are largely accessed through representation by national and regional business associations. For instance, Bouwen (2002) reported that even with the three-layer structure of the organisational form of European associations (i.e., EU association, national association, individual firms), regional associations channelled different opinions of their national member associations to regional policy frameworks; and national associations engaged with their respective governments. Regional associations were structured to represent national sectoral interests, and to provide high-quality information about their domestic encompassing interests.

In Africa, some authors have also explored how the state relates with the private sector (e.g., Pinaud, 2007; te Velde, 2013; Leftwich et al., 2008; Lemma & Willem, 2015). Evidence from available studies demonstrates that several African countries have institutionalised PPD platforms that function concurrently with informal PPDs (te Velde, 2013). Such formal and informal interactions between the state and business, have evolved over time (Pinaud, 2007), even though there is still limited information

on how the various dialogue platforms are interconnected from the local levels to the national and regional levels. Although both public and private sector-oriented PPD forums exist (Anderson et al., 2017; Charles, 2016), less attention has been paid in mapping them, and investigating how they interact to influence policy. Consequently, our study expands the available evidence by examining the nature of PPD structures in Tanzania and the EAC at large. This contributes knowledge to the collaborative governance literature by showing how PPDs bring together multi-stakeholders from formal and informal channels in a developing economy context, where both formal and informal economies function together (Dell'Anno, 2021).

Methodology

This article is based on the findings generated from a qualitative study which entailed a literature review and collection of data from senior officials from the government, private sector PSOs, and development partners. The exploratory research design was adopted to gain an in-depth understanding of PPD structures, their agendas and challenges; most of which had not been adequately studied. The research design provides new insights into the research problem and assists in identifying research areas for more intensive studies (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). As for the research process, we began with a review of academic literature and technical reports to determine the available knowledge before embarking on primary data collection. The literature reviewed was guided by keywords (e.g., collaborative governance, state business relations, PPD, dialogue and advocacy). The technical reports were drawn from the EAC resources, EABC reports; and also reports obtained from PSOs, the government, and development projects, as well as online resources.

Data collection focused on both the public and private sector driven PPD platforms at national and regional levels. To capture the relevant data, semi-structured checklists were prepared to guide interviews and consultative meetings with targeted government agencies, EAC bodies, PSOs and the relevant development partners. The areas covered were Dar es Salaam, Dodoma and Arusha. Dar es Salaam was selected because it is the biggest commercial city where most enterprises and PSOs are based (TPSF, 2014); while Dodoma is the capital city where most government ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) have their headquarters; and Arusha is the host of the EAC headquarters. The consent for participation in the study was sought from the respondents before beginning the interview process. Also, the researcher complied with the ethical standards by ensuring confidentiality and privacy of sensitive information collected from the respondents.

In total, 83 respondents who were purposefully selected from different institutions participated in the study as indicated in Table 1. On the government side, in-depth interviews were held with the Chief Secretary and the directors responsible for industries, trade and regional cooperation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and East African Cooperation, and the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Investment; the Commissioner of Budget; senior parliamentary committee officers; the Director of Parliamentary Committees; and the Director of Parliamentary and Political Affairs. At the EAC level, interviews were held with the Director of Trade and

Customs, the Executive Director of the EABC, the Executive Director of the East Africa Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (EACCIA), as well as coordinators of the EABC platforms.

Table 1: Interviews and Consultations Held

Respondents	Gov. Officials	EAC Regional PSOs	Regional DPs	National PSOs	RBCs	DBC	TNBC	Consultative Meeting	Total	
Frequency	10	3	8	14	9	8	15	4	12	83

On the private sector side, 23 representatives of regional business councils (RBCs) and district business councils (DBCs) were interviewed. Further, the Executive Director of the TNBC, executive directors and/or senior staff of apex PSOs (both national and sectoral), were interviewed. Other interviews were held with development partners involved in supporting PPDs. The interviews were complemented with data generated from consultative meetings with selected respondents to validate the findings.

Main issues captured from the interviews were about regional, national, sub-national and sectoral PPD frameworks, and agendas and challenges encountered in organising and running PPDs. Data from different sources were recorded, reviewed and edited to ensure their quality and accuracy. Conventional content analysis (inductive) was used to identify common responses emerging from the respondents. The process involved generating a provisional list of codes/themes that were in line with the study objectives. Validation was done through triangulation of sources (including asking the same information from multiple participants); circulating the draft report to respondents for review, corrections and suggestions; and organising consultative meetings. Common views and evidence from different sources were combined to form the findings presented in this article.

Findings

EAC Regional PPD Platforms

Tanzania is a member of the EAC, whose development strategy emphasises the deepening of integration of partner states through dialogues. Accordingly, for the purpose of understanding the existing PPD platforms in the region, and how national PPDs are connected with the regional agenda, we interviewed the EAC Secretariat members, coordinators of the national PPD platforms, and leaders of PSOs. Interviews held with the EAC Secretariat revealed that both the EAC Secretariat and the Summit provided the PPD platforms that included private sector delegations. Likewise, the EAC Secretary General's Forum provided an opportunity for the EAC Secretariat to meet with the private sector: first within each individual state, and then in a combined regional forum. In spite of these mechanisms, interviewed respondents from the EAC reported that there were persistent non-tariff and technical barriers to trade due to the absence of rules and guidelines on dispute settlement; lack of awareness/analytical capacities on the regional market conditions; fragmented national and regional PPDs; absence of harmonised procedures for cross-border businesses; and the lack of adequate support to cross-border committees by the EAC partner states and the EAC Secretariat.

With respect to private-sector-led PPDs, the regional platform was the EABC. Ideally, the EABC was the regional focal point of national apex PSOs. It was established in 1997 to foster the interests of the private sector in the EAC integration process, and it draws members from the EAC partner states. During the time of the interviews, the EABC had 54 associations, and 108 corporate members.¹ The EABC comprises the apex/national PSOs; manufacturers' associations; chambers of commerce, employer associations, women associations, and the confederation of informal sector associations. The national focal points were the national private sector apex bodies, of which the Tanzania Private Sector Foundation (TPSF) was the focal point for Tanzania. The Executive Director of EABC reported that *the EABC acted as a regional platform through which the EAC business community presented their concerns at the EAC policy-making bodies, with the overall aim of creating a more conducive business environment through policy reforms*. Nonetheless, he claimed that in most cases, *the EABC participated in the EAC meetings as an observer, which weakened its dialogue functions as the position of its member was articulated through the EAC Secretariat*. The dialogue agenda was geared towards influencing policy reforms to create a more conducive business environment to make the EAC region more competitive.

A review of the EABC structure showed that the EABC had the following specialised PPD platforms: (i) East African Women in Business (EAWB), addressing issues affecting women in business; (ii) East African Professional Services Platform (EAPSP), representing interests of the professional service providers; (iii) East African Employers Organisation (EAEO), protecting employers' interests; and (iv) the East Africa Standards Platform (EASP), addressing challenges faced by regional suppliers. The EABC had also established a platform for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) mentorship for the youth. The PSOs involved in PPD platforms through the EABC were: (i) the East African Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (EACCIA), representing the national and non-chamber apex bodies in various EAC organs; and (ii) the Eastern African Grain Council (EAGC), representing grain stakeholders' interests in addressing grain business environment challenges. Coordinators of the EABC platforms reported main issues covered in dialogue agendas, which were transport and logistics, trade facilitation, custom union, common market and tax, as well as standards and SPS (Table 2). Evidently, the dialogue agendas were largely aligned with the EAC reform agenda.

Despite the significance of the EAC PPD platforms, several challenges facing them were reported by the EABC Secretariat (i.e., the Executive Director, the Trade and Policy Advisor, and the Manager of Policy and Standards) as follows:

- inadequate financial resources and staffing;
- inadequate capacity to conduct critical analysis of national and regional issues affecting trade;
- poor linkages and inadequate coordination of national and regional platforms;
- lack of a well elaborate advocacy agenda; and
- limited focus on gender-based analysis and youth issues.

¹ Based on the data provided in their website in July 2021

Table 2: Dialogue and Policy Issues Identified in the EAC Platforms

Regional PPD agenda	EAC Secretariat	EABC	EACCIA	EASP	EAPSP	EAE0	EAGC	Women & youth platforms
Transport and logistics	Development of Central and Northern Corridors Construction of One-Stop Border Posts. Productivity improvement of Dar es Salaam and Mombasa Ports through infrastructure upgrading and computerisation. Harmonization of transport regulations of EAC Partner States	Domestication of EAC's air space Telecommunications	Facilitation of private sector involvement in PPPs in the implementation of Northern Corridor Roadside Stations Programme PPDs on mobilizing private sector funding for the development of Northern Corridor Infrastructure Projects				Promotion of Warehouse Receipt Systems including certification, financing, market linkages through secure and transparent trade platforms such as commodity exchanges.	Gender-responsive infrastructure and customs processes for informal cross-border women traders.
Trade facilitation	Identification of Non-Tariff Trade Barriers (NTBs) through transport observatories. Operationalization of the National NTBs Monitoring Committees.	Implementation of WTO trade facilitation agreement Combatting illicit trade within EAC Domestic market access threshold for export processing zones in the EAC region	Implementation of African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), Sensitization of SMEs of the benefits of the EAC trading arrangement.		Professional Services Platform's consultative and advocacy process to foster trade in professional services.		Facilitation of an efficient, structured and profitable grain trade in EAC Sensitisation of consumers on grain and pulses products for increased consumption and production	The development of women's networks at borders to ease and facilitate their movements and goods. Women and youth access

		Liberalisation of trade in services Free movement of workers	Implementation of Tripartite Free Trade Area (TFTA) as above Continuous focus on EAC regional integration through targeted trade facilitation tools	Integration of professional services Information sharing platform among professionals	to resources and markets to participate in trade.
Customs Union, Common Market and tax PPDs	Video Conferencing facilities at the EAC Secretariat with links to all EAC Partner State capitals	Comprehensive review of the EAC common external tariff EAC common external tariff on sugar for industrial use Domestic tax harmonisation	Enabling business environment in EAC	Implementation of the clauses relating to the free movement of labour; labour standards and regulatory environment; Recognition of academic and professional standards.	Enabling business environment in EAC and beyond through the removal or reduction of unproductive fees, tariff and non-tariff barriers
Standards and SPS	Harmonization of Partner States' standards and technical regulations as well as Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary Measures.	Elimination of NTBs Harmonization of standards and technical regulations	Sensitisation of regional SMEs on the benefits of quality production for increased market access both in the region and internationally	Harmonisation of Partner States' standards and technical regulations through the Standards Platform	Development and harmonisation of grain standards

Source: Compiled from the Interviews

It was further observed that most platforms were still immature and disconnected with the EAC decision-making frameworks. In addition, youth and women issues were minimally accommodated in the EAC-PPD frameworks through informal associations and networks. Unfortunately, the private sector from member states did not have a common position on such issues as common external tariffs proposals before presenting them to the EAC Secretariat. Rather, each national PSO made its own proposals, making it difficult for the EAC to make a common decision.

National PPD Frameworks

The identified national PPD platforms that were directly or indirectly connected to the regional PPDs were the Tanzania National Business Council (TNBC) and sub-national business councils; ministerial and inter-ministerial PPD platforms; sector and sub-sector PPD platforms; technical working groups; and private-sector-led PPDs. A review of their structures revealed that the TNBC was a formal dialogue platform made up of the public and private sector representatives from district, regional and national levels. The TNBC dialogue was conducted through council meetings, local and international investors' round tables, RBCs, and DBCs. Notwithstanding the existence of a well elaborate institutional structure of the TNBC and its sub-national platforms, the TNBC Executive Director and the Secretariat members reported that:

- (a) meetings rarely took place at the national level as required;
- (b) the Executive Committee mostly worked to prepare the TNBC meeting, rather than being an intermediate decision-making body to regularly resolve issues and escalate those that require attention of the TNBC at the national level;
- (c) meetings were crowded by very broad agendas, again symptomatic of their focus on preparing TNBC meeting rather than resolving issues;
- (d) there was a limited systematic tracking of issues and information-sharing on the status of implementation of decisions made;
- (e) the TNBC Secretariat was sustained financially by the government, making it a de-facto public sector entity;
- (f) absence of linkage of sectoral PPD platforms and processes to the TNBC structure or content, leading to unnecessary duplications;
- (g) limited or absence of internal dialogue within the public and private sector PPD partners; and
- (h) TNBC's focus on the TNBC meetings at national and sub-national levels rather than ensuring a complementary and efficient PPD framework from sub-national, sector, national, regional and even international levels.

Given that RBCs and DBCs were integrated into the TNBC structure, their structural strengths and weakness were established as shown in Table 2. Some good practices identified from RBCs and DBCs were: (i) existence of an Executive Committee that resolved issues, while escalating those beyond their mandate to the TNBC; (ii) establishment of district and regional local business environment reform (LBER) plans through the Councils; and (iii) existence of mechanism to ensure

broad representation of economic sectors in the councils. However, regular meetings took place in few places (e.g., Dodoma Municipality, Bahi and Arumeru) where their regional or district commissioners appreciated the value of PPD, or where there were donor projects supporting PPDs. Evidently, RBCs and DBCs faced capacity gaps in the secretariat and executive committees; limited/absence of budgets; junior government representatives attending meetings; inadequate link between RBC and DBC meetings with LGA decision-making frameworks; frequent change/transfer of political appointees; inadequate capacity of the private sector to organise and engage the government; and the absence of clear mechanisms to ensure inclusiveness of women, youth and SME issues.

Table 3: Identified Strengths and Weaknesses of RBCs and DBCs

Strengths	Challenges and Gaps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased cooperation and trust between the public and private sector working as partners. • Sector representation increased inclusiveness. • Regional and District Commissioners were considered key champions of councils. • Existence of local business environment review plans, signed by both public and private sector representatives. • The existence of an Executive Committee in both the DBCs and RBCs to resolve the issues which were within their capacity while escalating issues beyond their mandate to TNBC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue management skills gaps in the secretariat and executive committees. • Meetings held depend on the interest and commitment of the Regional or District Commissioner. • Some senior public sector officers are represented by junior officials in meetings, which makes it difficult to resolve issues at the meetings. • Limited resources to conduct research to inform dialogue of finance the meetings. • There is no link between RBC and DBC meetings to do with consultation at LGA level. • The practice of paying officials to attend meetings, while there were often no funds available to do so. • Frequent change/transfer of political appointees. • Private sector representatives in most regions and districts lacked the capacity to engage the government in a meaningful way.

Source: Compiled from the interviews

Other national PPD forums linked to the EAC and other regional and multilateral institutions were the ministerial and inter-ministerial PPD platforms (Table 4). These were mostly organised under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and East African Cooperation (MEAC), the Ministry of Industries and Trade (MIT), and the Ministry of Finance and Planning (MoFP). They informed bilateral, regional and multinational trade negotiations through technical working groups (TWGs), which developed national positions on specific issues. Relatedly, the MIT coordinated the national committees on Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary measures (SPS), technical barriers to trade (TBT), NTBs, and trade facilitation. Also, the MIT coordinated the Joint Border Committees (JBC) established to bring together stakeholders involved in cross-border trade. One of the most important PPDs was the Task Force on Tax Reforms (TFTR), a dedicated PPD for tax/revenue

measures envisaged for each financial year. The TFTR was attended by both the public and private sectors to address customs-related matters (import and export), levies and fees at border posts, excise duties, etc. Furthermore, there were mechanisms for escalating issues to the EAC decision-making bodies because the Common External Tariff (CET) was a regional matter; and was hence supposed to be presented to ministerial meetings at the EAC Summit. The main strengths of this PPD were its regularity, effective coordination, and private sector involvement. Its challenges included limited representation of MSMEs, limited capacity to conduct in-depth analysis of proposals and their implications; and inadequate awareness of the private sector participants in policy formulation processes.

Another category of inter-ministerial PPD platform were working groups established to inform and monitor business environment reform programmes. There had been four business environment reform programmes in the past ten years, namely: the Roadmap for Improvement of the Investment Climate (enacted in 2009), Big Results Now (BRN), Business Environment Reforms (2014–2015), and the Blueprint for Regulatory Reforms to Improve the Business Environment (Blueprint) (enacted in 2018). While one of the taskforces for the Roadmap addressed cross-border trade, the Blueprint addressed transport, logistics, standards and labour issues, *inter alia*. Both the Roadmap and the BRN had quarterly meetings at sectoral and national levels to monitor implementation; and the same was expected of the Blueprint. Observably, the BRN business environment reforms were largely incorporated in the Blueprint. While the Steering Committee of the Roadmap used to meet quarterly, most of the eight (8) technical working groups (MDA level), under the Steering Committee, were not meeting. In the absence of strong monitoring and accountability mechanisms, the Roadmap was barely implemented.

It was further observed that there were parliamentary forums under parliamentary committees, which provided an opportunity for the private sector to participate directly in parliamentary business. In this regard, there were housekeeping committees (the Steering Committee; Standing Orders Committee; Privileges, Ethics and Powers Committee); sectoral committees; cross-cutting committees; the Budget Committee, and ad-hoc committees. However, these parliamentary platforms were challenged by the inability of PSOs to attend hearings due to financial and human resources constraints; passage of bills under certificate of urgency, which limited in-depth consultations; insufficient time for bill scrutiny; inadequate structured stakeholders' consultations; low private sector awareness of opportunities to participate in legislative processes; and inadequate preparation among stakeholders. Other PPD platforms identified were the Tanzania Partnership and Accountability Committee (PAC); trade, logistics and standards platforms, including freight and logistics platform, national monitoring committee on non-tariff barriers chaired by MIT, and the Permanent Committee on Transport Issues. The Ministry responsible for tourism coordinated two platforms: the Tourism Facilitation Committee (TFC), and the Tourism Advisory Committee (TAC).

Table 4: Inter-Ministerial Dialogue Issues Connected to EAC Agenda

Regional PPD Agenda	MI&C	MITI	MoFP	Foreign Affairs & EAC	Parliament	High Level Inter-Ministerial
Transport and logistics to resolve NTBs	Development of Central Corridors Construction of One-Stop Border Posts Productivity improvement of Dar es Salaam and Mombasa Ports through infrastructure upgrading and computerisation. Harmonization of transport regulations of EAC Partner States	Implementation of the Blueprint		Measures to eliminate regional and national NTBs to be synchronised in the context of the Blueprint to improve Tanzania's business environment	Create awareness of trade and logistics among MPs and committees	
Trade facilitation		Redefining SMEs to bring clarity and effective mainstreaming in nation's PPDs. Implementation of the Blueprint.		Implementation of the Blue print	Working partnership between PSOs and Parliament on trade issues. PSO participation in legislative process	Implementation of the Blueprint
Customs Union, Common Market and tax PPDs		Involve PSOs in critical regional platforms	Enhancing the capacity of public sector actors participating in PPD task forces.	Analysis of Tanzania's participation in the continental FTA adopted by the AU Heads of States	Train parliamentary committee clerks and MPs in customs union and common market	Mainstream the High-Level Task Force decisions in the TNBC decision-making framework
Standards and SPS		Support the TWGs for NTBs, SPS, and Trade Facilitation Harmonisation of Tanzania's standards and technical regulations with those of EAC Partner States		Harmonisation of Partner States' standards and technical regulations through the Standards Platform		

Source: Compiled from the Interviews

There also existed sub-sector platforms, such as the National Sunflower Roundtable, the Cotton to Clothing (C2C) Roundtable; and the National Coffee Stakeholder Committee (NCSC). Most of these did not hold meetings as planned. Instead, they initiated ad-hoc PPD events to engage MDAs and local governments to fill gaps arising from inadequate functioning of the established platforms.

In view of the interviewed respondents, the ministerial and inter-ministerial PPD platforms faced several challenges, which contributed to their sub-optimal performance. These include:

- (a) multiple uncoordinated PPD platforms;
- (b) inadequate technical skills of the secretariats to coordinate the setting of agenda, document decisions, make follow-up, track and report on implementation and results;
- (c) most PPD activities and processes were not budgeted for, and even when they were, the budgets were not fully availed;
- (d) PSOs lacked sufficient skilled staff and financial resources to send their representatives to most PPD platforms;
- (e) PSOs lacked adequate funds for undertaking research to generate evidence to inform PPD;
- (f) both public and private sector participants in PPDs lacked systematic mechanism to engage in internal dialogue in the preparation for engagement with the other parties; and
- (g) PPD platforms lacked the mechanisms or capacity to mainstream youth, women, SMEs, EAC and international trade issues in the platforms.

PSO-led PPDs

The study shows that there were regional (East African) PSOs, national apex PSOs, sector apex PSOs, trade and logistics associations, as well as sub-national associations. About half of the associations were based in Dar es Salaam where agribusiness had the highest number of associations, followed by social and commercial services sector (Table 4). However, most PSOs were constrained by limited managerial, advocacy and governance capacities. One respondent noted that *their ability to form coalitions was still low, resulting in the duplication of efforts and weak engagement with the state*. More specifically, the PSOs that organised PPDs connecting to the EAC agenda were the TPSF and TCCIA. The TPSF was a national apex and focal point for the private sector aimed at ensuring that the sector could speak with one voice with the government. It represented the Tanzanian private sector in the EABC. In spite of its credibility, strong networks and linkages, the TPSF had limited resources to finance its operations; consequently, it relied heavily on donors. For example, *at least 7 of the 14 full-time professional staff were paid by donors, and 5 more were expected to be supported through a skills development project*. The TCCIA was an apex chamber of commerce with a multi-sector, hierarchical structure that ran from the national to the district level. Its structure enabled the chamber to effectively access regional, national and district platforms. Yet, as

reported by a respondent, *the association was seriously constrained by limited staff and financial capacity*. While regional chambers participated in RBCs and DBCs through the support of DPs, most of them had challenges relating to the dilution of district level issues in bottom-up communication processes, inadequate representation, and unclear positioning in the PPD landscape.

Observations made from both the TPSF and TCCIA were as follows:

- (a) they had established technical committees comprising their executives, technical staff and selected Board Members to develop a mechanism to ensure the two apexes were working as partners;
- (b) both had mainstreamed youth and women agenda in their dialogue initiatives through the youth internship program (TPSF), and the specific youth cluster (TCCIA); and
- (c) TCCIA had quite extensive network of sub-national PSOs to liaise with sector PSOs that did not have a local presence.

Sector Apex PSO' Platforms

The study found that several associations with multiple business membership organisations had formed sectoral apex PSOs. Sector apexes identified include the Tourism Confederation of Tanzania (TCT); Agriculture Council of Tanzania (ACT); Tanzania Horticulture Association (TAHA); Confederation of Tanzanian Industries (CTI); Rice Council of Tanzania (RCT); Agriculture Non-State Actor Forum (ANSAF), and the Tanzania Milk Processors Association (TAMPA). The dialogue activities of the sector apex PSOs included issues relevant to the regional agenda (e.g., logistics, customs, etc.); and specific issues affecting their members (multiple regulations, bureaucracy, infrastructure, taxes, fees and levies). However, almost all sectoral apex PSOs lacked effective membership and outreach strategies, leading to low membership. Interestingly, almost all of them had similar/related agenda intending to *strengthen their advocacy and dialogue capacity; improve membership services; enhance their sustainability; enhance governance; and develop strategic partnership, networks and alliances*. While the majority of them had qualified CEOs, some were likely to retire soon, leaving a skills gap that might be hard to fill. Like their national counterparts, sector apexes were heavily dependent on donors. For example, one respondent reported that *all of the 22 employees of the ACT, and all of the 5 employees of the RCT, were paid by donors*.

The trade and logistics PSOs identified were the Tanzania Association of Freight Forwarders (TAFFA); Tanzania Truck Owners Association (TATOA); Tanzania Ship Tally Association (TASHITA); Tanzania Exporters Associations (TANEXA); and the Tanzania Air Operators Association (TAOA). While these PSOs embarked on a dialogue that was relevant to regional agenda, the biggest challenges laid in their sustainability and capacity to conduct policy analysis, and effectively engage the government for policy change. Due to limited sources of internal funding, they relied on donors to support them prepare position papers; and to participate in dialogue

forums. As a result of their weaknesses in developing and sustaining services for their members, members' contributions were still very low compared to what was needed; covering less than 50% of their total costs.²

Youth and Women PPD Platforms

Some of the PPD networks championing youth entrepreneurship and dialogue agenda included the Sokoine University Graduate Entrepreneurs' Cooperative; Tanzania Graduate Farmers Association (TGFA); Tanzania Development Forum for Youth (TDFY), which was a non-governmental youth-led organisation. Other youth organisations were the Tanzania Youth Alliance (TAYOA); Tanzania Youth Coalition (TYC); Youth Entrepreneurs Network (YEN-TZ); and the International Association of Students in Economic and Commercial Sciences (AIESEC). Most youth-led organisations were non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or community based organisations (CBOs); most of which were small, with weak (or no) secretariats. Their agenda extended beyond business issues to include health, life and employability skills. Altogether, they relied on donors; and to a less extent, local corporate sponsors. In addition, they had limited governance, organisation and financial management skills and systems, which compromised their credibility and ability to attract funds. Likewise, their ability to send representatives to meetings was limited by financial constraints. As well, they faced leadership challenges, including succession management; and their networks were not formally linked to the mainstream sector and national dialogue platforms.

The women entrepreneurs' associations identified were the Tanzania Women Chamber of Commerce (TWCC); Tanzania Food Processors Association (TAFOPA); Federation of Association of Women' Entrepreneurs (FAWETA); Tanzania Women Miners Association (TAWOMA); African Women's Entrepreneurship Program (AWEP); Tanzania Women Entrepreneurs Network and Development Exposition (TWENDE); and the Coalition for Advancement of Women in Agriculture Tanzania (CAWAT). The agenda of these associations focused on the business environment for women; and gender-specific challenges such as sexual harassment and segregation of women. However, although the associations claimed to have hundreds—or even thousands—of members, only a handful of them were active; and even fewer paid membership fees. Likewise, they had weak (or no) secretariats, and very limited resources. They relied mostly on elected leaders (mostly busy entrepreneurs) or volunteers to run their day-to-day business, including dialogue. This limited their effectiveness as some associations had been dormant for years. To a large extent, the low capacities of women-led associations reflected low incomes and capacities of most of their members.

Donor Driven PPD Platforms

The findings show that the support of donor partners (DPs) to PPD was in the form of multilateral and bilateral aids channelled through the government and

² This estimate is based on the averages computed from interviewed PSOs.

PSOs. The multilateral organisations that supported PPD were the United Nations Development Program, which established the UN Global Compact Network Tanzania (2017–2020); World Bank Group and Canadian International Development Agency, which dealt with business-enabling environment support; Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) and partners (BEST-Dialogue (2004–2019), Local Investment Climate (LIC) Program (2014–2020); Agriculture Markets Development Trust (AMDT) with Irish Aid and Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA); Department for International Development (DFID) supporting Eastern and Southern Africa Staple Food Markets Programme, and Institutions for Inclusive Development (I4ID) 2017–2021; Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) breakfast meetings and Roadmap for Improvement of the Investment Climate (2017–2018); and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) – Feed the Future Enabling Growth through Investment and Enterprise Program (ENGINE) (2016–2020), East Africa Trade and Investment Hub (EATIH) (2014–2019), and Policy Analysis Group (PAG) (2013–2018). Despite the remarkable support by DPs, it was evident that there was inadequate coordination among them, leading to the duplication of efforts. In addition, the government and PSOs found it difficult to retain donor-funded experts because of their relative high pay; and most of them left when donor funding ended.

Discussion and Implications

This study has mapped the PPD structures in Tanzania, indicating how they are interconnected with regional platforms. Several regional, national, PSO-led (national and sector apex), youth-led and women-driven PPDs, as well as donor-driven PPDs, have been established. At the regional level, it is evident that the EAC Secretariat and the Regional Summit provide platforms for member states to dialogue on the regional trade agenda (transport and logistics, trade facilitation, custom unions, common market, taxes, as well as standards and SPS). It has been observed that the private sector agenda was aligned to the EAC agenda through the EABC and its specialised platforms (e.g., EAWB, EAPSP, and EASP); and regional PSOs (EACCIA, EAGC). Both the EABC and regional PSOs were interconnected with national public-sector-driven PPD frameworks (TNBC, ministerial and inter-ministerial platforms), and private-sector-led platforms organised by TPSF, TCCIA and the sector apex PSOs. As Bouwen (2002) reported, this demonstrates that regional PPDs are accessed through representation by national and regional business associations.

However, even as the agenda pursued by the public-driven PPDs (ministerial and inter-ministerial PPD platforms) aligned with the regional agenda, the private-sector-driven PPDs prioritised the agendas that were of interest of their members. Observably, the TNBC and its integrated structures (RBCs and DBCs), which were public-driven, incorporated private sector actors and covered wider business environment issues identified from the local to the national level. This aligns with the view that PPDs take place at local, national, or international levels; in an effort to promote better business environment (Herzberg & Lili, 2016). It supports the

bottom-up approach to dialogue, which brings about both the private and public sector actors as a basis for promoting collaborative governance from the grassroots (der Poel et al., 2005; Dovlo et al., 2016).

In addition, most sector-PSOs, which pursued specific agenda for their members (e.g., TCT, ACT, TAHA, CTI, RCT, ANSAF & TAMP), of course entailed both regional issues (e.g., logistics, customs, etc.), and sector-specific issues (multiple regulations, bureaucracy, infrastructure, taxes, fees and levies). As Irwin (2021) suggested, this shows that PSOs are often inclined to protecting the interest of their members. However, by default, issues pursued by the trade and logistics PSOs (TAFFA, TATOA, TASHITA, TANEXA and TAOA) were largely in line with the regional agenda. It is also observed that some informal platforms existed to pursue sector-specific and youth and women agendas, even though their interconnections with national and regional PSOs were unclear. While youth networks (e.g., TGFA, TDFY, TAYOA, TYC and YEN-TZ) extended their activities beyond business issues to include health, life and employability skills, women platforms (TAFOPA, FAWETA, TAWOMA, AWEP, TWENDE and CAWAT) pursued both the business environment agenda and gender specific issues. Contrary to a view that collaborative governance engages in a formal consensus-oriented decision-making (Huxham et al., 2000; Ansell & Gash, 2008: 544), this shows that collaborative governance in the context of a developing economy entails both formal and informal structures.

In general, all PPD platforms identified suffered from challenges associated with resource limitations, inappropriate design, and weak execution. The most prominent challenges emanated from human and financial capacity deficits; design, coordination and representation; inadequate link between regional and national PPDs; inadequate link between sectoral and formal PPDs; and inadequate integration of gender and youth agendas. More specifically, the human and financial capacity deficits were identified as one of the most serious challenges to both public and private-sector-driven PPDs. Consequently, as established by Charles (2016), most organisations lacked the capacity to prepare an appealing agenda with the necessary data, and to do the secretarial work of coordinating PPDs. Contrary to the views that business associations play an effective role in promoting the interests of the private sector as they are usually well-resourced and staffed by professionals (Sen, 2015), most PSOs were donor-dependent. The issue of donor dependence by PSOs is also reported by several other authors (e.g., Irwin; Wanzala-Mlobela & Banda, 2018; Charles, 2021). Indeed, the DPs interviewed were directly or indirectly involved in facilitation of PPDs as they financed, *inter alia*, the establishments and running of policy networks, dialogue projects and breakfast meetings.

In terms of design, coordination and representation, it is evident that most regional PPDs platforms were largely connected with ministerial and inter-ministerial platforms, while there was no clear linkages between private-sector-led PPDs. Unfortunately, there was no direct channel for picking up and communicating trade issues that could not be resolved at sub-national level to ministerial PPDs,

that could present the national position to EAC structures. Relatedly, the private sector in member states did not meet under the EABC to dialogue and have a common position before presenting it to the EAC Secretariat. Rather, each national PSO made its own proposals, making it difficult for the EAC to make common decisions since the positions of the private sector in different countries often differ.

For Tanzania, a formal national PPD (TNBC) functioned around TNBC, RBCs and DCBs, rather than as a national champion for PPDs. Regional and district commissioners did not regularly convene RBC and DBC meetings. Even when they convened such meeting, the decisions of PPDs were not properly communicated and referenced in subsequent meetings. There was sometimes inadequate, weak/confrontational communication between the public and private sectors before, during, and after PPDs; preventing meaningful dialogue, partnership and the resolution of shared problems. At the same time, there were a multiplicity of platforms, overlapping mechanisms, ad-hoc PPD meetings, lack of intra-government coordination, and a weak coordination of the private sector. Thus, the same discussions were held on many occasions because there was no coordination between different types of PPDs, and poor horizontal and vertical inclusion. Representatives from the informal sector, youth and women's groups were not included in national dialogues such as TNBC, and inter-ministerial PPDs. Part of the problem was that multiple platforms had been created independently without reference or linkage to those already existing.

Furthermore, sectorial—PPDs including ministerial and inter-ministerial ones—were not linked to the TNBC. Even worse, PPD platforms established as part of business environment reform plans (e.g., Roadmap) were not linked to ministerial and inter-ministerial PPDs, let alone to the TNBC. Except for the high level inter-ministerial dialogue platforms, the ministerial and inter-ministerial platforms had a narrow agenda focusing on specific budgeting, the legislative process, or EAC platforms. Meanwhile, the TNBC sector, sub-national PPDs and PPDs embedded in reform programmes tended to address a wide range of issues. This makes the PPD framework inefficient as there is bound to be duplication, which strains the already limited human and financial resources in both the public and private sector (Dovlo et al., 2016).

Overall, this article enhances the sphere of knowledge on collaborative governance by expanding the theoretical scope and insights regarding the structure of collaborative governance in a context where there are formal and informal multi-actors. Contrary to the previous literature, where collaborative governance is perceived as a formal public management process (Chris Ansell & Gash, 2008), the study indicates that by being the platforms for collaborative governance, PPDs facilitate engagements of the formal and informal actors. It demonstrates that PPDs have the potential to connect various stakeholders into the collaborative governance processes at various levels of government. However, while the challenges of resources, design and coordination of PPDs are evident, a mechanism for escalating issues identified at lower levels to higher levels are not effectively

integrated into formal collaborative governance processes. Furthermore, the study adds the regional perspective in the collaborative governance literature by indicating that if national PPDs are interconnected with regional platforms, they can pursue similar agendas. It reveals how PPD agendas escalate from national to regional levels, providing a broader understanding of collaborative governance. Still, the challenges arise when existing platforms are inclined to protecting interests of their members (such as PSOs, and women and youth networks), and they experience resource and capacity challenges to reach formal decision-making platforms. This shows that one of the main challenges of collaborative governance emerges from the divergent agendas of the multi-actors participating in the governance processes.

The study recommends that PPDs should be utilised to create a platform for integrating formal and informal actors into governance processes, especially where both formal and informal systems are functioning together. They can be used to create an important platform and vehicle for bridging the gap between public policy imperatives and various stakeholders to share their views and interests from diverse perspectives for improving the governance practice. This means policy makers should encourage a diversity of voices and foster relationships with a broad range of private sector stakeholders, from informal to formal and regional PPDs. In view of this, the policy process should not be limited to formal governance structures, but must build on structures and processes that are set up to facilitate interactions of formal and informal actors at all levels the economy.

Limitations and Areas for Further Studies

While our findings provide an in-depth understanding of PPDs and inform the literature on collaborative governance, they cannot be generalised beyond a similar context. Much as the study largely focused on PPDs in Tanzania and the EAC; hence a comparative analysis of the identified platforms with those existing in other regional blocks is likely to provide new insights on collaborative governance. Actually, more evidence is needed on how to improve the coordination of PPDs, address resource limitations, sustain PPD platforms, as well as integrate gender and youth issues into formal dialogue processes. Studying how to integrate informal PPDs into formal governance processes could also be an interesting research area.

References

- Amsler, L. B. (2016). Collaborative Governance: Integrating Management, Politics, and Law. *Public Administration Review*, 76(5): 700–711.
- Anderson, W., Busagara, T., Mahangila, D., Minde, M., Olomi, D., and Bahati, V. (2017). The dialogue and advocacy initiatives for reforming the business environment of the tourism and hospitality sector in Tanzania. *Tourism Review*, 72(1): 45–67.

- Ansell, C. & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4): 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>.
- Ansell, C., Sørensen, E. & Torfing, J. (2017). Improving Policy Implementation Through Collaborative Policymaking. *Policy and Politics*, 45(3): 467–486.
- Bouwen, P. (2002). Corporate Lobbying in the European Union: The Logic of Access. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(3): 365–390.
- Charles G. (2023). Assessing Institutional Capacity of Business Associations in Tanzania. *Forum for Development Studies*, 50(2): 303–306.
- Charles, G. (2021). Integrating Research into Policy Sphere: Evidence from Tanzania. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 13(4): 424–436.
- Charles, G., Jeppesen, S., Kamau, P. & Kragelund, P. (2017). Firm-level Perspectives on State Business Relations in Africa: The Food-processing Sector in Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia. *Forum for Development Studies*, 44(1): 109–131.
- CDell’Anno, R. (2021). Theories and Definitions of the Informal Economy: A Survey. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 36(2022): 1610–1643.
- Dovlo, D., Nabyonga-Orem, J., Estrelli, Y. & Mwisongo, A. (2016). Policy Dialogues - The Bolts and Joints of Policy-making: Experiences from Cabo Verde, Chad and Mali. *BMC Health Services Research*, 16(4): 328–336.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T. & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1): 1–29.
- Gerlak, A. K., Heikkila, T. & Lubell, M. (2013). The Promise and Performance of Collaborative Governance. *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Environmental Policy*, July (2018): 413–434.
- Herzberg, B. & Wright, A. (2006). *Public-Private Dialogue. The PPD Handbook. A Toolkit for Business Environment Reformers*. Worldbank, Washington DC.
- Herzberg Lili, B. S. (2016). *State of Play—Public-Private Dialogue. Public-Private Dialogue Practical Notes Series*. World Bank, Washington.
- Hetherington, D. (2016). *Business Environment Reform Facility Public-Private Dialogue Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa: Lessons for Zimbisa*. DFID, London.
- Huxham, C., Vangen, S., Huxham, C. & Eden, C. (2000). The Challenge of Collaborative Governance. *Public Management: An International Journal of Research and Theory*, 2(3): 337–358.
- Irwin, D. (2014). Features of Business Association Advocates in Africa. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 27(4): 306–316.
- Irwin, D. (2019b). Business Membership Organisations in East Africa : Perceptions of Success. PhD Thesis, Newcastle University.
- Irwin, D. (2021). African Approaches to Dialogue and Advocacy. In P. Harris, S. Bitonti, C. S. Fleisher and A. Korikjaer Binderkrantz (eds.). *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Interest Groups, Lobbying and Public Affairs*. Palgrave Macmillan, Chapter 1, pp. 1–12.

- Khine, T. T. (2018). Building Process of Public-Private Dialogue During Major Reforms in Myanmar. Walden Dissertations and Doctorial Studies, Walden University.
- Leftwich, A., Sen, K., te. Velde, D. W. & R. P. C. (2008). *The Economics and Politics of State-business Relations in Africa: Preliminary Findings*. IPPG, University of Manchester.
- Lemma, A. & Willem D. (2015). *State-business Relations as Drivers of Economic Performance*. WIDER Working Paper 2015 / 098.
- Pinaud, N. (2007). *Public-Private Dialogue in Developing Countries: Opportunities and Risks*. OECD Development Centre, ISBN: 9789264028838.
- Plotnikof, M. (2015). Challenges of Collaborative Governance in the Daycare Area. PhD Dissertation (Vol. 26). <http://openarchive.cbs.dk/bitstream/handle/10398/9185/MiePlotnikof.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Rijkers, B., Sisombat, L., Joseph, V. & Gandhi, I. (2015). *State Business Relations in Indian State Business*. Topic Guide About GSDRC. www.gsdr.org.
- Taylor, S. D. (2012). State-Business Relations and their Impact on Business Environments in Contemporary Africa. *Business and Politics*, 14(1): 1–35.
- te Velde, D. W. (2013). State-business Relations and Industrial Policy: Current Policy and Research Debates. Growth Research Programme, www.degrp.sqsp.com.
- Ulibarri, N., Emerson, K., Imperial, M. T., Jager, N. W., Newig, J. & Weber, E. (2020). How does Collaborative Governance Evolve? Insights from a Medium Case Comparison. *Policy and Society*, 39(4): 617–637.
- Wanzala-Mlobela, M. & Banda, K. (2018). *Literature Review of Best Practices in Designing and Conducting Public-Private Dialogues (PPDs) in Sub-Saharan Africa (with an emphasis on fertilizer PPDs)*. AAP, Michigan State Univeristy, USA [https://www.canr.msu.edu/fsg/projects/Literature Review of Best Practices in PPDs Final 11-5-2018_1.pdf](https://www.canr.msu.edu/fsg/projects/Literature%20Review%20of%20Best%20Practices%20in%20PPDs%20Final%2011-5-2018_1.pdf).