Rethinking multilateralism. A new role for the private sector.

Supporting Document 2:
INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS



ICC

ie UNIVERSITY

Rethinking multilateralism. A new role for the private sector.

Supporting Document 2: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS

Index

1. Introduction. 5

2. Concepts and methodology. 7

3. List of public & private collaboration frameworks. 15

4. Highlights and conclusions. 19

Insights addressing our four policy themes. 22

Insights from the analysis of the leading type of organization. 25

Insights from the analysis by mandate. 27

Emerging Conclusions. 29

Emerging Recommendations. 30

5. In depth framework analysis. 31

A. Multilateral development banks (MDBs) and regional development banks. 31

Framework 1: WBG Collaboration: proposal for an IFC–MIGA private sector window in IDA18.. 31
Framework 2: Financing of public-private partnerships: ppps in latin america and the caribbean (IDB). 35
Framework 3: Guide to public and private partnerships, European Investment Bank. 39
Framework 4: CAF. Sustainable finance framework (2023). 43
Framework 5: The ten principles of the UN global compact. 47

B. United Nations System and United Nations Agencies and Programmes. 51

Framework 6: Addis Ababa action agenda of the third international conference on financing for development, United Nations , 2015.. 51
Framework 7: Business and the United Nations – Working together towards the SDGs 2015. 56
Framework 8: UNIDO Mid-Term Programme Framework 2018-2021.61
Framework 9: United Nations Global Compact. (2019). Scaling SDG Finance: Innovations and collaboration to unlock capital at scale. 66
Framework 10: UN Global Compact Strategy Extension 2024–2025. 69
Framework 11: UN Global Compact – Accelerating Innovation in Sustainable Finance.. 73
Framework 12: Sevilla Commitment – Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development (2025). . . .77

C. OECD and Standard Setters. 81

Framework 13: OECD DAC blended finance principles for unlocking commercial finance for the SDGs (2018). 81
Framework 14: Effective results frameworks for sustainable development: achieving impact by design OECD, 2024. 86

D. Private Sector-Led and Third Sector-Led Initiatives. 90

Framework 15: Vision 2050-the new agenda for business. 90
Framework 16: The SDG partnerships guidebook. 95
Framework 17: The equator principles. 101
Framework 18: ICC principles for sustainable trade finance, international chamber of commerce (ICC), 2024. 102
Framework 19: Mesa de Donantes – Cooperación internacional para el desarrollo sostenible en Colombia (CEPEI 2005). 106

1. Introduction.

Purpose of the report.

The report "Rethinking multilateralism. A new role for the private sector" aims to identify and propose ways to strengthen collaboration between international organizations and private sector entities. It is widely recognized that through investment, entrepreneurship, and partnerships, the private sector helps grow and maintain economies. In addition, the private sector plays an essential role as a stabilizing force in economies facing development challenges (or crises) by maintaining employment, ensuring capital flows, and driving innovation.

But **what is the impact of the private sector in achieving sustainable growth and what role could and should it play considering ongoing changes in the multilateral landscape?** There is a widespread understanding that the impact of companies on sustainable development is highly valuable and could be significantly amplified through stronger collaboration with and within the multilateral system. However, to fully realize this potential, it is essential to strengthen the mechanisms that facilitate this kind of cooperation, ensuring a more structured engagement, better alignment of multilateral-private incentives, and trustworthy mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.

Understanding how these levers currently function and how they could be improved is the focus of the report "Rethinking multilateralism. A new role for the private sector" (the Report).

Methodology and scope of this document.

To address this goal, the methodology of the Report follows a qualitative approach, combining literature review, case studies, and expert consultations, structured in separate but complementary building blocks.

Building on this research, the Report aims to deliver an overview of the current situation regarding private sector participation in development and provide an action-oriented analysis, including the identification to deepen its participation and, hopefully, its impact.

The focus of this document, **Frameworks Analysis**, is to offer a review of existing an analysis of selected public & private collaboration frameworks in key institutions. The purpose is to first gain an understanding of the

breadth of frameworks that exist already, which organizations are leading them and what is their purpose and scope. To facilitate the analysis, we have organized the frameworks based on the type of "parent" organisation, that is, the organization that leads the definition and implementation of the framework.

Based on this, we will analyse whether existing frameworks address sufficiently the findings of the literature review and how they address the four guiding policy questions. Finally, the analysis will identify good practice and forward-looking recommendations. The structure of this Frameworks Analysis is as follows:

- **Section 2: Concepts and Methodology.** Defines the key concepts that underpin the study and explains the analytical framework applied. It sets out the criteria used to evaluate the selected institutional frameworks, ensuring consistency and comparability.
- **Section 3: List of Frameworks Considered.** Provides a consolidated inventory of the frameworks reviewed, organized by type of leading organization (e. g. , multilateral development banks, UN agencies, private sector–led initiatives). This section clarifies the scope of the analysis and the rationale for inclusion.
- **Section 4: Highlights and Conclusions.** Presents the comparative insights that emerge from the analysis. It distils lessons, strengths, gaps, and good practices across frameworks, and offers preliminary conclusions relevant to the broader research questions on multilateralism and private sector engagement.
- **Section 5: In-Depth Framework Analysis.** Includes detailed assessments of each framework reviewed, structured around the five analytical dimensions. Each profile combines an executive summary, structured analysis against criteria, and a conclusion with scoring. Together, they provide the evidence base for the comparative insights and conclusions.

2. Concepts and methodology.

Public-private engagement and cooperation frameworks.

A framework for cooperation between the private sector and multilateral institutions is **a structured system of principles, tools, and mechanisms designed to facilitate strategic collaboration, promote shared value creation, and ensure alignment between commercial objectives and development priorities within the mandate of the framework leading organization**.

The existence and relevance of these institutional frameworks can be very helpful in order to facilitate business engagement in multilateral negotiations, foster innovative solutions to pressing global challenges and overall, drive deeper and more transformative change by combining public and private means and aligning their objectives.

In general, a public-private cooperation framework provides 1) structured engagement protocols, enabling clearer roles, responsibilities, and communication; 2) incentive alignment mechanisms, such as risk-sharing tools, blended finance models, or policy structures; and 3) bridging instruments, like development impact standards or joint financing platforms.

The objectives guiding the design and implementation of frameworks can be varied, from leveraging private capital and supporting development goals, to building long-term collaboration between sectors or sharing good practice and innovative approaches that can help inform development initiatives. In doing so, **public private collaboration frameworks facilitate the alignment of multilateral and other organization's mandates and business interests with and for sustainable development outcomes**.

Methodological approach.

We have proposed a double approach to the analysis of existing frameworks. First, by selecting from the many existing frameworks those that are highly relevant to our guiding policy questions as set out by the International Chamber of Commerce to be addressed in the Report.

1. Policy and Governance.

- What policy frameworks can multilateral institutions develop to better align private sector investments with sustainable development goals (SDGs)?
- How can regulatory reforms facilitate stronger collaboration between the private sector and multilateral organizations for sustainable development?

2. Investment and Finance.

- What role does blended finance play in mobilizing private sector investment for sustainable development, and how can multilateral institutions enhance its effectiveness?
- How can risk-sharing mechanisms and financial incentives be structured to encourage private investment in high-impact sustainable development projects?
- How can domestic enabling environments be improved to improve investor confidence, especially considering prudential frameworks and dispute settlement systems?

3. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs).

- What are the best practices for structuring public-private partnerships (PPPs) to maximize their impact on sustainable development while reducing corruption?
- How do private sector due diligence policies (such as banks and other corporations) compare to similar policies at UN agencies? What is the impact of different levels of rigor?
- How can multilateral organizations benefit from business experience to ensure that PPPs are inclusive, address the needs of vulnerable populations and limit waste?

4. Global Coordination and Diplomacy.

- How can multilateral organizations enhance global cooperation between the private sector and governments to accelerate progress toward the SDGs?
- What lessons can be learned from successful private sector-multilateral partnerships in different regions and industries?

The analysed frameworks come from **multilateral development banks**, **UN agencies**, **OECD and donor governments** and/or **private sector-led or third sector led alliances**. We have grouped the frameworks by "parent organization" to facilitate easier understanding but also to see if any significant differences emerge in terms of governance or innovation based on the type of "parent organization".

Once the shortlist of frameworks was identified, we defined a set of analytical criteria to assess their relevance vis-à-vis facilitating the integration of the private sector within multilateral institutions. This approach draws on the findings of the literature review and provides a structured, comparable basis for analysis. While not exhaustive, these criteria allow us to evaluate in depth the capacity of each framework to strengthen public–private collaboration.

The analytical framework applied in this study is based on a structured checklist designed to assess the extent to which each institutional framework facilitates meaningful collaboration between the private sector and multilateral institutions. Drawing from the Terms of Reference (ToR) and the literature review, sixteen key elements were identified as essential components of an effective public–private cooperation framework. These elements include governance arrangements, incentive alignment, blended finance structures, risk-sharing mechanisms, accountability systems, due diligence processes, and mechanisms linking business objectives with broader development priorities.

Each framework reviewed was assessed against this checklist to determine whether the relevant element was fully addressed. Elements that were only partially reflected were not counted towards the final score. Based on the total number of criteria fully covered, a percentage-based rating was calculated for each framework, providing a comparative indication of its overall relevance and operational maturity in supporting structured multilateral–private sector engagement.

In parallel, the analysis also examined whether the frameworks addressed at least one of the four substantive mandate areas considered relevant for the study: Private Sector and Peace and Security; Private Sector and Development Cooperation; Private Sector and Human Rights; and Private Sector and Humanitarian Action. This additional layer of analysis helped identify thematic gaps and trends across the institutional landscape.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment.

This dimension assesses whether the framework sets a clear strategic rationale for engaging the private sector and whether it ensures that business objectives and multilateral mandates are aligned around sustainable development outcomes. Within this criterion we have considered the following elements:

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** whether the framework explicitly articulates what is expected from the private sector and what multilateral institutions commit to deliver in return.
- **An (structured) alignment of incentives:** the presence of mechanisms—financial, regulatory, or reputational—that align the interests of businesses and multilateral institutions for mutual benefit.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges:** whether the framework fosters new approaches to systemic issues such as climate change, inequality, or fragile contexts.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture.

This criterion examines how clearly the framework defines the roles of private actors and multilateral institutions, and whether it provides a structured architecture for their collaboration. Within this criterion we have considered the following elements:

- **Clear roles for the PS and the international organization:** how responsibilities are distributed between private companies, governments, and international institutions.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration/engagement:** whether the framework embeds formal mechanisms (e. g. , steering committees, joint boards) to guide collaboration.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and Multilateral Institutions:** the extent to which the framework provides models or instruments for building partnerships.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** whether there is an overarching platform or process for ongoing, systematic interaction rather than ad hoc cooperation.

3. Engagement & financing instruments.

This dimension evaluates the availability and sophistication of tools that enable financial collaboration between the private sector and multilateral institutions. Within this criterion we have considered the following elements:

- **Blended finance structure:** the use of concessional finance, guarantees, or other instruments to reduce risk and attract private investment.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms:** the presence of new financing models, such as sustainability-linked bonds, outcome-based finance, or fintech solutions.
- **Private sector investment mechanism:** whether the framework provides a clear pathway for private capital to participate in development initiatives.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms:** tools that distribute risks fairly between public and private actors, including guarantees, insurance, or revenue-sharing arrangements.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards.

This dimension focuses on whether the framework ensures that private sector operations are aligned with broader development priorities and that risks are managed through safeguards. Within this criterion we have considered the following elements:

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities:** how the framework links profitability and sustainability goals with SDG outcomes.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms:** whether the framework provides instruments for resolving conflicts between public and private actors.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism:** the existence of structured processes to assess risks and ensure compliance with environmental, social, and governance standards.

5. Integrity, accountability & results.

This criterion examines whether frameworks include mechanisms to ensure transparency, prevent corruption, and measure outcomes consistently. Within this criterion we have considered the following elements:

- **Anti-corruption mechanism:** whether the framework incorporates safeguards against fraud, corruption, or abuse of resources.
- **Accountability: embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results:** whether the framework defines indicators, reporting systems, or evaluation processes that allow both public and private partners to be held accountable for outcomes.
- Finally, each framework has received a score based on our qualitative analysis. Here the intention is to score on how closely they meet our guiding criteria. Based on this, we have identified a set of general conclusions (section 4 of the document) as well as provided a detailed analysis of each of the frameworks analysed.
- **Shortlisted frameworks.**

As a result, a total of **19 institutional frameworks** has been identified and analysed across a diverse landscape of organizations. These frameworks reflect the growing ambition and complexity of private sector engagement in sustainable development and multilateral cooperation.

They include both standards and good practice frameworks that shape investment behaviour (e. g. , the UN Global Compact Principles, the Equator Principles) and operational guides aimed at structuring partnerships, financing tools, or project design (e. g. , PPP manuals, blended finance guidelines).

The analysed frameworks come from **multilateral development banks**, **UN agencies**, **OECD and donor governments** and/or **private sector-led or third sector led alliances**. While many documents originate from multilateral actors (UN, World Bank, IDB, CAF), several are authored by private-sector associations (ICC, WBCSD).

Box 1: Selected Frameworks.

A. Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) and Regional Banks.

Institution	Frameworks	Year
CAF – Development Bank	Sustainable Finance Framework	2024
European Investment Bank (EIB) – EPEC	Guide to Public-Private Partnerships	2024
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	Framework for Financing of PPPs	2020
World Bank Group (IDA, IFC, MIGA)	IFC-MIGA Private Sector Window	2016

B. United Nations System and UN Agencies and Programmes.

Institution	Framework	Year
United Nations (UN)	Sevilla Commitment, Addis Ababa Action Agenda	2025, 2015
UN Global Compact (UNGC)	Ten Principles of the UNGC; Global Compact Strategy Extension 2024–2025; Innovation in Sustainable Finance; Scaling SDG Finance	2004, 2024, 2024, 2019
UNIDO	Mid-Term Programme Framework 2018–2021	2018
UNGC & ICC	Business and the United Nations	2015

C. OECD and Standard Setters.

Institution	Framework	Year
OECD	Effective Results Frameworks; DAC Blended Finance	2024, 2018

D. Private Sector-Led & Third Sector-Led Initiatives.

Institution	Framework	Year
International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)	The SDG Partnership Guidebook; ICC Principles on Sustainable Investment	2022, 2024
WBCSD – World Business Council for Sustainable Development	Vision 2050: The New Agenda for Business	2010
CEPEI – Centro de Pensamiento Estratégico Internacional	Mesa de Donantes: Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo Sostenible en Colombia	2005
Equator Principles Association	The Equator Principles	2020

The above reflects a diverse landscape of institutional approaches to private sector engagement, ranging from investment standards and results frameworks to practical guidelines and UN-business collaboration models.

It is important to note that in our analysis we have excluded sustainability and ESG related frameworks (e. g. , PRI, SASB) given that these represent a very specific set of public-private collaboration mechanisms (e. g. sustainable investment) that is beyond the scope of our study.

3. List of public & private collaboration frameworks.

N°	Framework Title	Institution	Reference	Strategic Note
Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) and Regional Development Banks				
1	Proposal for an IFC-MIGA private sector window in IDA18	World Bank Group	World Bank Group. (2016, June 8). WBG collaboration: Proposal for an IFC-MIGA private sector window in IDA18. IDA Resource Mobilization Department (DFiRM). https://documents1. worldbank. org/curated/en/251611468198009717/pdf/IDA18-WBG-collaboration-proposal-for-an-IFC-MIGA-private-sector-window-in-IDA18.pdf	The proposal outlines the establishment of a US$2. 5 billion Private Sector Window (PSW) under IDA18 to mobilize private sector investment in the poorest and most fragile countries. A joint effort between the International Development Association (IDA), International Finance Corporation (IFC), and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA)
2	IDB Framework for Financing of public-private partnerships: PPPs in Latin America and the Caribbean	IDB	Inter-American Development Bank. (2020). Financing of public-private partnerships: PPPs in Latin America and the Caribbean. IDB Publications. https://publications. iadb. org/publications/english/document/Financing-of-Public-Private-Partnerships. pdf	This framework provides practical guidance for structuring and governing multilateral PPPs. It emphasizes climate resilience, fiscal risk controls, and transparency, aiming to maximize development benefits from private infrastructure investments.
3	Guide to Public-Private Partnerships	European Investment Bank (EIB) – European PPP Expertise Centre (EPEC)	European Investment Bank. (2024). Guide to public-private partnerships. EIB (EPEC). https://www. eib. org/en/readonline-publications/epec-ppp-guide-welcome	Reference guide on PPP structuring, with a checklist of contractual risks.
4	Sustainable Finance Framework.	CAF	Sustainable finance framework. Development Bank of Latin America and the Caribbean. https://www. caf. com.	A comprehensive structure for issuing Green, Social, and Sustainability Bonds. Aligned with international principles, such as the ICMA Green Bond Principles (GBP), Social Bond Principles (SBP), and Sustainability Bond Guidelines (SBG).
United Nations System and United Nations Agencies and Programmes				
5	The Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact	UN Global Compact	United Nations Global Compact. (2004). The Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact. https://www.unglobalcompact. org/what-is-gc/mission/principles	Through its principles on environment, labor, and anti-corruption, the UNGC enables businesses to align operations with global norms and gives them a formal channel to join UN policy platforms and SDG progress reviews.

6	UN Financing for Development (FfD) – Addis Ababa Action Agenda	UN DESA	United Nations. (2015). Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa Action Agenda). United Nations. https://www. un. org/esa/ffd/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/AAAA_Outcome. pdf	This framework creates the multilateral architecture for integrating the private sector into global financing for sustainable development. It stresses inclusive governance, regulatory alignment, and stakeholder consultation, positioning private actors as co-creators in global policy and decision-making.
7	Business and the United Nations: Working together towards the SDGs	United Nations Global Compact & ICC	Sustainable Development Goals Fund (SDG-F), Business Fights Poverty (BFP), & The Hong Kong Society of Chartered Secretaries and Responsible Investment (HKSCSRI). (2015). Business and the United Nations: Working together towards the SDGs. https://www. sdgfund. org/sites/default/files/business-and-un/SDGF_BFP_HKSCSRI_Business_and_SDGs-Web_Version. pdf	This framework outlines the main channels through which the private sector can engage with the UN system. While platforms like the Global Compact Leaders Summit or the ECOSOC Business Forum exist, there are no permanent structures with decision-making power or formal follow-up, which limits the effectiveness of business participation. Representation is still uneven, especially for SMEs and businesses in the Global South.
8	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) Mid-Term Programme Framework 2018-2021	UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). (2018). Mid-Term Programme Framework 2018-2021. https://www. unido. org/sites/default/files/unido-publications/2023-03/MidTermPro-2018-en. pdf	The MTPF provides strategic guidance for the programmatic activities of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) over the next four years to realize its mandate of supporting countries in achieving inclusive and sustainable industrial development (ISID).
9	Scaling SDG finance: Innovations and collaboration to unlock capital at scale.	United Nations Global Compact	United Nations Global Compact. (2019). Scaling SDG finance: Innovations and collaboration to unlock capital at scale. https://d306pr3pise04h. cloudfront. net/docs/publications%2FScaling-SDG-Finance. pdf	Outlines how innovations like blended finance, corporate intermediation, and public-private partnerships can unlock capital at scale for the 2030 Agenda. It emphasizes aligning financial flows with sustainable development priorities through systemic collaboration and market incentives.
10	Global Compact strategy extension 2024–2025	United Nations Global Compact	United Nations Global Compact. (2024). UN Global Compact strategy extension 2024–2025. https://ungc-communications-assets. s3. amazonaws. com/docs/publications/UNGC-Strategy-Extension_2024-25. pdf	Framework aimed to scale the global collective impact of business by upholding the Ten Principles and delivering the SDGs through accountable companies and ecosystems that enable change.
11	Accelerating Innovation in Sustainable Finance.	United Nations Global Compact	United Nations Global Compact. (2024). Accelerating Innovation in Sustainable Finance. https://info. unglobalcompact. org/l/591891/2024-10-23/5b2hl1/591891/1729707560PTVse5iM/SF_InnovationReport_Oct17. pdf	Outlines strategies to unlock private capital for the SDGs through tools like blended finance, AI-driven data, and sustainability-linked bonds. It emphasizes overcoming barriers such as transparency and risk to scale sustainable investment globally

12	Compromiso de Sevilla / Sevilla Commitment	United Nations	Draft resolution submitted by the President of the Conference: Sevilla Commitment (A/CONF. 227/2025/L. 1). https://docs. un. org/en/A/CONF. 227/2025/L. 1.	The Commitment lays out a multilateral response to the urgent need for sustainable finance mechanisms that can deliver on the 2030 Agenda. It includes a call for a renewed global compact that aligns development finance with climate, gender equality, digital inclusion, and multilateral reform. The resolution emphasizes mobilizing both public and private capital and modernizing financing frameworks.
OECD and Standard Setters				
13	OECD DAC Blended Finance Principles for Unlocking Commercial Finance for the SDGs	OECD	OECD. (2018). OECD DAC Blended Finance Principles for Unlocking Commercial Finance for the SDGs. OECD Publishing. https://www. oecd. org/en/publications/oecd-dac-blended-finance-principles_dc66bd9c-en. html	This framework guides donor governments and multilaterals on structuring partnerships that mobilize private capital. It emphasizes development impact, risk-return transparency, financial additionality, and alignment with local priorities. It is a core multilateral standard for PPPs.
14	Effective Results Frameworks for Sustainable Development: Achieving Impact by Design	OECD	OECD (2024), Effective Results Frameworks for Sustainable Development: Achieving Impact by Design, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi. org/10. 1787/aaa4bb52-en.	This framework provides ideas to help development co-operation partners make the strategic and political leaps necessary to align all efforts and investments with sustainable development objectives.
Private Sector-Led and Third Sector-Led Initiatives				
15	Vision 2050: The new agenda for business	World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)	World Business Council for Sustainable Development. (2010). Vision 2050: The new agenda for business. WBCSD. https://www. wbcsd. org/resources/vision-2050-the-new-agenda-for-business	Lays out a pathway leading to a global population of some 9 billion people living well, within the resource limits of the planet by 2050.
16	The SDG partnership guidebook. UN Partnerships for SDGs Office & ICC	International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)	International Chamber of Commerce. (2022). The SDG partnership guidebook. UN Partnerships for SDGs Office & ICC. https://sdgs. un. org/sites/default/files/2022-02/SDG%20Partnership%20Guidebook%201. 11. pdf	Provides practical tools for structuring multi-stakeholder partnerships aimed at advancing the SDGs. It outlines lifecycle stages of partnerships and emphasizes principles like transparency, trust, and mutual benefit.

17	Equator Principles	Equator Principles Association	Equator Principles Association. (2020). The Equator Principles. https://equator-principles. com/	The Equator Principles are a globally adopted risk-management framework used by financial institutions to ensure environmental and social due diligence in project finance. They establish multilateral norms for financing private sector infrastructure in developing countries, focusing on managing ESG risks in formal PPP-like arrangements.
18	ICC Principles on Sustainable Investment	ICC	International Chamber of Commerce. (2024). ICC Principles for Sustainable Trade Finance. https://www. icc-austria. org/fxdata/iccws/prod/media/downloads/2024-ICC-Principles-for-Sustainable-Trade-Finance-1. pdf	This framework strengthens the voice of the private sector in shaping global investment rules. It sets out principles for ESG integration, cross-border accountability, and participation in UN-level dialogues to align global finance with sustainability.
19	Mesa de donantes: Cooperación internacional para el desarrollo sostenible en Colombia.	Centro de Pensamiento Estratégico Internacional (CEPEI)	Centro de Pensamiento Estratégico Internacional (CEPEI). (2005). Mesa de donantes: Cooperación internacional para el desarrollo sostenible en Colombia. https://cepei. org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/mesa-de-donantes. pdf	Donor Tables have been used on numerous occasions as a strategy to obtain cooperation resources and use them to promote development and reconstruction processes and respond to emergency situations.

4. Highlights and conclusions.

Summary of findings.

The 19 frameworks reviewed present a wide spectrum of how the private sector is positioned within the landscape of development and multilateral cooperation. Some frameworks cast the private sector primarily as a source of resources and technical capacity. Here, the role expected of business is to bring in capital, technology, and operational know-how, usually at the project or programme level. The CAF Sustainable Finance Framework and the EIB PPP Guide are good examples as they set clear operational expectations for private partners but position them within pre-defined public or multilateral agendas.

A second group of frameworks focuses on the private sector as a normative actor, encouraging alignment with global standards and values without prescribing direct governance roles. For example, the UN Global Compact Ten Principles and WBCSD's Vision 2050 articulate strong expectations on responsible conduct and alignment with SDGs. In these cases, the private sector's influence is reputational, signalling commitment through voluntary adherence to shared principles.

A smaller set of frameworks portray the private sector as a strategic partner in co-designing solutions and shaping development priorities. These are less common but notable for their attempt to formalise collaboration. The Sevilla Commitment and UNIDO's Programme for Country Partnerships (PCPs) exemplify this approach, giving private actors a seat in steering committees, policy platforms, or investment pipeline governance. The SDG Partnership Guidebook also falls in this category, with its detailed governance templates and partnership lifecycle management tools.

Taken together, **these frameworks show overall recognition of the strategic importance of the private sector. Yet they also show that the private sector has not yet fully integrated it as an institutional partner.** The private sector role is most often limited to implementation and/or financing. Yet it is worth noting that the most complete frameworks (CAF or IFC) combine financial and regulatory incentives (such as blended finance, guarantees, and results-based conditions) with political dialogue instruments and clear rules of engagement.

In practical terms, this means that **private sector engagement in multilateralism and development approaches is broad but shallow.** Companies are visible across a wide array of initiatives and funding mechanisms, and their contributions to innovation, capital mobilisation, and service delivery are well acknowledged. But **their influence on planning and prioritisation (including for programs that rely on the private sector to be operational), is far more limited**.

This matters because the scale and complexity of today's development challenges, from climate transition to digital inclusion, demand solutions that combine public mandates, private capabilities, and shared accountability**.** Without stronger, institutionalised mechanisms for the private sector to help identify priorities and solutions, and share governance responsibility, multilateralism risks under-utilising one of its most important potential allies.

A forward-looking insight is that **there seems to be a shift from frameworks focused on individual projects to those structured by sector, country, or region, which is a welcome change and aligned with the findings of the literature review**, as they can likely enable greater impact, scalability, and administrative efficiency.

Key findings per analysis criteria across the frameworks.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment.

All frameworks link private sector involvement to the SDGs or development goals. But in most cases, this is done in general terms. Only a few frameworks clearly explain what both sides aim to achieve while most of the frameworks assume that companies will follow development priorities without spelling out "what's in it for them" a point that has also emerged in several interviews so far.

2. Institutional roles & partnerships architecture.

Similarly, few frameworks define clear roles for public and private actors. Most treat the private sector as a partner in delivery, not in decision-making. Only a small number offer structured ways for companies to take part in planning or governance (e. g. boards, committees, or formal coordination platforms). In most cases, cooperation is based on projects, not long-term arrangements.

3. Engagement & financing instruments.

Many frameworks include well-developed financial tools to attract private investment (e. g. blended finance, guarantees, or sustainability-linked bonds). These are especially common in frameworks from development banks. However, the financial tools are usually not connected to broader partnership structures or joint planning processes.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards.

Most frameworks include ex-ante tools to ensure private sector alignment with development goals. These include ESG screening, due diligence, eligibility criteria. However, few frameworks provide systems to monitor or manage performance during implementation. Dispute resolution, role adjustment mechanisms, and partnership review protocols are largely absent. When they are mentioned (e. g. , EIB PPP Guide), they are typically embedded in contractual structures, not in institutional design.

5. Integrity, accountability & results.

Many frameworks include basic monitoring or reporting elements, especially where public resources or investor-facing instruments are involved, for example impact reports, ESG disclosures, or alignment with standard indicators. However, most frameworks define reporting as a technical requirement rather than a shared governance function.

Insights addressing our four policy themes.

A. Policy and governance.

Findings.

Across the frameworks reviewed, there is broad recognition that private sector engagement must be aligned with the mandates and policy priorities of multilateral institutions and, ultimately, with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). However, in practice, most frameworks do not embed the private sector into formal governance arrangements. Instead, they tend to rely on commitments such principle-based pledges or informal consultation processes. Individual corporate initiative cna then make a big difference in the degree of participation in the context of the existing collaboration frameworks.

OECD contributions are normative, setting principles for accountability and alignment but without institutional mechanisms. Private-sector alliances (e. g. , ICC, WBCSD) emphasize business leadership but lack structured co-governance authority. Overall, the UN frameworks are most advanced in policy integration, while MDBs remain more transaction oriented.

Yet there are exceptions that point to more structured integration. For instance, UNIDO's Programme for Country Partnerships (PCPs) proposes joint steering committees to give private sector representatives a seat in national planning and monitoring processes. The Sevilla Commitment proposes country platforms through Integrated National Financing Frameworks (INFFs) that formally bring together governments, multilateral agencies, and the private sector to co-manage investment pipelines. These arrangements are still emerging, but they demonstrate how governance integration could be operationalised.

B. Investment and finance.

Findings.

This is the area where frameworks display the highest degree of maturity. Many of the initiatives reviewed provide concrete mechanisms to mobilise private capital for development objectives, particularly through blend-

ed finance, guarantees, and co-investment structures. MDBs remain the anchor institutions in this area, while UN and OECD frameworks provide legitimacy and norms.

The IFC–MIGA Private Sector Window is a strong example of a well-defined approach. It combines multiple layers of risk mitigation (from political risk guarantees to local currency hedging) with governance rules that ensure coordination between World Bank Group entities. This structure lowers barriers for private investors in fragile and low-income markets, where perceived risk often outweighs potential returns.

Similarly, CAF's Sustainable Finance Framework demonstrates how labelled bonds (green, social, and sustainability) can be used to attract institutional investors while maintaining alignment with robust ESG safeguards.

The OECD DAC Blended Finance Principles reinforce discipline by clarifying development rationale and additionality. UN frameworks, such as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and Scaling SDG Finance, recognize blended finance and SDG-linked instruments but fall short on detailed operational design. Private-sector initiatives (ICC Sustainable Trade Finance, UNGC Sustainable Finance reports) push innovation on ESG-linked tools but depend on uptake by MDBs.

Persistent barriers remain across most frameworks. Currency risk, underdeveloped local capital markets, and inadequate project pipelines continue to constrain investment flows to low-income countries. Overall, this is an area where innovation is happening (green bonds, sustainability-linked loans) but where these tools are not yet fully embedded in the standard operating procedures of most multilateral institutions.

C. Public and private partnerships (PPPs).

Findings.

The PPP frameworks in the sample, particularly those developed by multilateral development banks, are among the most technically detailed. Indeed, MDB-led PPP frameworks are the most technically mature, focusing on contractual risk allocation, bankability, and long-term service delivery. However, they remain infrastructure-centric, with a scope typically limited to transport, energy, and other physical infrastructure sectors, with less attention to social sectors such as health, education, or climate adaptation, areas where PPP models could also be transformative for the SDGs.

UN and hybrid frameworks (e. g. , SDG Partnership Guidebook) expand the PPP concept toward shared value, inclusive governance, and joint monitoring. Finally, private-sector initiatives introduce partnership governance toolkits and innovative approaches but lack enforcement capacity. Overall, MDBs excel in technical PPP design, while UN and private-sector frameworks bring innovation on SDG integration.

Broader governance considerations are often underdeveloped. Anti-corruption provisions, dispute resolution systems, and joint monitoring arrangements are not consistently present.

D. Global coordination and diplomacy.

Findings.

Global coordination is arguably the weakest of the four policy areas. Frameworks such as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Sevilla Commitment articulate the need for multi-stakeholder alignment at the global level, but the mechanisms to sustain private sector involvement in these processes are often vague or temporary.

UN frameworks lead on diplomacy, leveraging legitimacy and convening power. Private-sector and third-sector initiatives (e. g. , ICC, WBCSD) contribute thought leadership but lack systemic influence in formal multilateral fora. The conclusion is that the UN is indispensable for global coordination, but needs stronger operational channels to move from consultation to structured co-decision with the private sector.

In practice, private sector engagement in global diplomacy tends to occur through forums, summits, and side events, high-visibility moments that provide networking opportunities but do not necessarily translate into sustained policy influence or co-decision-making. There are few examples of permanent, cross-border structures where private actors have a defined role in agenda-setting, negotiation, and follow-up.

The Sevilla Commitment makes a partial move in this direction by embedding private sector participation within country-level investment platforms that are linked to global SDG priorities.

This lack of institutionalised channels for “private sector diplomacy” limits the ability of businesses to contribute consistently to shaping multilateral policy and tracking outcomes.

Insights from the analysis of the leading type of organization.

Multilateral development banks and regional development banks.

MDBs and regional banks (e. g. , IFC–MIGA PSW, IDB PPPs, CAF Sustainable Finance) are the most advanced in operationalizing private sector engagement through financing instruments. They provide concrete structures for blended finance, guarantees, co-investment, and in CAF's case, labelled bonds backed by ESG safeguards. Their comparative strength lies in financial innovation and risk-sharing mechanisms that attract private capital into high-risk markets. However, their frameworks tend to remain narrowly focused on investment and infrastructure, often underdeveloped in governance integration, dispute resolution, or systemic inclusion of private actors in strategic decision-making.

United Nations system and agencies.

UN entities (e. g. , UNIDO PCPs, UN Global Compact, Sevilla Commitment, Addis Ababa Action Agenda) stand out for their convening power and ability to set norms that link business engagement with SDG priorities. They provide legitimacy, policy frameworks, and coordination channels that situate private sector action within global development goals. Yet these frameworks often remain aspirational or principle based. They articulate the importance of private sector roles but lack the financial architecture or institutionalized mechanisms to translate ambition into consistent practice. Exceptions such as UNIDO's PCPs or the Sevilla Commitment show the potential of joint steering committees and country platforms, but these remain the exception rather than the norm.

OECD and standard setters.

OECD frameworks (e. g. , DAC Blended Finance Principles, Results Frameworks) provide widely recognized benchmarks that codify good practice in mobilizing private finance and structuring effective partnerships. Their strength lies in setting clear principles. However, as standard setters, they are not implementers. This limits their ability to translate principles into practice or ensure consistent uptake across multilateral institutions.

Private sector and third sector alliances.

Business-led or hybrid frameworks (e. g. , ICC Principles on Sustainable Trade Finance, WBCSD Vision 2050, SDG Partnership Guidebook) bring innovation, practical partnership models, and tools tailored to business realities. They emphasize shared value creation, lifecycle approaches to partnerships, and ESG integration. Their advantage is proximity to the private sector, which allows them to design mechanisms that resonate with corporate incentives. Yet they depend heavily on voluntary uptake and lack enforcement or institutional authority. Without integration into multilateral mandates, their contribution remains important but uneven.

Taken together, the four groups of frameworks illustrate both the **diversity and fragmentation of approaches to private sector engagement in multilateralism**. MDBs and regional banks lead on financial sophistication, but governance integration remains limited. UN agencies excel at norm-setting and convening, yet too often stop at aspirational commitments without operational mechanisms. Standard setters such as the OECD provide principles and benchmarks that are widely used but lack direct implementation capacity. Private sector–led alliances bring innovation and practical partnership tools but depend on voluntary adherence and lack institutional weight.

The comparative analysis shows that no single group provides a complete model. A more effective architecture for multilateral–private collaboration will require combining the financial rigor of MDBs, the convening legitimacy of the UN, the normative guidance of standard setters, and the innovative energy of private alliances into a more coherent and mutually reinforcing system.

Insights from the analysis by mandate.

As part of the analysis all the framework documents have been analysed under the prism of the mandates and areas of work of MIs are the case studies about or what mandate they tackle.

These themes are:

- Private Sector & Peace and Security.
- Private Sector & Development Cooperation.
- Private Sector & Human Rights.
- Private Sector & Humanitarian Action.

Mandate Theme	No. of Frameworks	% of Total (20)
Private Sector & Peace and Security	1	5. 0%
Private Sector & Development Cooperation	17	85. 0%
Private Sector & Human Rights	8	40. 0%
Private Sector & Humanitarian Action	2	10. 0%

While this is not a representative sample, it is a simple exercise that sheds light over the potential gaps of Private Sector and multilateral institutions regarding its scope. Notably, development cooperation is by far the most common area of collaboration between MIs and PS, with 85% of the analysed frameworks tackling Private Sector & Development Cooperation. This shows the potential of this scope of collaboration to deepen its reach and results.

On the contrary, barely 5% of the analysed frameworks tackle “Private Sector & Peace and Security”. While this was not the focus of the study, it does suggest that in this area there might be potential to develop and integrate Private sector activity to promote, enhance, maintain and arrive at peace, a scenario most favourable to most businesses.
Regarding Private Sector & Human Rights, 40% of the analysed frameworks tackle this area, showing an important presence and willingness to involve the PS in this key area. Frameworks and guidance facilitate the observation and promotion of Human Rights when the Private Sector operates in certain scenarios and regions.

Finally, when analysing Private Sector & Humanitarian Action, just 10 % of the framework documents observe this mandate. This again might be an area for further private sector involvement, particularly sharing logistics and technology innovations that can help the deployment of humanitarian action safer and more effective.

Emerging Conclusions.

The comparative review of 19 institutional frameworks reveals **a significant but underutilized potential for private sector engagement in multilateral cooperation.** As mentioned before, while recognition of the private sector's role is widespread, operational models remain fragmented, and most frameworks still fall short of institutionalizing collaboration beyond transactional arrangements. The above can be summarized in the following overarching conclusions:

- **Structured engagement between multilateral institutions and the private sector is the exception.** Most frameworks provide limited or informal pathways for business involvement, often limited to consultation or implementation roles. Only a few establish formal coordination mechanisms or recurring engagement structures.
- **Shared risk structures are essential to mobilizing private capital but remain unevenly defined.** While blended finance is frequently referenced, few frameworks offer replicable models with clear design features (including risk sharing formulas) that can help lower entry barriers for private investors.
- **Operationally, there is a gap in governance, transparency, and compliance mechanisms.** Most frameworks lack tools for joint monitoring, integrity assurance, or dispute resolution. Some exceptions include second-party verification or and external reporting aligned with ESG standards.
- **Private sector input into policy and agenda-setting remains limited.** Although several frameworks acknowledge the need for business involvement in shaping development priorities few offer defined institutional roles. The Sevilla Commitment moves toward structured multi-stakeholder governance, but much more detail is required regarding the operationalization of co-decision models.
- **Collaboration with the private sector is not yet embedded in the core mandate and governance of multilateral institutions unless they are the private sector arm of an organization.** Most institutions refer to business actors as stakeholders, but this is rarely reflected in mandates, staffing, or reporting structures. Only in a handful of cases (such as CAF, which reserves a board seat for the private sector) is collaboration institutionalized. Establishing clearer expectations, KPIs, or collaboration targets in MI strategies would help enable long-term partnerships tied to SDG outcomes.

Emerging Recommendations.

- **Structured engagement platforms.** Experience suggests that facilitating a defined role for the private sector to participate in steering committees or country platforms improves alignment. Future frameworks should make joint governance bodies (boards, advisory panels, or country platforms) an indispensable tool with clear mandates, reporting duties.
- **Standard risk-sharing tools.** The examples show how layered guarantees, local currency hedging, and first-loss facilities can reduce barriers for private investors. New frameworks should build on these examples by offering a standard set of risk-sharing instruments that can be applied quickly and systematically, rather than negotiated case by case.
- **Governance and accountability.** Second-party verification and public impact reporting highlights the importance of credibility. New frameworks should build governance mechanisms (e. g. monitoring dashboards), facilitating co-responsibility, where both public and private actors are measured against financial and development outcomes.
- **Private sector participation in policy design.** Most frameworks involve business at a later stage, focusing on implementation rather than design. Tools like the SDG Partnership Guidebook show how this can change. Future frameworks should enable early value-added dialogue with private sector representatives in policy groups, investment pipeline design, and/or SDG platforms, with rules that guarantee regular, structured participation while addressing conflict of interest risks.

5. In depth framework analysis.

A. Multilateral development banks (MDBs) and regional development banks.

Framework 1: WBG Collaboration: proposal for an IFC–MIGA private sector window in IDA18.

World Bank Group. (2016, June 8). WBG collaboration: Proposal for an IFC-MIGA private sector window in IDA18. IDA Resource Mobilization Department (DFiRM). Link.

Executive summary.

This framework establishes a $2.5 billion **Private Sector Window (PSW)** within IDA18, designed as a joint initiative between the **International Development Association (IDA)**, **International Finance Corporation (IFC)**, and **Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA)**. The PSW's goal is to catalyse private investment in **fragile and conflict-affected states (FCS)** and other low-income countries, where risk and market failures often deter capital flows.

The PSW introduces six facility types—ranging from **risk mitigation and local currency hedging** to **SME guarantees and first-loss equity participation**—aimed at overcoming market gaps that prevent private sector involvement. It emphasizes **minimum concessionality**, **robust governance**, and a **One WBG** approach that allows for flexible and tailored financing solutions.

Role of the private sector.

The private sector is positioned as the primary driver of development financing in fragile contexts. It is engaged through equity, debt, and blended finance tools designed to offset non-commercial risks and incentivize investments in high-risk sectors such as infrastructure, agriculture, and SMEs.

Role of multilateral institutions.

IDA provides concessional capital and policy support. IFC structures, originates, and co-invests. MIGA de-risks through political risk insurance and guarantees. Together, they create a unified delivery mechanism to mobilize private finance aligned with IDA18's development priorities.

Scope of partnerships.

The PSW builds layered partnerships: (i) internal WBG collaboration through joint diagnostics and project origination, (ii) co-investment with private capital and philanthropic actors, and (iii) alignment with government reform agendas in target countries.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment – 2. 5/3.

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs** – *Fully covered.* Clear and complementary goals are outlined: private actors are expected to generate jobs, innovation, and infrastructure in fragile contexts, while MIs enable risk-sharing, impact alignment, and market entry.
- **An (structured) alignment of incentives** – *Fully covered.* Incentives are aligned through shared-risk facilities, concessional first-loss capital, and performance metrics linked to development results.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges** – *Partially covered.* Solutions target market failures in infrastructure, SME finance, and agriculture through instruments like risk hedging and de-risked co-investment—but innovation in digital finance or climate risk is limited.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture – 4/4.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization** – *Fully covered.* Each WBG arm and private sector actor has clearly defined operational, financing, and delivery functions across project lifecycles.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration** – *Fully covered.* Rule-based governance models, senior oversight bodies, and arms-length agreements structure coordination and mitigate conflicts of interest.

- **Definition of partnerships and mechanisms to partner between PS and MIs** – *Fully covered.* Formal facilities and joint implementation platforms are described in detail. Examples include Risk Mitigation Facility and Co-Investment Facility.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs** – *Fully covered.* Engagement is institutionalized through joint diagnostics, project origination, co-financing platforms, and operational alignment across the WBG.

3. Engagement & financing instruments – 4/4.

- **Blended finance structure** – *Fully covered.* The PSW is designed around blended finance principles, using IDA concessional capital to de-risk private investment via IFC and MIGA.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms** – *Fully covered.* Facilities include local currency hedging, first-loss guarantees, SME risk-sharing, and equity co-investment in fragile markets.
- **Private sector investment mechanism** – *Fully covered.* Multiple channels are provided for mobilizing private capital: ring-fenced facilities, risk participation structures, and co-investment funds.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms** – *Fully covered.* Structures include first-loss positions, reinsurance, political risk guarantees, and layered facilities for infrastructure and SME finance.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards – 2/3.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities** – *Fully covered.* Facilities are linked to SDG-relevant metrics (e. g. , jobs, gender inclusion, resilience), and development impact is a criterion for concessionality.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms** – *Partially covered.* MIGA's political risk insurance offers dispute resolution indirectly; however, a formal, cross-institutional mechanism is not described.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism** – *Fully covered.* Standard investment review, risk committees, environmental and social safeguards, and pricing frameworks are used across IFC/MIGA.

5. Integrity, accountability & results – 1. 5/2.

- **Anti-corruption mechanism** – *Partially covered.* While integrity standards are embedded in MIGA/IFC protocols, the PSW proposal does not describe specific anti-corruption measures.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results** – *Fully covered.* A results-based management system aligned to IDA18 tracks capital mobilization, job creation (especially women/youth), and sectoral reach.

Conclusion – 88/100.

The PSW under IDA18 represents one of the most operationally sophisticated institutional frameworks for mobilizing private finance in high-risk development settings. Its multi-layered design, rigorous governance, and emphasis on additionality make it a robust model. However, it would benefit from clearer articulation of anti-corruption protocols and broader innovation in inclusive finance domains such as digitalization and climate adaptation. Its alignment with WBG goals and operational maturity position it as a replicable instrument for other MDB-led initiatives.

Framework 2: Financing of public-private partnerships: ppps in latin america and the caribbean (IDB).

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), 2020. https://publications. iadb. org/publications/english/document/Financing-of-Public-Private-Partnerships. pdf.

Executive summary.

This report by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) explores the challenges and strategies for financing public-private partnerships (PPPs) in Latin America and the Caribbean. While PPPs are recognized as tools for closing the infrastructure gap, the report highlights persistent constraints—especially related to local capital markets, institutional investor participation, and fiscal risk management. It underscores the catalytic role of national development banks and multilateral institutions in crowding in private capital through blended finance and risk-sharing instruments, in particular:

- Providing guarantees, insurance, and concessional loans.
- Supporting project preparation.
- Assisting governments in regulatory reform and capacity building.
- Helping structure bankable PPPs (pp. 5, 9–10, 14).

The report also discusses regulatory frameworks, institutional capacity, and innovations in financing mechanisms as key factors for effective PPP implementation. It provides actionable recommendations for developing sustainable pipelines and deepening local financial markets to improve project bankability and long-term investment flow.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment – 3/3.

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the Mis.** *Fully covered.* Private sector seeks bankable, risk-adjusted investment opportunities with long-term certainty. MIs (e. g. , IDB) aim to facilitate infrastructure finance, deepen local markets, and achieve SDG-aligned development outcomes.
- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* Tools such as viability gap funding, minimum revenue guarantees, and blended finance instruments are proposed to align risk-return expectations between public and private actors.

- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Fully covered.* Promotes project bonds, refinancing tools, and local currency solutions to address currency mismatch and financing gaps. Calls for developing secondary markets and new credit instruments.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture – 3/4.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Fully covered.* Private sector: finance, construct, operate infrastructure. MIs. catalyse private investment, provide credit enhancements, support project prep and capacity building.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Partially covered.* Recommends transparent procurement and fiscal oversight frameworks but leaves formal governance design to national discretion.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* While co-financing and credit enhancement partnerships are promoted, institutionalized frameworks (e. g. , platforms, pooled funds) are not defined.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* Emphasizes development banks and governments as enablers. Engagement occurs through project preparation support, blended instruments, and long-term co-financing.

3. Engagement & financing instruments – 4/4.

- **Blended finance structure.** *Fully covered.* Central focus. IDB's role as blended finance facilitator is clearly articulated—using concessional capital, guarantees, subordinated debt, and risk mitigation tools.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Includes refinancing instruments, liquidity windows, project bonds, securitization, and customized credit solutions tailored to LAC market constraints.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Discusses equity participation, commercial debt, institutional investor channels, and development of investable project pipelines across the PPP lifecycle.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Strong emphasis on risk mitigation, including minimum revenue guarantees, partial credit/risk guarantees, and contingent public support mechanisms.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (1. 5/3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* Infrastructure and service delivery projects are framed to deliver public value while providing commercial returns. Encourages SDG-aligned capital investment.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* No reference to legal or arbitration provisions for resolving PPP disputes.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Partially covered.* Emphasis project prep, financial structuring, and risk analysis, but no standardized approach for environmental, social, or stakeholder safeguards.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (0. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* Highlights transparency, procurement standards, and regulatory clarity as enablers of trust, but lacks explicit anti-corruption systems or enforcement mechanisms.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Not covered.* While performance-based contracts are encouraged, no detailed M&E framework or shared metrics approach is included.

Conclusion (75/100).

This IDB framework provides one of the most practical assessments of PPP financing challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean. It offers realistic policy tools to improve bankability and deepen local financial markets, including blended finance instruments, credit enhancements, and institutional investor mobilization.

Its main contribution is in the financial architecture and risk-sharing design of PPPs. However, governance, accountability, and safeguards are delegated to national authorities, with limited guidance on transparency, compliance, or social oversight. Strengthening those dimensions—especially dispute resolution and M&E—would further enhance PPP sustainability and public trust in the region. Further, it provides a valuable set of recommendations:

- Strengthening enabling environments for PPPs, including legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks (p. 13).
- Expanding the use of blended finance and risk mitigation instruments (pp. 9–10).
- Enhancing project preparation facilities to generate more bankable projects (p. 14).
- Encouraging the use of local capital markets and institutional investors (p. 16).
- Improving fiscal monitoring and public accountability mechanisms for PPP contracts (p. 12).

Framework 3: Guide to public and private partnerships, European Investment Bank.

European Investment Bank (EIB) – European PPP Expertise Centre (EPEC), 2024 https://www. eib. org/en/readonline-publications/epec-ppp-guide-welcome.

Executive summary.

The EIB's Guide to Public-Private Partnerships, developed by the European PPP Expertise Centre (EPEC), offers a comprehensive operational framework for public authorities involved in designing and delivering PPPs. While tailored to the EU context, the guide's structure, principles, and tools are broadly applicable to PPP practitioners globally.

The guide supports public institutions across all stages of the PPP lifecycle — from project identification and assessment to procurement and implementation. It provides tools to evaluate whether a PPP is the appropriate delivery model, structure contractual relationships, and manage performance over time.

The guidelines emphasize four key pillars of effective PPP design. First, a lifecycle approach that considers long-term costs, risks, and benefits from conception through operation. Second, risk allocation to the party best positioned to manage each risk, ensuring project viability. Third, a strong focus on performance-based contracts that link private payments to the achievement of public service outputs. And fourth, guidance on private financing models, including their budgetary implications and conditions for financial close.

The guide defines PPPs as long-term contractual relationships between a public authority and a private company for the delivery of public services. It outlines governance structures involving project steering committees, multidisciplinary teams, and bid evaluation panels. Stakeholder engagement is encouraged from the earliest phase, with structured processes to manage communication, feedback, and long-term relationships.

Structure analysis.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (2. 5/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Partially covered.* The guide clearly defines objectives for the public and private sectors, especially around value for money, service delivery, and efficiency. These include:

  - To improve the quality of a service and its outputs (effectiveness, efficiency).
  - To reduce the cost of the required inputs (economy).
  - To meet a legal or regulatory requirement (compliance).
  - To replace an expiring arrangement or an asset no longer fit for purpose.
  - To advance social and/or environmental benefits (advancement).

- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* The guide stresses performance-based contracts (page 8), value-for-money (VfM) assessments, and risk-sharing mechanisms to align incentives between public and private partners (pages 18–19). It promotes output-focused procurement, ensuring that private sector revenue depends on meeting public service objectives (page 32).
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Partially covered.* The guide touches on sustainability and climate resilience, especially in line with EU policy objectives, and emphasizes performance-based infrastructure delivery, which is indirectly aligned with tackling service gaps and institutional challenges.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (2/4).

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Partially covered.* The guide explicitly defines roles in a PPP structure:

  - Public sector: identifies the need, structures the project, ensures affordability, manages the contract, and provides regulatory oversight.
  - Private sector: designs, builds, finances, operates, and maintains infrastructure /services. While MIs are not extensively discussed, they are assumed to act as advisors, co-financiers, or guarantors.

- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Partially covered.* The governance framework includes a project steering committee (or board), a multi-disciplinary project management team, and bid evaluation panels. However, no MI-specific governance mechanisms are defined.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanisms to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* The guide discusses PPP contractual structures in detail, including availability-based, user-fee-based, and DBFO models, but lacks formal mechanisms for MI–PS collaboration.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* The guide is designed for public authorities engaging the private sector. Multilateral institutions like the EIB are implicitly involved in PPP financing and technical assistance, but no formal structure for MI–PS engagement is presented.

3. Engagement & financing instruments (3/ 4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Partially covered.* The guide recognizes multiple sources of financing, including public funds, user fees, and private capital, but does not outline blended structures involving concessional capital or structured co-financing.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* The guide focuses on standard PPP tools with some innovations for PPP (availability payments, user-pays models, performance-linked payments). Newer financial instruments like impact bonds or climate-linked finance are beyond its scope.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* The guide details project finance structures (page 28), availability payments and user tariffs (pages 19–21), and contractual protections to support long-term private capital commitment (pages 63–72). Competitive procurement is emphasized (page 125).
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* The guide provides detailed guidance on risk allocation across the PPP lifecycle.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* The guide emphasizes the role of PPPs in improving public service delivery, aligning private incentives with social outcomes through VfM analysis, affordability assessments, and environmental/social safeguards.

- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* The guide identifies the need for dispute resolution clauses in PPP contracts, recommending negotiation and escalation protocols, independent expert review etc.
- **Due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* The guide lays out a comprehensive due diligence process, including legal, technical, financial, and environmental feasibility studies (pages 39–40), risk assessments (page 40), VfM tests (page 19), and affordability/fiscal analyses (page 85).

5. Integrity, Accountability and Results (1. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* The guide emphasizes transparency, competitive bidding, and audit trails, but does not offer dedicated anti-corruption tools (e. g. , whistle-blower mechanisms).
- **Accountability: monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* The guide recommends performance-based contracts with KPIs embedded in the contract, ongoing contract management, and monitoring mechanisms to ensure accountability throughout the project lifecycle.

Conclusion (63/100).

This guide is a solid and operationally mature manual for the design and delivery of Public-Private Partnerships. Its main strengths lie in its detailed treatment of project governance, risk allocation, and financial structuring. It provides actionable tools across the PPP lifecycle and clearly defines the division of responsibilities between public authorities and private partners.

However, while multilateral institutions like the EIB are implicitly referenced, the guide does not articulate formal engagement mechanisms with international organizations or define their roles within governance structures. It also only partially addresses innovation in finance and accountability. While monitoring, dispute resolution, and performance-based contracting are well covered, the guide remains narrowly focused on traditional PPP models without linking clearly to broader development cooperation or climate finance frameworks.

Despite these limitations, it stands as a technically rigorous and useful resource for national governments and implementing agencies seeking to structure bankable and accountable infrastructure partnerships.

Framework 4: CAF. Sustainable finance framework (2023).

CAF – Development Bank of Latin America and the Caribbean https://www. caf. com.

Executive summary.

The CAF Sustainable Finance Framework outlines a structured mechanism for issuing Green, Social, and Sustainability Bonds, aligned with international standards such as the ICMA Green Bond Principles (GBP), Social Bond Principles (SBP), and Sustainability Bond Guidelines (SBG). The framework aims to position CAF as a leading regional actor in mobilizing private capital toward SDG-aligned, climate-sensitive, and inclusive development outcomes. It establishes clear principles for eligible project categories, bond proceeds management, transparency, and impact reporting. While CAF's framework focuses on capital markets-based instruments, its approach to structuring engagement between the private sector and multilateral development mandates remains indirect and financial in nature, rather than institutional or co-governance oriented.

CAF highlights its intention to integrate ESG standards, strengthen disclosure, and adopt global benchmarks for sustainable finance credibility. Private sector participation is implicit, primarily through project implementation and bond subscription, while multilateral alignment is pursued through peer positioning, standard adherence, and joint validation processes.

The framework emphasizes a multi-tiered partnership approach. While the role of the private sector is not formalized through structured co-governance, its participation is nonetheless central. Private actors are engaged primarily in two capacities: as capital providers purchasing sustainability bonds and as project implementers executing eligible initiatives. CAF collaborates with capital market investors through labelled bond issuances and engages implementation partners at the project level to ensure delivery of impact-aligned outcomes. It anchors its framework in globally recognized standards such as the ICMA Green Bond Principles and the Harmonized Framework for Impact Reporting, ensuring alignment with international norms. This strategic orientation strengthens market credibility, investor confidence, and cross-border comparability.

Structured analysis.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (Score: 2/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs** – *Partially covered.* CAF's strategic role is well articulated: mobilize sustainable capital and deliver regional development impact. The private sector's role is implied but not fully delineated beyond its function as an investor and implementer.
- **Alignment of incentives** – *Partially covered.* CAF aligns investor interest with development goals by issuing labelled bonds with clear ESG outcomes. However, it does not incorporate incentive-based mechanisms like performance pricing, tax alignment, or outcome-linked structures.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges** – *Fully covered.* CAF's framework promotes investment in renewable energy, water security, biodiversity, inclusive infrastructure, and gender-sensitive development, aligning with the SDG agenda and regional development needs.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (Score: 3/4).

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization** – *Covered.* CAF acts as issuer, evaluator, and proceeds manager. Private sector actors are implementers or investors, but their engagement is not formalized through co-design or strategic partnerships.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration/engagement** – *Covered. CAF is the only MIs that has a permanent seat at the Board for the private sector.* No explicit mechanism is mentioned regarding other MIs.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs** – *Covered.* CAF aligns with international frameworks (e.g. ICMA, SBP), and has mechanisms to ensure dialogue with the PS.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs** – *Partially covered.* Engagement is primarily financial (through bond subscription and project execution), not institutionalized in any particular mechanism.

3. Engagement & financing instruments (Score: 2/4).

- **Blended finance structure** – *Not covered.* The framework does not define blended finance instruments or use public guarantees or concessional capital mechanisms.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms** – *Fully covered.* CAF applies sustainability-labelled bonds, an innovative tool in the region. Its framework enables access to ESG-focused capital and supports alignment with global standards (e. g. , Harmonized Framework for Impact Reporting).
- **Private sector investment mechanism** – *Partially covered.* The private sector invests indirectly by purchasing CAF bonds or implementing projects but does not participate through dedicated co-investment vehicles or facilities.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms** – *Not covered.* No guarantees, insurance, or risk-mitigation tools are introduced.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (Score: 3/3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities** – *Fully covered.* CAF ensures projects meet both financial and development criteria through robust ESG due diligence, alignment with SDGs, and sector-specific KPIs.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms** – *Covered.* CAF likely operates internal grievance mechanisms through its fiduciary controls.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism** – *Fully covered.* The framework includes environmental and social screening, exclusion lists, and monitoring protocols in line with international ESG safeguards.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (Score: 1. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism** – *Partially covered.* CAF's fiduciary controls and exclusion lists suggest anti-corruption safeguards, though they are not detailed.
- **Accountability: monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results** – *Fully covered.* CAF commits to transparent reporting via allocation reports, sector-specific KPIs, and second-party opinions (SPOs) to ensure credibility and compliance with global standards.

Conclusion (70/100).

The CAF Sustainable Finance Framework is a technically solid financial architecture for ESG-aligned bond issuance but falls short of institutionalizing private sector collaboration beyond financial participation. CAF positions sustainable finance not as an ancillary function, but as a central pillar of its institutional mandate. Through the strategic use of labelled instruments such as Green, Social, and Sustainability Bonds, the framework seeks to align investor incentives with the region's environmental and social development priorities. By embedding principles of transparency, third-party validation, and robust ESG risk management, CAF strengthens the credibility and accountability of its financing activities. This approach not only safeguards institutional integrity but also enhances investor confidence.

Ultimately, the framework consolidates CAF's ambition to act as both a regional leader and a global peer in sustainable finance—creating a scalable, credible platform for mobilizing long-term capital across Latin America and the Caribbean.

Framework 5: The ten principles of the UN global compact.

United Nations Global Compact, 2004. https://www. unglobalcompact. org/what-is-gc/mission/principles.

Executive summary.

The UN Global Compact (UNGC) offers a principle-based framework to align corporate conduct with universal values in human rights, labour, the environment, and anti-corruption. By committing to the Ten Principles, companies support the UN's broader mission for responsible business and sustainable development.

The Ten Principles are grounded in internationally recognized frameworks including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ILO conventions, the Rio Declaration, and the UN Convention Against Corruption. They are not prescriptive rules but a foundation for corporate action aligned with ethical standards and SDG priorities. The Compact fosters private sector commitment to public goals through global networking, reporting requirements, peer learning, and coordination with UN bodies.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (2 /3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework is directed at companies, encouraging them to align with sustainability and ethical standards. However, it does not provide explicit objectives for either the private sector's strategic contributions to development or for multilateral institutions as co-actors.
- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* Companies benefit from:

  - Access to the UN Global Compact's global and local networks.
  - Tools and training resources to implement ESG principles.
  - Peer learning and cross-sector collaboration.
  - Reputational alignment with international norms.

- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Not covered.* While the Ten Principles promote broad thematic action on pressing issues like climate, human rights, and governance, they are framed as values rather than instruments or innovations.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture – 2/4.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Partially covered.* Businesses are expected to take voluntary leadership, but roles for MIs and the public sector are not structurally defined in the framework.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Partially covered.* UNGC operates through a mix of global governance bodies (Board, Regional Councils, Government Group) and UN-private sector mechanisms (e. g. Partnership Hub), but without formal joint decision-making structures or contractual instruments.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* While the Compact fosters multi-stakeholder collaboration and provides match-making platforms (e. g. , business. un. org), it does not define co-investment, co-governance, or joint implementation models.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* Structured engagement exists through:

  - UN Private Sector Focal Points.
  - UNGC Board and local networks in 60+ countries.
  - Annual forums and thematic issue platforms.

3. Engagement & financing instruments – 1. 5/4.

- **Blended finance structure.** *Partially covered.* UNGC promotes blended finance as a concept and encourages knowledge exchange on tools like sustainability-linked bonds. This is further supported in related publications (e. g. , 2024 “Accelerating Innovation in Sustainable Finance”).
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* The Compact advocates for ESG integration, outcome-linked instruments, and AI-powered data tools, especially in its thematic workstreams on sustainable finance.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Not covered.* No investment structuring or financing channel is described directly in the Ten Principles or core documentation.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Not covered.* There is no mention of guarantees, credit enhancements, or other de-risking instruments.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards – 2/3.

Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities. *Fully covered.* The Compact provides guidance on how to align strategy with SDGs, including through:

- Corporate purpose alignment.
- ESG indicators.
- Reporting frameworks and issue platforms (e. g. , Women's Empowerment Principles, Business for Peace).

- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* While no legal mechanisms are provided, the framework recommends operational-level grievance mechanisms (esp. under Principle 1) as part of due diligence.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Principles 1–6 promote due diligence in human rights and labour, including:

  - Impact identification and mitigation.
  - Supply chain assessments.
  - Reporting and stakeholder engagement.

5. Integrity, accountability & results – 0. 5/2.

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Principle 10 is supported by:

  - Company-level risk assessments and whistleblower tools.
  - Reporting through Communication on Progress (CoP).
  - A dedicated Working Group and guidance materials.

- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** Not covered. While CoP is required, there is limited oversight or enforceability. The framework lacks a structured M&E model with shared metrics or third-party review.

Conclusion (50/100).

The UN Global Compact's Ten Principles serve as a foundational framework for responsible business conduct. They have helped institutionalize ESG standards, human rights due diligence, and anti-corruption norms across a global network of over 15,000 companies. Their simplicity and universality are key strengths—but also limit their operational depth.

While the framework fosters structured engagement between the UN system and business through networking platforms, local chapters, and soft accountability, it does not define institutional roles, financing mechanisms, or governance protocols. As a normative entry point, it is highly valuable. But as a structural tool for PPP implementation, it is best seen as complementary rather than standalone.

B. United Nations System and United Nations Agencies and Programmes.

Framework 6: Addis Ababa action agenda of the third international conference on financing for development, United Nations , 2015.

https://www. un. org/esa/ffd/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/AAAA_Outcome. pdf.

Executive summary.

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) is a landmark global agreement that provides a comprehensive framework for financing sustainable development and implementing the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It builds on the Monterrey Consensus and the Doha Declaration, establishing a renewed global partnership that recognizes the interdependence of public and private finance, domestic and international flows, and the need for systemic coherence and reform.

The agenda outlines over 100 concrete actions across seven key pillars: domestic resource mobilization, private finance, international development cooperation, trade, debt sustainability, systemic issues, and science, technology, and innovation. It calls for integrated national frameworks, strengthened multilateral coordination, and a central role for the private sector through enabling environments, blended finance, and PPPs.

A dedicated follow-up and review architecture—including the ECOSOC Forum and a UN inter-agency task force—tracks implementation and results. The agenda addresses both structural and institutional gaps and calls for bold investment in data, policy coherence, and innovation to mobilize resources at scale.

Role of the private sector.

The AAAA recognizes the private sector as a critical actor in mobilizing both domestic and international finance. It promotes enabling environments, blended finance, and risk-sharing tools to scale up private sector participation in development. Businesses are called on to align with sustainable development and human rights standards (pp. 9–10, 17–18, 25, 38).

Role of multilateral institutions.

Multilateral organizations such as the UN, IMF, and World Bank are charged with supporting capacity building, coordinating global financing efforts, and ensuring policy coherence. They are expected to align their financing tools and technical support with the AAAA's principles and the 2030 Agenda (pp. 11–13, 24, 37).

Scope of partnerships.

AAAA emphasizes structured engagement platforms—such as the ECOSOC FfD Forum and UN Inter-Agency Task Force—as mechanisms for ongoing collaboration between public, private, and multilateral actors. It supports inclusive governance and multi-level implementation of financing strategies (pp. 3–4, 13, 46–47).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (3/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the Mis.** *Fully covered.* The AAAA defines complementary and mutually reinforcing objectives:

  - Private Sector: To mobilize long-term investment in sustainable and inclusive development, support productive sectors, infrastructure, innovation, and deliver shared value.
  - Multilateral Institutions: To provide technical assistance, policy platforms, concessional financing, and help coordinate and scale global development resources.

- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* Incentive alignment is embedded through policy coherence, ESG frameworks, and enabling environments. The AAAA promotes regulatory clarity, responsible business conduct, and transparency in both public and private spheres.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Fully covered.* Innovation is institutionalized through mechanisms such as the Technology Facilitation Mechanism (TFM), and promoted across green finance, sustainable agriculture, digital inclusion, and impact investing.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Fully covered.* The agenda outlines roles clearly:

  - *Private Sector*: Catalysts of innovation, capital providers, infrastructure developers, and drivers of inclusive business.
  - *International Organizations*: Norm-setters, data providers, conveners, financiers, and policy coherence enablers.

- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Fully covered.* Governance is institutionalized through:

  - Integrated national financing frameworks.
  - Multistakeholder platforms for planning and implementation.
  - MDBs and DFIs playing coordination and oversight roles.

- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* AAAA defines and institutionalizes partnerships:

  - Establishes public-private dialogue platforms (para. 35).
  - Provides tools such as blended finance, joint investment planning, and policy alignment structures.

- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* The agenda formalizes MI–PS engagement through:

  - Country-led strategies.
  - MDBs and UN agencies facilitating co-financing and joint planning.
  - Policy frameworks that integrate PS contributions into national and global development goals.

3. Engagement & financing instruments (4/4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Fully covered.* AAAA endorses blended finance as a core tool. It encourages guarantees, public-private risk sharing, and credit enhancements to crowd in private capital.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Supports instruments including Green and social impact bonds, Diaspora and sovereign wealth funds. Climate finance innovations and results-based models.

- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Provides multiple entry points for PS investment:

  - Impact investing.
  - Capital market development.
  - Infrastructure and SDG-aligned sectors (e. g. , energy, health, water).

- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Risk sharing is explicitly supported via:

  - MDB-backed guarantees and first-loss capital.
  - Concessional loans.
  - Climate risk insurance and financial resilience tools.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (3/3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* AAAA calls for tools framed to generate commercial and developmental value:

  - Co-designed infrastructure platforms.
  - Inclusive business models.
  - SME support and trade capacity building.

- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Supports multilateral legal instruments for trade and investment. Emphasizes dispute resolution through:

  - WTO frameworks.
  - Multilateral coordination for sovereign debt restructuring.

- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* AAAA supports:

  - Screening of PPPs and blended finance for ESG standards.
  - Adoption of OECD Guidelines and UNGPs.
  - Institutional safeguards for responsible business conduct.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (2/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Anti-corruption is a pillar of AAAA:

  - Endorses UNCAC and calls for open data, procurement transparency, and beneficial ownership registries.

- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* Strong accountability framework includes:

  - Annual ECOSOC FfD Forum.
  - Inter-agency task force reporting on SDG-aligned indicators.
  - Strengthening national statistics, results-based finance, and public reporting.

Conclusion (100/100 as a framework, despite limited uptake).

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda offers a globally endorsed, institutionally integrated framework for financing sustainable development. It blends policy coherence, private sector engagement, and institutional reform into a single agenda that spans domestic and international resources, public and private actors, and traditional and innovative tools.

The private sector is positioned as an indispensable partner, with governments and multilateral institutions tasked with building enabling environments and de-risking tools to unlock capital at scale. It emphasizes partnerships based on transparency, national ownership, and shared global commitments. In particular, it calls for enhanced blended finance mechanisms and public-private partnerships (PPPs).

With formal follow-up systems, an annual FfD Forum, and an inter-agency reporting mechanism, it establishes a new governance standard for global development finance. However, the implementation is subject to reliable data systems, mutual accountability, and transparent tracking of commitments and results. While the AAAA remains a landmark commitment on paper, its practical application, especially around tax justice, blended finance deployment, and local governance, reflects ambition but limited practical execution.

Framework 7: Business and the United Nations – Working together towards the SDGs 2015.

https://www. sdgfund. org/sites/default/files/business-and-un/SDGF_BFP_HKSCSRI_Business_and_SDGs-Web_Version. pdf.

Executive summary.

This framework outlines how businesses and the United Nations (UN) can collaboratively support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through strategic partnerships, aligned incentives, and scalable action. It is intended as a practical guide for companies and UN entities seeking to engage more effectively with one another in the context of sustainable development.

The main objective is to bridge the disconnect between the private sector and the UN system, creating a mutually beneficial collaboration model to achieve the SDGs. It does this by:

- Addressing barriers to partnership.
- Identifying practical mechanisms and incentives.
- Sharing success stories and best practices.

Key framework pillars.

- **Shared Value Creation.** Encourages companies to move beyond CSR to core business integration of SDGs. Promotes the "business case" for sustainable development (profitability + impact). Emphasizes long-term value, risk mitigation, and market expansion.
- **Trust and Transparency.** Recognizes the trust deficit between companies and UN agencies. Recommends clear accountability, mutual respect, and transparency in roles and expectations.
- **Complementarity.** Stresses that companies and the UN have complementary roles: The UN provides legitimacy, development expertise, and access to marginalized communities. Businesses offer innovation, investment, and scalable solutions.

Mechanisms for Engagement outlines a five-part model (pp. 12–14) to structure partnerships:

- Define Shared Objectives – Align business goals with SDG priorities.
- Establish the Right Partnership Model – Choose between operational, financial, or strategic models.

- Design Governance Structures – Agree on accountability, decision-making, and risk-sharing.
- Secure Resources – Allocate funding, talent, and capabilities.
- Monitor and Report Impact – Use common metrics and transparent reporting.

Role of partnerships.

The report places strong emphasis on multi-stakeholder partnerships as a necessary foundation for achieving the SDGs. It argues that neither the public nor private sector can solve development challenges alone. Effective SDG implementation requires collaboration across business, governments, civil society, and the UN system. The United Nations is positioned as a neutral platform that can help align business objectives with development goals and facilitate coordination (pp. 6, 9, 24, 32).

Role of the private sector.

Businesses are portrayed as key actors in driving innovation, investment, and implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The report stresses that companies have a responsibility to integrate the SDGs into their strategies—not only for impact, but also for long-term competitiveness. Moreover, the private sector is encouraged to redefine its role beyond profit, contributing to inclusive growth and sustainable development. It also identifies how companies can create shared value and scale up impact through core operations, supply chains, and partnerships (pp. 7, 11–12, 16, 26–27).

Role of multilateral institutions.

The UN is described as a trusted convener, able to bridge sectors, build trust, and provide policy direction. Its role includes guiding private sector alignment with SDG priorities, offering credibility, and facilitating access to development contexts. UN agencies are also involved in co-designing programs, convening dialogue, and linking local needs with global resources and standards. The report outlines how collaboration with multilateral agencies strengthens both accountability and impact (pp. 5–6, 9, 23–24, 3.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (2. 5/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Fully covered.*

  - Businesses aim to contribute to SDGs while advancing commercial goals such as innovation,- market access, and reputation.
  - UN agencies seek to leverage private sector investment and capabilities to scale development solutions.

- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.*

  - Framework promotes incentives such as risk reduction, cost savings, and SDG brand- positioning.
  - Encourages alignment between profitability and impact as a condition for collaboration.

- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Partially covered.* Innovation is highlighted in strategic terms (e. g. , inclusive products, business-led pilots), but less emphasis is placed on technical or financial innovation mechanisms.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (3 /4).

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Fully covered.*

  - PS: Provides capital, innovation, and operations.
  - UN: Provides legitimacy, convening, and development capacity.

- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Fully covered.* Five-part model details role definition, governance structure, resource allocation, and impact tracking.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* The framework includes guidance on model selection (financial, operational, strategic), joint decision-making, and evaluation.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* Provides a model and case studies, but no reference to formal long-term platforms or institutionalized channels for recurring engagement.

3. Engagement & financing instruments (2/4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Partially covered.* Encourages shared financing and investment mobilization but lacks concrete models or instruments.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* References co-financing, joint resource mobilization, and public-private funding labs—but does not present financial tools in detail.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Partially covered.* Supports the business case for investment in SDG-aligned initiatives and scalable social ventures.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Not covered.* While risk perception is acknowledged, the document does not present formal tools or financial instruments for sharing or mitigating risk.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards – 1. 5/3.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* Anchors shared value as a strategic goal; encourages companies to align core business with development priorities.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* No references to dispute resolution clauses or mechanisms.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Partially covered.* Recommends basic due diligence protocols such as integrity checks and focal point designation but lacks a defined process.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (1 /2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* While transparency is emphasized, there are no mechanisms outlined specifically to address corruption.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* Strong emphasis on common metrics, third-party verification, and co-developed reporting standards.

Conclusion – 56/100.

The framework presents a pragmatic roadmap for improving business–UN collaboration around the SDGs. It reflects growing consensus that the scale of the 2030 Agenda requires systemic cooperation between the private sector and international institutions. Its key contribution is a structured, five-step model for engagement—clarifying how to align objectives, choose partnership types, allocate responsibilities, and evaluate results.

While strong in strategic clarity, the framework is weaker in operational innovation, financial structuring, and enforcement mechanisms. It treats risk-sharing, due diligence, and accountability primarily as conceptual pillars rather than integrated systems. Nevertheless, it remains a valuable guide for first-entry partnerships and business alignment with the SDGs.

Framework 8: UNIDO Mid-Term Programme Framework 2018-2021.

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), 2018. https://www. unido. org/sites/default/files/unido-publications/2023-03/MidTermPro-2018-en. pdf.

Executive summary.

The UNIDO Mid-Term Programme Framework 2018–2021 serves as a strategic planning document aimed at reinforcing the organization's mandate to promote Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID). It addresses global development challenges such as inequality, unemployment, environmental degradation, and technological disruption, while aligning with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, particularly SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure).

The framework is designed to guide the implementation of country-level projects and partnerships by focusing on results-based management, technical cooperation, policy advice, and normative work. It underscores the importance of innovation, resilience, and inclusive growth as levers of sustainable industrial development.

UNIDO emphasizes partnerships as central to its implementation strategy. It highlights the Programme for Country Partnerships (PCP) as a core model for leveraging resources and aligning stakeholders at national, regional, and global levels (p. 5, 19–20). These partnerships involve a wide range of actors, including governments, development finance institutions, the private sector, United Nations entities, academia, and civil society, all working together to foster country ownership and scale up ISID.

UNIDO identifies four strategic priorities: Creating Shared Prosperity, Advancing Economic Competitiveness, Safeguarding the Environment, and Strengthening Knowledge and Institutions. It recommends:

- Programmatic Integration & Scale-up: Move from project-based to large-scale programmatic delivery across all four strategic priorities (p. 11, 17).
- Prioritize PCP and multi-stakeholder partnerships to leverage resources and promote ownership (p. 5, 19).
- Strengthen collaboration with IFIs and private sector to increase financial and technical support (p. 9, 18).
- Enhance gender equality and youth entrepreneurship as cross-cutting goals (p. 14).

- Improve internal management systems (human resources, finance, ICT) to boost transparency, cost-efficiency, and delivery of results (p. 21–22).
- Reinforce monitoring and statistical systems to align with SDG reporting requirements (p. 8, 16).

Role of the private sector.

The private sector is framed as a key driver of innovation, investment, employment, and competitiveness. It plays a central role in scaling up green technologies, strengthening SME competitiveness, and supporting inclusive industrial development. UNIDO integrates businesses as core development partners, particularly through its Programmes for Country Partnerships (PCPs) (pp. 7, 14–15, 18).

Role of multilateral institutions.

UNIDO positions itself and other multilateral institutions as facilitators of inclusive and sustainable industrial development. They provide technical assistance, policy support, and institutional alignment with the SDGs, often working in concert with national governments, IFIs, and private actors (pp. 6–9).

Scope of partnerships.

Partnerships are structured through the PCP platform, enabling co-financing, technical alignment, and multi-stakeholder engagement across national and regional levels. These include joint steering mechanisms, resource mobilization, and project delivery frameworks explicitly linking UNIDO, governments, DFIs, and the private sector (pp. 5, 19–20).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (5/5).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Fully covered.* UNIDO's objectives for the private sector centre on entrepreneurship, SME competitiveness, employment generation, and green innovation. For MIs (including UNIDO), the objectives include facilitating ISID, providing technical cooperation, and ensuring alignment with the 2030 Agenda.

- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* The framework promotes ISID, aligning profitability with development goals. UNIDO supports market access, SME development, and efficient production—ensuring mutual benefit.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Fully covered.* UNIDO promotes green industry transformation, circular economy models, sustainable energy access, and post-conflict recovery industrial solutions—aligned with SDGs on climate resilience, equity, and sustainable production.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (6(6).

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Fully covered.* UNIDO acts as advisor, advocate, and capacity builder. The private sector is framed as an implementer, financier, and innovator. These roles are operationalized via PCPs.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Fully covered.* Governance is based on results-based management (RBM), interagency coordination, and joint strategic planning (e. g. UNDAF). Governance structures include steering committees and program accountability tools.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanisms to partner between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* PCPs and UNDAF-aligned programming formalize engagement between PS, MIs, and national institutions. Mechanisms include joint resource mobilization, technical cooperation agreements, and investment facilitation platforms.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* PCPs are explicitly designed to engage multilateral institutions, development finance institutions, the private sector, and governments in aligned implementation strategies.

3. Engagement & financing instruments (2. 5/4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Partially covered.* The programme mentions leveraging donor funds, development finance, and private capital, but lacks a detailed structure for blending.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* UNIDO promotes investment facilitation and PPPs but does not include tools like guarantees, sustainability-linked finance, or outcome-based instruments.

- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* PCPs are designed to attract private investment alongside donor and public funding. UNIDO supports value chain development, market access, and green finance platforms.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* The framework refers to multi-actor collaboration and leveraging public-private synergies but does not detail financial risk-sharing mechanisms like guarantees or insurance.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (2/3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* Through agribusiness, green industry, and trade capacity-building, the framework helps align profitability with environmental protection, inclusion, and job creation.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* The framework does not include mechanisms for arbitration, mediation, or complaints.
- **Due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* UNIDO applies results-based management and evidence-based planning. Due diligence includes project-level needs assessments, risk and context analyses, and institutional capacity evaluations.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (1. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* The document references UNIDO's normative commitment to good governance but offers no specific compliance instruments or enforcement tools.
- **Accountability: monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* UNIDO uses systematic reporting, M&E, results-based planning, and SDG-aligned KPIs to track outcomes and guide future programming.

Conclusion (69/100).

The UNIDO Mid-Term Programme Framework is a structured and institutionally grounded platform for aligning private sector participation with multilateral development goals. Its strengths lie in its detailed implementation model—Programmes for Country Partnership (PCPs)—which offer a practical structure for engagement, co-financing, and delivery. It effectively operationalizes the role of the private sector within multilateral frameworks and provides clear mechanisms for aligning industrial development with the SDGs.

Businesses are viewed as drivers of innovation, capable of developing and scaling sustainable products, services, and business models. It signals that most private sector engagement remains short-term and project-based, lacking long-term strategic integration into policy frameworks. There is a call to deepen partnerships through incentives, clearer value propositions, and better alignment of sustainability goals with business interests. “Engagement of the private sector must move beyond one-off contributions to long-term strategic collaboration embedded in national and sectoral SCP strategies.” (page 18).

The report highlights that MSMEs are often underrepresented in SCP partnerships. There is a call to increase technical assistance, financing access, and market integration for these smaller firms to foster inclusive sustainable development. However, the framework’s financial design remains conservative, with limited reference to blended finance models or formal risk-sharing tools. While it promotes institutional alignment and stakeholder inclusion, it does not provide explicit instruments for managing contractual disputes or corruption risks. Despite this, it stands as a valuable example of how a UN entity can engage the private sector in national development strategies at scale, with relevance for IFIs, donors, and ministries of industry.

Framework 9: United Nations Global Compact. (2019). Scaling SDG Finance: Innovations and collaboration to unlock capital at scale.

https://d306pr3pise04h. cloudfront. net/docs/publications%2FScaling-SDG-Finance. pdf.

Executive summary.

This report by the UN Global Compact presents a strategic approach to unlock private capital for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through innovation in financial systems, public-private collaboration, and regulatory reform. It positions the private sector not merely as a donor, but as a co-creator of capital solutions embedded in national and global SDG frameworks. The UN system and multilateral institutions are framed as standard-setters, conveners, and catalysts for innovation, while governments and regulators are urged to shape enabling environments. The report emphasizes blended finance, ESG integration, fintech, and policy coherence as levers to address sustainability-related investment barriers.

Role of partnerships.

The report emphasizes that collaborative ecosystems — involving financial institutions, businesses, regulators, and multilateral actors — are critical to scale sustainable investment. Structured partnerships (e. g. , Kenya Green Bond Programme, UNEP FI) exemplify the effectiveness of coordinated public-private innovation (pp. 6–13).

Role of the private sector.

Firms are urged to move beyond CSR toward integrated sustainability practices. They are seen as key actors in capital mobilization, fintech innovation, product development (e. g. green bonds, ESG funds), and aligning business models with SDG outcomes (pp. 4–6, 8–10).

Role of multilateral institutions.

Multilaterals such as UNEP, G20, and the Financial Stability Board are cast as standard setters, de-risking agents, and conveners of policy coherence. Their functions include developing taxonomies, facilitating blended finance, coordinating data systems, and guiding ESG regulation (pp. 6–8, 11–13).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (3/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and MIs**. *Fully covered.* Private sector objectives include developing innovative financial products aligned with ESG and SDG targets. MIs aim to provide enabling environments, standards, and catalytic capital (p. 4–8).
- **An (structured) alignment of incentives**: *Fully covered.* Incentives are embedded via green taxonomies, ESG rules, adjusted capital requirements, and subsidies (p. 10).
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges**: *Fully covered.* The report addresses climate risk, biodiversity, inclusion, and ESG transparency using cutting-edge tools (pp. 10–45).

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (3/4).

- **Clear roles for PS and MIs**. *Fully covered.* The private sector handles implementation and innovation; MIs lead regulation, convening, and standard-setting (p. 6–10).
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration**: *Partially covered.* Platforms such as UNEP FI and G20 taskforces are cited, but governance frameworks are not fully institutionalized (p. 13).
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanisms to partner**: *Partially covered.* Examples are given (Kenya, China–UK Task Force), but without generalizable institutional pathways (pp. 11–12).
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs**. *Fully covered.* National roadmaps, working groups, and multilateral task forces provide structured interaction (p. 13).

3. Engagement & financing instruments (4/4).

- **Blended finance structure**: *Fully covered.* The report highlights blended capital models and public risk absorption mechanisms in LDCs (p. 11–13).
- **Innovative financial mechanisms**: *Fully covered.* Includes green bonds, ESG credit tools, impact-linked loans, and fintech integration (pp. 14–16).
- **Private sector investment mechanism**: *Fully covered.* Market instruments such as labelled bonds, co-investment platforms, and ESG funds are central (p. 15).
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms**: *Fully covered.* Instruments include guarantees, first-loss tranches, and pooled vehicles enabled by DFIs (p. 13).

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (2/3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business and development priorities**: *Fully covered.* ESG integration, SDG-linked investment frameworks, and regulatory coherence are key tools bridging interests (p. 5–12).
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms**: *Not covered*. The report does not reference mechanisms for conflict resolution in financial partnerships.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism**: *Partially covered.* ESG and SDG screening are referenced, but no formal due diligence framework is presented.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (2/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism**: *Partially covered.* Anti-corruption is implicitly addressed through transparency standards and ESG frameworks, but not as a formal system.
- **Accountability: Monitoring, evaluation, and metrics**: *Fully covered.* The report supports ESG reporting, disclosure rules (e. g. , TCFD), and the development of impact metrics and benchmarks (pp. 25–27).

Conclusion (88/100).

This framework provides one of the most comprehensive and actionable blueprints for aligning sustainable finance systems with the SDGs. Its strength lies in identifying innovation domains, financial instruments, and institutional roles for both public and private actors. While it does not offer rigid operational architecture, it is conceptually robust, widely referenced, and highly applicable. Strengthening the governance and dispute resolution components would further enhance its effectiveness.

Framework 10: UN Global Compact Strategy Extension 2024–2025.

https://ungc-communications-assets. s3. amazonaws. com/docs/publications/UNGC-Strategy-Extension_2024-25. pdf.

Executive summary.

The UN Global Compact Strategy Extension 2024–2025 builds on the 2021–2023 strategy to provide a transitional roadmap toward 2030. It maintains strategic continuity while adapting to new global dynamics and focuses on strengthening accountability, mobilizing scalable corporate impact, and enhancing local-global coherence through networks.

Role of partnerships.

Partnerships are presented as essential for delivering on the Ten Principles and the SDGs. The strategy emphasizes multi-actor collaboration between business, government, investors, the UN system, and civil society. It highlights the role of the UN Global Compact as a system-level convenor, enabling cross-sectoral engagement to accelerate systemic change (pp. 7, 10, 13).

Role of the private sector.

Businesses are at the core of the strategy's implementation logic. They are called to lead on principle-based sustainability by aligning operations with UNGC commitments and scaling results through initiatives such as SDG Ambition and the Climate Ambition Accelerator. Businesses are expected to report consistently and adopt KPIs on governance, climate, labour, and anti-corruption (pp. 3, 5, 9, 11–12).

Role of multilateral institutions.

The strategy underscores collaboration with the UN development system and situates the Compact as a conduit for integrating business action into multilateral frameworks. It supports joint implementation at the national level via Local Networks and partnerships with UN Resident Coordinators (pp. 4, 13, 15).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment: 20/35.

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Covered.* Private sector goals are clear: commitment to the Ten Principles and alignment with SDG impact. MIs are tasked with enabling environments, coordination, and systemic accountability (p. 6).
- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Partially covered.* Incentives are shaped by reputational benefits, peer recognition (e. g. , SDG Pioneers), and internal benchmarking via the Communication on Progress (CoP) platform, though financial levers are not emphasized (pp. 6, 10).
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Partially covered.* The document presents programmatic innovations (e. g. , digital reporting tools, new regional platforms) but does not propose market-level or product-level transformations.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture: 20/35.

- **Clear roles for the PS and international organizations.** *Covered.* Roles are well-defined. The UNGC provides normative direction and platform leadership, while the private sector leads implementation and local action (p. 14).
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS-MIs collaboration.** *Partially covered.* The document outlines coordination with UN country teams and the use of Local Networks as delivery nodes but lacks detail on formal decision-making mechanisms or joint governance bodies.
- **Definition of partnerships and collaboration mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* Partnerships are encouraged at all levels, but mechanisms are mostly descriptive (e. g. , Local Networks, thematic programs), without detail on MoUs, investment consortia, or joint ventures.

- **Structure for engagement between PS and MIs**. *Covered*. The Compact itself is a structured platform; the Local Networks model provides formalized entry points for PS-MI engagement at country level (p. 13).

3. Engagement & financing instruments: 8/15.

- **Blended finance structure**. *Not fulfilled***.** No reference to financial structuring, co-investment tools, or concessional finance.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Not fulfilled***.** Financing approaches are not addressed.
- **Private sector investment mechanisms.** *Partially fulfilled*. The Compact indirectly promotes ESG-aligned investment by shaping reporting norms but does not propose dedicated capital mobilization tools.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Not fulfilled*. No such tools are identified.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards: 8/10.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives and development priorities**. *Fulfilled***.** The strategy outlines multiple Global Impact Initiatives designed to link business KPIs to SDG targets (e. g. , water, gender, climate). Programs like SDG Ambition aim to embed sustainability in business operations (pp. 8–9).
- **Due diligence processes.** *Partially fulfilled*. The CoP platform collects data on due diligence practices but does not constitute a formal screening or risk analysis system (p. 10).
- **Dispute resolution mechanisms.** *Not fulfilled***.** Voluntary mechanisms only.

5. Integrity, accountability & results: 7/10.

- **Anti-corruption mechanism**. *Partially fulfilled*. Anti-corruption is one of the Ten Principles and is embedded in CoP reporting, but no verification tools or enforcement measures are described.
- Accountability & shared metrics: Fulfilled. Accountability is a core pillar. CoP 2. 0 introduces mandatory ESG metrics, third-party assurance options, and harmonization with global reporting frameworks (p. 10).

Conclusion (63/100).

A well-structured strategic framework that institutionalizes business-UN engagement around principle-based sustainability. It is strongest on governance, engagement platforms, and accountability. Its main weaknesses lie in its financial architecture (it offers no financing tools or blended instruments) limiting its contribution to private capital mobilization. Strong on transparency, moderate on innovation.

Framework 11: UN Global Compact – Accelerating Innovation in Sustainable Finance.

https://info. unglobalcompact. org/l/591891/2024-10-23/5b2hl1/591891/1729707560PTVse5iM/SF_InnovationReport_Oct17. pdf.

Executive summary.

This report presents a global overview of innovations in sustainable finance, examining how countries, institutions, and markets are designing policy, regulatory, and market-based solutions to align financial systems with the SDGs. It emphasizes the role of multilateral institutions as system conveners and the private sector as innovation drivers and capital providers. The report catalogues financial innovations across five key domains (risk, disclosure, standards, incentives, and market practices), offers examples from a range of countries, and calls for greater transparency, harmonized ESG frameworks, and inclusive partnerships to close the sustainable investment gap.

Partnerships.

The report highlights partnerships between financial institutions, businesses, and multilateral bodies as essential to expanding sustainable finance. These collaborations drive co-creation of standards, shared infrastructure, and new governance models (p. 6).

Role of the private sector.

The private sector is positioned as a catalyst for innovation and scale, with firms expected to shift from CSR to integrated sustainability practices, including ESG-aligned investment products, risk tools, and inclusive fintech (pp. 4–6, 8–10).

Role of multilateral institutions.

MIs such as UNEP, G20, and the Financial Stability Board are presented as standard setters, capital mobilizers, and conveners of dialogue and co-regulation. Their roles include developing green taxonomies, de-risking capital, and enabling global coordination (pp. 6–8, 11–13).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (Score: 3/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Fully covered.*

  - Private sector: Innovate and deploy financial instruments that align with long-term value creation, ESG standards, and SDG targets.
  - MIs: Provide regulation, policy frameworks, de-risking tools, and global coordination platforms.

- **Alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* The report outlines how policy tools such as green taxonomies, ESG incentives, disclosure rules, and regulatory adjustments help shift private incentives toward sustainability. Market-based mechanisms (e. g. , adjusted capital rules, preferential treatment for sustainable assets) are discussed (p. 10).
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Fully covered.* The document covers climate resilience, biodiversity finance, financial inclusion, ESG credibility, and digital transparency tools as targeted innovations (pp. 10–45).

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (Score: 3/ 4).

- **Clear roles for the PS, the International Organization.** *Fully covered.* The report distinguishes the implementation role of the private sector (tools, products, capital), and the normative, convening, and catalytic roles of MIs (frameworks, guarantees, coordination).
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration/engagement.** *Partially covered.* Coordination platforms like UNEP FI, Green Bond taskforces, and national roadmaps are referenced, but the governance structures are described at a high level (e. g. , participation, not oversight).
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* Structured partnerships such as the Kenya Green Bond Program and UK-China Green Finance Task Force are discussed, but the document does not prescribe generalizable mechanisms for PS-MI institutional engagement.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* MIs are consistently shown to convene, co-finance, and co-regulate alongside the private sector. Examples include UNEP Inquiry, G20 platforms, and co-led innovation labs (pp. 6–7).

3. Engagement & financing instruments (Score: 3/4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Fully covered.* Blended finance is presented as a core tool to address market failure and risk perception in high-impact sectors. MDBs and DFIs are expected to offer concessional finance and guarantees (pp. 11–13).
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Tools include green bonds, sustainability-linked debt, fintech platforms, ESG credit ratings, climate risk stress tests, and open ESG data.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Partially covered.* While investment instruments are described, there is limited mention of concrete co-investment platforms or deployment mechanisms involving MIs or governments.
- **Risk sharing mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* Instruments like partial guarantees and first-loss capital are referenced in the context of blended finance but not elaborated in technical detail.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (Score: 1. 5/3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* ESG integration, climate risk analysis, and SDG-aligned product innovation are described as aligning investor goals with public development targets (p. 14–24).
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* No dispute resolution or conflict mediation mechanisms are described.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Partially covered.* ESG and climate risk integration are encouraged but not formalized into due diligence protocols. No explicit guidance is offered on KYC, legal screening, or safeguards.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (1. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* Transparency is discussed through open data platforms and ESG reporting. However, there are no integrity or compliance protocols presented.
- **Accountability:** *Fully covered.* Strong emphasis on disclosure, KPIs, impact reporting (e. g. , TCFD), and ESG comparability (pp. 12–18).

Conclusion (73/100).

This report stands out for its comprehensive overview of sustainable finance innovation and its strong emphasis on ESG standardization, blended finance, and cross-sector cooperation. It effectively bridges market logic and development priorities but offers limited detail on implementation governance and safeguards. The role of MIs is well-defined, while the private sector is positioned as the core delivery agent. However, structural frameworks for risk-sharing and formal dispute mechanisms are underdeveloped.

Framework 12: Sevilla Commitment – Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development (2025).

Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development, Sevilla, Spain. https://docs. un. org/en/A/CONF. 227/2025/L. 1.

Executive summary.

The Sevilla Commitment is the official outcome of the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development. It sets a multilateral roadmap to modernize the global financing system for the SDGs and climate action. The document explicitly recognizes the growing role of the private sector and promotes structured partnerships across national, regional, and global levels, leveraging platforms such as the SDG Stimulus, Global Digital Compact, and Global Tax Convention.

Role of partnerships.

The Sevilla Commitment positions multi-stakeholder partnerships—including with the private sector—as central to delivering sustainable development. It endorses integrated country platforms, blended finance solutions, and the use of global compacts to align incentives, strengthen regulatory coherence, and facilitate co-investment mechanisms.

Role of the private sector.

The private sector is recognized as a co-implementer and financier of sustainable development. Firms are expected to support SDG-aligned investment pipelines, digital public infrastructure, and climate finance instruments. The document promotes enabling environments that de-risk investments and improve transparency through sustainability reporting and alignment with national priorities.

Role of multilateral institutions.

Multilateral development banks and UN agencies are called to catalyze blended finance, harmonize policy frameworks, enhance ESG standards, and play a convening role in structured stakeholder engagement. INFFs (Integrated National Financing Frameworks) and other country-led platforms are the main coordination tools between the public and private sectors.

Strategic purpose & value alignment – 2. 5/3.

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs** – *Fully covered.* The private sector is expected to deliver capital, innovation, and implementation capacity. MIs are expected to de-risk, align policy incentives, and facilitate systemic coordination.
- **Structured alignment of incentives** – *Fully covered.* The document encourages guarantees, concessionality, and fiscal tools for investment de-risking. It references SDG Stimulus, climate taxonomies, and co-investment platforms.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges** – *Partially covered.* Innovation is referenced in climate finance, debt instruments, and digital inclusion. However, specific pilots or operational innovation mechanisms are not fully detailed.

Institutional roles & partnership architecture – 3. 5/4.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization** – *Fully covered.* The PS is expected to co-invest and implement SDG-related projects. MIs coordinate and provide enabling frameworks and guarantees.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration/engagement** – *Fully covered.* Country platforms (e. g. INFFs) are positioned as institutional coordination structures for all actors, with assigned responsibilities.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs** – *Partially covered.* The Sevilla Commitment outlines structured modalities (e. g. Global Compact, investment mapping), but lacks procedural detail for institutional onboarding.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs** – *Fully covered.* INFFs, the SDG Stimulus, and the Business Steering Committee are explicitly named as multi-actor platforms to align investment with SDG goals.

Engagement & financing instruments – 3. 5/4.

- **Blended finance structure** – *Fully covered* Blended finance is central, with emphasis on catalytic capital, risk guarantees, and scalable platforms such as debt-for-climate swaps and SDG investment facilities.

- **Innovative financial mechanisms** – *Fully covered.* Green, SDG, and sustainability-linked bonds, as well as digital finance tools, are referenced. Co-financing, digital IDs, and sovereign risk-sharing tools are encouraged.
- **Private sector investment mechanism** – *Fully covered.* Private investors are encouraged to engage through INFF pipelines, green bonds, and co-investment platforms. DFIs are tasked with crowding in capital.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms** – *Partially covered.* Risk-sharing tools such as first-loss positions, guarantees, and taxonomies are endorsed, but implementation pathways are not fully defined.

Operational alignment & safeguards – 2/3.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities** – *Fully covered.* The document aligns sustainability reporting, impact measurement, and ESG metrics with national and global SDG targets.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms** – *Not covered.* No arbitration or dispute resolution systems are outlined.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism** – *Partially covered.* ESG safeguards and investment screening are encouraged through INFFs and national planning systems, but no formalized framework is proposed.

Integrity, accountability & results – 1/2.

- **Anti-corruption mechanism** – *Partially covered.* Anti-corruption is referenced in the context of transparency and international cooperation, but without specific enforcement tools.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results** – *Fully covered.* The Sevilla Commitment mandates reporting frameworks (via the Inter-agency Task Force), harmonized SDG indicators, and multi-level accountability.

Conclusion (80/100).

The Sevilla Commitment provides a strong normative and institutional foundation for private sector engagement in financing for development. It advances co-governance through INFFs, structured country platforms, and global compacts, while calling for more inclusive, transparent, and sustainable finance systems. Its major contribution is the integration of private capital mobilization into a multilateral agenda, paired with concrete policy instruments such as guarantees, ESG standards, and impact-linked investments.

However, the framework would benefit from more concrete mechanisms for risk-sharing, dispute resolution, and formalized partnership agreements. Implementation will hinge on how the UN, MDBs, and national governments institutionalize these instruments and platforms over time.

C. OECD and Standard Setters.

Framework 13: OECD DAC blended finance principles for unlocking commercial finance for the SDGs (2018).

https://www. oecd. org/en/publications/oecd-dac-blended-finance-principles_dc66bd9c-en. html.

Executive summary.

The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has established five key principles to ensure that blended finance—strategic use of development finance to mobilize additional commercial finance—effectively contributes to sustainable development in developing countries. These principles serve as a policy tool for all providers of development finance, including donor governments, multilateral donors, development co-operation agencies, philanthropies, and other stakeholders.

- **Anchor Blended Finance Use to a Development Rationale.**
  Blended finance should be employed only when it supports sustainable development objectives. It must be aligned with partner countries' priorities and contribute to the SDGs, ensuring that development finance is used where it is most needed.
- **Design Blended Finance to Increase the Mobilization of Commercial Finance.**
  The primary goal of blended finance is to attract additional commercial capital. Development finance should be used strategically to mitigate risks and enhance returns, thereby encouraging private sector investment in projects that contribute to sustainable development.
- **Tailor Blended Finance to Local Context.**
  Blended finance initiatives must be designed with a deep understanding of the local context, including the specific economic, social, and environmental conditions of the partner country. This ensures that projects are relevant, effective, and sustainable.
- **Focus on Effective Partnering for Blended Finance.**
  Successful blended finance requires collaboration among diverse stakeholders, including public and private actors. Establishing clear roles, responsibilities, and mutual understanding among partners is essential for achieving development objectives.

- **Monitor Blended Finance for Transparency and Results**
  Robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are crucial to assess the impact of blended finance projects. Transparency in reporting and accountability ensures that blended finance contributes effectively to development goals and allows for continuous learning and improvement.

These principles have been widely recognized and endorsed by international bodies, including the G7 and G20, as a framework for deploying blended finance effectively. They are intended to guide the design and implementation of blended finance programs, ensuring that such initiatives are aligned with development objectives and deliver tangible results.

Role of partnerships.

Partnerships are emphasized as central to effective blended finance, ensuring that development and financial actors can work together without compromising their mandates. The document advocates for partnerships based on mutual respect, shared objectives (both development and financial), and risk-sharing. Principle 4: "Focus on Effective Partnering" outlines the need for partnerships that scale solutions, balance risk, and harmonize approaches. Development actors are urged to maintain high standards, while commercial actors pursue sustainability and returns (pp. 4–9).

Role of the private sector.

The private sector is viewed both as a financier and implementer of projects. Its capital, risk appetite, and operational expertise are essential for reaching the SDGs. Private actors are encouraged to engage in underfinanced sectors through well-structured blended finance deals. Blended finance aims to "crowd in" private investment where it's absent due to perceived risks or underdeveloped markets (pp. 3–8).

Role of multilateral institutions.

Multilateral institutions (like the UN, EU, and development banks) are seen as key players in developing and promoting common principles, building transparent results frameworks, and supporting accountability and harmonization of blended finance efforts globally. The principles were designed to guide not only bilateral donors but also multilateral initiatives and are aligned with G20/G7 goals (pp. 3, 10–11).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment – 3/3.

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Fully covered.*

  - Private Sector Objective: Mobilize capital and engage in ventures that create both commercial and development impact.
  - Multilateral Institutions Objective: Use development finance strategically to unlock sustainable investments that would not otherwise occur. These dual roles are embedded in Principles 1 and 2.

- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* Principle 2 directly addresses how to align risk/reward for commercial actors with development goals. Tools such as guarantees, concessional capital, and subordinated debt are promoted.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Fully covered.*

  - Encourages experimentation in blended structures, flexible capital stacking, and adaptation- to local contexts.
  - Highlights blending of grants with equity or debt, results-based finance, and tailored solutions for climate, infrastructure, and inclusion.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture – 3/4.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Fully covered.*

  - Principle 4 explicitly calls for role clarity and mutual accountability.
  - MIs are de-riskers and conveners, private sector acts as investor and operator.

- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Partially covered.* Governance principles are well outlined, but operational structures (e. g. steering bodies or joint facilities) are left flexible for implementation.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework strongly encourages partnering and provides principles to guide them but does not offer institutional blueprints or formal vehicles.

- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* Principles support multi-stakeholder dialogue, solution co-creation, and risk-layering—forming a conceptual architecture for engagement.

3. Engagement & financing instruments – 3. 5/4.

- **Blended finance structure.** *Fully covered.* This is the core of the framework: the definition, design, and use of blended finance tools is comprehensively developed.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Encourages tools like results-based finance, concessionality structuring, technical assistance, equity-debt layering, and risk mitigation.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Endorses tailored investment pathways: equity funds, co-financing platforms, structured credit, and risk participation.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* Includes guarantees, subordinated debt, and insurance—but does not detail design or delivery structures.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards – 1. 5/3.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* Emphasizes that all blended finance operations must align with SDGs and local priorities. Principle 5 supports performance tracking that aligns financial returns with development impact.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* No mention of arbitration, complaint handling, or third-party mediation.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Partially covered.* Implied through multiple principles, including development rationale, risk assessments, and context-based design. No formal checklist is provided.

5. Integrity, accountability & results – 0. 5/2.

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* Principle 5 promotes transparency and accountability but does not include corruption-specific protocols or enforcement measures.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* Principle 5 mandates performance tracking, impact reporting, and public disclosure.

Conclusion (69/100).

The OECD DAC Principles provide one of the most widely accepted frameworks for governing the use of blended finance in development contexts. They outline conceptual clarity, value alignment, and good governance without prescribing rigid institutional models. By emphasizing development rationale, commercial mobilization, local context, effective partnering, and performance monitoring, the framework offers a flexible but disciplined approach.

Its main limitations lie in implementation guidance: the lack of detailed dispute resolution mechanisms, corruption safeguards, or institutional vehicles means that operationalization depends heavily on each actor's internal capacity and integrity. However, its influence remains significant, particularly as G20 and MDBs increasingly rely on these principles for guidance.

Framework 14: Effective results frameworks for sustainable development: achieving impact by design OECD, 2024.

https://doi. org/10. 1787/aaa4bb52-en.

Executive summary.

This framework offers a comprehensive approach to designing, implementing, and using results frameworks (RFs) that not only track progress but actively support sustainable development impact. It responds to persistent challenges in development practice: results frameworks often measure activities and outputs but fail to guide real systemic change.

The guide reframes RFs as strategic design tools, emphasizing collaboration, learning, adaptability, and complexity-awareness. It promotes results frameworks that help organizations design interventions that are realistic, transformative, and accountable to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This framework urges development institutions to:

- Treat RFs as living documents that guide strategic decision-making.
- Build organizational capacities for adaptation, learning, and systems thinking.
- Go beyond compliance metrics to pursue transformational results.
- Embrace inclusive, transparent design and evidence-informed refinement.

The Guide identifies persistent challenges—such as vague objectives, rigid governance, power asymmetries, and weak accountability mechanisms—and outlines a structured partnering cycle and design tools to address them. It encourages strategic, trust-based collaboration across governments, MIs, civil society, and the private sector to create more inclusive, transparent, and mission-driven results systems (pp. 6–9, 14–17, 27–28).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (1. 5/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework defines clear institutional objectives for development actors like MIs, focusing on achieving impact by design, enhancing accountability and learning, and aligning strategies with SDGs and national priorities.
- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Partially covered.* Incentive alignment is addressed through strategic planning, encouraging clarity of roles and motivations across stakeholders. It emphasizes coherence between institutional mandates and national development priorities and supports designing impact pathways that reflect mutual interests.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Partially covered.* The framework encourages systemic thinking, flexible theories of change, and feedback loops to enable more responsive, problem-solving approaches to complex development challenges.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (2/4).

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Partially covered.* While the guide encourages collaborative governance, it does not explicitly define the roles of PS or MIs within its structured approach.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Partially covered.* The guide emphasizes institutional arrangements and governance structures—especially around decision-making roles, feedback loops, and data ownership—which are applicable to PS–MI collaboration, though not explicitly designed for it.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* A structured partnering cycle is defined and encouraged, including scoping, structuring, managing, and reviewing partnerships (pp. 19–21, 25–28), but this is framed generally rather than specific to PS-MI relations.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework promotes inclusive stakeholder engagement during the design of RFs, especially through co-creation, transparency, and ownership principles. However, engagement with PS and MIs is generic rather than formally structured.

3. Engagement & financing instruments (0/4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Not covered.* The framework is not focused on finance and does not reference blended financial instruments.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Not covered.* There is no reference to financial structuring or innovation.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Not covered.* The role of business is acknowledged as a partner in SDG delivery, but investment tools or mechanisms are not addressed.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Not covered.* The framework does not mention risk mitigation or financial de-risking mechanisms.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (2 /3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Partially covered.* The framework supports multi-actor results chains in which PS contributions (investment, innovation, employment) are linked to higher-level SDG outcomes. It encourages systems-based RFs that reflect market dynamics, regulation, and innovation.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* There is no formal dispute resolution mechanism, but the framework promotes adaptive learning, iteration, and feedback loops to address tension or course correction collaboratively.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* A strong conceptual due diligence process is embedded through:

  - Contextual analysis.
  - Theory of change validation.
  - Stakeholder mapping.
  - Iterative feedback and strategic alignment checks.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (1. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* The framework promotes transparency and accountability across institutional arrangements. While it does not present compliance tools, it supports open data, inclusive monitoring, and context-specific risk assessment.

- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* Accountability is a major strength of the guide. It promotes:

    - Shared indicators and results chains.
    - Monitoring dashboards and evaluation strategies.
    - Adaptive learning and feedback-driven strategy refinement.
    - Internal and external transparency for citizens, funders, and partners.

Conclusion (31/100).

The OECD's Effective Results Frameworks guide offers a strong conceptual foundation for designing results systems that are more transformative, adaptive, and aligned with the SDGs. It reinforces the importance of strategic partnerships and promotes co-created inclusive RFs that go beyond compliance and foster systemic learning and shared purpose.

While the guide does not offer detailed operational tools for PS-MI partnerships, financing structures, or investment risk management, it provides valuable guidance for embedding accountability, evidence-based decision-making, and feedback loops into development programs. It also highlights the importance of trust, transparency, and shared ownership as core enablers of long-term collaboration between multilateral institutions and the private sector.

D. Private Sector-Led and Third Sector-Led Initiatives.

Framework 15: Vision 2050-the new agenda for business.

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), 2010
https://www. wbcsd. org/resources/vision-2050-the-new-agenda-for-business.

Executive summary.

Vision 2050, published by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), presents a long-term roadmap for the global business community to lead the transformation toward a world in which over nine billion people can live well within planetary boundaries. The framework recognizes that current models of growth and development are unsustainable and argues that business has both the responsibility and capacity to drive system-level change. It calls on companies to embed sustainability in core strategy and collaborate across sectors to enable inclusive growth, environmental resilience, and long-term value creation.

The framework outlines nine transformation pathways, including energy, mobility, food, digital access, and finance, each with action priorities for 2030 and targets for 2050. It calls for businesses to become active partners in global development, leveraging finance, innovation, and cross-sector coalitions. Vision 2050 also identifies five key enablers: trust, transparency, metrics, governance, and capital alignment. It emphasizes that "any sources of influence, information, assets and capabilities will be required, supplied through complex coalitions made up of a number of different actors and areas of expertise. blending the best of each sector's knowledge, assets and capabilities in seamless partnerships" (p. 60).

Role of the private sector.

Businesses are portrayed as key actors in driving innovation, investment, and implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The report stresses that companies have a responsibility to integrate the SDGs into their strategies—not only for impact, but also for long-term competitiveness. Moreover, the private sector is encouraged to redefine its role beyond profit, contributing to inclusive growth and sustainable development. It also identifies how companies can create shared value and scale up impact through core operations, supply chains, and partnerships (pp. 7, 11–12, 16, 26–27).

Role of multilateral institutions.

The UN is described as a trusted convener, able to bridge sectors, build trust, and provide policy direction. Its role includes guiding private sector alignment with SDG priorities, offering credibility, and facilitating access to development contexts. UN agencies are also involved in co-designing programs, convening dialogue, and linking local needs with global resources and standards. The report outlines how collaboration with multilateral agencies strengthens both accountability and impact (pp. 5–6, 9, 23–24, 30).

Scope of partnerships.

The report places strong emphasis on multi-stakeholder partnerships as a necessary foundation for achieving the SDGs. It argues that neither the public nor private sector can solve development challenges alone. Effective SDG implementation requires collaboration across business, governments, civil society, and the UN system. The United Nations is positioned as a neutral platform that can help align business objectives with development goals and facilitate coordination (pages 6, 9, 24, 32).

Strategic purpose & value alignment (2. 5/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework outlines business objectives aligned with sustainability, resilience, equity, and systems transformation. It assumes multi-stakeholder convergence on achieving the 2030 Agenda and planetary boundaries.
- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* WBCSD explicitly calls for system-wide realignment of financial, policy, and business incentives to promote long-term value creation. It advocates for internalizing externalities (e. g. , pricing carbon, nature-based accounting) and for financial mechanisms that reward sustainable behaviour among private actors.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Fully covered.* Vision 2050 promotes solutions such as decarbonization, circular economy models, nature-positive practices, digital equity, and health system innovation. It also includes policy innovation, such as shifting subsidies, integrating ESG metrics, and carbon pricing.

Institutional roles & partnership architecture (2/4).

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Partially covered.* The private sector is assigned a leadership role in driving innovation, transforming value chains, and redefining corporate purpose. Multilateral institutions are seen as providing frameworks and guidance but not in defined operational roles.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Partially covered.* Governance is discussed in terms of corporate responsibility, trust, and stakeholder engagement. There is an emphasis on transparency and accountability, but no direct blueprint for governance structures between PS and MIs.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework promotes collaboration between businesses, governments, and civil society, and calls for stronger coalitions for systemic transformation. However, it remains high-level and aspirational.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework strongly emphasizes collaborative action between business, governments, and civil society, including support for public-private cooperation and stakeholder alignment. Engagement is conceptual, relying on shared missions and voluntary alignment.

Engagement & financing instruments (3. 5/4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Partially covered.* The framework supports multi-source funding models to accelerate systems transformation. It encourages private capital mobilization in line with public objectives, particularly in financial services and infrastructure pathways.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* The framework calls for innovation in finance, including:

  - Nature-based capital.
  - Carbon pricing and green bonds.
  - ESG integration.
  - Long-term valuation tools.
  - It also promotes realigning fiduciary duty and modernizing risk assessment frameworks to reflect sustainability challenges.

- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Vision 20`50 calls for large-scale private capital mobilization toward SDG-aligned and net-zero investments. It proposes mechanisms such as:

  - Internalization of environmental costs.
  - Taxonomy-aligned capital flows.
  - Transition bonds and sustainability-linked finance.
  - New business models that reward long-term, inclusive performance.

- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* The framework recommends:

  - Policy environments that de-risk sustainability investments.
  - Public-private cooperation to share systemic transition risks.
  - Use of enabling finance, ESG metrics, and long-term incentive alignment.

Operational alignment & safeguards (2/ 3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* The entire framework is built on integrating business strategies with development and sustainability goals. The nine transformation pathways call for private sector innovation to deliver inclusive growth, climate stability, and social equity.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* No dispute settlement mechanisms are mentioned.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Partially covered.* The framework calls on companies to integrate environmental and social issues into core strategy, and to adopt tools such as:

  - Science-based targets.
  - Sustainability performance indicators.
  - Materiality assessments (ESG due diligence).

Integrity, accountability & results (1. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* While the document promotes trust, transparency, and integrity, it does not outline specific anti-corruption mechanisms such as whistleblower policies, compliance frameworks, or third-party audits. It emphasizes the importance of restoring public trust in business through transparency and responsible behaviour *(p. 14)*.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* The Vision 2050 document promotes a metrics-driven approach, recommending that businesses:

    - Embed KPIs aligned with sustainability goals.
    - Track progress through shared metrics frameworks.
    - Disclose progress transparently to stakeholders (this includes using integrated reporting, impact measurement, and ESG benchmarking to enable ongoing accountability).

Conclusion (50/100).

Vision 2050 presents a compelling strategic roadmap for business-led sustainability transitions and calls for deep private sector engagement in global development challenges. Its strengths lie in articulating system-level transformations, aligning business models with long-term societal goals, and promoting innovation in areas such as energy, food, and finance.

However, its operational content remains high-level and conceptual. While it calls for partnerships and global collaboration, it offers limited detail on implementation structures, blended finance models, or accountability mechanisms. Roles for multilateral institutions and structured governance are mentioned aspirational rather than institutionally defined. It offers a valuable vision for aligning private capital with public good but requires complementary operational frameworks for real-world application.

Framework 16: The SDG partnerships guidebook.

UN Partnerships for SDGs Office & International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), 2022. https://sdgs. un. org/sites/default/files/2022-02/SDG%20Partnership%20Guidebook%201. 11. pdf.

Executive summary.

The SDG Partnership Guidebook is a comprehensive, practical framework for building high-impact multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) that can drive progress toward the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Drawing on nearly two decades of global experience, it reflects a shift from siloed development efforts to systemic, collaborative models that integrate the public sector, civil society, the private sector, academia, and multilateral institutions.

The guide presents a structured partnership lifecycle, decision-making tools, and capacity-building strategies to support transformational partnerships. It distinguishes between traditional, service-delivery partnerships and transformational ones that tackle root causes and build lasting ecosystems. Through concepts like Collaborative Advantage, the Partnership Delta, and shared governance, it articulates how value, innovation, and accountability can be scaled across sectors.

The guide emphasizes that the SDGs demand systemic thinking and that partnerships must be intentionally designed to address trust deficits, power imbalances, and structural gaps. It also includes toolkits on partner assessment, governance frameworks, conflict resolution, and monitoring and evaluation. Multilateral institutions are framed as norm-setters, conveners, and co-investors, while the private sector is positioned as an innovation partner and scale amplifier in SDG delivery.

Role of the private sector.

Businesses are recognized as central development partners—not merely donors or CSR actors, but strategic collaborators in implementing the SDGs. They are encouraged to move beyond philanthropy, aligning core business models and incentives with development impact. Capabilities in innovation, scale, and market creation are emphasized (pp. 10–11, 22–24, 31).

Role of multilateral institutions.

Multilateral institutions (especially UN agencies) serve as enablers of partnership ecosystems, providing legitimacy, global alignment, policy guidance, and financing platforms. Their convening capacity is highlighted as key to sustaining cross-sector collaboration (pp. 12, 15, 25–26, 34).

Scope of partnerships.

The guide presents a full lifecycle of partnership development—scoping, structuring, managing, and sustaining—and includes models for business-to-UN, business-to-NGO, and multilateral convening. The emphasis is on system-level transformation through durable, purpose-led, and inclusive collaboration (pp. 14–17, 32–33, 38–41).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (3/3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Fully covered.* The guide describes what each stakeholder brings and seeks, ensuring alignment of goals across development and commercial interests.
- **Private Sector Objectives**: Profitability with purpose, supply chain resilience, access to emerging markets, innovation, social license to operate.
- **Multilateral Institutions**: Achieve sustainable development outcomes at scale, provide global norms, policy support, funding, and convening power.
- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* The guide introduces Collaborative Advantage and the Partnership Delta *(pp. 34–36)* to ensure all partners derive value—financial, reputational, operational. Business incentives range from philanthropy to core business motives *(p. 16)*. It encourages MAX WIN–MAX WIN–MAX IMPACT negotiations *(p. 43)*.

- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Fully covered.* The guide promotes innovation for SDG impact:

  - Technology-enabled solutions.
  - Challenge funds and venture platforms.
  - Off-grid energy and pay-as-you-go health/education.
  - Impact investing and social entrepreneurship.
  - Case references highlight inclusion, climate action, and equity.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture (4/4).

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Fully covered.* The guide maps each actor's "value add" and roles:
- **Private Sector:** Drives innovation, financing, job creation, and supply chain transformation.
- **MIs/UN**: Stewards of global norms, funders, conveners, technical advisers.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Fully covered.* Governance guidance includes:

  - Boards, steering committees, working groups (pp. 25–28). Transparent decision-making, legal templates (e. g. , Tool 2: Partnering Agreement Template – p. 81).
  - Role definition, equity, and accountability.

- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* defined as collaborative arrangements to pool resources and share risk.

  - Partnering Spectrum illu3. state types of engagement.
  - Lifecycle phases (scoping, building, managing, reviewing).
  - Tools include governance templates, value creation frameworks, partnering health checks (pp. 80–91).

- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** Fully covered. The partnering lifecycle and formation journey (pp. 38–41) describe how partners engage and align internally and collectively. Encourages clear agreements, governance structures, and shared vision across MIs, PS, and civil society.

3. Engagement & financing instruments (4/4).

- **Blended finance structure.** *Fully covered.* Blended finance is promoted to:

  - De-risk private investment *(p. 19, 36)*.
  - Mobilize capital for infrastructure, agriculture, and health.
  - Support PPPs with co-financing from donors, development banks, and private investors
    Examples include impact bonds, guarantees, and the Gautrain public-private rail project in South Africa.

- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Financial innovation is central to the guide:

  - Performance-based contracts.
  - Shared value financing.
  - Non-monetary contributions (social capital, networks).
  - Digital tools and data-sharing to support transparency and scale.

- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Private capital is seen as catalytic. Mechanisms include:

  - Blended structures.
  - Social/development impact bonds.
  - Platforms co-created by MIs (e. g. , IFC, UNDP, GAVI).

- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Fully covered.* Risk is addressed through:

  - Financial and reputational risk distribution.
  - Technical assistance and shared measurement frameworks.
  - Governance structures that balance power and operational responsibility.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards (2. 5/3).

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* The guide stresses inclusive business models:
  - Pro-poor product innovation.
  - Value chain sustainability.
  - Employment generation for underserved communities.
  - Shared value is the core bridging concept, supported by case examples.

- **Dispute settlement mechanisms**
  Partially covered. Dispute management is embedded in governance. Tool 5: Troubleshooting *(p. 86)* supports early detection and collaborative resolution. While formal arbitration mechanisms are not defined, the guide emphasizes proactive feedback loops and conflict anticipation.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Tool 3: Internal Prospective Partnership Assessment *(p. 82)* helps organizations assess:
  - Strategic fit.
  - Legal/reputational risk.
  - Partner compatibility.
  - Operational viability.
  - Due diligence is required before formalizing any engagement.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (1. 5/2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Partially covered.* The guide promotes transparency, conflict-of-interest protocols, and risk registers. It calls for good governance, especially in public-private partnerships, and recommends embedding anti-corruption principles—but does not outline formal enforcement procedures.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* Monitoring and evaluation are built into the partnership lifecycle. Recommendations include:
  - Shared KPIs and M&E plans.
  - Partnership Health-checks.
  - Adaptive implementation and regular reviews (p. 39).
  - Partnership Delta to track collective impact versus individual effort.

Conclusions (97/100).

The SDG Partnership Guidebook offers one of the most detailed, operationally grounded, and strategically ambitious frameworks for multi-stakeholder collaboration aligned with the 2030 Agenda. It provides a full lifecycle model for partnership building, from scoping and design to governance, implementation, and adaptive review. With clear roles for governments, MIs, and the private sector, and extensive tools for value creation, conflict management, and shared accountability, it stands out as both a strategic and practical guide for action.

Its main contribution is to reframe partnerships as core operating systems rather than transactional add-ons. It successfully bridges business incentives and development goals through shared value models and blended investment structures. While it could benefit from a more formal anti-corruption and dispute resolution infrastructure, its emphasis on transparency, alignment, and co-ownership offers a powerful template for future SDG implementation.

Framework 17: The equator principles.

Equator Principles Association. (2020). The Equator Principles. https://equator-principles. com/.

Framework 18: ICC principles for sustainable trade finance, international chamber of commerce (ICC), 2024.

https://www. icc-austria. org/fxdata/iccws/prod/media/downloads/2024-ICC-Principles-for-Sustainable-Trade-Finance-1. pdf.

Executive summary.

The International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), in collaboration with Boston Consulting Group (BCG), has introduced a standardized, industry-wide framework to define and operationalize sustainable trade finance. This initiative addresses the complexity of assessing sustainability in trade finance, particularly where the purpose of goods or services is unclear at origination and aims to mitigate greenwashing while directing capital toward truly sustainable and inclusive trade finance products.

The framework defines sustainable trade across four product streams: Green Trade Finance (GTF), Sustainability-Linked Trade Finance (SLTF), Sustainability-Linked Supply Chain Finance (SLSCF), and a forthcoming Social Trade Finance stream focused on socioeconomic outcomes. It offers practical tools for aligning trade instruments with sustainability goals, including KPI-based incentives, DNSH safeguards, and reporting protocols linked to global standards such as the EU Taxonomy, ICMA Green Bond Principles, and the LMA Green Loan Principles.

Role of partnerships.

The ICC underscores that collaboration across financial institutions, corporates, regulators, and standard-setters is essential for scaling sustainable trade finance. It encourages harmonization of practices, taxonomies, and reporting standards, and calls for joint initiatives to develop practical tools, such as shared impact measurement frameworks and interoperability across ESG data systems (pp. 4, 12, 15).

Role of the private sector.

Private sector institutions, especially banks, traders, and large corporations, are expected to drive the integration of sustainability into trade finance by adopting ESG-aligned financing practices, conducting due diligence, and offering financial products that incentivize sustainable business behaviour. The document positions them as key enablers of climate and development goals through their influence over supply chains and capital allocation (pp. 3, 6, 11, 14).

Role of multilateral institutions.

Multilateral development banks and international bodies are encouraged to support risk-sharing tools, help develop ESG standards, and facilitate global cooperation. Their involvement can help align trade finance flows with the SDGs, especially in developing markets, and support capacity building for financial institutions and small businesses (pp. 12–13, 15).

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment – 2/3.

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Partially covered.* The framework is oriented toward corporates, financial institutions, and trade banks. Objectives for MIs are implied but not formally developed.
- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Fully covered.* The Sustainability-Linked Trade Finance (SLTF) and Supply Chain Finance (SLSCF) tools tie performance to pricing advantages, using KPIs and Sustainability Performance Targets (SPTs). Banks retain ESG labelling flexibility even when SPTs are missed, encouraging ambitious participation.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Not covered.* While innovation is referenced, the framework focuses more on standardization and process tools than on systemic solutions to global challenges.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture – 2/4.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Partially covered.* ICC acts as a global convenor, while the roles of MIs and governments are acknowledged in general terms. Responsibilities are not formally codified.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** Not covered. Governance mechanisms are not outlined. While partnerships are encouraged, **structural** details (e. g. , co-governance, joint decision-making) are missing.
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* Collaboration is promoted conceptually, but no institutional partnership models or operational mechanisms are proposed.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and MIs.** *Fully covered.* The ICC calls for convergence across corporates, regulators, and international bodies in developing standards, measurement tools, and ESG interoperability.

3. Engagement & financing instruments – 1. 5/4.

- **Blended finance structure.** *Not covered.* Although the ICC promotes mobilization of capital toward sustainability, blended finance instruments (e. g. , concessionally, guarantees) are not addressed.
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Partially covered.* Sustainability-linked instruments, HS/NACE code mapping, and digital scoring tools are discussed. However, more advanced tools (e. g. , impact bonds, blockchain traceability) are absent.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Fully covered.* Through standardization and eligibility frameworks, ICC enables the design of green and sustainability-linked trade finance instruments to support private sector investment.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Not covered.* No mention of guarantees, first-loss capital, or public-private risk-sharing facilities.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards – 2/3.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Fully covered.* The framework connects ESG performance with finance through KPIs, SPTs, and "Do No Significant Harm" checks. Trade activities are evaluated for both environmental and social outcomes.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* There are no provisions or references to grievance, complaint, or arbitration procedures.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* ICC establishes a structured due diligence process through:
  - Use of Proceeds criteria.
  - Independent evidence standards.
  - DNSH filters across sectoral and geographic risks.
  - Reference to the EU Taxonomy, IFC Performance Standards, and Equator Principles.

5. Integrity, accountability & results – 1. 5/2.

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Not covered.* No reference to anti-corruption, AML, or business integrity mechanisms.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results** *Fully covered.* The framework mandates KPI monitoring, client-level reporting, and bank verification protocols aligned with ICMA and LMA reporting guidelines.

Conclusion (50/100).

The ICC framework is a significant step toward building consistent, transparent, and verifiable standards for sustainable trade finance. It positions the private sector at the forefront of ESG integration in short-term trade transactions and encourages multistakeholder coordination.

While it succeeds in standardizing definitions, data, and due diligence for green and sustainability-linked trade finance, its practical gaps remain notable: no formal governance protocols, no mention of risk-sharing instruments, and no integration with blended finance mechanisms. For implementation at scale—particularly in emerging markets—greater involvement of MIs and public financiers would be necessary to close risk-adjusted return gaps and support structural transformation.

Framework 19: Mesa de Donantes – Cooperación internacional para el desarrollo sostenible en Colombia (CEPEI 2005).

https://cepei. org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/mesa-de-donantes. pdf.

Executive summary.

The "Mesa de Donantes" document outlines the institutional framework and strategic intent behind the coordination of international cooperation and donor engagement with the Government of Colombia. It focuses on aligning external assistance with national priorities, improving efficiency, and promoting mutual accountability among stakeholders.

Strategic objectives.

- Align Development Aid with National Plans: Ensure international cooperation supports Colombia's Plan de Gobierno 2022–2026 and long-term development vision (Plan de Nación y Visión de País).
- Strengthen Institutional Coordination: Establish mechanisms for coordination between donor agencies, government ministries, and decentralized institutions.
- Promote Transparency and Harmonization: Enable better tracking, planning, and monitoring of external resources to reduce duplication and increase impact.

Partnership and Engagement Principles.

The framework builds on the principles of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, including:

- National ownership of development priorities.
- Results-based management.
- Inclusive partnerships.
- Transparency and mutual accountability.
- It encourages harmonization of donor procedures, particularly around procurement, evaluation, and disbursement mechanisms.

Role of partnerships.

Partnerships are positioned as essential mechanisms for articulating the efforts of diverse actors—including donor governments, development agencies, civil society, private sector, and multilateral institutions—to align with national development strategies. The Mesa de Donantes is promoted as a space for coordination, alignment, and harmonization, ensuring better impact and reduced duplication.

Role of the private sector.

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) are highlighted as a vehicle for improving delivery and sustainability of development projects. The document acknowledges the private sector's role in post-conflict settings, employment generation, and rural development.

Role of multilateral institutions.

Multilateral organizations (e. g., UN agencies, regional development banks) are described as facilitators and technical enablers of donor coordination (p. 4). Their contributions include:

- Providing technical assistance and normative frameworks.
- Supporting institutional capacity-building.
- Mobilizing and channelling international funds.
- Promoting monitoring, evaluation, and performance-based mechanisms.

1. Strategic purpose & value alignment (1 /3).

- **Clear objectives for the PS and for the MIs.** *Partially covered.*

  - Development partners (MIs, donors) are expected to align with national development goals and territorial equity objectives.
  - The private sector is referenced in the context of rural and post-conflict development, but its objectives are not fully detailed.

- **Structured alignment of incentives.** *Partially covered.* Alignment occurs through coordination platforms and the use of the National Development Plan (PND) as a reference point, but lacks specific incentive tools or mutual benefits schemes.
- **Innovative solutions to pressing global challenges.** *Not covered.* The framework largely adheres to traditional cooperation mechanisms.

2. Institutional roles & partnership architecture – 2/4.

- **Clear roles for the PS and the International Organization.** *Partially covered.* MIs have clearly defined roles via donor tables, working groups, and formal inter-ministerial coordination. The private sector is referenced, but roles are informal and not operationalized.
- **Governance mechanisms to structure PS and MIs collaboration.** *Fully covered.* The Mesa structure includes thematic working groups, national oversight bodies (e. g. , Contraloría), and coordination via APC-Colombia and the Sistema Nacional de Cooperación Internacional (SINCI).
- **Definition of partnerships and mechanism to partner between PS and MIs.** *Partially covered.* Sectoral working tables and donor programming dialogues are used, but no formal long-term partnership models are proposed.
- **A structure for engagement between PS and Mis.** *Fully covered.* The Mesa de Donantes serves as a standing coordination platform for MIs and government institutions, with multi-level governance and periodic reporting.

3. Engagement & financing instruments – 0. 5/4.

- **Blended finance structure.** *Partially covered.* While not explicitly structured, references exist to combined use of domestic and external resources in instruments like the Fondo de Inversion para la Paz (FIP).
- **Innovative financial mechanisms.** *Not covered.* The framework does not present financial innovations beyond institutional design.
- **Private sector investment mechanism.** *Not covered.* No direct mechanisms are proposed to channel or incentivize private investment through the Mesa.
- **Risk-sharing mechanisms.** *Not covered.* Risk is acknowledged as a barrier in post-conflict settings, but tools to manage it are not proposed.

4. Operational alignment & safeguards – 1. 5/3.

- **Mechanisms that bridge business objectives with broader development priorities.** *Partially covered.* Multistakeholder initiatives in rural development and peacebuilding include private actors but are not formally integrated into the Mesa framework.
- **Dispute settlement mechanisms.** *Not covered.* Coordination relies on dialogue and consensus, with no legal mechanisms for dispute resolution.
- **A due diligence process or mechanism.** *Fully covered.* The framework includes screening, alignment with national priorities, and territorial agendas coordinated by APC-Colombia.

5. Integrity, accountability & results (1 /2).

- **Anti-corruption mechanism.** *Not covered.* No provisions or systems are mentioned to manage integrity risks or financial compliance.
- **Accountability: Embeds monitoring, evaluation, and shared metrics for results.** *Fully covered.* The SINCI framework includes national data systems, performance indicators, donor alignment dashboards, and periodic reporting.

Conclusion (31/100).

The Mesa de Donantes represents a solid example of **coordination architecture** in a middle-income country navigating peacebuilding and development simultaneously. It provides a multi-tiered platform for aligning donor contributions with Colombia's national goals and for structuring international cooperation around country ownership, transparency, and mutual accountability.

However, the framework remains largely state-centred and has yet to fully integrate the private sector into its governance or financing logic. While public–private partnerships are acknowledged, mechanisms for risk-sharing, financial innovation, or strategic co-investment are absent. To evolve into a modern SDG-aligned platform, the Mesa will need to develop pathways for integrating private capital.

Contact persons:

Jaime de Aguinaga

Vice Rector Strategy, Coordination,

and Institutional affairs.

IE University

jaime.deaguinaga@ie.edu

Paloma Durán y Lalaguna

Executive Director Strategy, Coordination,

and Institutional affairs.

IE University

paloma.duran@ie.edu

Authors:

Paloma Baena Olabe

Jose Carlos Ferrer Avila

Jaime de Aguinaga García

Paloma Durán y Lalaguna



ICC

ie
UNIVERSITY

www.ie.edu