Key Take-aways

► How things are done?
1. City doesn't get enough input from the key stakeholders. (top-down approach, no mechanisms for information exchange)
2. Community and public sector have no sense of ownership in the decision made by regional and city governments.
3. It is important to understand where your competitive advantage that you can invest in to support growth in a new industry or innovation in an exiting industry.

► What has this resulted in?
1. The state leadership has bought into a port city strategy, we are committed to it, but we haven’t really looked into other opportunities. Need to rethink what our strategy is based on a thorough an assessment of our strength.
2. There is a plan to reclaim land, is it validated by the analysis of demand?
3. What is our back up plan?
What needs to be accomplished

1. Improving analytical inputs into decision making
   1. Use analytics to identify Melaka’s strength (core assets and advantages) and Melaka’s weaknesses (what is not working, what are the gaps?)
   2. Validate the data that we are using? (are there really 16 million people visiting, do we really have 0% poverty, do we really have 0,9% unemployment)
   3. Increasing analytical capabilities, for understanding competitiveness opportunities and challenges.

2. Create a permanent forum for public private dialog, to create city vision.
   1. Revisit the Councillor policy of the council. Currently 90% of the local government are political appointees. The structure of the city council should be 20% of political appointees and 80% of representatives of private sector and communities.
   2. If that is not politically feasible – organize a council that works as a committee for the city, that will bring different interest groups and will engage them in high level strategic conversations.
## What needs to be accomplished

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core objectives</th>
<th>Short Term Actions (3 month)</th>
<th>Middle term Actions (1 year)</th>
<th>Long Term Actions (5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving analytical inputs into decision making</td>
<td>• Validating existing data</td>
<td>• Create a system for data collection, analysis and interpretation.</td>
<td>• Strong “NUDGE” capacity - United Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct analysis of data collection and sharing capabilities</td>
<td>• Set up a dedicated competitiveness analysis unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a permanent forum for public private dialog, to create city vision</td>
<td>• Improving the Government/Community/Private sector “engagement skills”</td>
<td>• Identify stakeholders to engage in dialog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TOR for the committee (objective and arrangements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct trial consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lessons and revision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

• How do we get state leadership on board.
• Small wedge.
• Is it too late to reverse, reconsider the strategy that state government has selected (Port city)?
• Lack of experience (culture) of public-private dialog, and lack of capacity for such engagement. On the government and on the private sector and community side.
Resources/ support needed

- Technical support - knowledge/capacity building (State Government + Federal Government + Private Sector + Community)