COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE CASE DATABASE

Purpose of database

This database provides a collective repository for collaborative governance case studies from around the world. The mission of the repository is to foster rich but systematic medium and large-N analysis of the conditions, processes, and outcomes of collaborative governance. Researchers who contribute a case to the database may use the entire dataset for their own research purposes. Moreover, contributed cases will be cited by other researchers in their analyses.

Key definitions and scope conditions

- *All types of collaborative governance cases from all policy domains are welcome*: Cases may involve only government entities, only non-government entities, or a mix of the two. Cases may represent successes or failures or something in between.
- *Definition of collaboration:* When two or more actors aim to constructively manage their differences in order to produce joint solutions to common challenges.
- *Definition of governance:* The arrangements and processes through which interdependent but operationally autonomous actors aim to formulate and achieve common goals through collective decision making.
- *Definition of collaborative governance:* A collective decision-making process based on more or less institutionalized interactions between two or more actors that aims to establish common ground for joint problem solving and value creation.
- *Definition of a case:* A set of actors collaborating on a shared issue over a specified time period within a given geographical space. The database allows contributors to chart the evolution of a collaboration over time. However, if the set of actors, the focal issue, or the geographical scope change drastically, the data may also be entered as separate but related cases.

Instructions to contributors

The survey consists of eight thematic sections, each starting with a series of closed questions and ending with an open text question that allows you to add your qualitative insights. Please provide as much information as you feel confident in providing on the basis of your knowledge of the case.. You can select 'Don't Know' if you do not have the answer. A confidence measure at the end of each section asks you to make a self-assessment of your level of confidence in the validity and reliability of the data you have entered. The survey takes about four hours to complete one case.

Before your survey is accepted into the database, a peer researcher will review your case description to make sure it is clear and consistent. You will also be asked to check at least one case submitted by a fellow contributor. Please contact the database editors at s.c.douglas@uu.nl to discuss any queries you may have about the database and about potential case contributions.

Content of survey

1. General case information 2
2. Main case characteristics 3
3. Starting conditions 1
4. Institutional design 7
5. Leadership 9
6. Collaborative process 11
7. Accountability 13
8. Outputs and outcomes of collaboration 15

1. General case information

1. Please provide a unique name for the case you are describing.

Community Enterprise Het Klokhuis

2. Please provide your name, institutional affiliation, and email address.

Case author(s)	José Nederhand
Institution / University	Erasmuss University Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Email address first author	nederhand@essb.eur.nl

3. Please specify the start and termination date of this collaboration.

Start of collaboration		End of collaboration	
April	2012	Ongoing	Ongoing

4. Please specify the period of the collaboration covered by your research data. Note: This is not about when you collected the data, but what period your data covers.

Start of period observed		End of period observed	
April	2012	February	2018

5. Please specify the type of data collection methods you used.

Methods	Used
Documents	✔
Interviews	✔
Observations Social network data	
Surveys	✔
Other, namely:	

6. Please provide up to three weblinks to published reports, articles, or books that document this case (e.g. a peer-reviewed article or an evaluation report).

Nederhand, J., Bekkers, V. and Voorberg, W. (2016) . Self- Organization and the Role of Government: How and why does self-organization evolve in the shadow of hierarchy?, Public Management Review, 18:7, 1063-1084 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14719037.2015.1066417

7. At which jurisdictional level did the collaboration occur? Choose more than one if necessary.

Level of collaboration	Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed
Local	✔	✔	✔
Regional			
National			
International (across borders)			
Supranational (UN, EU, etc.)			
Multi-level (collaboration between levels)			

8. In which country or region was the case situated? Pick more than one if necessary

Europe	Select	Select	Select	Select

2. Main case characteristics

9. What was the policy domain of the case? Choose more than one if required.

☐Agriculture	☐Environment & Climate	▣Social/Employment Policy
☐Culture/Leisure	☐Infrastructure & Planning	☐Technology & Transport
☐Economy & Trade	▣Public Health	☐ Other, namely …….
☐Education	☐Security & Public Safety	

10. To what extent was the collaboration driven by any of the following ambitions? (1 = not at all an ambition, 5 = this was the core ambition)

Ambitions of collaboration	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Develop a plan or policy for a shared problem or societal issue	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Develop a regulatory framework for a policy domain or industry	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Create innovative solutions in existing policies, programs, practices	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Increase efficiency by lowering costs or boosting benefits	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Increase effectiveness by increasing impact of interventions	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐
Increase legitimacy and support among different constituents	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Organize crisis and emergency planning, response and/or recovery	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Create holding environment to contain conflict among stakeholders	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other, namely:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

11. To what extent did the collaboration aim to include any of the following forms of collaborative governance? (1 = not at all an aim, 5 = this was the core aim)

Purpose of collaboration	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Co-initiation: Jointly identify required policies, services, or regulation	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Co-develop: Jointly create and arrange policies, services, or regulation	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Co-production: Implement policies, deliver services, or provide regulation	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Co-assessment: Jointly monitor and evaluate impact of policies, services, or regulation	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐

12. **How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?**

Highly confident

13. **Please describe in max. 600 words the (a) societal challenges and organizational issues the collaboration sought to address, (b) the stated ambitions and desired outputs and outcomes, (c) how these challenges, issues and ambitions evolved during the period observed.**

The top-down closure of the former community centre by the Amersfoort municipality in the Netherlands and the consideration being given to establishing an addiction clinic mobilized a small group of active inhabitants who were willing to take over the centre. Since its start in April 2012, when "Het Klokhuis" was legally established, about 300–400 inhabitants visit the centre each day and they are served by 40–50 volunteers. The building is rented from a third party to which the municipality has outsourced the exploitation of their buildings. Commercial activities such as renting spaces to other parties (such as for childcare) financially compensate for the social activities that are carried out to foster social cohesion. Furthermore, ‘Het Klokhuis’ provides internships in cooperation with the UWV (the Dutch unemployment agency), Wi-Fi hotspots, a small library, sports and hobby lessons, buddy projects for migrants and/or unemployed people and a low-threshold location to facilitate meetings, for instance with the police. The stated ambition of "Het Klokhuis" is that commercial activities cover the costs of the more social activities of the center. However, they have not yet succeeded in this ambition as they are still financially dependent from the Amersfoort municipality with whom they closely collaborate. During the observed period, the struggle for money to keep the community center open and running is a key one. For this reason they have regular meetings with public officials and politicians from the municipality. The interactions between initiators and the municipality was certainly at the beginning of the process strongly structured with a clear set of time, legal and financial guidelines that are formulated by the municipality and then ‘forced upon’ the initiators. During the process the municipality became somewhat more flexible. The ability and willingness to change the guidelines (in terms of exchanging knowledge and learning) can be explained by the fact that a community manager was able to link people and ideas resulting in improved trust between the initiators and the municipality parties, protected by the aldermen. Next to a strong hierarchical involvement of the municipality through the definition and enforcement of key parameters, rules-of-play and all kinds of requirements to be fulfilled, we see supportive actions through providing initiators with contacts, expert knowledge, useful information and the building lease.

3. Starting conditions

14. To what extent did the configuration of actors that made up the core of the collaborative process have a pre-history of mutual engagement? (1 = Very little history, 5 = Very extensive history)

Score					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	
☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐

15. To what extent was there trust between core participants at the start of the collaboration? (1 = Very low trust 5 = Very high trust)

Score					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	
◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

16. How was the collaboration first initiated? Please select one option.

Self-initiated by participants

17. To what extent did the participants have more or less equal levels of resources, (e.g. knowledge, influence, skills) to bring to the collaborative process? (1 = Highly unequal, 5 = Highly equal)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐

18. To what extent were there incentives to collaborate for the participants, e.g. financial gain or increased influence? (1 = Very little incentives, 5 = Very strong incentives)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐

19. To what extent did the participants feel mutually dependent on each other for fulfilling their ambitions? (1 = Very low sense of interdependence, 5 = Very high sense of interdependence)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐

20. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Highly confident

21. Please describe in max. 600 words the (a) the prehistory and past interactions of participants, (b) how the collaboration was initiated, (c) the sense of interdependence between participants and the incentives to collaborate, (d) any significant changes over time in the period observed.

(A) In Amersfoort, the initiators and the community manager shared a history of community activities. The initiators knew each other (establishing social capital), and had experience with how local politics worked in terms of political/institutional capital, which helped set the wheels in motion. However, scepticism continued: ‘We really had to build the level of trust with the municipality itself’ (interviewed initiators). The recurring interactions between initiators and key municipal people – civil servants and the responsible alderman – gradually helped the initiators feel positive about their plans and helped create a shared vision. The openness and frequency of these meetings led to the involved citizens feeling recognized. The alderman involved stated: ‘Contacts were frequent and also cordial. When the initiators asked me for time and attention, they always got it’. Eventually, the Board of Aldermen approved the citizens taking over the centre. Furthermore, the initial scepticism stimulated the initiators to stick together and feel motivated: ‘Our confidence has grown rather than declined as the result of the critical attitude of the municipality’ (interviewed initiators). (B) The top-down closure of the former community centre by the Amersfoort municipality and the consideration being given to establishing an addiction clinic mobilized a small group of active inhabitants who were willing to take over the centre. This was an important trigger: ‘We took a lot of actions and attended all the public hearing sessions in order to prevent an addiction care centre being located in the previous centre’ (interviewed initiators). The initiators organized a lobby to convince local politicians to consider alternatives. ‘We forced the alderman to talk to us about us taking over the centre. If necessary, we would even have occupied the building’ (interviewed initiators). The increased political pressure convinced the town council to adopt a resolution that forced the alderman responsible to organize a public tendering proce- dure for the centre. There was a single disruptive triggering event that fuelled the self-organization process, which can be viewed as a NIMBY-like response (not in my back yard) that changed the meaning that the inhabitants gave to the location. It emphasized their community belonging. From the side of the municipality there was no plan in the beginning. There was a constant threat that the municipality, framed by the initiators and citizens as ‘the opposition party’, would intervene in a top-down way and sell the building on the open market if the citizen group’s plan was not sufficiently strong or if they did not meet the requirements. This threat kept the initiators on their toes by creating a sense of urgency and also increased support from other inhabitants that convinced the initiators to keep going: ‘It was going to happen either way, good or bad’. (C) From the beginning of the process on, there certainly was a sense of interdependency. The initiators needed the real estate and financial resources of the municiplity. The municipality on the other hand needed the local community resources of the initiators to set up (and/or continue) innovative and effective services. (D) Over the time, the interdependency relationship continued to exist. As policies and political context change, it remains a struggle for the initiators to safeguard structural support from the municipality. The Amersfoort municipality would like to see that "Het Klokhuis" will become more financially independent.

4. Institutional design

22. How many (institutional/group) actors were involved in the collaborative process?

Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed	Don't know
6-10	6-10	6-10	☐

23. What different types of actors took part in the collaboration. Please select the backgrounds of the different participants.

Background of participants	Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed	Don't know
Political organizations / politicians	☑	☑	☑	☐
Public organizations / civil servants	☑	☑	☑	☐
Private, for-profit organizations	☑	☑	☑	☐
Private, non-profit organizations	☑	☑	☑	☐
Citizens / informal citizen groups	☑	☑	☑	☐

24. To what extent were the procedural ground rules for the collaboration clearly explicated by and for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐

25. To what extent were the procedural ground rules observed and applied? (1 = Very rarely applied, 5 = Almost always applied ground rules)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐

26. To what extent was the collaboration inclusive? (1 = Very few of the relevant and affected actors included, 5 = Almost all of the relevant and affected actors included)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐

27. To what extent were the decision-making processes in the key collaborative forums transparent? (1 = Rarely clear to participants how decisions were taken, 5 = Almost always clear)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐

28. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Mostly confident

29. Please describe in max 600 words (a) the ground rules of the collaboration, (b) the inclusiveness of the collaborative forum(s), (c) the transparency of decision making within the collaborative forum(s), (d) any significant changes in the institutional architecture of collaboration over time

(A) Especially at the beginning of the process, the municipality set out the ground rules for the collaboration. The initiators were allowed to produce their own welfare services and take over the building that was public property, but within the framework created by government. For instance, there had to be a strict seperation of functions between the community and the board of the association and their business case had to be reviewed by a third party. The initiators were forced to develop a (financial) plan, and this constrained their space to manoeuvre. Again, the involvement of an alderman and the community manager helped the civil servants become more willing to change their roles and to adapt existing rules. ‘The conditions that restricted us were loosened by the municipality so that we could act in a more business-like manner’ (interviewed initiators). (B) The collaborative forums are inclusive - all parties are allowed to participate - the access is for example not restricted by rules (C) To the collaborative partners is not entirely clear how the municipality internally comes to its decisions. In this respect, the collaborative forum is not really open and inclusive in all stages of the collaboration. The municipality is the most powerful actor in the collaboration process due to its unique resourcs. (D) No significant changes.

5. Leadership

30. Characterize the locus of leadership roles in the collaborative process

Locus of leadership	Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed	Don't know
One lead actor				
A few lead actors	✔	✔	✔	
Shared collective among all actors				

31. What were the backgrounds of those exercising leadership? Choose more than one if necessary.

Background of participants	Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed	Don't know
Political organizations / politicians	✔	✔	✔	
Public organizations / civil servants	✔	✔	✔	
Private, for-profit organizations				
Private non-profit organizations				
Citizens / informal citizen groups	✔	✔	✔	

32. To what extent was the leadership effective in convening / bringing together the relevant and affected actors (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly effective)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐

33. To what extent was the leadership effective in guarding the focus and integrity of the collaborative process intended in this case? (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly effective)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐

34. To what extent was the leadership effective in resolving or mitigating conflicts between actors? (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly effective)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐

35. To what extent was the leadership effective in creating and realizing concrete opportunities for creative problem-solving resolving? (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly effective)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐

36. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Highly confident

37. Please describe in max. 600 words the (a) the form and style of leadership within the collaboration, (b) the dynamics and impact of leadership on the collaborative process (c) changes in the leadership dynamics in the period observed.

As noted above, there were three leading parties: politicians, public officials and initiators. The process would not have gotten off the ground without the boundary spanning leadership of public officials and politicians. The community manager and the alderman responsible conducted significant boundary-spanning activities, thereby fostering trust. The alderman ensured political support and protected the initiative, making it easier for the community manager to overcome resistance within the municipality. One initiator observed: ‘The role of the community manager was a tough one since she experienced a lot of resistance’. The alderman commented: ‘I think my close involvement was one of the key factors for success’. This was important because ‘the municipality is a seven-headed monster, and some heads trust the initiators but other heads do not’ (interviewed civil servant). The ability and willingness to change the guidelines (in terms of exchanging knowledge and learning) can be explained by the fact that the community manager was able to link people and ideas resulting in improved trust between the initiators and the municipality parties, protected by the aldermen. On the side of the community enterprise "Het Klokhuis" there was also one leading initiator. She had a more transformational leadership style by motivating the other volunteers to keep going and keep pushing the municipality in the direction she wanted them to go. I see no changes in leadership over time or any major leadership shifts. Although the politicians changed (because of re-elections), they remained committed and facilitating.

6. Collaborative process

38. To what extent did the participants engage in face-to-face dialogue through holding regular meetings with good attendance? (1 = Very infrequently, 5 = Very frequently)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐

39. To what extent was the collaborative process concentrated in a single forum/arena/group? (1 = Very low concentration; 5 = Very high centralization in a single forum/arena/group)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐

40. To what extent did the participants in the collaborative process invest in joint fact finding? (1 = Very little investment, 5 = Very high investment)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐

41. To what extent did the participants in the collaborative process invest in knowledge sharing? (1 = Very little investment, 5 = Very high investments)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐

42. To what extent did the collaborative process focus on the alignment of interests and values among all actors? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐

43. To what extent did the collaborative process focus on joint problem-solving (e.g. joint problem framing, co-designing solutions)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐

44. To what extent did the collaborative process explicitly focus on producing tangible intermediate outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

45. To what extent did the collaborative process explicitly focus on producing tangible strategic outcomes? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐	◉	☐	☐

46. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Mostly confident

47. Please describe in max. 600 words (a) the collaborative process in terms of how the actors interacted with each other, (b) how they formulated and achieved shared outcomes, (c) how the process changed over the period observed.

The closing of the community centre and the NIMBY reaction to a threatened addiction clinic acted as a disruptive event that mobilized citizens to take over the community centre. The plan that was developed by the local community can be regarded as a process of mobilization against the municipality that had provoked them. This emerging tension can explain why the Amersfoort municipality chose to create a fear-based shadow of hierarchy. While accepting this alternative solution, the municipality wanted to control the centre's development. Again over time, these tensions were eased by boundary-spanning activities that generated trust. The fear-based collaboration process provided focus and structured the interactions between the initiators and the municipality through the imposition of various guidelines and requirements. A more benevolent interaction also became visible once the initial distrust and scepticism were replaced by a more positive attitude. The communication process between municipality and community enterprise (the inner circle of the collaboration process) mostly is on a face-to-face and a weekly basis with public officials, and on a monthly basis with politicians. The recurring interactions between initiators and key municipal people – civil servants and the responsible alderman – gradually helped the initiators feel positive about their plans and helped create a shared vision. The openness and frequency of these meetings led to the involved citizens feeling recognized. Halfway the process, however, a more distrustful relationship emerged because of problems with the renewed financing of the community enerprise by the municipality. Involved parties describe the process as laborious and time-consuming, and the attitude of the initiators of the community enterprise as rather aggressive as they seek a lot of political attention. It is effective though.

7. Accountability

48. To what extent were explicit joint goals articulated through statements of intent, memoranda, strategic plans, etc.? (1 = Very little explication of goals; 5 = Very highly explicated goals)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

49. How were the joint goals operationalized? (1 = Very little operationalization of goals, 5 = Very highly operationalized goals)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐

50. To what extent was there active monitoring of goal attainment? (1 = Very little monitoring of goal achievement, 5 = Very active monitoring of goal achievement)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐

51. To what extent did the participants render account of the collaboration to the following actors? (1 = Very little account-giving, 5 = Very active account-giving)

Actors	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Elected politicians	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Oversight bodies (e.g. auditors, courts)	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Civil society organizations	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Affected and/or concerned citizens	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

52. To what extent did the following external actors have influence over collaboration (1 = Very little influence, 5 = Very large influence)

Actors	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Elected politicians	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Oversight bodies (e.g. auditors, courts)	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Civil society organizations	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Affected and/or concerned citizens	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐

53. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Reasonably confident

54. Please describe in max. 600 words (a) how the goals of the collaboration were formulated and monitored, (b) how participants, elected officials, oversight bodies, and citizens held the collaboration to account, (c) how these dynamics changed over the period observed.

I felt that this was the hardest set of questions to answer given my knowledge of the case. As the ownership of the exploitation of ''Het Klokhuis'' is firmly rooted in the hands of the initiators of the community enterprise, the question is whether their goals are truly ''joined'' with the municipality. There are of course specific sub-goals formulated (that are attached to the subsidy the community enterprise received) that are actively monitored and operationalized. These goals are determined by politicians and public officials, but the initiators of the community enterprise do have a say. I don't see much evidence of changed dynamics, as noted earlier - the battle for public money and efficiency is a recurring one.

8. Outputs and outcomes of collaboration

55. To what extent did the collaboration produce the following outputs or outcomes? (1 = Very low, 5 = Very high). Note: This question mirrors the ambitions formulated in question 10.

Produced outputs and outcomes	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Develop a plan or policy for a shared problem or societal issue	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Develop a regulatory framework for a policy domain or industry	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Create innovative solutions in existing policies, programs, practices	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Increase efficiency by lowering costs or boosting benefits	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Increase effectiveness by increasing impact of interventions	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐
Increase legitimacy and support among different constituents	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Organize crisis and emergency planning, response and/or recovery	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Create holding environment to contain conflict among stakeholders	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other, namely:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

56. To what extent did the collaboration use any of the following forms of collaborative governance? (1 = Very low extent, 5 = Very high extent) NB: This question mirrors question 11.

Realized collaboration	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Co-initiation: Jointly identify required policies, services, or regulations	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Co-develop: Jointly create and arrange policies, services, or regulation	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Co-production: Implement policies, deliver services, or provide regulations	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Co-assessment: Jointly monitor and evaluate impact of policies, services, or regulations	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐

57. To what extent did the collaboration produce innovations, such as novel solutions, systems, and processes? (1 = Very little innovation, 5 = Very highly innovative).

Type of innovation	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Develop novel products or services for clients and partners	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Develop novel production processes for producing products or services	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Novel ways of coordinating between roles and/or services of participants	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐

58. To what extent did the collaboration create outcomes beyond its stated aims? (1 = Very little outcomes going beyond stated aims, 5 = Very high degree of outcomes beyond stated aims)

Type of innovation	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Built support and legitimacy for investing in future collaborations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Built joint operational capacity for solving future problems and challenges	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐
Created positive unintended societal consequences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Created negative unintended societal consequences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

59. To what extent did the collaboration achieve support among the different constituents of the collaboration? (1 = Very little support, 5 = Very extensive support)

Constituents	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Participants in the collaboration	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐
Elected politicians	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Oversight bodies (e.g. auditors, courts)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Civil society organizations	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Affected and/or concerned citizens	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐

60. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Mostly confident

61. Please describe in max. 600 words (a) the output of the collaboration in terms of results produced by the collaborative governance process, (b) the outcomes in terms of the impact on problem solving, goal achievement and legitimacy, taking into account any unintended consequences, (c) the changes to collective outputs and social outcomes over time.

The collaboration proces enabled the initiators of the community enterprise to establish a running organization. ‘Het Klokhuis’ is generally seen as a success story. Since its start in April 2012, when it was legally established, about 300–400 inhabitants visit the centre each day and they are served by 40–50 volunteers. In the beginning phase there were 20.000 visitors on a yearly basis, while in 2018 the counted number of visitors rose to 55.000 (not unique but total). A wide variety of welfare services are provided: from psychriatic self-care groups to buddy projects for migrants. To my knowledge, there are no negative unintended consequences. Perhaps the most remarkable outcome is that an innovative and novel community center is exploited by volunteers from the local community.