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

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

Community Enterprise De meevaart

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	
August	2010	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	
August	2010	February	2014

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	Netherlands	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 development of community enterprises in Amsterdam is stimulated by major investments by the Dutch government to solving problems in deprived neighborhoods. Community networks were strengthned and specific boundary spanning public officials were hired by the Amsterdam municipality to help build new relationships between citizens and the municipality. One of the key policy priorities was to establish an "experimentation zone" in which community enterprises such as The Meevaart collaborate with the municipality under supportive conditions. The intention is that De Meevaart offers a place for all kinds of local groups and initiatives so that they can meet and develop activities both in and beyond De Meevaart. By creating this overarching meeting place, the initiators aim to improve the social cohesion in the neighbourhood (such as by encouraging cooking and gardening activities). During the observerd period the initiators and neighborhood inhabitants (together with the Amsterdam municipality) were working on establishing a shared vision in order to elaborate the centre's mission. This was providing hard to define since there were many interests to be met.

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.

The collaboration process had started back in 2004, involving two inhabitants (supported by some politicians) who were unhappy with the poor state of their neighbourhood. They organized, in collaboration with the municipality, activities to improve neighbourhood cohesion. After renovating the community centre in 2010, the municipality wanted to put the building on the property market. This plan triggered the inhabitants to approach the municipality with a plan to take over the building as they were looking for a location for their activities. Furthermore, the establishment of an experimentation zone that allowed communities to experiment with new activities beyond existing legal and financial practices made possible by the Dutch Ministry of the Interior also boosted its development. In sum, the establishment of the enterprise was embedded in an environment in which citizen participation, and thus collaboration with the municipality, had flourished for many years. The initiators and civil servants had known each other for years and they valued each other's work. There are no significant changes over time in the period observed.

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
11-15	11-15	11-15	☐

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

The location of De Meevaart in an experimentation zone enabled the municipality to be more flexible than would otherwise have been possible. A civil servant said: ‘You try to make things possible, after that you look at the rules. That is one of our commitments in this experiment – to facilitate them [the community enterprises] in their work’. As a result, the municipality and the Ministry of the Interior actively explored the redrafting of rules and regulations that hindered change, such as allowing volunteers to receive compensation: ‘The upcoming period will be used to transform and apply rules that ease the start of community enterprises’ . The energetic and free flow of ideas, knowledge and experiences led to numerous ideas and partnerships on how to develop the enterprise, which was also a goal of the municipality: ‘We want to make things possible and build on partnerships: we try to connect many parties in order to facilitate mutual learning’(interviewed civil servant). The decision making process was very transparenti, inclusive and open. As a result, the initiators and neighbourhood inhabitants were still working on establishing a shared vision in order to elaborate the centre’s mission. This was proving hard to define since there were so many interests to be met: ‘Our targets are not set. Along the way, we are exploring what is the right way to go." There were no significant changes over time.

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.

Setting up community-enterprises was embraced as an inspirational story to trigger societal entrepreneurs and citizens into becoming active: ‘It all started with incentives: you try to make things attractive by inspiring stories and offering subsidies’ (interviewed civil servant). Furthermore, platforms were organized to share the experiences of similar initiatives. Municipal boundary spanners were able to bring people together in the enterprise. The programme manager and one of her policy officers on the central municipality level were actively linking people, ideas and resources. This helped overcome and avoid deadlocks. A civil servant said: ‘When I know that a district is struggling with a topic, I make sure that they contact a district that is very developed in that area so that they can help each other’. Furthermore, the municipality organized meetings and facilitated contacts with relevant parties to find alternative funding. In addition, the responsible aldermen frequently met with the initiators. By showing their support, they made the involved people feel recognized. The municipality tried to support and facilitate the process by providing all kinds of resources rather than influencing directly by imposing norms and guidelines. The kind of leadership can therefore best be described as supportive, inspirational and connecting: a ‘soft’ approach was visible, one that made use of supportive actions (providing resources), storytelling and helpful changes to the rules of the game (setting up the experimentation zone).There were no changes in leadership dynamics observed over time.

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?

Highly 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 interaction process between actors was very open and supportive. It is clear that in the process, the municipality brings in a lot of resources in order to support the initiatiors of De Meevaart to reach their goal of establishing a succesful community enterprise. The creation of an experimentation zone in Amsterdam provided the new community enterprise with financial opportunities: ‘We got a further subsidy for furnishing the building and, after that, a second amount to ensure the main floor looked good at the opening of the building’ . The municipality also helped groups of inhabitants to acquire additional funding by helping them with applications and by providing necessary contacts and knowledge. Supportive actions also included setting up the earlier mentioned platforms because it was considered important ‘to organize meetings to strengthen and broaden the network of community enterprises in order to exchange knowledge and experiences’ . This was also necessary because the development of a community enterprise requires the involvement of multiple administrative layers within the municipality that have specific knowledge. We observed no process changes during the period observed.

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?

Highly 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.

The interaction process between actors was very open and supportive. It is clear that in the process, the municipality brings in a lot of resources in order to support the initiatiors of De Meevaart to reach their goal of establishing a succesful community enterprise. The creation of an
experimentation zone in Amsterdam provided the new community enterprise with financial opportunities: ‘We got a further subsidy for furnishing the building and, after that, a second amount to ensure the main floor looked good at the opening of the building’ . The municipality also helped groups of inhabitants to acquire additional funding by helping them with applications and by providing necessary contacts and knowledge. Supportive actions also included setting up the earlier mentioned platforms because it was considered important ‘to organize meetings to strengthen and broaden the network of community enterprises in order to exchange knowledge and experiences’ . This was also necessary because the development of a community enterprise requires the involvement of multiple administrative layers within the municipality that have specific knowledge. We observed no process changes during the period observed.

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 <u>novel</u> products or services for clients and partners	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
Develop <u>novel</u> production processes for producing products or services	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐
<u>Novel</u> 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?

Highly 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.

In August 2010, inhabitants from ‘De Indische Buurt’ developed a plan to take over the ‘De Meevaart’ community centre. With more than twenty volunteers, it can be open seven days a week. A foundation, known as the ‘Meevaart Development Board’, owns the community enterprise. The intention is that De Meevaart offers a place for all kinds of local groups and initiatives so that they can meet and develop activities both in and beyond De Meevaart. By creating this overarching meeting place, the instigators aim to improve the social cohesion in the neighbourhood (such as by encouraging cooking and gardening activities). De Meevaart is considered a success due to the energy and dynamics that the process has unleashed among inhabitants. A national newspaper reported: ’What happens in [De Meevaart] is so innovative that visitors from Amstelveen and as far away as France and China are visiting the neighbourhood’. As the community enterprise is so deeply rooted in the neighborhood, the initiators of De Meevaart reach a lot of difficult (vulnerable) target groups. We have not enough (longitudinal) data to say something about the changes to collective outputs and social outcomes over time.