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.

Collaborative governance in Vietnam flooding

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

Case author(s)	Olivier Rubin
Institution / University	Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University
Email address first author	rubin@ruc.dk

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

Start of collaboration		End of collaboration	
January	2011	Select	Select

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	
January	2011	September	2016

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).

https://brill.com/abstract/journals/ajss/43/6/article-p760_6.xml
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/apv.12037
https://www.springer.com/la/book/9783642358036

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

East Asia	Select	Vietnam	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?**

Mostly 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 central Vietnamese government sought to collaborate with local associations and communes to provide disaster relief to vulnerable households in the wake of recurrent floods. Our research was primarily focused on central Vietnam, but the findings appear to have a high degree of replicability to disaster management in Vietnam as a whole.

Vietnam constitutes a special case not only because it provides an example collaborative governance in a developing country but also more importantly due to its distinct highly centralized political system. The central government is the highest organ of the governance system, and it is controlled by the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV). The CPV is the only legal party in Vietnam and its Central Committee is the top decision-making body. The local governance system in Vietnam is based on a three-tier system: the provincial level, the district level and the commune (township) level. Local-level governments in Vietnam have a popularly elected council, the People's Council, as well as an executive organ, the People's Committee. The People's Council is the local organ of state power: it is accountable not only to the local citizens, but also to the superior state organs. The People's Committee, on the other hand, is the local organ of the state administration and is responsible for implementing the decisions made at the higher level. In addition to the councils and committees, the local governments will also often have specialized agencies under the direct control of central line ministries. The key agency of relevance for flood relief is the Central Committee for Flood and Storm control.

The governance collaboration between the central government and local communes/association was meant to reduce the adverse impact of flooding for rural vulnerable households. Flooding is the dominant natural hazard stress factor for vulnerable households in our research sites where 80% of the households categorised themselves as being highly vulnerable to floods. Relative to other stress factors (such as illness, access to credit and access to land), flooding disasters were singled out in our survey as having the most serious impact on people's livelihoods. People's susceptibility to flooding was less caused by floods as such (most households are dependent on limited flooding for irrigation of their crops) but by flooding variability and severity. Households complained that traditional coping strategies, such as elevated in-house storage facilities and conduits to protect against saturation, were no longer sufficient protection against floods that they considered to be more severe, faster (flash floods) and out of sync with the usual weather patterns (possibly because of climate change combined with the construction of hydropower plants and extensive deforestation). Thus, many households were dependent on state relief to cope with floods. One of the few consistent findings in the disaster literature is the fact that the link between the vulnerable households and local governance is vital in a disaster situation. In situations where all community members face similar kinds of covariate risks, the local government institutions can play an important role as a protector of the last resort. Concretely, the emergency relief consisted mostly of rice, noodles, drinking water and a little cash.

We did not observe any major changes to either issues or ambitions in the research period, but it should be stressed that our research did not contain a substantial temporal component. While our anticipation was that an increased focus on participatory projects might impact the nature of collaborative governance, it was noticeable how little impact they, in fact, had on the overarching centralized governance structure and processes.

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.

Externally directed by law or authority

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?

Mostly 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.

In terms of institutional responses to natural disasters, the Central Committee for Flood and Storm control has been operational since 1955. The Ordinance on Flood and Storm Control in 1993 stipulates that at all levels throughout the country from central, provincial to district and commune, a Steering Committee for Flood and Storm Control shall be established. In emergency cases, the Prime Minister and the chairmen of the People's Committees of all levels may mobilize all forces, supplies and means of any associations and individuals to rescue people, projects and properties threatened or damaged by floods and storms and shall take responsibility for their decisions. Vietnam has compiled a National Strategy for Natural Disaster Prevention, Response and Mitigation to 2020, an Action Plan Framework for Adaptation and Mitigation of Climate Change in the Agriculture and Rural Development Sector and has adopted National Target Programmes in response to climate change. Multi stakeholders and community participants have been increasingly prioritised in the national target programmes. The 2010 World Development Report explicitly acknowledge that local communities typically precede national government in disaster response and adaptation, and much research has documented the importance of local institutions in livelihood adaptation in the wake of disasters. Accordingly, the Vietnamese government initiated several initiatives to improve local collaboration. At the time of our research, the government allocated 1 trillion VND (appr. 45 million USD) projects aimed at raising community awareness in disaster risk management. Our research group was involved in a project on the local implementation of a participatory information system aimed to integrate and spatialize multi- and inter-disciplinary scientific and technological knowledge with indigenous experiences to improve the preparedness of the community.

Historically, the management structures clearly have build on authority and expertise that extend from the central level down to the provinces. The CPV was present in the lower governance tiers and dominated all aspects of flood preparedness. By this very structure, interdependence between the actors – at the local and national level – was considerable as will be further substantiated in the next question. The incentives to cooperate, however, even for the local associations, were determined by the central government. Thus, the collaboration built on asymmetric power relations between the central government with the financial, institutional and political resources and then the local communities.

Again, we did not observe any major changes over time in the research period. On the contrary, the fundamental top-down governance structure in disaster management remained the same.

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
20+	20+	20+	☐

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 ground rules of collaboration are dictated CPV through decrees and ordinances. There is no national law on food security or the right to food in Vietnam's legislative framework. Vietnam does not have specific judicial procedures to deal with violations of rights to food, and it does not have a separate, independent institution to enforce rights to food in the country. Instead, the government supplies food and other necessities in emergency cases at its discretion. In the absence of a rights-based approach, such as rights to land, livelihoods or food security, rural people do not perceive of state support as other than situational endowments, such as in emergencies after disasters. Thus, the vulnerable households did not perceive disaster relief from the authorities as a right. The respondents expressed hope that they would receive immediate relief in the event of a disaster; they further hoped to receive some monetary compensation for the destruction caused by floods; and they hoped soon to be eligible for new and more disaster-resilient housing. However, the immediate help during disasters (evacuation, food, shelter and water), as well as the rebuilding efforts (compensation and rebuilding of physical infrastructure), were clearly not rooted in ideas of state obligation and citizen's rights.

The Vietnamese collaborative approach to disaster management is top-driven, with a clear focus on gauging the biophysical impacts of floods. Policies are mostly communicated down to the provincial government without clear plans and guidelines necessary to support implementation. There are clear vertical structures and hierarchies in the Vietnamese disaster management that confine and standardise initiatives along the more technocratic dimensions of the mainline ministries. Both the survey and additional interviews asserted that there is no encouragement for local people to organize spontaneously in order to carry out adaptation measures such as dikes, pooling of resources, protective forest belts, joint house-building, and the like. The local associations were not only dependent on the central government; they were an extension of the central government. This impacted the form of the collaborative governance. The governance structures tended to rely on command-and-control systems that resemble military operations and exclude participation; they sidelined local power structures and leave local people and institutions out of the community rebuilding process, making recovery more difficult; and they ignored local people's social and livelihood needs with the result that vulnerable groups may be left even more disadvantaged.

Community collaboration outside the realm of the CPV associations and agencies was modest. Relatives and neighbours played a very marginal role in coping with floods. Formal organizing was weak, while at the same time non-state actors were few and far between: 'civil society' development remains a sensitive issue. Neither traditional institutions such as Buddhist temples and lineage organization, nor new civil society organizations have great rooms of manoeuvre in disaster management. They work closely with public authorities and in accordance with government programs as is the norm in Vietnam. Interestingly, vulnerable households did not appear to pay much attention to the source of the disaster relief. Households were oblivious to whether the disaster relief they had received came from the state on one side or from domestic NGOs (for instance the Buddhist Associations) or international NGOs (for instance Oxfam and Red Cross) on the other. The fact that assistance from the state was not perceived to be qualitatively different from that of other sources is a direct consequence of most NGOs having to operate

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?

Mostly 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 previously mentioned, the style of leadership was very centre-driven. While reforms aimed at decentralisation and strengthening grassroots democracy have accelerated during the last decades, the Vietnamese local governance system is still characterised by limited fiscal devolution, as well as a lack of transparency and accountability. There was limited local authority autonomy. The central government continues to set tax rates and determine tax bases; the tax administration is still nationally centralised; and there continues to be heavy interference by central government in sub-national spending programmes. Central agencies keep control over the process of decision-making of local organs. The CPV strives to bring its governmental agencies as close as possible to the people and the villages in order to consolidate their organisational base. One of the chief means of rural consolidation and control is the Fatherland Front, an umbrella group encompassing the many different CPV mass-associations including the Farmers' Union, Women's Union, the War Veterans' Association and the Youth Unions. In this way, the CPV stretches downwards through the government tiers into most aspects of rural organisation. Decentralisation in Vietnam has been interpreted as being more of an exercise of power than a devolution of power. The state administrative apparatus is interpenetrated by the Party apparatus at all levels of governance.

Local associations are essentially political mass-organizations. Ninety-five percent of respondents in our study answered that members of their household were involved in formal associations. Only 6% reported being members of other organisations than the seven major mass-organisations tied to the CPV. These various formal mass-associations were increasingly being activated in preparing for floods. Interviewed members of the Farmers Union told us that they were part of village rescue teams, and the Women's Association had been involved in information dissemination and rescue teams when a major flood had occurred. These initiatives, however, were limited in scope and the active involvement (including training exercises) was restricted to a small portion of the surveyed/interviewed households. In addition, all activities were undertaken in close collaboration with the local commune, which functioned as an implementing agency. When asked about her greatest accomplishment in disaster management as head of the Women's Association, for instance, the head replied that it was to get people to follow the government's policies.

The leadership, in terms of initiative, design and implementation, primarily rested with the CPV. This produces a unique form of collaborative governance between the central government and local associations/communities during floods. From one perspective, the governance is impressive when considering the reach and swiftness of the flood relief. The collaborative dimension of governance, though, is largely absent, which results in subpar flood relief for many vulnerable households.

We did not observe any fundamental changes 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?

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.

An impressive rate of 93% of respondents reported receiving support from the local authorities during years when flooding struck. In-kind support (mainly clothes and food) was the predominant type of support received by 98% of those who got relief from the local authorities, 30% received cash, and less than 1% got a loan. Respondents were also asked to identify the most important sources of assistance when coping with natural disasters or other kinds of distress: 73% of the respondents pointed to relief from the local government, while only 4% of the respondents identified neighbours as an important (not even the most important) source for disaster protection. In essence, government relief is an essential part of coping strategies for vulnerable communities faced with recurrent floods. These statistics could surely be framed as an example of effective disaster governance. Surely, the reach and the swiftness with which relief could be distrusted was impressive for a lower-middle income country such as Vietnam. The collaborative nature of this type of governance, however, was limited. Our empirical evidence indicated a limited role of the local community in the collaborative governance of disaster relief. While local authorities were indeed actively preparing for floods, the nature of the collaboration was mainly restricted to act as subnational implementation units. Respondents referred to “announcements” as the single most important activity for the community associations. Announcements were almost exclusively conducted by loudspeakers while only a small minority of the respondents referred to announcements disseminated during community meetings where some participatory inputs could be gathered. Announcements are, in general, a top-down-driven form of communication and in the case of loudspeakers they are unequivocally also a one-way communication form. Only 2% of our respondents emphasized experience/information sharing as an activity in the collaboration with the government. An overwhelming majority (more than 90%) described local meetings that could best be characterized as fora for state announcements and information dissemination. People were in their own words “reminded”, “informed”, “encouraged” and physically “moved”. Cumbersome administrative processes hampered any actual feedback. Suggestions needed to be in writing and pass through several bureaucratic layers. Such processes were beyond most vulnerable and unconnected households. The collaboration was mainly a mechanism for control and implementation rather than actual deliberation of policy.

Accordingly, key government agencies considered flooding an exogenous natural hazard that can be forecasted and then dealt with through dikes, higher bridges, water reservoirs, and resilient infrastructure—what has been referred to as “climate proofing.” The remaining social problems are mainly dealt with through in-kind relief aid. With regard to the specific nature of disaster preparation, a small minority (12%) of respondents emphasized disaster management initiatives that could be interpreted as rooted in civil society, such as coordinating local meetings, sharing best-practices, streamlining village self-help groups, and participating in community rescue plans. The vast majority of the respondents (62%), however, emphasized state-led disaster policies, such as the provision of better roads, drainage, dikes/dams and housing. The qualitative interviews also pointed to state-led preparatory activities that were mostly related to physical infrastructure, such as preparing equipment, stacking sand bags, strengthening dikes

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?

Mostly 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.

In the Vietnamese case, I feel this question will mostly be a repetition of my previous answers. Naturally, this type of governance collaboration was limited in terms of electoral pressure, NGOs and CSOs involvement, oversight and accountability. The goals were formulated and monitored by the CPV. The state-led mass organizations had a near monopoly on rural organization, and any voluntarism was channeled through these mass organizations. In fact, households were often unaware of national policies and procedures related to disaster preparedness and planning: 49% of our respondents were unaware of national policies and procedures and 72% of interviewees did not know about disaster plans that were implemented at the community or commune level. The strong bureaucracy, top-down initiated policies and limited political accountability spurred a high degree of interaction with formal communities in disaster settings as well as high rates of memberships in political associations. However, the nature of the collaboration inhibited community-led participation, synergetic cooperation, and risk sharing at the local level. Thus, this type of collaborative governance might provide effective disaster relief through a quick and extensive mobilization of resources. But the disaster initiatives were not right-based and were not the result of bottom-up dialogue and stakeholder consultations. The interaction between local authorities and vulnerable households was substantial in quantitative terms. In qualitative terms, however, the close collaboration was not based on enforceable rights or electoral accountability. The result was disaster management that was mainly technocratic, focused on climate proofing through the construction of dykes, higher bridges, water reservoirs, resilient infrastructure and so on. The socio-economic disaster aid mostly consisted of short-term relief (food, clothes and shelter) whereas longer-term aid to bolster resilience to the recurrent floods received less attention.

Finally, the template has been constructed with a liberal democratic government in mind. This is, of course, most obvious when the template mentions “elected politicians” but it also creeps up in some of the other overarching questions. This focus is obviously the right choice considering the sample of countries that you will include. However, at times it made a bit difficulty for me to convey the true nature of the collaboration in the multiple choice questions. I hope these descriptions provides enough contextual information to allow you to interpret the template in the right way.

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: Cement existing power relations	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐

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 close-knitted collaboration between community and local authorities meant that the CPV could quickly identify and reach most flood victims. Interestingly, there is a significant positive relationship among the victims of floods between the importance placed on disaster relief from the local authorities on the one hand and then whether households received the disaster relief on the other. This could be indicative of good targeting in that those who deem state relief important are likely to receive it. Both the objective indicators of disaster management (did you receive support and what kind?) and subjective indicators (rate the importance and usefulness of the support) point to a success in terms of disaster management. The outcomes, therefore, in terms of goal achievement and legitimacy can only be deemed high. However, this type of collaboration is also indicative of a strong dependence on disaster relief from local authorities. The state-led mass organizations have a near-monopoly on rural organization, and any voluntarism is channeled through these mass-organizations. Forms of collaboration are not formed by bottom-up processes of community self-organization and reaching out but through top-down processes where the state has annexed and institutionalized important civil society spaces. The relations of power and control over the collaborative processes are highly skewed in favor of the local authorities. This has implications for the collaborative network's problem-solving capacity. Disaster management was primarily perceived as a technical issue. Disaster protection concentrated on reducing physically determined vulnerability with limited attention to the socially determined vulnerability. The social dimension was reduced to emergency aid (rice, drinking water and shelter) while longer-term social policies, catering to the specific needs of the communities, were limited. Recall, that less than one percent of the recipients of relief received loans. Community resilience, thus, did not increase over time.

On the contrary, in terms of 'unintended' consequences, the state centered collaboration crowed out other forms of civil society, bottom-up driven collaborations. Interviews with vulnerable households did not only indicate a substantial reliance on the local authorities for disaster protection, but they also revealed a weak reliance on other forms of collaboration during floods. Relatives and neighbors appear to only play a very modest role in coping with disasters, and more than 80 percent of the respondents rated aid from relatives and neighbors as irrelevant during disasters. We did not find a single erected safe-house where the building had been cooperative effort between the villagers; what would have been equivalent to 'barn raising.' Even minor constructions such as higher ledges (to store food in-house) were a private matter. Simple communal collaboration efforts such as sharing of boats as a protection against major floods also did not appear to take place. The weak basis for civil society collaboration and the reliance on state support during and in the immediate aftermath of flooding leave very little scope for communal participation and local knowledge sharing. Vulnerable households risked being squeezed between the adverse consequences of the actual floods and then the centralized disaster management efforts that provided immediate relief but little in terms of longer-term community development and resilience building.