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.

Grow houses in the neighborhood (Fight Against Organized Crime, Drugs)

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

Case author(s)	Sanderijn Cels, Jorrit de Jong, Martijn Groenleer, Esther Leferink
Institution / University	Harvard University, Harvard University, Tilburg University, Dutch Pul
Email address first author	M.L.P.Groenleer@uvt.nl

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

Start of collaboration		End of collaboration	
June	2015	August	2017

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	
June	2015	August	2017

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

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

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).

Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). Mijn dochtertje sliep ernaast. Hoe een Field Lab-team wietplantages in een woonwijk aanpakte. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch)

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.**

(a) Societal challenges and organizational issues
The societal challenge that the team under study faced was 'disrupting the criminal hemp industry' (Cels et al., 2018, p.2). The team members reformulated this challenge into 'combating illegal grow houses that can cause a fire hazard in residential neighborhoods' (Idem, p.4). In short, the prevention of domestic fires as a result of illegal drug practices thus became the societal challenge.

The various organizations involved (i.e., national police, public prosecution service, tax authority, municipality of Breda and regional energy provider) were willing to provide support and capacity, as long as their interests were taken into account. The main problem then was that they appeared to have diverging interests. For example, the police and the municipality were planning a large-scale campaign in Breda to fight against organized crime within the local community. The public prosecution service and the tax authority, by contrast, preferred to take on more serious criminals. Finally, the regional energy provider had no interest in fighting organized crime at all; they were in it for safety issues (much less financial issues, as initially expected by others). The major challenge was thus to bridge the differences between the various organizations involved (p.2).

(b) The stated ambitions and desired outputs and outcomes
The team was part of the Organized Crime Field Lab 2015-2016 (in short, OCFL 2015-2016). This experiential learning environment is a joint project of the Dutch Public Prosecution Service, the Dutch National Police and the universities of Tilburg/Harvard/Oxford. Teams participating in the OCFL 2015-2016 were challenged to develop and design creative and innovative solutions for various forms of organized crime with subversive effects. The stated ambition of the team under study was: 'combating illegal grow houses that can cause a fire hazard in residential neighborhoods' (Idem, p.4).

(c) How these challenges, issues and ambitions evolved during the period observing
As described above, the societal challenge was reformulated: a shift from 'disrupting the criminal hemp industry' (Idem, p.2) to 'combating illegal grow houses that can cause a fire hazard in residential neighborhoods' (Idem, p.4). This was done to align the diverging interests of the various organizations involved, and to arrive at a problem definition that all parties could support (Idem, p.2).

References
Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). My daughter slept next to it. How a Field Lab team approached cannabis plantations in a residential area. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch).

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.

Independently convened by a third party

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.

(a) The prehistory and past interactions of participants
Before the kick-off session of the OCFL 2015-2016, the participants had not met each other and thus had no prehistory or past interactions (Cels et al., 2018, p.1).

(b) How the collaboration was initiated
Direct supervisors of the participants, together with members of a dedicated task force 'Organized crime', had crafted a problem description for the collaboration as part of the OCFL 2015-2016. They decided which professionals were part of the collaboration. They selected a police man, a public prosecutor, a tax officer, a policy officer of the Municipality of Breda and a manager of the regional energy provider. Their proposal focused on drug crimes in the two southern provinces of the Netherlands (i.e., Noord-Brabant and Limburg). Therefore, all participants selected were working for an organization located in either Noord-Brabant or Limburg (Idem, pp.1-2).

(c) The sense of interdependence between participants and the incentives to collaborate
The participants had no sense of interdependence at the beginning of their collaborative project. Each of them had his* own ideas on how to approach the problem. For example, the police man and the policy officer of the Municipality of Breda aimed for a large-scale operation at the local level. However, for the public prosecutor and the tax officer, this local focus was irrelevant for they were responsible for the fight against organized crime, notably committed by serious criminals, at a regional level. Furthermore, the manager of the regional energy provider was not interested in crime fighting at all. In short, the participants had different ideas and interests. They tackled this by reframing the societal challenge (see also 13a). This increased both the sense of interdependence with regard to the reframed problem and the incentives to collaborate.

(d) Any significant changes over time in the period observed
The most remarkable change was the growing trust among the various participants and their ability to find mutually acceptable solutions to the societal challenge they aimed to tackle (see also 13a).

References
Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). Mijn dochtertje sliep ernaast. Hoe een Field Lab-team wietplantages in een woonwijk aanpakte. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch).

* All participants were male.

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
1-5	1-5	1-5	☐

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

From the start of the OCFL, the following organizations were involved in the collaborative forum: national police, public prosecution service, tax authority, municipality of Breda and regional energy provider. In the beginning of the process, it turned out that the various partners had diverging interests. The participants therefore had to change their societal challenge to ensure that all of them could add something to the collaborative project. Later on, two other important partners were invited to join the operation, namely the local government (in particular the mayor) and the local fire brigade. As a result, the collaborative forum became more inclusive (Idem, pp.8-9).

No significant changes in the institutional architecture of the collaboration were observed over time (Cels et al., 2018, pp.1-17).

References

Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). Mijn dochtertje sliep ernaast. Hoe een Field Lab-team wietplantages in een woonwijk aanpakte. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch).

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?

Not very 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.

(a) The form and style of leadership within the collaboration
The original case description (Cels et al., 2018, pp.1-17) did not provide any information on the form and style of leadership within the collaboration. If anything can be said about leadership, it is that leadership was dispersed among the members of the collaboration.

(b) The dynamics and impact of leadership on the collaborative process
The original case description (Cels et al., 2018, pp.1-17) did not provide any information on the dynamics and impact of leadership on the collaborative process, other than that members together exercised leadership by reframing the problem and organizing operational actions around the reframed problem.

(c) Changes in the leadership dynamics in the period observed
The original case description (Cels et al., 2018, pp.1-17) did not provide any information on the changes in the leadership dynamics in the period observed. If anything can be said it is that the dispersed form of leadership grew stronger.

References
Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). Mijn dochtertje sliep ernaast. Hoe een Field Lab-team wietplantages in een woonwijk aanpakte. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch).

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?

Reasonably 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 achieve shared outcomes, (c) how the process changed over the period observed.

(a) The collaborative process in terms of how the actors interacted with each other
The participants started the process with articulating their own ideas and interests. Because of this, it took some time before they had a shared understanding of the societal challenge (Cels et al., 2018, pp.2-3). However, after a few discussion sessions they had a shared problem definition and were able to start with developing solutions for this problem (Idem, pp.3-4). In sum, the participants first had their own ideas about the problem they aimed to tackle, and later on they listened to each other's ideas and developed a shared understanding (Idem, pp.3-4).

(b) How they formulated and achieved shared outcomes
In their search for a shared understanding of the societal challenge, they collected insights into the nature and the scope of the problem (i.e., production of drugs in the southern provinces of the Netherlands) and the ways in which the law enforcement authorities had approached this problem (e.g., previous actions against such crime). The participants shared their knowledge on these two issues (i.e., problem and solution) and looked for new ways to approach the problem (Idem, p.5). In doing so, they aimed for an experiment in which they could test their new approach, which was a combination of prevention (i.e., inform citizens of the risks of grow houses, and thereby attempting to increase societal support en informal capacity) and repression (i.e., to prosecute serious drug criminals).

(c) How the process changed over the period observed
After formulating a shared problem definition and developing a collective approach to tackle this problem, the participants had to get support from their own organizations for this idea. This turned out to be more challenging than they had expected, because every organization had its own interests (see also 13a en 21c). As a result, the participants had to redevelop their approach in order to keep all participants committed (Idem, p.6).

References
Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). Mijn dochtertje sliep ernaast. Hoe een Field Lab-team wietplantages in een woonwijk aanpakte. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch).

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.

(a) How the goals of the collaboration were formulated and monitored
A first experiment was carried out soon after reformulating the societal challenge (see also 13a) and redeveloping the collective approach (see also 47b). This experiment aimed to stop:
- hemp-related fires in residential neighborhoods;
- illegal drugs practices in residential neighborhoods ; and,
- exploitation of vulnerable citizens (Idem, p.6).

In addition, the collaborative approach was divided into four different steps:
1. The regional energy provider measured the electricity consumption in the residential neighborhoods under investigation and shared this information with the other participants;
2. The local police, the local fire brigade and the policy officers of the Municipality of Breda organized and coordinated a two-day operation in the neighborhoods under investigation;
3. Before and during the operation, the neighborhood councils distributed information about the danger of hemp-related fires;
4. After the operation, the participants organized an information market to evaluate the operation with citizens of the concerned neighborhoods (Idem, pp.6-7).

(b) How the participants, elected officials, oversight bodies, and citizens' held the collaboration to account
The collaboration had to inform participating organizations and citizens of the concerned neighborhoods (and beyond) about their operation (Idem, pp.6-7). The original case description, however, gave little information on how the collaboration was held accountable (Idem, pp.1-17).

(c) How these dynamics changed over the period observing
A major change in the group dynamics was the shift from promoting their own ideas to listening to each other's ideas. As a result of this change in the dynamics, they were able to formulate a shared problem definition and to develop a collective approach to tackle this problem (Idem, pp.2-7). Furthermore, they were willing to invite other relevant organizations (i.e., the local government and the local fire brigade) to join their two-day operation (Idem, pp.8-9).

References
Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). My daughter slept next to it. How a Field Lab team approached cannabis plantations in a residential area. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch).

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.

(a) The output of the collaboration in terms of results produced by the collaborative governance process
The outputs of the first experiment (see also 54a) were:
1. Reduction of grow houses in the neighborhood: two grow houses were found;
2. First experiences with collaborative governance process: various public and private organizations worked together;
3. First experiences with a new communication strategy: citizens of concerned neighborhoods were well-informed about the operation (Cels et al., 2018, pp.10-11).

(b) The outcomes in terms of the impact on problem solving, goal achievement and legitimacy, taking into account any unintended consequences
The following three lessons for follow-up operations can be seen as the outcomes of the first experiment:
1. Smaller scale: too much households were involved in the experiment;
2. Lower costs: the material costs of the operation were relatively high;
3. Clearer frame: local press and others did not always fully grasp the frame (i.e., promoting fire safety vs. fighting against organized crime) (Idem, pp.10-11).

(c) The changes to collective outputs and social outcomes over time
After the first experiment, the participants hoped to undertake similar collaborative operations in other neighborhoods. The individual team members promoted their innovative idea, but found out that most local governments were not so willing to follow their newly developed approach. The so-called 'road show' took the team members a lot of time and energy, but they felt that too little was achieved. After two years, they discontinued the 'road show', and thereby also with their collaborative project (Idem, pp.13-14). To be sure: members of the collaboration did continue with elements of the approach, and members kept in touch, but the collaboration as such ceased to exist.

References
Cels. S., De Jong, J., Groenleer, M.L.P. (2018). Mijn dochtertje sliep ernaast. Hoe een Field Lab-team wietplantages in een woonwijk aanpakte. Teaching Case (pp.1-17). Commissioned by the Dutch Public Prosecution Service and the Dutch National Police. (Only available in Dutch).