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.

Elite-Citizen Collaborations in NSW Parliament's Energy Inquiry

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

Case author(s)	Carolyn Hendriks
Institution / University	Australian National University
Email address first author	carolyn.hendriks@anu.edu.au

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

Start of collaboration		End of collaboration	
June	2012	September	2012

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	2012	November	2012

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).

Hendriks, C. M. (2016). “Coupling Citizens and Elites in Deliberative Systems: the role of institutional design.” *European Journal of Political Research*. 55 (1):

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

Australasia	Select	Select	Select	Select

2. Main case characteristics

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

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

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

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

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 case study centres on a collaborative process that was part of an Energy Inquiry conducted by the Public Accounts Committee of the New South Wales (NSW) parliament, a state legislature in Australia. The Committee is a permanent statutory committee of the lower house and it is primarily concerned with issues of public accountability. From time to time, the Committee is also asked by the Parliament or by a Minister to examine a particular policy issue, as was the case for the Energy Inquiry.

In late 2011 the NSW Minster for Resources and Energy requested an Inquiry into the comparable economics of energy generation in New South Wales (hereafter 'the Inquiry"). As part of its Inquiry the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) commissioned an independent research foundation – newDemocracy – to design and convene an innovative citizen engagement process. This community engagement process was to supplement the standard parliamentary inquiry procedure in which the Committee: 1) calls for public input and invites submissions from individuals and organisations; 2) reviews this 'evidence'; and 3) prepares a report which is then tabled in Parliament. The Government then considers the report, and is required to formally respond (typically within three months).

So in parallel to the conventional parliamentary inquiry process, PAC commissioned two concurrent citizens' juries: one run in a metropolitan area (Sydney); and the another in a regional centre (Tamworth).

The citizens' juries provided the elected representatives in the parliamentary with an opportunity to hear from a sector of the community that it struggles to reach, and thus represent. More specifically, it heard the considered views of a cross section of citizens from metropolitan and regional NSW on energy issues.

The focus in this case study is on the informal collaborations between the MPs in the PAC and the citizens in the citizens' juries (see question 21 for more).

According to Committee members (who were interviewed by the author) all the recommendations emerging from both citizens' juries were fully considered, and discussed at length. A number of members commented that they particularly valued the quality of the citizens' inputs. Most of the MPs stated that the citizens' juries added specific value to their final report, one that could not be captured in existing submissions. These positive self-reports hold some truth when one compares the citizens' recommendations with the committee's final report to parliament. However, the content analysis also reveals that the Committee misinterpreted or watered down some of the more controversial suggestions or issues of concern to the citizens.

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?

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.

This case is about informal collaborations between elected representatives in the PAC and everyday randomly selected citizens (who participate in one of the two citizens' juries).

The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) of the NSW Parliament is concerned with issues of public accountability. In terms of membership, the PAC is composed of elected representatives, drawn from political parties in similar proportions to that in the lower house of Parliament (the Legislative Assembly). During the 2012 sitting year, the PAC committee was composed of six MPs: three Liberal party members, one National party member, one member of the Australian Labor Party ('the opposition'), and one independent member.

In terms of public engagement, the PAC typically calls for written public submissions, and in some cases conducts public hearings where select groups or individuals are invited to present to the committee. As part of the Energy Inquiry the committee undertook a number of consultations including:
• Convened two public hearings (with invited witnesses and the public able to view the deliberations in the gallery), transcripts publicly available
• Called for submissions via a newspaper advertisement (received 39 submissions), submissions publicly available
• Three site visits (coal power station, gas fired power station and a wind farm).

In addition to these conventional consultative processes, the committee Chair (MP Mr. Jonathan O'Dea) was interested in experimenting for the first time with citizens' juries to explore broader community views on energy issues. With the support of the committee, the Chair commissioned the newDemocracy foundation – an independent non-partisan research foundation interested in democratic innovation – to design two citizens' juries into the Energy Inquiry. The resulting participatory design involved two concurrent citizens' juries: one run in an urban centre (Sydney); and the another in a rural centre (Tamworth).

There was no formal collaborative interactions between the citizens and the MPs in their respective deliberative spaces. Instead the outputs from one site – the citizens' juries – were fed into the deliberations of the legislative committee (PAC). Notwithstanding this institutional separation, some informal mixing and collaboration between the MPs and the citizens emerged in two noteworthy instances:

1) at one of the citizens' juries (Tamworth) most of the Committee members attended and directly observed the citizens' deliberations. During this process the MPs had the opportunity to interact face-to-face with the citizens, and listen to their arguments, questions and concerns.
2) at an informal luncheon at the parliament where approximately fifteen of the citizens (who had participated in the juries) presented their recommendations to the PAC

In terms of prior knowledge, the MPs in PAC had no prior knowledge or association with the randomly selected citizens in the two juries. They also had very low degree of interdependence

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?

Highly 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

Both the citizens' juries and the PAC have very strong procedural rules about participation, and rules of conduct and decision making.

The citizens' remit, which was determined by the Committee in consultation with newDemocracy, was to consider the financial and public perception aspects of alternative forms of electricity generation – one of several themes under consideration in the broader Energy Inquiry. In return the Committee formally stated: "that the Jury's recommendations will be provided to the NSW government as part of the Committee's final report" (PAC 2012 p. 193).

However, the interactions and collaborations between the MPs and citizens was much less clear.

The citizens were brought into the Committee's inquiry process, rather than the committee responding to a citizen-driven agenda. In other words, the MPs were able to mutually adjust their preferences in light of the citizens' recommendations but the reverse was not possible since the citizens' deliberated in isolation from, and prior to the committee's deliberations. In this sense the opportunities for mutual adjustment were limited from the beginning.

Second, the Committee was keen to keep their Inquiry at arms length from the citizens' juries in order to protect the independence and integrity of the citizens' deliberations. At the same time they did not want to give the impression of disinterest or neglected; the citizens needed reassurance that the Committee would take their recommendations seriously. Here newDemocracy (as the convenor) served as a useful mediating institution that was able to create some distance between the MPs in the committee and the citizens in the citizens' juries.

While the PAC publicly celebrated the citizens' juries and published the citizens' reports in their final report to parliament, it was not transparent how and why the MPs adopted some of the citizens recommendations but not others.

For example, some of the citizens' policy suggestions were accepted by the PAC. The most significant substantive contribution of the citizens' juries was described by the Chair as follows (PAC 2012, vii.):
Demand Management was a major theme of feedback received from the innovative Citizens' Policy Jury, which informed the Committee's deliberations. Demand Management became a key focus of this Inquiry, with ten of the reports 24 recommendations addressing this issue (p. vii).

But a number of the more controversial suggestions or issues of concern to the citizens were watered down or completely ignored. Some of politically sensitive proposals (such as nuclear energy) were noted by the Committee but not endorsed.

The informal collaborations between MPs and citizens all took place before the MPs tabled their report to Parliament. This meant that citizens were not given the opportunity to directly question

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.

Central to this case is the leadership of the Committee Chair, Jonathan O'Dea MP who seeded the idea of embedding a citizens' jury within the parliamentary inquiry. He persistently championed the jury model and the value of listening to the informed views of citizens on complex policy issues. For example, he encouraged his fellow committee members to learn about citizens' juries, to observe them, and he created new informal spaces where citizens and MPs could meet and mix.

The Committee Chair also functioned as an “enabling leader” who reached out to an independent organization (newDemocracy) to design and convene the juries. Interestingly one MP suggested that the relationship at times between the Chair and newDemocracy may have been too close, where the Chair maybe have become too much of a ‘process champion’, but it was also acknowledged that it is a tricky balancing act.

The Committee Chair also used the citizens' juries as an opportunity to promote his capacity to be an innovative leader. For example, he took many opportunities to publicise the process both within parliament and in the media. When visiting the citizens at their regional deliberations, most of the Chair’s time was consumed with public relations activities (including several pre-recorded radio interviews and several press meetings with print and television teams) rather than interacting with the citizens. This public relations effort could be viewed as a distraction from the consultative intentions of the citizens' juries. On the other hand the Chair’s efforts to widely publicise the citizens' juries and its findings can also be viewed as evidence of effective collaborative leadership and entrepreneurship.

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.

See extensive discussion under Question 21.

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.

The PAC formally reported to the NSW Parliament on the outcomes of their inquiry, making 24 recommendations. In this report the MPs referred to the citizens' juries, and responded to the citizens' recommendations. The NSW Minister then gave a formal response to Parliament on the PAC's Report.

While relevant government agencies and interest groups were involved in various aspects of the Inquiry they had little or no involvement with the citizens in the two citizens' juries.

The media covered the citizens' juries - largely due to the public relations efforts of the Chair (see response to Q. 37). There was however little or no public media coverage on whether, how and to what extent the government acted on citizen recommendations.

Indirectly the informal collaborations between MPs and citizens in this case served to create an 'informal' accountability between elites and the public. As one MP explained, he was keen for the committee's report to reflect a message of gratitude to the citizens (MP3, 15 Nov 2015):
I wanted to basically say to these people, yeah, we heard what you said and we thank you for the time you gave, you didn't have to do it, you didn't have to give up your weekends but you were part of this process and we acknowledge it by making sure you know we heard you…. I wouldn't normally have that attitude to public submissions.

The public elements of the Committee process also facilitated some of the moralizing effects that publicity can create for policy deliberations, such as encouraging public rather than private reasons. For example, when the Committee tabled their final report, five of the six members (including those most sceptical of the juries) stood up in Parliament and congratulated the citizens for their contributions to the report. In other words, in the public arena all the MPs were keen to be seen to be supporting the citizens and their policy efforts in this instance.

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: demonstrate how innovative citizen engagement forums can	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐

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?

Reasonably 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 informal collaborations between MPs and citizens described in this case had limited impact in terms of substantive policy outcomes.

This is mostly because the timing of the Inquiry was out of step wit a host of other policy discussions and decisions that were taking place at the state and federal level. Energy policy is particularly multifaceted and fast moving policy domain, and in a federal system, initiatives or recommendations on energy and climate change policy at the state level can be quickly superseded by national initiatives.

While the direct policy impacts in this case may have been limited, the collaborations between the MPs and the citizens from the citizens' juries demonstrated to elected representatives in Australia that our parliamentary institutions can adapt and incorporate more innovative forms of public engagement.

The collaborations also appear to have shifted the way some of the MPs view and engage with the broader public. As one MP explained :
"What community members tend to write to you is about is price impacts or the immediate concern they have of affordability or capacity to pay. But when you deal with these forums, they're actually considering the whole issue and the broader context ... So there's a much more considered position and they have the time and they're bouncing off others and listening to experts. It's a more considered view than perhaps a reaction to something when you're writing to your local member about one aspect of the particular problem…" For some MPs the main value of citizens' juries was in their capacity to 'test' public opinion on a policy, or on a controversial local issue.

Most PAC members in this case felt that MPs could engage more constructively with citizens in their parliamentary work. As one MP explained (MP4, 15 Nov 2012):
Parliament consults, likes to consult, so consultation is not a new thing, but the notion of consulting a random group of people through a deliberative process is something that we don't do....in a citizens' jury process it's about educating them to come up with an informed view, not just a snapshot, or superficial response, and that is very important. Where this sort of process, I think, works, is where there is a relatively complex challenge or question or .... terms of reference.