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 <u>s.c.douglas@uu.nl</u> 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
	Leadership	
	Collaborative process	
	Accountability	
8.	Outputs and outcomes of collaboration	. 15

1. General case information

- 1. Please provide a unique name for the case you are describing.
- 2. Please provide your name, institutional affiliation, and email address. Case author(s) Institution / University

Email address first author

- **3.** Please specify the start and termination date of this collaboration. Start of collaboration End of collaboration
- 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

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).

7. At which jurisdictional level did the collaboration occur? Choose more than one if necessary.Level of collaborationStart of periodMiddle of periodEnd of period

	observed	observed	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

2. Main case characteristics

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

□ Public Health

□Agriculture □Culture/Leisure

Education

Economy & Trade

- Environment & Climate
- □ Infrastructure & Planning

□ Security & Public Safety

- \Box Social/Employment Policy
- □ Technology & Transport
- □ Other, namely

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	S	Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End ob	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)

governance: (1 – not at an ann, 5 – this was the core ann)																
Purpose of collaboration	Start of period observed								perio	od	End of period observed					Don't
	observed observed								00	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?
- 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.

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

		Score			Don'
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.
- 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 observedMiddle of period observedEnd of period observedDon't know

		Joniou	00001	ou	IVIIC		penea	00001	vou	<u> </u>		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)

Sta	art of p	period	observ	/ed	Mic	dle of	period	obser	ved	E	nd of p	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

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.

4. Institutional design

Don't know

- **22. How many (institutional/group) actors were involved in the collaborative process?** Start of period observed Middle of period observed End of period observed
- 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	Middle of period	End of period	Don't
	observed	observed	observed	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 2 3 4 5 2 5 1 2 5 1 1 3 Λ 3 Λ

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					Mic	dle of	period	obser	E	nd of p	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)

Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	/ed	Mic	dle of	period	l obser	vedEnd of period observed512345			ed	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 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 5 2 5 3 4 3 4

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

30. Characterize the locus of leadersh	5. Leadershi			
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 the	se exercising lead	ership? Choose m	ore than one if	

necessary

Background of participants	Start of period	Middle of period	End of period	Don't
	observed	observed	observed	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)

Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	/ed	Mic	dle of	period	obser	ved	E	nd of p	eriod o	observ	ed	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 2 3 4 5 2 4 5 1 1 2 3 4 5 1 3

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

Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	/ed	Mic	dle of	period	lobser	ved	E	nd of p	eriod o	bserv	ed	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)

Sta	art of p	eriod o	observ	/ed	Mic	Idle of	period	obser	ved	E	nd of p	eriod o	observ	ed	Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	

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.

6. Collaborative process

0.0	art of pe	eriod o	bserv	/ed	Mide	dle of	period	obser	ved	End	d of p	eriod o	bserved	k	Don't knov
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Э. То	what e	extent	was	the co	llabora	ative p	oroces	s con	centra	ited in a	sing	gle foru	um/arer	na/gr	oup? (1 =
Ve	ry low	conce	entrat	ion; 5	= Very	high	centra	lizatio	on in a	single	foru	m/aren	na/grou	p)	
Sta	art of po				Mide		period						bserved	ł	Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
					ticipar Very h				ative p	process	inve	est in jo	oint fac	t fin	ding? (1 =
	art of p						period		ved	End	d of p	eriod o	bserved	ł	Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
					ticipar = Very					process	inve	est in k	nowled	lge s	haring? (1
	art of p						period			End	d of p	eriod o	bserved	4	Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Bonthalo
у То	what a	ovtont	did t	-	labora	tive n	000055	focus	s on th	-	mon	t of int	orosts :	and	values
am		II acto	rs? (1	he col I = Vei	r <mark>y wea</mark> l	k focu		Very s	strong	ne align focus)			erests a		values Don't knov
am	ong al	II acto	rs? (1	he col I = Vei	r <mark>y wea</mark> l	k focu	i s, 5 = ` period	Very ៖ obser	strong ved	ne align focus)	d of p				
am Sta 1 3. To	ong al art of po 2 what e	II acto eriod o 3 extent	ors? (1 observ 4 : did t	he col I = Ver /ed 5 he col	ry weal Mide 1 Iabora	k focu dle of 2 tive p	is, 5 = [•] period 3 rocess	Very solution	strong ved 5 s on jo	ne align focus) Enc 1 pint pro	d of p 2 blem	eriod o 3 -solvir	bserved 4 ng (e.g.	1 5	
am Sta 1 3. To fra	ong al art of po 2 what o ming,	II acto eriod o 3 extent co-de	ors? (1 observ 4 : did t signii	he col I = Ver /ed 5 he col ng sol	ry weal Mide 1 Iabora utions)	k focu dle of 2 tive pr	s, 5 = period 3 rocess	Very s obser 4 focus weak	strong ved 5 s on jo focus,	ne align focus) End 1 pint pro 5 = Ve	d of p 2 blem ry sti	eriod o 3 -solvir ong fo	bserved 4 ng (e.g. ocus)	5 join	Don't knov t problem
am Sta 1 3. To fra	ong al art of po 2 what e	II acto eriod o 3 extent co-de	ors? (1 observ 4 : did t signii	he col I = Ver /ed 5 he col ng sol	ry weal Mide 1 Iabora utions)	k focu dle of 2 tive pr	is, 5 = [•] period 3 rocess	Very s obser 4 focus weak	strong ved 5 s on jo focus,	ne align focus) End 1 pint pro 5 = Ve	d of p 2 blem ry sti	eriod o 3 -solvir ong fo	bserved 4 ng (e.g.	5 join	Don't knov t problem
am Sta 1 3. To fra Sta 1	ong al art of po 2 what of art of po 2	II acto eriod o 3 extent co-de eriod o 3	ars? (1 bbserv 4 c did t signin bbserv 4	he col /ed 5 he col ng sol /ed 5	ry weal Mide 1 laborat utions) Mide 1	k focu dle of 2 tive p ? (1 = dle of 2	rocess Very 3	Very s obser 4 focus weak obser 4	strong ved 5 s on jo focus, ved 5	ne align focus) 1 pint pro 5 = Ve Enc 1	d of p 2 blem ry sti d of p 2	eriod o 3 -solvir ong fo eriod o 3	bserved 4 ng (e.g. bcus) bserved 4	5 join 5	Don't knov t problem Don't knov
am Sta 1 3. To fra Sta 1 4. To	ong al art of po 2 what of ming, art of po 2 what of	II acto eriod o 3 extent co-de eriod o 3 extent	ars? (1 bbserv 4 : did t signin bbserv 4 : did t	he col l = Ver /ed 5 he col ng sol /ed 5 he col	ry weal Mide 1 labora utions) Mide 1 labora	k focu dle of 2 tive pr ? (1 = dle of 2 tive pr	rocess period 3 rocess Very period 3 rocess	Very s obser 4 focus weak obser 4 expli	strong ved 5 s on jo focus, ved 5 citly fo	ne align focus) Enc 1 pint pro 5 = Ve Enc 1 cocus or	d of p 2 blem ry sti d of p 2 n pro	eriod o 3 -solvir ong fo eriod o 3	bserved 4 ng (e.g. bcus) bserved 4	5 join 5	Don't knov t problem Don't knov
am Sta 1 3. To fra Sta 1 4. To out	ong al art of po 2 what of ming, art of po 2 what of tputs (II acto eriod c 3 extent co-de eriod c 3 extent (quick	ars? (1 bbserv 4 a did t signin bbserv 4 a did t wins	he col /ed 5 he col ng sol /ed 5 he col)? (1 =	ry weal Mide 1 Iabora utions) Mide 1 Iabora	k focu dle of 2 tive p ? (1 = dle of 2 tive p weak f	s, 5 = 7 period 3 rocess Very v period 3 rocess focus,	Very s obser 4 focus weak obser 4 expli 5 = Ve	strong ved 5 s on jo focus, ved 5 citly fe	ne align focus) Enc 1 pint pro 5 = Ve Enc 1 cocus or ong foc	d of p 2 blem ry stu d of p 2 n pro	eriod o 3 -solvir rong fo eriod o 3 ducing	bserved 4 ng (e.g. bcus) bserved 4 g tangib	join 5 5 1 5	Don't knov t problem Don't knov
am Sta 1 3. To fra Sta 1 4. To out	ong al art of po 2 what of ming, art of po 2 what of tputs (II acto eriod c 3 extent co-de eriod c 3 extent (quick	ars? (1 bbserv 4 a did t signin bbserv 4 a did t wins	he col /ed 5 he col ng sol /ed 5 he col)? (1 =	ry weal Mide 1 Iabora utions) Mide 1 Iabora	k focu dle of 2 tive p ? (1 = dle of 2 tive p weak f	s, 5 = 7 period 3 rocess Very v period 3 rocess focus,	Very s obser 4 focus weak obser 4 expli 5 = Ve	strong ved 5 s on jo focus, ved 5 citly fe	ne align focus) Enc 1 pint pro 5 = Ve Enc 1 cocus or ong foc	d of p 2 blem ry stu d of p 2 n pro	eriod o 3 -solvir rong fo eriod o 3 ducing	bserved 4 ng (e.g. bocus) bserved 4 g tangib	join 5 5 1 5	Don't knov t problem Don't knov
am Sta 1 3. To fra Sta 1 4. To out Sta 1	ong al art of p 2 what e ming, art of p 2 what e tputs (art of p 2	II acto eriod o 3 extent co-de eriod o 3 extent (quick eriod o 3	ars? (1 bbserv 4 a did t signin bbserv 4 a did t wins bbserv 4	he col /ed 5 he col /ed 5 he col)? (1 = /ed 5	ry weal Mide 1 laborat utions) Mide 1 laborat Very v Mide 1	k focu dle of 2 tive pr ? (1 = dle of 2 tive pr weak f dle of 2	rocess very v period 3 vocess very v period 3 rocess focus, period 3	Very s obser 4 focus weak obser 4 expli 5 = Ve obser 4	strong ved 5 s on jo focus, ved 5 citly fe ery str ved 5	ne align focus) 1 pint pro 5 = Ve Enc 1 ocus or ong foc Enc	blem ry sti d of p 2 n pro cus) d of p 2	eriod o 3 -solvir ong fo eriod o 3 ducing eriod o 3	bserved 4 ng (e.g. bocus) bserved 4 g tangib bserved 4	join join 5 le in 5	Don't knov t problem Don't knov termediate Don't knov
am Sta 1 3. To fra Sta 1 4. To out Sta 1 5. To	ong al art of po 2 what of ming, art of po 2 what of art of po 2 what of 2 what of	II acto eriod o 3 extent co-de eriod o 3 extent (quick eriod o 3 extent	a did t signin bbserv 4 a did t signin bbserv 4 a did t wins bbserv 4 a did t	he col /ed 5 he col /ed 5 he col)? (1 = /ed 5 he col	ry weal Mide 1 laborat utions) Mide 1 laborat Very v Mide 1	k focu dle of 2 tive p dle of 2 tive p weak 1 dle of 2 tive p	rocess focus, period 3 rocess focus, period 3 rocess focus, period 3	Very s obser 4 focus weak obser 4 expli 5 = Ve obser 4 expli	strong ved 5 s on jo focus, ved 5 citly fo ery str ved 5 citly fo	ne align focus) Enc 1 pint pro 5 = Ve Enc 1 ocus or ong foc Enc 1	blem ry sti d of p 2 n pro cus) d of p 2	eriod o 3 -solvir ong fo eriod o 3 ducing eriod o 3	bserved 4 ng (e.g. bocus) bserved 4 g tangib bserved 4	join join 5 le in 5	Don't know t problem Don't know
am Sta 1 3. To fra Sta 1 4. To out 5. To out	ong al art of po 2 what of art of po 2 what of art of po 2 what of 2 what of come	II acto eriod o 3 extent co-de eriod o 3 extent s? (1	ars? (1 bbserv 4 a did t signin bbserv 4 a did t wins bbserv 4 a did t signin bbserv 4	he col ved 5 he col ng solu ved 5 he col)? (1 = ved 5 he col y weak	ry weal Mide 1 labora utions) Mide 1 labora 1 labora	k focu dle of 2 tive pr ? (1 = dle of 2 tive pr dle of 2 tive pr 5, 5 = \	rocess rocess rocess rocess rocess rocess rocess rocess /ery st	Very s obser 4 focus weak obser 4 expli 5 = Ve obser 4 expli rong obser	strong ved 5 s on jo focus, ved 5 citly fo focus) citly fo focus)	ne align focus) End 1 pint pro 5 = Ve End 1 pocus or 0 cus or 1 pocus or End	blem ry stu d of p 2 n pro- cus) d of p 2	eriod o 3 -solvir ong fo eriod o 3 ducing eriod o 3 ducing	bserved 4 ng (e.g. bocus) bserved 4 g tangib bserved 4	join 5 le in 5 le st	Don't knov t problem Don't knov termediate Don't knov

reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

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.

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)

Sta	art of p	period	observ	ved	Mic	dle of	period	obser	ved	E	nd of p	eriod o	observ	ed	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)

Sta	art of p	period (observ	/ed	Mic	dle of	period	obser	ved	E	nd of p	d of period observed 2 3 4 5			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)

Sta	art of p	period (observ	/ed	Mic	dle of	period	obser	ved	E	nd of p	eriod o	observ	ed	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	S		of p serv		d	M	iddle ob	e of serv	•	od	E		of p serv		b	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	S		of p serv		d	Μ	iddle	e of serv		od	E	End	of p serv		b	Don't know
		UL.	Serv	/eu			00	Serv	eu			00	Seiv	eu		KIIOW
	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																

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.

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	St	of p serv	d	Μ	e of serv	od	E	of p ser\	erio	b	Don't know
	1	3	5	1	3	5	1		4	5	KIIOW
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.

	Don't
	know
5	
	5

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

	 , .	•		, ,,,,	y		010		·/·							
Type of innovation	Start of period observed							e of serv	peri ved	od	E	End ob:	Don't know			
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Develop <u>novel</u> products or services for clients and partners																
Develop <u>novel</u> production processes for producing products or services																
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 <t< th=""><th>Juiconnes going beyond stated anns</th></t<>	Juiconnes going beyond stated anns
1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5	Type of innovation
Built support and legitimacy for	
Dant support and logitimacy for	t support and legitimacy for
investing in future collaborations	esting in future collaborations
Built joint operational capacity for	t joint operational capacity for
solving future problems and challenges	ring future problems and challenges
Created positive unintended societal	ated positive unintended societal
consequences	sequences
Created negative unintended societal	ated negative unintended societal
consequences	sequences

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

	יונ, י	- 0	A CI	y Ca	LCI1	2116	Jup	νρυ								
Constituents	Start of period						iddle	e of	peri	od	E	End	Don't			
	observed						ob	ser	/ed			ob	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																

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.