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
	Main case characteristics	
	Starting conditions	
	Institutional design	
	Leadership	
	Collaborative process	
	Accountability	
	Outputs and outcomes of collaboration	

1. General case information

Please provide your name, institutional affiliation, and email address.
 Case author(s)
 Institution / University
 Email address first author

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

 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.

End of period observed

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

Start of period observed

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

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.

The transfer jurious contains to the use the con-	aboration cocar i	moodo moro man o	
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

	. M	lain d	case	cha	arac	teris	stics	5								
			~ !						.,							
9. What was the policy domain of th							nan	one						•	D ''	
3			nent								ial/E		•			•
			cture		rlanı	nıng					hnol				-	
y			ealth							Oth	er, r	nam	ely .			
□Education	Sec	urity	& Pu	ablic	Saf	ety										
10. To what extent was the collabora	tion	driv	an h	v an	v 04	f tha	foll	O14/	na	amb	sitic	ne?	(1 -	- no	t at	all an
ambition, 5 = this was the core at			en D	y an	y UI	uie	iUII	UWI	ııy	aiiik	JILIO	113 ((1=	- 110	ı al	an an
Ambitions of collaboration			t of p	erio	d	Mi	iddle	of r	oeri	od	E	End	of po	erio	d	Don't
			oserv					serv					serv			know
	1		3		5	1		3		5	1		3		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 of	r															
boosting benefits																
Increase effectiveness by increasing impact of interventions																
Increase legitimacy and support among different constituents	9															
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 collaborat governance? (1 = not at all an ain									low	ing	forr	ns c	of co	ollak	oora	tive
Purpose of collaboration			s wa t of p				iddle		neri	od		-nd	of n	erio	4	Don't
1 dipose of collaboration			oserv		J	IVII		serv		ou	Ĺ		oi pi serv		J	know
	1			4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	KITOW
Co-initiation: Jointly identify required policies, services, or regulation	·	_			<u> </u>								<u> </u>			
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, o	r															
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
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)

	.,	•		,	D 11.1
		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)

	iuciici	c, onii	13) 10 1	Jinig (O tile	COllab	Olativ	e proc	C33: ((i — i ii	giny u	meque	ıı, J –		equal
Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	ed	Mic	ldle 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	

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)

1110	,ı casc	u IIIII	JEHLE	: (1 -	very r	ittie iii	CEIILIV	C3, J -	- veiy	3000	y iiice	1111162	,		
Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	/ed	Mic	dle of	period	obser	ved	Eı	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	

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)

an	IDILIOI	13: (1	- veij	y IOW i	3C113C	OI IIILE	zi uche	FIIUEIIC	,c, J –	v e i y	ılıyıı ə	CHOC (אווווני	uepei	iuerice)
Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	ed	Mic	ldle 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	

2	 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.

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 23. What different types of actors took part in the collaboration. Please select the backgrounds the different participants. Background of participants Start of period observed
Start of period observed Middle of period observed End of period observed Don't 23. What different types of actors took part in the collaboration. Please select the backgrounds the different participants. Background of participants Start of period observed 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 a 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 23. What different types of actors took part in the collaboration. Please select the backgrounds the different participants. Background of participants Start of period observed 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 a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
23. What different types of actors took part in the collaboration. Please select the backgrounds the different participants. Background of participants Start of period observed Middle of period observed 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 a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
the different participants. Background of participants Start of period observed Middle of period observed 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 a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
the different participants. Background of participants Start of period observed 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 a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
observed observed observed observed keep continuous political organizations / politicians Public organizations / civil servants Private, for-profit organizations Private, non-profit organizations Citizens / informal citizen groups
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 a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
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 a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
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 a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
Private, non-profit organizations Citizens / informal citizen groups 24. To what extent were the procedural ground rules for the collaboration clearly explicated by a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
24. To what extent were the procedural ground rules for the collaboration clearly explicated by a for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
for the participants? (1 = Very little articulation of ground rules, 5 = Very detailed articulation
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 app 5 = Almost always applied ground rules)
Start of period observed Middle of period observed End of period observed Don't
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 ac
included, 5 = Almost all of the relevant and affected actors included)
Start of period observed
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 of
transparent? (1 = Rarely clear to participants how decisions were taken, 5 = Almost always of Start of period observed

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

	5. Leadershi	9												
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 tho	se evercising leads	ershin? Choose m	ore than one if											
necessary.	se exercising lead													
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														
•		ctive) End of period	od observed [ot and Don't know										
•		nly ineffective, 5 = End of perio	Highly effective) Oon't know										
34. To what extent was the leadership (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly e	ffective)													
	of period observed 2 3 4 5	End of period 1 2 3		Oon't know										
35. To what extent was the leadership creative problem-solving resolving Start of period observed Middle		ective, 5 = Highly e	effective)	ities for Oon't know										
	2 3 4 5		3 4 5	JOH E KHOW										
36. How confident do you feel the answ reliable, and rooted in data and obs		to the questions i	n this section are	e valid,										

37	7. 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.	

38. To what extent did the participants engage in face-to-face dialogue th	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)														
	riod 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 Very low concentration; 5 = Very high centralization in a single forum														
	riod 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 inves	st in joint fact finding? (1 =													
Very little investment, 5 = Very high investment)	3 (
·	riod 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 inves = Very little investment, 5 = Very high investments)	et in knowledge sharing? (1													
	riod 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 among all actors? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)	of interests and values													
	riod 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-s														
framing, co-designing solutions)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very stro														
Start of period observed Middle of period observed End of period of period observed 1 2 3 4 5 1 2	riod observed Don't know 3 4 5													
1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2	3 4 5													
	ucina tanaible intermediate													
44. To what extent did the collaborative process explicitly focus on production outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)	ucing tangible intermediate													
outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)														
outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)	riod observed Don't know													
outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus) Start of period observed	riod observed Don't know 3 4 5													
outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus) Start of period observed	riod observed Don't know 3 4 5													
outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus) Start of period observed	riod observed Don't know 3 4 5 ucing tangible strategic													

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																		
40 T	a what	ovton	t word	ovolic	sit ioint	aool	o ortio	uloto	d 4h.	-	ah a	*****	mant	o of i	nton	4 m	om.	oron	da
					cit joint Very lit														
				ed .	Midd						I	End c						_	ı't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	2	3	4		5		
	ow wei				peration	onaliz	:ed? (1	l = Ve	ry li	ttle	оре	eratio	onaliz	ation	n of g	goal	s, 5	= V	ery
	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																		
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	•	1	2	2	3	4		5		
					active r								1 = V	ery li	ttle ı	mon	itor	ing	of goal
	tart of p						period						of per	iod ol	bser	ved		Dor	i't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	,	1	2	2	3	4	;	5		
					ticipan ing, 5 :								ratio	n to t	the f	ollo	wing	g ac	tors?
		Α	ctors	_	_,	3	Start of obse	f peric erved		N		e of poserve	period ed	i	End ob	of p		d	Don't know
						1	2 3	3 4	5	1	2	3	4 5	5 1	2	3	4	5	
Elect	ed poli	ticians																	
					, courts)													
	society																		
Affec	ted and	d/or co	ncerne	ed citiz	ens														
					owing		nal act	tors h	ave	inf	luen	ice o	ver c	ollab	orat	ion	(1 =	Ver	y little

influence, 5 = Very large influence)

Actors	S		•	erio	d	M			peri	od	E		of p		b	Don't
		observed					ob	ser	/ed			ob	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																

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	S	Start ob	of p		d	Mi		e of serv	peri ⁄ed	od	E	End ob	of p	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	S		of p	erio ⁄ed	d	M		e of serv	peri ⁄ed	od	E		of p		d	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	S	Start of period observed				M		e of serv	perio ed	bc	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				M	iddle ob	e of serv	•	bo	Ē	End ob	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																

ν	7	

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																

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.