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.

Managing Uttarahalli Lake

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

Case author(s)	Arvind Lakshmisha and Andreas Thiel
Institution / University	Section of International Agricultural Policy and Environmental Gover
Email address first author	arvind@uni-kassel.de

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

Start of collaboration		End of collaboration	
Select	2010	Ongoing	Ongoing

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	
Select	1964	October	2018

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).

this case has not been documented in peer-reviewd articles. Only by media and reports by NGOs

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

South Asia	Select	India	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: Overcome resource constraints	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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 focuses on a collaborative process that emerged between state and non-state actors to manage Uttarahalli Moggekere(UM) lake in the city of Bangalore, India. Urban transformation of the surrounding areas there has been biophysical and demographical changes including changes in governance of the lake, leading to changes in perception of the community residing around the lake. An increase in heterogeneity in the community and actors with varied perceptions and ideas of how a lake should be hampered self-organization. With unplanned urbanization and expanding jurisdiction the city administration as the custodian of lakes has the responsibility to maintain and manage them. The large number of lakes in the city-region is seen as a liability and the city administration is unable to meet the financial requirements needed to maintain the large number of lakes as lake management is not considered in the allocated budgets, nor does the city administration have the required human resource to maintain all lakes in the city. Further, an environmentally aware urban populace of the city are demanding the conservation and sustainable management of lakes. Concerned citizens across the city have worked with the city administration to manage lakes by sharing certain responsibilities. These collaborations formed to address long-standing issues of financing and implementation of day-to-day activities in lake management.

In our case lake (UM), the lake was restored in 2009-10 by the city administration, after which the city administration in 2010 invited a third-sector organization (United Way Bengaluru, UWB) to collaborate mainly in securing finances from private sector in addition to creating awareness among the heterogeneous resident community towards the lake.

UWB, was an outsider to the locality and had no organizational presence, hence they had to initially build trust among the residents and develop a shared understanding of the importance of the lake to preserving the local ecosystem. During this process of creating awareness and enabling active community participation, UWB established a local community association (Uttarahalli Moggekere Nadigedarara Vedike, UMNV) comprising of interested citizens, which was also made a partner to the initial collaboration in 2017 by signing of a tri-partite agreement. Thus, the responsibilities were further shared with the state providing technical support and enforcement, UWB responsible for financial support and public relations and UMNV responsible to monitoring and implementation of day-to-day activities.

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.

Self-initiated by participants

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.

There was limited interactions between the actors involved before the collaboration before 2010. UWB, had previously collaborated with the city administration indirectly, to secure finances for managing another lake in the city. There had been limited interactions between the city administration and the resident community along the lake and UWB was a complete newcomer in the area, and had no previous interactions with the local community.
The city administration invited UWB for partnering with them to secure finances for maintenance of the lake in 2010 and this was an opportune time as UWB was also looking to work on lakes in Bangalore based on previous experience of working with another lake group were looking to work on lakes by themselves and thus were keen to collaborate when asked by the city administration.
The main incentive for the city administration was lowering of both financial and transaction costs involved in lake management. In the case of UWB, it was establishing itself in the city and had identified lake management in the city as an important issue that the organization would like to involve themselves. Thus, were keenly looking for opportunities to work on issues of lake management. This partnership with the city administration was seen as an opportunity to gain a reputation for the organisation to be recognized and established as one of the key reliable actors not just in the city, but within the locality for lake management.
Over a period of time, UWB was able to establish itself as a reliable actor for lake management in the locality by building trust among the community, create awareness and organize the community leading to the establishment of UMNV (local community association) in 2017 and involve them as collaboration partners thus ensuring inclusion of community views and perceptions in lake management.

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	Select	☐

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

At the start of the collaboration in 2010, there were two main actors, the city administration and UWB (third-sector organisation) who signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The MoU clearly detailed individual roles and responsibilities, with the city administration providing infrastructural and technical support and UWB responsible for securing finances and creating awareness among the local residents. With the inclusion of UMNV (local community association) as a collaboration partner in 2017, there was a new tri-partite agreement signed between the three collaborators which clearly layed out the rules in addition to responsibilities of each actor towards lake management. Where the UMNV (local community association) was responsible for mainly for monitoring activities and enforcement of certain activities in consultation with the other two actors. The city administration and UWB retained their previous responsibilities of providing infrastructural and technical support and securing finances and creating awareness among the local residents for the lake.

In 2010, when the collaboration was initiated, it was clear that both actors were responsible for certain activities and were in direct contact with each other in case of need. At the start, the collaboration did not include the community, which can be attributed to the heterogeneity and skepticisms of the community towards both the city administration and UWB (which was an outsider to the area). Over the years, UWB overcame skepticisms and identified interested and key community members who were ready to work with the collaborative partners to shoulder some responsibilities in addition to acting as community representatives who acted as bridges between the larger resident community and the collaboration partners. To formalize the inclusion of community voices, UWB established the UMNV in 2017.

The decision-making process has always been transparent at least among the collaborators since the beginning of the collaboration. With the signing of the tripartite agreement in 2017, decisions regarding lake management is taken based on discussions and consensus at regular monthly meetings between the three actors.

5. Leadership

30. Characterize the locus of leadership roles in the collaborative process

Locus of leadership	Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed	Don't know
One lead actor	✔			
A few lead actors		✔		
Shared collective among all actors				

31. What were the backgrounds of those exercising leadership? Choose more than one if necessary.

Background of participants	Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed	Don't know
Political organizations / politicians				
Public organizations / civil servants	✔	✔		
Private, for-profit organizations				
Private non-profit organizations	✔	✔		
Citizens / informal citizen groups		✔		

32. To what extent was the leadership effective in convening / bringing together the relevant and affected actors (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly effective)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

33. To what extent was the leadership effective in guarding the focus and integrity of the collaborative process intended in this case? (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly effective)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

35. To what extent was the leadership effective in creating and realizing concrete opportunities for creative problem-solving resolving? (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly effective)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

36. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Mostly confident

37. Please describe in max. 600 words the (a) the form and style of leadership within the collaboration, (b) the dynamics and impact of leadership on the collaborative process (c) changes in the leadership dynamics in the period observed.

The leadership in this collaboration has been open and flexible with each actor mutually respecting and leading certain activities. The city administration took the lead to initiate and establish a collaboration in 2010, with individual responsibilities clearly highlighting individual roles and responsibilities leading to non-infringement of each other's roles. This open and flexible collaboration based on inclusion and deliberation between the actors. The city administration as the de jure custodian of the lake, has the final say in all decisions, are quite open to discussions and all decisions are based on consensus between the collaborators.

UWB has been a leader in securing private finances and brining in private volunteers in addition to creating awareness and organising the community for lake management. Under the leadership of UWB, there were several awareness campaigns, activities and workshops to create awareness and build trust within the community members and between the collaborators. These activities established UWB as a key actor who played a bridging role between the city administration and community members and still play abridging role in the collaboration.

Thus, during the period of collaboration, there has been a shift in the actor leading the collaboration, the city administration which initiated the collaboration in 2010, and UWB which keeps the collaborators together and plays an important bridging role.

6. Collaborative process

38. To what extent did the participants engage in face-to-face dialogue through holding regular meetings with good attendance? (1 = Very infrequently, 5 = Very frequently)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

39. To what extent was the collaborative process concentrated in a single forum/arena/group? (1 = Very low concentration; 5 = Very high centralization in a single forum/arena/group)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

40. To what extent did the participants in the collaborative process invest in joint fact finding? (1 = Very little investment, 5 = Very high investment)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

41. To what extent did the participants in the collaborative process invest in knowledge sharing? (1 = Very little investment, 5 = Very high investments)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

42. To what extent did the collaborative process focus on the alignment of interests and values among all actors? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

43. To what extent did the collaborative process focus on joint problem-solving (e.g. joint problem framing, co-designing solutions)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

44. To what extent did the collaborative process explicitly focus on producing tangible intermediate outputs (quick wins)? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

45. To what extent did the collaborative process explicitly focus on producing tangible strategic outcomes? (1 = Very weak focus, 5 = Very strong focus)

Start of period observed					Middle of period observed					End of period observed					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	●	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

46. How confident do you feel the answers you provided to the questions in this section are valid, reliable, and rooted in data and observation?

Mostly confident

47. Please describe in max. 600 words (a) the collaborative process in terms of how the actors interacted with each other, (b) how they formulated and achieved shared outcomes, (c) how the process changed over the period observed.

The main reasons for collaboration in 2010 between the city administration and UWB was to lower costs of lake management by the city administration. The city administration had briefly worked with UWB, who were in collaboration with another lake group in the city. When the city administration reached out to UWB, it was mainly to secure finances and create awareness among the citizens towards lake management. These goals were formulated based on the requirements and strengths of the collaborators. In 2010, the community was highly heterogeneous and with varied perceptions of how the lake should be leading to lack of a common community voice and representation led to lack of organization of the community. Further, the community was skeptical of the city administration mainly as they had seen the lake fall into disuse and deteriorate under state control since the early 90s. With the beginning of the collaboration in 2010, the city administration had collaborated with UWB, which was unknown to the community and was considered an outsider and felt alienated from lake management.
The outcomes were formulated mainly to increase benefits and reduce costs for all actors involved since the beginning of the collaboration in 2010 and the same was followed throughout the period of collaboration. The main outcome of the collaboration which was to undertake day-to-day activities and ensure lake maintenance and management remained constant throughout the process. This outcome was in-line with the aims and objectives of both the city administration which wanted to ensure lake conservation and increase citizen participation in lake management and UWB which had the organizational mandate to identify innovative solutions to societal issues through private financing. UMNV (local community association) which was established formally by UWB in 2017 was mainly mandated to work on issues of lake management to provide citizens a forum to participate and take an active role in lake management. Thus, the overall outcome of the collaboration remained constant.
Over the period of time the collaboration became more inclusive of local concerns and issues, especially as in 2010, there was no involvement of the citizens and with the establishment of UMNV and signing of the tri-partite agreement in 2017, there was a recognition and formal inclusion of local community as equal partners in managing Uttarahalli Moggekere lake.

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 goals of the collaboration were formulated to ensure sustained lake management by the actors involved in 2010 and the same continued in 2017 with the addition of the community as part of the collaboration. These goals were formulated based on the realization of potential benefits and the organizational objectives of the actors. During the initial stages of collaboration (in 2010), the city-administration and UWB (third-sector organization) shared a common goal and worked towards its achievement, as for UWB it was a matter of building its reputation and establishing itself as a key actor for lake management in the city. For the city administration, this was a matter of ensuring its investment in reviving the lake in 2010 was not wasted in the long-term. The city administration as the government custodian of the lake monitored the activities of UWB, based on the financial support garnered for undertaking activities of lake management. Further, the private companies that provided financial support to UWB under their corporate social responsibility schemes to undertake activities had their own mechanisms of monitoring their support through regular checks and visits to the lake. The community,
The signing of the tri-partite agreement in 2017, and the inclusion of the community as collaborators led to establishment of a monitoring committee as was stipulated in the agreement. This committee comprised of 2 members representing each of the actors and meet regularly to oversee that each actor discharges their roles and responsibilities as envisaged in the agreement. If any issues are raised at the meetings of the monitoring committee and remedial action is not undertaken within 30 days the actors have the rights to terminate or withdraw from the agreement. Further, the agreement also specifies that if the city administration observes that UWB or UMNV is not discharging their activities, the city administration can terminate the contract with them and the same rights are provided to UWB and UMNV, who can withdraw from the agreement in case they observe the city administration is not fulfilling its stated responsibilities.

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.

The collaboration was initiated by the city administration with the main objective of reducing costs of managing Uttarahalli moggekere (UM) with the help of non-state actors (citizens and third-sector organizations). The main output for UWB (as this was the first lake they worked on individually) was the development of a blueprint to expand its strategies for lake management based on the lessons learnt on how to work with the city-administration and on gaining trust of the community.

There were several outcomes produced by this collaboration, namely: securing finances from private companies by UWB since 2010. The creation of a common goal for lake management among a heterogeneous community and the establishment of UMNV (local community organization) in 2017 comprising of interested citizens from the community residing along the lake to be part of the collaboration ensuring the inclusion of citizen perspectives and local voices and knowledge by UWB. This led to the signing of the tri-partite agreement in 2017 highlighting the success of collaboration between state and non-state actors and indicating that if a common goal was established between these actors, a collaborative relationship for the betterment of society could be a possibility in other lakes across the city leading to a win-win situation for all actors involved. Further the collaboration led to UWB gained the reputation and was recognized as a key actor for securing private finances as well as in engaging with local communities by creating awareness and aid in organizing the community towards a societal good. Post this collaboration, UWB partnered with the city administration to work across several lakes in the city. For the city administration the main outcome was reduction in transaction costs and overcoming skepticism that non-state actors can also be part of the solution aiding the government in achieving its objectives. For the community, the outcome was mainly an improvement of their neighborhood, and increase in social interactions in an otherwise heterogeneous community with limited interactions. Further, this collaboration helped the community organize itself to develop a common understanding of various issues in the locality and work towards identifying solutions based on community knowledge.