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

1. Please provide a unique name for the case you are describing.											
2. Please provide your name, institutional	affiliation, and ema	ail address.									
Case author(s) Institution / University Email address first author											
3. Please specify the start and termination Start of collaboration End of	n date of this collab f collaboration	oration.									
Please specify the period of the collaboration about when you collected the data, but	what period your d		Note: This is not								
Start of period observed End of p	period observed										
5. Please specify the type of data collection	on methods you use	ed.									
Methods	Used										
Documents											
Interviews Observations Social											
network data											
Surveys											
Other, namely:											
6. Please provide up to three weblinks to	nublished reports	articles or books th	nat document this								
case (e.g. a peer-reviewed article or an		articles, or books ti	iai document tins								
\ 0	,										
7. At which jurisdictional level did the coll	laboration occur? C	hoose more than o	ne if necessary.								
Level of collaboration	Start of period	Middle of period	End of period								
Local	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.	Mai	n c	ase	cha	arac	teris	stic	S								
0. What was the nalisy demain of the	h a .			Sh o		m 0	اء ما	hon	.	. :£		اد ما	ı				
9. What was the policy domain of t				nent				nan	One					0 1 100	ont	Dali	0) (
3												ial/E	_	-			-
				ture		lan	nıng					hnol	0,			•	
				alth						Ш	Oth	ier, i	nam	ely .			
☐ Education [∃S	ecur	ity d	& Ρι	ublic	: Sat	fety										
10. To what extent was the collaboration				n by	y an	y of	f the	fol	low	ing	amb	oitio	ns?	(1 =	= no	t at	all an
ambition, 5 = this was the core a	mb		•														
Ambitions of collaboration		S		of p		d	M			peri	od	E	End			b	Don't
				serv					ser					serv			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 amor different constituents	ng																
Organize crisis and emergency																	
planning, response and/or recovery																	
Create holding environment to contain	1																
conflict among stakeholders																	
Other, namely:																	
11. To what extent did the collabora	tion	ı air	n tc	inc	.lud	Δ ar	nv o	f th	a fo	llow	/ina	forr	ne c	of co	Mah	ora	tivo
governance? (1 = not at all an ai										110 VI	, iii g	1011	113 (,, ,,	mak	JOI a	LIVE
Purpose of collaboration										neri	ho	F	nd	of n	eriod	4	Don't
Tarpooc or conaporation				serv		· G			ser\		ou	•		serv		4	know
	ľ	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	14.1011
Co-initiation: Jointly identify required			_	<u> </u>				_					_				
policies, services, or regulation																	
Co-develop: Jointly create and arrang	e																
policies, services, or regulation																	
Co-production: Implement policies,																	
deliver services, or provide regulation																	
Co-assessment: Jointly monitor and																	
evaluate impact of policies, services, of	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)

		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)

	,	Don't know			
1	2	Score 3	4	5	Don't know

- 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)

	iuciic	z, akııı	3 10 1	orning i	io tile	COllab	Olativ	c proc	C33: ((gilly u	meque	11, J –	ıngıny	equai
Sta	art of p	eriod o	observ	⁄ed	Mic	dle of	period	lobser	ved	E	nd of p	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	Jence	: (very i	ery fittle incentives, 5 - very strong incentives,											
Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	ved	Mic	ddle of	period	obser	ved	Eı	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)

ambitions: (1 = very low sense of interdependence, 5 = very mgn sense of interdepende														iderice)	
Sta	art of p	eriod	observ	⁄ed	Mic	ldle of	period	lobser	ved	E	nd of p	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?

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.

					4.	Institu	tional	des	ign					
							_							
22. How man														S 16 . 1
Start of pe	erioa oi	oserve	ed	Midale	ot be	erioa c	bserve	ea	End	of perio	a obs	ervea	L	Oon't know
23. What differently the differently				ors took	part	in the	colla	bora	ation. Ple	ase sel	ect tl	ne ba	ckgrou	ınds of
Backgı	St	tart of obser	period ved		Middle of obser		Е	nd of obse	period rved	Don't know				
Political organ Public organi: Private, for-pi Private, non-p Citizens / info		3.230			5230.			2230		3				
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														
1 2	3	7	J	•	_	3	7	J	, i	2	,	7	J	
25. To what e							ules ol	oser	ved and	applied	l? (1	= Ver	y rarel	y applied
5 = Almos														
Start of pe							bserve			of perio				Don't knov
1 2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2 3	3	4	5	
26. To what e included,											evan	t and	affect	ed actors
Start of pe							bserve			of perio	nd oh	serve	4 [Don't know
1 2	3	4	5		2	3	4	5	1	2 3		4	5	JOH C KITOV
27. To what e	xtent	were 1	the de	cision-r	nakir	ng pro	cesse	s in	the key	collabo	rative	e foru	ms	
transpare														
Start of pe							bserve			of perio				Don't know
1 2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2 3	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?

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. Leadersl	nip		
30. Characterize the locus of leaders	thin roles in the col	lahorative process		
Locus of leadership	Start of period observed	Middle of period observed	End of period observed	Don't know
One lead actor		0.00000		
A few lead actors				
Shared collective among all actors				
31. What were the backgrounds of the necessary.	nose exercising lea	dership? Choose n	nore than one if	
Background of participants	Start of period	Middle of period	End of period	Don't
Daoing round of participants	observed	observed	observed	know
Political organizations / politicians				
Public organizations / civil servants				
Private, for-profit organizations				
Private non-profit organizations Citizens / informal citizen groups				
Chizono / imorrial chizon groups				
32. To what extent was the leadersh affected actors (1 = Highly ineffe	ctive, 5 = Highly eff	ective)		
·	dle of period observe		od observed [3 4 5	Don't know
1 2 3 4 5 1	2 3 4	5 1 2 .	3 4 5	
33. To what extent was the leadershicollaborative process intended in Start of period observed Middle 1 2 3 4 5 1		ghly ineffective, 5 = ed End of period	Highly effective) Don't know
34. To what extent was the leadersh (1 = Highly ineffective, 5 = Highly	effective)			
	dle of period observe			Don't know
1 2 3 4 5 1	2 3 4	5 1 2	3 4 5	
35. To what extent was the leadershic creative problem-solving resolving Start of period observed Middle	ng? (1 = Highly inef		effective)	ities for Don't know
1 2 3 4 5 1			3 4 5	2011 CIGIOW
36. How confident do you feel the ar reliable, and rooted in data and c	· ·	d to the questions	in this section ar	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.	

														h hold	ing re	egular
										iently , ved		_	-	y) bserve	d	Don't know
	Stai 1	2	3	4	3 u 5		2				1			4	5	DOIT KNOW
	I	2	3	7	J	'	۷	3	7	J	'	2	3	7	J	
39.																oup? (1 =
				entratio bserve										n <mark>a/gro</mark> u bserve		Don't know
	Stai 1	2	3	4	3 u 5	1	2	3	4	veu 5	1	10 01 p	3	4	5	DOIT (KITOW
	1	۷	3	4	3	ı	۷	3	4	3	'	2	3	4	J	
40.								the co		ative p	oroces	s inve	st in j	oint fac	ct find	ding? (1 =
				bserve						ved	Fr	nd of n	eriod o	bserve	h	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know
	1	۷	3	7	3	'	۷	3	7	3	'	۷	3	7	J	
41.											oroces	s inve	st in k	nowle	dge s	haring? (1
					-			invest		•	Г.	ماملات	ميامما م	h a a m . a	ام	Don't know
								period			1			bserve	5	DON L KNOW
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
42.										s on th			of int	erests	and v	values
				bserve				period					eriod c	bserve	ed	Don't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	2011(1111011
12	Tov	uhat a	vtont	did th	المو ممال	abarat	iivo n	r00000	foor	s on is	int pr	ablam	colvir	a (a a	ioini	t problem
43.									, iocu	5 UII JU	יוע אוווע	Juieiii	-201411		. 101111	LDIODIEIII
		mig, t	·U-UE		y Suit	11101151		. Vary	wook			rv etr	ona fo	verie)	. ,	
	_ ∖ tar	t of ne								focus,	5 = Ve				_	•
			eriod o	bserve	ed	Mid	dle of	period	obser	focus, ved	5 = V 6	d of p	eriod c	bserve	ed	•
	Star 1	t of pe								focus,	5 = Ve				_	Don't know
	1 . To v	2 vhat e	eriod o 3 extent	bserve 4 did th	5 ee coll	Midd 1 aborat	dle of 2 tive p	period 3 rocess	obser 4 s expli	focus, ved 5	5 = Ve Er 1	of p 2 n pro	eriod o	bserve 4	ed	•
	1 . To v outp	2 vhat e	eriod o 3 extent quick	did th	5 ie coll ? (1 =	Midd 1 aborat Very v	dle of 2 tive p	period 3 rocess focus,	obser 4 s expli 5 = Ve	focus, ved 5 icitly foery str	5 = Ve Er 1 ocus o	nd of p 2 n proc cus)	eriod o 3 ducing	bserve 4 g tangil	ed 5 ble in	Don't know
44.	1 . To v outp	2 vhat e	eriod o 3 extent quick	did th	5 ie coll ? (1 =	Midd 1 aborat Very v	dle of 2 tive p	period 3 rocess focus, period	obser 4 s expli 5 = Ve	focus, ved 5 icitly foery str	5 = Ve Er 1 ocus o	nd of p 2 n proc cus)	eriod o 3 ducing	bserve 4	ed 5 ble in	Don't know
44.	1 . To v outp Star 1	vhat e outs (o t of pe	extent quick eriod o	did th wins) bserve	ed 5 ne coll ? (1 = ed 5	Midd 1 aborat Very v Midd 1	tive p veak dile of	rocess focus, period	obser 4 5 expli 5 = V6 obser 4	focus, ved 5 icitly foery stroyed 5	5 = V6 Er 1 ocus o ong fo Er	n procus) ad of p 2 an procus) ad of p 2	eriod o ducing eriod o 3	y tangil bbserve	ed 5 ble in ed 5	Don't know termediate Don't know
44.	1 . To v outp Star 1	2 vhat exputs (of percent) 2 vhat exputs (of percent)	eriod o 3 extent quick eriod o 3	did th wins) bserve	ed 5 ne coll ? (1 = ed 5	Midde 1 aborate Very vomantical Midde 1	tive p veak to die of 2	rocess focus, period 3	obser 4 s expli 5 = Ve obser 4 s expli	focus, ved 5 icitly for ery strived 5	5 = V6 Er 1 ocus o ong fo Er 1	n procus) ad of p 2 an procus) ad of p 2	eriod o ducing eriod o 3	y tangil bbserve	ed 5 ble in ed 5	Don't know
44.	. To v outp Star 1	vhat ecomes	extent quick eriod o 3 extent e? (1 =	did th wins); bbserve 4 did th = Very	ed 5 ne coll ? (1 = ed 5 ne coll weak	Midden of the Mi	tive p veak to dle of 2	rocess focus, period 3	obser 4 s expli 5 = Ve obser 4 s expli arong	icitly for sicitly for focus,	5 = Veneral Errors of the Security of the Secu	n process	eriod o ducing eriod o 3 ducing	tangil bbserve 4 tangil	ble in ble st	Don't know termediate Don't know
44. 45.	. To v outp Star 1	vhat ecomes	extent quick eriod o 3 extent e? (1 =	did th wins) bserve	ed 5 ne coll ? (1 = ed 5 ne coll weak	Midden of the Mi	tive p veak to dle of 2	rocess focus, period 3 rocess Very st	obser 4 s expli 5 = Ve obser 4 s expli arong	icitly for sicitly for focus,	5 = Veneral Errors of the Security of the Secu	n process	eriod o ducing eriod o 3 ducing	y tangil bbserve	ble in ble st	Don't know termediate Don't know
44. 45.	. To voute Star 1 . To voute Star 1	2 vhat e outs (of 2 vhat e comes t of pe	extent quick eriod o 3 extent s? (1 = eriod o	did th wins)? bserve 4 did th = Very bserve	ee coll ? (1 = ed 5	Midd 1 aborat Very v Midd 1 aborat focus Midd	tive p veak to dle of 2 tive p , 5 = N dle of	rocess focus, period 3 rocess Very st period 3	obser 4 s expli 5 = Ve obser 4 s expli trong obser 4	icitly for strictly for focus, ved 5	5 = V6 Er 1 ocus o ong fo Er 1	n processing processin	eriod o	tangil bbserve 4 tangil bbserve 4	ble in ble st	Don't know termediate Don't know

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.

48						cit joint														da,
						Very lit Midd														ı't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4			1	2		3	4	5	5		
49					goals o	operationals)	onali	zed? (1	l = Ve	ery li	ttle	ope	ratio	naliza	ation	of g	goals	s, 5	= V	ery
	Sta	rt of pe	eriod o	observ	/ed	Midd	dle of	period	obsei	rved		E	End o	f perio	od ok	serv	/ed		Dor	i't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	,	1	2	:	3	4	5	5		
50						active r								l = Ve	ery lit	tle r	noni	itor	ing	of goal
	Sta	rt of pe	eriod (observ	/ed	Midd	dle of	period	obsei	rved				f perio	od ok	serv	/ed		Dor	i't know
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	:	3	4	5	5		
51						ticipan ing, 5 :								ration	to t	he fo	ollov	ving	g ac	tors?
		J		ctors	J	Δ,		Start o		od		liddle				End	of pe		d	Don't know
							1		3 4		1				1		3		5	KIIOW
FI	ected	d politi	cians																	
_				e.a. ai	uditors.	, courts)													
		ciety				, 000.10														
					ed citiz	ens														
	. To \	what e	extent	t did t	he foll	owing ofluenc			tors h									-		-

7. Accountability

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?

Start of period

observed

2 3 4 5 1

Middle of period

observed

2 3 4 5 1

End of period

observed

2 3 4 5

Don't

know

Actors

Oversight bodies (e.g. auditors, courts)

Affected and/or concerned citizens

Elected politicians

Civil society organizations

54. Please describe in max. 600 words (a) how the goals of the collamonitored, (b) how participants, elected officials, oversight bod collaboration to account, (c) how these dynamics changed over	lies, and citizens held the

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 serv		d	M		e of serv	peri ⁄ed	bc	E	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:																

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.

(. = 10.) ion extent, c = 10.) ingi		••••			4				. • . •	7 4 4		•				
Realized collaboration	S	Star	t of p	erio	d	M	iddle	e of	peri	od	E	End	of p	erio	d	Don't
		ok	ser	/ed			ob	serv	/ed			ob	serv	'ed		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		of p		d	M		e of serv		bc	E	end ob:	of poserv		b	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	S	tart	of p	erio	d	M	iddle	e of	peri	od	Ē	End	of p	erio	d	Ďon't
		ob	serv	/ed			ob	serv	⁄ed			ob	serv	ed		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	S		of p	erio ⁄ed	d	M		e of serv	peri ⁄ed	od	E	end ob	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?

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.