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.

Endangered Species Conservation on Private Lands - Idaho

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

Case author(s)	Casey L. Taylor
Institution / University	University of Delaware
Email address first author	taylorc@ude.edu

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

Start of collaboration		End of collaboration	
Select	2003	Select	2010

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	2003	Select	2010

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).

https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/graduate_thesis_or_dissertations/h415pc939

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

North America		USA	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:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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?**

Highly 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.**

a) Society challenges and organizational issues that the collaboration sought to address

This collaborative effort was focused on developing a conservation agreement between private landowners in a ranching community, state agency officials and scientists, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in order to protect the Greater Sage-Grouse, a former candidate for federal protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In exchange for adopting specific conservation strategies, landowners would be protected from additional regulations in the event the bird became federally protected. In this case study, it is notable that normal ranching operations (not including overgrazing) are not considered a primary threat to sage grouse. The FWS has been increasingly encouraging a more cooperative approach for the ESA, but many landowners remain skeptical of the agency, which they primarily view as a regulator. This is problematic since many vulnerable species depend on privately-owned land for habitat, and effective conservation for many will require partnerships with landowners. At the same time, the ESA remains contentious, and implementation decisions are frequently subject to a steady stream of lawsuits as political actors seek to achieve their preferred policy outcomes. In response, officials may seek to create “bullet-proof” decisions that will be highly defensible in court—by adhere strictly to existing rules and procedures and carefully documenting the evidence used in each step of the decision. This may prevent decisions being overturned in the courts, it can also lead to lengthy decision timelines and officials that are unwilling to exercise the flexibility and creativity that are critical for effective conservation efforts, particularly when working with private landowners.

b) The stated ambitions and desired outputs and outcomes

The West Central Local Working Group (LWG) was formed according to Idaho’s 1997 statewide Sage-Grouse Management Plan. LWGs were created as a mechanism for local stakeholders, with financial and technical assistance from the state, to create a sage grouse plan for their associated area. Unlike the areas represented by other LWGs in the state, the West Central is dominated by private property. As a result, LWG members chose to focus their energy on developing a “Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances” (CCAA). LWG members thought a CCAA would provide for a way to support grouse populations while also providing a measure of protection for private landowners who chose to participate.

c) How did challenges, issues, and ambitions evolved over the period

Over time tensions rose as several landowners felt that agency representatives had taken over the process and that their voices no longer being heard. Officials and landowners repeatedly butted heads over the nature and extent of various threats to sage grouse populations, as well as how the threats should be addressed. Landowner attendance at meetings declined, and enthusiasm for the project fell. These conflicts came to a head when, constrained by limited time and resources, both the overall CCAA and the Site-Specific Plan for the lead rancher were both

3. Starting conditions

14. To what extent did the configuration of actors that made up the core of the collaborative process have a pre-history of mutual engagement? (1 = Very little history, 5 = Very extensive history)

Score					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	
☐	☐	◉	☐	☐	☐

15. To what extent was there trust between core participants at the start of the collaboration? (1 = Very low trust 5 = Very high trust)

Score					Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	
☐	◉	☐	☐	☐	☐

16. How was the collaboration first initiated? Please select one option.

Externally directed by law or authority

17. To what extent did the participants have more or less equal levels of resources, (e.g. knowledge, influence, skills) to bring to the collaborative process? (1 = Highly unequal, 5 = Highly equal)

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

18. To what extent were there incentives to collaborate for the participants, e.g. financial gain or increased influence? (1 = Very little incentives, 5 = Very strong incentives)

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

19. To what extent did the participants feel mutually dependent on each other for fulfilling their ambitions? (1 = Very low sense of interdependence, 5 = Very high sense of interdependence)

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

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

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.

(a) the prehistory and past interactions of participants

The Idaho Office of Species Conservation (OSC), which worked alongside the state Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) on sage grouse conservation efforts, had previously been involved with creating a programmatic CCAA for the Southern Idaho Ground Squirrel in the same general area. This agreement was adopted by the FWS in 2005, so there is an overlap of landowners who would have been eligible to enroll in both agreements. The ground squirrel's CCAA had worked well enough to keep that species from being listed, and was popular among the landowners according to the OSC, and there was little conflict involved. Given the dominance of private land in the West Central, the OSC suggested using the same model for the sage grouse in order to provide protections for landowners. A consultant with family ties to the ranching community, who had also worked with many of the interested landowners on previous projects, was hired to direct the process. The local FWS official involved with the CCAA was well-known and liked among the community.

(b) how the collaboration was initiated

The LWG structure was initiated by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game as required by its 1997 Sage Grouse Management Plan, in which the state addressed its rapidly declining populations. This plan explains that the first meeting of each LWG would be organized by IDFG and involve a variety of stakeholders, and that each LWG was expected to develop a management plan within a year of its first meeting. The West Central LWG first began meeting in 2003, and the OSC hired a well-known consultant to lead the process. Soon after, OSC recommended that the group consider the CCAA model, to which the LWG participants agreed.

(c) the sense of interdependence between participants and the incentives to collaborate

There is no explicit evidence regarding the level of interdependence among the different groups of stakeholders, although many participants noted that there was a lot of relationship-building that occurred in the first few years of the effort.

The incentive to collaborate was to gain a degree of regulatory protection for private lands in the event the sage grouse was listed under the Endangered Species Act. This private land agreement was also intended to be linked with a CCA (Candidate Conservation Agreement) to be adopted for grazing allotments on public land later on in the process.

(d) any significant changes over time in the period observed.

N/A

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
Select	Select	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?

Highly confident

29. Please describe in max 600 words (a) the ground rules of the collaboration, (b) the inclusiveness of the collaborative forum(s), (c) the transparency of decision making within the collaborative forum(s), (d) any significant changes in the institutional architecture of collaboration over time

a) ground rules for collaboration

No information.

b) inclusiveness of collaborative forums

The West Central LWG was formally open to anyone who wished to be involved, but specifically, Idaho's 1997 sage grouse management plan described that, once initiated, each LWG would be organized by an internal leadership team that would include at least one member representing agricultural interests, one from a state or federal land management agency, one from a wildlife conservation organization, and one from IDFG itself. The report indicated that if this leadership team included more than four individuals, it should maintain a balanced membership among those groups.

c) transparency of decision making within forums

No specific information about decision-making early on in the process, however transparency issues factored in substantially with the ultimate collapse of the effort. While there was general acceptance of the draft CCAA agreement, modifications were made following internal FWS review that the landowners involved felt were made without their input and that they were not provided adequate notice of those changes prior to adoption.

d) any significant changes in institutional architecture over time

Landowner LWG participants complained that over time, the group became increasingly dominated by state and federal agencies. Those interviewed reported that landowner participation declined in response.

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	●	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 process was formally led by a consultant hired by the Idaho OSC. While the consultant had expertise in forestry and timber management, he was well-known to state officials and had family ties to the local ranching community. Local landowners were primarily led by one well-respected individual from the ranching community.

As the process continued, there was increasing reliance on this key individual, to whom many looked for an indication of whether or not to trust the process or engage with the FWS. Two additional consultants were hired to provide technical expertise in wildlife and range management.

Although the lead landowner had begun their involvement as an enthusiastic supporter of the process, as time went on their perspective began to sour. At the end, when there were some significant moments of miscommunication, this individual decided that they could no longer trust the process or those involved. According to some participants, the individual then began to undermine any remaining interest in the program among the community, and ultimately the agreement was abandoned despite being technically complete.

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.

(a) the collaborative process in terms of how the actors interacted with each other

The West Central LWG met regularly, often on a monthly basis. There was an early focus on the legal context and the potential threat of increased regulation, as well as understanding the habitat needs of sage grouse. These conversations were interspersed with CCAA development. There were a number of debates with agency officials and scientists about the threats facing sage grouse, how to measure threats and impacts, and the appropriate manner of addressing them.

(b) how they formulated and achieved shared outcomes

No detailed information available.

(c) how the process changed over the period observed

No detailed information available.

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.

In the end, landowners held the collaboration to account by walking away from the completed agreement. Beyond this, no detailed information is available.

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.

(a) the output of the collaboration in terms of results produced by the collaborative governance process

A completed CCAA agreement was developed, and the associated FWS permits were issued.

(b) the outcomes in terms of the impact on problem solving, goal achievement and legitimacy, taking into account any unintended consequences

Goals for improved sage grouse populations were not met, as no landowners enrolled as participants under the programmatic CCAA agreement. Interviewed landowners as well as state officials recognized that the overall idea of CCAAs had likely lost their earlier appeal, and landowners expressed a deeper skepticism of engaging in voluntary programs with the FWS.

(c) the changes to collective outputs and social outcomes over time

Early discussions focused on how to improve conservation outcomes without substantial impacts to ranch operations. Landowners increasingly felt that consideration for their economic needs were not being accounted for as time went on, and that they were not being listened to by the scientists and agency officials. Landowners, state officials, and hired consultants observed that the growing relationships and trust that had been built early on in the process were damaged by the way the collaboration ended, perhaps irreparably. The FWS contested this conclusion, maintaining that these relationships were largely still in place despite the conflict.