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
2. Main case characteristics 3
3. Starting conditions 1
4. Institutional design 7
5. Leadership 9
6. Collaborative process 11
7. Accountability 13
8. Outputs and outcomes of collaboration 15

1. General case information

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

Grass Roots Re-Municipalisation in Berlin

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

Case author(s)	Blanchet, Nolden, Olivier, Runte, Kunze, Busch, Wenderlich
Institution / University	FU Berlin
Email address first author	olivier.berthod@icn-artem.com

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

Start of collaboration		End of collaboration	
October	2010	July	2021

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	
March	2011	October	2021

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://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0957178716300303
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421514005692?casa_token=Ekxpd4tYckMAAAAA:VTnvVoSe0SUfFt8QHa-w7gMrrb82y9aPFBu9yCkaxJW_vxJSN8iQVYZZ0eCQne_w9BZJ1PS4QDp5
Becker, Sören/Kunze https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0308518X19881164 Conrad, Energy Democracy, Rosa Luxemburg

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

Europe	Select	Germany	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?**

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.**

a) The transition to renewable energie was expected to be faciliated by public ownership and control. The central infrastructures were the electricity grid and RES. The grid had been privatised and its opperator (Vattenfall) had no ambitions for such a transition. In 2014 a window of opportunity opened as the 20 year contract to operate the grid expired and could be terminated by the city senate. Energy prices were regarded as unjust and too high. Control and ownership by the city senate was mistrusted as it had privatised before. The Senate and administration were reluctant to obey to popular opinion and enforce a post carbon transition. The coalition had to build enough pressure in the city society to enforce a referendum and win it.

b) The aim was to move the senate to terminate the contract and take the grid back into public ownership. Secondly, the grid should have been a stepping stone to massive public investments in RES to power it with 100% green energy. Thirdly, social justice and democratic control were not means to create legitimacy but ends in themselves. Control of the grid-and-production-utility should have been democratised by direct vote and worker participation.

c) In the start of the period observed (2010 - 2011) app. 50 grass root initiatives united in one super structure, the BET (Berliner Energietisch). They had to agree on internal rules to discuss, moderate, decide and speak in public. They succeeded. In the middle of the p.o. (2011 - 2013) BET had to mobilise thousands of volunteers to collect signatures twice. This was a success. BET had to press the incumbent actors (governemnt) for a favourable agenda setting (date of the vote). This failed. BET had to convince the popular opinion in the city for its case and did so. It had to mobilise 25% of the electorate to go vote and failed narrowly (24%). In the end of the p.o. (2014 - 2021) BET had only a minor role as observer. The government coopted the project. It established a new actor (Berlin Energie) that became the agent of change though with lower ambitions. After a change in government and long court cases BE reached one aim of BET in 2021 in grid re-municipalisation. A second goal, the new green city owned utility was realised too but in a much smaller fashion than desired. The radically democratic element (direct vote of board) and justice element (price policy) where scraped. Public opinion turned widely against privatisation and embraced re-municipalisations.

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.

a) Already at the end of 2010, attac Berlin, BürgerBegehren Klimaschutz and PowerShift came together to discuss the possibility of the city of Berlin taking over the Berlin power grid.
They shared a history of colaborating in two very similar but smaller projects: the popular vote on the S-Bahn (local train transport) 2011, public vote to disclose the secret water contracts that resulted in a success, the re-municipalising of public Water (2004 - 2012). The latter (water) was the first success of a popular vote that forced the city governemnt to re-municipalise.
Attac had a leadership in the water campaign and carried then on to energy with similar people. Continuity of people (mostly volunteers) was greater than that of organisations and names.
b) By 3 non profit Berlin based actors or branches: Attac, BürgerBegehren Klimaschutz and PowerShift. In a second step by a one weekend long workshop, in a third step by 12 plenary sessions (10/2011 – 01/2012).
c) Initiators and those that joined later had a common sense of a joint struggle against a monopolist, parts of the governemnt and parts of the local press (David against Goliath). The notion was that only joined forces had a chance. There was a clear sense that climate and energy were public goods worth "fighting" for. (that language was used) Volunteers had rather an ecological than a social-justice motivation.
d) The coalition grew from 3 to app. 50 groups in 2 years. It united a centrist-left labour union, large NGOs and post-communist and radical green groups. It collected donations to fund paid for positions. The alliance reduced its activity after the depressing and narrow defeat in the 10/2013 vote. It then functioned as an observer and well visible critique of the government run institution (BE) that aimed to re-municipalise the grid. BE as a government institutoin was adjacent to BET's bottom up culture.
On a landscape level major events happened: The Fukushima Accident, the 2nd nuclear exit decision by the national government, the rapid transition to RES, the highly contested discourse over national energy policy, the emergence of the climate justice movement, climate camps, wide politization of energy, climate change emerged as a topic. Neoliberal ideology of privatisation began its decline, the social question began to re-emerge in Berlin, popular protests against Vattenfall in Hamburg (new coal power station).

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	20+	1-5	☐

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

a) The initial one weekend workshop and the following plenary sessions in 2011 where rather flat in hierarchies. Each group could send one representative, so the room filled with up to 50 people. Each person had one equal vote disconected from the groups size or role.
Obviously some groups and people had more time, experience and knowledge than others, especially attac and the other 2 iniators.
An agenda for each meeting was made before hand, every one could contribute. There was an ethic of benevolence and trust.
b) Many groups of BET opened participation to a wide range of activists. Though only few people are activists. Theoreticaly everyone could join the plenary sessions. But knowledge was a key obviously.
c) very high, open vote in a circle of people in a room
d) paid for position in the middle periode, working groups on certain topics in the middle periode, a break down to some core activists in the late periode as the referendum failed.

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.

a) early phase: very flat hierarchy, mutual respect and some merits earned in the water campaign by some. middle phase: leading role in public by one person.
b) those with success in the water campaign enjoyed respect and trust and benefited the process c) unknown

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?

Not very 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) low hierarchies, mutual respect as part of a movement
b) one weekend workshop and later plenary sessions to formulate the demands (Selbstverständnis)
c) started small, took up speed after few months, was highly dynamic in 2013, then broke down

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?

Highly 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.

a) monitoring happened by collecting 20.000 and later 228.000 signatures by volunteers successfully, the final monitoring was the voter turnout of 24%.
b) paid for positions, speakers and delegates were elected in the main plenary sessions by everyone present
c) a certain formalisation took place in the main phase as more decissions needed to be made than activists could understand in the time given, thus trust in delegates had to complement full comprehension.

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?

Reasonably 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) a very successful social movement and campaign against a strong incumbent
b) probably a strong support for the subsequent evolution of the climat justice movement, for further attempts to de-privatise, a certain disenchantment with social democracy and the electorate but that is very hard to assess.
c) the electricity grid was de-privatised in 2021 with little public attention, the re-municipalisation of the gas grid failed in 2021 finally.
A democratised large public utility never materialised, only a "bonsai" version as some mocked it.