

Horizontale analyse adaptatiewiel

Auteur: Judith Klostermann

1 juni 2010

Inhoud

1	Outline for the Horizontal Analysis.....	2
1.1	Introduction.....	2
1.2	Method.....	2
2	Dimension Variety.....	6
2.1	Variety of problem frames.....	6
2.2	Multi-actor, multi-level en multi-sector approach.....	11
2.3	Room for diversity.....	15
2.4	Redundancy.....	18
3	Dimensie Learning.....	22
3.1	Trust.....	22
3.2	Single loop learning.....	25
3.3	Double loop learning.....	31
3.4	Discuss doubts.....	34
3.5	Institutional memory.....	37
4	Dimensie Room for autonomous change.....	42
4.1	Continuous access to information.....	42
4.2	Act according to plan.....	45
4.3	Capacity to improvise.....	49
5	Dimensie Leiderschap.....	53
5.1	Visionary leadership.....	53
5.2	Entrepreneurial leadership.....	56
5.3	Collaborative leadership.....	60
6	Dimensie Hulpbronnen.....	64
6.1	Authority.....	64
6.2	Human resources.....	68
6.3	Financial resources.....	71
7	Dimensie rechtvaardig bestuur.....	74
7.1	Legitimacy.....	74
7.2	Equity.....	77
7.3	Responsiveness.....	82
7.4	Accountability.....	85
8	Conclusies horizontale analyse.....	89
8.1	Reflectie op de methode.....	89
8.2	Reflectie op de inhoudelijke resultaten.....	91

1 Outline for the Horizontal Analysis

1.1 Introduction

This Working Document is the third document about the Content Analysis performed in the context of the CcSP project ‘IC12: Institutions for Adaptation’.

- The first working document is the background document, summarizing the content of 93 policy documents and laws in the Netherlands.
- The second working document is the scorecard document, assessing the content of a selection of 23 policy documents and laws.
- This third and last document performs a so-called ‘horizontal analysis’ of the outcomes of the scorecard document.

In the scorecard document, all policy documents and laws were ‘vertically scored’, meaning that for every policy document or law, the criteria were assessed. In this horizontal analysis, we look at every criterium across all policy documents to discover what arguments lead to which scores.

The aim of this analysis is to find out what elements of Dutch institutions are well developed and allow for adaptive capacity and where improvements can be made. This results in a cross-sectoral ‘legobloesding’ of measures that could be implemented to increase the adaptive capacity of Dutch policy and law. Furthermore, this analysis will show which criteria are not adequately or insufficiently addressed by Dutch policy and law. Last, this document serves as a retrospective analysis of the Adaptive Capacity Wheel. Especially the choice between +1 and +2 and between -1 and -2 was difficult to make. Considering the arguments for a specific score all together will help to improve our methods.

1.2 Method

This analysis builds on the outcomes of the scorecard document. We use the finalized version of 15 September 2009. This horizontal analysis could be reason to adjust te scores in the scorecard document; however, if necessary, this will be done in at a later stage – for now, the scorecard document remains ‘frozen’.

The scorecard document is cut into smaller textual parts using Atlas-ti software. The policy documents and laws are depicted in the table below.

Table 1.1 List of policy documents assessed in the scorecard document

Nr	Sector	Beleidsdocument / wetstekst
2.1	Klimaat	UNFCCC, 1992; Kyoto Protocol 1997
2.2	Natuur	Convention on Biological Diversity
2.3	Water	EU Framework Directive on Water
2.4	Water	EU Directive on Flood Risks
2.5	Landbouw	Common Agriculture Policy (CAP)
2.6	Natuur	Natura 2000 and Birds and Habitats Directives
2.7	Klimaat	European Whitepaper on Adaptation
3.1	Klimaat	National Adaptation Strategy: make space for climate!
3.2	Klimaat	Strategy National Safety and National Risk Assessment
4.1	Landbouw	Agenda for a Living Countryside - Multi-year program 2007-2013
4.2	Landbouw	Law on Land Use in Rural Areas (Wet Inrichting Landelijk Gebied - WILG)
4.3	Landbouw	New agrarian insurances
5.1	Natuur	National Ecological Network
5.2	Natuur	Law for the Protection of Nature (Natuurbeschermingswet)
5.3	Natuur	Flora and Fauna Law
6.1	Water	National Agreement on Water / Nationaal Bestuursakkoord Water (NBW)
6.2	Water	National Water Plan 2008 (NWP)
6.3	Water	Policy Guideline Large Rivers
6.4	Water	Water Law
6.5	Water	Water Test
7.1	Ruimtelijke Ordening	National Spatial Strategy (Nota Ruimte: Ruimte voor Ontwikkeling)
7.2	Ruimtelijke Ordening	Spatial Planning Act (Wet Ruimtelijke Ordening)
7.3	Ruimtelijke Ordening	Strategic Environmental Assessment (MER & Strategische Milieubeoordeling (SMB)/plan-m.e.r.)

All arguments given in the scoredocument are sorted by criteria using Altas-ti software. They are depicted in tables A where all arguments are shown for every score (2, 1, 0, -1, -2) on each criterion. An example of a table A is given in table 1.2. In these tables the source of the argumentation is linked to the primary documents with a numer that corresponds to table 1.1.

Table 1.2: example of an A-Table that shows the division of scores on Dutch institutions, in this case for the ‘variety of problem frames’ criterion.

2	1	0	-1	-2
Several causes of floods are identified: natural and human. At the level of the EU, only the aspiration of reducing the risk and impacts of floods is set. No explicit solutions are pre-scribed to enhance	By employing the integral ecosystems approach, in which sustainable growth is important, multiple problems frames are possible and multiple solutions are even stimulated. Not aimed	Taps into the IPCC related consensus among EU climate scientists. “The framework is de-signed to evolve as further evidence becomes available.” (emphasis by us): the document	Its main aim 40 years ago was to encourage farmers to produce enough food for Europe and enhance farmer income. Now it aims only at income support. At the moment the Cap is under reconstruction.	The Directives offer little space for multiple problems and solutions: the Directives lays down which habitats and species should be protected at what location.(2.6)

local-specific solutions. (2.4)	at adaptation however.(2.2)	builds on the notion of scientific facts and not on the notion of different problem frames.(2.7)	In the coming years it may also aim at other societal values, such as landscape, vital rural areas, animal welfare, climate. It tries to stay within GATT agreements of reducing market distortion through government subsidies.(2.5)	
etc	etc	etc	etc	etc

There are also B-tables. B-tables summarize the arguments in do's and don't's for every criterion. In these tables, corrections are made in primary scorings to assure a consequent scoring pattern. Where scores are corrected, this is noted between the A and B tables. These corrections could be reason to adjust scores in the primary scoring document at a later stage.

Table 1.3: Example of a B-Table with do's en do-not's for the 'variety of problem frames' criterion.

2	1	0	-1	-2
- only a general goal; no explicit solutions prescribed - policy of region-specific implementation - etc.	- use of holistic concepts such as integral ecosystems or sustainable growth, without explicitly aiming at climate adaptation. - etc	- builds on the notion of scientific facts e.g. IPCC related consensus and not on the notion of different problem frames. - etc	- limited, sectoral aim e.g. enhance farmer income. - limited by global agreement e.g. GATT - etc	- little space for multiple problem frames - very specific in its aims e.g. which species should be protected at what location. - etc

The last methodological step concerns the aggregation of the results of the A and B-tables. This is done in the conclusion chapter, which is divided in two parts: One for A-tables and one for B-tables.

The aggregated A-tables provide an overview of which scores are mostly assigned to the criteria. For example, the crition 'variety of problem frames' is valued positively; the most applied score is 2 (8x). For the criterion 'trust', a score of 1 is assigned most (11x), while for 'financial resources' a score of -1 is mostly applied. Table 1.4 gives an example.

Table 1.4: example of cross-sectorale applied scores for three criteria

Score	2	1	0	-1	-2
Variety of problem frames	8	5	3	3	4
Trust	2	12	5	3	1
Financial resources	5	5	4	8	1

The outcomes of the aggregated B-tables are qualitative. They are summarized in the concluding chapter in recommendations on how to improve the adaptive capacity of Dutch institutions within existing strategies and instruments. Also, we comment on which criteria in our opinion require new rules to increase the adaptive capacity.

Last, for every criterium, we reflect on the method of assigning scores and the results that come out of our assessment using the next list of 12 questions:

Method:

1. Can the criterion be measured, or are the arguments too indirect?
2. Is it possible to assess the criterion through a content analysis, or is assessment in a case study more appropriate?
3. Have we used proper arguments?
4. Does the criterion overlap with other criteria – are the same arguments used?
5. Could the criterion be removed without losing information?
6. Is it necessary to reformulate the criterion?

Result:

7. How are scores divided – which score is applied most?
8. Are Dutch institutions well-developed on this criterion? Why?
9. How can the adaptive capacity on this criterion be improved?
10. Does the institutional structure provide an adequate number of positive solutions?
11. Which options could we recommend to further improve the adaptive capacity?
12. Which columns are empty (which scores are not assigned) and what kinds of arguments could we expect here?

2 Dimension Variety

2.1 Variety of problem frames

Table 2.1. A: Emphasis in Dutch formal institutions on ‘variety of problem frames’

2	1	0	-1	-2
Several causes of floods are identified: natural and human. At the level of the EU, only the aspiration of reducing the risk and impacts of floods is set. No explicit solutions are pre-scribed to enhance local-specific solutions. (2.4)	By employing the integral ecosystems approach, in which sustainable growth is important, multiple problems frames are possible and multiple solutions are even stimulated. Not aimed at adaptation however.(2.2)	Taps into the IPCC related consensus among EU climate scientists. “The framework is de-signed to evolve as further evidence becomes available.” (emphasis by us): the document builds on the notion of scientific facts and not on the notion of different problem frames.(2.7)	Its main aim 40 years ago was to encourage farmers to produce enough food for Europe and enhance farmer income. Now it aims only at income support. At the moment the Cap is under reconstruction. In the coming years it may also aim at other societal values, such as landscape, vital rural areas, animal welfare, climate. It tries to stay within GATT agreements of reducing market distortion through government subsidies.(2.5)	The Directives offer little space for multiple problems and solutions: the Directives lays down which habitats and species should be protected at what location.(2.6)
The Directive has a broad scope. It leaves room for the regional level to define their own problems and solutions, so it leaves room to define adaptation goals (2.3)	New agrarian insurances allow for as many problem frames as there are insurance companies; however, right now there are only two.(4.3)	The document seems mostly oriented towards convincing others of the new problem frame that climate change makes spatial adaptations necessary. Maybe the term ‘tailormade solutions’ offers some space to negotiate different problem frames. (3.1)	Striving to create one vision on safety to enable hierarchical control, post 9/11; but allows room for input from think tanks (3.2)	The EHS problem frame is defined by a relatively small group of experts. It is being re-framed with 18 nature types and 58 subtypes. (5.1)
Striving for diversification of agriculture and for multifunctional landscapes, which provides opportunities for many different points of view. It is a policy of region-specific implementation, which means space for different problem frames. (4.1)	The instrument demands to incorporate at least three perspectives and evaluate all of them (7.3)	This policy document is not concerned with other frames, only with solving concrete conflicts (6.3)	The main problem frame is that of water safety. The document seems to be made to create one shared problem frame, not to create room for more problem frames (6.1)	Framing of the problem is limited to the ex-perts from the nature sector working at different organizations (5.1)
It is a process-oriented law that allows for exchange of different problem frames between governmental levels and land owners (4.2)	The National Water Plan allows regional development processes which enable other problem frames, but it is not clear if this is the intention of the planA new approach in the NWP is that not only the spatial planning authority has to take the water requirements into			The Flora and Fauna law is based on the definition of valuable species by a small group of experts and decided by the Ministry of LNV. Climate change is not explicitly taken into account (5.3)

	account (short term en long term water requirements), but that the water manager also has to anticipate on spatial-economic development. (6.2)			
The Climate Convention sees the importance of adaptation, although mitigation gets more emphasis. It differentiates between the needs of different geographic countries. It allows all countries to make their own policies taking into account their specific circumstances. (2.1)				
Sets a new paradigm of development-oriented spatial planning processes which leaves room for multiple problem and solution frames (7.1.)				
More development planning leaves more room for different approaches (7.2)				
<p>Although the law mainly integrates existing wa-ter laws, it does introduce some new elements that can enhance the adaptive capacity in the water sector, for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrated water management is a new perspective (quality and quantity of water, ground water and surface water, etc.); 2. 'Water system' is a new legal concept, which includes: a connected set of one or more bodies of surface water and groundwater, with associated storage areas, flood defence structures and an-cillary structures; 3. One of the purposes of the act is: "al-lowing water systems to meet society's needs". In potential this new purpose can be a link between the need of soci-ety to adapt and the Water Act. 4. National and regional water plans also constitute a 				

structure plan. This is the legal basis of an important link between water law and spatial planning law. (6.4)				
Two problem frames meet: the municipality's spatial planning decisions and the water board's water tasks. (6.5)				
9	4	3	3	4

Table 2.1. B: Do's en don't's for 'variety of problem frames'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only a general goal; no explicit solutions prescribed - Policy of region-specific implementation, tailor-made solutions - Striving for diversity e.g. diversified economy and multifunctional landscapes - Process-oriented law that allows for exchange of different problem frames - Introduce a new paradigm e.g. development-oriented spatial planning or integrated water management - Provide legal basis to link between legal sectors e.g. water law and spatial planning law. - Demand process in which two sectors have to meet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of holistic concepts such as integral ecosystems or sustainable growth, without explicitly aiming at climate adaptation. - Introduction of a new institutional arrangement such as new agrarian insurances allows for many problem frames; however, uncertain of it will succeed - Demand incorporation of at least three perspectives - Incorporate a concept alien to the sector e.g. the water manager also has to anticipate on spatial-economic development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build on scientific facts e.g. IPCC related consensus and not on the notion of different problem frames. - Mostly oriented towards convincing others of goals and paradigms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited, sectoral aim e.g. enhance farmer income. - Limited by global agreement e.g. GATT - Debate to create one shared problem frame, not to create room for more problem frames 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very specific targets do not allow for multiple problem frames e.g. which species should be protected at what location. - Problem frame is defined by a small group of experts - Processes of structural change such as climate change are not taken into account

Reflection on method:

1. Can the criterion be measured, or are the arguments too indirect?

Scores 2 and 1 are scored reasonably similar in the B-table: elements are scored positive when they provide *room for* different problem frames. The existence of multiple problem frames is not explicitly found in the documents. Assessing the extent to which institutions provide room for more than one problem frame is useful, because this is how institutions can enhance the adaptive capacity on this criterion.

Yes (although indirect)

2. Is it possible to assess the criterion through a content analysis, or is assessment in a case study more appropriate?

Especially on the negative side, arguments are based on an evaluation of the policy-making process. Therefore, the existence of multiple problem frames can best be measured through anthropological interviews in case study research.

Case study

3. Have we used proper arguments?

Concerning positive scores, yes; we have used proper arguments. Concerning negative scores, we have relied too much on our own background knowledge of the policy process in practice. Hence, an open question is: What kinds of arguments should be given for a negative score?

For the largest part, yes

4. Does the criterion overlap with other criteria – are the same arguments used?

This criterion links closely to the criterion of multi-actor governance. When few actors are being involved, few problem frames exist. When institutions allow for the involvement of many actors, there is still a challenge to also incorporate multiple problem frames. Allowing for multiple problem frames often occurs through decentralization. Therefore, this criterion also partly overlaps with diversity. Collaborative leadership will also lead to inclusion of more problem frames.

Close to multi-actor
Close to diversity
Close to collaborative leadership

5. Could the criterion be removed without losing information?

Could perhaps be removed when multi-actor and diversity stay.

Ja

6. Is it necessary to reformulate the criterion?

No

Reflection on outcomes:

7. How are scores divided – which score is applied most?

Table 2.1.A shows that the emphasis in scoring this criterion is placed at a score of 2 (8x); the score of 1 is also often applied (5x). Positive scores prevail. However, in ten documents, this criterion is evaluated as negative (scores between 0 and -2), so there is room for improvement.

Emphasis: 2

8. Are Dutch institutions well-developed on this criterion? Why?

Generally, this criterion seems to be a well-developed element in Dutch institutions. 13 of the 23 policy documents and laws provide room for different problem frames.

Well-developed

9. How can the adaptive capacity on this criterion be improved?

The B-table offers information on rules and procedures that increase the variety of problem frames. Positive rules are: specifying a general goal at national level and leaving room for interpretation to implementing and executing parties; encouraging tailor-made solutions; explicitly aiming for diversification; process oriented rule of law; a new paradigm which enables people to act; obligating two or more sectors by law to cooperate with each other in the policy implementation phase.

Indirect measures that promote multiple problem frames are: the use of holistic concepts like sustainability; the introduction of new institutional arrangements; explicitly demanding three perspectives like is done in a MER and incorporating a policy concept from another sector that is new to another sector.

Tailor-made solutions,
innovation, collaboration

10. Does the institutional structure provide an adequate number of positive solutions?

There are several options to increase the presence of multiple problem frames; more explicitly aiming for multiple problem frames in policy processes (like the dialogue method developed by Cuppen/Hisschemöller).

Sufficient

Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Expliciete methode voor meer
problem frames

1. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

0 is het meest leeg; negatief is ook leger. Minder gunstig is het om de nadruk te leggen op één problem frame (0) of andere problem frames te negeren (-1). Ruimte in problem frames wordt minimaal als er zeer specifieke doelen worden gesteld, als slechts een kleine groep experts mag meepraten, en/of als wordt uitgegaan van een statisch wereldbeeld.

0 is het meest leeg (niet erg)

2.2 Multi-actor, multi-level en multi-sector approach

Tabel 2.2.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Multi-actor, multi-level en multi-sector approach’

2	1	0	-1	-2
EU recognizes that measures are taken at local, regional and national level and aims to support these. Main sectors for coordination at EU level are agriculture, water, biodiversity, fisheries and energy infrastructure. Aims also at public-private partnerships. A Steering group is set up involving Member states, civil society and the scientific community. 7:2	It is multilevel, but not multi-sector or multi-actor. 4:2	Although the national and sub-national level have influence through drafting regional management plans, they do not have a say in which species should be protected. No other sectors other than the nature sector are involved. 3:2	The EHS covers different administrative levels but it is almost entirely within the nature sector; some overlap is now being created with agriculture and water. 12:2	
It is a multilevel institution: general goals are formulated at the European Union level and area specific goals and policies on how to reach them is delegated to national and sub national levels. The Directive promotes participation of local actors in developing the river basin management plans. 8:2	The Convention officially only involves nation states. However, there are mechanisms to link up with other treaties and actors. 5:2		A limited number of actors is involved, mainly nature sector and spatial planning/construction sector 12:46	
It tries to involve many actors in planning for the future, especially at other governmental levels but also private companies and citizens. 11:2	The practical interpretation is left to national governments and subnational regions: it is multilevel, but not multi-sector. 6:2		A limited number of actors is involved: the initiator of the plan, the government and some experts. 13:46	
Involves everyone: governments, private sector and citizens. 11:24	The programme aims to involve many different parties; however, apart from agriculture, nature and provincial governments the involvement may still be limited 10:2			
All levels and sectors are involved in the planning process. 13:2	Involves all land owners and governments in a region. People who do not own land are not involved. 10:24			
All sectors and actors and levels are participating in the process. 13:24	Insurance companies, farmers, LTO and national government involved. LNV supports this development with a special subsidy for insurance companies.			

	10:46			
The plan involves a broad range of levels, sectors and actors. After the instalment of the NWP, regional water plans will be made for specific areas. 15:24	The Climate Convention has a multi-level, actor and sector structure. The Convention is to be applied by states and states can further subdivide responsibilities to lower authorities and social actors. NGOs and other actors have an observer role in the Climate Negotiations. 14:2			
	All levels and sectors that are planning activities in nature have to deal with this law. Everyone is informed in the phase of the implementation plan. 12:24			
	Certainly multi-level (although water boards and municipalities are only represented by their associations); also linkages with other sectors; mostly government and little influence of citizens and private sector. 15:2			
	Several actors and levels involved. 15:46			
	Multilevel cooperation is strengthened by the option of water agreements. 15:68			
	Municipalities and Water Boards apply the water test in an interactive process. On strategic regional level the water test is being applied by the provincial government (provincial spatial plans and decisions). External actors (civilians, etc.) don't have a formal position in this process. 15:90			
7	12	1	3	0

Tabel 2.2.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Multi-actor, multi-level en multi-sector approach'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involve local, regional, national and EU level - Involve private sector, civil society / citizens and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only other governments involved - Only unofficial ways to involve other levels/ sectors/ actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some (limited) influence of lower levels in implementation phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited number of parties involved - Only one sector involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

<p>the scientific community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involve more than one sector e.g. water, nature, agriculture - Require area specific implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two-lateral: only two sectors, or only two different types of actors - Multi-actor and multi-level, but all within one sector - Passive involvement: observer role or mass media information 			
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect? Tabel 2.2.B laat zien dat scoren op dit criterium vrij eenduidig is: hoe meer levels, soorten actoren en sectoren, hoe beter. Met soorten actoren wordt hier bedoeld: een verdeling over overheid, markt en civil society (NGO's). Een indirecte methode om te scoren op dit criterium is de gebiedsgerichte benadering.

Ja, redelijk makkelijk

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus? Omdat een participatieve benadering tegenwoordig een norm is voor goed beleid, wordt de interactie met diverse actoren vaak in de inleiding van beleidsdocumenten uiteengezet. In wetsteksten is dat minder het geval; daar kan weer wel expliciet om participatie worden gevraagd. Via een casus is het ook goed te meten.

Content en casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja
Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Dit criterium is sterk verbonden met het vorige (variëteit aan problem frames), want het betrekken van meerdere actoren, sectoren en levels is een methode om meer problem frames binnen te halen, en leidt ook tot meer problem frames als je dat niet zo had bedoeld. Het is niet 1 op 1: een zeer dominante of kapitaalkrachtige actor zal zijn problem frame kunnen opleggen aan de rest. Ook zijn veel mensen zich niet bewust van het bestaan van meerdere problem frames (bijvoorbeeld natuurwetenschappelijke onderzoekers). Zij zullen onwillekeurig van hun eigen problem frame blijven uitgaan en de rest negeren als ruis. Dit criterium zegt niet veel over de kwaliteit van de interactie, daar is 'problem frames' een betere indicator voor.

Overlap met problem frames en collaborative leadership

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee. Het is zowel voor klimaatverandering als voor governance belangrijk.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee, het is een gebruikelijke formulering in de literatuur.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Bij dit criterium is er een redelijk positief beeld met 7x score +2 en 12x score +1, een teken dus dat hier in de instituties aan gewerkt wordt. Er zijn maar twee negatieve scores.

Zwaartepunt 1

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Het zwaartepunt bij 1 laat zien dat er vaak aan gewerkt wordt. Het is echter nog niet optimaal. Burgers en bedrijven zijn moeilijke categorieën om erbij te betrekken. De methodieken om iedereen erbij te betrekken zijn er wel, maar de methodiek wat vervolgens te doen met al die verschillende meningen is nog weinig ontwikkeld. Om redenen van efficiency en beheersbaarheid wordt vaak voorlopig gekozen voor een beperkte set van actoren en de brede communicatie wordt uitgesteld.

Redelijk, participatie nog niet uitontwikkeld

9. Hoe kan het beter?

De tweede helft van het participatieve proces moet nog beter worden ontwikkeld. Hoe verwerk je alle verschillende meningen inhoudelijk? Hoe kan het toch nog efficiënter? Hoe wordt de link met de normale democratische besluitvorming weer gelegd?

Betrekken burgers en bedrijven verbeteren, tweede helft participatief proces verder ontwikkelen

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Nog niet: zie vraag 9.

Nee, positieve opties moeten worden doorontwikkeld

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Methodes verbeteren voor niet georganiseerde burgers en voor kleinere bedrijven; wat betreft burgers zie bv. onderzoek Erna Ovaar 'Grenzen aan participatie' in Leven met Water: wanneer hoef je burgers NIET te betrekken? Wat betreft bedrijven: hebben VROMs duurzame convenanten gewerkt?

Dialogmethode Cuppen / Hisschemoller voor betere inhoudelijke analyse. Discourse methode.

Methodes participatie verbeteren voor burgers, bedrijven, dialogmethode, discourse methode

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

De categorie -2 is voor de onderzochte instituties leeg. Daar zou je actieve uitsluiting verwachten, besluitvorming expliciet afsluiten voor inmenging uit andere sectoren, en beperken tot een kleine groep; rassensegregatie, getto's, apartheid. Partijen die vinden dat ze het exclusieve recht hebben ergens over te besluiten. Het bestaat waarschijnlijk wel, maar het komt in formele instituties niet naar boven.

-2: actieve uitsluiting

2.3 Room for diversity

Tabel 2.3.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Room for diversity'

2	1	0	-1	-2
The Convention mainly prescribes an approach. Goals and means should be decided at the level of an ecosystem. Thus, it allows much diversity. 5:3	The general goals leave ample room to decide on situation-specific solutions and procedures. Moreover, with the Treaty of Luxembourg support to farmers has moved away from production towards income support, which may lead to the search for alternatives to the most cost-effective production method, and diversity is stimulated. 4:3	Not a lot of diversity yet as the development of new insurance is in its infancy. 10:47	The aim is not to be comprehensive in its assessment. Rather, the strategy hopes to include the most likely risks, which need to be updated based on experiences. 11:25	The Directive set out very specific and static goals. Little room is left for decision making at the lowest level. 3:3
Only sets out general aspirations which allows for diversity. 6:3	With a more decentralized approach, there will be more diversity. 13:3	There is limited diversity in instruments and solutions. Biodiversity conservation is the main goal. 12:3	Diversity is not a goal, only an efficient and effective water management for new developments. 15:91	
Due to regional variability ... most adaptation measures will be taken at national, regional or local level. (EU can strengthen this)	Decentralization creates more diversity. 13:25	The law offers a minimum of diversity in instruments. 12:47		
As the Directive prescribes only general goals and no specific measures, the institution promotes diversity. 8:3	The procedure generates a (limited) diversity of ideas. 13:47			
The programme uses a location-specific	A diversity of policy instruments related to			

approach which generates opportunities for local diversity and variation; 10:3	water is addressed. 15:3			
Region-specific and innovative solutions are possible. 10:25	Some experiments to create diversity of options. 15:47			
There is openness to a diversity of solutions; it is the start of a process and research and development are explicitly planned in a diversity of directions. 11:3	The major goals are preventive water safety and better water quality, for a diversity of functions. 15:69			
Biodiversity is the goal of the law; nature parks are also diverse. The rule of compensation is unspecific so leaves room for diversity. 12:25				
The general goal of adaptation is stated, without specifying specific adaptation goals. This leaves a lot of room for actors to define goals and instruments themselves. 14:3				
A three layer approach to safety includes a large number of solutions 15:25				
10	7	3	2	1

Tabel 2.3.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Room for diversity'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Set out only general goals and aspirations which allow for a diversity of solutions - Strengthen location- and region-specific measures, adapted to regional variability - Make sure that innovative solutions are possible - Start a process and research and development in a diversity of directions - Include 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decentralization creates more diversity - A procedure prescribing formulation of three alternatives generates some diversity of ideas - Use a diversity of policy instruments for the same goal - Allow some experimentation to create more options - Strive for an integrated approach for a diversity of functions - Moving from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leave new institution to the market: not a lot of diversity yet as long as the development of a new institution (insurance) is in its infancy - Limited diversity in instruments and solutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only include the most likely risks, no effort to be comprehensive in the assessment - Only efficient and effective management is a goal, not diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Set out very specific and static goals - Leave little room for decision making at the lowest level

diversity as an explicit goal	production support to income support may lead to a search for alternative ways of farming			
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?
 Diversiteit en variëteit kunnen zeker gemeten worden: inhoudelijk via aantal verschillende oplossingsrichtingen, disparity (de mata waarin oplossingen van elkaar verschillen) en ... pm opzoeken in aantekeningen 27jan10. Hier meten we diversiteits bevorderende elementen in instituties, los van de inhoud en ook dat lijkt goed mogelijk.

Ja

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?
 Via content en casus is allebei mogelijk.

Content en casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Er is overlap met variety in problem frames. Verschil is dat hier de nadruk meer ligt op oplossingsrichtingen.

Ja: problem frames

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee, een belangrijk criterium voor de dimensie.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee, gebruikelijke term in de literatuur. Wel goed definiëren: wat is het verschil met variety?

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?
 Bij dit criterium ligt het zwaartepunt bij de positieve score +2 (10x). Er zijn voldoende opties om diversiteit te bevorderen.

zwaartepunt 2

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?
Er zijn verschillende directe en indirecte methoden ontwikkeld. Het is een oude economische gedachte (leg niet al je eieren in één mandje) en komt ook voort uit de innovatie literatuur.

Ja: oude gedachte

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Bij grote investeringen zoals ruimtegebruik (bv. een woonwijk), technologische netwerken (riolering) en publieke werken (dijken) is evengoed een sterke padafhankelijkheid die niet alleen in de harde infrastructuur maar ook in de zachte infrastructuur is vastgelegd. Het blijft de vraag hoe je grootschalige veranderingen (transities) kunt sturen.

Transities onderzoeken

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja: diverse opties zijn ontwikkeld.

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Diversiteit meer expliciet maken en meer belonen. Uiteindelijk wil de mens toch weer versimpelen en diversiteit afstrepen. Diversiteit blijft vaak als hobby bestaan (bv hobbyrassen bij kippen) wat ook beloond zou kunnen worden.

Diversiteit meer expliciet maken en meer belonen

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Geen kolommen leeg. Negatieve kolommen zijn wel beperkt ingevuld. Streven naar schaalvoordelen veroorzaakt eenvormigheid.

-2: streven naar schaalvoordelen

2.4 Redundancy

Tabel 2.4.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Redundancy'

2	1	0	-1	-2
The idea is to improve prevention of flooding, and improve reactions if the prevention measures fail. Water safety is the only area in which redundancy is seen as necessary. 11:4	With the above mentioned income support instead of subsidy based on production (quantities), a tendency away from cost-effective solutions is initiated and this increases redundancy. 4:4	Neither prevents nor encourages redundancy. 3:4	The Directive aims for efficiency of measures in a river basin rather than for redundancy. 6:4	Nature's resources are limited and declining; the goal is to save what can be saved and nothing more. 12:26
Combines prevention, preparation and response. Redundancy is not an explicit goal. 11:26	Redundancy of SBM procedures. 13:48	Not specifically addressed. 5:4	Aims at efficient and cost-effective adaptation. 7:4	

The NBW encourages redundancy as uncertainty about the climate is a reason to take more robust measures - better safe than sorry. 15:4	For water safety at national level redundancy is allowed; for regional water problems and water quality, efficiency is leading. 15:26	The document does not promote or discourage Redundancy. 13:4	The Directive aims for efficiency of measures in a river basin. 8:4	
Redundancy of options for extreme water flows is the main goal 15:48		Not aimed at. 13:26	Aims to achieve national targets/goals as efficiently as possible. 10:4	
		Not an issue. 15:70	It is a zero sum game: space is limited. Infrastructure may improve, but efficiency is the norm. 10:26	
		Mostly a low cost strategy for both water board and municipality. Does give an incentive to search for alternative options. 15:92	The farmers generally receive only a part of their lost income e.g. 70%. 10:48	
			The EHS aims at a minimum protection of nature in the Netherlands. 12:4	
			As soon as a species becomes abundant, the protection is cancelled. 12:48	
			Cost effectiveness is a guiding principle 14:4	
4	3	6	9	1

Tabel 2.4.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Redundancy'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With income support instead of subsidy based on production (quantities), a tendency away from cost-effective solutions is initiated and this increases redundancy - Encourage redundancy; uncertainty about the climate is a reason to take more robust measures; better be safe than sorry - Combine prevention, preparation and response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water safety is the only area in which redundancy is seen as necessary, for regional water problems and water quality, efficiency is leading - Redundancy is allowed but is not an explicit goal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not promote or discourage redundancy - Not specifically addressed - Mostly a low cost strategy but does give an incentive to search for alternative options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aim for efficiency of measures rather than for redundancy - It is a zero sum game: space is limited. Infrastructure may improve, but efficiency is the norm - Only a part of lost income compensated e.g. 70% - Aim at a minimum level of protection of nature - As soon as a species becomes abundant, the protection is cancelled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nature's resources are limited and declining; the goal is to save what can be saved and nothing more

to flooding				
-------------	--	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Dit is een moeilijk te meten criterium. Overdaad, overbodige luxe, of overcapaciteit komen we niet als doelstelling in de stukken tegen. Robuust is een term die we wel hebben gevonden. Misschien nog zoeken naar termen als veiligheidsmarge, achtervang, reservecapaciteit, noodvoorraad? Het is nu vooral aan de negatieve kant gemeten: efficiency als streven dat negatief wordt gescoord.

Nee, moeilijk te meten

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Zowel in content als in casussen was dit lastig. Wat moet je je erbij voorstellen? Dat weten de geïnterviewden ook niet.

Content en casus beide moeilijk

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Het is moeilijk je een voorstelling te maken van redundancy in een cultuur die doordrenkt is van het streven naar efficiency. Redundancy is er niet, en dat is maar goed ook: het is verspilling van middelen. We zouden het nog beter moeten definiëren om het te kunnen traceren.

Niet bekend, betere definitie nodig

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Er is snel verwarring met diversity: je wilt bij beide criteria meerdere opties hebben. Bij diversity gaat het om verschillende opties, en bij redundancy om meer van hetzelfde. In de praktijk is dat onderscheid moeilijk omdat twee opties nooit identiek zijn: de burgemeester en de loco-burgemeester, het energiebedrijf en het noodaggregaat, de grote veerpont en de kleine veerpont.

Raakvlak met diversity

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Het zou weg kunnen. Dan bij diversity wat aandacht aan het streven naar efficiency besteden.

Ja

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

De term is op zich goed, nauwkeurig en komt voor in de literatuur. De concrete, praktische betekenis is het probleem.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?
Voor het criterium redundancy ligt het zwaartepunt bij -1 (9x). In de Nederlandse en de Europese bestuurscultuur wordt blijkbaar meer op efficiency gestuurd dan op extra (en misschien overbodige) beschermingslagen.

Zwaartepunt -1

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?
We hebben weinig concrete, positieve voorbeelden gevonden. Is een verzekering een vorm van redundancy: je hebt een bezitting, en verzekert je daarnaast voor het geval je bezitting beschadigd raakt? Een loco-burgemeester, een schaduwkabinet? Het streven naar efficiency voorkomt waarschijnlijk vaak het ontstaan van redundancy. Redundancy kan wel door toeval ontstaan: door gebrek aan coördinatie bijvoorbeeld.

Nee: efficiency belangrijker

9. Hoe kan het beter?
Als alles redundant aanwezig zou zijn, zou dat inderdaad verspilling zijn. Het zou bewust moeten worden afgewogen waar je het wel en niet nodig hebt. Dat gebeurt deels al: bij waterveiligheid treffen we het aan. Vergelijkbaar met de regel voor verzekeringen: verzeker alleen dat wat je nooit zelf zou kunnen betalen (wel brandverzekering, geen glasverzekering).

Bewust afgewogen tegenover efficiency

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Nee.

Nee

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Werk het begrip 'robuust' verder uit in de richting van redundancy. Wat gaat er mis in verschillende worst case scenario's, en hoe zijn die gebeurtenissen te voorkomen? Wat zijn daarvan de kosten en wie zou die kosten willen opbrengen?

Begrip robuust uitwerken met worst case scenario's

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-2 is vrij leeg. Absolute armoede zou daar kunnen staan: zo weinig middelen dat nergens een marge voor bestaat en elke tegenslag een grote ramp betekent. De regen-afhankelijke landbouw in Oost-Afrika.

-2: armoede

3 Dimensie Learning

3.1 Trust

Tabel 3.1.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘trust’

2	1	0	-1	-2
The structure of the convention, with its annual COPs and meetings of the subsidiary bodies, might be seen as an opportunity to build trust (2.1)	The CAP provides income support, which provide a basis for trust between the actors (2.5)	No incentives that stimulate trust (2.6)	Nothing is allowed in nature parks, and if someone wants to do something he/she has to prove first that it has no damaging effect (5.2)	The strategy is mostly defensive towards other sectors of society (‘no, unless-regime’) (3.1)
The river basin management approach encourages actors in the water field from different countries to work together (2.3)	COP structure could be seen as a mechanism to build trust. Also, equitable sharing of goods of environmental resources through mutually agreed agreements is one of three aims of the convention (2.2)	The document reflects cooperation and trust between central and local governments. However, there are no instruments to accomplish this, against several instruments (e.g. de visitations to evaluate if provinces are able to realize national goals.) that may lead to distrust. (4.1)	Trust between parties does not play a role, the procedure is often put in the hands of experts and more or less bureaucratic (7.3)	Distrust is a main assumption (terrorism) and a reason to seek control; trust in government is mentioned but few ways to achieve this are mentioned apart from a respectful tone in education on disaster responses (3.2)
Because of the river basin management approach, actors in the water field from different countries are encouraged to work together (2.4)	Trust is not mentioned in the Whitepaper. The procedure of issuing a greenpaper for discussion, then a whitepaper and so on is implicitly meant to build trust. (2.7)	The document promotes trust implicitly because it allows parties to come together. Contract-style and quantitative targets with financial consequences may reduce trust (4.2)		
The document builds on the trust between parties (6.1)	The insurance arrangement encourages business transactions and this only works well when there is trust between actors and the transaction also builds trust between actors (4.3)	There is no explicit mechanism to enhance trust (5.3)		
The National Water Plan encourages parties to work together and thereby creates more trust (6.2)	Trust is mentioned as an important factor; however, there are no measures taken for building trust (3.1)	No mechanism to increase trust. (7.2)		
The document calls on parties to cooperate and there is room for creating trust. (6.3)	The regional water plans can be seen as a vehicle for building trust (6.4)			
The test stimulates collaboration between water boards, municipalities and project developers and				

thus stimulates trust. (6.5)				
The policy allows for the building of trust be- cause it encourages decentral collaboration (7.1)				
8	6	5	2	2

Tabel 3.1.B Do's en don'ts voor 'trust'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Convention with annual meetings as an opportunity to build trust - Stimulates collaboration between different actors and sectors - International cooperation encouraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Income support as a basis for trust between the actors - Equitable sharing of environmental resources through mutually agreed agreements - Issuing a draft for discussion, then a final version is implicitly meant to build trust - Insurance arrangement builds on trust between actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No incentives that stimulate trust - Internal tensions with unclear effect on trust e.g. stimulate cooperation versus quantitative targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Several instruments that may lead to distrust (e.g. visitations to evaluate if provinces are able to realize national goals.) - Burden of proof that there is no damage lies with innovative actors - Bureaucratic procedure - Decisions in the hands of experts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategy is mostly defensive ('no, unless-regime') - Distrust is a main assumption (terrorism)

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Vertrouwen is moeilijk te meten om verschillende redenen. Het is een abstract begrip voor een gevoel dat mensen ten opzichte van elkaar hebben aan de hand van een geschiedenis die ze met elkaar hebben meegemaakt. De mate van vertrouwen kan snel veranderen door de omstandigheden. Je kunt ernaar vragen en dan blijft nog de vraag of je het goed hebt gemeten. Er wordt zelfs over gezegd: als het ter sprake komt is dat een teken dat er een gebrek aan vertrouwen is. De argumenten in de tabel zijn dus erg indirect.

Moeilijk te meten

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

In content is het extra moeilijk te meten. Het woord 'vertrouwen' komt maar zelden in de teksten voor. Dat kan dus een goed teken zijn maar ook gebrek aan aandacht voor het opbouwen van vertrouwen.

Beter via casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ten eerste is het dus moeilijk te meten, ten tweede zijn we het weinig (expliciet) tegengekomen. We weten dus niet wat de juiste argumenten zijn om dit te meten.

Onbekend

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Er is overlap met verschillende andere criteria:

- Discussie dubt: vertrouwen is een noodzakelijke voorwaarde om onzekerheden op tafel te kunnen leggen. Dat is zelfs een belangrijke reden om het als criterium op te nemen.
- Leadership: Leadership is iets wederkerigs, iemand stelt zich als leider op en men geeft zo iemand dan het vertrouwen.
- Accountability: Dit is ook een 'two-faced' fenomeen: accountability is georganiseerd wantrouwen, maar je verantwoordt je om aan vertrouwen te bouwen.

Ja: met discussie dubt, leadership, responsiveness en accountability

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Misschien kan het weg gezien de overlap met andere criteria, en gezien het feit dat het moeilijk te meten is.

Misschien wel

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Reflecterend op het overzicht bij 4 gaat het ons niet zozeer om het vertrouwen op zich maar om het bewust bouwen aan vertrouwen.

Ja: bewust bouwen aan vertrouwen

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt ligt bij +2 (8x). Hoewel het alleen vrij indirect gemeten kan worden (in ieder geval met onze methode), lijkt het toch goed te zijn ontwikkeld in de Nederlandse instituties.

+2

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Of de Nederlandse instituties wel of niet goed ontwikkeld zijn weten we niet.

Onbekend

9. Hoe kan het beter?

We weten niet of het beter moet. Er is de afgelopen jaren veel energie gestoken in het ontwikkelen van participatieve beleidsontwikkeling en daar hebben wij op dit moment niets aan toe te voegen.

Onbekend

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Onbekend, in elk geval niet in onze meetmethode.

Onbekend

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Methodieken voor participatieve processen zijn volop in ontwikkeling, en zijn nog niet optimaal. Vooral de tweede helft, het doorpakken naar gedragen besluiten, is nog moeilijk. De tijd nemen is waarschijnlijk een belangrijke factor.

Participatieve besluitvorming, de tijd nemen

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Er zijn geen kolommen leeg. De kolom voor +2 is onhoudelijk matig. Samenwerking bevorderen, elkaar ontmoeten is het enige dat er nu staat. Een goed proces lijkt belangrijker: transparant, inclusief etc.

+2: goed beleidsproces

3.2 Single loop learning

Tabel 3.2.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Single loop learning’

2	1	0	-1	-2
The Convention itself sets up discussion meetings. Also a technological expert group on bio-diversity and climate change is installed. Furthermore, the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) is introduced: an internet-based information-sharing instrument for different actors in different nation states. Stimulates nation states to implement research and educational programs, and information campaigns, themselves. Does not specifically address adaptation however. 5:8	There is a lot of research going on for improving the quality of EHS territory. 12:8	No educational, research or information campaigns are set up. Does provide that management plans be revised every six years. 3:8	No institutionalised learning mechanism. Slow learning process as Luxembourg treaty shows. 4:8	
The management plans will be assessed every six years in the light of new climatic circumstances. 6:8	There is a fauna fund that has research and education among its tasks. 12:52		Contract style of long-term programmes and land exchange programmes limits learning to the preparatory stage, and then fixes it for many	

			years. 10:30	
The Commission will regularly review progress in implementing the first phase of the framework for action. 7:8	Water plans are revised every 6 years, primary dykes are checked every 6 years. 15:74		No learning mechanisms: no evaluation, no monitoring, no research. 13:30	
Progress in different EU countries is evaluated regularly to compare approaches and find best practices. 8:8	Learning is not an explicit goal but may be the result of the instrument 15:96			
Single loop learning is organized in a strong way through goals, criteria and monitoring. The monitoring and evaluation is in itself well organized. A process evaluation is planned, and effect indicators will be developed during the process. There is a research budget and help with process facilitation which may lead to regional learning. 10:8				
The instrument is being researched and studied and this may indirectly lead to a learning process. The investors are likely to audit their results and draw conclusions. 10:52				
The main strategy is to do more research and develop adaptation strategies for all parts of society in an ongoing process of learning. 11:8				
Large scale analysis to learn more about coordination and cooperation between governments and other social actors. 11:30				
The obligatory national communications are a source of information and best practices of local adaptation are available online, therefore they are a vehicle to stimulate learning. 14:8				
There are several mechanisms for learning: the Nature policy plans can be adjusted; progress of policy and status of nature are regularly reported, and the 'appropriate				

assessment' can also be a source of learning. 12:30				
There is learning involved through two-yearly updates. Moreover, learning processes with regard to the implementation of the new steering philosophy are stimulated through the designation of several exemplary projects and the appointment of a national advisor for integrated area planning (adviseur gebiedsontwikkeling). The central aim of the exemplary projects and the committee for integrated area planning is to 'stimulate learning by doing'. 13:8				
The goal of the procedure is to learn about more sustainable alternatives. 13:52				
There is a knowledge platform and innovation programmes have been started. Every 4 years the agreement is evaluated. 15:8				
A lot of research, progress monitoring and evaluation is planned. 15:30				
The process will be evaluated on a structural basis; learning also takes place for technical measures. 15:52				
15	4	1	3	0

Tabel 3.2.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Single loop learning'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a research budget and develop adaptation strategies for all parts of society in an ongoing process of learning - Install a technological expert group, a knowledge platform and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researching an instrument may indirectly lead to a learning process - A fund that has research and education among its tasks - Allow for adjustment of policy plans - Revise plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No educational, research or information campaigns are set up, only six-yearly evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contract style of long-term programmes and land exchange programmes limits learning to the preparatory stage, and then fixes it for many years - No institutionalised learning mechanisms: 	

<p>innovation programmes on adaptation to climate change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement research and educational programs - Organize large scale analysis to learn more about coordination and cooperation between governments and other social actors - Design exemplary projects - Implement information campaigns - Introduce the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM): an internet-based information-sharing instrument for different actors in different nation states - Make obligatory national climate communications available as a source of information and best practices of local adaptation - Organize monitoring through goals, criteria, effect indicators and process evaluation - Review progress of implementing 	<p>every 6 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Check primary infrastructure every 6 years - Report regularly on status and progress of a policy - Development of three alternatives can lead to learning about more sustainable alternatives - Prescribe an the 'appropriate assessment' before a permit can be given - Help with process facilitation - Set up discussion meetings 		<p>no evaluation, no monitoring, no research</p>	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------	--

frame-work for action regularly - Evaluate an agreement every 4 years - Evaluate progress in different EU countries to compare approaches and find best practices - Audit results and draw conclusions				
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Dit kan goed gemeten worden, er zijn allerlei structuren herkenbaar in het beleid die leren bevorderen.

Goed te meten

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

In de content zijn deze structuren makkelijker te herkennen dan in een casus. Je ziet het leren in de teksten terug als een ingebouwde routine. In een casus moet je ook nagaan wat er nou eigenlijk is geleerd. Als er dan veel geleerd is moet je weer nagaan waaraan het ligt dat er is geleerd: is dat door de instituties, door de individuele inzet van mensen? Als er een vliegtuig neerstort wordt er ook veel geleerd maar dat is niet wat we hier graag zouden zien.

Beter in content

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja, het is een rijke verzameling aan heldere elementen.

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Vooral het onderscheid met double loop learning is lastig. Hoe ver moet je buiten de gebaande paden gaan voordat het double loop wordt? Bijvoorbeeld: toetsen of een dijk aan de norm voldoet is single loop. En de norm voor de dijk 15 cm omhoog doen, is dat al double loop? Of moet je daarvoor minstens naar een heel ander systeem zoals buitendijks bouwen?

Er is misschien overlap met responsiveness: je moet als overheid luisteren naar het publiek, maar ook daar wat mee doen.

Vage grens naar double loop
Responsiveness?

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Singel loop learning is misschien niet specifiek genoeg voor klimaatverandering. Je zou het ook tot double loop learning kunnen beperken. Maar single loop learning ondersteunt in de discussie wel het begrip double loop learning.

Eventueel alleen double loop meten

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee, veel gebruikt begrip, duidelijk.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt ligt nu geheel aan de kant van score 2 (13x) met ook nog een grote vertegenwoordiging in score 1 (6x). Single loop leerprocessen lijken dus in veel instituties gemeengoed te zijn. Dit maakte het ook makkelijker om erop te scoren, wat de score weer laat stijgen.

+2

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Ja, goed ontwikkeld, er zijn veel verschillende lerende elementen bedacht en ook ingebouwd in wetten en beleid. Voorbeelden: onderzoeksprogramma's, voorbeeldprojecten, informatiecampagnes, internet, monitoring en evaluatie.

Ja: veel opties beschikbaar

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Het vooruitgangsgeloof is misschien zelfs wat doorgeschooten. Minder geld naar innovatief onderzoek, meer geld om het te laten landen en voorbeeldprojecten op te schalen.

Kennisdoorwerking verbeteren

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja: onderzoeksprogramma's, voorbeeldprojecten, informatiecampagnes, internet, monitoring en evaluatie.

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Meer aandacht voor de opnamecapaciteit van alles dat er is geleerd. Ambtenaren minder in de politieke mallemlen laten hollen en meer tijd geven hun kennis bij te houden.

Kennisabsorptie bij overheid verbeteren

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-2 is leeg. Heel erg negatief is een instortende maatschappij, bijvoorbeeld oorlog of rechteloosheid (Rusland), gebrek aan stabiliteit die investeringen remt zoals in Afrika, maar ook een stabiele, onderdrukkende maatschappij zoals het Spanje van van Franco.

-2: oorlog, onderdrukking, instabiliteit

3.3 Double loop learning

Tabel 3.3.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Double loop learning’

2	1	0	-1	-2
The management plans will be assessed every six years in the light of new climatic circumstances. 6:6	Under the Convention, the subsidiary bodies provide scope to discuss different problems, assumptions, solutions and Technologies. 5:6	No incentives that stimulate double loop learning. 3:6	The CAP does not facilitate double loop learning. 4:6	The principles behind the EHS are not open for discussion, even when its limits are clear within the nature sector itself for example the difficulties for naturally dynamic nature types. 12:6
The framework is designed to evolve as further evidence becomes available. Aims at developing the knowledge base for development of appropriate policy responses. Also an education policy. Expects a long and continuous process of adaptation. 7:6	As the instrument is in its infancy, it will be tested and compared to similar institutions in other countries. 10:50	No mechanism to stimulate double loop learning. 8:6	There is limited opportunity for questioning the assumptions. 11:28	Goals are fixed and not open for discussion. 12:28
The complex structure of discussing implementation bottlenecks in the subsidiary body on implementation provides room to generate potential solutions and for double loop learning. 14:6	The planner is at a higher (strategic) level compared to a project mer and can lead to reflection on norms. 13:50	Double loop learning is only lightly touched upon and then only by external developments, not internal discussion between the parties of the contracts. 10:6		The ideal state of nature is a static concept, based on the state of nature in the past. No mechanism to check assumptions. 12:50
New climate scenarios are taken into account allowing for challenging the assumptions. 15:6	The previous guideline has been evaluated and this has led to a less rigid approach. 15:50	Double loop learning is not part of Long-term plans; it can be part of land exchange processes (infrastructure improvement) but is not made very explicit there either. 10:28		Basic assumptions are not open for discussion. 15:28
	Norms for water safety will be revised every 12 years. 15:72	There is no mechanism to reflect on the basic assumptions of this strategy. 11:6		
		There is no mechanism described to reflect on the norms of the Nota Ruimte itself. 13:6		
		Double loop learning does not seem to be an issue: Wro is about rules how people		

		should deal with each other. 13:28		
		No reflective mechanism. 15:94		
4	5	8	2	4

Tabel 3.3.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Double loop learning'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess management plans every six years in the light of new climatic circumstances - Take new climate scenarios into account to challenge present assumptions - Design a framework that will evolve as further evidence becomes available - Develop a knowledge base for development of appropriate policy responses - Education policy - Expect a long and continuous process of adaptation - A structure of discussing implementation bottlenecks provides room to generate potential solutions and for double loop learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Strategic Environmental Analysis at a higher (strategic) level compared to a project level can lead to reflection on norms - An international convention provides the scope for subsidiary bodies to discuss different assumptions - Test and compare an instrument to similar institutions in other countries - Use a less rigid approach - Revise norms every 12 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No incentives that stimulate double loop learning - No mechanism to stimulate double loop learning - Double loop learning is not made explicit - No reflective mechanism - No awareness of basic assumptions of a strategy - No mechanism to check assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not facilitate double loop learning because norms are decided upon at a high (EU) level after long negotiation - Limited opportunity for questioning the assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The principles are not open for discussion, even when its limits are clear - Basic assumptions are not open for discussion - Goals are fixed and not open for discussion - The ideal state is a static concept, based on the state in the past

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Redelijk goed: Plaatsen waar normen of aannames ter discussie worden gesteld zijn aanwijsbaar in de teksten.

Ja

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Goed te meten in content; casus weet ik niet.

Content

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja.

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Zoals hierboven is besproken kan het onderscheid met single loop learning soms vaag zijn, maar double loop is dan juist belangrijker om te signaleren. Er is misschien wat overlap met variety of problem frames, omdat je die ook kunt gebruiken om (dominante) aannames ter discussie te stellen. Maar niet storend.

Weinig, (single loop learning en variety of problem frames)

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee: belangrijk vanwege veranderende klimatologische omstandigheden.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee, gebruikelijke term in de literatuur.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt in de A-tabel voor double loop learning ligt bij 0. Er is nog weinig aandacht voor, misschien omdat instituties de huidige consensus en kennis proberen vast te leggen? In de B-tabel worden wel diverse opties zichtbaar om double loop learning in instituties onder te brengen, soms direct gerelateerd aan klimaatverandering.

0

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Er is een begin gemaakt met het inbouwen van double loop learning, maar er zijn nog veel instituties die het niet meenemen.

Begin gemaakt

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Double loop learning inbouwen is niet moeilijk: het hoeft alleen expliciet te worden opgeschreven. Is dat eenmaal gebeurd, dan kan het wel een ‘doos van Pandora’ zijn, als afspraken steeds weer ter discussie staan en steeds opnieuw vastgelegd moeten worden. Instituties zijn bedoeld om continuïteit, efficiëntie van de besluitvorming en rechtszekerheid te verbeteren; er moet dus een balans zijn tussen vastigheid en flexibiliteit.

Double loop learning expliciet maken in instituties

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Er is een redelijk aantal positieve voorbeelden (score 2 4x en score 1 5x)..

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Geen

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Geen leeg.

Geen

3.4 Discuss doubts

Categorieën + 2 en -2 geven wel enkele aanwijzingen hoe je dit zou kunnen bevorderen.

Tabel 3.4.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Discuss doubts’

2	1	0	-1	-2
The NAS sees climate change as an unavoidable source of uncertainties and therefore dealing with uncertainties must become part of any adaptation strategy. 11:7	There is room to discuss doubt in the subsidiary bodies. 5:7	Not intentionally aimed at due to the closed agricultural community. 4:7	The document has goals for 2013, and holds provinces accountable for them. 10:7	By specifying aims very specifically, no room is left to discuss doubts. 3:7
There is room to discuss doubts even up to the Council of State. 12:29	More knowledge is needed on climate impact and vulnerability. Uncertainties are lightly touched upon: look for no-regret options. 7:7	No mechanism to articulate doubts. 6:7		The instrument does not allow for doubts to be discussed. 10:51
Scenario's are the way to deal with uncertainty in a structural way; however, they may be hypothetical. 11:29	Legal procedures are the explicit way to discuss doubts in a land exchange process. 10:29	No explicit room created to articulate doubts. 8:7		It is preferred to wait with discussing doubts until the territorial goals of EHS are achieved in 2015/ 2018. 12:7
The assumption is that the central government does not have all the knowledge, and is therefore open to discuss plans with	In the negotiations, doubts and uncertainties are articulated. The meetings of the subsidiary bodies and	No mechanism to discuss doubts. 13:29		

lower level governments. On the long term, uncertainty is also considered. 13:7	the COPs provide room to discuss doubts; at least they are not specifically excluded. 14:7			
Uncertainties about climate change are dealt With. 15:29	No explicit mentioning of doubts. Doubts about different options can be discussed, knowledge gaps are identified. 13:51	No mechanism to discuss doubts. 12:51		
Discussing doubts is what the instrument is about. 15:95	Double loop learning implies that doubts are taken into account. 15:51	There is no explicit mechanism to discuss doubts. 15:7		
	Double loop learning implies room to discuss doubts. 15:73			
6	7	6	1	3

Tabel 3.4.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Discuss doubts'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look at climate change as an unavoidable source of uncertainties and therefore deal with uncertainties as a part of any adaptation strategy - Room to discuss doubts - Assume that a central government does not have all the knowledge, and is therefore open to discuss plans with lower level governments - Consider uncertainty on the long term - Use scenarios as a way to deal with uncertainty in a structural way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Room to discuss doubt in the subsidiary bodies - Look for no-regret options - Acknowledge that more knowledge is needed - Legal procedures as the explicit way to discuss doubts - Doubts and uncertainties can be articulated during negotiations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not intentionally aimed at due to a closed community - No mechanism to articulate doubts - No explicit room created to articulate doubts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formulate goals for the future, and hold other parties accountable for them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specifying aims very specifically leaves no room to discuss doubts - A market-based contract does not allow for doubts to be discussed - Wait with discussing doubts until a policy goal has been achieved

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Aan de positieve kant moeilijk te meten, discussie wordt in de regel niet expliciet gemaakt. Instaties die klimaatverandering hebben opgenomen vormen de uitzondering: daar is vaak de term 'onzekerheden' aanwezig. Aan de negatieve kant kun je wel zien als heel gedetailleerde doelen worden vastgelegd: dan pretendeer je het systeem volledig te begrijpen. Vooral in new public management vind je dit: afrekenbare doelen etc.

Term onzekerheid ivm klimaat; vaker niet expliciet; wel aan negatieve kant bij afrekenbare doelen

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Vermoedelijk wordt in de praktijk wel vaak over onzekerheden gediscussieerd; dus beter te meten in een casus.

Casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Moeilijk te meten, de argumentatie is gevarieerd, maakt geen complete indruk.

Misschien

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Zoals eerder gesignaleerd is er enige overlap met trust: je bediscussieert alleen je onzekerheden met partijen die je vertrouwt. Besluitvorming kan overigens ook getraineed worden door te vragen om meer onderzoek. En er is overlap met double loop learning: twijfels zijn een bron van leren.

Trust en double loop learning

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Misschien gezien bovengenoemde overlap; aan de andere kant wel belangrijk voor klimaatverandering.

Misschien

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Wanneer je het meer richt op onzekerheden wordt het meer aan klimaat gerelateerd.

Omgaan met onzekerheid tav de toekomst

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt voor 'discussie dubt' ligt bij +1. De belangrijkste reden daarvoor is dat het moeilijk is om op dit criterium te scoren, omdat instaties twijfels meestal niet expliciet maken. Dan kom je bij indirecte aanwijzingen terecht (score +1) of je ziet er niets van (score 0).

+1: indirecte aanwijzingen

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom? In nieuwere documenten zijn klimaatonzekerheden en klimaatscenario's vaak expliciet opgenomen. In oudere documenten wordt hier geen aandacht aan besteed. Er is een trend (geweest) van afrekenbare doelen die tegengesteld is aan omgaan met onzekerheden. Bij afrekenbare doelen pretendeer je dat je het systeem door hebt, en dat kan tot perverse effecten leiden.

In nieuwere documenten staan klimaat onzekerheden expliciet; afrekenbare doelen kunnen averechts werken

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Een brede verwijzing naar maatschappelijk normbesef, zoals de KRW doet met de norm 'goede ecologische kwaliteit' werkt waarschijnlijk beter dan zeer gedetailleerde getalsmatige doelen. Verder zouden onzekerheden expliciet genoemd kunnen worden in instituties: dat ze er zijn en hoe je ermee denkt om te gaan.

Onzekerheid expliciet, brede doelen formuleren

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Redelijk.

Redelijk

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Een breed doel ten aanzien van klimaatadaptatie: experimenten en pilots met nieuwe instituties mogelijk maken en evalueren.

Experimenten met nieuwe instituties mogelijk maken

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-1 is vrij leeg; hier zou je dubbelzinnigheid verwachten dus enerzijds onzekerheid en anderzijds getalsmatige doelen bv berekend zijn op een bepaald soort hittegolven.

-1: tegenstrijdige instrumenten

3.5 Institutional memory

Tabel 3.5.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Institutional memory'

2	1	0	-1	-2
Through the CHM, institutional memory is created. Moreover, parties are obligated to submit national communications. 5:9	Documents are kept and there is basic institutional memory. 6:9	There may be institutional memory available to a close community of actors, but this is not available for outsiders. 4:9	No institutional memory created. 3:9	

Processes are evaluated and these results are also publicly available. 10:9	Suggestion to establish a Clearing House Mechanism as an IT tool and database on climate change impact. 7:9	The strategy seems project based and is not supported structurally yet. This is in an early stage of institutionalization. 11:9	Statistics unavailable and this causes hesitation at insurance companies. 10:53	
Knowledge on land exchange processes is well developed and DLG is structurally involved. 10:31	Progress in the implementation process is monitored and made available on website (but not explicitly part of the directive) 8:9		The process is fragmented across the Netherlands, there is no mechanism to learn from ex-periences in previous situations or other locations. 15:97	
The obligatory national communications create institutional memory; the discussions in all the different fora are recorded and are also part of the institutional memory. 14:9	National risk analysis at regular intervals. 11:31			
There is a lot of monitoring and evaluation. 12:9	Provincial governments have to enforce and monitor the policy; the institutional memory exists in the government records. 12:53			
The regular reporting activities and the underlying monitoring represents a large institutional memory. 12:31	Memory is mainly organized in the form of maps. Prescribed spatial plans at central, provincial and local level are also a way to create institutional memory. 13:9			
Usually the process is well-documented; monitoring of effects is part of the procedure. 13:53	All plans have to become publicly and digitally available in the form of maps. 13:31			
Monitoring and evaluation is well developed: results are monitored and evaluated on a structural basis. 15:9	Evaluations will be reported. 15:53			
Monitoring, modelling and evaluation reports are widely available. 15:31				
Norms, plans and agreements are made explicit quantitatively in a detailed way. 15:75				
10	8	2	3	0

Tabel 3.5.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Institutional memory'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Record discussions in all the different fora - Make norms, plans and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documents are kept and there is basic institutional memory - Suggestion to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There may be institutional memory available to a close community of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No institutional memory created - Statistics unavailable and this 	

<p>agreements explicit quantitatively in a detailed way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor results and evaluate on a structural basis - Combine monitoring with modelling - Processes are evaluated and these results are publicly available - Obligation to submit national communications - Through the Clearing House Mechanism, institutional memory is created - Maintain an organization that is structurally involved in land use change processes 	<p>establish a Clearing House Mechanism as an IT tool and database on climate change impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress in the implementation process is monitored and made available on website (but not explicitly part of the directive) - National risk analysis at regular intervals - The institutional memory exists in the government records - Memory is mainly organized in the form of maps. Prescribed spatial plans at central, provincial and local level are also a way to create institutional memory - All plans have to become publicly and digitally available in the form of maps - Evaluations will be reported 	<p>actors, but this is not available for outsiders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The strategy seems project based and is not supported structurally yet 	<p>causes hesitation at insurance companies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The process is fragmented across the Netherlands, there is no mechanism to learn from experiences in previous situations or other locations 	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?
 Institutional memory is op zich goed te meten want is vastleggen en (breed) beschikbaar maken van informatie. Het komt alleen vaak niet expliciet in wetten en beleidsdocumenten naar voren; je merkt dat het er is omdat er gebruik van is gemaakt.

Ja maar soms indirect

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Via een casus dwz de praktijk is het beter te meten. Je kunt achterhalen of het er is en in welke staat het is.

Casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Argumenten zijn redelijk maar omdat ze op content zijn gebaseerd zouden ze wel beter kunnen worden door ze via een casus te meten.

ja (kan wel beter)

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Er is overlap met continuous acces to information. Institutional memory gaat meer over het opslaan van gegevens en access to information gaat meer over of het ook publiek beschikbaar is.

Ja met access to info

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Het is wel nuttig om te behouden.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Niet nodig, bekende term in de literatuur en leidt niet tot verwarring.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Bij het criterium 'institutional memory' zijn de meeste scores aan de positieve kant: 10x +2 en 8x +1. Waar dit niet het geval is, is meestal sprake van jong beleid of jonge instituties.

+2

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Ja; veel positieve opties beschikbaar.

Ja: veel opties

9. Hoe kan het beter?

De noodzaak van institutional memory zou in nieuw beleid iets meer aandacht kunnen krijgen. Welke gegevens zijn nodig, hoe ga je ze verzamelen?

Inst memory ook in nieuw beleid al regelen

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja.

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Meer expliciete aandacht voor inst memory, zoals:

Is de onafhankelijkheid van de inst memory geregeld? Peer review?

Worden de bronnen van kennis voldoende onderkend en gefinancierd? bv waterschappen, oudere medewerkers

Expliciete aandacht om dit goed te regelen

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-2 is leeg, vernietiging en verwaarlozing van inst memory.

-2: vernietiging van data

4 Dimensie Room for autonomous change

4.1 Continuous access to information

Tabel 4.1.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Continuous access to information’

2	1	0	-1	-2
The Directive commits member states to map areas that are prone to flood risk. 6:10	Somewhat provided for through national communications and CHM. Parties should identify and monitor components of biological diversity, identify processes that influence those components. 5:10	There is uncertainty in the information available; no plans yet to keep citizens updated. 11:10	No monitoring. 3:10	Very little information on climate change; lightly linked to the ARK programme; 7 year contracts (2007-2013) between national government and provincial government have been established. In 2010 there is a mid-term evaluation. 10:10
Helping citizens and companies to be prepared is an important part of the strategy. 11:32	A Clearing House Mechanism and sharing of best practices among member States, so measures aiming at scientists and governments. Not for businesses, farmers or citizens. 7:10	Lack of concrete climate info; intention to make info available through the internet. 13:10	No open, structural evaluation. 4:10	
	The Climate Convention and its subsidiary bodies provide general information on the kinds of adaptation measures to be taken by countries and a structure on how the reporting should take place. 14:10	The WRO does facilitate information supply but in an unspecified way. 13:32	Public information on local water quality or quantity is not made available. 8:10	
	The EHS provides information, also through the internet. 12:10	The policy does not provide a disaster management information system. However, this will be arranged in a related document (ROR). 15:54	No information on climate change yet. Detailed maps are part of land exchange processes so may be easily to implement. 10:32	
	There is considerable information available and is probably accessible?? 12:32	The Water Act doesn't provide in an information system. 15:76	Little information available. 10:54	
	A public campaign with general information is Continued. 15:10		The law does not cover data on climate effects. 12:54	
	The Plan is making information available to the public. 15:32		The instrument does not facilitate information Supply. 13:54	
	The outcome of the debate is publicly available. 15:98			
2	8	5	7	1

Tabel 4.1.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Continuous access to information'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Map areas that are prone to flood risk - Help citizens and companies to be prepared 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify and monitor components of biological diversity, and identify processes that influence those components - A Clearing House Mechanism and sharing of best practices among member States, aiming at scientists and governments . Not for businesses, farmers or citizens. - Provide general information on the kinds of adaptation measures to be taken by countries - Provide a structure on how the reporting should take place - Provide general information, also through the internet - A public campaign with general information - Make the outcome of a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertainty in the information available; no plans yet to keep citizens updated - Lack of concrete climate info; intention to make info available through the internet - Does not provide a disaster management information system. However, this will be arranged in a related document later - Law does facilitate information supply but in an unspecified way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No monitoring - No open, structural evaluation - Information on local water quality or quantity is not made available publicly - Little information available - The law does not cover data on climate effects - The instrument does not facilitate information supply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very little information on climate change

	debate publicly available			
--	---------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Het kan goed gemeten worden, maar, analoog aan vorige criterium institutional memory: formele instituties zijn hier vaak niet expliciet over. Een zekere beschikbaarheid wordt als een gegeven beschouwd, en het recht van burgers op informatie speelt niet zo.

Ja

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Beter via casus omdat instituties onvoldoende expliciet zijn.

Casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja. Dit is een redelijk eenduidig criterium. We hebben het wel vaak naar een crisissituatie vertaald, meer in het bijzonder naar een overstroming. Maar je zou ook aan urban heat kunnen denken of aan de Natuurkalender.

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Zie vorige criterium: enige overlap met institutional memory. In the individual responsibility case study there was a clear difference between institutional memory (data were kept) and access to information (the data were only accessible to a very limited extent)

Ja: institutional memory

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee. Is een belangrijke voorwaarde voor autonoom handelen.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt voor het criterium 'continuous access to information' ligt strict genomen bij +1, maar -1 scoort zo dicht daar bij dat een gemiddelde score van 0 ook te verdedigen is.

+1 (0)

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?
Er is in veel gevallen wel wat informatie beschikbaar, maar het is zelden optimaal, en het is ook regelmatig minder goed geregeld.

Kan meestal beter

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Vooral het recht van burgers op informatie ontbreekt, overheden delen de informatie vaak actief met elkaar en de rest zoekt het maar uit.

Meer informatie voor burgers beschikbaar maken

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Nee. De informatie wordt wel verzameld en vastgelegd maar beperkt beschikbaar gemaakt voor burgers. Iedereen vindt dat blijkbaar te duur en te moeilijk. KNMI / PCCC probeert het wel.

Te weinig publiek beschikbare informatie

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Vooral internet kan beter worden benut: dreigend hoogwater, hittegolven in de stad, droogte, verzilting, oplossingen

Meer soorten info via internet

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

De -2-score komt weinig voor. Daar zou je verwachten: burgers expres informatie onthouden bv internet blokkeren of bewust verkeerd informeren.

-2: expres verkeerd informeren

4.2 Act according to plan

Tabel 4.2.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Act according to plan'

2	1	0	-1	-2
The Directive commits member states to develop a flood risk plan to prevent floods and minimize the impacts of floods. 6:11	People do know what to do and how: which species and habitats to protect following the regional management plan. No attention paid to adaptation however. 3:11	The Climate Convention has commitments for all countries. Each country is allowed to make its own judgement as to what is needed in the domestic context. In subsequent years, it called on the poorer countries to make a National Adaptation Plans of Action. 14:11	No blue print. 5:11	
No EU-wide blueprint set out, but prescribes regional Plans. 8:11	The CAP provides income support on a structural basis, farmers know to a certain extent what to expect from	The guideline has no clear end goal, it supports open planning processes under the spatial planning law.	The strategy basically is an agreement among governments to continue their cooperation; it is more	

	CAP and can act on this knowledge. 4:11	There are 15 experiments with building in riverbeds, not clear how they will end. 15:55	visionary than a plan. 11:11	
It is a second generation plan and it is implemented. Very structured with negotiations, contracts, lists of budgets and so on. 10:11	By publishing a Greenpaper in 2007 and a Whitepaper in 2009 the EU shows some capacity to act according to plan. 7:11		It is open ended and complicated to have a controlled implementation. 13:11	
When a transaction is made, it has the status of a contract. 10:55	Detailed plans are made, but implementation is dependent on many factors and actors, is slow and is often overhauled by a new process. 10:33		The open process makes it more difficult to act according to plan (who is in charge?). The planning process also becomes more fluid: everyone is making visions and plans all the time. 13:33	
The plan follows certain steps and is reviewed on a yearly basis. 11:33	The EHA is a plan with more or less clear goals. There is a slow progress towards achieving the goals of EHS however. 12:11		The outcome is not legally binding, it is often unclear what happens with it. 15:99	
The procedure supports the planning process and prevents legal barriers. 13:55	There is a detailed planning cycle in the law. For every nature territory there will be a plan; if plans are feasible is not assessed beforehand. 12:33			
It is a feasible plan with clear goals and milestones. 15:33	There is a fauna management plan that gives some guidance when to do an intervention. 12:55			
Strong planning cycles. 15:77				
It is an explicit plan with tasks divided between parties; evaluation shows that most aspects have been realized and the all should be achieved by 2015. Moreover, the National Agreement on Water, and the National Agreement on the Water Chain are sometimes incompatible. 15:11				
9	7	2	5	0

Tabel 4.2.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Act according to plan'

2	1	0	-1	-2
- Commit member states to develop a flood risk plan to prevent floods and	- People know what to do and how, following the regional management plan. No attention paid	- Commitments for all countries. Each country is allowed to make its own judgement as	- No blue print - The strategy is an agreement among governments to continue their	- Plans and laws are sometimes incompatible

<p>minimize the impacts of floods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prescribe regional plans - A procedure that supports the planning process and prevents legal barriers - A feasible plan with clear goals and milestones - The plan follows certain steps and is reviewed on a yearly basis - Second generation plan, very structured with negotiations, contracts, lists of budgets and so on - Strong planning cycles - When a transaction is made, it has the status of a contract - An explicit plan with tasks divided between parties; evaluation shows that most aspects have been realized 	<p>to adaptation however</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides income support on a structural basis, farmers know to a certain extent what to expect until 2013 - Implementation is dependent on many factors and actors, is slow and is often overhauled by a new process - A plan with more or less clear goals. There is a slow progress towards achieving the goals - Detailed planning cycle in the law; if plans are feasible is not assessed beforehand - Management plan that gives some guidance when to do an intervention 	<p>to what is needed in the domestic context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The guideline has no clear end goal, it supports open planning processes - There are experiments, not clear how they will end 	<p>cooperation; it is more a vision than a plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy is open ended and complicated to have a controlled implementation - An open process makes it more difficult to act according to plan (who is in charge?) - Everyone is making visions and plans all the time - The outcome is not legally binding, it is often unclear what happens with it 	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Ja, daarkracht en uitvoering is wel te meten. Je ziet in de praktijk of iets is gebouwd etc.

Ja

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Dit criterium is moeilijk te beoordelen vanuit formele instituties, in feite kijk je naar de praktijk.

Casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Eigenlijk niet, omdat we naar content hebben gekeken zijn het indirecte argumenten waarvan we verwachten dat ze e daadkracht bevorderen bv heldere doelen.

Nee: indirect

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Er is overlap met entrepreneurial leadership, daar kijk je naar dezelfde feiten namelijk wordt er iets gerealiseerd.

Ja: entrepreneurial leadership

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Misschien wel als entrepreneurial leadership blijft.

Misschien wel

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

De relatie met de dimensie Room for autonomous change is niet direct duidelijk vanuit deze formulering. Het gaat om: weten de mensen wat ze moeten doen ten tijde van een crisis en kunnen ze het dan ook realiseren om de schok in het (maatschappelijke) systeem op te vangen? De dimensie zou eigenlijk Room for autonomous *action* moeten heten.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt voor het criterium 'act according to plan' ligt bij +2 (9x) met eveneens een vrij hoge score voor +1 (7x).

+2

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Daadkracht is cultureel wel belangrijk en alle instituties streven er wel naar, maar het blijft moeilijk om maatschappelijke veranderingen voor elkaar te krijgen.

Men streeft echt naar uitvoering en houdt zich vaak aan afspraken

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Lokale autonomie meer steunen en stimuleren. Act according to plan heeft een centraal basisplan nodig, maar wellicht meer in balans met decentrale besluitvorming. Centraal kan decentraal meer steunen met decision support systems, professionalisering.

Centraal niveau kan decentraal meer faciliteren

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Niet goed uit content analyse te halen. Teveel daadkracht is ook niet goed.

Onbekend

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Draaiboeken, publiekscampagnes, oefeningen. Resources zijn belangrijk voor daadkracht, maar die komen elders terug. Gemotiveerde mensen, durf (valkuil: zelfoverschatting), een ondernemende bedrijfscultuur (entrepreneurial leadership). Fouten accepteren en corrigeren (dus leren).

Draaiboeken,
publiekscampagnes, oefeningen

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Geen kolommen leeg. -2 is weinig; daar zou kunnen staan maatschappelijke verlamming door eindeloos polderen of door patstelling in conflict.

Eindeloos polderen, conflict

4.3 Capacity to improvise

Tabel 4.3.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Capacity to improvise’

2	1	0	-1	-2
With the LEADER approach, and income support to farmers, autonomous adaptation is stimulated. 4:12	With the ecosystems approach together with the sustainable growth approach, the Convention argues for finding integrated solutions in which several actors together find the best solutions/strategies. 5:12	The Directive neither encourages or discourages the use of local competencies. 6:12	Once the territory is acquired, borders and goals seem pretty fixed. 12:12	Because of the static and specific goals, little room is left for local actors to autonomously adjust. 3:12
Explicitly leaves room for local water actors to manoeuvre. 8:12	The decentralized approach improves bottom-up input and therefore also potential innovation. 10:12	Whitepaper states that autonomous adaptation is only possible for some individuals and businesses, and may be mal-adaptation for example when it causes more energy consumption. 7:12	The instrument does not encourage initiative or improvisation and is highly bureaucratic. 13:56	No room at all for autonomous improvisation or innovation. 12:34
Innovation and autonomous development are encouraged. 13:12	In principle it can enhance opportunities for involved parties to reach their goals (agriculture, nature, water, recreation). However, mostly oriented towards safeguarding vested interests. 10:34	The Climate Convention and its follow-up agreements do not hamper or enhance autonomous adaptation. 14:12		The law is mostly restrictive, does not enhance innovation. 12:56
There is a lot of room for new ideas and initiatives. 13:34	Contracts are adapted to user needs by the insurance companies. 10:56	Not an issue. 15:78		
Innovation programmes have been started / continued. 15:12	Adaptation is seen as an opportunity to innovate, also for the commercial sector. 11:12	No incentives for innovation. 15:100		
Local stakeholders are encouraged to come up with their own plans	Autonomous improvisation is supported, mainly with			

and solutions; and to get their own Insurance. 15:56	education, not with infrastructural changes. 11:34			
	Innovation is stimulated, improvisation not. 15:34			
6	7	5	2	3

Tabel 4.3.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Capacity to improvise'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With subsidies for rural development and income support to farmers, autonomous adaptation is stimulated - Explicitly leave room to manoeuvre for local actors - Encourage autonomous development - Create room for new ideas and initiatives - Encourage local stakeholders to come up with their own plans and solutions - Encourage local stakeholders to get their own insurance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use integrating concepts like sustainability or ecosystems through which several actors find the best solutions/ strategies together - A decentralized approach improves bottom-up input - A law that guides a land use change process with all actors in an area can enhance opportunities for adaptation but may also safeguard vested interests - Adapt insurance contracts to user needs - Look at adaptation as an opportunity, also for the commercial sector - Support autonomous improvisation with education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither encourages or discourages the use of local competencies - States that autonomous adaptation is only possible for some individuals and businesses - States that autonomous adaptation may be mal-adaptation for example when it causes more energy consumption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A highly bureaucratic instrument does not encourage initiative or improvisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Static and specific goals leave little room for local actors to autonomously adjust - No room at all for autonomous improvisation or innovation - A restrictive law does not enhance improvisation

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Of mensen de capaciteit hebben om te improviseren kan via content niet direct gemeten worden. Toch zijn er redelijk veel signalen te vinden als er ruimte wordt gelaten voor improvisatie of als het expliciet wordt gestimuleerd.

Indirect, maar toch van belang

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Dit criterium is alleen indirect te meten in formele instituties, in de case studies kunnen we zien of het lukt in de praktijk.

Content en casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Er is wat overlap tussen innovatie en improvisatie; daar liggen misschien dezelfde capaciteiten aan ten grondslag. Het is niet helemaal helder op welke tijdschaal we dit criterium bedoelen: accuut bij een ramp weten te improviseren; bij het dagelijkse werk vrij zijn oplossingen te zoeken zoals eerder zaaien, met een eigen bootje naar school varen; op de lokale schaal unieke, structurele oplossingen bedenken, bv. nieuwe techniek of nieuwe institutionele arrangementen.

Op welke tijdschaal is improvisatie? Kan variëren van accuut tot structureel

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Dit is een redelijk uniek criterium, het overlapt met geen enkel ander criterium. Alleen een raakvlak met double loop learning omdat improvisatie een bron van leren kan zijn.

Geen overlap

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Kan niet weg, dit is het ultieme meetpunt voor adaptive capacity.

Niet weg

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee, ook al is het lastig te definiëren: hier gaat het om. Capacity to improvise zou unique local solutions moeten opleveren

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt bij dit criterium ligt bij de score +1 (7x). +2 is ook redelijk ingevuld (6x). Dit komt niet overeen met onze intuïtie dat het met het lokale improvisatieniveau in Nederland slecht gesteld is door de centralistische (paternalistische) benadering in Nederland. Misschien ontstaat dit verschil doordat het centralisme wel aan de orde is in de watersector, die het debat domineert en ook erg aanwezig is in onze case studies. De andere sectoren die we hebben onderzocht, vooral RO en landbouw, laten wel degelijk veel lokale autonomie bestaan. Een gelegenheid dus voor sectoren om van elkaar te leren.

+1: redelijke score

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom? In landbouw en RO zijn redelijk veel opties ontwikkeld; minder voor natuur en water. Misschien vergen natuur en water een blik op grotere schaal (Europa, een catchment). Waarschijnlijk hebben waterschappen in hun dagelijkse praktijk al veel lokale oplossingen die deels niet op papier staan of niet als gedeeld/toegankelijke informatie. Lokale oplossingen kunnen verder ontwikkeld worden, ook omdat ze zullen bijdragen aan draagvlak.

Redelijk, kan beter.

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Gebiedsgerichte oplossingen zoeken, eventuele innovaties (technisch of institutioneel) breder beschikbaar maken. Cross-over van strategieën uit RO en landbouw naar natuur en water.

Gebiedsgericht werken, cross over tussen sectoren

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja.

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Liberaal standpunten zoals eigen verantwoordelijkheid, ruimte om te ondernemen. Subsidiariteitsbeginsel uit EU zou ook tussen nationaal en regionaal niveau toegepast kunnen worden. Een risico bij dit type autonomie-stimulerend beleid is altijd dat het centrale niveau dit met de mond belijdt en tegelijk probeert de touwtjes weer aan te trekken of het resultaat toch heel strict wil controleren: dit speelt in de decentralisatie van RO, in ILG, bij de NS. Dus waken voor intern conflicterend beleid, barrières.

Eigen verantwoordelijkheid, subsidiariteit, waken voor intern conflicterend beleid van toch weer controleren

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Geen kolommen leeg. -1 is weinig; daar zou je intern conflicterend beleid verwachten. We hebben dit niet expliciet in de analyse betrokken. Er is een link met accountability te leggen: als die heel goed is, is het improvisatievermogen dan juist slecht?

-1: Intern conflicterend beleid

5 Dimensie Leiderschap

5.1 Visionary leadership

Tabel 5.1.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Visionary leadership’

2	1	0	-1	-2
Adaptation needs to be mainstreamed in EU policies, in each policy sector key questions must be answered. 7:13	The Convention states that the proposed approach asks for leadership from nation states. The ecosystem/sustainable growth approach also leaves room for visionary leadership. 5:13	Not intentionally aimed at. Leadership depends on the leadership of EU actors. Will they dare to really reform CAP? 4:13	This instrument based on international obligations does not allow visionary leadership. 12:57	Because the policy is quite rigid and top-down, little room is provided for visionary leadership. 3:13
Promotes an attractive vision of good water quality on the medium term. 8:13	Taking measures to prevent floods is not new; international cooperation is more or less visionary. 6:13	It is a reactive instrument. 10:57		A reactive, but visionary strategy, mimicking international developments. Does explicitly encourage visionary leadership. 11:35
The adaptation strategy proposes a policy change in many sectors and introduces several concepts for governmental policy: robustness, flexibility and using natural processes. 11:13	This document allows for visionary leadership at decentralized level, but not necessarily with respect to climate change. 10:13	The law does not encourage nor discourage visionary leadership. 15:79		It is a reactive instrument to safeguard nature rights and to implement EU regulation. 12:35
The document allows for visionary leadership A paradigm change from more centralized permission planning to more decentralized development planning. 13:13	The document allows for visionary leadership at decentralised levels in terms of approach but not in terms of goals. 10:35	The instrument does not enhance nor encourage visionary leadership. 15:101		
The Act with its development approach allows for visionary leadership. 13:35	UNFCCC states that the developed countries must provide leadership but provides no incentives that stimulate or hamper visionary leadership 14:13			
	The EHS is in itself a vision, but does not discourage or not encourage visionary leadership 12:13			
	The instrument provides room for visionary leadership. 13:57			
	The document provides a comprehensive vision for the medium term although it does not change the existing paradigm; it allows for visionary leadership.			

	15:13			
	The Plan allows for visionary leadership by encouraging the development of regional plans that leave room local interpretation of aims and means. 15:35			
	As the document allows for experiments, there is room for visionary leadership. 15:57			
5	10	4	1	3

Tabel 5.1.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Visionary leadership'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mainstream adaptation in EU policies - Promote an attractive vision of good environmental quality on the medium term - Propose a policy change in many sectors - Introduce robustness, flexibility and using natural processes as new concepts for governmental policy - Introduce a paradigm change from centralized permission planning to decentralized development planning - A development approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ask for leadership from nation states - Older concepts like ecosystem/ sustainable growth leave room for visionary leadership - New international cooperation can be visionary - Visionary leadership in terms of a new approach but not in terms of goals - Formulating a most environmentally friendly alternative creates an opportunity for visionary leadership - Provide a comprehensive vision for the medium term - Encourage the development of regional plans that leave room local interpretation of aims and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not aimed at visionary leadership - The instrument does not enhance nor encourage visionary leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An instrument based on detailed international obligations does not allow visionary leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A rigid and top-down policy provides little room for visionary leadership - A reactive instrument

	- means Allow experiments			
--	---------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Visionair leiderschap is moeilijk te meten omdat het een relatief begrip is: iets is visionair ten opzichte van het verleden en ten opzichte van wat de omgeving doet. Na een tijdje is datzelfde idee niet meer visionair omdat het gemeengoed is geworden. De scores zijn gebaseerd op een gevoel en kunnen dus van beoordelaar tot beoordelaar erg verschillen. Een hard criterium kan nog zijn een lange termijn visie: 2040, 2050, 2100; zeker relevant in de klimaatdiscussie. Je kunt het eigenlijk ook alleen op de langere termijn beoordelen.

Moeilijk te meten, relatief begrip

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Moeilijk te meten in content, want daarvoor moet je een document in zijn tijdgeest plaatsen. Een oud document kan destijds visionair zijn geweest maar als er dan al 20 jaar niets meer is veranderd, is het dan nog te kwalificeren als visionair? In andere gevallen kun je achteraf pas constateren dat iets visionair is geweest: als het een grote impact heeft gehad. In een casus is het ook niet makkelijk, maar dan kun je in elk geval de mening van de betrokkenen vragen. Problematisch is verder dat leiderschap ook sterk aan personen gekoppeld is: een beleidsveld moet voldoende aantrekkelijk zijn om capabele leiders aan te trekken en dan is dit nog afhankelijk van toeval, de juiste competenties bij de juiste ontwikkelingen. Een goede crisisburgemeester is misschien een slechte burocrat. Er is ook een decentraal aspect: soms hebben we dit gescoord als: een beleidsinstututie geeft ruimte aan visionair leiderschap door decentralisatie en lokaal afgestemd beleid toe te laten. In dit geval is er overlap met multilevel en actor.

Content en casus beide moeilijk;
casus misschien iets beter

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Zoeken naar een lange termijn visie: 2040, 2050, 2100; zeker relevant in de klimaatdiscussie. Hoe om te gaan met koppeling aan personen?

Transitiedenken, backcasting, conceptueel vernieuwend.

Kan beter: lange termijn visie,
transitiedenken, backcasting,
conceptueel vernieuwend

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

In het algemeen is er wat overlap tussen leadership en authority, maar niet storend.

Beetje met authority

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee, leiderschap is een belangrijke dimensie en visionary is een beproefde drieenheid met de andere vormen van leiderschap.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee; gebaseerd op literatuur en het onderscheid werkt verder prima.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Zwaartepunt ligt bij +1. Dat is waarschijnlijk vooral omdat het moeilijk te meten is in content.

+1: moeilijk te meten

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Toch denken we dat instituties redelijk goed ontwikkeld zijn: vernieuwing wordt cultureel gewaardeerd en ook gefaciliteerd via proeftuinen etc. Maar persoonlijk leiderschap ligt misschien weer moeilijker: zie de ophef over Verburgs Glossy

Redelijk

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Mijn gevoel dat dit niet echt beter kan; ruimte geven in een markt democratie.

Kan niet beter

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Vermoedelijk wel, komt niet echt duidelijk uit deze analyse.

Niet duidelijk

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Meer persoonlijke zelfverheerlijking? Minder krabbenmand effect: mensen naar beneden proberen te halen uit jaloezie ('hoge bomen vangen veel wind', doe maar gewoon dan doe je al gek genoeg)

Bijzondere mensen meer ruimte geven zichzelf te zijn

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Niets is leeg; aan de negatieve kant is weinig gevonden. Bureaucratie en dogmatisme zijn killing.

-2: bureaucratie en dogmatisme

5.2 Entrepreneurial leadership

Tabel 5.2.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Entrepreneurial leadership'

2	1	0	-1	-2
Entrepreneurial leadership is stimulated. 4:14	The document formally supports agricultural entrepreneurs and also the recreation sector (vitality of the rural areas). Supports public-private partnerships lightly. Is, however, mainly an agreement between central and provincial governments. 10:14	The ecosystem/ sustainable growth approach neither encourages nor discourages entrepreneurial leadership. 5:14	The bureaucratic character of a Strategic Environmental Assessment does not appeal to entrepreneurs. 13:58	Little room is provided for entrepreneurial leadership. 3:14
Leaves a lot of initiative to a region; legal possibility of a commission may improve leadership.10:36	Mainly a governmental issue; but pushes citizens to action during an emergency. 11:36	The market is not involved, it is a governmental domain. 6:14	The Plan does not actively engage the non-governmental sector. 15:36	The legal and bureaucratic approach stifles all entrepreneurship. 12:36
The instrument encourages entrepreneurial leadership, because it offers opportunities for the insurance companies, although the present ones have no commercial goal. 10:58	UNFCCC calls on parties to develop appropriate market and non-market mechanisms including insurance. 14:14	Does not hamper or promote entrepreneurial leadership. 8:14		Does not stimulate the private sector or civil society to come up with activities. 12:58
Aims at increasing resilience of production systems and physical infrastructure. Aims at public-private partnerships. (all this in more or less abstract terms). Insurance and other market-based instruments are explored. 7:14	Oriented to acting: specifies tasks for actors; mostly governmental however and not so much the private sector. 15:14	The EHS allows for private sector participation but implementation is difficult. 12:14		
Climate adaptation is presented as an opportunity for innovation and international entrepreneurship in climate adaptation. The NAS proposes Public Private Partnerships (PPP) to implement the NAS. 11:14	Initiative from local actors, including private sector, is lightly encouraged. 15:58	The law does not encourage nor discourage entrepreneurial leadership. It is dominated by governments. 15:80		
The document merely provides general guidelines for spatial planning: the actual and concrete spatial planning decisions are left to actors at the regional level. 13:14		No involvement of the private sector. 15:102		
Entrepreneurship is encouraged. 13:36				
7	5	6	2	3

Tabel 5.2.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Entrepreneurial leadership'

2	1	0	-1	-2
- With subsidies for rural development	- Present safety mainly as a governmental	- Neither encourages nor	- The bureaucratic character of	- Restrict room for economic development

<p>entrepreneurial leadership is stimulated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leave a lot of initiative regarding land use change to a region - Offer opportunities for insurance companies - Development oriented land use planning encourages entrepreneurship - Increase resilience of production systems and physical infrastructure - Aim at public-private partnerships - Explore market-based instruments 	<p>issue; only push citizens to action during an emergency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present climate adaptation as an opportunity for innovation and international entrepreneurship - Call on other parties to develop market mechanisms including insurance - Specify concrete tasks for actors; mostly governmental however and not so much the private sector - Initiative from local actors, including private sector, is encouraged within strict limits - Supports agricultural entrepreneurs, the recreation sector and public-private partnerships in words; is, however, mainly an agreement between central and provincial governments 	<p>discourages entrepreneurial leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The market is not involved, it is a governmental domain - Allow for private sector participation without offering a profit 	<p>a Strategic Environmental Assessment does not appeal to entrepreneurs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not actively engage the non-governmental sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A bureaucratic permit system stifles all entrepreneurship - A restrictive law does not stimulate the private sector or civil society to come up with new ideas
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?
 Als het gaat om concrete uitvoering kan het vanaf papier alleen indirect zijn: worden partijen opgeroepen of uitgenodigd tot actie? Het betrekken van de private sector is redelijk naspeurbaar.

Enigszins

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Via een casus zal het beter te meten zijn.

Casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Het betrekken van de private sector is nu vooral als argument gebruikt. In casussen kunnen wellicht betere indicatoren worden gevonden.

Eenmaal een dubieus argument: 4:14: income support stimuleert entrepreneurial leadership niet, een ontwikkelingssubsidie wel?

Redelijk

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Er is in elk geval overlap met 'act according to plan', al kijken we daar meer naar of er iets wordt gerealiseerd en hier of de private sector erbij betrokken is. Wellicht ook wat overlap met Capacity to Improve.

Act according to plan

Capacity to improve

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Leiderschap is wel belangrijk en ook de verschillende vormen van leiderschap. We zouden moeten zoeken naar dit beter meetbaar te maken.

Nee: beter meetbaar maken?

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee, is gebaseerd op literatuur

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt ligt bij +2, maar 1 en 0 scoren ook vrij hoog. Er is dus wel potentie maar het kan sterker. Dat kan ook liggen aan het feit dat dit in een content analyse moeilijk te meten is.

+2

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom? Wisselend beeld want 1 en 0 scoren ook vrij hoog. Op een aantal beleidsterreinen is het entrepreneurial leadership niet sterk ontwikkeld: ruimtelijke ordening, natuur. Op deze terreinen stellen overheden zich remmend op en wordt betrokkenheid van het bedrijfsleven afgehouden. Op watergebied voert de overheid veel zelf uit en is er veel daadkracht (relatie met resources?).

Wisselend beeld want 1 en 0

scoren ook vrij hoog

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Bedrijfsleven meer betrekken; resources beter regelen?

Bedrijfsleven meer betrekken;
resources beter regelen?

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Een prijsvraag, kunstenaars betrekken en andere middelen om creativiteit los te maken.

Creativiteit losmaken

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Geen

Geen

5.3 Collaborative leadership

Tabel 5.3.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Collaborative leadership’

2	1	0	-1	-2
Allows for establishing regional networks. 6:15	Regional management plans provide some room for collaboration. 3:15	Not intentionally aimed at. 4:15	In the first phase of deciding on the goals, only a limited number of actors is involved, in the implementation phase many actors are in-volved. 12:37	
Aims at collaboration and coordination between EU member states, for example for migration of species across borders or river basin management. A Steering group is set up involving Member states, civil society and the scientific community. 7:15	The ecosystem/ sustainable growth approach stimulates collaborative leadership. 5:15	Does not stimulate collaboration but does not prohibit it either. 12:59		
Allows for establishing regional networks 8:15	In principle, an insurance is a collaborative fund. 10:59			
The document promotes regional collaboration. Central-provincial cooperation is also im-portant. 10:15	UNFCCC calls on parties to collaborate with regard to adaptation. No mechanism introduced however. 14:15			
Cooperation is the basis	Some collaboration			

of the law. 10:37	with water sector and farmers. 12:15			
The strategy is meant to involve other parties, mainly other governments but also citizens and the private sector. 11:15	Involving other actors is part of the procedure. 13:59			
Collaboration between governments and with other agencies is important. 11:37	The guideline was made in cooperation with municipalities, water boards and so on: only governmental actors are included. 15:59			
Promotes regional planning processes in which many actors work together. 13:15	Importance of cooperation with other governments is recognized. 15:81			
Collaboration is a prerequisite to get anything done in the new law. 13:37				
Collaboration is the main goal of the document. 15:15				
The plan established collaboration, especially between governments. 15:37				
Collaboration between governments is the main goal of the instrument. 15:103				
13	9	2	1	0

Tabel 5.3.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Collaborative leadership'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish regional networks - Promote regional planning processes in which many actors work together - Aim at collaboration and coordination between EU member states across borders - Set up a steering group involving member states, civil society and the scientific community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide some room for regional collaboration - Use an integrative approach that indirectly stimulates collaboration, like the ecosystem/sustainable growth approach - In principle, an insurance is a collaborative fund - Calls on parties to collaborate with regard to adaptation, without 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not intentionally aiming at collaboration - Not stimulating collaboration but not prohibiting it either 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only a limited number of actors is involved in deciding on the goals, involve many actors in the implementation phase 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote collaboration between governmental levels - Formulate a strategy involving other parties: other governments, citizens and the private sector - Make collaboration a prerequisite to get anything done 	<p>introducing a mechanism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaboration with a few actors - Make involving other actors part of the procedure - Make new regulations in cooperation with other governmental actors (excluding non-governmental actors) 			
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Kan gemeten worden: samenwerking is goed herkenbaar in procedures ondergebracht.

Ja

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Het is in content duidelijk herkenbaar aanwezig. In casussen is het ook goed te onderzoeken.

Beide

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Ja. Er zijn wel raakvlakken met multisector, multilevel..., met trust en met responsiveness

Ja (wel raakvlakken met multisector, trust en responsiveness)

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee, maakt onderdeel uit van trio leiderschap.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee, komt uit literatuur.

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt is duidelijk bij +2, het lijkt goed ontwikkeld in Nederland.

+2

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

De Nederlandse instituties lijken goed ontwikkeld op dit punt; dat is ook te verwachten gezien de traditie van het polderen.

Ja: polderen

9. Hoe kan het beter?

In de natuurhoek kan het wellicht beter door multisector, multiactor op te pakken.

Natuursector kan multisector oppakken

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja.

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Geen

Geen

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-2 is leeg: als het extreem competitief is (het Angelsaksische model) of als er armoede is (derde wereld, oost Europa), of oorlog (Midden-Oosten).

Extreme competitie of armoede of oorlog

6 Dimensie Hulpbronnen

6.1 Authority

Tabel 6.1.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Authority'

2	1	0	-1	-2
EU member states have committed themselves to binding goals. Moreover, EC itself has the authority to designate areas that should be protected if member states have not added them to their list. 3:16	An EU whitepaper is taken seriously, but is no law. An EU adaptation strategy will be developed before 2013. 7:16		Authority is delegated to provincial level, not a lot of hierarchical power and dependent on charisma of local people. 10:38	
EU member states have committed themselves to the Luxembourg treaty. 4:16	The arrangement is supported by LNV, Rabo-bank and LTO. 10:60		The document has authority. The decentralizing strategy reduces its authority. 13:16	
The Convention is legally binding and is an authoritative document. 5:16	The EHS has authority: it is an established plan, supported broadly by governments at national and provincial level. 12:16			
The European Union directive has authority in itself. EU member states have committed themselves. When the EU thinks a member state does not take sufficient measures to deal with floods, it can install the necessary measures itself. 6:16	The act has a degree of authority: the law is widely known among people in the planning sector. The WRO leaves a lot of decision room for decentral levels, but at the same time guarantees that the central government can have a final say in decision procedures. 13:38			
EU member states have committed themselves to the Directive. It is accepted by actors in the water field as an important directive. 8:16	Most important governments are involved; municipalities and water boards are indirectly involved via their collective organizations; not legally binding. 15:16			
It is a formally approved programme and is based on negotiations between central and provincial governments. 10:16	The NWP has some authority. 15:38			
The document is signed by four ministries, and by the associations of lower governments VNG, Unie van Waterschappen and IPO. 11:16	The process is directed from the national level, but not in a rigid top down way; public support exists. 15:60			
Supported by cabinet, parliament and so on.				

Strict authority arrangements in case of a crisis. 11:38				
It is formally approved at the national level and supported at the EU level; the ministry of LNV has a lot of power according to the law. 12:38				
It has the authority of law. 12:60				
A formally approved and often used institution with a firm legal status. 13:60				
UNFCCC is a widely known and accepted international policy. Most nation states have committed themselves to specific policies on mitigation. This authority could be used for adaptation. 14:16				
The law has authority. It is backed by a strong ministry with license to operate and ability to do so. 15:82				
It has been formally agreed to use the instrument in the National Agreement on Water, the Spatial Planning law and the National Water Plan. The instrument is accepted in society. 15:104				
14	7	0	2	0

Tabel 6.1.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Authority'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EC itself has the authority to designate areas that should be protected if member states have not added them to their list - Make a convention legally binding - When the EU thinks a member state does not take sufficient measures to deal with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ask parties to sign a policy plan - An EU whitepaper is taken seriously, but is no law - Gain broad support over the years - Make sure a law is widely known among people - Leave a lot of decision room for decentral levels, but at the same time 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dependent on charisma of local people - A decentralizing strategy reduces authority 	

<p>floods, it can install the necessary measures itself</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ask of member states to commit themselves to a directive - Formulate strict authority arrangements in case of a crisis - Use the authority of law (instead of a policy or strategy) - Create a ministry with a license to operate and the ability to do so - Centralize legal power 	<p>guarantee that the central government can have a final say in decision procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The process is directed from the national level, but not in a rigid top down way - Ask a number of important parties for formal support 			
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Authority is difficult to measure: the question is if decision power is centralized somewhere and if this power is actually used. It was hard to find this type of statements in the documents.

Difficult to measure

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

In content it is difficult because in the texts harmony and compliance are taken as a given; not conflict and non-compliance. So who uses authoritative power in a conflict is often not so explicit. In a case study it is easier to ask if authority is used, but even then, opinions may be based on myths instead of on how things actually happen(ed).

Better in case study

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Partly arguments overlap with the criterion legitimacy. We could have looked more at final paragraphs in legislation on how conflicts are managed. Enforcement of legislation. What are other ways to detect use of authority as a resource?

Arguments a bit off the mark but hard to define what the correct arguments should be

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

There is overlap with legitimacy (in the Netherlands) because approved law has more authority. Also overlap with all three forms of leadership although these would not use coercive force. Especially with visionary leadership, as this also concerns some kind of central or dominant vision.

Overlap with legitimacy and leadership

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

No, because it seems a hot issue in many cases. Even though it is hard to pinpoint or measure, raising a discussion is valuable.

No: should be discussed

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

No.

No

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

We had the feeling that authority is not often used in the Dutch context; however, only the columns for 2 and 1 are filled. In that judgement there has been too much emphasis on established law and too little on use of coercive force. -1 and -2 are almost empty. If something is difficult to find, it is even harder to find if it is not present.

+2 but maybe not correct

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

We are not sure how well developed the institutions are. Some parts are probably better (water) than others (nature). This is mostly because of lack of enforcement which means a lack of human resources.

Unknown

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Conflicts are generally avoided which may be constructive. However, sometimes conflict may be necessary to avoid borders being crossed and then moved and then crossed again.

More explicit conflict

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Unknown.

Unknown

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

More explicit on hierarchies of laws; more explicit about sanctions; more trials?

More hierarchy, more sanctions

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?
 -1 an -2 are empty. Even though the rules exist in the formal documents, the question is if the rules are imposed or not. Negative examples are laissez faire and lack of enforcement.

-1 and -2: lack of enforcement

6.2 Human resources

Tabel 6.2.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Human resources’

2	1	0	-1	-2
Dedicated personnel at the ministry of agriculture, at provinces and also many researchers are involved on a medium term basis. A DLG workforce is dedicated to implementation. 10:17	Does enhance human resources. 5:17	Not mentioned. 7:17	The EU has experts in place and has chosen regional development plans – but there is not much policy to encourage the use of local expertise. 3:17	
DLG structurally involved in process and also at state level. 10:39	The Directive encourages regional experts to decide for themselves and calls for local participation. 8:17	Little human effort, not a large market yet. 10:61	No research programs or training programs. 4:17	
Many people are working on realization of this accord. 15:17	The Climate Convention calls on parties to develop education, training materials and public awareness on adaptation. 14:17	Nearly everyone involved is working on adaptation as an extra task, project based. 11:17	No educational programs or involvement of the public. 6:17	
A large number of people available for implementation. 15:39	Several organizations are specialized in managing nature (national nature organizations, provincial landscape organizations etc), small but stable directorate Nature at national level. 12:17	Not clear who has to perform the tasks. 11:39	No real workforce committed to this law apart from some committees. 12:61	
Sufficient workforce (including water boards) 15:83	Some human resources are reserved for producing the national update reports. 12:39	Human resources are not mentioned in the document. 13:17	No extra workforce available. 15:105	
	Some supportive agencies are part of the law: Spatial Planning Office and spatial planning committees. 13:39			
	A certain amount of people is working in this area; MER committee installed. 13:61			
	Some people will be working on monitoring and evaluation of the guideline. 15:61			
5	8	5	5	0

Tabel 6.2.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Human resources'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dedicated personnel at a ministry and at provinces - Many researchers are involved - Create (or keep) an agency dedicated to implementation - Involve other organizations employing people who can help with implementation - Create sufficient workforce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance human resources - Call for local participation - Develop education, training materials and public awareness on adaptation - Support civil society organizations to manage nature - Maintain small but stable government staff at national level - Some human resources for monitoring, evaluation and/or producing the national update reports - Some supportive agencies are part of the law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Little human effort - Not a large market yet - Nearly everyone involved is working on adaptation as an extra task - Project based - Human resources not mentioned - Not clear who has to perform the tasks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not much policy to encourage the use of local expertise - No research programs or training programs - No involvement of the public - No workforce committed to this law apart from some committees - No extra workforce available for a new instrument 	

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?
 Het is wel moeilijk omdat formele documenten zelden op de human resources ingaan. Als ze er zijn wordt het als een gegeven beschouwd en als ze er niet zijn wordt het elders geregeld.

Moeilijk

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?
 In content moeilijk, in een casus gaat het beter, dan gebruik je de kennis die je hebt van personeelsomvang, opleidingsniveau etc.

Beter in casus

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Nee, duidelijk onderscheiden item.

Nee

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee, het is een doorslaggevende factor.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt ligt bij +1; dat is voornamelijk te wijten aan de moeilijke meetbaarheid hiervan in een contentanalyse.

+1 (moeilijk te meten)

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom? Nederlandse instituties hebben het er niet over; het wordt als vanzelfsprekend beschouwd. Wanneer er een tekort is (zoals bij natuur) dan blijft dit dus ook onder de oppervlakte.

Eigenlijk niet

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Er zou meer expliciet op ingegaan moeten worden: dat er voldoende human resources beschikbaar moeten zijn voor uitvoering van wetgeving; dat hier ook op getoetst en geëvalueerd wordt.

Expliciet maken hoeveel menskracht er moet zijn.

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja; afgezien van toetsingsmethoden.

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Toetsing of voldoende human resources

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-2 is leeg. 1-kindpolitiek zou er kunnen staan; het mensen onmogelijk maken ergens aan te werken; sociale ontwrichting zoals in Zimbabwe, waardoor mensen zich puur op dagelijks levensonderhoud gaan richten.

Sociale ontwrichting

6.3 Financial resources

Tabel 6.3.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘financial resources’

2	1	0	-1	-2
There is a significant budget for implementation (even though it may not be enough to achieve all goals) (4.1)	Farmers get subsidized, but large amounts are contested. (2.5)	EU has made several funds available for protection of nature. It is left to member states to decide which subsidies are used for which obligations. (2.6)	No extra economic resources (2.4)	No funding organized in the law; project developers and planners must pay for the procedure (7.3)
Clear which resources are available (4.2)	The Convention has a financial mechanism operated by the Global Environment Facility; implicitly also for adaptation. (2.2)	No explicit funding yet apart from research budgets (3.1)	No extra economic resources available from the EU level for achieving the aims (2.3)	Costs have to be covered by landowners and provincial government (5.2)
Land exploitation chapter of the law improves financial arrangements in favour of the municipality who had to pay for all infrastructure in the past (7.2)	Climate change is a priority for the EU multi-annual financial framework 2007-2013, if funds reflect this priority still has to be ensured. Revenues from European GHG emissions trade may be used for adaptation (2.7)	The Climate Convention set up the financial mechanism, which has in recent years been empowered to fund adaptation activities in the developing world. However, there is little money in this fund. (2.1)	Low margin in sector, government guarantee may help (4.3)	
Sufficient resources at state level (6.2)	The Fauna fund provides some resources for damage recovery, research and education (5.3)		No budgetary consequences for implementing this policy in the documents (3.2)	
Sufficient resources (6.4)	Mostly regular budgets but some extra ‘synergy budget’ is made available by the state level (6.1)		There are some reservations but always a lack of funds; land acquired for nature goals immediately loses its economic value (5.1)	
			Budget is limited, developments have to finance themselves, no transferring of budget from central to decentral level accompanying the decentralization of decision-making (7.1)	
			No extra budget (6.3)	
			No extra funding; the two parties have to negotiate who pays for what (6.5)	
5	5	3	8	2

Tabel 6.3.B Do's en don'ts voor 'financial resources'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient resources - Significant budget for implementation (even though it may not be enough to achieve all goals) - Clear which resources are available - Law improves financial arrangements: distribution rules 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resources available, but contested. - Has a financial mechanism but unclear if available - Marked as a priority but if funds reflect this priority still has to be ensured. - Some financial resources available but clearly not enough - Mostly regular budgets but some extra 'synergy budget' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Several funds available but not labeled - No explicit funding apart from research budgets - Financial mechanism, little money in this fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No extra budget for achieving new aims - Low margin in sector - Lack of funds - Implementation negative for economic value of land - Decentralization not accompanied with budget transfer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No funding organized in the law - Leads to extra costs at lowest level of implementation

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Ja. Financiering is meestal wel op een of andere manier op papier geregeld.

Ja

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Het is via content redelijk te meten en via casus nog beter.

Beide

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Ja

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Geen raakvlakken met andere criteria.

Nee

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

Nee.

Nee

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

Nee

Nee

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Het zwaartepunt ligt bij -1.

-1

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom? Het is vreemd dat het in een rijk land als Nederland op -1 ligt. Is dat omdat er altijd wordt geklaagd over te weinig geld? We hebben sectoren onderzocht waar geldgebrek regeert (natuur, landbouw).

Nee: vooral in natuur en landbouw te weinig financial resources

9. Hoe kan het beter?

Andere prioriteiten stellen.

Andere prioriteiten stellen

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Ja.

Ja

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Er wordt overal al met harde doelstellingen gewerkt; als er politiek geen prioriteit aan wordt gegeven komt er toch niet meer geld.

Geen

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

Geen.

Geen

7 Dimensie rechtvaardig bestuur

7.1 Legitimacy

Tabel 7.1.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Legitimacy'

2	1	0	-1	-2
The treaty has been negotiated in accordance with the rules of procedure and is a legitimate document. It has used input from bottom-up processes. 5:19	The Directive has been made in accordance with the rules of procedure but is top down. Does have clear rules and procedures. 3:19	Not formally approved yet; is also a structural decision according to the spatial planning law. 15:41		
Directive has been adopted in accordance with rules of procedure, although not many EU citizens will be aware of its existence. 6:19	This is a legal process, and farmers interests are also represented by politicians. 4:19			
The Directive is established using the rules of procedure of the EU and also tries to stimulate a bottom-up approach. 8:19	The procedure of a Greenpaper for discussion and then a whitepaper has created support. 7:19			
Accepted law, in which several older and tested laws are integrated (e.g. reconstruction, agricultural nature management, investment programme rural areas). 10:41	It is a negotiated outcome between central government and provincial government. Whether local actors support it remains to be Seen. 10:19			
Fits within existing insurance structures, supported by several organizations. 10:63	Approved by all governments; not legally binding. 15:19			
The document was made in a cooperative process with four ministries and with several other parties involved. 11:19	Formally approved guideline; the document is not legally binding. 15:63			
Supported by cabinet, parliament and so on; implemented top down, no consultation of citizens. 11:41	The process is an obligation but the outcome uncertain and not binding. 15:107			
Participation in the UNFCCC and its protocol are voluntary. Decisions are taken in accordance with the democratically decided rules of procedure. The formal negotiating process is open to those who register. The international negotiations are available on-line have a high degree of				

transparency. 14:19				
In principle, broad support in society and formally approved at national level. 12:19				
It is formally approved at the national level and based on EU directives. 12:41				
It is an approved law with backup from the EU level; there is little bottom-up input. 12:63				
Formally approved by Senate in 2006 and accepted in society. 13:19				
Is formally approved since 1 July 2008, other law is still active on the background for 10 more years. 13:41				
Formal legislation, several steps for fair governance such as public announcement and participation. 13:63				
The law is accepted and thus legally binding. 15:85				
15	7	1	0	0

Tabel 7.1.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Legitimacy'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have clear rules and procedures - Decisions are taken in accordance with the democratically decided rules of procedure - The international negotiations are available on-line have a high degree of transparency - Public announcement and participation - The formal negotiating process is open to those who register - Use input from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make new rules in accordance with the rules of procedure but top down - A procedure that creates some support - A negotiated outcome between central government and provincial government; whether local actors support it remains to be seen - Approved by all governments; not legally binding - The process is an obligation but the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not formally approved yet 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bottom-up processes - Gain supported by several organizations - Write a document in a cooperative process with several parties involved - Based on broad support in society - Formally approved by cabinet, parliament and so on - Fit within existing institutional structures - Ground it in higher level legislation 	<p>outcome uncertain and not binding</p>			
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Rather easy to measure what procedures exist and if they are followed because this is usually reported in the documents.

Easy to measure

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

A lot of aspects visible in content; in case study more information on process can surface.

Content is good option, case study even better

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Yes

Yes

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Some overlap with authority: if legislation is formally approved at all levels it can be expected to have more authority compared to a new and preliminary policy document.

Also related to collaborative leadership and multi sector/ actor / level approach.

Overlap with authority, related to collaborative leadership and

multi sector/ actor / level
approach

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

An important criterion in the literature; does not differentiate much in the Netherlands but may be important internationally.

Not so important in the
Netherlands

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

No

No

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

+2 is mostly scored. In general the laws and policies are legitimate.

+2: legitimate laws

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Well developed: clear procedures which are followed; higher levels that are respected (although there have been severe problems with EU directives in the domain of agriculture).

Well developed

9. Hoe kan het beter?

No improvements necessary.

Already OK

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Yes.

Yes

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

No options

-

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-1 and -2 empty: lawlessness, breakdown of society, war.

-1 and -2 empty: lawlessness,
breakdown of society, war

7.2 Equity

Tabel 7.2.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Equity'

2	1	0	-1	-2
Solidarity and no shifting of responsibilities are important principles: measures may not have detrimental effects on other countries. 6:20	The Convention includes equity principles and states that the sovereignty of nations to exploit their own resources but also have the duty to make sure activities within their jurisdiction have no detrimental effects in other countries. Moreover, it is stated that parties should make sure that access to environmental goods is fairly distributed, especially taking the position of developing countries into account: this should be achieved through mutually agreed agreements. Still these are only statements: no actual mechanisms to ensure equity are introduced. 5:20	No equity mechanisms. 3:20		
Aims at sharing knowledge and best (policy) practices between member states of EU. Health and social policies to distribute burdens equitable. Also attention for vulnerable farmers and for developing countries. 7:20	One of the aims of river basin management is to limit the transfer of water problems from upstream to downstream countries 8:20	No equity mechanisms. 4:20		
In principle open to everyone and without aim of profit. 10:64	The law aims at fair results. Non-landowners may be excluded. 10:42	Generally supportive, does not exclude anyone; however, does not either support or discourage. 10:20		
Includes everyone, children, elderly and so on; and does differentiate between actors. 11:42	Giving everyone a chance to take initiative in spatial developments; intention to prevent social exclusion, but no instruments to achieve this. 13:20	No equity mechanisms or principles included. 11:20		
	There are many equity assurances included in the Convention for adaptation. However, implementing these is more complicated. 14:20	Is neutral on equity issues. 12:20		
	One of the goals is to balance the interests of citizens with those of project developers, municipalities and water boards. To prevent that houses are built in an irresponsible way	Equity is not an issue. 12:42		

	leaving households with wet premises or water boards with high costs. 15:108			
		There are no provisions on equity. 12:64		
		No equity mechanisms included. 13:42		
		Equity is not an issue. 13:64		
		There are no provisions on equity in this Document. 15:20		
		The Law does not say anything about equity. 15:42		
		The policy does not provide any equity provisions. 15:64		
		The law provides no equitability mechanisms. 15:86		
4	6	13	0	0

Tabel 7.2.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Equity'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solidarity - Aim at sharing knowledge - Health and social policies to distribute burdens equitably - Extra support for vulnerable farmers and developing countries - Benefits in principle open to everyone - Includes everyone, children, elderly and so on - No shifting of responsibilities - Measures without detrimental effects on other countries - Best (policy) practices - Not aiming for a profit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statements on equity, no actual mechanisms to ensure equity is introduced - Make sure that activities within a country's jurisdiction has no detrimental effects in other countries (while confirming the sovereignty of nations to exploit their own resources) - State that access to environmental goods should be distributed fairly, especially taking the position of developing countries into account - State that fair distribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No equity mechanisms or principles included - Does not support or discourage equity - Is neutral on equity issues - Equity is not an issue 		

	<p>should be achieved through mutually agreed agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equity assurances are included but implementing these is more complicated - The law aims at fair results, however, non-landowners may be excluded - Intention to prevent social exclusion, but no instruments to achieve this - Limit the transfer of water problems from upstream to downstream countries - Balance the interests of project developers and municipalities with those of citizens and water boards, to prevent that houses are built in an irresponsible way. 			
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

It is visible in the documents but it needs some interpretation to decide that a measure is chosen because of equity.

More or less

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Aiming at equity is often an implicit norm, but with some interpretation it can be found in the documents. In a case study the norm can be made more explicit through interviews.

Possible in content and in case study

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

Yes, although only one aspect of equity gets most attention (equal sharing of resources). Other aspects could be not shifting the burden to future generations, access to legal procedures and so on.

Yes but interpretation could have been broader

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

Related to variety of problem frames and trust, but no overlap.

No overlap, related to variety of problem frames and trust

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

No, important criterion in governance literature.

No

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

No, well known terminology.

No

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Most comments in 0 category which shows that it is often not visible in documents. -1 and -2 categories empty to show that explicit inequity is not likely to be found in the documents.

0: often hard to detect equity

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?

Equity is an implicit norm in the Netherlands, and rules can be found here and there to ensure equity. Negative categories are empty. Equity rules may be more explicit in other policy domains such as health care, social security and education.

Well developed

9. Hoe kan het beter?

It could be more explicitly responsible towards future generations and to other species than humanity.

More equity for future generations

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

Yes.

Yes

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

We cannot think of any rules for future generations

-

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

-1 and -2 are empty. It could be rules to strengthen inequality and unfairness such as exclusion of certain religions, races or sexes from civil rights; limit access to legal procedures; provide extra rights to the rich and powerful.

-1 and -2: unintended and intended rules to strengthen inequality and unfairness such as exclusion of certain religions, races or sexes from civil rights

7.3 Responsiveness

Tabel 7.3.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor ‘Responsiveness’

2	1	0	-1	-2
The management plans should be assessed every six years in the light of new climatic circumstances. 6:21	Allows for strategy adjustments, but does not provide incentives for this. 5:21	Not specifically aimed at. 4:21	Once the targets have been set, no discussion or learning is possible anymore. However, these targets can be changed at later date. 8:21	The static character of the protection obligations, reduce the adaptability of goals and procedures. 3:21
Inputs of other parts of society are welcomed. 11:21	It is a process with internal feedbacks. 10:21	The greenpaper was responsive; the whitepaper does not invite any comments. 7:21	Insurance organization decides on the rules. 10:65	Top down, no mechanisms for addressing Complaints. 11:43
Openness creates maximum opportunity for discussing spatial planning ideas. The development approach allows for responsiveness. 13:21	Process oriented development stage; after clo-sure of contracts, no change is possible for the specific contract but not for future contracts. 10:43	No responsiveness issues. 13:65	No procedure for debate. 12:21	The top down decision making process leaves little opportunity to amend. 12:43
The development approach allows for responsiveness. 13:43	The document allows for comments and for responses to the comments. 15:65	Not much interaction outside of the governments: only an information campaign and a short reaction period on spatial plans. 15:21	Mostly fixed rules, few feedback possibilities, only for protected living areas. 12:65	
The formal negotiating process is open to those who register. The international negotiations are available on-line have a high degree of transparency. 14:21	Integration of water laws into one law was open for discussion; discussion is not an integral part of the law. 15:87			
The draft plan allows for feedback and	The responsiveness between water board			

responses. NWP still is a draft. Everybody is invited to give feedback on this concept (during 6 months, up to June 2009). Responses on the concept plan can have influence on the final plan. 15:43	and municipality is enhanced; the test allows for responsiveness because it obliges to re-evaluate building projects with respect to water impacts. 15:109			
6	6	4	4	3

Tabel 7.3.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Responsiveness'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A development approach allows for responsiveness - Openness creates maximum opportunity for discussing ideas - Inputs of other parts of society are welcomed - The formal negotiating process is open to those who register - The international negotiations are available on-line and have a high degree of transparency - Invite everybody to give feedback on a draft plan during 6 months - Assess management plans every six years in the light of new climatic circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allows for strategy adjustments, but does not provide incentives for this - A process with internal feedbacks - Development stage open process but after closure of contracts, little change is possible - The document is open to comments and to responses to the comments - In the revision phase a law is open for discussion; but discussion is not an integral part of the law - Responsiveness is arranged between municipal and water governments with an obligation to re-evaluate building projects with respect to water impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responsiveness is not specifically aimed at - Does not invite any comments - No responsiveness issues - Not much interaction outside of the governments: only an information campaign and a short reaction period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insurance organization decides on the rules - No procedure for debate - Mostly fixed rules, few feedback possibilities - Once the targets have been set, no discussion or learning is possible; targets can be changed at later date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The static character of the law reduces the adaptability of goals and procedures - The top down decision making process leaves little opportunity to amend - Top down, no mechanisms for addressing complaints

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?

Responsiveness in an informal setting provides much more opportunities for interaction and for unexpected (out of the box) forms of feedback, compared to formally organized responsiveness. However, if formal responsiveness is organized (if responsiveness is an obligation) this provides a minimal opening, and it is likely to trigger more intensive informal pre-processes, because organizations do not want to be caught as unresponsive or confronted with massive resistance in such a formal responsiveness procedure. If formal responsiveness is organized, this is easy to recognize in the documents.

Can be measured

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?

Responsiveness should be visible in formal documents because it shows normative acceptance of this rule; it can be observed more vividly in a case study.

Content and case

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?

In general good arguments (although not very insightfull at level of actual instrument). Exception: responsiveness should be only in relation to people, not to climate change (6:21) but that does not harm the overall picture.

Ja

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)

There are relations with Multilevel/sector/actor, Discuss doubts, and Collaborative leadership. These criteria refer more to the process. Responsiveness is a rightful criterion on its own because it measures if government or another powerful actor actually is open to the content of what has been said.

Related criteria

Multilevel/sector/actor, Discuss doubts, and Collaborative, but not really overlap

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?

No, important in governance literature.

No

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?

No, accepted term

No

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?

Scores +2 and +1 equally strong. This would mean that it is rather strong, many strategies are developed and also implemented in many cases.

2, 1: rather strong institutions

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?
 Dutch institutions are well developed, it is the norm to be responsive. Not in every type of legislation though, so room for improvement.

Yes well developed

9. Hoe kan het beter?

There still are institutions that could be adapted /improved in their responsiveness. This analysis shows where they are.

Improve certain institutions in this respect

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?

There are many institutions but as this is complex, more and better institutions to manage responsiveness efficiently, effectively and oriented to long term problems is still needed.

improvement for long term still needed

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?

Interactive scenarioworkshops
 Effort to involve from beginning
 Tool to share frames

Interactive scenarioworkshops
 Effort to involve from beginning
 Tool to share frames

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?

No empty columns.

Not applicable

7.4 Accountability

Tabel 7.4.A Zwaartepunt in Nederlandse formele instituties voor 'Accountability'

2	1	0	-1	-2
For each of the objectives actions are formulated, often with deadlines (e.g. develop guide-lines ... by the end of 2009...) 7:22	Although not specifically aimed at adaptation, protection goals are obligatory. 3:22	Accountability is only arranged in regular reporting as well as policy implementation. 12:44	No accountability mechanisms. 4:22	
Once a river basin management plan has been developed, member states have an obligation to achieve specified aims. 8:22	The documents makes provisions for accountability. 15:66	Results are monitored and evaluated on a structural basis; however, the parties cannot be held accountable. 15:22	No accountability mechanisms introduced. 5:22	
Main goals have been made specific / SMART and are extensively monitored. 10:22	Goals are clear (quantitative) and are measured and evaluated on a regular basis. Accountability		No accountability mechanism. 6:22	

	mechanisms are not included. 15:88			
Contract between state and provincial level is very detailed and quantitative. Land exchange chapter is also detailed. Provinces are obliged to achieve their targets. 10:44	Legally both parties (spatial planning agency and the water manager) are accountable. They are obliged to lay down the outcome of the water test in the spatial plan (water paragraph). The test provides no obligation to act upon the outcome however. 15:110		Although there is a clear goal, there is much uncertainty about how to achieve this. No accountability measures. 11:22	
Easily retracable how the instrument has worked because all financial streams are recorded. 10:66			No system of accountability, no concrete goals. 11:44	
Structural monitoring and evaluation procedures. 12:22			The UNFCCC has no accountability mechanism for adaptation. 14:22	
Well reported and documented process; monitoring of effects is part of procedure. 13:66			Monitoring of species is taken into account but no steps are taken in the event of policy failure. 12:66	
Clear, quantitative goals and milestones. 15:44			Lack of preset goals makes evaluation of its success and accountability more difficult. 13:22	
			No specific goals which make it hard to evaluate the outcome. No accountability procedures. 13:44	
8	4	2	9	0

Tabel 7.4.B Do's en don'ts voor 'Accountability'

2	1	0	-1	-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For each of the objectives actions are formulated, often with deadlines - Contract between state and provincial level is very detailed and quantitative - Clear, quantitative goals and milestones - Main goals have been made specific / SMART 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protection goals are obligatory although not specifically aimed at adaptation - The document makes provisions for accountability - Goals are clear (quantitative) and are measured and evaluated on a regular basis. Accountability mechanisms are not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results are monitored and evaluated on a structural basis; however, the parties cannot be held accountable - Accountability is only arranged in regular reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No accountability mechanisms - No system of accountability, no concrete goals - Lack of preset goals makes evaluation of its success and accountability more difficult - Although there is a clear goal, there is much uncertainty about how to achieve this 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Once a management plan has been developed, member states have an obligation to achieve specified aims - All financial streams are recorded - Structural monitoring and evaluation procedures - Well reported and documented process; monitoring of effects is part of procedure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - included - Legally both parties are obliged to lay down the outcome in the plan (water paragraph). The text provides no obligation to act upon the outcome however 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring of species is taken into account but no steps are taken in the event of policy failure 	
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Reflectie op methode:

1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?
It can be observed in the documents because this generally is made explicit (qualitate qua).

Yes

2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?
It can be measured in content and in case study.

Content and case study

3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?
Yes.

Yes

4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria? (omdat dezelfde argumenten worden gebruikt)
Trust is related, financial resources and act according to plan more distantly related, but no real overlap.

Yes clear distinction

5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?
No.

No

6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?
No, it is clear.

No

Reflectie op resultaat:

7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?
Strangely, both columns +2 (8x) and -1 (9x) stand out. So in some cases it is well arranged and in others it is absent. An explanation for this could be that in older legislation, where there is more experience, there is enough knowledge for measurable goals. In younger policies there may not be and then its probably wiser not to institutionalize the wrong goals and objectives.

-1. Accountability can only help when enough knowledge and experience is available

8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?
Yes: enough strong examples.

Yes

9. Hoe kan het beter?
If goals are set and not met, action should follow. Not necessarily sanctions but study and effort.

Develop constructive institutions when goals are not met

10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?
Yes.

Yes

11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?
Develop constructive institutions when goals are not met.

Constructive institutions when goals are not met

12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?
-2 is empty (which is a good sign). Mafia, corrupt government, closed networks, only market-oriented media (Berlusconi). Endangered journalism.

Mafia, corrupt government, no freedom of speech

8 Conclusies horizontale analyse

8.1 Reflectie op de methode

In onderstaande tabel een samenvatting van de horizontale analyse met betrekking op de methode. In oranje zijn de probleemgebieden aangegeven. Vooral in de eerste twee dimensies (Variety en Learning) zijn veel criteria moeilijk te meten en is ook sprake van enige overlap. Criteria waarmee problemen zijn:

- Variety of problem frames: overlap met diversity
- Redundancy: moeilijk te meten
- Trust: moeilijk te meten
- Discuss doubts: overlap met trust en double loop learning
- Act according to plan: overlap met entrepreneurial leadership
- Authority: moeilijk te meten en overlap met leadership en legitimacy

Naar aanleiding hiervan lijkt het goed om Variety of problem frames, Trust en Discuss doubts weg te laten uit het adaptatiewiel: dan zijn er voor elke dimensie drie criteria. De dimensie Variety could be subdivided into Multilevel, actor, sector; Room for different solutions; Balance efficiency/redundancy.

De andere drie criteria lijken ondanks de problemen te belangrijk om weg te laten; een beter oplossing is om Redundancy, Act according to plan en Authority beter te operationaliseren.

De dimensie Room for autonomous change zou ook Room for autonomous *action* kunnen heten.

Tabel 8.1: Reflectie op methode

	1. Kan het criterium gemeten worden? Of zijn de argumenten te indirect?	2. Was het te meten via content? Of kan het beter via casus?	3. Hebben we de juiste argumenten gebruikt?	4. Is er een te onduidelijk onderscheid met andere criteria?	5. Zou het criterium zonder veel verlies weg kunnen?	6. Moet het criterium anders worden geformuleerd?
Dimensie variëteit						
Variety of problem frames	Ja (al is het indirect)	Casus	Ja (grotendeels)	Overlap met problem frames en diversity	Ja	Nee
Multi-actor, multi-level en multi-sector approach	Ja	Beide	Ja	Overlap met problem frames en collaborative leadership	Nee	Nee

Room for diversity	Ja	Beide	Ja	Overlap met problem frames	Nee	Nee
Redundancy	Moeilijk	Beide moeilijk	Onbekend, betere definitie nodig	Raakvlak met diversity	Ja	Nee
Dimensie Learning						
Trust	Moeilijk	Casus	Onbekend	Raakvlak met discussie, leadership responsiveness en accountability	Misschien	Ja: bewust bouwen aan vertrouwen
Single loop learning	Ja	Content	Ja	Raakvlak met double loop en responsiveness	Misschien: Eventueel alleen double loop meten	Nee
Double loop learning	Ja	Content	Ja	Raakvlak met single loop learning en variety of problem frames	Nee	Nee
Discuss doubts	Enigszins	Casus	Kan beter	Overlap met trust en double loop learning	Misschien	Ja: omgaan met onzekerheid tav de toekomst
Institutional memory	Enigszins	Casus	Kan beter	Raakvlak met toegang tot informatie	Nee	Nee
Dimensie Room for autonomous change						ja? Room for autonomous action
Continuous access to information	Ja	Casus	Ja	Raakvlak met institutional memory	Nee	Nee
Act according to plan	Ja	Casus	Nee: indirect	Overlap met entrepreneurial leadership	Misschien	Nee
Capacity to improvise	Enigszins	Beide	Kan beter	Nee	Nee	Nee
Dimensie Leiderschap						
Visionary leadership	Moeilijk	Beide moeilijk	Kan beter	Raakvlak met authority	Nee	Nee
Entrepreneurial leadership	Enigszins	Casus	Kan beter	Overlap met act according to plan, raakvlak met capacity to improvise	Nee	Nee
Collaborative leadership	Ja	Beide	Ja	Raakvlak met multisector, trust en responsiveness Close to collaborative leadership	Nee	Nee

Dimensie Hulpbronnen						
Authority	Moeilijk	Casus	Kan beter	Overlap met legitimacy en leadership	Nee	Nee
Human resources	Moeilijk	Casus	Ja	Nee	Nee	Nee
Financial resources	Ja	Beide	Ja	Nee	Nee	Nee
Dimensie rechtvaardig bestuur						
Legitimacy	Ja	Beide	Ja	Overlap met authority, raakvlak met collaborative leadership en multi sector/ actor / level approach	Nee, hoewel in Nederland niet onderscheiden	Nee
Equity	Enigszins	Beide	Kan beter	Raakvlak met variety of problem frames en trust	Nee	Nee
Responsiveness	Ja	Beide	Ja	Raakvlak met Multilevel/sector/actor, Discuss doubts, en collaborative leadership	Nee	Nee
Accountability	Ja	Beide	Ja	Nee	Nee	Nee

8.2 Reflectie op de inhoudelijke resultaten

In tabel 8.2 zijn de aantallen keren weergegeven dat een score aan een Nederlandse institutie is gegeven. Hoe vaker de score 2 is toegekend (de hoogste score) hoe beter het gesteld zou moeten zijn met de adaptieve capaciteit van de Nederlandse instituties. In de laatste kolom is weergegeven waar volgens de analyse Dit is voor 10-11 van de criteria het geval. Daarnaast zijn er 5-6 criteria waarbij score 1 het meest voorkomt; dus op 17 van de 22 criteria staan de Nederlandse instituties er redelijk tot goed voor.

In groen zijn de criteria aangegeven waarop de score twijfelachtig is. In sommige gevallen is dat goed verklaarbaar:

- Redundancy: er is in Nederland altijd een nadruk op efficiency;
- Double loop learning: het ter discussie stellen van normen is altijd moeilijk, en zeker voor overheden omdat die bestaan bij de gratie van normen en regels.
- Continuous access to information: er is bij de Nederlandse overheid meer een houding van 'wij regelen het voor u' dan een 'right to know' beleid.
- Accountability: er is wel meer een trend gekomen van afrekenbare doelen onder invloed van New Public Management, maar merendeels gebeurt het werk van de overheid nog steeds op basis van vertrouwen.

Bij twee criteria is de twijfelachtige score contra-intuïtief:

- Financial resources: er zouden in Nederland genoeg middelen beschikbaar moeten zijn; dit geldt echter niet voor alle sectoren die nu zijn onderzocht. Met name in de sectoren landbouw en natuur zijn de middelen schaars.
- Equity: het zwaartepunt ligt bij 0 terwijl de nederlandse smaneleving toch geldt als zeer egalitair. Bij nader inzien heeft dit met de methode te maken: er zijn geen negatieve scores gevallen en wel positieve, maar vooral veel scores 0 omdat equity niet zichtbaar was in de instituties.

Tabel 8.2: Cross-sectorale aantallen scores voor 22 criteria

Score	2	1	0	-1	-2	Zwaartepunt
Dimensie varieteit						
Variety of problem frames	9	4	3	3	4	2
Multi-actor, multi-level en multi-sector approach	7	12	1	3	0	1
Room for diversity	10	7	3	2	1	2
Redundancy	4	3	6	9	1	-1
Dimensie Learning						
Trust	8	6	5	2	2	2
Single loop learning	15	4	1	3	0	2
Double loop learning	4	5	8	2	4	0
Discuss doubts	6	7	6	1	3	1
Institutional memory	10	8	2	3	0	2
Dimensie Room for autonomous change						
Continuous access to information	2	8	5	7	1	1 (0)
Act according to plan	9	7	2	5	0	2
Capacity to improvise	6	7	5	2	3	1
Dimensie Leiderschap						
Visionary leadership	5	10	4	1	3	1
Entrepreneuria l leadership	7	5	6	2	3	2
Collaborative leadership	13	9	2	1	0	2
Dimensie Hulpbronnen						
Authority	14	7	0	2	0	2

Human resources	5	8	5	5	0	1
Financial resources	5	5	3	8	2	-1
Dimensie rechtvaardig bestuur						
Legitimacy	15	7	1	0	0	2
Equity	4	6	13	0	0	0
Responsiveness	6	6	4	4	3	1-2
Accountability	8	4	2	9	0	-1

In tabel 8.3 zijn alle inhoudelijke resultaten van de horizontale analyse samengevat, als beoordeling van de Nederlandse instituties als geheel (in de vier onderzochte sectoren).

Volgens deze uitkomsten zijn de criteria waarop de meeste verbetering noodzakelijk is:

- Redundancy: minder streven naar efficiency
- Double loop learning: inbouwen in instituties want dit gebeurt niet vanzelf
- Continuous access to information: meer kennis laten doorstromen naar burgers
- Financial resources: is in sommige sectoren echt een barriere, vooral natuur en landbouw

De criteria Equity en Accountability scoren relatief laag maar in het eerste geval is dat waarschijnlijk te wijten aan de methode en in het tweede geval aan de jeugdige fase van klimaatbeleid.

Tabel 8.3: Reflectie op resultaat

	7. Wat zegt de verdeling over de kolommen, waar ligt het zwaartepunt?	8. Zijn de Nederlandse instituties wel/niet goed ontwikkeld op dit punt? Waarom?	9. Hoe kan het beter?	10. Zijn er voldoende positieve opties ontwikkeld?	11. Welke kunnen we er bij verzinnen?	12. Welke kolommen zijn leeg en wat zou je daar verwachten?
Dimensie variëteit						
Variety of problem frames	2	Goed ontwikkeld	Maatwerk, vernieuwing, samenwerken	Voldoende	Expliciete methode voor meer problem frames	0 is het meest leeg (niet erg)
Multi-actor, multi-level en multi-sector approach	1	Redelijk, participatie nog niet uitontwikkeld	Betrekken burgers en bedrijven verbeteren, tweede helft participatief proces verder ontwikkelen	Nee, positieve opties moeten worden doorontwikkeld	Methodes participatie verbeteren voor burgers, bedrijven, dialoogmethode, discourse methode	-2: actieve uitsluiting
Room for diversity	2	Ja: oude gedachte	Transities onderzoeken	Ja	Diversiteit meer expliciet maken en meer belonen	-2: streven naar schaalvoordelen
Redundancy	-1	Nee: efficiency	Bewust afwegen	Nee	Begrip robuust	-2: armoede

		belangrijker	tegenover efficiency		uitwerken met worst case scenario's	
Dimensie Learning						
Trust	2	Onbekend moeilijk te meten	Onbekend	Onbekend	Participatieve besluitvorming, de tijd nemen	+2: goed beleidsproces
Single loop learning	2	Ja: veel opties beschikbaar	Kennisdoorwerking verbeteren	Ja	Kennisabsorptie bij overheid verbeteren	-2: oorlog, onderdrukking, instabiliteit
Double loop learning	0	Begin gemaakt	Double loop learning expliciet maken in instituties	Ja	Geen	Geen
Discuss doubts	1	In nieuwere documenten staan klimaat onzekerheden expliciet; afrekenbare doelen kunnen averechts werken	Onzekerheid expliciet maken, brede doelen formuleren	Redelijk	Experimenten met nieuwe instituties mogelijk maken	-1: tegenstrijdige instrumenten
Institutional memory	2	Ja: veel opties	Institutional memory ook in nieuw beleid regelen	Ja	Expliciete aandacht om dit goed te regelen	-2: vernietiging van data
Dimensie Room for autonomous change						
Continuous access to information	1 (0)	Kan meestal beter	Meer informatie voor burgers beschikbaar maken	Te weinig publiek beschikbare informatie	Meer soorten info via internet	-2: expres verkeerd informeren
Act according to plan	2	Men streeft echt naar uitvoering en houdt zich vaak aan afspraken	Centraal niveau kan decentraal meer faciliteren	Onbekend	Draaiboeken, publiekscampagnes, oefeningen	Eindeloos polderen, conflict
Capacity to improvise	1	Redelijk, kan beter	Gebiedsgericht werken, cross over tussen sectoren	Ja	Eigen verantwoordelijkheid, subsidiariteit, waken voor intern conflicterend beleid van toch weer controleren	-1: Intern conflicterend beleid
Dimensie Leiderschap						
Visionary leadership	1	Redelijk, moeilijk te meten	Kan niet beter	Niet duidelijk	Bijzondere mensen meer ruimte geven zichzelf te zijn	-2: bureaucratie en dogmatisme

Entrepreneurial leadership	2	Wisselend beeld want 1 en 0 scoren ook vrij hoog	Bedrijfsleven meer betrekken; resources beter regelen?	Ja	Creativiteit losmaken	Geen
Collaborative leadership	2	Ja: polderen	Natuursector kan multisector oppakken	Ja	Geen	Extreme competitie of armoede of oorlog
Dimensie Hulpbronnen						
Authority	2	Onbekend, moeilijk te meten	More explicit conflict	Unknown	More hierarchy, more sanctions	-1 and -2: lack of enforcement
Human resources	1	Eigenlijk niet, moeilijk te meten	Expliciet maken hoeveel menskracht er moet zijn.	Ja	Toetsing of voldoende human resources	Sociale ontwrichting
Financial resources	-1	Nee: vooral in natuur en landbouw te weinig financial resources	Andere prioriteiten stellen	Ja	Geen	Geen
Dimensie rechtvaardig bestuur						
Legitimacy	2	Well developed legitimate laws	Already OK	Ja	Geen	-1 and -2 empty: lawlessness, breakdown of society, war
Equity	0	Well developed often hard to detect equity	More equity for future generations	Ja	Geen	-1 and -2: unintended and intended rules to strengthen inequality and unfairness such as exclusion of certain religions, races or sexes from civil rights
Responsiveness	1, 2	Yes well developed rather strong institutions	Improve certain institutions in this respect	improvement for long term still needed	Interactive scenarioworks hops Effort to involve from beginning Tool to share frames	Not applicable
Accountability	-1	Accountability can only help when enough knowledge	Develop constructive institutions when goals are not met	Yes	Constructive institutions when goals are not met	Mafia, corrupt government, no freedom of speech

		and experience is available				
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--