# Disabled case

1. Measurements: getting the right ones
   a. Physcial
   b. Social
   c. Participants rates
2. Qualitative design: local context and in-depth exploration
3. Beware of simple league table-based identification of high performers
4. Focus on tools
5. Focus on front-line values
6. Comparative design
   a. High vs low
   b. Experiments: lifting average.
7. Alternative standards to natural policy objective/benchmark → stakeholder interviews

# Gambling authority case

1. Theoretical:
   a. Balancing competing forces
   b. Strategic paradox (Meyer and De Wit)
   c. From agency performance focus to network stewardship focus. Other regulators are relevant as well as non-profits.
2. Method: social network analysis
3. Content analysis of (annual) reports:
   a. Political rationality
   b. Policy rationality
4. Criteria choices based on
   a. Theories about multiple goal alignments
   b. Feedback loops
   c. Support in AE
   d. Performance on KPI's (key performance indicators)
5. Goal ambiguity perspective
   a. What is realistic achievement
   b. Small wins-perspective (for a young organization)
   c. Broader legal/political/stakeholder view
6. Paradox: agency level versus policy level evaluations
7. What is the relevant population of the cases
8. Blame avoidance logic.
9. Off-line versus on-line regulatory challenges. Only soft regulation possible in online challenges. It requires community building in the sector.
10. International perspective