

Appendix 1. Assessment questions

We operationalized the complexity framework (Table 3) by adding a set of guiding questions for assessing the cases (Table A1).

Table A1. Guiding questions for assessing how cases of resilience practice engaged with complexity.

Features of CAS	Guiding questions
1. Contextual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>How did you make the framework/framing of the assessment relevant for the particular context?</i> ❖ <i>Did you deal with the possibility of multiple valid descriptions and framings? If yes, how?</i> ❖ <i>Did you consider your own role in shaping the outcomes? If yes, how?</i>
2. Open	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>How did you capture and deal with cross-scale interactions, external drivers, and teleconnections – both in the process and in the analysis?</i> ❖ <i>How did you delineate the system, and why?</i>
3. Relational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>What relations did you build through the assessment process/resilience interventions (e.g. through who you collaborated with)? And were there any specific things you did that were useful in fostering dialogue and building relations?</i> ❖ <i>What relations between components <u>in</u> the system were you considering explicitly in the analysis? Was there any specific framework or method that was useful in capturing those relations?</i>
4. Dynamic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Did you capture dynamics over time, and e.g. potential regimes/thresholds, and feedback loops? Any specific approach or method that you found useful?</i>
5. Adaptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>How did you build in flexibility and learning in the assessment process to deal with unexpected shocks /responses?</i> ❖ <i>How did the process foster adaptive responses and/or learning experiences?</i>
6. Emergent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Were there any emergent, unplanned outcomes (positive or negative) of the assessment process (e.g. better relations between people that did not speak to each other before, more trust, activating different networks)? And how did you deal with them?</i>

	<p>❖ <i>How did you allow for emergence (e.g. putting certain conditions in place, or designing a process that allowed for new interactions and novelty)?</i></p>
--	---

To better understand the background of each case, and capture reflections about the case and the approach used, we added a set of general questions:

- What was the rationale/purpose for choosing this approach for this context?
- In what other types of contexts would you recommend using this approach? (were there any requirements for using this approach? e.g., of data, or participation)
- What are the advantages of this approach?
- What are the disadvantages of this approach?
- What was most useful in enabling you to better deal with complexity? (e.g., concept, tool, engagement strategy, or something else that helped unlock the case)
- Were there things you did that usefully addressed two or more of these features (1-6)?
- What do you see, in the end, as the most important contribution of your assessment/process?