



Governance for closer collaboration and communication in Swedish Climate Neutral Cities

A Case Study of Viable Cities

Molly Lind Mayer

Independent project • 30 credits

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU

Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences

Environmental Communication and Management - Master's Programme

Uppsala 2024



Governance for closer collaboration and communication in Swedish Climate Neutral Cities. A case study of Viable Cities

Molly Lind Mayer

Supervisor: Hanna Bergeå, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development
Examiner: Camilo Calderon, Swedish University of Agricultural Science, Department of Urban and Rural Development

Credits: 30 credits
Level: Second cycle, A2E
Course title: Master thesis in Environmental science, A2E
Course code: EX0897
Programme/education: Environmental Communication and Management - Master's Programme
Course coordinating dept: Department of Aquatic Sciences and Assessment
Place of publication: Uppsala
Year of publication: 2024
Copyright: All featured images are used with permission from the copyright owner.
Online publication: <https://stud.epsilon.slu.se>
Keywords: collaborative governance, viable cities, collaborative dynamics, environmental communication

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Division of Environmental Communication

Abstract

In order to address the ongoing climate crises, we must develop effective multilevel responses that can be implemented to engage actors in decision-making practices. Subsequently, to better understand how various governance processes can support sustainability there is a need for collaborative actions such as efficient strategies that involve multiple levels of organizations working together. However, collaborative governance can be seen as highly resource-consuming and idealistic and it risks becoming overly complex, overly promising, or diluting responsibility. This study aims to understand how effective implementation of collaborative governance works in climate neutral cities using the case of the Swedish strategic innovation program, Viable Cities. Viable Cities aims to create new forms of governance and management to govern the process together, from a bottom-up approach, with municipalities, authorities, the business community, civil society, and their member organizations. The data originate from semi-structured interviews, observations of Viable Cities events, and literature. The study uses an Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance to examine how collaborative governance is understood and perceived in practice by representatives from municipalities, Viable Cities, and authority. The results show that the understanding of governance by the representatives is related to the collaborative dynamics of principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. The study's representatives recognize Viable Cities as necessary to govern collaborative actions for their mission. Viable Cities' facilitating initiative with face-to-face interactions can help the participants to set ambitions and keep motivated. This is not unexpected, considering Viable Cities explicitly aims to stimulate innovation and facilitate collaboration with participating municipalities. However, it can be difficult to understand when and how collaborative governance should be connected to decision-making processes. Conversely, the representatives' understanding of collaborative governance is difficult to analyse in this specific case since it appears to have different meanings at different levels and has a wide definition spectrum. The representatives' prerequisites for collaborative governance change with external or internal context, giving a broad definition to governance. The theoretical framework has proven useful in understanding prerequisites for collaboration and can be seen as a useful tool to improve strategies and understanding of cities' collaborative governance in practice.

Keywords: Collaborative governance, viable cities, collaborative dynamics, environmental communication

Table of contents

List of tables	7
Abbreviations	8
1. Introduction	9
1.1 Problem Formulation and Research Questions	10
2. Background	12
2.1 Governance.....	12
2.2 Obstacles of Governance	13
2.3 Viable Cities	14
2.3.1 Communication in Viable Cities	14
2.4 Collaboration, Communication, and Climate Neutral Cities.....	15
3. Theoretical Framework	17
3.1 Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning.....	17
3.2 Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance	18
4. Research Context and Methodology	21
4.1 Reflexivity.....	21
4.2 Data Collection.....	22
4.2.1 Documentation and Observation	22
4.2.2 Semi-structured Interviews	23
4.3 Data Analysis	24
4.4 Anonymity and Validity.....	24
4.5 Delimitation	24
5. Results	26
5.1 Collaborative Dynamics	26
5.1.1 Principled Engagement.....	26
5.1.2 Shared Motivation.....	30
5.1.3 Capacity of Joint Action	32
5.2 Defining Collaborative Governance	35
5.3 Implementation of Collaborative Governance.....	37
5.4 Challenges of Collaborative Governance	38
6. Discussion	40

7. Conclusion.....	44
References	45
Popular science summary.....	48
Acknowledgements.....	50
Appendix 1	51
Appendix 2	54

List of tables

Table 1. Collaborative dynamics, its components, and elements based on Emerson et al.'s (2012) Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance	18
Table 2. List of reviewed video recordings of Transition Lab Forums	22
Table 3. Titles, subheadings, and a brief description of the Viable Cities documents and reports analysed in this study.	54

Abbreviations

CCC 20230	Climate City Contract 2030
CNC 2030	Climate Neutral Cities 2030
CGR	Collaborative Governance Regime
SIP	Strategic Innovation Program
IFCG	Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance

1. Introduction

In order to address the ongoing climate crisis, there is a need to develop effective multilevel responses, such as strategies that can be implemented to improve horizontal coordination between different actors in key decision-making practices (Storbjörk et al 2019). Cities areas are identified as crucial actors in reaching an emission-free future (Shabb & McCormick 2023; Della Valle et al. 2023; Boehnke et al. 2019). However, cities are growing rapidly and already account for over 70% of the global CO₂ emissions (Viable Cities d. 2020). In Sweden, 93% of the population is estimated to be living in urban areas by 2050 (Pasic, 2022). The past discourse identifying cities as problem areas for climate change has shifted towards framing them as part of the solution. At the same time, cities are vulnerable places to the effects of climate change (ibid). Therefore, is it essential to include cities in the discussion around global warming, greenhouse gas mitigation, and climate change adaptation. Additionally, it is not always clear how climate policies for mitigation and adaptation ought to work out at different governance levels (Jensen et al. 2020). Municipalities find it challenging to determine which collaborative arrangements are to be applied to reach climate goals in practice (Storbjörk et al. 2019). Multilevel governance refers to vertical governance and has been identified as more complex than traditional institutional hierarchies (Pierre 2019). However, multilevel governance can engage innovative collective action in cities to address complex issues such as climate change and sustainability (ibid). Subsequently, to better understand how various governance processes can support sustainability there is a need for collaborative actions (Smedby & Neij 2013). Despite the substantial literature on collaborative governance, the definition remains uncertain both from the conceptual and empirical standpoint (Bianchi et al. 2021). The practice and theory are missing important evaluations of how collaborative governance works especially within environmental, socioeconomic, and political contexts (Ulibarri et al. 2023). How collaborative governance should be led and understood for climate transformation is important for city decision-makers to understand (Vedeld & Hofstad 2022). The definition and shared understanding of what governance is and how it works in practice are key for any collaborative process (Ulibarri et al. 2023).

Viable Cities is a strategic innovation program (SIP) with the mission to accelerate the climate transition towards Climate Neutral Cities (CNC) 2030, with

a good life for all within the boundaries of the planet (Pasic 2022). The mission is in line with the Swedish environmental objectives and climate policy framework and long-term goal to have net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2045, as well as the European Union's goal of climate neutrality by 2050 (Viable Cities h. n.d.). Viable Cities also works in a holistic approach to contribute to the implementation of Agenda 2030 (ibid). Viable Cities aims to create new forms of governance and management, civic engagement, cooperation between the state and municipalities, Climate City Contracts (CCC) 2030, coordination in financing, climate investments in cities, and support policy development and decision-making processes (Viable Cities h. n.d.). The idea is to govern the process together, from a bottom-up approach, with municipalities, authorities, the business community, civil society, and their member organizations (ibid). Viable Cities supports reflexive learning and skills development through knowledge (Viable Cities h. n.d.). This master's thesis will advance the understanding of governance implementation, support the collaborative process system thinking to improve a shared understanding of process criteria inputs and outcomes, and elucidate how some of these implementations are experienced in practice.

1.1 Problem Formulation and Research Questions

Collaborative governance can be seen as highly resource-consuming, and idealistic and risks becoming overly complex, overly promising, or diluting responsibility (Huxham 2003). However, it has strengths in creating closer collaboration and trust in relationships when working over organizational boundaries (ibid). Viable Cities are trying to find new ways for governance and how it can work in practice. This thesis aims to contribute to the understanding of how effective implementation of communication and collaboration is perceived and experienced by the representatives and could look like in Viable Cities in the mission of CNC 2030. What concepts and strategies are used to guide collaboration in Viable Cities' mission for Climate Neutral Cities (CNC) 2030? A collaborative process in these aspects requires a horizontal share of knowledge to build trust and interaction that rely on regular communication between multiple different actors (Storbjörk et al. 2019). Defined forms of communication improve access to knowledge and policy innovation (Lemos & Agrawal 2006). Furthermore, I will focus on examining how collaboration is understood and utilized in Viable Cities and the work they are doing in supporting cities towards climate neutrality. I will ask the following questions:

1. How is collaborative governance understood by the representatives in Viable Cities?

2. What is viewed as important for collaboration and multilevel governance by the participants?
3. What challenges are identified and what improvements for more effective collaboration are identified?

With these research questions, I hope to contribute to the understanding of how collaborative governance is perceived amongst participants in Viable Cities, how they exchange complex expertise, knowledge sharing its “know-how” between actors and at the same time foster sustainability. The study will start with a background description of Viable Cities and the implementation of collaborative governance in this case. Thereafter the framework for collaborative governance will be outlined as well as the methodological approach used in this research. This is followed by presenting the results and putting the results in a broader context through the discussion and finally conclusions.

2. Background

In this chapter, I will provide a brief overview of the fragmented governance landscape, definition, and use. Followed by a background of Viable Cities and a literature review of collaborative and communicative strategies in helping city decision-makers achieve climate neutrality.

2.1 Governance

The concept of governance has many different definitions and has been widely used with a rich history that has evolved alongside the development of human societies (Balme & Ye 2014). Public policy is not looking the same as it did just three decades ago and has gone through progressive changes of decentralization (ibid). Decentralization transformed the old-style central government to strengthen capacities to more local and intermediary levels of government and new policy innovations from “the bottom-up” (Bevir 2023). Over the last couple of decades, governance has gained popularity within the context of urban governance and the possibility of integrating approaches to sustainable development (Jacquier 2005). The scope of urban governance has become a more inclusive and comprehensive process of various sustainability aspects because of the shift in urban planning transitioning from the perspective of government to governance (Smedby & Neij 2013). In neoliberalism ideology, is the state inherently seen as no longer capable of managing state policy decisions and should instead turn to public systems (Bevir 2023). Government refers to the traditional structured hierarchical form of governing with command-and-control systems (Smedby & Neij 2013).

The term “governance” refers to the act of governing in both the public and private sectors (Emerson et al. 2012). Collaboration is a prominent aspect of environmental management since environmental issues are commonly complex and include many different components and factors (Ulibarri et al. 2023). However, many different definitions of governance exist within the field. Multi-actor governance goes under many different terms and uses such as multilevel governance (Pierre 2019), collaborative governance, new public governance, policy networks, network governance, participatory governance, and interactive governance, among others (Bianchi et al. 2021). They all contend with the requirement of complex interactions with a large number of interdependent actors from various levels. The multi-actor governance processes assist and manage multiorganizational action to solve complex, wicked problems, consisting of challenges involving many actors and sectors (ibid). Multilevel governance and collaborative governance are related concepts. Multilevel governance is crucial and

has enabled innovative transnational and international areas for cities to work towards new policy learning and knowledge (Pierre 2019). Multilevel governance focuses on the distribution of power, authority, and decision-making across various levels of government (ibid). Collaborative governance is defined as the processes of management and public policy decision-making that constructively engage people in collaborative forums (Emerson et al. 2012). Collaborative governance focuses on collaboration across different levels of government, it also encompasses cooperation between various non-governmental actors, emphasizing the importance of working together (ibid). Common for all these terms and uses for governance is the knowledge and shared understanding it enables and that it demands interaction between large numbers of codependent actors. The question remains, what does governance truly mean in this case? In many cases of theory building, it is seen as fundamental to have a shared definition of concepts. Although, at a fundamental level it is important not to have a too narrow definition of collaborative governance (Ulibarri et al. 2023). Governance processes with broad participation are essential for better knowledge and decision-making (Smedby & Neij 2013). Viable Cities define governance in the CCCs' as:

“The process of when many actors at different levels of governance work together to jointly go beyond what they as an individual part have direct control over in order to realize goals and missions as a whole. This means a system shift towards a holistic approach in public administration and a more network-based governance. Governance refers to the process and structure of governing, leading, and regulating an organization, society, or system.” (Viable Cities b. 2030:17)

I will use the term “collaborative governance” because it encompasses the definition and understanding of “collaborative policymaking” and “management.” Collaborative governance enables me to look closer into the collaborative aspects of how climate neutral cities are governed. For example, in this research, will I focus on the collaborative governance between actors at different levels and factors that revolve around CNC 2030, communication, shared motivation, engagement, and joint action. I will look at perspectives from those who work between different disciplines or levels with the transition. Therefore, in this study I will assign an open and undefined definition of collaborative governance from the beginning, letting the definition be identified by the stud's representatives.

2.2 Obstacles of Governance

Although collaborative planning has a significant impact on planning theory, it is criticized for having an idealized view of communication and therefore disregarding real power dynamics in society (Smedby & Neij 2013). Collaborative governance seems to sometimes be a too promising approach where if we govern

collaboratively the aspired outcomes are promised to come true without a high cost (Ansell & Gash 2008). However, many advocate for new types of issues to arise (ibid). When integrating many different actors in a horizontally cooperating way, one of the most difficult challenges tends to be the integration of actors itself, because it juxtaposes many skills, work methods, cultures, organizations, etc. which can threaten already existing professions (Jacquier 2005). Governance involves bringing together different types of knowledge and managing the interfaces that exist between knowledge and governance (van der Molen 2018). Collaborative management concerns the role of an intermediary actor whose goal is to achieve cooperation concerning a shared objective and inform decision-makers, coordinate experts and policymakers, and so forth (ibid). However, it is not always clear how collaboration should be linked to decision-making processes in collaborative governance (Shabb & McCormick 2023). Furthermore, it is well established that leadership is so important in collaborative governance since it calls for a part that is understanding of the whole process (Ansell & Gash 2008).

2.3 Viable Cities

Viable Cities aims to accelerate the climate transition in cities in order to reach climate neutrality by 2030, with a good life for all within the boundaries of the planet (Viable Cities e. n.d.). The initiative began in 2019 and successfully involved 23 municipalities by fall 2021, which represents 40% of Sweden's population (Pasic 2022). The purpose is to mobilize actors and resources for a transformative system change (Viable Cities c. n.d.). Creating long-term persistent efforts across several sectors and disciplines locally, regionally, and nationally by a large number of actors working together (Viable Cities g. n.d.). Viable Cities aims to create new forms of; governance and management, civic engagement, cooperation between the state and municipalities, Climate city contracts 2030, coordination in financing climate investments in cities, and support policy development and decision-making processes (ibid). Viable Cities contribute to the transition by creating meeting places so that the municipalities can work together, co-learn, and collaborate (Viable Cities h. n.d.). Viable Cities' communication focuses on supporting the program's mission and encouraging a movement among diverse actors in society (Viable Cities f. n.d.).

2.3.1 Communication in Viable Cities

In this section, I will provide a background to what Viable Cities utilize as communicative tools and methods for collaboration and governance. They create places to find new methods and ways to work together with the help of the tools CCC 2023, Transition Lab Forum, policy labs, system demonstration, and many

more (Viable Cities e. n.d.). I will present two of the tools connected to collaboration, governance, and communication that will be relevant later in this study.

Transition Lab Forums are held four times a year and are Viable Cities' core event and tool for accelerating and spreading change (Viable Cities i. n.d.). The events focus on a different topic each time, inviting different actors interested and specialized in the subject to present relevant knowledge and inspire (ibid). Here they work together with a diversity of people and organizations from the public, industry, civil society, and academia for a multilevel collaborative approach (Viable Cities g. n.d.). The main purpose is to enable innovation, co-creation, and reflexive learning in a collaborative context with regard to governance and management, citizen involvement, and so forth (Viable Cities i. n.d.). This is why these activities and events are suitable to look further into for collaborative governance.

CCC's 2030 are agreements between municipalities, Swedish cities, public authorities, government agencies, and Viable Cities to collectively face the climate transition (Viable Cities a. n.d.). The contracts are tools for long-term commitment between cities and the national level. The basic idea is to revise the content every year create a way forward together and identify how to develop the CCC 2030 at both local and national levels (Larsson 2023). In Sweden, 23 cities have currently signed a CCC with Viable Cities (ibid).

2.4 Collaboration, Communication, and Climate Neutral Cities

Relatively little attention has so far been given to how collaboration and communications strategies can provide and engage city decision-makers from multiple levels and sectors in reaching climate neutrality in practice. Most of the literature on the subject covers an international European scope. Few have focused on smaller national sample groups for closer collaboration. However, all conclude that cities are “natural” key agents in addressing global climate change, as sites of innovative and experimental actions (Shabb & McCormick 2023; Della Valle et al. 2023; Boehnke et al. 2019). This indicated that the field of research is essential to understanding collaborative governance around climate action.

One study that investigated the development and process of Viable Cities' CCC in Sweden in comparison to Europe found that formal communication structures to inspire action were challenging to assess since the CCC focuses more on engagement as an aspect of communication (Shabb & McCormick 2023). In the CCC the indicator of collaboration overlapped with engagement and communication. Showing that collaboration, communication, and engagement are intertwined. However, collaboration actions should be linked to a decision-making

process but how is not clear in existing processes today according to that study (Shabb & McCormick 2023). The study identified governance as part of the CCC template and for cross-sectoral collaboration. Finally, all municipalities and Viable Cities participating in this study identified the need for better tools in collaboration between actors in order to encourage co-creation (Shabb & McCormick 2023). Cities that prioritize communication strategies and receive cross-sectorial support from higher governance levels are also more likely to be climate-aware at all levels (Della Valle et al. 2023). However, it is essential for cities that develop climate action plans to be aware of injustice (ibid). If cities do not talk about or recognize how their planning process for climate efforts, they risk becoming loci for injustices (ibid). Further research on the subject is much needed and could include how climate justice is understood by urban decision-makers and citizens. Although I agree that the aspect of justice is important to be included in the research, an in-depth focus on justice will be outside this study's scope. When engaging in collaborative interaction over a longer time, dialogues are important for knowledge exchange and advanced learning between municipalities in relation to climate change (Storbjörk et al. 2019). Long-term engagement in these issues requires expertise, funding, knowledge, and political commitment (Pierre 2019). The type of collaborative arrangement that is best suited for the realization of climate goals is still something Swedish municipalities struggle with (ibid). Ulpiani and Vetter (2023) also conclude in their study that communication and engagement campaigns on climate action are much needed to get more people and public opinions involved, internalize commitment, and make sure all voices are heard. Among all EU countries, the consensus existed that inadequate governance structures and miscommunication are seen as a high risk for reaching the climate goals in cities (ibid).

In summary, the literary review indicates that there are still areas within the subject of reaching CNC 2030 regarding governance tools, dialogue and knowledge sharing, trust, co-learning, and how to work together with collaboration and communication efforts that need further investigation. Better methods, decision-making, and ways to collaborate to reach the goals efficiently are today in need of more knowledge. Additionally, to develop an understanding of how the process of collaborative governance is experienced by the practitioners leading the transition. Therefore, this master's thesis will look closer at collaboration in governance for CNC 2030.

3. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, I will outline the analytical and theoretical framework used to denote and understand collaborative governance for Viable Cities.

3.1 Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning

I will begin by providing a more substantial background for my framework by explaining Innes and Booher's (1999) framework for evaluating collaborative planning. They outline a theory to help understand how and why collaborative policy dialogues work in practice. The concept is used to construct the impacts or possible outcomes of the Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance which I will dive deeper into. This can provide a further epistemological and ethical understanding of collaboration as a deliberative governance strategy. The framework for evaluating collaborative planning is grounded in and inspired by Jurgen Habermas's concept of communicative rationality (Innes & Booher 1999). The basic idea of communicative rationality, according to Habermas, is that all interests must be joined in the discourse (Innes & Booher 1999). For a collaborative process to be successful it must meet certain criteria. All criteria do not have to be fully met, but if little to none are present, they will most likely hinder the effectiveness and quality of the process and its outcomes. Although important to note, a process that fulfils process criteria must not necessarily result in process outcomes. The potential collaborative outcomes are new collaborations, more coevolution, less destructive conflict, new institutions, new norms and heuristics, and adaptations of cities as well as regions, resources, or services (ibid). In this study, collaborative planning will remind us that all interests are important in collaboration however not all criteria for a process must be present for it to produce desired outcomes. If the representatives mention similar outcomes or experiences when interviewed about their work in practice for CNC 2030 will it be used to evaluate the presence of the collaborative dynamics explained in Emerson's et al. (2012) framework. Furthermore, this study will apply the concept of collaborative planning to make sense of Emerson's et al. (2012) Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance (IFCG).

3.2 Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance

The requirements for collaborations are important to comprehend when creating an understanding of interdisciplinary practices in the context of working towards the mission of CNC. In order to identify these key factors for a collaborative process, this study includes Emerson et al.'s (2012) IFCG. Emersons et al.'s framework is a useful lens to view and describe environmental issues as a theory built for collaborative governance through a system approach (ibid).

The theory is about what factors lead to successful and effective collaborative governance within a Collaborative Government Regime (CGR) (Emerson et al. 2012). CGR refers to a public decision-making model or system for cross-boundary collaboration that over time achieves one collective purpose through autonomous organizations working together. The IFCG's structure involves nested dimensions and their elements within components. The system includes collaborative dynamics and collaborative actions whose presence determines how effective the whole system is. The collaborative dynamics are three interactive components that are viewed as cyclical or iterative: principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. Neither all components nor elements of collaborative dynamics, are constantly present in the process nor needed at the same extent.

Table 1. Collaborative dynamics, its components, and elements based on Emerson et al.'s (2012) Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance

Dimension		Collaborative Dynamics	
Components	Principled engagement	Shared motivation	Capacity for joint action
Elements within Components	Discovery	Mutual trust	Procedural and institutional arrangements
	Definition	Mutual understanding	Leadership
	Deliberation	Internal legitimacy	Knowledge
	Joint Determination	Shared commitment	Resources

In Table 1 there is an overview presenting the collaborative dynamics, its components, and elements based on Emerson et al.'s (2012) framework. The framework can be applied to study CGR as a whole or separated into dynamics and elements to focus on more specific components (Emerson et al. 2012: 2). In this case, this enables me to look further into collaboration by connecting the collaborative governance dimension to what is being perceived by representants in this study's result. The framework's collaborative dynamics will be applied to understand collaborative governance in practice in Viable Cities. The

representatives' answers are categorized into the components of the collaborative dynamics in the result. The representatives' answers are analysed by me as a researcher to get an understanding of how collaborative governance is perceived by the representatives.

Principled engagement refers to fair, open, and inclusive communication, when including perspectives and knowledge from all participants. It is when people with different relational, identity, and content interests collaborate across respective institutional, sectoral, and jurisdictional borders to solve and address issues, settle disputes, or provide value. It refers to processes that include different stakeholders at different points over time. Principled engagement is advantageous from face-to-face interactions, although it is not necessary and can also take place digitally. Principled engagement involves four process elements. *Discovery* refers to the understanding and identification of individual and shared interests, relevant information as well as concerns and values. *Definition* refers to processes when discussing problems and opportunities from different perspectives. It is the efforts to create shared meaning through finding joint purpose and objectives. *Deliberation* is also described as reasoned communication that occurs when participants have divided interests- and perspectives. Collaborative governance should foster constructive self-assertion and processes that enable asking and answering difficult questions, listening, and finding consensus. Finally, the process of making *joint determinations* refers to the presence of procedural decisions like setting agendas, assessing a workgroup, reaching agreements, and so forth.

Shared motivation refers to the relational and interpersonal elements of collaboration and builds on mutual trust, understanding, internal legitimacy, and shared commitment. *Mutual trust* refers to the potential to enable parties to work together and stimulate learning, innovation, and knowledge exchange. This leads to the element of *mutual understanding* where respect develops into the ability to see others' perspectives, values, or goals. In turn, this leads to *internal legitimacy* that motivates collaboration through trustworthiness and credibility. This leads to the final element, *shared commitment*, which enables participants to create cross-boundary connections and work together over sectoral and organizational boundaries.

Capacity for joint action emphasizes the purpose of collaboration is engaging and it aims to achieve outcomes that cannot be accomplished individually. It is described as “a collection of cross-functional elements that come together to create the potential for taking effective action” and serve “as the link between strategy and performance” (Emerson et al. 2012: 14). The capacity for joint action is comprised of four essential elements. Most of them identify leadership as an essential part of the capacity for joint action. The first element, *procedural and institutional arrangements*, presents interactions, at both inter- and intra-organizational levels. The second element, *leadership*, is essential in collaborative

governance and can be identified as representatives, facilitators, mediators, and sponsors, among others. *Knowledge* is the third element and is referred to as the currency of collaborations, that is generated and shared with others and has the ability to guide action. “The term “knowledge” in this framework refers to the social capital of shared knowledge that has been weighed, processed, and integrated with the values and judgment of all participants” (Emerson et al. 2012: 16). Finally, *resources* which are defined as time, funding, technology, logistical support, administration, special expertise, power, etc.

This framework will allow me to identify institutional dynamics to understand how principled engagement creates shared motivation and enables the capacity for joint action when implementing collaborative governance in practice. Analysing the collaborative dynamics with the aim of creating transformative system changes based on the mission of CNC 2030 is valuable. By understanding how to support collaborative actions with the capacity of joint actions, are they more likely to be implemented, according to Emerson et al. (2012). If correctly identified, the dynamics of a CGR could be suitable to apply to the case of Viable Cities for understanding how collaborative efforts are perceived in practice to govern policy-making processes at different levels. Therefore, to deepen the understanding of governance by its participants, this framework is suitable for analysing the results of this study.

4. Research Context and Methodology

In this chapter I will explain this research context and relation to the field of environmental communication and why that is important. After that, I will describe the methodological approach and how it was applied. Finally, I will go through how I analysed the result as well as the delimitations of this study.

4.1 Reflexivity

In qualitative research, the researchers reflect on how their role in the study is affected by their own background (Creswell & Creswell 2018: 260). This means that my background will influence how I understand the knowledge-making process through what matters to me. I have an environmental scientific approach from my academic background. I am shaped by both my conscious and unconscious background, and my previous assumptions and context, which can affect how I understand and analyse the data. In my research, I will do my best not to let my background influence why and how I'm asking my questions or analysing the data. However, it can also be seen as a useful resource that enables me to make sense of my research. Even if I recognize my subjectivity in my position, it has the potential to impact the way the study is conducted. In my positionality, I consider myself an outsider to the case, where I position myself as a neutral observer of the research in order to make sense of the data.

Concerning environmental issues, environmental communication and governance are often seen as distant operating processes in policy, strategy, and decision-making (Irwin et al. 2018). However, communication is central in decision and policymaking and can help constitute governance processes over the organization (ibid). Therefore, communication and governance are no longer seen as distant processes. In order to influence environmental behaviour and achieve intended societal changes, an effective governance process relies on clear communication of policies (Irwin et al. 2018). Therefore, environmental communication is essential in governance and policymaking for environmental and societal issues. Decision-makers need to make sense of complex ideas and messages from different societal, scientific, and industrial groups (Irwin et al. 2018). Therefore, is it important to consider the governance implications of environmental communication (ibid). In this study, I see communication as a process to create meaning and value. This is helpful to understand the social realities we are creating (Schoeneborn et al. 2019). This enables investigation of current organizational structures and explores ways of communication that lead to more favourable outcomes for more people.

4.2 Data Collection

The study relies on collecting qualitative data that enables an understanding of different perspectives of collaborative governance. Subsequently, a total of six interviews were conducted with representatives from four municipalities, a representative from Viable Cities, and a representative from a participating authority. Formerly a brief literature study was conducted in order to get an understanding of the case to begin with. Further observations were made through the interviews, recordings of the Transition Lab Forum, and finally analysing documents from Viable Cities.

4.2.1 Documentation and Observation

The analysed documents contain elements relevant to how Viable Cities describes governance and collaborative processes. The first document, Communication Strategy Phase 3 (Viable Cities g. n.d.) enabled me to get an understanding of how Viable Cities describe their operative and controlled ways of communication. The second document – Program Description Phase 3 (Viable Cities h. n.d.) describes CCC 2030 and forms of governance management. The last document, Climate transition of cities (Klimatomställning av städer) is a governance report from Allan Larsson (Larsson 2023). The documents are further described in the appendix 2.

Transition Lab Forum is Viable Cities’ core event that occurs four times a year (Viable Cities g. n.d.). Every forum is unique and adapted to the theme (ibid). I made observations of recorded live streams from Transition Lab Forum 9- 14, listed in Table 2. These recordings are available to the public on Viable Cities’ YouTube page. However, important to note is that there are parts of the forums not available to the public consisting of workshops and other things. The forums are central points for developing and sustaining processes for learning, innovation, and co-creation through collaboration (Viable Cities i. n.d.). Observing these recordings of the Transition Lab Forums, enabled me to get an understanding and experience of how they moderate and arrange these events. Asking the representatives about their experience of the events, allowed me to analyse the parts of the event that were not available to the public.

Table 2. List of reviewed video recordings of Transition Lab Forums

Activity	Date	Forum theme	Location
Transition Lab Forum 9	June 2022	Climate Smart Mobility 2030	Helsingborg
Transition Lab Forum 10	October 2022	Energy investments and electrification for climate neutral cities	Uppsala

Transition Lab Forum 11	March 2023	Circularity and Resources Efficiency for Climate Neutral Cities	Växjö
Transition Lab Forum 12	May 2023	Future mobility in climate neutral, sustainable and accessible cities	Stockholm
Transition Lab Forum 13	October 2023	A sustainable food system for resilient and climate-neutral cities	Kristianstad
Transition Lab Forum 14	March 2024	Tourism and events for attractive and climate neutral places	Östersund

4.2.2 Semi-structured Interviews

A total of six semi-structured interviews were conducted and the sound of all interviews was recorded. All interviewees approved the audio recording, by reading a consent form in advance and then approving verbally in the recordings. The people being interviewed were picked based on who could participate and who is currently involved in Viable Cities' work. All representatives have been to a Transition Lab Forum and work with multiple actors in their work. The interviews were held with representatives from four different municipalities, one representative from Viable Cities, and one representative from a participating authority. One interview could be held in person. The online interviews were held via Zoom which allowed face-to-face interaction through a camera.

The questions asked at each interview were based on the same interview guide. However, the questions were adapted to each individual interview so not all sub-questions were necessarily asked to all the interviewees. The questions are presented in Appendix 1. The interviews were held in Swedish and later translated into English after being transcribed and analysed. In a semi-structured interview, the questions should allow the informants to reflect and speak freely and not be constrained by predetermination and are therefore built on open-ended questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018: 257). This gives the interviewer space to freely change the order of the questions if necessary as well as to pick up on interesting additions (Bryman, 2012: 471). The advantage of face-to-face interviews is that one can follow up on interesting responses and explore underlying motives that a questionnaire will not be able to (Robson & McCartan 2016). In this case, those abilities were crucial to get a deeper meaning out of things that were not said directly.

4.3 Data Analysis

When all the interviews were completed, the analysis began. The sound files were saved in numbers that could not be connected to identifying the person. When processing the collected data, I made sure to first transcribe or write down all observations and then read it through several times before deciding on themes and coding the material. All data was collected, transcribed, color-coded, and thematically organized. The codes were organized partly with the theoretical framework and partly with reoccurring themes brought up by multiple interviewees or in the other data. When transcribing I used the Word 365 transcription tool of sound files to facilitate the process. The coding process was done manually.

4.4 Anonymity and Validity

Validity is essential to strengthen and support the qualitative research (Creswell & Creswell, 2018: 274). Qualitative research implies that the researcher checks the accuracy of the collected data, which can be done through using multiple data procedures, such as triangulation (ibid). Having a triangulated method including interviews, observations, and literature builds a coherent justification of and increases the validity of the results (ibid). All participants in this research are anonymized. At first, I thought I would keep the participating cities identified to give them a voice in research and to strengthen the results context in the political and societal context. Even though most of my data is dependent on the perspectives and reflections from the interviewees I decided to keep all the representatives anonymous since their roles are too specific not to risk being identified. Additionally, during the analysis stage, the files and documents were all numbered and not identified to each individual, also kept anonymized.

4.5 Delimitation

The scope of this study is to examine the national dimensions and perspectives of governance of Viable Cities. Collaborative governance at an international level of interaction was not included in the scope. The data in this study is limited to represent the collaborative governance in Viable Cities in Sweden because of necessary limitations in proximity to this study. While these results can still be useful for all cities internationally, the study's data do not explicitly cover collaborative governance. Due to time constraints, I could not contact and interview all participating municipalities or authorities in Viable Cities. If the time frame had been longer, more cities, local actors, and representatives from both authorities and Viable Cities could have been included to perhaps strengthen the result of the study.

Additionally, I come from an environmental scientific perspective from my academic background. As mentioned in Chapter 4.1 this has the potential to affect how I both shape and analyses the data.

5. Results

In this chapter, the empirical analysis results are presented. The analysis is structured according to each collaborative dynamic from the research theoretical framework. First, I examine collaborative governance as an emergent system with the help of the IFCG by Emerson et al. (2012). Through this, I can identify what is perceived as collaborative governance and how it would work through following the dynamics in the framework. The components of collaborative dynamics are interactive and cyclical, and data can belong to more themes, elements, or dynamics than just one. I can contribute to the understanding of how collaboration can be adapted and what is perceived as important to foster a better governance approach in practice by identifying the collaborative dynamics in the representatives' answers. Thereafter, chapters 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 are separated to answer the questions: 1. How is collaborative governance understood by the representatives in Viable Cities? 2. What is viewed as important for collaboration and governance by the participants? 3. What challenges are identified and what improvements for more effective collaboration are identified?

5.1 Collaborative Dynamics

The collaborative dynamics in the CGR provide an understanding of the requirements of a system where the dominant way of engagement or behaviour is cross-boundary collaboration (Emerson et al. 2012). The analysis results are presented following the three interactive components presented in Chapter 3.2: principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action.

5.1.1 Principled Engagement

Principled engagement represents all relevant and significant interests in an inclusive and fair civil discourse and open and inclusive communications (Emerson et al. 2012). Overall, the representatives showed interest and a common understanding of their purpose and need for engagement.

Discovery refers to finding individual and shared interests, concerns, and values (Emerson et al. 2012). The representatives describe governance through a shared interest in how it is necessary and relevant in this case. All representatives share a fundamental care for a better future for all life and acknowledge it cannot be achieved by working alone. Essentially, all representatives have a shared understanding that a change in how things are governed in cities must happen. They are in need of a new approach of policy- and decision-making to be adapted to the

mission of Viable Cities. When describing what CNC actually means, Viable Cities' representative explains that:

“The mission is about understanding that, because when you work mission-driven as we do in CNC 2030, you can't continue the way you have done things before... everyone is on the same journey and work together to support each other...”

Not only the importance of their own, representatives, but the public's initial interest is mentioned as important for collaborative governance. The public and citizen's understanding and initial interest in the program and engagement in the mission are seen as important. Representatives also share an interest in taking part in the public knowledge. Especially representatives from the cities mention their close relationship with local business owners and other local people. Locals, or people referred to as working outside the direct mission or the representatives' workplace, were also mentioned as showing interest in understanding the transition they are trying to achieve. The representative from Viable Cities states that they experience that resistance or dissatisfaction about sustainability is abating. How the engagement of working toward a better life for all and a more sustainable place to live, almost creates an interest itself without them feeling like they must motivate people to an extent. The industry is requiring decision-makers to involve them in policy-making processes and that is what they want to. One interviewee describes it as “we don't have to fight for our purpose”, most people in the cities are eager to join or to help, especially local business owners.

“... there are a lot of people who want to be involved and it also creates that feeling of a community to do this together. I think it's very important that there are a lot of positive initiatives, there are a lot of people who want to contribute.” Says the Viable Cities representative.

Every one of the representatives appears to have the idea that Viable Cities are necessary to govern the process and to direct those initial interests to create a community. However, methods vary to context and can take some time to identify.

Definition is the process when building shared meaning or common purpose (Emerson et al. 2012). The continuous efforts to identify problems and opportunities from different perspectives to create shared meaning through joint objectives (ibid).

All representatives appear to have a shared understanding of what the mission means. They identify their purpose to work towards a more sustainable future, and better life for all. The common purpose is a driving force and motivation for all representatives. The analysis indicates that the common definition and purpose communicated by Viable Cities can help the participants set ambitions and stay motivated. This is not unexpected, considering Viable Cities explicitly aims to stimulate innovation and facilitate collaboration with participating municipalities.

The shared understanding is also evident from the documents and program description, which states that they strive to accelerate the climate transition for the mission (Viable Cities d. 2020). It is possible that the representatives' shared understanding of the purpose is coming from the description that is well communicated by Viable Cities. The mission is recurring, mentioned, and described many times through Viable Cities' work. For example, in Transition Lab Forums, CCC 2030, homepage, and similar. Most of the participants talk about it in a similar way as described by Viable Cities. However, when the representatives describe what CNC 2030 means, different meanings appear. CNC 2030 is, by some representatives, simply seen as their mission and project title. When describing what it means, some of the representatives are not sure it fully represents their work or is a suitable title in all cases. Some say it focuses too much on CO₂ emissions and reducing the environmental impacts since climate neutrality is understood as something tangible and measurable. Most of the representatives say their work facilitates so much more. Something that they all strive for and also want to include is the unmeasurable parameter of a good life for all. One representative explains:

“... but what’s interesting, what is a climate neutral city that also means a good life for everyone who lives there? That is something I believe we don’t know today 100%, that is what we are exploring.”

The definition of common purpose can also be found in seeing the representatives' roles. One representative says that it was difficult, especially in the beginning, to find their role. However, it has been improved and is now easier to know your role with the facilitating help of Viable Cities and having a physical arena to collaborate in. Another representative expresses it as “...many want to be involved, although it is a huge gap between wanting – and to truly understand your role.” This shows that the common understanding of “your own” role and purpose can be difficult to navigate and therefore a definition is not fully obtained. This can potentially also affect how one views other actors' roles (Emerson et al. 2012).

Deliberation refers to candid and reasoned communication and is essential for successful engagement and depends on how well encouragement of individual and represented interests are expressed (Emerson et al. 2012). Collaborative governance involves skilful advocacy for difficult questions, creating a space for such deliberation where different perspectives are brought forward (ibid). The representative's perspective on and knowledge about communicative skills are important for governance. The result indicates that some representatives appreciate the more positive focus in collaborative efforts however some seek a more challenging tone and want to raise challenges and issues to avoid repeating mistakes. According to the interviewees, this is important from an aspect of talking about challenges they are facing in the transition and not only the advances to motivate. According to some of the representatives, this needs more time and space.

Although the representatives still express their appreciation and understanding that Viable Cities does encourage hard conversations at activities, it could be improved. A common motivation, from almost all representatives and the observations made for the Transition Lab Forums, is shared knowledge. The Transition Lab Forums are described as positive and inclusive. Almost all representatives explain that the live events organized by Viable Cities are important places for open communication and deliberation. For example, the representative from Viable Cities says:

“It is physical and then you get to know each other, people that you know and are fond of. It is much easier to collaborate with everyone’s purposes...”

The results show that some representatives from the cities appreciate more structure and preparation in advance for the events. However, it is sometimes seen as a good thing that they do not plan the events too much and leave room for improvisation. However, the themes could be better expressed in advance to give time to prepare who to bring according to some. Although with less structure, it is important to give space for individuals to speak freely without restrictions. For example, different perspectives are brought forward in less structured events, creating something referred to as the “talk in between.” This is exemplified in workshops when they discuss different perspectives and share relevant information as well as different existing digital channels used to maintain the conversation outside of the events. This is also mentioned in the document “communication strategy”, not only that operative communication ways are important for dialogue and the personal meeting to encourage easy and simple ways to communicate outside of these operative ways (Viable Cities g. n.d.). One of the representatives from the larger cities says:

“When you're talking about such big issues. I don't think you can really control those discussions without, what you have a clear purpose. But I think that in some way there is a point in not having it too controlled either.”

This allows the conversation to be spontaneous and genuine, to motivate the sharing of knowledge and innovative ideas.

Joint Determination refers to the processes of setting agendas, assessing a workgroup, and reaching agreements (Emerson et al. 2012). Determinations are long-term processes and can be made over time or shift depending on context (ibid). However, the idea is to create new ways of reaching agreement, determination, and setting agendas, and the representatives all seem to have the experience that it takes time and that they in some areas have it easier than others. Representatives say that working with communication, networking, and creating long-term collaborative strategies for collaboration are essential. Overall decisions are formed over time and there is almost no hesitation that everyone is part of setting agendas and reaching agreements together. One representative describes it:

“... we do it together and that's what's a bit tricky to manage and make decisions together... There's no governance in the sense that it's one person who's responsible for all this, there's no role like that. Decisions are made jointly.”

One of the representatives refers to Viable Cities' role as a facilitator for coordinating and assessing workshops and bringing everyone's opinions together. Additionally, the transition teams in each municipality have leading and supporting roles. One representative from a smaller city says it is sometimes difficult to give common ways to govern these processes because each city has a unique political structure, which affects how decisions are made. Decisions are taken formally, and, in some matters, by the highest decision-making body. However, some representatives explain that they are yet not there on a city level to really implement collaborative governance in their work and create a place for setting agendas. This indicated that cities have reached different stages in finding new ways to work in a matter of assessing workgroups and setting agendas. However, it is uncertain if it depends on the need for more time or a certain context that can be easily assessed over time. Because many representatives mention that they are still in the testing phase of implementations.

5.1.2 Shared Motivation

Shared motivation refers to the collaborative dynamics of self-reinforcing, interpersonal, and relational social capital (Emerson et al. 2012). Principled engagement is the first step towards shared motivation (ibid). Overall, the shared motivation according to the representatives' understanding appears to be understood as driven by collaboration, communication, good dialogue, and the relationships the participants can build through actively working together, cross-boundary.

Mutual trust develops over time as different actors cooperate, learn to know one another, and demonstrate their abilities to be sensible, reliable, and trustworthy (Emerson et al. 2012). Trust is usually referred to as the necessity for collaboration, which also is the base for stimulating learning and knowledge (ibid). The building of mutual trust is exemplified by the interviewees as an outcome of Viable Cities' activities. Especially from the Transition Lab Forums. This means that everyone can come together in a physical forum and get to know each other. When getting to know a person behind their purpose and work, they build new interests and perspectives on that person's work which strengthens their relationship. The representatives show understanding and trust in how other actors and organizations organize and allocate their time. When they are able to meet face-to-face with different actors that are facing the same or even different challenges as they are. Where the participants can have these open discussions is where the representatives find the strongest connection to mutual trust. The trust amongst the participants has increased over time and appears to foster an environment where interdependent

interests are understood and even desired. The representatives say it was more uncertain in the beginning but strengthened through Viable Cities. One of the representatives says that:

“To meet face-to-face gives good relations, networking is important, and key to developing relations, it’s important to be aware of the fact that we have many different agendas all the time, we have to learn how to manage different existing opinions and how to think and plan in advance.”

When asked why civil dialogue is important one of the interviewees answered that it is “very important in order to avoid dissatisfaction, to enable a place to vent thoughts and feelings together, to create trust and support each other “. Building relationships and creating trust with local actors appears to focus on building trust with stakeholders and city actors. The method is to invite the people working on the projects and take their opinions and ideas into consideration when making decisions. The representatives explained that when people get to be a part of the dialogue and identify what makes a society good, it gives trust to the municipalities and everyone working with the transition. A representative says:

“Of course, the citizens should be involved in the transition, everyone should be involved, even if you should not put the responsibility on each and every one when you do big things, you have to relate to changes that take place in your surroundings, therefore everyone must be involved if we are to change a society.”

The representatives emphasize that no one should carry the responsibility alone, but everyone should be involved.

Mutual understanding refers to respect that develops into appreciation of each other’s work and differences (Emerson et al. 2012b). This is not the same as shared understanding, they don’t have to understand the same thing, just understand each other.

Internal legitimacy refers to the confirmation of trustworthiness between participants in ongoing collaboration. Both mutual trust and mutual understanding are building up to internal legitimacy (Emerson et al. 2012).

The representatives all share the idea that the mission is something no one can work with alone. One of the representatives describes that building relations over time where they can trust each other, leads to something similar in definition to internal legitimacy. They feel comfortable enough to contact each other outside of the events and steer new ideas together. The most important outcomes can be summarized as mentioned by the representatives, recognition of each other, strengthening each other, and building relations with people in the same roles at different places. One of the most important aspects according to the representatives is consistency and maintenance of relationships and personal meetings. One of the representatives says:

” The regularity there and the context is incredibly valuable, and I think it's easy if you want to get in touch with someone else in between the meetings because you've got personal relationships”.

Viable Cities contributes to creating communication ways, referred to as slack channels where active participants in Viable Cities can join. The aim is to communicate easily and efficiently to exchange knowledge (Viable Cities g. n.d.). The representatives say it is a helpful way to maintain relationships and build on trustworthiness.

Shared commitment is the importance of setting and committing to the goal and vision and enabling participants to cross organizational boundaries. Shared commitment is fundamentally necessary to work towards common goals (Emerson et al. 2012). When the representatives were asked to describe CNC 2030 as well as governance, commitment to a goal and vision appeared. Most described their common goal as the commitment to the work they are doing. Shared commitment connects to the understanding of collaborative governance in Chapter 5.2. Collaborative governance requires a multidisciplinary system perspective and the commitment of actors at all levels. The authority and city representatives mention that is not only necessary to network and build relationships, but to support each other. Shared commitment is motivated through talking about positive outcomes that can inspire others. The representative from Viable Cities explains:

” After all, climate transition is very much about anchoring. To anchor and create understanding, create commitment and that's where communication is very important.”

On the contrary, some city representatives say commitment from local actors exists without them having to communicate much on their own. The commitment from other actors is easier to attract through signing a CCC and taking part in Viable Cities. During the end summary of Transition Lab Forum 9, a participant from a municipality said that they talk all the time about physical projects and governance, and work from respective mandates or areas of expertise. However, they don't think that's enough. Everyone must commit at a personal level for the system transition to have the desirable effect.

5.1.3 Capacity of Joint Action

Capacity for joint action generates outcomes to collaboration that could not have been accomplished separately (Emerson et al. 2012). Overall, collaboration and communication over sectorial boundaries enable joint action and appear important for the representatives to maintain over time.

Procedural and institutional arrangements enable fixed and long-term relationships and collaboration and are characterized by structures, operating protocols, rules, regulations, and so forth (Emerson et al. 2012). Representatives

from both authority and the city express the importance of structured-based material and competence in their everyday work. The importance that those agreements and written ambitions “actually” can be achieved in practice is of importance to not only the mission itself but also the people participating. Structure is needed so that everyone knows where to find and how to interpret the long-term goals and structures. One representative says:

“How do we make sure those documents, for example, how governance should work expressed in the Climate City Contracts, are implemented the way we intend and are not just a pretty document? And make sure that it is a powerful and effective tool to accomplish what we say we do.”

Except for having a shared commitment and goal, it appears that some strategies are still missing in practice. Another representative says they need more structure in the way they evaluate and govern the transition. Indicating that there is not always a complete understanding of how to utilize all the knowledge and information that is provided today.

Leadership is necessary for collaborative governance and can consist of external and internal drivers, facilitators, representatives from organizations, or others (Emerson et al. 2012). Collaborative governance should encourage multiple roles of leadership where some might last over time while some are important for critical moments (ibid). In this study, leadership is never expressed by the representatives as inequitable or to foster uneven power relations which otherwise could be a risk. The representatives say that decisions on how to create new policy standards are taken together. In Viable Cities’ program description leadership is called for in aspiration to their vision that “Sweden inspire to and has a leading role in the transition to climate neutral and sustainable cities” (Viable Cities h. n.d.:5). Furthermore, in Viable Cities’ mission strategy pioneer cities roles are to lead the way to accelerate the journey towards climate neutrality by 2030 (ibid). “Lead the way” means that the cities or companies that have gotten further with the transition or work should inspire and lead the way for the rest. Without Viable Cities, those strategies or connections to create “lead the way” could be more difficult or even never occur according to some representatives. However, how this should be accomplished and implemented is sometimes more difficult said than done. One of the representatives clarified that:

“Places, cities, or businesses that have gotten further in their work must lead the way and inspire others. This is key in leadership roles and why collaboration is important, to lead the way to others who lack the knowledge. “

Therefore, is collaboration and communication between different organizations and levels so important for leadership. Another representative mentions Viable Cities as a facilitator who can provide leadership. Leadership is important, but not

identified as one individual and one organization taking all the responsibility, nor is it put on solely the public. A concept they mention as successful is “Glo and Sno,” where Viable Cities gather and encourage cities to take ideas from each other. One representative says: “We have to face it together, and it helps to meet up and talk about our common concerns and challenges. “Cross-border commuters (in Swedish so-called gränsgångare) is a leading role mentioned by both the city representatives and at Transition Lab Forums. In Transition Lab Forum 14 it is described as someone who juggles many different roles at the same time. Cross-border commuters are situated between different organizations to enable collaborative understanding and transparency. One of the city representatives identifies oneself as this and describes it as a “spider in the web.” Someone who works with and is in contact with many different areas at the same time. These roles could represent and organize different organizations and facilitate mutual understanding.

Knowledge is usually seen as the currency of collaboration (Emerson et al. 2012). Knowledge guides action, and the more complex the institutional infrastructure becomes the greater the need for collaboration and governance (ibid). The ability to effectively transmit high-quality knowledge across organizations are essence of conductivity (Emerson et al. 2012). When asked why they need to collaborate, some representatives said it enables the right knowledge to be provided from policymakers to practitioners. The representatives mention knowledge to be exchanged as the main incentive for working together. However, in some cases, it is seen as too complex to understand each other over organizations. It is a constant requirement for more high-quality knowledge to influence structural and behavioural change. Most of the representatives mention that some actors will have more knowledge and resourcefulness and therefore take more decisions and responsibility in certain contexts. However, this does not make the others feel less empowered. It appears natural to have more or less power in certain questions where you know more or less. At least the representatives participating in this case appear to experience it unproblematic. Knowledge is seen as a product of collaborative processes, which does not just appear without reason. Knowledge must be requested or asked for in a suitable context or exchanged for something. One of the representatives from the larger cities says, “It must exist a win-win situation for people to collaborate, and knowledge is one of them”. This expressed feeling closely connected to the theory from the framework where knowledge is described as the currency of collaboration.

The representatives express that it almost always depends on the context and that before any decision it is important to gather as much knowledge as possible. Knowledge comes from each other, both locally between the organizations and other cities transition teams, universities, science, construction workers, bikers, and pedestrians among many others mentioned. Knowledge also comes from meeting

each other, in the cities, building networks, and attending events. In Transition Lab Forum 9, the moderator said “We promise that you will learn something here today, everyone’s here to learn” showcasing the importance of sharing knowledge. If comparing the opinions of the representatives, they say knowledge exchange is a big part of the Transition Lab Forums. For sharing knowledge some representatives mentioned workshops as inspirational. Finally, it cannot be overlooked that some of the representatives think that knowledge is not always enough or “right.” Knowledge is difficult and the challenge is to know what to do with it and direct it. One representative said they do not always have enough information. However, they said it makes sense to them because they want to create a flexible and complex transition.

Resources are shared in collaborative processes and are usually seen as instrumental to successful collaboration. Resources could be time, funding, technical and logistical support, special expertise, and administrative and organizational assistance among many others (Emerson et al. 2012).

In this case, resources were not only understood as technical support but also traits or special sets of skills and expertise. The mentioned traits are bravery, stamina, and creativity referring to trying new methods and going beyond what is known, shared motivation meaning to get more people involved such as local actors and larger companies and finally, communication so that we understand each other. Another resource that multiple representatives say is important is funding. Both authorities and municipality representatives say they experience that funding, knowledge, and other resources, are sometimes unevenly distributed. This can cause hindrances in the long run. This connects to the capacity of joint action and consequential incentives and if better allocated may lead to new initiatives, better-induced leadership, and engagement among participants (Emerson et al. 2012). However, some representatives also express that closer collaboration and communication between cities can bring balance to how resources are utilized and experienced by everyone.

5.2 Defining Collaborative Governance

This section examines how the representatives understand and talk about governance. As mentioned earlier, a shared understanding of governance is essential for the collaborative process and its outcomes. The representatives clearly state that communication, knowledge, and understanding of each other are necessary for collaboration. The representatives were asked “What is governance” and if they could connect it to CNC 2030. Most of the representatives say collaborative governance is a central part of their work. Almost all representatives in this study say they work with some form of collaboration. Especially when defining how to work together. Viable Cities’ and the authority representative both

mention that, how governance is understood and performed, will be crucial to face the climate transition together.

On the other hand, the representatives from the smaller cities have more difficulties finding words to explain collaborative governance to begin with. Both mention it is difficult to work with at a local level and to give successful examples from their work. The representative from the largest city also says that governance is not something that they refer to in their everyday work. However, it is seen as important, but sometimes difficult. One representative says it is difficult to distinguish from when they are talking about “how to work together” and when collaborative governance is “actually relevant.” This indicates that some city representatives can have difficulties with governance and that they do not work with collaboration at a local level. However, the representatives' understanding is difficult to analyse in this specific case since it appears to move in different levels and has a wide definition spectrum.

Furthermore, what can be analysed is the representatives' understanding of governance in relation to the mission and how Viable Cities describes collaborative governance. Collaborative governance is seen as the process or method of working together over the boundaries and structure of institutional systems and organizations. The focus is sharing information, cooperation, communication, and collaboration. In the program description document the connection is described.

“... to change entire systems. This requires a multidisciplinary perspective and the commitment of actors at all levels. It is about breaking silos and allowing actors who otherwise do not meet to discuss problems and solutions. The aim is for everyone to work in the same direction with a common goal in focus.” (Viable Cities g. n.d.:7)

A “system perspective” is also mentioned by the representatives as connected to governance in order to face the mission. The representatives say that the system perspective makes it especially clear that they must find ways to collaborate. They must understand each other between organizations, to feel long-term commitment. System perspective is also mentioned in Transition Lab Borum 11 and 12 for example. There it is described as when many different expertise come together building on each other, where none can work alone. This is a great example of when collaborative governance is being identified according to the representatives. The authority representative says, “It is not only about how things are governed within the organization but between organizations”.

They mention that “who has resourcefulness” over certain things as well as finding new ways to work are fundamental. New ways should involve various actors, platforms, and interactions between participants. One of the representatives from the larger cities says that:

“Collaborative governance is about agreeing on how to transition together, how much to give and take so that we can reach that common goal and rethink how we do things today.”

The idea of finding ways to work transdisciplinary and cross-boundary is pervasive. However, the representatives still mention that some organizations will be more or less essential for collecting and creating that cross-boundary platform. For example, larger companies and bigger organizations are seen as essential. Another representative says that the most important actors in the work, are the municipalities that have signed a CCC 2030. It is important to create a transition arena in their cities that will include representatives from the business community, universities, citizens, organizations, and more. In that sense, they are fundamental for creating new ways of working together.

5.3 Implementation of Collaborative Governance

The ideas of implementation and what to do are related to how to face these challenges in the future. The representatives were asked “how to implement governance” or how this work should be done” to give an example of what to focus on next or give someone else recommendations when attempting do the same.” These questions substantially got different answers from all interviewees with a few common factors to relate their ideas and understanding. Despite this, I choose to include this theme because it demonstrates the diversity in challenges and ideas the different actors are facing or have, to improve or move forward.

Communicative skills are important for any implementation of collaborative governance. Not only communicative skills to communicate between organizations but also education on how to perform dialogue for example. The representatives say that civil dialogue is important for successful collaborative governance. Many great examples of where this has already been implemented were mentioned. However, there is a need to educate people working with collaborative governance and civil dialogue on how to do it. One representative describes it as “... and you can’t communicate something you don’t understand yourself...”. Education would facilitate their work to include more knowledge and people. For example, civil dialogues are mentioned as useful when constructing new bike lanes, building new housing, schools, transportation, parking, infrastructure, and so forth. It is a way to get a broader perspective on ideas while giving the citizens the opportunity to speak up and share their knowledge and needs. In Transition Lab Forum 12 they also mention civic engagement as a tool to think outside of their expertise by inviting the public to speak.

Furthermore, some say they should dare to talk more about difficulties in public events. A representative says, “It’s totally okay to make mistakes and to say, ‘This is difficult’”. That is where they see the greatest value. Likewise, almost all representatives explain that workshops or events where they can speak freely about

topics are the most developing and should be implemented more in the future as well.

Some deviating ideas about strategies that exist are to both plan and think ahead more and at the same time not to be afraid to just do and don't plan so much. Once again, adaptation to the situation is important and to know when to plan and when not to plan too much. Furthermore, local CCC is understood as a successful way to integrate more actors. The concept is similar to the contract Viable Cities signs with the municipalities. However, this is between local business owners and the municipalities. The cities can then "feature small businesses that want to contribute and give inspiration to other local businesses to do the same." This is seen as inspirational leadership for others to join. Finally, both the cities and Viable Cities' representatives mentioned that it is important to celebrate the "small successes" and "steps forward" as an implementation needed to motivate, inspire, and drive their work to be more collaborative and inclusive.

5.4 Challenges of Collaborative Governance

This part identifies challenges or concerns about how the process is governed and how to work forward. It is relevant to provide an understanding of what is not working well today and where to apply attention for development. This could drive new innovative thinking to collectively understand how to work for societal change. The results show the complexity of approaching the "wicked problems" and that cities both face similar and very different challenges. The representatives were asked what challenges or difficulties they see with collaboration. All representatives express some encountered obstacles or apprehension regarding finding new ways to collaborate. Some concerns are already present and palpable, while some are important to elucidate for the future.

Most of the representatives mention the challenge of understanding when governance is happening or when they are just collaborating since they are all part of deciding and defining it. It is difficult to analyse why this is difficult. Consequently, some representatives mention that challenges to implementing collaboration at a local level can depend on a shortage of resources and knowledge of "how." One of the representatives from the larger cities says, "It is difficult to understand what we are doing sometimes... when collaborative governance is happening." Furthermore, the authority representative emphasizes the importance of addressing these questions and says "What do we mean when we say we want to achieve effective governance, does everyone understand what we are talking about?" They say the understanding will vary depending on context and place. When asked about challenges with governance another city representative says "... it depends on the question; it would be governed differently if we look at municipality level or in the larger context..." Additionally they appear to have the understanding

that the challenge is that there is no, “one size fits all example,” and “every city has their own local challenges.” However, the same representative mentions that when working with problems like climate change, it is still necessary to work together with other cities and discuss these challenges.

Furthermore, there is a need for more structure and organization in the way they evaluate their implementations today. One representative describes it as “We need a clearer structure on how to govern the transition.” Another representative talks about challenges with “goal conflicts” referring to conflict when making decisions in cities and actors have different contradictory interests and opinions of what should be done. Today they are trying civil dialogue to find ways to collaborate with local knowledge. In those cases, they say it is still too early to evaluate.

6. Discussion

In this chapter, I will discuss and bring the results from this study to a broader literary context. The thesis aims to contribute to an understanding of how effective implementation of collaboration can work in Viable Cities' mission. In this section, I discuss how the collaborative dynamics relate to how collaborative governance is understood and utilized in Viable Cities and the work they do in supporting cities towards climate neutrality.

Firstly, this study aims to grasp how collaborative governance is understood by the representatives from municipalities, an authority, and Viable Cities. In the CCC 2030 is governance referred to as “the process and structure of governing, leading, and regulating an organization, society, or system”(Viable Cities b. 2030:17). Hence governance is described as a multi-actor process where joint action is achieved through cross-boundary collaboration. However, after analysing the representatives' ideas of collaborative governance, much more is to be included in practice. The result indicates that the representatives believe collaboration is important for new ways of governance. Almost all representatives referred to their mission as integration and aiming to change the old ways of policymaking with a bottom-up approach that must be identified together. On the other hand, the representatives' understanding is difficult to analyse in this specific case since it appears to have different meanings at different levels and has a wide definition spectrum. The representatives' requirements for collaborative governance change with external or internal context, giving a broad definition. However, having a broad definition of governance is important to enable a wider range of institutional structures to partake (Ulibarri et al. 2023). Overall, the analysis found that all representatives have similar concerns, values, and interests that have brought them to work for the same mission.

The representatives' understanding of collaborative governance can be found in the shared value of building relationships and trust. This reiterates the collaborative dynamics' element of mutual understanding. Collaborative initiatives for physical arenas in this study are important because they create space for sharing competence, values, knowledge, and much more. Collaboration is recognized in the dynamics of procedural and institutional arrangement that motivates structured meetings and norms of asking and sharing. The representatives stated that communication, knowledge, and mutual understanding are necessary components for the transition. Huxham (2003) also found that building relationships between participants in collaborative processes is the precondition for any progression. This study saw the strongest connection to mutual trust and knowledge exchange when the representatives meet face-to-face with different actors who are facing the same or even different challenges as they are. Storbjörk et al. (2019) also found that

constructive dialogue with face-to-face deliberation led by public actors increased trust and knowledge-sharing, which promotes clearer terms and collaborative governance. Furthermore, according to Ansell and Gash (2008), communication and face-to-face dialogue are at the heart of processes for building trust, shared commitment, and knowledge. In addition, the representatives have deepened the relationships over time and appear to have mutual trust and commitment which foster an environment where interdependent interests are understood and even desired. However, mutual understanding is not complete in this case, indicated by the need to develop a more inclusive language and to educate practitioners in civil-dialogue. Communication is challenged between organizations since it is different within each organization. Mutual understanding can in turn affect principled engagement in joint determination if not improved. All representatives mentioned that building trust, persistent relationships, and legitimacy are important aspects of nurturing a successful collaborative process and working towards their mission. Huxham (2003) also strengthens the conclusion that leading collaborations toward desired results among many actors requires constant nurturing of collaborative processes.

Furthermore, the result of this study indicates the requirement for collaborative governance as sharing interdisciplinary competence, resourcefulness, and working cross-boundary. The result implies that norms of asking and sharing are valued and should constantly be stimulated through candid communication and engagement. At the same time, the frequent contact with Viable Cities' organized activities does not just stimulate trust but makes the participants see and appreciate each other's differences. Communicative skills are identified as key to coordinating all the cities and organizations' administrations in the system development of effective cross-boundary collaborative methods. How to work together is today under development and many representatives say they are still trying new methods for collaboration. Civil -dialogue and communication are identified as necessary proficiencies for development. Except for having a shared commitment and goal, it appears that some strategies are still missing in practice and call for leadership. Conversely, understanding when and how to talk about governance and create transformative system changes based on the mission of CNC 2030 is valuable. This aspect is still uncertain and difficult to analyse in this study. Shabb and McCormick (2023) also found difficulties for the municipalities when analysing climate city contracts to explicitly describe their mode of governing. They found that enabling collaboration, engagement, and integration was an overarching approach. Collaborative governance in this study allows for shared decision-making, trust, cooperation, and other activities across organizations. However, both Shabb and McCormick (2030) and this study's results indicate that it is still unclear how collaboration should be connected to the decision-making process in practice.

The results also imply that collaborative governance requires a system perspective. Governance should aim for transformative change in society and to enable joint action. New forms of governance are not only attempted within organizations, but in the larger systems, the transformation includes the whole government systems (Jacquier 2005). This connects to the capacity for joint action since it defines governance as an indirect influence on other actors to act in parallel. Influence in this case can take place in information, sense-making, values, knowledge, and much more. The collaborative governance regime refers to cross-boundary collaboration where the system defines the dominant objective (Emerson et al. 2012). However, this study does not mean that all CGR dynamics should be dominant for CNC 2030. Structures and processes to generate and manage interactions over time are important. For the participants to make sense of governance more collectively, institutional agreements require more time for collaborative action. The result revealed that internal and external leadership such as “leading the way” and “cross-border commuters” are essential. Good collaborative leadership builds trust and guides practitioners within the process (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Bianchi et al. (2021) came to a similar conclusion that leadership is required for the implementation of cross-sectorial collaborative governance. Leadership is also identified as local business owners, facilitators, Viable Cities, communicators, and much more. Leadership should aim to understand each other and different participants from different organizations and coordinate committed to the same challenges. The result indicates that resources could be more evenly distributed. However, one of the purposes of collaboration is to benefit the potential of distributing scarce resources better or increase the potential to share. This is not uncommon but the perceived and real fairness depends on how the differences are being managed (Emerson et al. 2012).

Further, this study aims to understand what collaborative governance efforts should be incentivized. The result emphasized collaboration and communication as key for climate neutral cities to govern the transition at different levels. This in turn would motivate participants, and deepen trust and shared understanding, which leads to commitment to the process and stimulates desired outcomes. Ansell and Gash (2008) also found that collaborative favourable outcomes are created when forums focus on “small wins” that deepen trust, commitment, and shared understanding. Other implementations are local climate city contracts. The representatives strive to collaborate more with each other and the public. This shows that more knowledge and information from the public is requested. They need to initiate the public compatible and interdependent interest to get support in the transition.

Finally, the thesis aims to address the current areas of development and challenges from the representatives’ perspective. Overall, the big challenge mentioned is how to face the challenge together in the best way, evident that all the

representatives in this study really care about the mission. Expressed as a challenge is how to include the public, implement new strategies for collaboration and dialogue, scale up, distribute resources, and support each other. Challenges have been addressed over time and the situation improved. Through collaboration between different organizations, highlighting the importance of nurturing and having activities and events that focus on constructive dialogue, sense-making, and knowledge sharing “know-how” between actors and at the same time foster sustainability.

In this case, the result of the empirical analysis indicates that Viable Cities could benefit from the CGR to identify elements and implementation to manage collaborative governance. Additionally, this study found it difficult to identify the representatives' understanding of collaborative governance with the chosen theoretical framework. However, whether it depends on the initial understanding and practice of the representatives or analysis is unclear. Suggestions for interesting future development in this case are to look at this study in comparison to other European perspectives. This research provides an initial knowledge of how dynamics and elements of collaborative governance are understood in decision- and policymaking for Viable Cities and similar strategic innovation programs. From a wider perspective, the research provides additional knowledge about the importance of face-to-face interaction, communication, and trust-building for collaborative governance and climate mitigation and adaptation in Swedish cities. With this, I hope to contribute to how collaborative governance is understood in practice, for anyone concerned about knowledge, communication, and experience of collaborative governance dynamics in an interdisciplinary field.

7. Conclusion

This study is written from the perspective of Viable Cities and the mission to accelerate the climate transition towards CNC by 2030, with a good life for all within the boundaries of the planet. Viable Cities aims to create new forms of governance and management. This study has provided insight into the representatives' perspectives on how the governing process is understood and experienced in practice. The aim was to understand how effective implementation of collaboration is experienced and understood in the mission of CNC 2030.

If cities are meant to address the ongoing climate crisis and integrate it into key decision-making practices there is a need for closer collaboration, civil dialogue, communicative skills, face-to-face interactions, leadership that connects actors, and constant nurturing of relationships and trust-building. Collaboration between levels will enable suitable knowledge and policymaking to reach practitioners. Overall, the analysis found that the representatives' understanding of governance in this case is closely connected to the mission and to what is important for creating cross-boundary relations. The representatives experienced Viable Cities' collaborative efforts as inclusive, and decisions are taken collectively without diluting responsibility. Viable Cities should focus on engaging participants in activities that foster trust and knowledge sharing, build on face-to-face interaction through civil- dialogue, and have a more inclusive language. However, the representatives' understanding is difficult to analyse in this specific case since it appears to have different meanings at different levels and has a wide definition spectrum. The representatives' prerequisites for collaborative governance change with external or internal context, giving a broad definition. Viable Cities' collaborative efforts are experienced to increase trust over time and appear to foster an environment where interdependent interests are understood and even desired. Internal and external leadership creating "leading the way" and "cross-border commuters" are essential for cross-boundary collaboration. However, finding new forms of governance takes time and appears ever-changing and flexible depending on context. The participants and representatives that has signed a CCC have taken on a vast and important mission. Conversely, it is not impossible to expect new forms of governance in the future thanks to the hard work of everyone in Viable Cities. Even though the study was limited, I hope that it can contribute valuable insight for anyone interested in collaborative governance processes. The result emphasized collaboration and communication as key for climate neutral cities to govern the transition at different levels. However, it is important to establish time and place for participants to engage in closer collaboration to share knowledge and build trust to create desirable outcomes.

References

- Ansell, C. & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18 (4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Balme, R. & Ye, Q. (2014). Multi-Level Governance and the Environment: Intergovernmental Relations and Innovation in Environmental Policy. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 24 (3), 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1635>
- Bevir, M. (2023). *Governance | Definition, Types, Structure, & Facts | Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/governance> [2024-04-04]
- Bianchi, C., Nasi, G. & Rivenbark, W.C. (2021). Implementing collaborative governance: models, experiences, and challenges. *Public Management Review*, 23 (11), 1581–1589. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1878777>
- Boehnke, R.F., Hoppe, T., Brezet, H. & Blok, K. (2019). Good practices in local climate mitigation action by small and medium-sized cities; exploring meaning, implementation and linkage to actual lowering of carbon emissions in thirteen municipalities in The Netherlands. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 207, 630–644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.264>
- Creswell, J., M. & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative & mixed methods approaches*. 5th. ed Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Della Valle, N., Ulpiani, G. & Veters, N. (2023). Assessing climate justice awareness among climate neutral-to-be cities. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10 (1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01953-y>
- Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22 (1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Huxham, C. (2003) ‘Theorizing collaboration practice’, *Public Management Review*, 5(3), pp. 401–423. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1471903032000146964>.
- Innes, J.E. & Booher, D.E. (1999). Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems: A Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 65 (4), 412–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944369908976071>
- Irwin, A., Burchi, M., Felt, U., Smallman, M. & Yearley, S. (2018). Re-framing Environmental Communication: engagement, understanding and action. MISTRA. https://www.mistra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/re-framing-environmentalcommunication_mistra-bp-2018-1.pdf
- Jacquier, C. (2005). On Relationships Between Integrated Policies for Sustainable Urban Development and Urban Governance. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96 (4), 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2005.00469.x>

- Jensen, A., Nielsen, H.Ø. & Russel, D. (2020). Climate Policy in a Fragmented World—Transformative Governance Interactions at Multiple Levels. *Sustainability*, 12 (23), 10017. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su122310017>
- Larsson, A. (2023). *Klimatomställning av städer - En svensk governance-modell för att öka takten i omställningen*. https://viablecities.se/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/KTH_ViableCitiesRapport_Klimatomstallningavstader.pdf [2024-06-21]
- van der Molen, F. (2018). How knowledge enables governance: The coproduction of environmental governance capacity. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 87, 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.05.016>
- Pasic, E. (2022). *Viable Cities*. <https://www.energimyndigheten.se/forskning-och-innovation/forskning/strategiska-innovationsomraden/viable-cities/> [2024-04-09]
- Pierre, J. (2019). Multilevel governance as a strategy to build capacity in cities: Evidence from Sweden. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41 (1), 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1310532>
- Robson, C. & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real world research: A Resource for Users of Social Research Methods in Applied Settings* 4th ed. Printed in Italy by Printer Trento.
- Schoeneborn, D., R.Kuhn, T. & Kärreman, D. (2019). *The Communicative Constitution of Organization, Organizing, and Organizationality*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618782284>
- Shabb, K. & McCormick, K. (2023). Achieving 100 climate neutral cities in Europe: Investigating climate city contracts in Sweden. *npj Climate Action*, 2 (1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44168-023-00035-8>
- Smedby, N. & Neij, L. (2013). Experiences in urban governance for sustainability: the Constructive Dialogue in Swedish municipalities. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 50, 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.11.044>
- Storbjörk, S., Hjerpe, M. & Glaas, E. (2019). “Take It or Leave It”: From Collaborative to Regulative Developer Dialogues in Six Swedish Municipalities Aiming to Climate-Proof Urban Planning. *Sustainability*, 11 (23), 6739. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236739>
- Ulibarri, N., Imperial, M.T., Siddiki, S. & Henderson, H. (2023). Drivers and Dynamics of Collaborative Governance in Environmental Management. *Environmental Management*, 71 (3), 495–504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-022-01769-7>
- Viable Cities a. (n.d.). Climate City Contract 2030. *Viable Cities*. <https://viablecities.se/en/klimatneutrala-stader-2030/klimatkontrakt/> [2024-04-10]
- Viable Cities b. (2030). *Klimatkontrakt_Stockholm_2023.pdf*. Viable Cities. https://viablecities.se/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Klimatkontrakt_Stockholm_2023.pdf [2024-04-01]
- Viable Cities c. (n.d.). Om Viable Cities. <https://viablecities.se/om/> [2024-03-12]
- Viable Cities d. (2020). *Programbeskrivning etapp 2*. <https://playground.viablecities.se/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/ProgrambeskrivningViableCitiesetapp2.pdf> [2024-02-22]
- Viable Cities e. (n.d.). Viable Cities - Climate Neutral Cities 2030. *Viable Cities*. <https://viablecities.se/en/klimatneutrala-stader-2030/> [2024-02-05]
- Viable Cities f. (n.d.). Viable Cities - Communication. *Viable Cities*. <https://viablecities.se/en/klimatneutrala-stader-2030/kommunikation/> [2024-02-06]

- Viablcities g. (n.d.). *Viablcities-3-Kommunikationsstrategi-etapp-3*.
<https://viablcities.se/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Bilaga5.-Viablcities-SIP-etapp-3-Kommunikationsstrategi.pdf> [2024-05-16]
- Viablcities h. (n.d.). *Viablcities programplan 2024- 2027 inriktning av det strategiska innovationsprogrammet Viablcities, etapp 3, november 2023*.
<https://viablcities.se/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Viablcities-etapp-3-Programplan.pdf> [2024-03-12]
- Viablcities i. (n.d.). Viablcities Transition Lab. *Viablcities*.
<https://viablcities.se/en/klimatneutrala-stader-2030/transition-lab/> [2024-04-05]

Popular science summary

In Sweden, 93% of the population is estimated to be living in urban areas in 2050. Cities are vulnerable places to the effects of climate change. However, to address the ongoing climate crisis there is a need to include cities in decision-making practices for effective multilevel responses such as efficient strategies that involve multiple levels of organizations working together. It is essential to include cities in the discussion around global warming, greenhouse gas mitigation, and climate change adaptation. There is a need to understand how different actors in society can work together for various governance processes to support sustainability. However, collaborative governance can be seen as highly resource-consuming and idealistic, and it risks becoming overly complex, overly promising, or diluting responsibility.

There is a recognized need to understand how to work with collaborative governance for city decision-makers. This is important because they make sense of complex ideas and messages from different societal, scientific, and industrial groups. This study examines practitioners' understanding of collaborative governance, how it works, and is experienced using the case of the Swedish strategic innovation program Viable Cities. Viable Cities' mission is to accelerate the climate transition towards Climate Neutral Cities 2030, with a good life for all within the boundaries of the planet. Viable Cities aims to create new forms of governance and management to govern the process together, from a bottom-up approach, with municipalities, authorities, the business community, civil society, and their member organizations. A collaborative process in these aspects requires a horizontal share of knowledge to build trust and interaction that relies on communication between multiple different actors. The study collected data through semi-structured interviews, observations, and literature. Additionally, to identify these key factors for a collaborative process, this study applied the collaborative dynamics from Emerson et al.'s Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance to examine how collaborative governance is understood and perceived in practice by representatives from climate neutral municipalities, Viable Cities, and authorities.

The collaborative dynamics are referred to as principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. I have provided an understanding of how

the process is experienced through identifying the elements within collaborative dynamics to the representatives' understanding of collaborative governance. The result indicates that the representatives believe collaboration is important for new ways of governance. Almost all representatives referred to their mission as changing the old ways of policymaking with a bottom-up approach where they can include everyone in the process. For that collaboration, communication between different actors, and cooperation between different levels are recognized as necessary. On the other hand, the representatives' understanding of how collaborative governance should be carried out is difficult to analyse in this specific case since it appears to have different meanings at different levels and a wide definition. This leads to a broad definition and use of collaborative governance. However, this study saw that the representatives connected successful collaborative governance to mutual trust and knowledge exchange that happens when the representatives meet face-to-face with different actors as well as involve civil dialogue.

These findings can contribute to an initial knowledge of how collaborative dynamics are understood in decision and policymaking for climate neutral cities and similar strategic innovation programs. In a wider perspective, the research provides additional knowledge about the importance of face-to-face interaction, communication, and trust-building in governance processes for Swedish cities and their work towards sustainability. The results can also help city decision-makers to understand the prerequisites for collaboration. The understanding of how collaborative governance is experienced in practice is important in order to develop processes that are not highly resource-consuming, idealistic, overly complex, overly promising, or risk diluting responsibility. With this, I hope to contribute to how collaborative governance is understood in practice, for anyone concerned about knowledge, communication, and experience of collaborative governance dynamics in an interdisciplinary field.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my family and friends for supporting me through the process of writing this thesis. I want to thank the representatives who took their time to be interviewed and share their experiences and thoughts, without you this work would not have been possible. I also want to thank my supervisor Hanna Bergeå for guiding me through this journey with useful comments and encouragement while still allowing the work to be my own.

Appendix 1

Hej tack för att du deltar

- Samtycke till inspelning
- Frågor innan vi börjar och deltagare information om uppsatsen

Introduktion och bakgrundsinformation

- Vad är relationen till Viable Cities
- Vad betyder Klimatneutrala städer 2030 egentligen
- Varför gick ni med
- Vad är målet / vad är ert syfte

Collaborative Governance

- Vad är collaborative governance, vad är samstyre/kollaborativt styre
- Hur tar ni del av samstyre i ert arbete
- Hur tas beslut
- Hur fördelas ansvar
- Vad är viktigt/mindre viktigt med samarbete
- Vilka ska driva arbetet

Vad finns det för mötesplatser mellan kommun, Viable Cities och myndighet

- Vilka deltar på eventen och vilka är svårare att få med
- Behövs dessa mötesplatser
- Varför behövs mötesplatser
- Har du personligen deltagit på några aktiviteter från Viable Cities
- Vilka av dem
- Hur var det
- Om flera, upplever du någon skillnad
- Har relationerna påverkats av mötena
- Var kunskaps utbyte stöttat av processer vid dessa möten mellan aktörer på olika samhällsnivåer och hur
- Hur tydliggörs syftet med mötena för deltagarna
- Ska syftet tydliggöras
- Hur bidrar det till delad förståelse och samarbete i mobiliseringen
- Hur skapar ni mötesplatser för att involvera aktörer från olika samhällssektorer?
- Hur länge har ni haft kontakt med de flesta aktörer

- Har ni märkt skillnad på arbetet utifrån relationer som byggts
- Vad passar inte bra / fungerar inte bra/
- Vad är utmaningar med ert arbete mellan städer och aktörer
- Vart skulle du vilja se fokus på utvecklig och satsa resurser
- Finns det något ni skulle vilja förbättra eller göra annorlunda i ert arbete framöver
- Varför anser ni att inkludering av olika aktörer är viktigt för era project/ arbete
- Är det svårt att inkludera någon specifik grupp

Lokalt arbete med kommunikation och samarbete

- Vilka strategier används för samarbete med olika aktörer och nivåer i samhället
- Kan du ge exempel på några framgångsrika samarbetsprojekt där ni har involverat olika aktörer
- Kan du ge exempel på någon gång man har haft problem med att samarbeta
- Hur hanterar man och bemöter missnöje
- Hur skapar ni lokala mötesplatser för att involvera aktörer
- Vad går bra/ fungerar mindre bra
- Vilka utmaningar med samstyre har ni lokalt
- Finns det något ni skulle vilja förbättra eller göra annorlunda

Kunskap och resurser

- Vem får man kunskap från/ vem har kunskap om vad
- Har ni tillräckligt med kunskap/ information
- När eller hur markerar man att man inte har tillräckligt med kunskap och vad händer då
- Vem vänder man sig till för kunskap
- Hur vet man vad man ska göra och hur delar man med sig av sin kunskap och kompetens
- Hur använder ni information och kunskap
- Vilka resurser krävs för ett effektivt samstyre och samverkan
- Vart skulle du vilja se fokus på, vilka resurser behövs framöver

Reflektioner och Utveckling

- Vad har ni lärt er genom era erfarenheter med att skapa inkluderande mötesplatser och samarbeta för hållbara städer
- Vilka råd skulle du ge till andra städer som vill arbeta med liknande initiativ för hållbara städer.
- Vad önskar du att ni hade haft med er från början eller hade ni gjort något annorlunda
- Finns det något annat du skulle vilja dela med dig av som vi inte har pratat om ännu

Tack så mycket för ditt deltagande

Appendix 2

The analysed documents are all published by Viable Cities and contain elements relevant to how Viable Cities describe governance and the collaborative processes. The documents are listed in table 3. Though the documents are in Swedish, I translated relevant headlines and sub-headings I found central to this study. In the first document, Communication strategy, I analysed headlines *operative lines of communication* (operative kommunikationsvägar), *aim* (syfte), strategy (strategi) and so forth. This document enabled me to get an understanding about how Viable Cities describe Transition Lab Forum and other operative and controlled ways of communication, the aim of the strategic innovation program and how they chose to motivate and strategically approach their mission. In the second document – program description phase 3, I analysed headlines *climate contract 2030 and mission infrastructure* (Klimatkontrakt 2030 och missionsinfrastruktur) and *appropriate forms of governance management* (Ändamålsenliga former för styrning och ledning) closer. The last document, Climate transition of cities (Klimatomställning av städer) is a governance report from Allan Larsson and has much relevant information that provides knowledge and substance to this report. Relevant background information is about policy overview, governance and implementation in urban development projects, and new forms of support for innovation.

Table 3. Titles, subheadings, and a brief description of the Viable Cities documents and reports analysed in this study.

Document title	Sub - headings	Description
Kommunikationsstrategi; viable cities etapp 3, 2024-2027	Aim, strategy, line of communication	Viable Cities communication enables connection between many different actors in society to achieve climate neutral cities 2030.
Viable Cities programplan 2021–2027; inriktning av det strategiska innovationsprogramme	Climate city contract 2030 and mission infrastructure, appropriate forms of	Program content and strategy forward

t Viable Cities, etapp 3, november 2023	governance management	
Klimatomställning av städer - En svensk governance-modell för att öka takten i omställningen	Why cities, why governance? Viable Cities: Climate City Contracts 2030	Provide a policy-relevant overview of two new elements of sustainable development, as well as new forms of governance to lead, govern and implement urban development projects, as well as new forms of support for innovation in the form of system-changing missions. Contribute to the further development of these experiences and lessons learnt focus on new forms of governance for climate change transition in cities and municipalities.

Publishing and archiving

Approved students' theses at SLU are published electronically. As a student, you have the copyright to your own work and need to approve the electronic publishing. If you check the box for **YES**, the full text (pdf file) and metadata will be visible and searchable online. If you check the box for **NO**, only the metadata and the abstract will be visible and searchable online. Nevertheless, when the document is uploaded it will still be archived as a digital file. If you are more than one author, the checked box will be applied to all authors. You will find a link to SLU's publishing agreement here:

- <https://libanswers.slu.se/en/faq/228318>.

YES, I/we hereby give permission to publish the present thesis in accordance with the SLU agreement regarding the transfer of the right to publish a work.

NO, I/we do not give permission to publish the present work. The work will still be archived and its metadata and abstract will be visible and searchable.