"Take It or Leave It": From Collaborative to Regulative Developer Dialogues in Six Swedish Municipalities Aiming to Climate-Proof Urban Planning
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Abstract: Enhancing legitimacy and effectiveness of climate policy requires improved interactions between and within administrative levels, the latter including horizontal public–private coordination. In the heavily decentralized Swedish urban planning process, developer dialogues are used to enhance collaboration and thereby increase the climate-proofing of new housing districts. In practice, municipalities struggle with identifying what types of collaborative arrangements best support the realization of climate goals, in light of strong property developer interests and bargaining. Based on qualitative interviews with coordinating planners, this paper illustrates lessons from repeated collaborative practices in six Swedish municipalities. We analytically characterize a shift between first- and second-generation developer dialogues. In first-generation dialogues, coordinators attempted to ensure jointly agreed upon principles, priorities and commitments, which instead resulted in troublesome negotiations. In second-generation dialogues, coordinators used mixed approaches to ensure more competitive and climate-proof urban development by mechanisms of indirect command and control. Principles of collaborative interaction were abandoned to regain control over urban planning. This documented shift contrasts heavily with theoretical assumptions from the climate governance literature, where enhanced collaboration assumedly increase effectiveness of climate policy implementation. Acknowledging the practical implications of using developer dialogues to climate-proof urban planning in different settings is critical for improved policy implementation.
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1. Introduction

Effective multilevel responses are required for societies to address our ongoing climate crisis and be able to integrate climate considerations in key decision-making practices. To accomplish policy integration, improved horizontal coordination between public and private actors is needed [1]. Investing in public–private interaction is expected to enhance legitimacy and effectiveness of governing climate change [2–6]. It can also, however, have unintended side-effects that rather reduce legitimacy, accountability and hamper implementation [1,7]. Assessing the benefits and limitations of various types of practical collaborations between public and private actors allows us to gradually identify what types of collaborative arrangements and implementation mechanisms best support the realization of climate goals [2,8].

In this paper, we direct our focus to practices of urban planning. Cities are, through their various operations, contributing heavily to increased climate change and the current lock-in to carbon-dependency. Cities are also highly vulnerable to the consequences of a changing climate,
signaling the urgency of urban responses to climate change and intensified research endeavors targeting urban practices [9–11]. Urban planning becomes a key arena for managing both the causes and effects of climate change in cities [12–14]. Additionally, in this context, improving interaction between public and private actors is deemed critical [15,16]. While Swedish urban planning is heavily decentralized, with municipalities having “monopoly on planning”, the starting-point for enhanced public–private interaction comes from the national level.

In 1998 the National Government initiated the Building and Living Dialogue (Sw. ByggaBoDialogen), a national voluntary educational program involving dialogues between national authorities, municipalities and the private building sector with the goal to increase knowledge of and engagement for sustainable development. As part of this, an initiative called Constructive dialogues (Sw. Det goda samtalet) was launched in 2004 and applied in six municipalities. Property developers were to be engaged early in planning to interact with public actors for developing sustainable and attractive cities. Practical experiences differed, and assessments reported primarily on challenges in terms of limited ability of municipalities to steer development and settle commitments in urban planning towards implementing sustainability or climate policy goals. As Smedby and Neij stated “although goals were not overly ambitious, they were not reached” [17]. Despite this, similar collaborative initiatives, termed developer dialogues, have thereafter spread across the country. Some cities have repeatedly used developer dialogues as a means for raising ambitions in planning, of which the work in Malmö is perhaps most renowned [18,19], while others have attempted using dialogues in singular high-profile sustainable districts [20]. Additionally, outside the Swedish context, practical experiences of collaborative interactions vary, documenting challenges with reluctant property developers [21,22], dialogues resulting in weakened rules and regulations [21,23] and efforts favoring the position of private actors [24,25].

It thus remains to be clarified what the forms and focus of a productive public–private interaction to strengthen opportunities for climate-proofing in planning are. There are recent indications that the identified problems can be explained by either place-dependency, where municipalities located far from the larger cities and are considered less attractive by property developers which limits their willingness to invest in climate measures [26], or lack of previous experience, where municipalities previously unaccustomed to use collaborative interaction have limited steering-capacity [20]. Picking up on these indications, we turn our empirical focus to municipalities that both are considered attractive and have a longer history of using developer dialogues to extract lessons regarding what forms and focus might ensure a more productive interaction. Following this, the aim of this paper is to assess how abilities to govern urban development towards increased climate-proofing evolve over time when using developer dialogues as collaborative interaction. Lessons from practices adopted in six attractive municipalities that have repeatedly worked with developer dialogues are put in focus for the analysis. Three research questions guide the analysis:

1. How do the six municipalities use developer dialogues to strengthen urban climate-proofing over time?
2. How are these developer dialogues organized and what steering-strategies are used? How are collaborative and authoritarian elements of interaction balanced?
3. What challenges are identified in using public–private interaction to support climate policy implementation? How can more effective forms of interaction be created?

Lessons of what works in practice in the six municipalities, highlighting both differences and similarities between municipalities, are important.

After this introduction follows methodological considerations, motivating the selection of municipalities and presenting the approach taken for gathering and analyzing data. Thereafter the paper turns to theoretically characterizing the ideal of, and critical components for, collaborative interaction. This will then be put in relation to the empirical data which is analytically structured in
two sections, characterizing the first- and second-generation developer dialogues respectively. In a final section, key conclusions are drawn regarding shifting interactive practices for climate-proofing.

2. Materials and Methods

The paper empirically builds on interviews with municipal coordinators of developer dialogues in six Swedish municipalities. Previously, studies have been made of municipal use of developer dialogues in the form of singular cases, either in-depth explorations in singular municipalities like Karlstad [20] and Norrköping [27] or comparative studies targeting several municipalities but evaluating a specific dialogue initiative (Sw. Det goda samtalet) launched in 2004 [17].

In this paper, we instead make a comparison between six municipalities that have a history of using developer dialogues as a collaborative approach to climate-proof urban development. This means that we can draw conclusions of how such collaborative efforts evolve over time and identify lessons regarding what works or not from municipalities with a vast experience of coordinating such activities. The large cities of Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö and the cities of Uppsala, Örebro and Lund were included. The three larger cities were in previous studies identified as having a frontrunner status of working with developer dialogues to reach broader sustainability and specific climate goals [17,20,27]. The additional cities were identified by initial contacts with the three larger cities, where examples of other municipalities repeatedly using developer dialogues were asked for. In all six municipalities, property development today is booming. Several city districts with a high sustainability and climate profile have recently been built or are under construction, where developer dialogues are a key strategy (see Table 1). Often such city districts function as municipal learning labs for progressing with innovative green and/or climate-oriented agendas at municipal level [18,19].

Table 1. Included cities, their climate goals and relevant city districts.

| City      | Population | Climate Goals in Comprehensive Plan (ÖP)                                                                 | Districts Using Developer Dialogues, Mentioned in the Interviews |
|-----------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Stockholm | 949,761    | “A climate-smart and robust city” that is fossil-free and adapted for a changing climate (2018).            | Hammarby Sjöstad, Brofästet, Södra Värtan, Kolskajen            |
| Göteborg  | 564,039    | “A climate-smart and robust city” that reduce emissions and adapt settlements and infrastructure (2018).  | Eriksberg, Sandgården, Kvillebäcken, Lindholmshamnen, Frihamnen |
| Malmö     | 333,633    | “Ambitious sustainability goals aimed at energy efficiency, reduced transportation and adaptation” (2018). | Bo01, Flagghusen, Fullruggaren, Kappseglaren, Sorgenfri, Nyhamnen |
| Uppsala   | 219,914    | Facilitate “responsible societal development that contributes to climate recovery” (2016).                  | Östra Sala Backe stage 1–2, Ulleråker, Rosendal stage 1–3        |
| Örebro    | 150,291    | “A climate neutral municipality that reduce climate impacts and manage a changing climate” (2017).        | Södra Ladugårdsängen stage 1–2.5                                  |
| Lund      | 121,274    | “Reduce climate emissions close to zero, prioritise sustainable mobility and climate adaptation” (2018).  | Brunnhögs stage 1–3                                            |

We chose to interview key municipal coordinators with extensive experience of working with developer dialogues. Instead of interviewing several municipal actors involved in planning, to capture actors in different roles/functions and to be able to triangulate data within municipalities, we specifically sought to pinpoint these key actors—their lessons and long-term practical experiences of designing and mediating developer dialogues—as our starting-point. Based on their lengthy experience it was possible for us to capture perspectives of changed interactive practices. Seven interviewees from the
six municipalities were interviewed between October 2017 and February 2018 (see Table 2). During the interviews, a consistent pattern was observed in how developer dialogues were used, leading us to conclude that we had reached a saturation point where the value of adding new interviews was limited [28].

Table 2. Interviewees.

| City       | Interviewee                  | Gender | Personal Driving-Force                                                                 |
|------------|------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Stockholm  | Project Leader Norra Djurgårdsstaden | Female | Improve conditions for everyday life. Improve social sustainability.                    |
| Göteborg   | Process Leader Sustainability | Female | Sustainable development. Solving tricky challenges by collaboration.                   |
| Malmö      | Project Leader Exploitation   | Male   | Developing collaborative methods for sustainable cities.                                 |
| Uppsala    | Planning Architect           | Female | Improving living-conditions and genuinely make the most of the city.                    |
| Örebro 1   | Head of Land Exploitation     | Male   | Creating sound projects and ensuring internal collaboration.                            |
| Örebro 2   | Planning Architect           | Female | Safeguarding proper urban space and functions. Seeing the larger picture.               |
| Lund       | Project Leader Brunnsköld   | Female | Create districts that bring long-term values to the city and its inhabitants.            |

The interviews followed an interview guide, targeting how property developer dialogues were organized over time and how they influence urban climate-proofing. Initial open questions were combined with specific follow-up questions to theoretically characterize collaborative interaction and its different components. Each interview lasted approximately 1.5 hours and was audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interview transcripts were analyzed inductively and stepwise with the goal of “reflecting upon the patterned character of participants’ portrayals of action” [28] (p. 448). We combined the exploration of specific contents of each interview with identifying reoccurring analytical themes regarding developer dialogues, following the aim of the paper. The validity of interpretations is strengthened by comparing interview statements from different municipal contexts [29], where we identify a high level of agreement in many of the response patterns. The regular use of verbatim quotes from interviewees allows clarification of what leads us to draw certain analytical conclusions. Many of the quotes presented function as examples of general analytical patterns. Where similar statements are made by several interviewees this is also systematically noted to increase transparency and validity of interpretations. It is, however, equally important in qualitative studies to illustrate individual perspectives when they highlight important alternative versions, which deepen our understanding of the research questions [29]. Since there are few municipal documents available describing the process of collaborative interaction, systematic method triangulation comparing interview statements with local policies is not possible. Some notable exceptions are documentation regarding the early type of developer dialogue in Malmö [30] that have been used.

3. Theoretical Perspectives

Traditionally, governing implies sharp boundaries between public and private realms where the former steers society by means of “rule-orientated, legalistic and formal” hierarchies and authoritarian instruments of command and control [31] (p. 2). What is called the collaboration imperative or the collaborative governance paradigm came as a response to implementation failures emanating from such hierarchical state-centered practices [32]. Acknowledging that the public domain is increasingly dependent upon outside actors to mobilize knowledge, resources and support for the realization of policy agendas, new interactive arenas are seen as a way to increase the quality and effectiveness of
policy implementation [33–35]. They are also seen as a means to foster innovative practices supporting the realization of bold, reinvigorating and cutting-edge ideas [4,36]. Distinguishing itself from both the hierarchical (state-centered command/control) and the market-based (self-coordination of autonomous actors) modes of governing, the dominating policy instruments for collaborative governance are communicative and negotiated agreements [5,37]. Applied and studied in diverse policy contexts such as planning, public administration, risk management and environmental governance, definitions of collaborative interaction vary. Ansell and Gash defines collaborative interaction as “a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making-process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets” [38] (p. 544). Emerson et al. uses a somewhat broader definition of “constructively engaging” participants, e.g., the state, the private sector, civil society, and the community in partnerships, networks, co-management regimes or community-based collaboratives to carry out “a public purpose” [39] (p. 2). For the purpose of studying Swedish developer dialogues, we align with the first definition suggesting collaborative interactions as formal arrangements led by public actors.

While “ultimate authority still lies with the public agency”, processes are non-hierarchical, meaning that the role of public actors change “from authoritarian decision-makers to negotiation partners and mediators” [34,37]. Participants work collectively towards achieving consensus, meaning that they are directly involved in producing policy outcomes [38] (p. 846). Negotiation and bargaining are central elements in collaborative interactions [32]. This negotiative setting thus means that there must be “a real chance of leaving the bargaining table with a result that is beneficial to all parties” [34] (p. 325). A collaborative mode of interaction is horizontal and further denoted by trust, mutual respect, interactive personal relations, regular communication, shared responsibilities and little competition between the main parties [21,31,37,40]. Driessen et al. acknowledges the importance of “proceeding with caution” in the interactive process. This means “weighing interests and cultivating consensus, explaining the decisions, making the steps transparent, and clarifying the roles of the participants” also realizing that “consensus have to be continuously verified” [34] (p. 325f).

Heterogeneous collaborative experiments have resulted in large variations in local applications [38] meaning that differences in intentions and practical outcomes in terms of, e.g., scope, scale, actor relations, activity among intensity among collaborative arrangements [31,40] are expected. We may also, at closer glance, find mixed approaches where what is initially framed as collaborative interaction is shown to involve elements of hierarchical steering or steering through competition [40]. Collaborative interaction may create needs to activate other types of steering and control, meaning that “shadows of hierarchy” may still prevail, thus shaping practical outcomes [32] (p. 105). Studies have also shown that modes of interaction can change during an interactive process, where initial collaborative interaction is gradually transformed to traditional regulation as planning proceeds [20].

Several studies have made efforts to outline theoretical frameworks of critical components for making collaborative interactions work in practice [31,38,39]. Some recurrent key components that are emphasized as being important for creating capacity for collaboration are:

1. Motive: The participants need to identify added value, joint interests and collaborative advantage of taking part in the collaboration.
2. Organizational design: The collaboration needs to build on structures, procedures, roles and responsibilities that strengthen shared ownership, mutual trust and understanding.
3. Constructive dialogue: The collaboration needs to build on face-to-face deliberations, based on candid and reasoned communication, fostering productive and self-reinforcing interactions among participants, as team-players.
4. Knowledge-sharing: The participants needs to be willing to share knowledge and learn from each other, to facilitate the pooling of resources and innovation.
5. Outcomes: The collaboration needs to A. Develop shared meaning and definitions, B. Develop joint commitments and agreements, and, C. Enact these joint commitments and agreements.
The theoretical literature also states that the extent and quality of collaborative dynamics depend on self-reinforcing cycles of the above-mentioned components where, e.g., mutual trust and understanding influence legitimacy and commitments [39] (p. 13). Further, the prehistory of cooperation or conflict between parties may prove important for outcomes [38].

Empirical studies of public–private collaborations in urban planning show examples of both more successful collaboration, where climate ambitions are increasingly benchmarked [21,25], and more problematic collaboration, where the complexity of interacting have instead increased conflicts and led to excessive private influence in planning [23,24,37]. In the Swedish case of using developer dialogues in urban planning there are similarly experiences of positive outcomes, where dialogues are effective for advancing learning and knowledge exchange with respect of climate change [18,19], and experiences of dialogues leading to more limited outcomes in terms of enhancing sustainability and/or climate considerations in urban development [17,20]. Torfing et al. writing extensively on the theory and practice of collaborative governance, summarize the challenges involved; involving corporate interests may “significantly boost the city’s governing capacity” but it also “puts it in a complex dependency toward the corporate sector” which may produce suboptimal results because of the extensive negotiations involved” [32] (p. 39). Den Uyl and Russel further illustrates how this can manifest itself in the form of deadlocks or inaction, impeding implementation [7].

These theoretical characterizations of the ideals and the practical challenges of collaborative interaction are used to analytically illustrate the practice of using developer dialogues in the six municipalities.

4. Results

Through the empirical analysis, a sharp distinction is revealed between how municipal coordinators describe a first- and second-generation developer dialogues. Early first-generation dialogues, representing initial attempts to engage in public–private interaction, are more aligned with the ideals of collaborative interaction. Lessons drawn of the practical challenges of achieving the goals for collaborative interaction in all municipalities have led the municipal coordinators to gradually revise their approach to public–private interaction. In what can analytically be described as second-generation dialogues, the interaction relies less on the ideals of collaborative interaction and more on traditional regulatory practices.

4.1. First-Generation Dialogues: Collaborative Interaction as Norm

The motives for engaging in developer dialogues is almost identical in the six municipalities. Except for the very initial attempts in Göteborg, where the goal was to trigger property development in a situation where nothing was being built, they key motives for the early developer dialogues are related to achieving municipal sustainability goals. For a city like Malmö, starting their dialogues at the turn of the millennium with the international housing exhibition BO01, interaction was used to “raise the sustainability bar”:

“When we started our dialogues the national building requirements for environmental sustainability was weak. We wanted to implement higher sustainability goals in urban development and needed the dialogues to raise the ambitions.” (Municipal coordinator, Malmö)

The characteristics of these developer dialogues was to engage property developers in a coherent and continuous process with municipal actors aiming to “develop housing areas with a specific sustainability profile” [30]. The interactive exchange of experience and learning was expected to raise both internal competence and general ambitions. Dialogues were also used to “strengthen the ability to find synergies and realize innovations” in urban development [30].

In the early dialogues, collaborative forms of interaction were clearly the norm. Property developers were invited early on and the dialogues aimed at jointly creating both a detailed development plan and a formal sustainability agreement:
In the first phase of Östra Sala Backe we invited property developers broadly to cooperate with us in a dialogue process to identify joint and concrete goals based on our vision. It built heavily on collaboration.” (Municipal coordinator, Uppsala. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Göteborg, Lund, Malmö)

The general idea, referred to in the above-mentioned interviews, was that the dialogues would ensure trust, understanding and education so that property developers would start seeing the benefits of approaching environmental sustainability instead of the short-term thinking of building and selling houses. The organizational design of the dialogues was one that required engagement and cooperation from all involved parties and there were expectations of an increased understanding for the different roles and abilities of participants, following the ideals of collaborative interaction.

The municipal steering-mechanisms adopted in these collaborative interactions involved selecting participants and setting an overall vision. In the initial stages of the collaborative process, the vision was jointly refined and filled with content. To improve the knowledge-base and facilitate sharing and learning from each other a combination of regular meetings, study-visits, inspirational lectures and concrete workshops took place. In all municipalities the goal was to jointly produce an ambitious outcome, e.g., sustainability programs or sustainability agreements that would specify conditions for development. Additionally, the detailed development plan was primarily co-produced between municipalities and property developers. Another steering-mechanism used was delaying land-allocation meaning that focus turned to jointly taking a helicopter-perspective to identify solutions at the wider district-level instead of immediately targeting what was to be accomplished in specific building-plots. The collaborative ideal manifested itself in an interaction focused on identifying collaborative advantages and offering face-to-face dialogues to build trust, understanding and knowledge-sharing which would then support the establishing of joint perspectives and priorities.

While municipalities do report on successful early dialogues (Malmö: Fullriggaren, Kappseglaren), it is equally clear from the interviews that the first generation of developer dialogues were generally presented as too demanding and highly unproductive:

"Developers are often passive. They do not want to show anything about their projects in front of their competition. Meetings often turns out as one-way communications which is sad. I wanted a dialogue amongst them, that they would also make an effort. They have been spoiled by being served by us, expecting the municipality will fix everything down to the smallest Danish pastry.” (Municipal coordinator, Malmö. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Göteborg, Örebro)

All interviewees present examples of tangled and protracted processes where dialogues resulted in unproductive bargaining which limited the ability to raise sustainability and climate agendas:

"Collaborative dialogues take too much time and property developers often try to avoid making tough commitments. There are endless discussions and negotiations.” (Municipal coordinator, Lund. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Göteborg, Malmö, Stockholm, Uppsala)

While negotiations as such are a key element in collaborative interaction, following the theoretical perspectives, shifting the power-balance between public and private actors made it difficult to achieve the goal of ambitious outcomes. The consensual agreements produced tended to be temporary and loose force as plans proceeded towards their practical realization. This was suggested in most municipalities:

"When land is being allocated they promise sincerely what to do but later they come and say 'well it got too expensive because of the demands you pose on us.’” (Municipal coordinator, Göteborg. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Lund, Malmö, Uppsala)

Interviewees suggest that property developers tried to optimize their economic gains, which resulted in diluted measures based on smallest common denominators requiring only limited efforts:
When the land was allocated, they knew we wouldn’t kick them out and then what could we do. They move forward their positions to increase profits. Collaboration isn’t cosy. It is a harsh reality we live in” (Municipal coordinator, Lund. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Malmö, Uppsala, Göteborg)

This meant that collaborative interactions did not accelerate urban climate-proofing. Rather, efforts turned flat:

“We got stuck in long checklists with very little energy and lust. Property developers ticked off ‘yes we have a birdhouse for biodiversity’. They did it because they had to but without engagement and willingness.” (Municipal coordinator, Lund. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Malmö, Uppsala, Göteborg)

In practice, the dialogues did not manage to become the expected springboard for climate-proofing urban development. Additionally, it was clear that developer dialogues took a lot of energy from the municipality. In the district of Sorgenfri in Malmö, it took 10 years to produce a joint detailed development plan due to disagreements both internally between municipal departments and between municipal coordinators and property developers. This created stress, frustration and triggered a rethinking of the organization of public–private interaction in urban development. The other municipalities have drawn similar conclusions regarding a necessary change in how developer dialogues are designed and practiced. According to municipal coordinators, the dialogues simply did not deliver the intended outcomes (Municipal coordinators Lund, Malmö, Uppsala, Stockholm, Göteborg). Due to this, the public–private interaction has evolved quite substantially over time. The second-generation developer dialogues are quite far from the ideals of collaborative interaction.

4.2. Second-Generation Dialogues: Increased Regulative Steering

The municipal coordinators motivate the current take on developer dialogues by the perceived lack of steering-capacity emanating from the early dialogues. Opening urban development to collaborative interaction between municipal coordinators and private property developers neither led to increased efficiency nor to enhanced climate-proofing. The recent change in design of developer dialogue is therefore a conscious attempt by municipalities to increase municipal control to regain quality and protect long-term values in urban development:

“It increases the quality of our accomplishments and secures municipal control over questions that are locally important.” (Municipal coordinator, Örebro 1. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Stockholm, Uppsala, Göteborg, Lund)

This stricter steering becomes a way to make sure that developer dialogues increase the ambitions of specific sustainable development or climate change goals in planning:

“Dialogues makes it possible to gather strength and communicate what we want to achieve with key goals such as climate change. It is about raising the bar.” (Municipal coordinator, Lund. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Göteborg, Örebro, Malmö, Uppsala, Stockholm)

In that sense, the new type of dialogue thus serves to ensure the will, ambition and expectations of the city where public actors beforehand set the terms for what private actors need to deliver in urban development. Municipal coordinators see the clarification of such terms beforehand as important for efficiency:

“The more we have settled before developers come in the better. They need to see all the facts in the prospectus. Order and remedy. They like that.” (Municipal coordinator, Lund. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Stockholm, Malmö, Göteborg, Uppsala, Örebro)
This means that the room for compromise and negotiation that risk reducing climate efforts diminishes heavily. Facilitating such clear-cut public steering of urban development is seen as a municipal responsibility:

"It is, after all, the role of the municipality to get the market to act on societal needs, to put responsibility on developers. Municipalities must get stronger in stating what is good and bad." (Municipal coordinator, Göteborg. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Malmö, Lund, Stockholm, Uppsala, Örebro)

This stricter approach is also motivated in all municipalities by the current need to more efficiently progress with urban development to meet acute housing shortage. A clear and coherent municipal steering is believed to allow municipalities to “make the most of the time we live in” as an obligation to those in public administration who have been brave and put climate change on the agenda, as the municipal coordinator in Uppsala puts it. The municipal coordinator in Lund also describes that not putting the publicly owned land on sale is an obligation to the citizens. A critical precondition for such an approach is the active use of municipal land ownership and that the land in question is highly valued by property developers, which is emphasized in all municipalities. Such beneficial conditions are most accentuated in the larger cities of Stockholm, Malmö and Göteborg:

“We have in Stockholm a very, very favorable position. We would be stupid if we didn’t take that opportunity to drive development.” (Municipal coordinator, Stockholm. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Malmö and Göteborg).

The cities of Lund, Uppsala and Örebro have also gradually become braver in setting their standards, although conditions vary somewhat compared to the larger cities:

“The first attempts were fumbling but when we see that there is demand, an ability to make the projects work and a good response even to the highest demands we become more secure in setting standards.” (Municipal coordinator, Uppsala. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Lund, Örebro)

There are also striking similarities in how the municipalities enact this stricter steering. In a preparatory phase, the municipality produces the detailed development plan (Municipal coordinators Stockholm, Uppsala, Lund, Örebro). In Örebro, Uppsala, Malmö (Nyhamnen) this plan is general and flexible. In Stockholm it is a draft. The municipal coordinators emphasize the importance of having an internal process where municipal departments are coordinated, to avoid previous organizational silos:

“We have an internal process where all relevant questions are highlighted. We gather from all departments for coordination: what to do and how to solve tricky issues. Everyone partakes, gets the same picture and feels responsibility.” (Municipal coordinator, Malmö. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Stockholm, Uppsala)

This new approach creates a knitted and creative group where important matters are discussed and solved beforehand while also allowing the municipality to speak with a common voice towards property developers:

“We need to become one municipality. Not a municipality where answers differ depending on which official you speak to but a united front.” (Municipal coordinator, Örebro. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Malmö, Stockholm, Uppsala)

When the municipality has already produced an existing detailed development plan, predictability is provided, and the risk of later appeals reduced. Further, municipal coordinators present not detailed demands but goals, visions and concepts in prospectus and sustainability programs, clarifying public expectations for the new district. Criteria for assessing future property developer proposals are also specified. This preparatory work, undertaken before property developers enter the stage, serves as a strengthened steering-mechanism:
"We have used it as a steering-strategy by saying what we will reward. Thereafter it is up to the market to respond to our request." (Municipal coordinator, Örebro2. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Stockholm, Lund, Uppsala)

Instead of public and private actors jointly determining demands, which triggered unproductive bargaining in the first-generation dialogues, or settling demands gradually, which property developers interpret as municipalities imposing demands afterwards, the key is to clarify public expectations early. The decision to partake is then left to the market:

"Taking part in property development is voluntary. Either developers accept the prospectus or they do not apply for land allocation. Take it or leave it. It is a success-factor to be clear about the intentions of the city, our ambitions and expectations." (Municipal coordinator, Stockholm. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Lund, Malmö, Uppsala, Örebro, Göteborg)

This leaves property developers with the task to compete with each other for land allocation by submitting competitive and sharp proposals that meet public expectations:

"They have to decide what to excel in and show what they can do in competition with others. It is not a dialogue focused on bargaining." (Municipal coordinator, Lund. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Uppsala, Malmö, Stockholm)

According to municipal coordinators, proposals also enable property developers to present innovative spear-head solutions in areas where they want to excel:

"We have given them challenges in order to find the cutting-edge. We don’t say how they should solve them but that we will evaluate how well they respond to them. It is a chance for developers to excel where they want to. / … / The element of competition is used as a springboard for finding good solutions." (Municipal coordinator, Uppsala. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Malmö, Lund, Stockholm)

The proposals submitted by property developers are then evaluated by municipal coordinators to identify who performs best according to the stipulated assessment criteria:

"We control what the city wants and developers have to deliver sharp proposals backed up with calculations where we can pick and choose. Those who fulfils the expectations are allocated land on one of the best places in Sweden." (Municipal coordinator, Malmö. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Lund, Stockholm, Uppsala, Örebro2)

To keep the public steering intact, the tendency is to further prolong the actual selling of the land until “the package of promises” have been fulfilled. Either land is sold when building permits are given or when building is initiated. Before this, an interactive process takes place to secure the intended outcomes. In Örebro, a stepwise process for interaction is used:

"First we sign a prestudy agreement where developers in dialogue with us agree on how the property will be developed and built. We discuss and give feedback to provide new ideas and solutions. When we are ready, we sign a reservation agreement. When developers apply for building permits, we are contacted by the building permit department to ensure that the application fits what we previously have agreed on. If there is a mismatch, developers must redo their work. Not until they start building, we actually sell the land." (Municipal coordinator, Örebro1)

Municipal coordinators in Örebro do not deem large competence seminars and interactions as necessary for the ability to create efficient processes that provide results:

"We need the dialogue but not these large forums really. We have the incentives we need and the tools to govern." (Municipal coordinator, Örebro2)
Contrary to such small-scale interactions between individual property developers and municipal coordinators, there are, in the other municipalities, various larger interactive processes at play from the stage of land allocation to the stage of building permits. The interviewed municipal coordinators are clear about the importance of nurturing acceptance by informing about the process, public expectations and why the city focus on energy, transportation, ecosystem services, etc. The goal is to share competence and provide inspiring successful examples that makes it possible for property developers to raise the bar. Such large meetings are deemed important to create a common point of reference (Municipal coordinators Malmö, Stockholm, Uppsala). Several interviewees note that these interactions have become more constructive in the second-generation dialogues:

"I had a colleague that quit his job due to the meetings we used to have. Now the meetings are really rewarding. The developers are interested and get a boost in knowledge. Now when they don’t sit there to bargain, they are motivated to engage." (Municipal coordinator, Lund. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Stockholm, Uppsala)

When the negotiating elements of interacting is reduced, the willingness to engage constructively in learning from each other and identifying new solutions thus appears to increase. Having property developers presenting their proposals can sometimes trigger a positive sense of competitiveness, as discussed by the following two quotes from the municipal coordinator in Stockholm:

"In one of the seminars one property developer started saying ‘this is impossible, we won’t accept this’. I just felt that everything would collapse right there since it was the first time with tough sustainability demands but then another developer got up and said ‘You mean you can’t handle it? We can.’ That stopped the whole discussion." (Municipal coordinator, Stockholm)

Seminars are also used to evaluate progress and assess the performance of property developers. To publicly show who gets green, yellow and red light according to municipal standards is an attempt to premier those who make an effort:

"We can use these seminars to say ‘those of you who are green and have chosen these solutions, you will pass, while those of you who are yellow are a bit uncertain and you have to make an effort’. When we have marked developers as red we say we need to meet you individually." (Municipal coordinator, Stockholm)

While the second-generation dialogues are mostly described as being beneficial and maneuverable, municipal coordinators are also clear that several challenges remain. For example, there is a need for better follow-up of what accomplishments property developers make on the way from proposal to concrete building. Here several municipal coordinators are currently in the process of developing and refining their steering-instruments (Municipal coordinators Göteborg, Uppsala, Lund). Additionally, throughout the dialogues, municipal coordinators need to be able to efficiently balance the roles of coaching facilitator and strict regulator, thus alternating between acting as good cop and bad cop:

"The balance between clarity and participation, between authority and project developer is tricky. Both expecting the municipality to act judge and to trigger new solutions in dialogue." (Municipal coordinator, Uppsala. Similar statements from municipal coordinators in Göteborg, Lund)

Balancing differing roles becomes pertinent for the ability of coordinators to more successfully manage developer dialogues and strengthen the role of climate and broader sustainability concerns. Keeping a stricter position in the interaction becomes the necessary guarantee for achieving quality:

"Throughout the process we create strong incentives for the property developers to act according to municipal expectations. As long as we own the land and have not renounced that mandate they have to adjust. It is our way of steering and securing quality in
While the interactive process in the second generation of developer dialogues appears more beneficial with respect of reaching municipal climate goals, it also deviates in many respects from the ideals of collaborative interaction. In reaction to the pitfalls from the first generation of developer dialogues, efforts are made to reduce the room for negotiation. The previous co-production of plans, programs and agreements are abandoned in favor of stricter steering-mechanisms.

5. Discussion

The analysis shows a clear pattern in how municipalities redesign their developer dialogues over time. Aligned with the theoretical basis of collaborative interaction, the first generation of developer dialogues were formal, consensus-oriented and deliberative [38], inviting property developers to partake in communicative exchange. While the interaction was still led by municipal coordinators, sustainability agreements, development plans and quality programs were co-produced in interactive practices [38]. In this context, participants were put on equal footing in horizontal and consensus-oriented interaction. This was an attempt to build understanding, agreement and joint ownership of strengthened climate and sustainability ambitions in urban development. Shadows of hierarchies did exist, with municipal efforts to steer interactions towards increased climate-proofing by different steering-mechanisms. However, this consensus-oriented interaction came at the prize of extended bargaining. The literature is clear that negotiations are inherent in collaborative interaction [5,32], allowing participants to benefit from their involvement [34]. However, the implications of bargaining also need to be clarified [32].

In the case of the property developer dialogues, bargaining become problematic since the property developers manage to shift power-balances in a way that reduce rather than enhance the overall sustainability and climate efforts, making it difficult to fulfil the intentions with the interaction. The risk of power-imbalance in planning, favoring private agendas, have been previously documented [20,23,24,37]. The first-generation developer dialogues are empirically described as protracted, ineffective and messy, flattening overall efforts and diluting the ability to steer urban development in new directions. Based on their experiences, municipal coordinators came to abandon the principles of collaborative interaction to regain control and ensure competitive and climate-proof urban development by mechanisms of indirect command and control. Instead of municipalities working with property developers in dialogue to jointly settle common grounds and agreeing on principles, priorities and commitments, as in the first-generation dialogues, the trend in the second-generation dialogues is regulation.

In the second generation of developer dialogues, municipal coordinators take a more active regulative approach, using a mix of approaches to ensure collectively binding agreements by mechanisms of indirect command and control. This stricter steering is more in line with traditional governing maintaining sharp boundaries between roles and responsibilities of public and private actors [31]. This means that hierarchies do not reside in shadows [32], as with the first-generation dialogues, but are instead open and transparent. The steering-mechanisms employed are sharpened. In the initial prospectus, public expectations are clearly communicated. Visions, quality programs and development plans are not open for negotiation, but instead settled beforehand by internal municipal coordination. Public actors clarify expectations, set objectives, identify goals, provide feedback, and review results. The municipality speaks with one voice and it is up to the property developers to prove themselves capable of fulfilling expectations in competition with others. Sharp proposals are evaluated by municipal coordinators against predefined assessment criteria and land allocation is further delayed, to ensure compliance. Using the element of performance management and competition creates incentives for property developers to follow municipal expectations. Joint agreements based on consensus and lengthy negotiations, where property developers were able to imprint outcomes, is avoided. An interaction of indirect command and control allows public actors to
provide incentives for private actors to accomplish strategic public objectives. Elements of constructive dialogue and knowledge-sharing in interactive settings is still used in most municipalities to gain acceptance and support the sharpening of proposals. Here it seems that when the negotiating element of interactions are reduced, the willingness to engage more constructively in learning from each other appears to increase, at least in some of the municipalities.

There are thus mostly differences, but also some similarities, when comparing the two generations of developer dialogues in the six municipalities (see Table 3).

| Overarching principle                                      | First-Generation Developer Dialogues | Second-Generation Developer Dialogues |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Motive/value                                               | Added value: Initiating public–private interaction to facilitate efficiency and raise ambitions for sustainability/climate-proofing. A belief in identifying joint interests and collaborative advantage. | Added value: Overcoming troublesome public–private interaction to facilitate efficiency and raise ambitions for sustainability/climate-proofing. A belief in safeguarding public interests. |
| Organizational Design                                      | Opening up boundaries of roles/responsibilities: horizontal and consensus-oriented interaction. | Maintaining sharp boundaries between roles/responsibilities of public and private actors. |
| Constructive dialogue                                      | Face-to-face deliberation led by public actors to build trust and understanding. Development plan, sustainability agreement and quality programs are co-produced. | Face-to-face deliberation led by public actors to clarify terms and expectations. |
| Knowledge-sharing                                          | Joint study-visits, seminars and workshops to enhance sharing and exchange of knowledge. | Joint study-visits, seminars and workshops to enhance sharing and exchange of knowledge. |
| Steering-mechanism: selecting participants                  | Participants are selected in competition, based on evaluating intentions. | Participants are selected in competition, based on evaluating sharp proposals. |
| Steering-mechanism: land allocation                        | Delayed land-allocation to focus on district-level solutions to ensure engagement and team-oriented private actors. | Delayed land-allocation and selling of the land to ensure both engagement and compliance of private actors. |
| Steering-mechanism: visions, plans and programs            | Public actors set the vision beforehand. | Public actors set the vision, development plan, sustainability and quality program beforehand. |
| Outcomes                                                   | Negotiated agreements: compromise and bargaining to determine what is acceptable. Limited incentives to excel. Outcomes are diluted/flat. | Private actors respond to requests by delivering sharp proposals in competition. Ambition is necessary and secured by gradual evaluation. |
| Benefits                                                   | The position/ambition of private actors. | The position/ambition of public actors. |

In answering the aim of the paper, we thus conclude that the ability to govern urban development towards increased climate-proofing is gradually strengthened, as the six municipalities revise their interactive practices. However, it is not a refinement of the critical components for successful collaborative practices discerned in previous research. Rather, the repeated experience of working with developer dialogues leads municipal coordinators to revise their interactive practices in a way that sharpens their own governing capacity. The forms for designing and conducting developer dialogues are changed in a way that ensures stronger public steering by means of performance management and indirect command and control, albeit with deliberative elements. While the current interaction appears more beneficial with respect of reaching ambitious climate goals and move towards the necessary climate-proofing of urban development, it also deviates quite substantially from the theoretical assumptions in the climate governance literature, emphasizing the importance of enhanced collaborative practices to support effective and innovative climate change policy implementation. To enhance the latter, a shift from collaborative to regulative developer dialogues appears necessary.

Even with the current take on public–private interaction, difficult challenges remain to take the steps needed towards more transformative urban development patterns. Evaluating progressive and
problematic efforts are required, both zooming in on specific districts and zooming out to capture overall urban development trends. Additionally, the ability to make necessary changes in the existing city structures, rather than pinpointing efforts made in newly built areas, is urgently required. We must also consider contextual differences. The study is undertaken in progressive municipalities where property development is currently booming, in a time where public debates on climate change is gaining ground. This creates a clear window of opportunity where municipalities with ambitions and attractive land to sell and develop can reclaim control over the urban development wheel to pursue their goals. Smaller cities that are considered less attractive and lack experience of engaging in public–private interactions are likely to experience difficulties with employing such an approach of “take it or leave it”. This was suggested in previous studies [20,26] and is increasingly clear from the current study. Conditions vary and accumulated experiences of developer dialogues, drawing lessons of what works and not, how practices can be sharpened and more effective, etc. can—as in the municipalities here targeted—create a positive spiral and bravery to take new steps. Acknowledging the practical implications of using developer dialogues to climate-proof urban planning in different local contexts with divergent dispositions and abilities to ensure effective coordination and action-space [1] is critical for improved climate-proofing.
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