

# Arena Breivoll, Norway

**Scored by name(s):** Trond Vedeld, Oslo Metropolitan University ([trondv@oslomet.no](mailto:trondv@oslomet.no)) and Gavin McCrory, Oslo Metropolitan University ([gamcc9382@oslomet.no](mailto:gamcc9382@oslomet.no))

**Date:** 14/11/2024

**Cite as:** Vedeld, T. & McCrory G. (2024). Arena Breivoll, Norway (GOGREEN Case Report Series No. 20), Roskilde: Roskilde University. ISBN: 978-87-7349-314-4

## **Is the project a case of...:**

- State-initiated co-creation
- Entrepreneur-driven co-creation
- Grassroots-based co-creation (NGO initiated)

*\*For an elaboration of the typology, please consult the GOGREEN theoretical framework p. 25.*

## **Integrated case analysis**

Before proceeding to the scoring of the GFs, please provide a 3–5 page case analysis in which you describe the background, history, and national, regional, and local contexts of the case, the problems and goals addressed by the local collaboration, the participating actors and their relationships, the unfolding of the co-creation process, the most important governance factors (this may include factors other than those in focus in this project), and the generated outputs and outcomes. The conclusion may specify a few lessons learned from the case study.

### **1) Background, history, and national, regional, and local contexts of the case**

#### **Arena Breivoll – The productive housing area Breivoll**

Arena Breivoll constitutes a multiparty platform across public and private organizations aimed to provide a shared vision for developing the local neighbourhood as a productive and sustainable residential micro-city. Such a 'Pådriv-arena' is a way of organizing an intervention across organizations and businesses to achieve concrete results within a geographic and/or thematic field ([www.paadriv.no](http://www.paadriv.no)). The idea of starting an Arena and a collaborative planning process matured over the period 2016-2020. Arena Breivoll was initiated by core leaders of Pådriv Oslo in the spring of 2021 observing the potentials of the area linked to a VPOR – a plan for use of public space – produced by the municipality of Oslo (2012) and on-going planning in adjacent neighbourhoods (Hovinbyen). Initially Pådriv mobilized a few local property owners and stakeholders around the co-creation of a vision note for Breivoll with the aim of producing a plan for transforming Breivoll into a sustainable, productive micro-city. A small catalyzing grant was provided by the municipality for start-up work, which also provided the process with public legitimacy. As a potential new housing area, Breivoll at the time of forming the Arena, lacked a realistic detailed plan and investment plan for realizing it as a 'station town' and substantive public transport hub in the short- and medium term. Funding from private business partners secured funding of the co-creation process and Pådriv's leadership role for a 2 years process.

Breivoll is a peri-urban area located on the outskirts of a major new development zone, Hovinbyen, in Eastern Oslo. It is an industrial low-density built-up area adjacent to River Alna and related green structures

and enclosed by E6 and several railway lines. It encompasses a set of local businesses, property owners and logistics firms. The River Alna and adjacent green areas are potentially important for recreation, biodiversity, and flood protection. The area's main attraction lies in the presence of several medium-scale property owners and local businesses interested in place-based development, and the area's location and low-density with available land for further development. The idea was to develop a multifunctional micro-city with new housing, services, and business development. It is confronted with challenges in terms of noise and pollution from transport/industry and contains few local cultural or developed natural attractions.

**Contextually**, it was critical that the **municipality** had pointed to Breivoll as a substantive public transport hub and development area in Oslo city's Municipal plan already in 2008, reinforced through municipal plans at regional, city-wide and local level. The development of the area attracted increased attention by both public and private agencies following the preparation of an informal guiding municipal plan for the area in 2012 (Guiding Plan for Public Space - VPOR). The vision of this plan was to transform the existing business and industrial area into an area with housing, offices, cafés and new productive activities. The plan suggests the area to have 'large transformation potential' following its location adjacent to the denser part of the city. It suggests space for about 2-3 000 dwelling units and up to 15 000 workplaces provided the transport situation is improved. This plan lacked detailed prescriptions, but outlined a general strategy for the area and certain activities for development of the public spaces as basis for further development related to roads infrastructure biking lanes, public squares, meeting places, green parks and multifunctional activities. The 2012 plan initiated increased interest among a set of local property owners, businesses/ creative businesses and developers, mobilized by Pådriv, in further dialogues and workshops about potential innovation and change in the area. The ambitions of developing Breivoll are reiterated in the municipal master plans for 2015 and again in 2023. The goal of Arena Breivoll was to accelerate public plans and interests and to accelerate small experimental investments to enhance further attention to the area. Hence, when Pådriv Oslo as a social incubator decided to investigate the possibilities for bringing together local and city-wide actors in an arena for discussing visions and plans for the area, it was able to attract many of the most important local actors to sign up as partakers. No cost-estimates or attempts to provide cost-sharing arrangements between public and private investments were attempted at first, however, voluntarily small contributions were encouraged and materialized following the funding support by the municipality. The Planning and Building Agency (PBE) run a parallel planning process with core regional transport agencies (Ruter – regional transport company and the state Railway authorities from 2017-2022) and the leadership of this process joined the process led by Pådriv in the Arena Breivoll to ensure interaction and sharing of information.

**Regionally**, interest in Breivoll emerged from 2015/16 and onwards, related to the area's status as a transport hub in the 2015 regional land-use and transport plan and the city's focus on Hovinbyen as a major development zone for Groruddalen in Oslo East. The regional transport agency, Ruter, also took part in meeting with the public authorities running a parallel planning process.

**National level interest** was largely in the form of major transport and infrastructure authorities e.g. state Railway authorities.

## **2) The aims of the project and the sustainability problems that it seeks to address**

**The central goal of Arena Breivoll** was to bring together local and city-wide actors, in an arena or platform, for discussing visions and plans for the area of Breivoll. A local aim for the work of Arena Breivoll was agreed between the main participants in the first meeting; to focus on **short-term value creation for nature and people that work, use or own Breivoll**. This focus would build upon the vision note prepared by Påldriv Oslo in the spring of 2021 which outlined a step-wise approach towards the 'station city Breivoll'. This would include exploring future mobility solutions, enhancing knowledge on what kind of production could be developed, as well as identifying concrete actions and instruments to attract developers to the area. In addition, there were ambitions to define how production could unfold within a residential area or micro-city, initiate pilot projects and create direction and outside attention to Breivoll, and, finally, identify more systemic solutions to transform Breivoll into a sustainable, productive community. The relevant SDGs referred to in the project approach involved SDG 11, 12 and 13 (to lesser degree SDG 14 and 15) reflecting both municipal and regional land-use and transport plans which focused on densification around transport hubs and station towns as main vehicles for furthering sustainable urbanization. There were stated ambitions by a variety of public and private stakeholders to safeguard biodiversity and green space in Breivoll and neighboring city district Alna in conjunction with a densification agenda that expects to transform a single-use industrial area into a dense, livable and attractive mixed-use residential area. However, the main focus of the discussions in the Arena meeting, more so than on green transition, was on creating a multifunctional and attractive productive town with local economic and circular economy potentials. Local actors had diverse views and opinions about the importance of focusing on green structures and sustainability. However, an early involvement of the city's Environmental Agency placed natural resources management and sustainability issues relatively firmly on the local agenda. According to informants in Påldriv, they preferred an attitude of listening to the partners and focus on doing something concrete and local for enhancing local sustainability and economic attractiveness.

The Arena Breivoll represented an **attempt to contextualize the broad sustainability ambitions within the city of Oslo** – (1) sustainable, multi-functional urban densification through a place-based approach, (2) mobility transformations with a strong focus on investments in public transport and multi-model planning, (3) multi-stakeholder platforms as catalysts for partnership-base approaches to sustainability – in a district in the city with unique histories and conditions. Arena Breivoll as a platform operated at the formative stages of a place-based transformation process.

The project applies a **platform approach** and seeks to engage public and private actors in joint efforts to explore and design sustainable urban pathways of an historically industrial area in the periphery of the city center of Oslo, signposted as a strategic densification location and transport hub for housing, services and business development in the next 20 – 30 years. Påldriv in collaboration with other public and private actors saw this platform approach as an important strategy attract enhanced interest by both local and city-wide interest in the area and possibly make a variety of businesses establish themselves in response to the contextual opportunities that Breivoll provided. These included the broad expectation that Breivoll would become a future local, municipal- and regional transport hub, as manifest in municipal and regional strategies.

This process began at a time when interests and capacities to act in Breivoll were dispersed across various actors, some of which worked and lived outside of this district. Hence, **a main problem** was to simply assemble and align fragmented actors for collaborative efforts. However, there remained considerable uncertainty and lack of clarity regarding how and when this would take place and if the public and state authorities were ready to provide required investment in the area in the short- to medium-term.

### **3) The participants and their interaction and communication in and between meetings**

The Arena Breivoll invited openly a set of participants including local property owners, developers, local businesses/tenants, creative businesses from outside of the area, civil society, public agencies (planning, environment, finance), transport agencies (regional and national) and politicians. Initially the work of the Arena was supported financially by a few large property owners and developers and local businesses.

**Core actors** were involved in process planning, knowledge sharing, strategy development & monitoring.

**Pådriv - process owner and intermediary actor.** Pådriv Oslo is to this end perceived as an instrument for sustainable city- and societal development and ideally provides an 'open access' infrastructure or platform for sustainable urban development. Pådriv operate as a mediator in this context. The infrastructure provided by Pådriv is available for relevant and concerned citizens, businesses, organizations and public agencies. Pådriv boasts specific competence in bringing together multiple actors for tackling complex public problems that require cross-cutting competence and collaboration. Pådriv, as an incubator or intermediary, constitutes in itself *and* creates a meeting arena for the co-creation of knowledge and problem solutions. Only some actors in Arena Breivoll are **members** of the Steering Committee while other actors are **invited** to the work within collaborative working groups or workshops and others again to join open workshops/seminar. However, a central principle of Arena Breivoll was that all participants in meetings, workshops and seminars participate on an equal footing.

#### **Main involved property owners/developers and co-financers in formative phase of Arena Breivoll:**

- a) Property developer company (Nielco AS)
- b) Local/large property owner and developer company (Løvenskiold Eiendom)
- c) Large national property owner company (Eiendomsspar AS)
- d) Developer and project managing company (Sohlberg og Toftenes)

#### **Private partners:**

- e) Sustainable wood enterprise (Trefokus AS)

#### **Knowledge and academic partners:**

- f) Oslo Metropolitan University
- g) University of Oslo (INCLUDE program)

**Other actors** that are mostly involved in open meetings and working groups, as well as seminars, events and bilateral meetings:

#### **City actors:**

- h) Oslo City council for finance and property
- i) City of Oslo Planning and Building Agency (PBE)
- j) City of Oslo Environment agency
- k) Ruter, the main public transport enterprise in Oslo city

l) City District Alna

**Private actors:**

- m) Fragment – architect firm
- n) A-Lab architecture studio
- o) Kroloftet – furniture enterprise
- p) Rodeløkkens Maskinverksted – machine workshops

**Civil society organizations:**

- q) Fretex – second-hand social enterprise in the city of Oslo
- r) Rethinking economics Norway – a professional association

**4) How often do they meet and do they communicate between meetings?**

Communication varied in intensity during Arena Breivoll. Between 2021 and 2022, workshops were integrated into the process design and accompanied open meetings and more focused working groups. In total, there were several types of meetings including open workshops (2), working groups (3-4 meetings) with 6-8 participants, steering group meetings, and more informal meetings in between the larger gatherings. For example, the aim of Arena Breivoll was jointly agreed in the first meeting of the partners and involved knowledge sharing to develop a joint vision for the area. This would include an agreed plan and small pilot projects with the aim to enhance public value and attention outside the area.

Open meetings included a spectrum of public and private actors, such as Oslo municipality, property developers and landowners in Breivoll, SMEs in the area and with an ambition to explore possibilities for collaborating in Breivoll. An example of this is a co-creation workshop organized in May 2022. Here 25 participants, formed as three thematic groups, ideated with possible project ideas in Breivoll. In addition to a working group on the productive micro-town and transport, one group looked into how to transform Breivoll's reputation or identity towards an attractive place to live and work. These open meetings led to working groups, designed to consolidate around the chosen thematic areas of interest, (1) the productive city ('Breivoll Fabrikker'), and (2) Breivoll as a mobility hub (Knutepunkt 2.0). Informants referred to informal face-to-face meetings between Pådriv employees and potential property owners/developers to ensure support, active engagement and funding. Finally, a steering group of a number of core triple-helix actors, operated in conjunction with Arena Breivoll. Their role was to coordinate possibilities, explore funding opportunities and to represent Arena Breivoll as a platform. There were also a set of informal meetings and contacts taken by Pådriv leadership with partners, in part based on personal acquaintances. This occurred both in the early phases of the process to mobilize key actors and during the process, in between meetings, especially as interest among some of the property owners started to fade. Attempts were made to maintain their interest.

**5) The role and forms of knowledge sharing, coordination and joint problem-solving**

The design approach of Arena Breivoll to local development was thus to develop local knowledge about the area and its attractiveness as a basis for a vision and a plan and project experimentations through co-investments. A stated approach was to move from a 'knowledge'- and 'talk-centric' approach to an 'action-centric' approach by solving concrete local problems and initiating concrete pilot projects. The hope was

that local production pilots could be co-created and create added value and thus spur social and political interests in Breivoll. This would in turn lead to enhanced public decisions about funding and development of Breivoll as a multi-functional transport hub or station town and catalyze sustainable transformation of the area.

The activities of Arena Breivoll involved the board and its members, as well as additional property owners and potential participants. This coalition of partners formed the main arena. Within this, individual change agents were important for maintaining enthusiasm for the process and creating commitment and trust. Most of the partners in Arena Breivoll were initially unknown to each other, and they needed time and effort to get to know and accept Pådriv and the process as legitimate. Hence, effort by Pådriv and the board was needed in face-to-face communications, creating commitment, and clarifying mutual expectations.

Many of those most enthusiastic were creative actors and consultants which were considered outside of core actor groups. They recognized potential in the design and operation of Breivoll Fabrikker. Beyond the board, actions were taken upwards towards public agencies at city and regional level, especially to engage large public transport actors, but with limited success. Hence, activities included both **knowledge creation** and mapping of opportunities at the micro-level related to the implementation of specific workshops, but also **policy-related lobbying** and engagement at meso-level. Attempts were made to involve local citizens and civil society but with limited success, due in part to very few citizens actually living in the area. The main knowledge co-producing processes involved the creation of a vision note and the preparation of two strategies by two separate working groups headed by hired consultants. Regarding the focus on sustainability and green transition of the area, Pådriv raised the issue and invited a broad set of actors also to engage with such a particular interest in the environment reflecting municipal plans and involvement of the city's Environment Agency. According to an interviewed planner, Arena Breivoll contributed to a discussion about sustainability and green transition. However, despite the property owners being interested in green space and related attractiveness of the area as a housing zone, they expressed limited interest in explicit investments in nature conservation or in biodiversity as an overarching concern related to protection of the riverine zone. No citizen groups were engaged to enhance these kinds of issues.

#### **6) The relation between consensus and conflict and the handling of the latter**

Conflicts between participants can potentially undermine collaboration and knowledge sharing and require mechanisms to be tackled. Despite asymmetries in resources and interests between the participants, there emerged no direct conflicts between participants in the Arena, according to interviewees. On the contrary, actors were according to the leadership interviews largely in agreement about the goals for sustainable urbanization. As one public employee insisted: 'local actors (including participants in the Arena and core public agencies) all agreed on the large narrative about making Breivoll into a productive and sustainable micro-city and collaboration was central to reach such a goal'. Moreover, both public and private respondents were largely positive of the role that Pådriv had with regards to process design and facilitation. All informants indicate that collaboration was good and joint agreements on main visions and goals for the area were not difficult to reach.

Although no direct conflicts did occur, there are indications that divergent interests existed with regards to how productivity and sustainability could be understood in Breivoll. These differences are not only held by actors but are also connected to broader, competing narratives about how sustainable urban development can be conceptualized and practiced in transformation areas such as Breivoll. In addition, it gradually became clear that as the Arena struggled to mobilize early transport investment or metro/rail station at Breivoll, which required substantive public investments, the interests among some of the most resourceful and early enthusiastic actors faded (according to both a public employee and other informants). Given the process focus of Arena Breivoll, it could also be argued that limited time and space existed for surfacing and working through tensions, as such deviations would introduce time and resource constraints into Arena Breivoll. One respondent referred to the process as 'light', involved mostly ad hoc knowledge creation through workshops/working groups and sharing that did not move into (co-)investments and implementation which might have enhanced interest conflicts.

#### **7) The role and form of leadership: lead actor, steering group and/or collective leadership**

**Leadership of the arena** and a **core driver** of the process to assemble and align fragmented actors seemed critical, since relevant or concerned actors were both public and private and at both local and city-wide/policy levels. Pådriv took a leading role from the start and maintained a core driving function that was critical for a dynamic process, according to both public and private actors. The **leadership structure** of Arena Breivoll was important to broaden the leadership and consisted of a Steering committee with Pådriv as the convening actor and leader of the secretariat. While the Steering committee remained the main coordinating body, day-to-day leadership was with Pådriv and a few close actors around the secretariat, including the workshop leaders, while a broader group of actors were invited to public workshops. In sum, the leadership model was basically one of a **lead actor model** with some elements of **core group leadership** – with important **collective inputs** through workshops. The main task of Pådriv as an arena leader and manager was to mobilize actors and ensure their assembly and alignment behind the Arena Breivoll vision. They therefore assumed a double role of 1) leading the process of creating and integrating shared knowledge across participants, and 2) building long-term collaborative problem-solving capacity and engagement in local development that extended beyond Arena Breivoll. While Pådriv according to all informants maintained a role as lead actor, including as convener and facilitator, Pådriv leadership clearly adopted an attitude of 'listening' to partakers and enhancing democratic leadership. This was also manifest in the dialogue the topics of the two working groups that were allocated the task of developing the core project ideas to be implemented; one about productive local industries, and one about sustainable transport development. This is also manifest in Pådriv's basic approach of open dialogue and that participants have an equal voice and footing during both idea-driven workshops and thematic working groups. Given the position of Breivoll as a strategic transformation district, Pådriv sought to embed the engagement of core public agencies at city, regional and national levels. Such commitment is at the core of Pådriv Oslo's mission and is visible in how they exercised their leadership role. Key employees of Pådriv express genuine commitment to work with core private and public actors and create an open forum guided by informality and the wish to enhance creative thinking among participants.

Additionally, regarding the relationship to municipal agencies, the work within Arena Breivoll was motivated by interaction with **an enthusiastic senior planner** in the Planning and Building Agency who also initiated a parallel collaborative process with core transport agencies to tease out their stance on making

Breivoll a substantive public transport hub and station town as stated in the long-term municipal plans. This planner also took active part in several workshops and meetings. Moreover, it was important for the local legitimacy of the process that the City Council for Finance and Ownership funding Pådriiv in the pilot phase to produce the vision note. It signaled to potential partners that there was interest at the level of the City Council to pursue a planning process. However, no additional public funding emerged in support of the process beyond the initial support for the vision note.

Finally, the management of the Arena was a challenging task for other reasons too. A main problem confronting the participants – stated also in the vision note prepared by Pådriiv - was to overcome prevailing narratives about whether the time was mature enough for the initiation of an accelerated development of Breivoll. A narrative existed among local property owners and developers that it was in fact premature to initiate local activities since core public planning agencies provided for initiation of detailed public plans and investments only well into the future, beyond 2030. The relatively passive role of municipal agencies in support of the Arena Breivoll processes, more as neutral albeit positive participants and less as committed gatekeepers, marked a double-burden that Pådriiv faced. The need to both assume the role of process designer, as well as initiative convenor and builder, at a time when planning horizons were still uncertain, undermined the ownership to the Breivoll processes from core strategic actors at key moments, both private and public. The commitment of leadership and partakers summarized above did not materialize in any advancement of public plans for the area or any new transport investment plans for a Breivoll 'station town'. These remained as long-term plans, however, in the municipal 2023 plans.

#### **8) The temporal unfolding of the co-creation process: major shifts and ups and downs**

The unfolding of the Arena Breivoll process can be divided into **three different phases**:

- a) *Formation phase – 2012 – 2021;*
- b) *Pilot process – 2021 – 2023*
- c) *Withdrawal and learning process 2022 - 2023*

*Formation process:* Despite success in convening more than 20 agencies behind the Arena Breivoll plans, the formation process, it turned out later, was not well enough anchored with core municipal agencies. According to a public planner, the core actors involved had diverse expectations about the outcomes of the process, while Pådriiv, at the time, had limited experiences in actually leading such complex urban planning processes. Despite the Agency for Property and Business in the municipality providing funding for the initial vision plan, a main challenge confronting the planning and implementation of pilots was that no public agencies, including the regional transport company, Ruter, and the state Railway Authority, had concrete plans in the short- or medium term for creating a metro or railway station to enhance Breivoll's value as a transport hub and as productive, multifunctional residential area. Several property owners and developers had expectations that such plans could be mobilized through the operation of the Arena Breivoll and Pådriiv's driving role. The public planning and services agencies perceived development in Breivoll as part of a gradual and sequential development from Oslo center via Hovinbyen and Økern - to subsequently reach peri-urban Breivoll beyond 2030 and beyond.

*Pilot process:* Even if confronted with these challenges, Pådriiv was in 2021 able to secure an agreement among the most relevant and resource-full local stakeholders behind the working groups to design the



potential pilot projects. However, since it became clear to core private actors that such plans and investments would not materialize in the foreseeable future, the pilot projects suggested by the working groups were not perceived interesting enough for some of the core property owners and developers to continue their engagement. Their interests faded and one after the other disengaged in late 2022 and in early 2023. Public investments in transport infrastructure were seen as a main obstacle to private investments and public-private engagement in developing the area.

*Withdrawal and dissolution process, including learning:* Hence, according to Pådriv leadership, the process faded due to lack of anchorage and funding from public agencies. Pådriv themselves may not, according to informants, have made the expectations clear enough to the participants. They would have required further commitment by the core private actors to co-fund the suggested pilot (local industry hub). Pådriv might also have miscalculated the time span required to establish such an arena; which would demand more than one year. Pådriv leadership suggests they did not have enough time or spend the resources required for the face-to-face interaction needed to create sufficient commitment to the cause. In fact, the informants suggest that some of the most active and committed were entrepreneurial outsiders to the area that saw potentials for local creative businesses; zealots that could translate goals, create trust and represent innovative business opportunities. They were never able to mobilize citizens, which remained a lost opportunity.

It was also held as unfortunate for the anchorage of the process that the local District council (Alna) never engaged and opted out from an invitation to be part of the Arena. They claimed to be preoccupied with regular and day-to-day social issues and services, with limited time to engage in an (uncertain) planning process.

Despite the seemingly unsuccessful platform formation process, the outcomes in terms of local knowledge creation about opportunities in Breivoll for development and learning among actors including both private businesses, public agencies (planning) and Pådriv are substantial (see below).

## **9) The most important governance factors**

Several governance factors might have contributed to both successes and failures:

- a) Contextual circumstances – were complex - both in terms of demography, geography and environment – and determined the scope for perceived importance of biosphere conditions - but also for the expectations among relevant and concerned and potentially affected actors
- b) Diverse framing of sustainability and urban, green transition
- c) The public governance was open to the co-creation Arena to play a role and happy about Pådriv engaging resourceful local actors. The involvement of municipal government was crucial both in terms of seed-money to get the Arena process going and providing legitimacy, but undermined the process since core agencies did not take great enough interest due to their different time horizons which resulted in limited immediate interest in co-funding transport infrastructure (station town at Breivoll)
- d) The Arena Breivoll was embedded in a nested set of plans for the Breivoll area within the municipal and regional multi-level planning system. Hence, co-creation unfolds in the Arena as an entangled tool closely linked – but not in sync with local government planning processes and agency.

- e) Blended finance and co-financing between resource rich local actors, both private and public agencies, would have been required to further the pilot projects
- f) Citizen involvement remained a lost opportunity, and since the platform was operated by non-municipal actors the formalized regulations for citizen participation did not come to use
- g) Pådriv was a competent translator of local circumstances into a collaborative agenda and process. It engaged in attempting to reconcile diverse interests and expectations among local private property owners and developers and public agencies into a common overall narrative albeit diverse interest finally led to core actors withdrawing from the process, more linked to circumstantial conditions than failure of the co-creation process itself. Participants were fairly open about interdependencies and diverse interests and problems of acting jointly upon common visions given the lack of government interest
- h) Experimental tools for innovative co-creation involved both the user-centered or stakeholder driven design process and knowledge creation and a focus on pilot projects
- i) Competence and capacity in co-creation among all actors could have been greater – none had full experience in leading or partaking in such complex multi-actor urban planning; trust in the process and potential outcomes eroded as private stakeholders realized the government would not fund transport infrastructure in the short or medium term
- j) Facilitative leadership by Pådriv was both critical for the mobilization/convening of actors and leading and driving the process – and creating a robust platform - albeit also with some limited experience in running such complex urban planning processes
- k) Learning and critical self-reflection is a core dimension of Pådriv's approach as a social incubator

*Context:* In hindsight, according to several informants, the contextual circumstances at Breivoll were maybe not fully mature for the kind of collaborative innovation process Pådriv tried to initiate through this platform approach.

*Diverse framing:* Diverse framing of sustainability among different actors exposed diverse focus on and expectations from potential investments in sustainability and green transition, but never undermined the process since no actual investments in local pilots materialized and made conflicts really surface

*Role of government:* It turned out that the municipality and relevant planning and environment agencies were critically important, first of all, to guide and provide legitimacy to local processes, but also as potential societal developers and funders of infrastructure. It was also the public agency, represented by the city's Environmental Agency and Planning Agency that ensured a focus on sustainability, which added to Pådriv's preoccupation with production and circular economy.

*Commitment to the process by participants – and scale:* As the number of key agents involved was limited, the collaborative process was also vulnerable to specific circumstances. For example, as the core change agent from the Public Planning and Building Agency became sick and stopped coming to meetings, the minimum momentum provided by the public administration faded. Moreover, as one of the key property owners and developers pulled out, others followed suit, and the process was finally terminated.

#### **10) The generated outputs and outcomes (Vision, working groups, indirect outcomes & learning outcomes across scales)**

As suggested by the scoring of the outcome variable in the survey reveals, the collaboration and co-creation processes managed by Pådriv/Leadership Committee of the Arena Breivoll spurred creative problem formulation (e.g. on a productive, sustainable micro town) and solutions and provided innovative pilots to further sustainable urbanizations, even if the Arena was finally dismantled and the pilots never materialized to provide sustainable outcomes on the ground.

Outputs were in the form of vision notes, a five-year plan for the area, working groups reports on pilot projects and two master theses which provided new and creative knowledge about the area and its potential as a productive micro-town. Outcomes relate to the interactional co-creation process and collective learning about place-based sustainability challenges and potentials of networking and collaboration for future sustainability (opportunities, constraints and challenges). There was also leadership and institutional learning among partners regarding the convening and facilitation of such processes, especially within Pådriv.

Regarding Pådriv's role and engagement it was greatly appreciated across participants and built upon previous work and emerging collaborative leadership capacities to run such processes. It provided a useful infrastructure and mode of operations for the Arena in the form of design and operational rules.

Despite the output from the working groups in the form of suggested pilots being observed as relevant for sustainable development, investments did not materialize since the 'energy' among potential investors was not there, given the reluctance of public planning and infrastructure investments.

But there were indirect and unforeseen outcomes related to e.g.:

- a) Cross-scale learning – critical self-reflection regarding capacities to facilitate soft transformation processes such as Arena Breivoll (according to an academic partaker)
- b) Facilitation of such process: Pådriv referred to deep learning about how to hold such spaces, as well as the relationship between co-creation and place-based conditions
- c) Internal change and growth within Pådriv – given that the process constituted formative stages in their own journey as an intermediary actor attempting to co-create platforms around sustainability – lessons they have brought into subsequent, similar initiatives in Oslo and beyond
- d) Pådriv informants also emphasize the process learning with regards to movement from open perspectives in the Arena to thematic working groups, to consolidated project ideas and the importance of the step-wise approach and interactions among participants through this process
- e) Learning also emerged about the challenges of aligning diverse interests and values as part of co-creation processes; including about power dynamics and asymmetries between interdependent yet divergent private interests, place-based interests and competing frames without full or solid commitment from all participants.

### **11) Lessons learned about the conditions for co-creating green solutions**

Despite the Arena Breivoll being discontinued after a year or so after its initiation, there are important lessons to be drawn regarding both conditions that enable co-creating green and sustainable urbanization, and constraints that may easily undermine such collaboration. The relative success of Arena Breivoll that brought both private and public stakeholders together to co-create innovative solutions and learning consists of a specific storyline and a set of mechanisms and tools.

The **storyline** is that the city of Oslo cannot resolve climate and green transition challenges across areas such as Breivoll without substantive collaboration and commitment from resourceful private and civic stakeholders. Moreover, the collaborative planning needs to comply with formalized plans and timelines to foster sufficient government commitment and finance. The important role of core property owners and developers as relevant and affected actors in sustainable urbanization is in this regard well-known across both public and private actors. However, the fact that Pådriiv as an intermediary decides to take an initiative to establish Arena Breivoll as a platform for concerned local stakeholders greatly enhance the opportunities and willingness of stakeholders to collaborate.

The main **mechanisms** for allowing actors to assemble and co-create solutions is the Arena combined with Pådriiv's role as facilitator, legitimized by seed money for their input, initially from the city, subsequently from a few of the core private business actors (property owners and developers).

The main **tools** utilized for convening and facilitating collaboration is a combination of leadership (by Pådriiv mainly), co-creation through thematic working groups, and learning. Since protection of green areas and sustainability transition is initially not a main concern of the private stakeholders, the insistence on overall city municipal goals as guiding the process and the (light) involvement of the City Environment Agency gradually enhance the focus on also green transition.

However, the various private and public interests concerned with Breivoll, despite being in large agreement about the overall goals and potentials of area and work of the Arena, were also manifest in competing frameworks and different perspective and stands on development and investment opportunities that were not fully surfaced and worked through (e.g. regarding potentials of small-scale pilots prior to large-scale transportation development or the relative importance of green structures and environmental sustainability for the attractiveness and climate adaptiveness of the area).

The involvement of public agencies, even if not extensive, was critical and contributed, both directly and indirectly, to enhance the climate and sustainability focus of the planning in the Arena. For example, the focus on environmental management, protection of green and blue structures (the river), and climate- and circularity issues is enhanced as a topic in Arena discussions mainly as the city Environment Agency is invited in by the Planning and Building Agency to be part of the parallel municipal-run planning process. However, even if the area is identified as a densification- and transport-hub in the Regional land use and 2015 transport plan, the focus on concrete SDGs is neither a main concern in the Arena discussions, nor a preoccupation among the local business actors. According to several of the interviewees, the local property owners are preoccupied with enhancement of property values and private profit from such value increases.

Regarding more specific points for learning about how to enhance opportunities and cope with constraints in spurring co-creation, we would highlight the following based on key informant interviews (with Pådriv and other stakeholders):

- a) The importance of the place-based context and opportunities to provide motives and opportunities for diverse stakeholders to engage in relation to wider city goals of enhancing green transition and sustainability
- b) Formalized metropolitan and strategic municipal plans and frames provided important enabling opportunities, but at times also disabled collaboration, due to their longer term planning and development perspective for the area
- c) Timing of co-creation initiatives in relation to overall formal public plans was critical
- d) Stakeholders are aware of interdependencies, but also come to the table with diverse views and interests and resources in terms of furthering green transition and sustainability. The clarification of dilemmas and interest differences demanded time and collective reflection. According to a public employee, Arena Breivoll did contribute new and innovative knowledge to the discussion of sustainability and green city development in the urban periphery
- e) The initiative by an intermediary incubator, such as Pådriv, can play a highly positive and constructive role in facilitating co-creation and develop innovative pilot projects across diverse stakeholders
- f) The clarification of roles and role expectations are critical in the early phases, especially since the local stakeholders were neither acquainted with Pådriv and the role it could play, nor with their own roles and relationships to other stakeholders within an Arena such as Breivoll. Time and effort were required in the start to create mutual commitment and trust in each other
- g) The role of local government across diverse agencies is critical for determining goals, collaborative contexts, purpose, funding, expectations and investment opportunities for public-private partnerships
- h) Leadership capacity and experience of managers and participants with collaborative platforms are central mechanisms and tools to make the process work, including also how working groups are led and operate
- i) Informal contacts and meetings between Pådriv leadership and core private stakeholders facilitated funding and engagement by a couple of the core private actors
- j) Collaboration requires time and efforts since the relevant stakeholders are unknown to each other and to working in a platform and need to accept Pådriv and clarify mutual expectations and resolve divergent views and interests
- k) Co-funding by government is central to providing legitimacy and enhancing interest among private actors
- l) Commitment by core private stakeholders to the co-creation process, both in terms of time, participation and funding is critical
- m) Lack of citizen involvement in the process was a concern throughout, without appropriate solutions found to enhance this. Lessons were drawn about how such participation could be improved in similar processes in the future

*Below we outline some of these lessons in more detail.*

**Clarifying expectations, roles and relationships and build trust:**

According to Pådriv informants (and others) the clarifications of expectations from such a collaborative process and the roles of diverse actors, including the role of Pådriv was important. More time might have been needed to clarify such roles and relationships within the co-creation processes and build commitment and trust. He says that everybody needs to understand Pådriv's role. There might have been too high expectations in the beginning, and when the city agencies did not sufficiently engage, the private investors pulled out of the process. Pådriv informants emphasize their critical role as a facilitator and a driver of the collaborative process, a 'neutral' broker, and that they should avoid pursuing their own themes or agendas.

**Critical role of formal public plans and framing in relation to place-based circumstances:**

Pådriv management suggest that a main lesson was that such as process needs to be firmly anchored with the local government and local resourceful actors and formal planning processes. Pådriv and the Arena engaged a variety of public agencies, especially the Planning Agency (PBE), Finance and the Environment Agency, in a variety of meetings. However, despite these agencies engaging in a parallel public process of discussing development of Breivoll, these public agencies were never well coordinated internally, nor did they provide any strong coordinated voice about Arena Breivoll or local development. They did not substantively engage with the Arena or the process. The local District Alna did not decide to join the discussions. These observations are shared both by a public planner involved in organizing this parallel process and by Pådriv informants. A lesson is thus that the municipality is not a monolithic institution and there are large cultural differences between the local Districts and between central entities and agencies in relation to the willingness to engage in co-creation and in processes run by Pådriv. Pådriv worked to some extent as a convening external agency to assemble internally fragmented public agencies, albeit they did not perceive Breivoll mature enough for public investments. In particular, Arena Breivoll worked with one internal zealot who assembled other public agencies in a planning process. Unfortunately, they fell sick in the course of the process, which constrained collaboration regarding this planning process. Change agents are important also within the municipality, while reliance on a few zealots make the process vulnerable to incidences of sick-leave or other reasons for shift of staff.

**Learning, critical self-reflection and capacity for management and drawing lessons from experience:**

Pådriv leadership admits there was much to learn in relation to Pådriv's own role, competence and ways of working. Moreover, several informants suggested there might have been limited experience among most of the partners, including Pådriv, in how to form and operate such an Arena to pursue a place-based collaborative transformation process. The formation and operation of such an arena as a multiparty platform was a relatively new and innovative exercise for which none of the partners had much experience at the time. For Pådriv itself the work with arena provided ample opportunities to test and learn about how such platforms could operate, what interactive tools for collaborative innovation could be utilized and what major governance factors could undermine the process. Pådriv initiated both an external and an internal self-reflection process as the process came to an end. As leaders of the process, Pådriv informants also stress the importance of teaching others in change- and interactional processes and work in a platform.

**Organize and rally around concrete ideas and pilot actions on the ground: from talk-centric to action-centric modes**

One informant suggests that it was important for the co-creation process to rally around concrete ideas and pilot projects i.e. to move from 'talk-centric' to 'action-centric' ways of collaborating. 'There is a difference between a good idea and a good project', said a Pådriv leader.

#### **Combine informality with formal organisation**

While informal contacts and networks helped gain initial commitment among core private business actors and was needed throughout the process, a Pådriv leader suggests that in retrospect the Steering Committee of the Arena could have been formalized more and thus provided a more legitimate structure for enhancing formal dialogues with public agencies and possibly enhance broader commitment to the process. Communication from leadership to concerned stakeholders and public agencies could have been enhanced.

#### **Citizen participation and engagement**

All informants suggest that involvement of local civil society and citizens was always weak and should have been strengthened to build broader commitment to sustainability transitions.

#### **12) Points of interest in subsequent studies**

Several lessons can be drawn and point to what focus further studies of what such collaborative platforms should cover. More attention should have been allocated to the robustness and sustainability of the Arena itself. The anchorage of the process to the place-based context was key. Co-financing was critical but did not materialize. The municipality as key actor did not set aside enough time and resources for Breivoll. Core public zealots fell sick and the interest among key private developers faded. Deeper and broader involvement and communication could have facilitated stronger and broader commitment and robustness of the process (Pådriv informant).

These topics relate to considerations in subsequent studies, such as; Context matters and needs to be mapped and understood (socio-economic, geographic, environmental boundaries). The boundaries of the arena and participants is important to map and adjust (who to include); clarification of expectations among concerned actors to be done early; the process of establishing agreements should be interactive and not just be about overall goals but also about the rules of the co-creation and how to proceed; the role of core rallying points for knowledge creation and concrete actions/pilots should be studied; the crucial role of government engagement for providing legitimacy, goals, plans and co-funding but also for placing green transition firmly on the agenda is critical to understand, including how government is key to enhance predictability for private sector investments; how to enhance learning and capacity enhancement (double/triple loop learning); timing and timescales are critical; interdependence and how to address dilemmas between diverse interests, narratives and powers - and raise sustainability and green transition issues – are key to facilitate co-creation.

## Scoring and analysis of governance factors

### 1. Perceived importance of biosphere conditions

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Interviews

Documents

Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Arena Breivoll focused on urban, productive development and mobility transitions, where sustainability was also an important concern. However, no explicit references to particular SDGs were made in Arena discussions during the project, according to key informants. Climate change was perceived as a background concern – albeit a motivator – which facilitated an innovative focus on circularity and circular economy issues. Despite general agreements about the development strategies for the area, the focus on and role perceived for investments in green transition (riverine and green structures) differed between the private property owners and developers and public agencies. According to informants, most of the private businesses did not place sustainability and green transition as an upfront concern for local development. They were preoccupied with enhancement of property values and business opportunities and private profit from value increases. Stakeholders held competing frameworks and stands on development and investment opportunities that were not fully surfaced and worked through (e.g. on the relative importance of green structures and environmental sustainability for the attractiveness and climate adaptiveness of the area). Consequently, Pådriv facilitated dialogue processes in this direction, i.e. towards how Breivoll could evolve into a productive, residential area with improved public transport. The enhanced focus on biosphere and green structure in part reflected Pådriv's own mandate and ambitions to pursue the city's climate goals within a broad approach to community sustainability. Pådriv ensured that issues surrounding sustainability and circular economy were brought into the first vision note for the area, and later as a concern within the working groups reports for area development.

Despite the central focus on urban transformation in Arena Breivoll, biosphere issues were explicitly motivated as part of local discourses by relevant municipal agencies (the Agency for Environment and Agency for Climate). As indicated by one informant; the "Involvement of the Environment Agency increased emphasis on biodiversity in area and the importance of biosphere conditions". The Regional land-use and transport plan also places high emphasis on Breivoll to become a densified and sustainable transport hub, according to the local planner. Moreover, a 5-year plan was created in collaboration with Pådriv in 2018, with ambitions to generate value for humans and nature, and to create value for a more productive Breivoll as part of holistic city development. It highlights the unique biodiversity and nature in the city, with particular emphasis on the neighbouring Alna district, Alna River, as well as historical trees in the city and natural paths. At the same time, the history of industry in Breivoll has led to lingering concerns regarding noise and air pollution. Both these framing documents exist as a background for collaboration within Arena Breivoll.



## **2. Legislation, programs, and formal goals**

### QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

### Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

### Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The regulative planning framework and formal goals and plans developed by the municipality for Breivoll area stand out as critical for the formation of Arena Breivoll and for providing motives for interested parties to join the Arena, according to several informants. Moreover, these formal plans encouraged local agenda setting and the direction of internal dialogues within the Arena. A concrete reference to an area-based plan (known as Områdeplan 2012 – 2013) is what initiated the first meeting in Pådriv about Breivoll in 2015 – and much later – the initiative to establish Arena Breivoll in 2021. The operations of the Arena and the problem solutions and outputs/outcomes from the Arena were strongly inspired by municipal plans over a 20-years period that define and regulate Breivoll’s social and geographic role as a multi-functional station town and position as a peripheral area in relation to a hierarchy of other larger and smaller transport hubs and centers. Breivoll has been identified as a core transport hub in the 2015 Regional land-use and transport plan and municipal master plans from 2008, 2015 and 2023, as well as in the 2012 municipal plan for development of public space and green structures for the area. The public policies and plans for Breivoll are in this regard both enabling and constraining for the strategic and operational functioning of the Arena. The fact that Breivoll had been pointed to as a transport hub motivated property owners and developers to join the Arena. Conversely, the fact that municipal agencies at the end of the day felt that time was not mature for accelerated development investments led to fading interest among the stakeholders. A decision had been made within Arena Breivoll to use temporality and contingency in order to make use of experimentation to enhance the area’s attractiveness through e.g. the idea of housing Breivoll Fabrikker that took inspiration from the successful Vollebekk Fabrikker in Hovinbyen. However, core stakeholders did not find this an attractive enough pilot to invest in.

## **3. Relative openness of public governance paradigms**

### QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

### Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

### Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The concerned local government agencies were positive, open and encouraging to the collaborative problem-solving taking part within Arena Breivoll and the role of Pådriv as intermediator. This reflected the position among public administrators that private property owners and developers hold a strong and accepted position for taking a lead role in local planning, investments and development within the

Norwegian planning system. Finally, citizens are also, according to the Planning Act supposed, to be consulted and involved in such local planning processes. Hence, collaborative platforms are encouraged and perceived as a useful complement to formal and bureaucratic urban planning and investments. However, despite the city government planning agencies of concern participating in a number of Arena Breivoll meetings, they did not engage proactively over time to enable required orchestration of the collaborative processes. Instead, the government ran a parallel process with powerful and important public environment/climate and transport agencies with ad hoc consultation with the Arena Breivoll process. The local City District Council did not volunteer to take part, since it was preoccupied with day-to-day service provisioning. Hence, although initial public funding for preparation of a Vision note by Pådriv was made available, and the content of municipal plans were supportive of the work in Arena Breivoll, the role of public plans and concerned agencies, especially due to the long time-horizon for starting transport investments in and around Breivoll, became more of a constraint on the work than facilitating.

**4. Formalized institutional channels for citizen participation and community mobilization**

<u>QCA score:</u>	<u>Scoring confidence:</u>	<u>Data sources:</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> Low confidence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interviews
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0.33	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium confidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Documents
<input type="checkbox"/> 0.66	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High confidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Observations
<input type="checkbox"/> 1		

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The Norwegian Planning Act and public planning traditions encourages a variety of channels for citizen participation and community mobilization. However, Arena Breivoll is a private actor-initiated organization, and did not engage in planning of the type that was regulated under the Planning Act. Hence, no formal rules or channels spurred citizen involvement. Moreover, as Breivoll remains relatively unpopulated with few civil society or community groups directly impacted or relevant for involvement, the proactive attempts by Pådriv to engage citizens did not materialize in any substantive citizen representation. Even if both formalized and informal channels were open to citizen involvement, actual citizen involvement remained insignificant throughout the process.

**5. Mechanism for ensuring top-down government and bottom-up social accountability**

<u>QCA score:</u>	<u>Scoring confidence:</u>	<u>Data sources:</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> Low confidence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interviews
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0.33	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium confidence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Documents
<input type="checkbox"/> 0.66	<input type="checkbox"/> High confidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Observations
<input type="checkbox"/> 1		

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Accountability mechanisms existed at two scales. **Top-down government mechanisms** were open and encouraging towards the bottom-up formation of Arena Breivoll. Leadership – as well as core partners – of the Arena adhered to institutional policies, plans and rules of the city government. Participants collectively agreed to build a common vision and develop the Arena based on accountability mechanisms that aligned with city plans and visions. Public administrators were invited to take part in the operation of the Arena on par with other stakeholders and were informed continuously about the process. The local District council was invited to join the Arena, but chose not to. In general, the accountability mechanisms among private and public agencies in such processes are both formal and informal. However, although present, the accountability mechanisms were not optimally utilized due to government administrators not proactively taking part.

The leadership of the Arena also ensured that **downward accountability mechanisms** interplayed with accountability mechanisms towards public authorities and the (minimum) financial and operational forms of support provided by public agencies (upward accountability). However, the leadership and operation of the Arena was quite ‘soft’ and based on voluntarism and informal interactions more so than on formal and strict rules for collaboration. The working groups reported back to the Arena but did so when the interest and active involvement among stakeholders was fading. There were no firm norms or rules established that ensured active participation of partners in meetings or reporting mechanisms enshrined in the Arena design, beyond the summary taken from meetings and plans produced for collective review and approval by working groups. However, the infrastructure and rules guiding the operation of Arena Breivoll gave all participants an equal voice and opportunity for influencing agenda setting and operations (sideway and upward accountability). There was however no firm bottom-up social accountability, since no citizen representatives took part in the work. In conclusion, Arena Breivoll was organized in ways that were compatible with public rules and programs, but the unique conditions of Breivoll (unpopulated industrial district, in combination with limited political engagement with public authorities) undermined its social accountability.

## **6. Strategic agenda-setting by means of translation**

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Interviews

Documents

Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Pådriv - through its role in the leadership of the Arena – expressed commitment to sustainability and enhanced the translation of climate and sustainability goals into the local discourses and products and pilot project designs arising from the work of the Arena. This approach found support in municipal plans and agencies active in the area. Pådriv’s climate and sustainability mandate helped bring in the focus on circularity and circular economy in discussions about a productive local community at Breivoll. Hence, within a broad framework of sustainable change, participants translated and shaped the agenda to fit

place-based opportunities for transformation. The vision note and working groups provided thematic translations of relevance and design of pre-pilot projects. Several informants stressed, however, that the focus of the Arena was always more on social and economic value creation, than on sustainability and green transition of the area. To this end, the agenda evolved in the direction that the participants wanted and where the energy for change evolved (i.e., according to logics of local appropriateness). Despite the SDGs explicitly shaping urban development in the city of Oslo, and being a concern to Pådriiv, the goals themselves were not referred to, or translated as part of Arena Breivoll.

### **7. Construction of narratives about successful multi-actor collaboration**

QCA score:

- 0  
 0.33  
 0.66  
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence  
 Medium confidence  
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews  
 Documents  
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The design process and operations of Arena Breivoll is largely about constructing narratives on how and why multi-actor collaboration is required to pursue sustainable, productive town development. The main collective narrative concerned the potential of co-creating experimental projects that can attract local and outside attention and pursue greater stakeholder interest in support of local development within a common five-year plan. There was limited previous experience within Pådriiv and the local actors about such collaborative projects at that time. Citizen involvement was attempted, but not successful.

### **8. Building or harnessing institutional platforms and arenas**

QCA score:

- 0  
 0.33  
 0.66  
 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence  
 Medium confidence  
 High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews  
 Documents  
 Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Arena Breivoll is in itself a **multi-stakeholder platform** that for over two years succeeded in mobilizing a variety of stakeholders together for collaboration and joint problem-solving and innovation. It was both an institutional and a physical organisation with a set structure of leadership and rules for its operation. Ad hoc arenas in the form of **working groups** were formed within the platform to create space for communication, knowledge sharing and joint action on sustainable, productive development. Formal meetings were held within neutral spaces and informal meetings and exchanges took place in-between formal events. Several documents provide background on Arena Breivoll and its operations.

### **9. Provision of access to blended financing**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Arena Breivoll benefitted from early blended financing in order to support collaboration in formative stages. Subsequently, both public and blending financing dwindled, undermining the collaboration. Pådriv obtained limited public funding to develop the vision note for the area, which helped build momentum for stakeholders in the Arena. Subsequent financing of the work was shared between multiple private business sources, based on agreed plans, with no additional public funding materializing. The private funding was only sufficient for a light two-year planning process. The limited access to blended finance and reluctance by the public agencies to engage, severely limited the stakeholders' interest in the work of the Arena. This undermined outputs and outcomes, which were more in the form of plans and learning than investments in experimental projects. The lack of blended funding and co-funding thus was a main hindrance to successful outcomes. Pådriv itself – as a social incubator – depends on funding from others to run such an arena and did not have own funds to contribute.

### **10. The capacity to leverage support from authorities to enable local collaboration**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Pådriv was continuously active in leveraging support from authorities to enable local collaboration, and believed that such support is essential in enabling operation of the arena. This is evident in 1) their ability to acquire public financing in the beginning of the project, 2) sustained engagement by Pådriv leadership to bring public authorities on board in the project, as well as 3) their continuous interest in connecting to ongoing developments in the area where authorities were involved. While regional and local public plans were supportive of the collaborative arena in the development of Breivoll area along the lines agreed, the concerned public agencies perceived investments to begin only around 2030. No concrete detailed plans were mature enough to encourage private investments at the point in time when Arena Breivoll was formed. A lesson drawn by Pådriv leadership is that the local government needs to be present and provide co-investments and administrative and professional input, not just provide a planning framework. The municipality needs to be an agenda provider and not a barrier. It is needed in different capacities to provide an enabling and predictable framework for attracting local investments. While some attempts were made by the Planning and Building Agency to bring together core transport and environmental

agency, there remained a lack of public investment plans to resolve transport issues in the short-term, thus undermining private investment interests.

An attempt was made, however, by a planner in the planning agency to run a parallel dialogue process with important public transport agencies to seek resolution to the transport issue, but without successful outcomes. This lack of success was in part because the public planner fell sick during the process.

### **11. Inclusion and empowerment of relevant and affected actors**

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Interviews

Documents

Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Arena Breivoll organized predominantly relevant and concerned private actors with important resources and knowledge, with some involvement of public actors. Each had the same voice in the Arena dialogues. Attempts were made by Pådriiv to include citizens and civil society organizations, according to several informants, but these efforts did not succeed. One interviewee suggested that this reflected the fairly 'soft' process of engaging actors and that the interested parties were mainly businesses located in the area. Several of the actors were large property owners and developers and thus fairly 'empowered' from the outset. Few citizens live in this industrial area and thus the number of potentially relevant concerned or adversely affected citizens remained limited. If concrete pilot projects had materialized, the involvement of citizens might have gradually become more relevant.

### **12. Clarification of interdependence vis-à-vis common problem and joint vision**

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Interviews

Documents

Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Local actors were clearly aware of mutual interdependencies and the need to collaborate to reach common goals. Such awareness was articulated between the private actors, as well as between private and public actors. At the same time, there were persistent and hard to resolve differences in interests, especially between the short-term development goals of private businesses partners in the Arena versus the longer-term plans of the public transport and planning agencies. Moreover, these differences were reflected by the tension between economically productive views of value (per sqm) among property owners/developers, and broader understandings of social value (creative, non-commoditized value) held

by e.g. Pårdriv and local government agencies. The leadership of the Arena, including Pårdriv, actively attempted to reduce differences and enable collaborative processes through joint visions, plans and pilot projects, which were developed through two thematic working groups encompassing partners with specific interests or competencies on one or the other topic. At the same time, these differences in interests and perspectives spilled over into the inability of Arena leadership to attract sufficient blended finance for pilot projects and promotion of the work. In retrospect, Pårdriv admits that more effort should have been put into clarification of differences, roles and expectations, being open about the possibility that public funding for transport infrastructure might not materialize.

**13. Trust-building and conflict mediation**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The Arena Breivoll was able to develop both institutional trust in the procedures of the project and interpersonal trust among the participants through the leadership of Pårdriv. No specific conflicts were engaged with actively, even if participants had diverse resources, powers and interests in local development. Participants did not initially know each other well and despite several meeting occasions, the rather ‘soft’ approach meant that this remained the case apart from the members of the leadership committee. Even so, informants suggest that the interactions in meetings were open and frank, and that they could provide opinions as they deemed relevant. Even so, as one of the core property owners/developers pulled out of the arena after a year or so, reflecting fading interests and perceptions that full expectations from the project would not be obtained, Pårdriv had to engage in extra efforts to convince actors to remain active. Several informants indicate how the interest of other core actors also gradually started to fade, not due to lack of trust as such, but due to a realization that the original expectations of government investments in the transport hub and local development would not materialize. Despite Pårdriv’s convening power, it turned out that it did not have capacity to deal with these tensions and maintain enthusiasm for the pilot projects and the Arena. These tensions were not between the private partners of the Arena, but mainly between the goals of the Arena and a variety of public agencies regarding what priority should be provided to Breivoll at that point in time.

**14. Use of experimental tools for innovation**

QCA score:

- 0
- 0.33
- 0.66
- 1

Scoring confidence:

- Low confidence
- Medium confidence
- High confidence

Data sources:

- Interviews
- Documents
- Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

The Arena Breivoll was in itself an innovative tool with a 'user-centred design' created largely by Pådriv as a social incubator to access the knowledge and resources of participants in collaborative problem-solving processes. Moreover, a thematic focus on place-based sustainability and circular economy was novel, according to several informants. Informants pointed to how collaborative problem-solving rallied around vision creation, participatory workshops, creative working groups and the design of pilot projects for learning and local image building of the area.

**15. Ongoing critical self-reflection and learning (i.e., process and/or developmental evaluation):**

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Interviews

Documents

Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

On-going learning and critical-self-reflection were substantive dimensions of Pådriv's modus operandum. According to key informants, Arena Breivoll was one of the first platforms of this sort Pådriv took the initiative to create, at a time when the organization was in a start-up phase. Pådriv was also not well known or had fully developed its reputation for being a professional incubator with local public agencies or the private business actors. Hence, Pådriv had to earn its credibility for managing the Arena with a variety of actors as the project evolved. While learning within the Arena was focused mainly on how to create mutual commitment and interact on specific topics and take these topics forward, for Pådriv it became important to engage in continuous in-house evaluation and learning to stay on top of the evolving agenda. According to key informants, one of the main outcomes of the Breivoll process is learning and capacity building within Pådriv. Pådriv organized internal meetings to evaluate and learn from the project. Despite the absence of a formal project evaluation, the internal developmental and process evaluations led to crucial learning for Pådriv. The lessons learned have subsequently been utilized in redesign and operations of similar platforms in other place-based contexts in Norwegian cities.

**16. Exercise of facilitative leadership:**

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Interviews

Documents

Observations



Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this governance factor:

Facilitative leadership by Pådriiv was crucial for initiating and designing the Arena and convening relevant actors. Despite the formation of a leadership committee, Pådriiv assumed a leader role and facilitated the collaboration and creative planning towards the pilot project designs. Leadership was exercised in support of a collaborative problem-solving and process development. Clear rules of the game were produced and exercised and agreed upon by all partners (e.g. open access arena and one vote for each participant). The Arena was not self-organizing. A public employee suggests that the Arena provided innovative thinking and proposals for a type of productive industries; a house with pop up entrepreneurs and creative firms that would encourage a local circular economy. From the public side, the leadership role of Pådriiv, and the processes involved, was perceived as very positive, although concrete results on the ground did not materialize in terms of pilot project implementation.

In retrospect, Pådriiv reflected upon the competences required in fully understanding the challenges that confronted the Arena and how diverse perspectives from key stakeholders would challenge the co-creation process. The leadership of the arena might have underestimated the contextual challenges and the limited interest by private actors in the absence of public support for development. Pådriiv at the time was rapidly learning how to facilitate such projects given their immaturity, and participants lacked experience in actively collaborating in such platforms.

One informant also reflected on Pådriiv's double role in the Arena and the process, and how this required tactful leadership. Pådriiv was both a manager of the Arena, but also as a driver of the co-creation processes. Pådriiv to this end was not perceived as a passive actor, although its leadership attempted to make available an 'open' and 'neutral' space for deliberations. An outside informant suggests that Pådriiv should reflect more on how best to manage its own double role as legitimizer and designer of such an Arena and as leader and driver of the operations.

In summary, the difficulty in achieving successful outcomes in Arena Breivoll may be more attributable to the contextual conditions of Breivoll as a transformation district than to any lack of facilitative leadership. These conditions – involving the long time-horizons, unclear planning trajectories, limited public involvement, fading interest of private actors, diverse urban discourses – undermined process leadership with Arena Breivoll over time.

### **Outcome variable: Successfully co-created green transitions**

The outcome variable 'co-created green transitions' are scored in two parts related to the results of a survey. The survey was administered to 21 people and received 11 replies, thus producing a response rate of 52%. First, 'co-creation' is scored based on an assessment of whether the participants in the initiative, project or process engaged in collaborative problem solving that fostered creative ideas and innovative solutions'. Next, 'green transitions' is scored based on an assessment of whether the project and process have fulfilled or is expected to fulfill its green goals, ambitions and aspirations. Data consists of survey data combined with interviews and internal and/or external evaluation reports, including scientific publications.

*The scoring of this variable is done in two parts:*

- 1. Is the developed solution based on collaborative problem-solving spurring creativity and innovative solutions?*
- 2. Does the developed solution engender a green transition?*

*This scoring should be conducted based on both the survey and complementary green outcome evaluations. Please consult Sections 4.4 and 6.10 in the Research Protocol for more details.*

**Note:** Since outputs and outcomes from the Arena Breivoll project are more in terms of creative ideas, plans and learning about ‘sustainable urban transition’ than concrete pilot investments to further ‘green transition’ on the ground, respondents may have slightly different answers to the survey questions related to ‘successful co-created green transitions’. The fact that Arena Breivoll was discontinued after less than two years may also imply that respondents underestimate the relative success of the co-created project results. Hence, the survey results should be interpreted with some caution.

**1. Is the developed solution co-created?**

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Survey

Interviews

Documents

Observations

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this part of the governance factor, including the data sources used for the scoring.

A series of survey questions focus on the presence of collaborative problem-solving (1), the fostering of creative and innovative solutions (2-6), the support for process, outcomes and the level of engagement (7-12), and the attainment of goals that are robust and serve to enhance sustainability (13-15).

An overall assessment of the answers to the 15 questions presented in the table above, suggests that answers are mostly on the positive side i.e. respondents are either fairly neutral (neither agree/disagree) or agree that the project (Arena Breivoll) and process engaged in collaborative problem solving that fostered creative ideas and innovative solutions.

The distribution of answers to the **first question** indicates a strong agreement that different ideas and forms of knowledge have been mobilized to develop new perspectives. 82% either strongly agree or agree with this. Hence, Arena Breivoll was clearly a case of collaborative problem solving.

The answers to questions 2-6 suggest that the Arena produces creative and innovative solutions, in particular 72% agree or strongly agree that the co-created solutions offer new ideas to address the green transition problem (probably understood by respondents as something like ‘sustainable urban transition’). Moreover, a majority also agree slightly to strongly that the collaborative problem-solving process has led to different ideas/experiences and knowledge have been mobilized to search for unconventional solutions (73%), that solutions go beyond standard/text-book solutions (64%), that co-created solutions break with established practices (82%) and disrupts conventional wisdom (64%).

The responses to questions 7-10 reveal that there is strong support for the collaborative process and outcomes of the Arena Breivoll. 72% agree or strongly support the co-created solutions (question 12) and 83% suggest the multi-actor collaboration was a prerequisite for the success (question 9) and that actors which were involved were engaged (72%, question 12). There is however less satisfaction with the overall content and results of the collaborative process and that the project resulted in innovative solutions (circa

80% state they slightly agree or neither agree/disagree to these questions 8 and 10-11), something that likely reflects the fact that several participants gradually pulled out and results on the ground were limited.

Regarding questions 13-15, a majority of the respondents are either neutral or agree/agree slightly that the co-created solutions meet the project goals (91%) and that the solutions are durable or robust in the long term (82%). The group that is neutral is, however, by far the largest in both instances (45%), indicating that respondents are uncertain and refer to the fact that the co-created process and Arena Breivoll was terminated before it reached its full potential.

If possible, please insert your survey responses in the table below (in % for each response), including the mean/average % for each survey item.

n = 11	Strong. dis.	Dis.	Slight. dis.	Neither agr/dis	Slight. agree	Agree	Strong. agree	Mean score
	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
1. Problem-solving mobilized different experiences, and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge to develop new perspectives	-	-	-	9 %	9 %	27 %	45 %	2,27
2. Through the collaborative problem-solving process, different experiences and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge have been mobilized to search for unconventional solutions	-	-	-	27 %	18 %	36 %	18 %	1,45
3. The collaborative problem-solving process mobilized different experiences, and/or ideas and/or forms of knowledge to search for solutions that go beyond standard/text-book solutions	-	-	9 %	27 %		36 %	27 %	1,45
4. The co-created solution breaks with established practices	-	-	-	18 %	45 %	18 %	18 %	1,36
5. The co-created solution disrupts conventional wisdom	-	-	9 %	27 %	27 %	27 %	9 %	1,00
6. The co-created solution offers new ideas to address the green transition problem	-	-	-	-	27 %	45 %	27 %	2,00

7. I'm supportive of the co-created solution			9 %	18 %		36 %	36 %	1,73
8. I'm content with the overall collaborative process of the project	-	-	-	45 %		36 %	18 %	1,27
9. I feel the multi-actor collaboration process was a prerequisite for the success of the project	-	-	-	-	18 %	55 %	27 %	2,09
10. I'm satisfied by the results of the co-creation effort in terms of expected impact on the welfare of the community	-	-	-	55 %	27 %	18 %		0,64
11. The collaborative interaction in the project has led to an innovative solution	-	-	-	36 %	45 %		18 %	0,82
12. The actors involved in the project are engaged in collaborative interaction that stimulated creative problem-solving	-	-	-	18 %	9 %	45 %	27 %	1,82
13. The co-created solution meets the proposed goals of the project	-	-	9 %	45 %	9 %	36 %		0,73
14. The co-created solution will be durable and robust in the long run	-	-	18 %	45 %	36 %			0,18
15. The co-created solution is expected to significantly improve sustainability for the whole community	-	-	-	45 %	27 %	18 %	9 %	0,91

## **2. Does the developed solution engender a green transition<sup>1</sup>?**

QCA score:

0

0.33

0.66

1

Scoring confidence:

Low confidence

Medium confidence

High confidence

Data sources:

Survey

Interviews

Documents

Observations

<sup>1</sup> By "green transitions", we mean objectives and aspirations that correspond to at least one of the Green SDGs (SDG 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). In our case, the project does not have to refer explicitly to these green SDGs, but to the green and sustainability transition objectives of Arena Breivoll.

Please elaborate on the reasoning behind your scoring for this part of the governance factor, including the data sources used for the scoring:

A series of **survey questions** focus on whether the project has produced or is expected to produce a green or sustainable transition aiming to avoid a worsening of the status quo, maintain the status quo or improve the status quo.

The answers below show that 91% of the respondents think the Arena Breivoll has not produced any *green solution*, reflecting that the project was discontinued and the results were more in the form of new ideas, visions and plans and learning processes, not results or solutions on the ground. However, 91% respond that the project is expected to produce green transition solutions aiming to improve the status quo. Moreover, all the respondents suggest that the project does not only aim to avoid worsening or maintaining status quo but actually improving the local situation.

If possible, please insert your survey responses in the table below (in % for each response).

1. The project:	Yes	No	Don't know
...did not produce any green transition solution	91 % (n = 10)	9% (n = 1)	-
...has produced or is expected to produce a green transition solution aiming to avoid a worsening in the status quo	0% (n = 0)	100% (n = 11)	
...has produced or is expected to produce a green transition solution aiming to maintain the status quo	0% (n = 0)	100% (n=11)	-
...has produced or is expected to produce a green transition solution aiming to improve the status quo	91% (10/11)	9% (n = 1)	-

n = 11

**Please list all the informants you have interviewed for the case study (list project role + interview date):**

We interviewed 5 people in connection with the study of Arena Breivoll, two Pådriiv leaders, one private business actor in the Arena leadership, one public planner and one academic participant. Given the limitation of the case in time and scale, we found that the number of interviews, albeit small, provided a fairly saturated empirical data set. All interviews were conducted in Norwegian. 11 persons answered the survey. All interviews were conducted between 1<sup>st</sup> Nov and 7<sup>th</sup> December 2023.

**List of informants:**  
The informants are displayed anonymously, but we have a full list of names.

**Please list all the observations you have made (type of meeting/workshop/etc. + observation date):**

13<sup>th</sup> January, 2023, core researcher took part in a leadership arena meeting discussing the outcomes from the two working groups. Interviews were in person and conducted via teams.

**Note:** In addition to the survey data, we have a **set of documents** and more informal dialogues with Pådriv employees that support our scoring of the outcome variable. These documents are listed below and are mostly in Norwegian. Some of them have been referred to in the text above. They may be translated through google translate or similar methods.

<a href="#">Pådriv Arena Breivoll homepage</a>	<a href="#">Webpage</a>	<a href="#">Pådriv Oslo: Arena for produktiv boligby på Breivoll (paadriv.no)</a>  Oppsummering 31.05.22 Breivoll (åpent tilgjengelig) - Google Dokumenter	Pådriv	2022
<a href="#">Hovinbyen - hvordan kan den bli sosialt inkluderende?</a>	<a href="#">Research project webpage</a>	<a href="#">Hovinbyen - hvordan kan den bli sosialt inkluderende? - INCLUDE – Forskningscenter for sosialt inkluderende energiomstilling (uio.no)</a>	INCLUDE/UIO	2020
Vår by, vår framtid: Kommuneplan for Oslo 2018. Samfunnsdel med Byutviklingsstrategi. Visjon, mål og strategier mot 2040.	<a href="#">Planning document</a>	<a href="#">Visjon, mål og strategier mot 2040. Link here</a>	<a href="#">Oslo Kommune</a>	<a href="#">2018</a>
<a href="#">Klimatiltak i Norge mot 2030: Oppdatert kunnskapsgrunnlag om utslippsreduksjonspotensial, barrierer og mulige virkemidler.</a>	<a href="#">Kunnskapsgrunnlag dokument</a>	<a href="#">Klimatiltak i Norge mot 2030: Oppdatert kunnskapsgrunnlag om utslippsreduksjonspotensial, barrierer og mulige virkemidler - 2023 - Miljødirektoratet (miljodirektoratet.no)</a>	<a href="#">Miljødirektoratet</a>	<a href="#">2023</a>
<a href="#">Stedsutvikling på Breivoll: Erfaringer fra intervensjoner på tvers av institusjoner, sektorer og generasjoner</a>	<a href="#">Research Project blog</a>	<a href="#">Stedsutvikling på Breivoll - Include – Forskningscenter for sosialt inkluderende energiomstilling (uio.no)</a>	<a href="#">INCLUDE Project, University of Oslo</a>	<a href="#">Unclear</a>

**Please note the response rate for the survey/measurement of outcome variable:**

The survey was administered to 21 people and received 11 replies, thus producing a response rate of 52%.